

2 SUMMARY

2.1 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

2.1.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The Tahoe Vista Partners, LLC Affordable Housing and Interval Ownership Development Project site is located within the unincorporated portion of Placer County, California. The project site is located in Plan Area Statement (PAS) 022, Tahoe Vista Commercial, and is entirely within the Tahoe Vista Community Plan (TVCP) boundaries. The TVCP identifies the front portion of the site as Special Area #2 (Commercial Core), while the back portion of the site is designated Special Area #1 (Tourist Area). Regional access to the site is provided by State Route (SR 28). The approximately 6.25-acre project site is located at 6873 North Lake Tahoe Boulevard (SR 28), approximately 250 feet north of Lake Tahoe and about one mile west of the intersection of SR 28 and SR 267. The site is largely unpaved and contains Sandy Beach Campground (a campground and recreational vehicle [RV] park), an approximately 7,300-square foot (sf) main 2-story commercial building fronting SR 28, and several other smaller buildings. The site includes 174,324 sf of impervious surfaces (including 109,708 sf of compacted dirt), which results in approximately 64% site coverage. The Placer County Assessors Parcel Number (APN) for the project site is 117-071-029. Land uses surrounding the project site include residential uses to the west; vacant land to the north, which is also the location of the proposed Vista Village Workforce Housing Project; residential uses, a nursery, and other commercial uses to the east; and Sandy Beach Public Recreation Area, a small 200-foot beach maintained by the North Tahoe Public Utility District (NTPUD), just south of the site and across SR 28.

2.1.2 SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT (ALTERNATIVE A)

Tahoe Vista Partners, LLC has submitted applications to TRPA and Placer County for the land use approvals necessary to develop the proposed Tahoe Vista Partners, LLC Affordable Housing and Interval Ownership Development Project. The purpose of the project is to enhance the local economy by replacing the existing seasonal Sandy Beach Campground Development with a year-round source of destination tourists, provide affordable housing to the north Lake Tahoe area, and install permanent best management practices at the site.

The proposed project (also known as Alternative A) includes the removal of the Sandy Beach Campground and the construction of 45 interval ownership tourist accommodation units (TAUs), a clubhouse/administration building, 10 deed-restricted affordable/employee (for sale or lease) housing units, improvements to the existing main 2-story commercial building, and SR 28 frontage improvements. The for sale affordable/employee housing units would provide for very low (income not in excess of 50% of the County's median income), low (income between 51% and 80% of the County's median income) and moderate income (income between 81% and 120% of the County's median income) households in a manner consistent with Placer County and TRPA regulatory requirements. The need for affordable housing in the north Lake Tahoe area and throughout the greater Lake Tahoe Basin has been acknowledged by both TRPA and Placer County. Units not sold immediately would be available for lease. Each of the units would be deed-restricted to ensure that tenant incomes and monthly costs are adjusted based on the County's median income requirements – the deed restrictions would limit future sales or leases to buyers that meet the same affordable requirements. Preference would be given to the sale versus leasing of these homes.

The project site would be subdivided into three parcels. The project applicant would retain control of each of the parcels, but the proposed subdivision would allow the separate uses to operate under individualized covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs). Parcel 1 would include the 10 affordable/employee housing units; Parcel 2 would include the 45 fractional ownership TAUs and the clubhouse/administration building; and Parcel 3 would include the improvements to the main 2-story commercial building and SR 28 frontage improvements. An

easement in the northern part of the site would be granted to the NTPUD (or jointly to several agencies including the NTPUD) for a future multiple use (including bicycles) public trail consistent with the TVCP and NTPUD's plans for a trail alignment within the vicinity of the project site. With the exception of the "Manager's Cabin," seven ancillary buildings near the main 2-story commercial building as well as the campground restroom facility and RV dump station would be demolished and removed from the site. The "Manager's Cabin" would be advertised for sale and relocation for a 2-week period to the public and agencies. If there is a lack of interest in its acquisition and removal, the "Manager's Cabin" would also be demolished.

Alternative A would result in approximately 3.88 acres (169,061 sf) of impervious surfaces. This would result in 62% site coverage, which would be a reduction of approximately 5,263 sf of site coverage in comparison to the TRPA-verified coverage for the site. This land coverage reduction would be banked by TRPA. Project construction would likely start as early as May 1, 2008 with complete occupancy of the buildings occurring as early as July 2011. Alternative A is described in detail in Chapter 3, "Project Description."

2.1.3 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

This EA/EIR addresses three alternatives in addition to the proposed project, Alternative A, which is summarized above. Alternatives B, C and D are summarized below and are described in detail in Chapter 4, "Alternatives."

Alternative B considers the Reduced Development Alternative. Alternative B would be similar to Alternative A and located on the same site; however, Alternative B would have a different site plan and would reduce the number of TAUs to 39, which is six TAUs (or about 13%) fewer than Alternative A. In addition, there would be 10 fewer parking spaces and the four decked spas proposed under Alternative A would be eliminated. These changes would reduce the number of occupants, the units per acre, and the amount of site coverage. The total site coverage would be approximately 3.75 acres (163,459 sf), or 60% total site coverage, approximately 2% less coverage than Alternative A.

Alternative C considers the Reduced Development with Recreation Elements Alternative, which would be substantially similar to Alternative B. Alternative C would be located on the same site and would result in a total of 39 TAUs, which is 6 TAUs (or about 13%) fewer than Alternative A. As with Alternative B, Alternative C would have 10 fewer parking spaces and the four decked spas proposed under Alternative A would be eliminated. This would reduce the number of occupants, the units per acre, and the amount of site coverage. The Reduced Development with Recreation Elements Alternative would result in approximately 3.75 acres (163,459 sf) of coverage, resulting in 61% total site coverage (see Table 4-2), approximately 1% less coverage than Alternative A. The primary distinction between Alternatives B and C is the recreation elements that have been incorporated into Alternative C. These include a kayak/bicycle rental concessionaire's addition to the main 2-story commercial building, a public pedestrian path connection to the multiple use public trail easement, bicycle racks, and shared day use parking for the Sandy Beach Recreation Area in the main 2-story commercial building parking lot.

Alternative D is the No Project Alternative, which considers a scenario in which none of the project components would be implemented. The project site would remain a partially developed campground and RV park, with a main 2-story commercial building and small ancillary buildings fronting SR 28, as it is today.

2.2 KEY ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

This EA/EIR identifies and addresses the following key environmental issues that are known to the lead agencies or were raised by agencies or interested parties during the public and agency review period associated with the Notice of Preparation (NOP):

- ▶ The proposed project would change the use of the site from a campground/RV park (Sandy Beach Campground) into an interval ownership and affordable housing development, which could affect TRPA's recreational threshold carrying capacity. The loss of the campground/RV park and associated recreational capacity may also be inconsistent with the objectives of the Recreation Element of the Tahoe Vista Community Plan. While there are several nearby public campgrounds, there are few privately-owned facilities similar in character to the Sandy Beach Campground.
- ▶ The proposed project would result in impervious surfaces on a partially developed site, and would increase and/or alter runoff from the project site to downgradient areas during storm events. The proposed project could increase sediment, contaminant, and nutrient concentrations in Lake Tahoe.
- ▶ The proposed project would regrade the majority of the project site and result in substantial tree removal. Substantial tree removal may result in habitat loss, especially when considered in combination with other large development projects planned near the project site.
- ▶ The proposed project would generate additional trips on SR 28 and increase the amount of traffic on local roadways.
- ▶ The proposed project would result in an increased demand for public services and utilities.

2.3 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

A variety of issues were raised during the public scoping period for the EA/EIR in spring 2006. These issues are summarized below:

- ▶ Trees play an important role in stabilizing the land and preventing it from eroding into Lake Tahoe. The proposed project should limit tree removal, and consider impacts to Lake Tahoe water quality.
- ▶ The proposed project would result in site grading, drainage, and traffic cumulative impacts. Appropriate mitigation measures should be taken to address these cumulative impacts.
- ▶ The proposed project would result in the elimination of the Sandy Beach Campground and associated RV dump station. This would reduce campground capacity and public access to Lake Tahoe in the north Lake Tahoe area.

2.4 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the elimination of overnight camping facilities and outdoor recreation concessions in Special Areas #1 and #2 of the TVCP. To mitigate this impact, the project applicant shall mitigate for the loss of 27 camping/RV sites. Prior to approval, mitigation for the loss of 27 camping/RV sites in the form of a mitigation fee must be approved by the Placer County Planning Commission and the TRPA Governing Board.

2.5 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

2.5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND PROPOSED AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

Chapters 6 through 18 of this EA/EIR describe in detail the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project and project alternatives. Impacts of the project are classified as: (1) no impact (actions that result in no adverse effects); (2) beneficial impact (actions that result in favorable effects); (3)

less than significant (adverse effects that are not substantial); (4) significant (substantial or potentially substantial adverse changes in the environment, for which mitigation measures must be recommended, if feasible); and (5) significant and unavoidable (substantial or potentially substantial adverse changes in the environment that cannot be feasibly reduced with mitigation measures to a less-than-significant level).

Chapters 6 through 18 of this EA/EIR describe in detail the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of Alternatives A through D. Table 2-1 summarizes these impacts and associated mitigation measures. The summary table is arranged in four columns: environmental impacts; level of significance before mitigation; mitigation measures; and level of significance after mitigation. In addition, Table 2-2 presents a comparison of the environmental impacts of the four alternatives after mitigation.

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
6 Land Use			
6.A-1 Consistency with Regional Plan Land Use Goals and Policies and TVCP Policies. Alternative A, the proposed project, would result in 45 TAUs, 10 affordable/employee housing units, and commercial space, which would be consistent with the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan and the applicable policies of the TVCP as described in Table 6-1.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
6.A-2 Potential for Conversion of Land Use. Alternative A would remove the existing private campground and RV park and would construct 45 TAUs, a clubhouse/administration building, 10 affordable/employee housing units, improvements to the existing main 2-story commercial building, and SR 28 frontage improvements. Although the site would change from a developed campground to TAUs and affordable/employee housing, the land use would remain consistent with the TVCP tourist area and commercial core designations.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
6.A-3 Potential for Division of an Existing Community (or Land Use Compatibility and Density). Alternative A would not divide an established community because the project's proposed affordable/employee housing units, TAUs, and commercial land uses would be similar to those existing in the surrounding area and Alternative A would include features that would serve to connect the project site with the surrounding community.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
6.B-1 Consistency with Regional Plan Land Use Goals and Policies and TVCP Policies. Because Alternative B would be located on the same site as Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 6.A-1 described above for Alternative A. Alternative B would result in a lower density development than Alternative A, with 39 TAUs, 10 affordable/employee housing units, and commercial space,	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
which would be consistent with the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan and the applicable policies of the TVCP as described in Table 6-1.			
6.B-2 Potential for Conversion of Land Use. Because Alternative B would be located on the same site as Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 6.A-2 described above for Alternative A. Alternative B would remove the existing private campground and RV park and would construct 39 TAUs, a clubhouse/administration building, 10 affordable/employee housing units, improvements to the existing main 2-story commercial building, and SR 28 frontage improvements. Although the site would change from a developed campground to TAUs and affordable/employee housing, the land use would remain consistent with the TVCP tourist area and commercial core designations.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
6.B-3 Potential for Division of an Existing Community (or Land Use Compatibility and Density). Because Alternative B would be located on the same site as Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 6.A-3 described above for Alternative A. Alternative B would not divide an established community because Alternative B's affordable/employee housing units, TAUs, and commercial land uses would be similar to those existing in the surrounding area and Alternative B would include features that would serve to connect the project site with the surrounding community.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
6.C-1 Consistency with Regional Plan Land Use Goals and Policies and TVCP Policies. Because Alternative C would be located on the same site as Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 6.A-1 described above for Alternative A. Alternative C would result in a lower density development than Alternative A, with 39 TAUs, 10 affordable/employee housing units, and commercial space,	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
while increasing recreational amenities, which would be consistent with the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan and the applicable policies of the TVCP as described in Table 6-1.			
6.C-2 Potential for Conversion of Land Use. Because Alternative C would be located on the same site as Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 6.A-2 described above for Alternative A. Alternative C would remove the existing private campground and RV park and would construct 39 TAUs, a clubhouse/administration building, 10 affordable/employee housing units, improvements to the existing main 2-story commercial building, SR 28 frontage improvements, and recreational amenities. Although the site would change from a developed campground to TAUs and affordable/employee housing, the land use would remain consistent with the TVCP tourist area and commercial core designations.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
6.C-3 Potential for Division of an Existing Community (or Land Use Compatibility and Density). Because Alternative C would be located on the same site as Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 6.A-3 described above for Alternative A. Alternative C would not divide an established community because Alternative C's affordable/employee housing units, TAUs, commercial land uses, and recreational amenities would be similar to those existing in the surrounding area and Alternative C would include features that would serve to connect the project site with the surrounding community.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
7 Recreation			
7.A-1 Granting of an Easement to the NTPUD for Proposed Future Multiple Use (including bicycles) Public Trail. Implementation of Alternative A would result in the granting of an easement to the NTPUD for a future multiple use public trail connecting the North Tahoe Regional Park to National Avenue. The public trail would cross the project site's northeast corner.	B	No mitigation is required.	B
7.A-2. Closure of Sandy Beach Campground/Loss of Recreation Capacity. Implementation of Alternative A would result in the conversion of the site from a campground/RV park to a TAU and affordable/employee housing development. Implementation of Alternative A would result in the elimination of overnight camping facilities and outdoor recreation concessions in Special Areas #1 and #2 of the TVCP. This land use conversion would reduce regional and basin-wide campground capacity.	S	<p>7.A-2. Mitigate for Loss of 27 Camping/RV Sites.</p> <p>Prior to the approval of any grading permits for the proposed project and subject to the approval of the Placer County Planning Commission and the TRPA Governing Board, the project applicant shall provide the means (in the form of a mitigation fee) by which replacement campsites can be constructed to mitigate for the loss of 27 existing camping/RV sites allowed under the Housing and Community Development (HCD) operating permit. Off-site and in-kind mitigation shall be achieved by providing equal funding for the following campground facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ NTPUD-Owned Property in North Lake Tahoe. The project applicant has had discussions with NTPUD staff regarding the relocation of campsites at a 1:1 ratio to an NTPUD-owned facility. The District owns two undeveloped properties that are potential locations for future campground facilities: the 16.5-acre Mogilefsky Property and the 103.7-acre Firestone Property. An action item in the NTPUD's Draft Recreation and Parks Master Plan identifies the Mogilefsky Property (APN: 111-010-007) north of the North Tahoe Regional Park as a suitable location for the development of campsites as part of a planned environmental camping retreat. <p>The Mogilefsky Property is located within Plan Area Statement 024—North Tahoe Recreation Area, outside of the TVCP. Both developed and undeveloped campgrounds are identified as permissible uses in PAS 024. The maximum allowable density for developed campgrounds in PAS 024 is eight sites per acre.</p> 	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>PAS 024 also includes a target of 200 PAOTs for additional developed outdoor overnight recreation facility capacity. Relocation of the campsites to the Mogilefsky Property (or other NTPUD-owned property) would require expansion of water/wastewater and electricity services to the site and access to and from the site. The construction of campground sites at the Mogilefsky Property would also be subject to subsequent environmental review and approval of the NTPUD Board. Under such an arrangement, the project applicant would pay fees towards the construction of the campground facilities and possibly fees to cover on-going maintenance costs, while NTPUD staff would be responsible for its continued operation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ <u>Burton Creek State Park near Tahoe City</u>. The Burton Creek State Park General Plan proposes, among other day use facilities, the possible future development of a campground on high capability lands that would include between one and 200 campsites (including one group area). The possible future campground development was among several primary reasons for preparation of the General Plan. The General Plan EIR recognizes that the campground may contribute to significant and unavoidable traffic congestion on SR 28 (California State Parks 2005). The development of campground facilities at the 2,000-acre Burton Creek State Park is not envisioned for many years (perhaps 10 to 20 years) and would be subject to subsequent environmental review. <p>The feasibility of these off-site and in-kind campsite replacement projects has been discussed with senior NTPUD and State Parks staff. Funding is not available at this time for the establishment of facilities at either the NTPUD Mogilefsky Property or at Burton Creek State Park. Therefore, the mitigation fee for the loss of Sandy Beach Campground would provide needed funding to the NTPUD and State Parks to initiate design, environmental review and permitting, and construction of campground facilities that could expedite their development. The mitigation fee shall be calculated at a cost of \$17,488 per campsite (based on the average</p>	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		of two fee estimates: that of a private RV consultant which estimated the per campsite fee at \$10,975, and that provided by State Parks staff, which estimated the per campsite fee at \$24,000). Therefore, the mitigation fee for the loss of 27 campsites would be \$472,176—based on this estimate a total of \$236,088 would be directed to both the NTPUD and State Parks and earmarked for campground facility development.	
<p>7.A-3 Increase in Use of Parks and Other Recreation Facilities. The addition of new residents and tourists in the Tahoe Vista area could result in an incremental increase in the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities. Implementation of Alternative A would increase the area’s population by approximately 292 occupants, which would result in the demand for 1.46 acres of new on-site recreational facilities and increased use of local recreation areas.</p>	PS	<p>7.A-3. Provide 1.46 acres of On-site Recreational Facilities and Provide Additional Park Fees to Placer County to Offset Any On-site Shortfall.</p> <p>The project applicant shall ensure that Alternative A provides, to the satisfaction of the Placer County Department of Facility Services, 1.46 acres of on-site recreational facilities. If it is determined that the project cannot feasibly provide the complete 1.46 acres of on-site recreational amenities, then the applicant shall be responsible for the payment of additional park fees (beyond the standard park fees assessed by the County) commensurate with the percentage of the shortfall of the required on-site recreation facilities as determined by the Placer County Department of Facility Services. The additional park fees would be determined and assessed by the County at the time of final map approval and/or final building permits (Kimbrell, pers. comm., 2007).</p>	LTS
<p>7.B-1 Granting of an Easement to the NTPUD for Proposed Future Multiple Use (including bicycles) Public Trail. This impact would be the same as Impact 7.A-1 for Alternative A above. Implementation of Alternative B would result in the granting of an easement to the NTPUD for a future multiple use public trail connecting the North Tahoe Regional Park to National Avenue. The public trail would cross the project site’s northeast corner.</p>	B	No mitigation is required.	B
<p>7.B-2 Closure of Sandy Beach Campground/Loss of Recreation Capacity. This impact would be the same as Impact 7.A-2 above for Alternative A. Implementation of</p>	S	<p>7.B-2. Mitigate for Loss of 27 Camping/RV Sites. See Mitigation Measure 7.A-2 described above for Alternative A.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>Alternative B would result in the conversion of the site from a campground/RV park to a TAU and affordable/employee housing development. Implementation of Alternative B would result in the elimination of overnight camping facilities and outdoor recreation concessions in Special Areas #1 and #2 of the TVCP. This land use conversion would reduce regional and basin-wide campground capacity.</p>		<p>The same mitigation measure discussion would apply.</p>	
<p>7.B-3 Increase in Use of Parks and Other Recreation Facilities. This impact would be the same as Impact 7.A-3 for Alternative A. The addition of new residents and tourists in the Tahoe Vista area could result in an incremental increase in the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities. Implementation of Alternative B would increase the area’s population by approximately 258 occupants, which would result in the demand for 1.29 acres of new on-site recreational facilities and increased use of local recreation areas.</p>	<p align="center">PS</p>	<p>7.B-3. Provide 1.29 acres of On-site Recreational Facilities and Provide Additional Park Fees to Placer County to Offset Any On-site Shortfall.</p> <p>See Mitigation Measure 7.A-3 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure discussion would apply. However, Alternative B would be required to provide 1.29 acres of on-site recreational facilities and, if necessary, payment of additional park fees (beyond the standard park fees assessed by the County) commensurate with the percentage of the shortfall of the required on-site recreation facilities as determined by the Placer County Department of Facility Services.</p>	<p align="center">LTS</p>
<p>7.C-1 Granting of an Easement to the NTPUD for Proposed Future Multiple Use (including bicycles) Public Trail and an Easement to Placer County for a Public Foot Path Connection to the Bicycle Trail. This impact would be similar to that of Impact 7.A-1 for Alternative A. Implementation of Alternative C would result in the granting of an easement to the NTPUD for a future multiple use public trail connecting the North Tahoe Regional Park to National Avenue. The trail would cross the project site’s northeast corner. In addition, Alternative C would include a dedicated easement to Placer County and construction of a public pedestrian walkway along the eastern boundary of the site that would provide a public connection from the multiple use public trail easement through the project site and to Sandy Beach Recreation</p>	<p align="center">B</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p align="center">B</p>

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Area.			
<p>7.C-2 Closure of Sandy Beach Campground/Loss of Recreation Capacity. This impact would be similar to Impact 7.A-2 for Alternative A above. Implementation of Alternative C would result in the conversion of the site from a campground/RV park to a TAU and affordable/employee housing development. Implementation of Alternative C would result in the elimination of overnight camping facilities in Special Area # 1 of the TVCP, but would be different from Alternative A in that it would not result in the loss of existing outdoor recreation concessions in Special Area # 2. The Alternative C land use conversion would reduce regional and basin-wide campground capacity. Also, Alternative C would include several recreation elements (i.e., public pedestrian footpath, a replacement facility on the main 2-story building for the bicycle/kayak rental facilities, shared day-use parking to support use of the Sandy Beach Recreation Area in the main 2-story building parking lot, and bicycle racks) intended to offset the loss of recreation capacity associated with the proposed development.</p>	S	<p>7.C-2. Mitigate for Loss of 27 Camping/RV Sites. See Mitigation Measure 7.A-2 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure discussion would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>7.C-3 Increase in Use of Parks and Other Recreation Facilities. This impact would be the same as Impact 7.A-3 for Alternative A above. The addition of new residents and tourists in the Tahoe Vista area could result in an incremental increase in the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities. Implementation of Alternative C would increase the area’s population by approximately 258 occupants, which would result in the demand for 1.29 acres of new on-site recreational facilities and increased use of local recreation areas.</p>	PS	<p>7.C-3. Provide 1.29 acres of On-site Recreational Facilities and Provide Additional Park Fees to Placer County to Offset Any On-site Shortfall. See Mitigation Measure 7.A-3 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure discussion would apply. However, Alternative C would be required to provide 1.29 acres of on-site recreational facilities and, if necessary, payment of additional park fees (beyond the standard park fees assessed by the County) commensurate with the percentage of the shortfall of the required on-site recreation facilities as determined by the Placer County Department of Facility Services.</p>	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
8 Hydrology and Water Quality			
<p>8.A-1 Potential Short-Term Accelerated Soil Erosion and Sedimentation and/or Release of Pollutants to Nearby Water Bodies During Construction. Slope and soil disturbance associated with Alternative A construction could cause accelerated soil erosion and sedimentation or the release of other pollutants to nearby waterways.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>8.A-1a. Prepare and Implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and Obtain a Storm Water Quality Permit.</p> <p>In compliance with the requirements of the State General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit as well as the Basin Plan, the project applicant shall prepare a SWPPP, which describes the site, erosion and sediment controls, means of waste disposal, implementation of approved local plans, control of post-construction sediment and erosion control measures and maintenance responsibilities, and nonstormwater management controls. The SWPPP shall be submitted to the Lahontan Regional Board for review. The applicant shall require all construction contractors to retain a copy of the approved SWPPP on the construction site. BMPs identified in the SWPPP shall be implemented in all subsequent site development activities. Water quality controls shall be consistent with TRPA guidelines, the Placer County Grading Ordinance, and the Lahontan Regional Board's Regional Project Guidelines for Erosion Control and shall demonstrate that the water quality controls would ensure compliance with all current requirements of the County and the Lahontan Regional Board. Water quality controls shall ensure that runoff quality meets or surpasses TRPA and the Lahontan Region (Lahontan Regional Board 1995) water quality objectives, and complies with the Basin Plan's narrative water quality objectives, state antidegradation policy, and maintains beneficial uses of Lake Tahoe, as defined by the Basin Plan. Stormwater quality sampling and reporting associated with the SWPPP shall be the responsibility of the project applicant.</p> <p>Because the proposed project would result in ground disturbance on an area exceeding one acre, it is subject to construction stormwater quality permit requirements of the NPDES program. Therefore, the project applicant shall obtain a permit from the Lahontan Regional Board and shall provide to the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) evidence of a state-issued water discharge identification number or filing of Notice of Intent and fees</p>	<p>LTS</p>

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>prior to the start of construction.</p> <p>8.A-1b. Prohibit Grading Activities During Winter Months. Grading activities shall be prohibited during the winter months, unless approved by TRPA, Placer County ESD, and the Lahontan Regional Board. Exposed graded areas shall be protected during the winter months using approved methods. Site disturbance, such as clearing and grubbing, grading, and cut/fill, is limited to the period from May 1 to October 15 without special authorization from the appropriate agencies.</p> <p>8.A-1c. Develop and Implement a Permanent and Temporary BMP Plan and BMP Maintenance Plan. Before improvement plan approvals, the project applicant shall develop a permanent and temporary “BMP Plan” (including maintenance) and identify who would be responsible for ensuring its implementation and making the necessary updates/modifications. Water quality BMPs, shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development/Redevelopment, or for Industrial and Commercial (Lahontan Regional Board 1988 or other similar source as approved by TRPA, Placer County ESD, and Lahontan Regional Board). BMPs shall be designed and implemented to mitigate (e.g., minimize, infiltrate, filter, or treat) stormwater runoff to meet TRPA, ESD, and Lahontan Regional Board discharge requirements. Construction (temporary) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Temporary erosion control facilities shall be installed to prevent the transport of earthen materials and other waste off the property prior to commencement of grading (or other ground disturbance) activities. These facilities shall be reinforced and have a level of performance greater than typical requirements at the lower end of the site to prevent discharge to Lake Tahoe. 2. Temporary gravel earthen berms, sandbag dikes or filter fence 	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>shall be used as necessary to prevent discharge of earthen materials from the site during periods of precipitation or runoff. These facilities shall be inspected regularly to ensure that they continue to function properly.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Tree protection fencing shall be installed around trees that are to remain in place throughout construction of the project. 4. A minimum of 48-hours notice shall be provided to the appropriate agencies so that a pre-grading inspection could be conducted at the site to ensure proper installation of the temporary erosion control measures. 5. Ground compaction and disturbance activities shall be minimized in unpaved areas not subject to construction. The nonconstruction areas shall be protected with fencing or other barriers to limit access. 6. Before October 15 of each year, all disturbed or eroding areas shall be stabilized by installation of permanent, or temporary if the project is incomplete, vegetative or mechanical stabilization measures as outlined by the plans. 7. After October 15 of each year, construction vehicle movement on-site must be only on paved roads and parking areas with permanent BMPs in place and protected. 8. All slopes subject to erosion shall be stabilized. 9. All loose piles of soil, silt, clay, sand, debris, or other earthen material shall be protected in a reasonable manner to prevent the discharge of these materials caused by runoff. All grading is to be completed in the first construction season; no such piles shall remain on-site after the grading season. 10. If groundwater is encountered during construction and the excavated area requires dewatering to complete the work, a separate NPDES Permit may be required. Dewatering shall proceed according to the dewatering plan noted below, and in a manner that treats the water and allows it to infiltrate back into the ground or reduce the levels of constituents of concern to a level acceptable for discharge into surface waters. 	

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>11. Dust shall be controlled to prevent transport of such materials off the project site, into any surface water, or into any drainage course. Because Lake Tahoe is 250 feet from the lower end of the site, special diligence shall be required for the control of dust.</p> <p>12. The discharger shall immediately clean up and transport to a legal disposal site any spilled petroleum products or petroleum-contaminated soils, to the maximum extent possible. A spill prevention plan shall be developed and implemented as part of the SWPPP.</p> <p>13. At or before completion of the construction project or at the end of the grading season, all surplus or waste earthen materials shall be removed from the project site and disposed of only at a legal, authorized point of disposal or shall be stabilized on-site, in accordance with previously approved erosion control plans.</p> <p>14. Drainage swales disturbed by construction activities shall be stabilized by appropriate soil stabilization measures to prevent erosion.</p> <p>15. All areas compacted by construction activities and not intended to become permanent land coverage shall be ripped and revegetated with native vegetation to create a pervious surface.</p> <p>Storm drainage from on- and off-site impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, infiltration basins, water quality basins, filters, etc. for the entrapment of sediment, debris, and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the ESD, TRPA, and the Lahontan Regional Board. BMPs shall be designed at a minimum, in accordance with the Placer County Guidance Document for Volume for Flow-Based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction BMPs for Storm Water Quality Protection and shall be installed as early in the project construction phasing as feasible. Post-development (permanent) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Infiltration trenches/pits shall be incorporated at the outlet of all 	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>new culverts draining proposed impervious road surfaces. These infiltration pits shall be sized based on TRPA and Lahontan Regional Board requirements. The infiltration pits shall provide settling time and filtering as the water is absorbed into the ground. Infiltration trenches and pits shall be inspected once yearly to ensure they are functioning properly and to ensure debris is removed from the flow path.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Rock energy dissipaters shall be placed at pipe outlets to reduce the velocity and energy of concentrated storm water flows. Outlet protection shall help to prevent scour and to minimize the potential for downstream erosion. Rock riprap shall be placed at the outlet of pipes, drains, culverts, conduits, or channels at the bottom of mild slopes. Rocks are typically angular, and hand placed to ensure locking and efficient filling of voids. Where appropriate, runoff from outlets shall be returned to sheet flow via level spreaders. 3. Modified drain inlets shall be required for the pretreatment of most roadway runoff. The modified inlets shall include sediment sumps with drains and oil-separation baffles at the outlets. These inlets may also be fitted with oil-absorbent pillows if necessary, or other appropriate inlet filters. Oil-absorbent pillows are equipped with retaining ring and cord, secured to or under the frame and cover for hand access. Drain inlets shall be inspected once per year to determine the need for replacement of oil-absorbent pillows and the need for sediment removal. 4. Sand oil separators shall be required for pretreatment of runoff from larger areas subject to vehicular traffic and parking. Larger sand-oil separation vaults shall generally be used where the placement of multiple smaller modified drain inlets is impractical, or where the flow rate from any one source of runoff from vehicular areas is too large for the smaller inlets to handle. 5. Vegetated/rock lined swales have been designed with a combination of rock and vegetation swales, where overland 	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>sheet flow must remain concentrated, to promote reduction in flow velocity and to increase infiltration opportunities. The vegetated/rock swale shall collect and detain storm water runoff to provide ample settling time before the water is absorbed into the ground water. Excess runoff shall be returned to sheet flow where appropriate.</p> <p>6. Revegetation shall be implemented for all finished excavation and cut slopes and all areas disturbed by construction to establish a vegetative cover. Typical revegetation of roadway disturbance involves ripping to break compacted soil, transplanting, hand or hydroseed, fertilizer or appropriate compost incorporation, and mulch. Other disturbed areas may receive similar treatment depending on the slope, aspect, soil constituents and size of the disturbed area. Some portions of the developed area would also be landscaped with various types of shrubs, trees, and grasses. The application rates, seed mixes, fertilizer content and other specifics of the revegetation process are developed on a case by case basis, and shall be submitted with the construction drawings along with landscape construction plans.</p> <p>7. The project site shall be designed to eliminate or reduce runoff contaminants originating in snow storage areas. Filtering devices may be necessary in areas storing snow that may contain water quality contaminants such as de-icers and automobile exhaust components. Alternatives may include designing storage areas to utilize filtering devices for roadway runoff. Another alternative is the use of a hard system to clean out sand and oil from snowmelt. All methods would comply with TRPA and Lahontan Regional Board standards to prevent water quality impacts downstream and to meet local, state, and federal water quality standards.</p> <p>No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.</p> <p>All BMPs shall be maintained as required to insure effectiveness.</p>	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation. Proof of on-going maintenance, such as contractual evidence, shall be provided to ESD upon request. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees unless, and until, a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance. Prior to Improvement Plan or Final Map approval, easements shall be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of possible Placer County maintenance.	
8.A-2 Interception of Groundwater Table During Construction. Excavation during construction of Alternative A could intercept the groundwater table, creating the potential for introduction of contaminants to groundwater. Excavation activities for the foundations of the proposed buildings and other facilities (e.g., the swimming pool and the clubhouse/administration building basement) may reach a maximum depth of approximately 12 feet below ground surface (bgs). Based on data generated during the soils/hydrologic subsurface investigation, proposed construction excavation on the site should not encounter groundwater and TRPA has issued an approved excavation exemption (TRPA Permit #20021821), which allows for excavation at depths of up to a maximum of 15 feet bgs; however, variable subsurface conditions may be present resulting in interception.	PS	8.A-2. Develop and Implement a Dewatering Plan and Groundwater Quality BMPs in the SWPPP as Part of Mitigation Measure 8.A-1a. The SWPPP developed and implemented as part of Mitigation Measure 8.A-1a shall specifically include a dewatering plan and measures to prevent/minimize sediment and contaminant releases into groundwater during excavations and methods to clean up releases if they do occur. If necessary, dewatering shall be done in a manner that allows discharge to an infiltration basin approved by TRPA and Lahontan Regional Board. Measures to prevent/minimize sediment and contaminant releases into groundwater during excavations and methods to clean up releases may include using temporary berms or dikes to isolate construction activities; using vacuum trucks to capture contaminant releases; and maintaining absorbent pads, and other containment and cleanup materials on-site to allow an immediate response to contaminant releases if they occur. Additionally, permanent perimeter subsurface drainage systems shall also be constructed below the planned depth of all building excavations prior to any finish grading to pass groundwater flow around foundation structures if intercepted.	LTS
8.A-3 Impervious Surface Area and Runoff. Development of Alternative A would result in approximately 3.88 acres or 168,061 sf of impervious	PS	8.A-3a. Submit, Obtain Approval, and Implement a Final Drainage Report in Conformance with Placer County Storm Water Management Manual.	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>surfaces (a reduction in coverage from existing conditions) on a currently developed site, and would possibly increase and/or alter runoff from the project site to downgradient areas during storm events.</p>		<p>Prepare and submit, with the project Improvement Plans, a drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual (LDM) and the Placer County SWMM that are in effect at the time of submittal, to Placer County ESD for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of project improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and detention facilities, features to protect downstream uses and property, and drainage easements to accommodate downstream flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. BMP measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable. ▶ Stormwater runoff shall be reduced to pre-project conditions for 10-year and 100-year storm events at the project’s drainage outfall point through the installation of retention/detention facilities and where appropriate, returned to sheet flow. Retention/detention facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County SWMM that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of Placer County ESD. The ESD may, after review of the project drainage report, delete this requirement if it is determined that drainage conditions do not warrant installation of this type of facility. No retention/detention facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals. ▶ All related underground and surface drainage systems must be addressed to ensure full integration of areas that would generate runoff. These areas would include rooftops, sidewalks, cut/fill slopes, patio areas, streets, parking lots, up gradient off-site 	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>source areas, and impervious landscaping areas. Seepage from underground sources must also be addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Staging Areas: Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be identified on the Improvement Plans and located as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area. <p>8.A-3b. Design and Implement Drainage Facilities in Accordance with Requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual.</p> <p>Drainage facilities, for purposes of collecting and treating runoff on individual lots, shall be designed and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County SWMM, TRPA, and Lahontan Regional Board that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of Placer County ESD. These facilities shall be constructed with subdivision improvements and easements provided as required by Placer County ESD. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project applicant or other entity approved by Placer County.</p> <p>8.A-3c. Prepare and Implement an Erosion Control/Water Quality Mitigation and Monitoring Plan in Accordance with Placer County Condition MM5.</p> <p>An Erosion Control/Water Quality Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (MMP), prepared by a civil engineer or other Development Review Committee (DRC) approved erosion control specialist, shall be submitted with the project's Improvements Plans.</p> <p>An annual monitoring report for a minimum period of 1 to 5 years from the date of installation, prepared by the above-cited professional, shall be submitted to the DRC for review and approval. Any corrective action shall be the responsibility of the project applicant.</p> <p>Prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans, a Letter of Credit, Certificate of Deposit, or cash deposit in the amount of 100% of the accepted proposal shall be deposited with the Placer County Planning Department to assure on-going performance of the</p>	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>monitoring program (i.e., monitoring needs to demonstrate that stormwater BMPs are performing as designed and discharge standards are being met). Evidence of this deposit shall be provided to the satisfaction of the DRC prior to the approval of Improvement Plans. For the purposes of administrative and program review by Placer County, an additional 25% of the estimated cost of the Monitoring Program shall be paid to the County, in cash, at the time that the 100% deposit is made. With the exception of the 25% of the administrative fee, 100% of the estimated costs of implementing the monitoring program shall be returned to the applicant once the applicant has demonstrated that all years of monitoring have been completed to the satisfaction of the DRC. Refunds would only be available at the end of the entire review period.</p> <p>It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure compliance with the MMP. Violation of any components of the approved MMP may result in enforcement activities per Placer County Environmental Review Ordinance, Article 18.28.080 (formerly Section 31.870). If a monitoring report is not submitted for any one year, or combination of years, as outlined in these conditions, the County has the option of utilizing these funds and hiring a consultant to implement the MMP. Failure to submit annual monitoring reports or take corrective action could also result in forfeiture of a portion of, or all of, the deposit. An agreement between the applicant and County shall be prepared which meets DRC approval that allows the County use of this deposit to assure performance of the MMP in the event the project applicant fails to perform.</p>	
<p>8.A-4 Possible Increased Urban Contaminants in Surface Runoff. Operation of Alternative A could result in an increase in urban contaminants in surface runoff</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>8.A-4. Implement Construction and Operational Water Quality Control Measures as Provided in Mitigation Measures 8.A-1a and c, and 8.A-3a, b, c and, to Remove Pollutants of Concern from Downstream Water Bodies or Groundwater.</p> <p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures 8.A-1a and c, and 8.A-3a, b, and c would require construction and operational features of the project to provide sufficient water quality control measures (including specially designed water quality treatment facilities for</p>	<p>LTS</p>

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		removal of pollutants of concern, as approved by Placer County ESD, TRPA, and Lahontan Regional Board) to ensure no adverse impacts to downstream water bodies or groundwater as a performance standard and would reduce Impact 8.A-4 to a less-than-significant level.	
<p>8.B-1 Potential Short-Term Accelerated Soil Erosion and Sedimentation and/or Release of Pollutants to Nearby Water Bodies During Construction. Because Alternative B would be constructed on the same site and would result in the development of similar facilities, this impact is the same as Impact 8.A-1 described above for Alternative A. Slope and soil disturbance associated with Alternative B construction could cause accelerated soil erosion and sedimentation or the release of other pollutants to nearby waterways.</p>	PS	<p>8.B-1a. Prepare and Implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and Obtain a Storm Water Quality Permit. See Mitigation Measure 8.A-1a described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>8.B-1b. Prohibit Grading Activities During Winter Months. See Mitigation Measure 8.A-1b described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>8.B-1c. Develop and Implement a Permanent and Temporary BMP Plan and BMP Maintenance Plan. See Mitigation Measure 8.A-1c described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>8.B-2 Interception of Groundwater Table During Construction. Because Alternative B would be constructed on the same site and would result in the development of similar facilities, this impact is the same as Impact 8.A-2 described above for Alternative A. Excavation during construction of Alternative B could intercept the groundwater table, creating the potential for introduction of contaminants to groundwater. Excavation activities for the foundations of the buildings and other facilities (e.g., swimming pool and the clubhouse/administration building basement) may reach a maximum depth of approximately 12 feet bgs. Based on data generated during the soils/hydrologic subsurface investigation, Alternative B construction excavation on the site should not encounter groundwater and TRPA has issued an approved excavation exemption (TRPA Permit #20021821), which allows for excavation at depths of up to a maximum of 15 feet bgs;</p>	PS	<p>8.B-2. Develop and Implement a Dewatering Plan and Groundwater Quality BMPs in the SWPPP as Part of Mitigation Measure 8.B-1a. See Mitigation Measure 8.A-2 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS

<p align="center">Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives</p>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
however, variable subsurface conditions may be present resulting in interception			
<p>8.B-3 Impervious Surface Area and Runoff. Because Alternative B would be constructed on the same site and would result in the development of similar facilities, this impact is the same as Impact 8.A-3 described above for Alternative A. Development of Alternative B would result in approximately 3.75 acres or 163,459 sf of impervious surfaces (a reduction in coverage from existing conditions) on a currently developed site, and would possibly increase and/or alter runoff from the project site to downgradient areas during storm events.</p>	PS	<p>8.B-3a. Submit, Obtain Approval, and Implement a Final Drainage Report in Conformance with Placer County Storm Water Management Manual. See Mitigation Measure 8.A-3a described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>8.B-3b. Design and Implement Drainage Facilities in Accordance with Requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual. See Mitigation Measure 8.A-3b described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>8.B-3c. Prepare and Implement an Erosion Control/Water Quality Mitigation and Monitoring Plan in Accordance with Placer County Condition MM5. See Mitigation Measure 8.A-3c described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>8.B-4 Possible Increased Urban Contaminants in Surface Runoff. Because Alternative B would be constructed on the same site and would result in the development of similar facilities, this impact is the same as Impact 8.A-4 described above for Alternative A. Operation of Alternative B could result in an increase in urban contaminants in surface runoff.</p>	PS	<p>8.B-4. Implement Construction and Operational Water Quality Control Measures as Provided in Mitigation Measures 8.B-1a and c, and 8.B-3a, b, and c, to Remove Pollutants of Concern from Downstream Water Bodies or Groundwater. See Mitigation Measures 8.A-1a and c and 8.A-3a, b, and c described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measures would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>8.C-1 Potential Short-Term Accelerated Soil Erosion and Sedimentation and/or Release of Pollutants to Nearby Water Bodies During Construction. Because Alternative C would be constructed on the same site and would result in the development of similar facilities, this impact is the same as Impact 8.A-1 described above for Alternative A. Slope and soil disturbance associated with Alternative C construction could cause accelerated soil</p>	PS	<p>8.C-1a. Prepare and Implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and Obtain a Storm Water Quality Permit. See Mitigation Measure 8.A-1a described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>8.C-1b. Prohibit Grading Activities During Winter Months. See Mitigation Measure 8.A-1b described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
erosion and sedimentation or the release of other pollutants to nearby waterways.		<p>8.C-1c. Develop and Implement a Permanent and Temporary BMP Plan and BMP Maintenance Plan.</p> <p>See Mitigation Measure 8.A-1c described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	
<p>8.C-2 Interception of Groundwater Table During Construction. Because Alternative C would be constructed on the same site and would result in the development of similar facilities, this impact is the same as 8.A-2 described above for Alternative A. Excavation during construction of Alternative C could intercept the groundwater table, creating the potential for introduction of contaminants to groundwater. Excavation activities for the foundations of the buildings and other facilities (e.g., swimming pool and clubhouse/administration building basement) may reach a maximum depth of approximately 12 feet bgs. Based on data generated during the soils/hydrologic subsurface investigation, Alternative C construction excavation on the site should not encounter groundwater and TRPA has issued an approved excavation exemption (TRPA Permit #20021821), which allows for excavation at depths of up to a maximum of 15 feet bgs; however, variable subsurface conditions may be present resulting in interception.</p>	PS	<p>8.C-2. Develop and Implement a Dewatering Plan and Groundwater Quality BMPs in the SWPPP as Part of Mitigation Measure 8.C-1a.</p> <p>See Mitigation Measure 8.A-2 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>8.C-3 Impervious Surfaces and Runoff. Because Alternative C would be constructed on the same site and would result in the development of similar facilities, this impact is the same as Impact 8.A-3 described above for Alternative A. Development of Alternative C would result in approximately 3.75 acres or 163,459 sf of impervious surfaces (a reduction in coverage from existing conditions) on a currently developed site, and would possibly increase and/or alter runoff from the project site to downgradient areas during storm events.</p>	PS	<p>8.C-3a. Submit, Obtain Approval, and Implement a Final Drainage Report in Conformance with Placer County Storm Water Management Manual.</p> <p>See Mitigation Measure 8.A-3a described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>8.C-3b. Design and Implement Drainage Facilities in Accordance with Requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual.</p> <p>See Mitigation Measure 8.A-3b described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>8.C-3c. Prepare and Implement an Erosion Control/Water</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Quality Mitigation and Monitoring Plan in Accordance with Placer County Condition MM5.</p> <p>See Mitigation Measure 8.A-3c described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	
<p>8.C-4 Possible Increased Urban Contaminants in Surface Runoff. Because Alternative C would be constructed on the same site and would result in the development of similar facilities, this impact is the same as Impact 8.A-4 described above for Alternative A. Operation of Alternative C could result in an increase in urban contaminants in surface runoff.</p>	PS	<p>8.C-4. Implement Construction and Operational Water Quality Control Measures as Provided in Mitigation Measures 8.C-1a and c, and 8.C-3a, b, and c, to Remove Pollutants of Concern from Downstream Water Bodies or Groundwater.</p> <p>See Mitigation Measures 8.A-1a and c and 8.A-3a, b, and c described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measures would apply.</p>	LTS
9 Geology, Soils, and Land Capability and Coverage			
<p>9.A-1 Land Coverage. Alternative A would result in a total of approximately 3.88 acres or 168,061 sf of impervious surfaces on the project site, or 62% coverage, in LDC 6. This would result in a reduction of 5,263 sf (0.12 acre) in comparison to the TRPA-verified coverage for the site (174,324 sf). This land coverage reduction would be banked by TRPA.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>9.A-2 Seismic Hazards. The project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone; however, several faults are located in the North Lake Tahoe Area that could subject the project site to ground shaking. Because the project would be designed and constructed in accordance with the current design requirements of UBC Seismic Zone 3, there would be no substantial increased risk of injury or property damage from strong ground shaking or earthquake-induced liquefaction or landslides caused by unstable soils.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>9.A-3 Non-Seismic Geologic Hazards. The project would be constructed on a relatively level site, where no known non-seismic geologic hazards, such as landslides,</p>	PS	9.A-3a. Submit Final Geotechnical Engineering Report and Improvement Plans.	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>mudslides, sinkholes, or lava flows, have occurred in the past. The soils/hydrologic subsurface investigation found no severe soil constraints that would preclude construction and determined that the maximum depth of excavation of approximately 12 to 13 feet bgs should not encounter groundwater. However, variable subsurface conditions may be present during construction, resulting in the potential to encounter soil constraints or intercept groundwater. Furthermore, site grading activities have the potential to result in soil erosion.</p>		<p>The project applicant shall implement the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Submit to Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) for review and approval, a geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following: (1) road, pavement, and parking area design; (2) structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable); (3) grading practices; (4) erosion/winterization; (5) special problems discovered on-site (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, evidence of previous mining activity); and (6) slope stability. Once approved by Placer County ESD, two copies of the final report shall be provided to Placer County ESD and one copy to the Building Department for their use. If the soils report indicates the presence of critically expansive or other soils problems which, if not corrected, could lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the requirements of the soils report may be required before issuance of building permits. It is the responsibility of the developer to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report. ▶ The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications, and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal) to Placer County ESD for review and approval of each project construction phase. The plans shall show all conditions for the project, as well as pertinent topographical features both on- and off-site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on-site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities in the public right-of-way or public easement, or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall 	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>pay plan check and inspection fees and before plan approval, all applicable recording and production costs shall be paid. The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review and/or Design Review Committee (DRC) review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed before submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to Placer County ESD in both hard copy and electronic version to be approved by Placer County ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ All proposed grading, drainage, and utility improvements, and vegetation and tree removal shall be shown on the improvement plans, and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance that are in effect at the time of the submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall take place until the improvement plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the Design Review Committee. All cut/fill slopes shall be at 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and Placer County ESD concurs with said recommendation. The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation undertaken from April 1 to October 1 shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project improvement plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control winterization during project construction. Where soil stockpiling or borrow areas are to remain for more than one construction season, proper erosion control measures shall be applied as specified in the improvement plans/grading plans. Plans shall provide for erosion control to the satisfaction of 	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>the Placer County ESD where roadside drainage is off the pavement. The applicant shall also submit to Placer County ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110% of an approved engineer’s estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work before improvement plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. On the County’s acceptance of improvements and satisfactory completion of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent.</p> <p>If at any time during construction a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the improvement plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the Design Review Committee/Placer County ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals before any further work proceeds. Failure of the Design Review Committee/Placer County ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The applicant shall provide Placer County ESD with a letter from the appropriate fire protection district describing conditions under which the service will be provided to the project. Said letter shall be provided before the approval of Improvement Plans, and a fire district representative’s signature shall be provided on the plans. <p>9.A-3b. Include a Dewatering Plan in the Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Plan (SWPPP) Developed and Implemented Pursuant to Mitigation Measure 8.A-1a.</p> <p>The SWPPP developed and implemented as part of Mitigation Measure 8.A-1a (see Chapter 8, “Hydrology and Water Quality”) must specifically include a dewatering plan that details procedures</p>	

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>for safely and appropriately dealing with seasonal groundwater encountered during excavation.</p> <p>9.A-3c. Obtain Grading Permit from the Placer County ESD, Secure a Source for the Transportation and Deposition of Excavated Materials (if deemed necessary in the Final Grading Plan), and Ensure that All Earthwork is Monitored by a Geotechnical Engineer.</p> <p>The project applicant shall ensure the following prior the commencement of any earthwork:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Obtain a Grading Permit from the Placer County ESD before export or import of any soil or other material to or from an off-site location. ▶ The construction and excavation contractor secures a source of transportation and a location for deposition and/or storage of all excavated materials removed from the project site. ▶ All earthwork shall be monitored by a geotechnical engineer tasked with the responsibility of providing oversight during all excavation activities, placement of fill, and disposal of materials removed from and deposited on the project site. 	
<p>9.B-1 Land Coverage. Alternative B would result in a total of approximately 3.75 acres or 163,459 sf of impervious surfaces on the project site, or 60% coverage, in LDC 6. This would result in a reduction of 10,865 sf (0.25 acre) in comparison to the TRPA-verified coverage for the site (174,324 sf). This land coverage reduction would be banked by TRPA.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>9.B-2 Seismic Hazards. Because Alternative B would be located on the same site as Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 9.A-2 described above for Alternative A. Alternative B would not be located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone; however, several faults are located in the north Lake Tahoe area that could subject the site to ground shaking. Because the Alternative B project</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>components would be designed and constructed in accordance with the current design requirements of UBC Seismic Zone 3, there would be no substantial increased risk of injury or property damage from strong ground shaking or earthquake-induced liquefaction or landslides caused by unstable soils.</p>			
<p>9.B-3 Non-Seismic Geologic Hazards. Because Alternative B would be located on the same site as Alternative A, this impact would be similar to Impact 9.A-3 described above for Alternative A. Alternative B would be constructed on a relatively level project site, where no known non-seismic geologic hazards, such as landslides, mudslides, sinkholes, or lava flows, have occurred in the past. The soils/hydrologic subsurface investigation found no severe soil constraints that would preclude construction and determined that proposed excavation to a maximum depth of approximately 12 to 13 feet bgs should not encounter groundwater. However, variable subsurface conditions may be present during construction, resulting in the potential to encounter soil constraints or intercept groundwater. Furthermore, site grading activities have the potential to result in soil erosion.</p>	<p align="center">PS</p>	<p>9.B-3a. Submit Final Geotechnical Engineering Report and Improvement Plans. See Mitigation Measure 9.A-3a described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation would apply.</p> <p>9.B-3b. Include a Dewatering Plan in the Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Plan (SWPPP) Developed and Implemented Pursuant to Mitigation Measure 8.B-1a. See Mitigation Measure 9.A-3b described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation would apply.</p> <p>9.B-3c. Obtain Grading Permit from the Placer County ESD, Secure a Source for the Transportation and Deposition of Excavated Materials (if deemed necessary in the Final Grading Plan), and Ensure that All Earthwork is Monitored by a Geotechnical Engineer. See Mitigation Measure 9A-3c described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation would apply.</p>	<p align="center">LTS</p>
<p>9.C-1 Land Coverage. Alternative C would result in a total of approximately 3.75 acres or 163,459 sf of impervious surfaces on the project site, or 61% coverage, in LDC 6. This would result in a reduction of 10,865 sf (0.25 acre) in comparison to the TRPA-verified coverage for the site (174,324 sf). This land coverage reduction would be banked by TRPA.</p>	<p align="center">LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p align="center">LTS</p>

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>9.C-2 Seismic Hazards. Because Alternative C would be located on the same site as Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 9.A-2 described above for Alternative A. Alternative C would not be located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone; however, several faults are located in the north Lake Tahoe area that could subject the site to ground shaking. Because the Alternative C project components would be designed and constructed in accordance with the current design requirements of UBC Seismic Zone 3, there would be no substantial increased risk of injury or property damage from strong ground shaking or earthquake-induced liquefaction or landslides caused by unstable soils.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>9.C-3 Non-Seismic Geologic Hazards. Because Alternative C would be located on the same site as Alternative A, this impact is similar to Impact 9.A-3 described above for Alternative A. Alternative C would be constructed on a relatively level project site, where no known non-seismic geologic hazards, such as landslides, mudslides, sinkholes, or lava flows, have occurred in the past. The soils/hydrologic subsurface investigation found no severe soil constraints that would preclude construction and determined that proposed excavation to a maximum depth of approximately 12 to 13 feet bgs should not encounter groundwater. However, variable subsurface conditions may be present during construction, resulting in the potential to encounter soil constraints or intercept groundwater. Furthermore, site grading activities have the potential to result in soil erosion.</p>	PS	<p>9.C-3a. Submit Final Geotechnical Engineering Report and Improvement Plans. See Mitigation Measure 9.A-3a described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation would apply.</p> <p>9.C-3b. Include a Dewatering Plan in the Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Plan (SWPPP) Developed and Implemented Pursuant to Mitigation Measure 8.C-1a. See Mitigation Measure 9.A-3b described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation would apply.</p> <p>9.C-3c. Obtain Grading Permit from the Placer County ESD, Secure a Source for the Transportation and Deposition of Excavated Materials (if deemed necessary in the Final Grading Plan), and Ensure that All Earthwork is Monitored by a Geotechnical Engineer. See Mitigation Measure 9.A-3c described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation would apply.</p>	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
10 Scenic Resources			
<p>10.A-1 Scenic Quality of Roadway Travel Unit 20A. Portions of the project site are visible from SR 28, which is within Roadway Travel Unit 20A. The existing main 2-story commercial building and area along the front of the project site would continue to be visible from SR 28 under Alternative A. All other existing buildings and campground facilities on the project site would be removed. Approximately 130 trees, plus the remaining 25 trees previously marked by TRPA for removal, would be removed from the project site. Intermittent views of fences, parking facilities, and the upper portions of buildings constructed as part of the proposed project would be more visible from SR 28, but frontage improvements would be more visible as enhancements compared to current conditions. All utilities, except Sierra Pacific Power Company electrical lines, would be moved underground and street front improvements (e.g., curbed roadway, landscaping) would be made. Because views of the project facilities would be limited and many street front improvements would be made to the site, the proposed project would not degrade the scenic quality rating of the Roadway Travel Unit and would have a less-than-significant impact on the scenic quality of SR 28.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>10.A-2 Scenic Quality of Shoreline Travel Unit 21. Views of the project site, which is located north of SR 28 outside of the Shorezone, as seen from Shoreline Travel Unit 21 and the edge of Lake Tahoe are largely obscured by distance, topography, and intervening vegetation. The only perpendicular views of the project site that are currently available from Shoreline Travel Unit 21 are views of a portion of the second story and roof of the main 2-story commercial building, the area immediately to the east of the 2-story building, and the roof of the bicycle rental office building. Intervening trees, vegetation, and buildings</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>obscure views of all other portions of the project site from this shoreline area as seen from the direction of the lake. Although there would be a reduction in tree cover on the project site, the scenic consequences of this change would be minor recognizing that the backdrop would be a combination of forest, the replaced main 2-story commercial building roof with a darker, TRPA-compliant color, and removed ancillary buildings. Under this alternative area views would have improved scenic quality, as viewed from Shoreline Travel Unit 21. The proposed project would, therefore, not degrade scenic quality, as seen from the Shoreline Travel Unit, and the scenic quality effect would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>10.A-3 Scenic Quality Impact from Public Recreation and Bicycle Trail Areas. Sandy Beach Recreation Area is currently the only public recreation area that has views of the project site; however, this area is not a TRPA-designated scenic resource. There are currently no bicycle trail areas that have views of the project site. As described in Impact 10.A-2 above, Alternative A would have a less-than-significant impact on the Sandy Beach Recreation Area. Because Alternative A would have a less-than-significant impact on public recreation areas and would have no impact on bicycle trail areas, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>10.A-4 Consistency with Plans, Policies, and Guidelines. Buildings constructed as part of Alternative A would be constructed in accordance with basic TRPA building height standards, except for four of the TAU buildings and the clubhouse/administration building. The additional building heights would be based on the ability of TRPA to make findings regarding the project per TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 22.4.A(1), which allows for increasing the maximum building height by 4 feet, but not to exceed a maximum of 38 feet, and Code of Ordinances Section</p>	PS	<p>10.A-4. Comply with TRPA Code of Ordinances Sections 22.4.A(1) and 22.4.B.</p> <p>The project applicant shall prepare a letter report providing the necessary information consistent with TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 22.7 to support findings per Code of Ordinances 22.4.A(1), which allows for increasing the maximum building height by 4 feet, but not to exceed a maximum of 38 feet, and Code of Ordinances Section 22.4.B, which allows for increasing the maximum building height for TAUs in Community Plan Areas</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>22.4.B, which allows for increasing the maximum building height for TAUs in Community Plan Areas up to a maximum of 48 feet. All new buildings would be constructed in variations of the Tahoe Style Theme, and landscaping would be done in accordance with TVCP standards. All other facilities included as part of the project would be constructed or altered consistent with all applicable policies and guidelines. Because Alternative A would include buildings that exceed the maximum allowed building height, Alternative A may be inconsistent with the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Alternative A would be consistent with all other local, state, and federal plans, policies, and guidelines related to visual resources that apply to development on the project site.</p>		<p>up to a maximum of 48 feet. TRPA shall make the necessary findings per Section 22.7, listed below. Findings (1), (2), and (3) must be made for TAUs; findings (1), (3), and (2) or (4) must be made for public service buildings; and findings (1), (2), (3), (4), and (7) must be made for the recreation uses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) When viewed from major arterials, scenic turnouts, public recreation areas or the waters of Lake Tahoe, from a distance of 300 feet, the additional heights will not cause a building to extend above the forest canopy, when present, or a ridgeline. For height greater than that set forth in Table A for a 5:12 pitch, the additional height shall not increase the visual magnitude beyond that permitted for structures in the shoreland as set forth in Section 30.15.G, Additional Visual Magnitude, or Appendix H, Visual Assessment Tool, of the Design Review Guidelines. (2) When outside a community plan, the additional height is consistent with the surrounding uses. (3) With respect to that portion of the building which is permitted the additional height, the building has been designed to minimize interference with existing views within the area to the extent practicable. (4) The function of the structure requires a greater maximum height than otherwise provided for in this chapter. (5) That portion of the building which is permitted the additional height, is adequately screened, as seen from major arterials, the waters of lakes, and other public areas from which the building is frequently viewed. In determining the adequacy of screening, consideration shall be given to the degree to which a combination of the following features causes the building to blend or merge with the background. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The horizontal distance from which the building is viewed; (b) The extent of screening; and (c) Proposed exterior colors and building materials. 	

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		(6) The building is located within an approved community plan, which identifies the project area as being suit able for the additional height being proposed. (7) The additional height is the minimum necessary to feasibly implement the project and there are no feasible alternatives requiring less additional height. (8) The maximum height at any corner of two exterior walls of the building is not greater than 90 percent of the maximum building height. The maximum height at the corner of two exterior walls is the difference between the point of lowest natural ground elevation along an exterior wall of the building, and point at which the corner of the same exterior wall meets the roof. This standard shall not apply to an architectural feature described as a prow. (9) When viewed from a TRPA scenic threshold travel route, the additional height granted a building or structure shall not result in the net loss of views to a scenic resource identified in the 1982 Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Inventory. TRPA shall specify the method used to evaluate potential view loss. (10) The building is no more than two stories in height.	
10.A-5 Increased Light and Glare. Alternative A would include new bollard pedestrian lighting along the street frontage and would introduce artificial nighttime light that could radiate upward and outward from the project site, disturbing views of the nighttime sky.	PS	10.A-5a. Comply with TRPA Design Review Guidelines and Placer County Guidelines Regarding Lighting. The project applicant shall incorporate the following measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Construction of the project shall adhere to TRPA Exterior Lighting Standards described in Chapter 7 of the TRPA Design Review Guidelines, Chapter 4 of the Standards and Guidelines, and TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 30.8. ▶ Construction shall adhere to Placer County design standards regarding exterior lighting, as described in the TVCP. ▶ All exterior lighting shall be shielded, focused downward, and focused away from residential areas. ▶ All exterior lighting shall be limited to non-sodium-vapor 	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>lighting.</p> <p>10.A-5b. Submit a Detailed Lighting Plan to the Placer County Design Review Committee.</p> <p>Concurrent with the submittal of Improvement Plans, a detailed lighting and photometric plan shall be submitted to the North Tahoe Design Review Committee (DRC) and TRPA for review and approval, to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The site lighting plan shall demonstrate compliance with the TVCP and the Standards and Guidelines. Night lighting shall be designed to minimize impacts to adjoining and nearby land uses. No lighting is permitted on top of structures. Lighting may not be directed against building walls, unless necessary for essential security purposes. (b) Site lighting fixtures in parking lots shall use of high pressure sodium (HPS) or metal halide. Any light source over 10 feet in height shall incorporate a cut-off shield to prevent the light source from being directly visible from areas off-site. The metal pole color shall be such that the pole will blend into the landscape (i.e., black, bronze, or dark bronze) subject to final TRPA approval. All site lighting in parking lots shall be full cut-off design so that the light source is fully screened to minimize the impacts discussed above. (c) Building lighting shall be shielded and downward directed such that the bulb or ballast is not visible. Lighting fixture design shall complement the building colors and materials and shall be used to light entries, soffits, covered walkways and pedestrian areas such as plazas. Roof and wall pack lighting shall not be used. Lighting intensity shall be of a level that only highlights the adjacent building area and ground area and shall not impose glare on any pedestrian or vehicular traffic. 	
<p>10.B-1 Scenic Quality of Roadway Travel Unit 20A. Because Alternative B would be similar to Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 10.A-1 described above</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>for Alternative A. Portions of the development associated with Alternative B would be visible from SR 28, which is located within Roadway Travel Unit 20A. The existing main 2-story commercial building along the front of the project site would continue to be visible from SR 28 under Alternative B. All other existing buildings and campground facilities on the project site would be removed. Alternative B would result in the removal of approximately 100 trees, plus the remaining 25 trees previously marked by TRPA for removal. While the overall number of trees to be removed under Alternative B would be less than Alternative A, the trees that would be removed within Parcel 3 and closest to SR 28 would be the same. As a result of the tree removal, intermittent views of fences, parking facilities, and the upper portions of buildings constructed as part of Alternative B would be more visible from SR 28, but frontage improvements would be more visible as enhancements compared to current conditions. All utilities, except Sierra Pacific Power Company electrical lines, would be moved underground and street front improvements (e.g., curbed roadway, landscaping) would be made. Because views of the Alternative B facilities would be limited and many street front improvements would be made to the site, Alternative B would not degrade the scenic quality rating of the Roadway Travel Unit and would have a less-than-significant impact on the scenic quality of SR 28.</p>			
<p>10.B-2 Scenic Quality of Shoreline Travel Unit 21. Because Alternative B would be similar to Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 10.A-2 described above for Alternative A. Alternative B development would be north of SR 28 outside of the Shorezone. Views of the project site from Shoreline Travel Unit 21 and the edge of Lake Tahoe are largely obscured by intervening vegetation, distance, and topography. The only perpendicular views of</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>the project site that are currently available from Shoreline Travel Unit 21 are views of a portion of the second story and roof of the main 2-story commercial building, the area immediately to the east of the 2-story building, and the roof of the bicycle rental office building. Intervening trees, vegetation, and buildings obscure views of all other portions of the project site from this shoreline area as seen from the direction of the lake. Although there would be a reduction in tree cover on the project site, the scenic consequences of this change would be minor recognizing that the backdrop would be a combination of forest, the replaced main 2-story commercial building roof with a darker, TRPA-compliant color, and removed ancillary buildings. Under this alternative area views would have improved scenic quality, as viewed from Shoreline Travel Unit 21. Alternative B would, therefore, not degrade scenic quality, as seen from the Shoreline Travel Unit, and the scenic quality effect would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>10.B-3 Scenic Quality Impact from Public Recreation and Bicycle Trail Areas. Because Alternative B would be similar to Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 10.A-3 described above for Alternative A. Sandy Beach Recreation Area is currently the only public recreation area that has views of the project site; however, this area is not a TRPA-designated scenic resource. There are currently no bicycle trail areas that have views of the project site. Because Alternative B would have a less-than-significant impact on public recreation areas and would have no impact on bicycle trail areas, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>10.B-4 Consistency with Plans, Policies, and Guidelines. Because Alternative B would be similar to Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 10.A-4 described above for Alternative A. Buildings constructed as part of Alternative B would be constructed in accordance with</p>	PS	<p>10.B-4. Comply with TRPA Code of Ordinances Sections 22.4.A(1) and 22.4.B. See Mitigation Measure 10.A-4 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation discussion would apply.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<p align="center">Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives</p>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>TRPA building height standards, except the clubhouse/administration building and possibly TAU buildings. The additional height would be based on the ability of TRPA to make findings regarding the project per TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 22.4.A(1), which allows for increasing the maximum building height by 4 feet, but not to exceed a maximum of 38 feet, and Code of Ordinances Section 22.4.B, which allows for increasing the maximum building height for TAUs in Community Plan Areas up to a maximum of 48 feet. All new buildings would be constructed in variations of the Tahoe Style Theme, and landscaping would be done in accordance with TVCP standards. All other facilities included as part of Alternative B would be constructed or altered consistent with all applicable policies and guidelines. Because Alternative B would include at least one building that exceeds the maximum allowed building height, Alternative B may be inconsistent with the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Alternative B would be consistent with all other local, state, and federal plans, policies, and guidelines related to visual resources that apply to development on the project site.</p>			
<p>10.B-5 Increased Light and Glare. Because Alternative B would be similar to Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 10.A-5 described above for Alternative A. Although the amount of artificial lighting introduced by Alternative B would be incrementally less than under Alternative A (as the decrease in light has a direct correlation with the reduction in TAUs from 45 to 39 units and related parking area development), this alternative would still include new bollard pedestrian lighting along the street frontage and would introduce artificial nighttime light that could radiate upward and outward from the project site, disturbing views of the nighttime sky.</p>	PS	<p>10.B-5a. Comply with TRPA Design Review Guidelines and Placer County Guidelines Regarding Lighting. See Mitigation Measure 10.A-5a described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation discussion would apply.</p> <p>10.B-5b. Submit a Detailed Lighting Plan to the Placer County Design Review Committee. See Mitigation Measure 10.A-5b described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation discussion would apply.</p>	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>10.C-1 Scenic Quality of Roadway Travel Unit 20A. This impact under Alternative C would be similar to Impact 10.A-1 for Alternative A, with the exception of additional changes that would be made to the west side of the existing main 2-story commercial building and the installation of two bicycle racks. The existing main 2-story commercial building and area along the front of the project site would continue to be visible from SR 28 under Alternative C. All other existing buildings and campground facilities on the project site would be removed. Alternative C would result in the removal of approximately 98 trees, plus the remaining 25 trees previously marked by TRPA for removal. While the overall number of trees to be removed under Alternative C would be less than Alternative A, the trees that would be removed within Parcel 3 and closest to SR 28 would be the same. As a result of the tree removal, intermittent views of fences, parking facilities, and the upper portions of buildings constructed as part of Alternative C would be more visible from SR 28. All utilities, except Sierra Pacific Power Company electrical lines, would be moved underground and street front improvements (e.g., curbed roadway, landscaping) would be made. Because changes made to the project site would be consistent with the character of the surrounding area, and street front improvements would be made to the site, Alternative C would not degrade the scenic quality rating of the Roadway Travel Unit and would have a less-than-significant impact on the scenic quality of SR 28.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>10.C-2 Scenic Quality of Shoreline Travel Unit 21. This impact under Alternative C would be similar to Impact 10.A-2 under Alternative A, with the exception of a 1,000-sf addition to the west side of the main 2-story building and the installation of bicycle racks. Alternative C development would be north of SR 28 outside of the Shorezone. Views of the project site from Shoreline Travel Unit 21 and the</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>edge of Lake Tahoe are largely obscured by intervening vegetation, distance, and topography. The only perpendicular views of the project site that are currently available from Shoreline Travel Unit 21 are views of a portion of the second story and roof of the main 2-story commercial building, the area immediately to the east of the 2-story building, and the roof of the bicycle rental office building. Intervening trees, vegetation, and buildings obscure views of all other portions of the project site from this shoreline area as seen from the direction of the lake. Although there would be some changes to the views of the area immediately west of the 2-story building and there would be a reduction in tree cover on the project site, the scenic consequence of these changes would be minor recognizing that the backdrop would be a combination of forest, the replaced main 2-story commercial building roof with a darker, TRPA-compliant color, and removed ancillary buildings. Under this alternative area views would have improved scenic quality, as viewed from Shoreline Travel Unit 21. Alternative C would, therefore, not degrade scenic quality, as seen from the Shoreline Travel Unit, and the scenic quality effect would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>10.C-3 Scenic Quality Impact from Public Recreation and Bicycle Trail Areas. Because Alternative C would be similar to Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 10.A-3 described above for Alternative A. Sandy Beach Recreation Area is currently the only public recreation area that has views of the project site; however, this area is not a TRPA-designated scenic resource. There are currently no bicycle trail areas that have views of the project site. Because Alternative C would have a less-than-significant impact on public recreation areas and would have no impact on bicycle trail areas, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>10.C-4 Consistency with Plans, Policies, and Guidelines. Because Alternative C would be similar to Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 10.A-4 described above for Alternative A. Buildings constructed as part of Alternative C would be constructed in accordance with TRPA building height standards, except the clubhouse/administration building and possibly TAU buildings. The additional height would be based on the ability of TRPA to make findings regarding the project per TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 22.4.A(1), which allows for increasing the maximum building height by 4 feet, but not to exceed a maximum of 38 feet, and Code of Ordinances Section 22.4.B, which allows for increasing the maximum building height for TAUs in Community Plan Areas up to a maximum of 48 feet. All new buildings would be constructed in variations of the Tahoe Style Theme, and landscaping would be done in accordance with TVCP standards. All other facilities included as part of Alternative C would be constructed or altered consistent with all applicable policies and guidelines. Because Alternative C would include at least one building that exceeds the maximum allowed building height, Alternative C may be inconsistent with the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Alternative C would be consistent with all other local, state, and federal plans, policies, and guidelines related to visual resources that apply to development on the project site.</p>	PS	<p>10.C-4. Comply with TRPA Code of Ordinances Sections 22.4.A(1) and 22.4.B. See Mitigation Measure 10.A-4 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation discussion would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>10.C-5 Increased Light and Glare. Because Alternative C would be similar to Alternative A, this impact is the same as Impact 10.A-5 described above for Alternative A. Although the amount of artificial lighting introduced by Alternative C would be incrementally less than under Alternative A (as the decrease in light has a direct correlation with the reduction in TAUs from 45 to 39 units and related parking area development), this alternative would still include new bollard pedestrian lighting along</p>	PS	<p>10.C-5a. Comply with TRPA Design Review Guidelines and Placer County Guidelines Regarding Lighting. See Mitigation Measure 10.A-5a described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation discussion would apply. 10.C-5b. Submit a Detailed Lighting Plan to the Placer County Design Review Committee. See Mitigation Measure 10.A-5b described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation discussion would apply.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
the street frontage and would introduce artificial nighttime light that could radiate upward and outward from the project site, disturbing views of the nighttime sky.			
11 Cultural Resources			
11.A-1 Effects on Known Cultural Resources. No cultural resources inventoried on the project site are significant according to TRPA, CEQA, or CRHR criteria. Therefore, Alternative A would have no effect on any known significant cultural site, feature, or artifact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
11.A-2 Previously Undiscovered Cultural Resources. Although the Cultural Resources Assessment did not identify any significant historic resources or archaeological material on the project site, it is possible that buried or concealed cultural resources could be present and detected during ground-disturbing activities associated with Alternative A. If previously undiscovered, significant cultural resources are disturbed during construction, this could be a significant impact.	PS	11.A-2. Mitigate for Previously Undiscovered Cultural Resources. In the event that previously unknown archaeological resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, the construction crew shall immediately halt work in the vicinity of the find. A qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to evaluate the resource in accordance with State and TRPA guidelines. If the discovered resource is determined to be significant, mitigation measures consistent with the State CEQA Guidelines and TRPA Code of Ordinances shall be devised and a mitigation plan submitted for approval by the Placer County Planning Department and TRPA. Any necessary archaeological excavation and monitoring activities shall be conducted in accordance with prevailing professional standards. Mitigation, in accordance with a plan approved by TRPA and the County, shall be implemented prior to resumption of work within the area of the resource find.	LTS
11.A-3 Previously Undiscovered Burials. Although the cultural resources investigation did not produce evidence suggesting that any prehistoric or historic-era marked or un-marked human interments are present on the project site, it is possible that unmarked previously unknown graves could be present and detected during ground-disturbing activities associated with Alternative A. If previously undiscovered human remains are disturbed during	LTS	11.A-3. Mitigate for Previously Undiscovered Burials. In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, the contractor and/or the project applicant shall immediately halt potentially damaging excavation in the area of the burial and notify the Placer County Coroner and a professional archaeologist to determine the nature of the remains. The coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>construction, this could be a significant impact.</p>		<p>receiving notice of a discovery on private or state lands (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5[b]). If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by phone within 24 hours of making that determination (Health and Safety Code Section 7050[c]). Following the coroner’s findings, the property owner, contractor or project applicant, an archaeologist, and the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendent (MLD) shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments are not disturbed. The responsibilities for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in California Public Resources Code Section 5097.9.</p> <p>Implementation of Assembly Bill 2641 requires that if the discovery of human remains is made after January 1, 2007 the following procedures will be implemented:</p> <p>Upon the discovery of Native American remains, the procedures above regarding involvement of the Placer County Coroner, notification of the NAHC, and identification of a MLD shall be followed. The landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity (according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards and practices) is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD has taken place. The MLD shall have 48 hours to complete a site inspection and make recommendations after being granted access to the site. A range of possible treatments for the remains, including nondestructive removal and analysis, preservation in place, relinquishment of the remains and associated items to the descendants, or other culturally appropriate treatment may be discussed. AB 2641 suggests that the concerned parties may extend discussions beyond the initial 48 hours to allow for the discovery of additional remains. AB 2641(e) includes a list of site protection measures and states that the landowner shall comply with one or more of the following:</p>	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>(1) Record the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center.</p> <p>(2) Utilize an open-space or conservation zoning designation or easement.</p> <p>(3) Record a document with the county in which the property is located.</p> <p>The landowner or their authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance if the NAHC is unable to identify a MLD or the MLD fails to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being granted access to the site. The landowner or their authorized representative may also re-inter the remains in a location not subject to further disturbance if they reject the recommendation of the MLD, and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner. Adherence to these procedures and other provisions of the California Health and Safety Code and AB 2641(e) will reduce potential impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level.</p>	
<p>11.B-1. Effects on Known Cultural Resources. This impact is the same as Impact 11.A-1 described above for Alternative A. No cultural resources inventoried on the project site are significant according to TRPA, CEQA, or CRHR criteria. Therefore, Alternative B would have no effect on any known significant cultural site, feature, or artifact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>11.B-2 Previously Undiscovered Cultural Resources. This impact is the same as Impact 11.A-2 described above for Alternative A. Although the Cultural Resources Assessment did not identify any significant historic resources or archaeological material on the project site, it is possible that buried or concealed cultural resources could be present and detected during ground-disturbing activities associated with Alternative B. If previously undiscovered,</p>	PS	<p>11.B-2. Mitigate for Previously Undiscovered Cultural Resources.</p> <p>See Mitigation Measure 11.A-2 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure discussion would apply.</p>	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
significant cultural resources are disturbed during construction, this could be a significant impact.			
11.B-3 Previously Undiscovered Burials. This impact is the same as Impact 11.A-3 described above for Alternative A. Although the cultural resources investigation did not produce evidence suggesting that any prehistoric or historic-era marked or un-marked human interments are present on the project site, it is possible that unmarked previously unknown graves could be present and detected during ground-disturbing activities associated with Alternative B. If previously undiscovered human remains are disturbed during construction, this could be a significant impact.	PS	11.B-3. Mitigate for Previously Undiscovered Burials. See Mitigation Measure 11.A-3 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure discussion would apply.	LTS
11.C-1 Effects on Known Cultural Resources. This impact is the same as Impact 11.A-1 described above for Alternative A. No cultural resources inventoried on the project site are significant according to TRPA, CEQA, or CRHR criteria. Therefore, Alternative C would have no effect on any known significant cultural site, feature, or artifact.	PS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
11.C-2 Previously Undiscovered Cultural Resources. This impact is the same as Impact 11.A-2 described above for Alternative A. Although the Cultural Resources Assessment did not identify any significant historic resources or archaeological material on the project site, it is possible that buried or concealed cultural resources could be present and detected during ground-disturbing activities associated with Alternative C. If previously undiscovered, significant cultural resources are disturbed during construction, this could be a significant impact.	PS	11.C-2. Mitigate for Previously Undiscovered Cultural Resources. See Mitigation Measure 11.A-2 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure discussion would apply.	LTS
11.C-3 Previously Undiscovered Burials. This impact is the same as Impact 11.A-3 described above for Alternative A. Although the cultural resources investigation did not	PS	11.C-3. Mitigate for Previously Undiscovered Burials. See Mitigation Measure 11.A-3 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure discussion would apply.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<p align="center">Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives</p>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>produce evidence suggesting that any prehistoric or historic-era marked or un-marked human interments are present on the project site, it is possible that unmarked previously unknown graves could be present and detected during ground-disturbing activities associated with Alternative C. If previously undiscovered human remains are disturbed during construction, this could be a significant impact.</p>			
<p>12 Vegetation and Wildlife</p>			
<p>12.A-1 Common and Sensitive Habitats. The project site does not support sensitive habitats. Implementation of Alternative A would result in the loss or disturbance of approximately 6.2 acres of Sierran mixed conifer forest, a common habitat in the project region.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>12.A-2 Vegetation Removal. Buildout of Alternative A would result in the conversion of approximately 6.2 acres of Sierran mixed conifer forest to buildings, walkways, driveways, parking, and landscaping. Because vegetation removed would exceed 50% of the existing on-site vegetation, this would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>12.A-2. Develop and Implement a Revegetation Plan. Implementation of the following measures would reduce the conversion of vegetation at the project site to a less-than-significant level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A Revegetation Plan addressing all areas temporarily disturbed by project development shall be prepared by a qualified environmental professional (e.g., a licensed landscape architect, restoration specialist, Registered Professional Forester [RPF] or Certified Arborist with restoration qualifications, or similar qualified professional), and shall adhere to TRPA’s landscaping and revegetation standards in the Code of Ordinances (Chapters 30 and 77) and Rules of Procedure. The Revegetation Plan shall be submitted to and approved by TRPA and the Placer County Department of Resource Conservation (DRC) prior to Final Map approval. <p>The site plan and construction plans shall be designed to minimize removal and disturbance to existing vegetation. The Revegetation Plan shall demonstrate how site development and construction planning minimizes the removal and disturbance of</p>	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>vegetation, and specify the extent and location of areas to be revegetated.</p> <p>Construction and landscaping disturbance within all areas of vegetation to be retained shall be minimized. All areas of vegetation to be retained shall be fenced with sturdy, high-visibility protective fencing. This fencing shall be included on all site plans (e.g., Staging, Grading, Drainage, and Utility plans) and shall be depicted in the Revegetation Plan. Other minimization measures shall include clustering utilities in shared trenches, where feasible.</p> <p>The Revegetation Plan shall include a plant list, a planting plan, planting and maintenance techniques, and measures to control the introduction or spread of invasive plants. All landscaping shall consist of native, drought-tolerant plant species from the TRPA-approved plant list, except for accent plants which can be adapted plants. Transplanting shall follow International Society of Arboriculture [ISA] and American National Standards Institute (ANSI) standard digging and transplanting techniques to ensure proper handling and successful transplanting of trees and other plants. A water-conserving irrigation system shall be installed by the project applicant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ All vegetation protection obligations required herein and in the Tree Management Plan (TMP, discussed below) shall be incorporated into construction contracts. Vegetation installation shall be inspected and approved by TRPA and/or DRC staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Vegetation shall be installed with sufficient time to establish prior to the winter season. All areas not revegetated prior to the winter season shall be winterized according to requirements in Mitigation Measure 8.A-1a. ▶ A Vegetation Monitoring Plan (VMP) prepared and implemented by a qualified environmental professional shall be submitted to and approved by the TRPA and the County prior to Final Map approval. The VMP shall include monitoring protocols, including the protocol for evaluating vegetation 	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>health and vigor. A monitoring report detailing vegetation success shall be submitted annually to the TRPA and the County for a minimum period of 5 years. Any revegetation falling below an 85% survival rate shall be replaced by the project applicant. Mitigation and monitoring of replacement revegetation shall continue until it satisfies the criteria for successful establishment. Criteria for successful establishment shall include survivorship for a period of at least 5 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ If on-site avoidance and revegetation retains or restores a minimum of 50% of the project site to native conditions, no further mitigation is required. If on-site disturbance permanently removes over 50% of the area of existing vegetation at the site, off-site revegetation in accordance with TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 30 and 77 shall be required. The restored off-site area shall be equivalent in ecological value to that portion of the project site beyond 50% that would be disturbed, shall be within the north Tahoe Basin as close to the project site as possible, and shall be preserved in perpetuity by a conservation easement, deed restriction, or other similar mechanism. <p>A Revegetation Plan and a Vegetation Monitoring Plan, prepared as described above, shall be created for this off-site revegetation as well, and shall be submitted to and approved by Placer County and TRPA prior to tree removal or the issuance of a Grading Permit. This off-site restoration may be combined with off-site tree revegetation required by Mitigation Measure 12.A-3, if the site chosen for off-site tree revegetation would be equivalent in ecological value (following revegetation) as that lost at the project site.</p>	
<p>12.A-3 Tree Removal. Buildout of Alternative A would result in the loss of approximately 155 individual trees between 6 and 29 inches dbh.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>12.A-3. Minimize Tree Removal, Develop a Tree Management Plan, and a Tree Replacement Plan. Implementation of the following measures would reduce the impacts of project-related tree removal to a less-than-significant level.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>The project shall minimize, to the maximum extent feasible, the removal of trees, especially any incense cedars, sugar pines, ponderosa pines, or any specimen trees or snags identified by a Certified Arborist or RPF. Any unavoidable impacts to trees shall be mitigated with the following measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Before tree removal occurs, a Timber Harvest Plan (THP) shall be prepared by an RPF, and shall be submitted to CDF for review and approval. If the THP includes trees to be removed that were not indicated by a TRPA permit (TRPA permit # 2937), a copy of the THP shall also be submitted to TRPA for review. An Exemption From Timberland Conversion Permit for Subdivision shall also be obtained from CDF. ▶ A Tree Management Plan (TMP) shall be prepared by a qualified environmental professional (i.e., a restoration specialist, Registered Professional Forester (RPF) or Certified Arborist with restoration qualifications, or similar qualified professional), and shall be submitted to a TRPA RPF or other qualified TRPA professional and to Placer County for review and approval, prior to Tentative Map approval. Alternatively, if the THP prepared for CDF meets the requirements described in this mitigation measure, the THP may be submitted to TRPA and Placer County for review and approval in lieu of a separate TMP. <p>The TMP shall adhere to the provisions in the TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 71, including the preservation of individual incense cedar trees (71.4.A-4), and other identified specimen trees where practicable. The plan shall include protection measures for snags and coarse woody debris as appropriate and feasible for an urban area. In accordance with the TRPA Threshold Standards for Common Vegetation, the plan shall maintain relative species richness, relative abundance, and relative age class as appropriate and feasible within an urban area, to contribute to the attainment of the region-wide Threshold Standard.</p> <p>Permanent disturbance (i.e., disturbance following project</p>	

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>construction caused by the proposed land use changes) and temporary disturbance (i.e., disturbance from construction activities) of all trees to be preserved that are 6 inches in dbh (or 10 inches dbh aggregate for multi-trunk trees) shall be minimized. This shall include minimizing cuts, fills, grade changes, paving or other coverage, soil compaction, and landscaping impacts within the critical root zone of all trees, as determined by a qualified environmental professional. Creation of detailed site plans and construction documents shall be coordinated with a qualified environmental professional to minimize permanent and temporary disturbance. The TMP shall demonstrate how site development design will minimize the permanent disturbance of all trees to be preserved, and how construction planning will minimize temporary disturbance of all trees to be preserved. The TMP shall include the following requirements.</p> <p>To minimize permanent disturbance, utilities shall be clustered and shall be designed so as to avoid crossing in the root zone of trees to be protected, unless the utilities are installed by drilling under the root zones to avoid impacts associated with cutting roots. Feasibility of drilling under trees will be based on soil conditions. Pervious surfaces shall be used in the root zone whenever possible, and uses that encourage compaction (e.g., informal parking, trails) shall be avoided within the root zone. Snow storage areas shall be sited such that snow removal activities will not pose a risk of damage to preserved trees, and so that excessive snow-melt does not over-saturate the root zone of trees to be preserved.</p> <p>To minimize temporary disturbance, the TMP shall provide for vegetation protection during construction in accordance with TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 65 and 30. Protection measures shall include the following, at a minimum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sturdy high-visibility protective fencing shall be installed at the limits of construction (including all grading, road improvements, underground utilities, staging, storage, 	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>parking, or other development activity), and outside of the critical root zone of all trees to be preserved that have critical root zones in the limits of construction, and that are 6 in inches dbh (or 10 inches dbh aggregate for multi-trunk trees). The critical root zone is defined here as the area within 10 feet of a tree's drip line. This fencing shall be included on all site plans (e.g., Staging, Grading, Drainage, and Utility plans) and shall be depicted in the TMP.</p> <p>2. If grading, trenching, or transplanting is necessary within the root zone of trees to be preserved, the work will be supervised by a certified arborist, an RPF, or other qualified biologist, and the following measures shall be implemented: soil shall be removed in lines radial to, rather than tangential to the tree to avoid excessive ripping and shattering of roots; if root cutting cannot be avoided, roots shall be cut cleanly at a 90-degree angle; a minimum of 6 inches of soil or sand shall be placed over exposed cuts and roots to reduce soil desiccation until the area is back-filled; and native soil shall be used to back-fill all cuts.</p> <p>3. All necessary pruning shall be performed under the supervision of a Certified Arborist or RPF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All tree protection obligations required herein and in the TMP shall be incorporated into construction contracts. Tree protection measures shall be installed, and shall be inspected by staff from the Placer County Department of Public Works and TRPA prior to issuance of a grading permit. • A Tree Replacement Plan shall be prepared by a qualified environmental professional, in accordance with TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 30 and 77. This plan shall be submitted to and approved by Placer County and a TRPA RPF or other qualified TRPA professional prior to tree removal or the issuance of a Grading Permit. <p>Replacement shall be required for all native trees removed that are 6 inches in dbh or larger, native multi-trunk trees with an</p>	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>aggregate diameter of 10 inches in dbh or greater, and such native trees with disturbance to their critical root zone. Compensation shall be provided on a three to one basis, or as specified by TRPA at the time of issuance of the tree permit. Trees shall be replaced with trees grown in 5-gallon containers, or the functional equivalent, using native species appropriate for the selected revegetation site to contribute to the attainment of the TRPA common vegetation Threshold Standard region wide. Trees that shall be removed for project development, that are also recommended for thinning in the TMP for fire safety, or the 25 trees recommended for removal for forest health reasons in TRPA Permit No. 2937 but that remain in place on site to serve as barrier trees offering protection to other healthy trees, shall not require replacement. Trees to be planted should be outside recommended defensible space distances.</p> <p>The Tree Replacement Plan shall include a plant list, a description of appropriate planting stock for new trees, a planting plan, planting and maintenance techniques, and measures to control the introduction or spread of invasive plants. Transplanting will follow International Society of Arboriculture [ISA] standard digging and transplanting techniques to ensure proper handling and successful transplanting of trees and vegetation.</p> <p>To compensate for the potential loss of trees that incur disturbance within their critical root zones, all such trees shall be monitored for a period of at least 7 years, in conjunction with the monitoring program described below. Any tree that does not survive shall be replaced on a three to one basis, and likewise monitored for a period of 7 years.</p> <p>Tree replacement may occur on-site if remaining undeveloped project areas can support additional trees, as determined by a qualified environmental professional. If the remaining undeveloped project areas cannot support sufficient plantings, off-site replacement shall be required. Off-site replacement shall occur in areas in need of additional trees, shall be located as close to the project site as possible, and shall be preserved in perpetuity</p>	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>by a conservation easement, deed restriction, or other similar mechanism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A Certified Arborist, an RPF, or other qualified biologist shall inspect the results of construction activities to document which trees were removed by grading and construction, and to document disturbance to preserved trees. This documentation shall be provided to the County and TRPA, and the total number of trees to be replanted, as described in the Tree Replacement Plan, shall be modified as necessary to reflect the actual tree removal and disturbance that occurs during construction. ▶ Tree replacement installation shall be inspected and approved by TRPA and/or County staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. ▶ A VMP shall be prepared and implemented by a Certified Arborist, an RPF, or other qualified biologist, for areas to be revegetated as mitigation. The VMP shall be submitted to and approved by the County and a TRPA RPF or other qualified TRPA professional prior to Final Map approval. This plan shall include monitoring protocols, including the protocol for evaluating tree health and vigor. A monitoring report detailing vegetation success shall be submitted annually to the County and the TRPA through the monitoring period, for a minimum period of 5 years. The mitigation and monitoring of a replaced tree shall continue until it satisfies the criteria for a successfully established sapling, dies, or is otherwise no longer part of a mitigation effort. Criteria for successful establishment shall include survivorship for a period of at least 5 years, with at least 2 years without supplemental watering. 	
12.A-4 Wildlife Movement Corridors. No wildlife movement corridors have been identified on the project site and no significant corridors are likely to exist.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>12.A-5 Nesting Raptors and Migratory Birds. Development of Alternative A could adversely affect nesting raptors and other migratory birds.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>12.A-5. Avoid Vegetation Removal During Nesting Season and Conduct Preconstruction Surveys.</p> <p>To the extent feasible, the project applicant shall avoid removing vegetation during the peak nesting season (approximately March 1 through August 15).</p> <p>If vegetation that could support nesting birds is to be removed during the nesting season, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct two focused preconstruction surveys for active nest sites of raptors on the project site. These surveys shall be conducted within 14 days of vegetation removal initiated during the nesting season. In addition, two focused preconstruction surveys shall be conducted within 14 days of grading initiated during the nesting season. If grading immediately follows tree removal, two focused preconstruction surveys within 14 days of initiating tree removal shall be sufficient.</p> <p>If an active raptor nest is located during the preconstruction surveys, the County, TRPA, DFG, and/or USFWS shall be notified, as appropriate to the species and its status. Vegetation removal and construction shall be delayed within 500 feet of the nest to avoid disturbance until the nest is no longer active. If nesting northern goshawk is found, vegetation removal and construction shall be delayed within 2,640 feet (0.5 mile) of the nest to avoid disturbance until the nest is no longer active. The buffer may be altered through consultation with the County, TRPA, and/or the appropriate agency (depending on the species found).</p> <p>If any active nests of other birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act are found during surveys for special-status birds and raptors, the County and TRPA shall be notified. Removal of an active nest site shall be delayed until the nest is no longer active.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>12.A-6 Special-Status Species and Common Wildlife. Development of Alternative A could adversely affect special-status species or common wildlife. However,</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
special-status species are not expected to occupy the project site and Alternative A would not threaten the viability of common species populations.			
12.A-7 Bat Species. Development of Alternative A could adversely affect common bat species living in the project vicinity. Direct mortality and loss of roosting habitat would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	12.A-7. Conduct Bat Surveys and Prepare Bat Management Plan. Prior to vegetation removal or demolition of existing structures, a visual and/or acoustical bat survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. If any bat roosts are identified, a Bat Management Plan shall be developed. The Bat Management Plan shall include recommendations for passively relocating bats. Passive relocation from a site typically involves first constructing artificial roosting habitat features (e.g., “bat boxes”) nearby to provide local populations with replacement habitat, then excluding bats from the occupied roosting site to be removed. Techniques for excluding bats involve sealing (e.g., with aluminum screening or other material) roost entrances after bats have exited the roost to forage.	LTS
12.B-1 Common and Sensitive Habitats. This impact is the same as Impact 12.A-1 described above for Alternative A. The project site does not support sensitive habitats. Implementation of Alternative B would result in the loss or disturbance of approximately 6.2 acres of Sierran mixed conifer forest, a common habitat in the project region.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
12.B-2 Vegetation Removal. This impact is the same as Impact 12.A-2 described above for Alternative A. Buildout of Alternative B would result in the conversion of approximately 6.2 acres of Sierran mixed conifer forest to buildings, walkways, driveways, parking, and landscaping. Because vegetation removed would exceed 50% of the existing on-site vegetation, this would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	12.B-2. Develop and Implement a Revegetation Plan. See Mitigation Measure 12.A-2 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
12.B-3 Tree Removal. Buildout of Alternative B would result in the loss of approximately 125 individual trees between 6 and 29 inches dbh.	PS	12.B-3. Minimize Tree Removal, Develop a Tree Management Plan, and a Tree Replacement Plan. See Mitigation Measure 12.A-3 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
12.B-4 Wildlife Movement Corridors. This impact is the same as Impact 12.A-4 described above for Alternative A. No wildlife movement corridors have been identified on the project site and no significant corridors are likely to exist.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
12.B-5 Nesting Raptors and Migratory Birds. This impact is the same as Impact 12.A-5 described above for Alternative A. Development of Alternative B could adversely affect nesting raptors and other migratory birds.	PS	12.B-5. Avoid Vegetation Removal During Nesting Season and Conduct Preconstruction Surveys. See Mitigation Measure 12.A-5 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
12.B-6 Special-Status Species and Common Wildlife. This impact is the same as Impact 12.A-6 described above for Alternative A. Development of Alternative B could adversely affect special-status species or common wildlife. However, special-status species are not expected to occupy the project site and Alternative B would not threaten the viability of common species populations.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
12.B-7 Bat Species. This impact is the same as Impact 12.A-7 described above for Alternative A. Development of Alternative B could adversely affect common bat species living in the project vicinity. Direct mortality and loss of roosting habitat would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	12.B-7. Conduct Bat Surveys and Prepare Bat Management Plan. See Mitigation Measure 12.A-7 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
12.C-1 Common and Sensitive Habitats. This impact is the same as Impact 12.A-1 described above for Alternative A. The project site does not support sensitive habitats. Implementation of Alternative C would result in the loss or disturbance of approximately 6.2 acres of Sierran mixed conifer forest, a common habitat in the project region.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>12.C-2 Vegetation Removal. This impact is the same as Impact 12.A-2 described above for Alternative A. Buildout of Alternative C would result in the conversion of approximately 6.2 acres of Sierran mixed conifer forest to buildings, walkways, driveways, parking, and landscaping. Because vegetation removed would exceed 50% of the existing on-site vegetation, this would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>12.C-2. Develop and Implement a Revegetation Plan. See Mitigation Measure 12.A-2 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>12.C-3 Tree Removal. Buildout of Alternative C would result in the loss of approximately 123 individual trees between 6 and 29 inches dbh.</p>	PS	<p>12.C-3. Minimize Tree Removal, Develop a Tree Management Plan, and a Tree Replacement Plan. See Mitigation Measure 12.A-3 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>12.C-4 Wildlife Movement Corridors. This impact is the same as Impact 12.A-4 described above for Alternative A. No wildlife movement corridors have been identified on the site and no significant corridors are likely to exist.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>12.C-5 Nesting Raptors and Migratory Birds. This impact is the same as Impact 12.A-5 described above for Alternative A. Development of Alternative C could adversely affect nesting raptors and other migratory birds.</p>	PS	<p>12.C-5. Avoid Vegetation Removal During Nesting Season and Conduct Preconstruction Surveys. See Mitigation Measure 12.A-5 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>12.C-6 Special-Status Species and Common Wildlife. This impact is the same as Impact 12.A-6 described above for Alternative A. Development of Alternative C could adversely affect special-status species or common wildlife. However, special-status species are not expected to occupy the project site and Alternative C would not threaten the viability of common species populations.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>12.C-7 Bat Species. This impact is the same as Impact 12.A-7 described above for Alternative A. Development of Alternative C could adversely affect common bat species living in the project vicinity. Direct mortality and loss of roosting habitat would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>12.C-7. Conduct Bat Surveys and Prepare Bat Management Plan. See Mitigation Measure 12.A-7 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<p align="center">Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives</p>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>13 Public Services and Utilities</p>			
<p>13.A-1 Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, Distribution, and Storage. Implementation of Alternative A would result in increased water demand. The Alternative A total peak day water demand would be approximately 85,000 gallons per day (gpd). NTPUD has indicated that improvements to the existing water supply, treatment, distribution, and/or storage systems are needed to serve increased water demands. In September 2007 NTPUD approved a new water connection fee to help pay for system-wide improvements to the water system, including improvements to accommodate projected increases in water service demands resulting from new development in the NTPUD service area. As established by NTPUD these fees have been determined to be sufficient to provide for the water system improvements necessary to accommodate additional development, including the development of the proposed project, in the NTPUD service area.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>13.A-2 Increased Demand for Wastewater Service. Implementation of Alternative A would result in an increased demand for wastewater service. Alternative A would generate a total peak day wastewater discharge of approximately 125,000 gpd. The T-TSA's treatment facility would adequately serve the proposed project. Capacity at the NTPUD wastewater treatment facility would also be adequate to serve the proposed project, however future improvements to the existing NTPUD wastewater conveyance facilities are necessary to maintain service. In September 2007 NTPUD approved modifications to the existing sewer connection fee in part to obtain funds for improvements to the existing wastewater facilities. The adjusted sewer connection fee would apply to the proposed project. As established by NTPUD these fees have been determined to be sufficient to provide for the</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
wastewater system improvements necessary to accommodate additional development, including the development of the proposed project, in the NTPUD service area.			
13.A-3 Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services. Alternative A would generate additional solid waste, requiring collection and disposal by TTSD. TTSD has adequate capacity to serve development associated with Alternative A, which would not adversely affect TTSD's existing services or facilities.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
13.A-4 Increased Demand for Electricity and Required Extension of Electrical Infrastructure. Implementation of Alternative A would increase the demand for electricity and electrical infrastructure at the site. Sierra Pacific Power Company would be able to provide electricity to the site and the increase in demand for electricity would not be substantial in relation to the existing electricity consumption in Sierra Pacific Power Company's service area.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
13.A-5 Increased Demand for Natural Gas and Required Extension of Natural Gas Infrastructure. Implementation of Alternative A would increase demand for natural gas. Southwest Gas Corporation would be able to provide natural gas services to the site, provided necessary improvements are installed.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
13.A-6 Increased Demand for Telecommunications Service. Implementation of Alternative A would result in an increased demand for telecommunications services. Although limited on- and off-site improvements would be necessary to establish service, SBC would be able to serve the level of development associated with Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>13.A-7 Emergency Access During Construction. Construction activities associated with Alternative A could temporarily interfere with the ability of the Placer County Sheriff’s Department and the North Tahoe Fire Protection District to provide emergency services to the project area, particularly those parcels adjacent to the site.</p>	PS	<p>13.A-7. Ensure Emergency Access During Construction. The project applicant shall prepare and submit an emergency access plan to TRPA, Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD), Placer County Sherriff’s Department, and the NTFPD for review and approval before construction permits are issued. The plan shall include detailed descriptions of how emergency access would be maintained throughout project construction. Emergency access measures are expected to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Phasing construction activities to provide continual access to emergency vehicles during construction; ▶ Backfilling trenches and/or placing metal plates over the trenches at the end of each workday; ▶ Using alternate access routes as needed; and ▶ Notifying the Placer County Sheriff’s Department and the NTFPD of construction activities and providing these agencies with a copy of the emergency access plan. 	LTS
<p>13.A-8 Increased Demand for Fire Protection. Implementation of Alternative A would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for fire protection.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>13.A-9 Increased Demand for Police Services. Implementation of Alternative A would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for police services, which could result in a need for the addition of 1/3 PCSD deputy to effectively maintain the existing level of service.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>13.A-10 Increased Student Enrollment in Tahoe Vista Schools. Implementation of Alternative A would increase student enrollment at TTUSD’s schools. Payment of the development impact fees would provide the legally maximum required level of funding under State law, and would fully mitigate project-related school impacts.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>13.A-11 Increased Demand for Postal Service. Implementation of Alternative A would result in an increased demand for postal services. Although street delivery is not available in Tahoe Vista, the TVCP contains an action element to provide home mail service throughout the area, with a specific requirement that appropriate facilities for mail delivery be provided.</p>	PS	<p>13.A-11. Install Appropriate Facilities for Mail Delivery. Before occupancy of the proposed project, the project applicant shall install clustered postal boxes near the entrance of the project site, provide an area for the mail carrier to park, and provide a parking area for residents, to allow for postal delivery if this service is provided in the future.</p>	LTS
<p>13.B-1 Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, Distribution, and Storage. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-1 described above for Alternative A. However, the Alternative B (49 units [39 TAUs and 10 affordable/employee units], approximately 258 residents) total peak day water demand would be approximately 75,000 gpd. NTPUD has indicated that improvements to the existing water supply, treatment, distribution, and/or storage systems are needed to serve increased water demands. In September 2007 NTPUD approved a new water connection fee to help pay for system-wide improvements to the water system, including improvements to accommodate projected increases in water service demands resulting from new development in the NTPUD service area. As established by NTPUD these fees have been determined to be sufficient to provide for the water system improvements necessary to accommodate additional development, including Alternative B development, in the NTPUD service area.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>13.B-2 Increased Demand for Wastewater Service. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-2 described above for Alternative A. However, Alternative B (49 units [39 TAUs and 10 affordable/employee units], approximately 258 residents) would generate a total peak day wastewater discharge of approximately 116,000 gpd. The T-TSA's treatment facility would adequately serve Alternative B. Capacity at the NTPUD wastewater treatment facility would also be adequate to serve Alternative B, however</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>future improvements to the existing NTPUD wastewater conveyance facilities are necessary to maintain service. In September 2007 NTPUD approved modifications to the existing sewer connection fee in part to obtain funds for improvements to the existing wastewater facilities. The adjusted sewer connection fee would apply to Alternative B. As established by NTPUD these fees have been determined to be sufficient to provide for the wastewater system improvements necessary to accommodate additional development, including Alternative B development, in the NTPUD service area.</p>			
<p>13.B-3 Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-3 described above for Alternative A. However, Alternative B (49 units [39 TAUs and 10 affordable/employee units], approximately 258 residents) would generate approximately 1,806–2,064 pounds of solid waste per day, which equates to approximately 330–377 tons of solid waste annually, not including construction waste, requiring collection and disposal by TTSD. TTSD would be able to serve development associated with Alternative B, which would not be expected to adversely affect TTSD’s existing services or facilities.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>13.B-4 Increased Demand for Electricity and Required Extension of Electrical Infrastructure. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-4 described above for Alternative A. Implementation of Alternative B would increase the demand for electricity and electrical infrastructure at the site. Sierra Pacific Power Company would be able to provide electricity to the site and the increase in demand for electricity would not be substantial in relation to the existing electricity consumption in Sierra Pacific Power Company’s service area.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
13.B-5 Increased Demand for Natural Gas and Required Extension of Natural Gas Infrastructure. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-5 described above for Alternative A. Implementation of Alternative B would increase demand for natural gas. Southwest Gas Corporation would be able to provide natural gas services to the site, provided necessary improvements are installed.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
13.B-6 Increased Demand for Telecommunications Service. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-6 described above for Alternative A. Implementation of Alternative B would result in an increased demand for telecommunications services. Although limited on- and off-site improvements would be necessary to establish service, SBC would be able to serve the level of development associated with Alternative B.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
13.B-7 Emergency Access During Construction. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-7 described above for Alternative A. Construction activities associated with Alternative B could temporarily interfere with the ability of the Placer County Sheriff's Department and the North Tahoe Fire Protection District to provide emergency services to the project area, particularly those parcels adjacent to the site.	PS	13.B-7. Ensure Emergency Access During Construction. See Mitigation Measure 13.A-7 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
13.B-8 Increased Demand for Fire Protection. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-8 described above for Alternative A. Implementation of Alternative B would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for fire protection.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
13.B-9 Increased Demand for Police Services. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-9 described above for Alternative A. Implementation of Alternative B (approximately 258 residents) would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for police	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
services, which could result in a need for the addition of 1/4 PCSD deputy to effectively maintain the existing level of service.			
13.B-10 Increased Student Enrollment in Tahoe Vista Schools. Implementation of Alternative B would increase student enrollment at TTUSD’s schools. Payment of the development impact fees would provide the legally maximum required level of funding under State law, and would fully mitigate school impacts associated with Alternative B.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
13.B-11 Increased Demand for Postal Service. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-11 described above for Alternative A. Implementation of Alternative B would result in an increased demand for postal services. Although street delivery is not available in Tahoe Vista, the TVCP contains an action element to provide home mail service throughout the area, with a specific requirement that appropriate facilities for mail delivery be provided.	PS	13.B-11. Install Appropriate Facilities for Mail Delivery. See Mitigation Measure 13.A-11 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
13.C-1 Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, Distribution, and Storage. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-1 described above for Alternative A. However, the Alternative C (49 units [39 TAUs and 10 affordable/employee units], approximately 258 residents) total peak day water demand would be approximately 75,000 gpd. NTPUD has indicated that improvements to the existing water supply, treatment, distribution, and/or storage systems are needed to serve increased water demands. In September 2007 NTPUD approved a new water connection fee to help pay for system-wide improvements to the water system, including improvements to accommodate projected increases in water service demands resulting from new development in the NTPUD service area. As established by NTPUD these fees have been determined to be sufficient to provide for the water system improvements necessary to accommodate additional	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
development, including Alternative C development, in the NTPUD service area.			
<p>13.C-2 Increased Demand for Wastewater Service. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-2 described above for Alternative A. However, Alternative C (49 units [39 TAUs and 10 affordable/employee units], approximately 258 residents) would generate a total peak day wastewater discharge of approximately 116,000 gpd. The T-TSA’s treatment facility would adequately serve Alternative C. Capacity at the NTPUD wastewater treatment facility would also be adequate to serve Alternative C, however future improvements to the existing NTPUD wastewater conveyance facilities are necessary to maintain service. In September 2007 NTPUD approved modifications to the existing sewer connection fee in part to obtain funds for improvements to the existing wastewater facilities. The adjusted sewer connection fee would apply to Alternative C. As established by NTPUD these fees have been determined to be sufficient to provide for the wastewater system improvements necessary to accommodate additional development, including Alternative C development, in the NTPUD service area.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>13.C-3 Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-3 described above for Alternative A. However, Alternative C (49 units [39 TAUs and 10 affordable/ employee units], approximately 258 residents) would generate approximately 1,806–2,064 pounds of solid waste per day, which equates to approximately 330–377 tons of solid waste annually, not including construction waste, necessitating collection and disposal by TTSD. TTSD would be able to serve development associated with Alternative C, which would not be expected to adversely affect TTSD’s existing services or facilities.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>13.C-4 Increased Demand for Electricity and Required Extension of Electrical Infrastructure. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-4 described above for Alternative A. Implementation of Alternative C would increase the demand for electricity and electrical infrastructure at the site. Sierra Pacific Power Company would be able to provide electricity to the site and the increase in demand for electricity would not be substantial in relation to the existing electricity consumption in Sierra Pacific Power Company’s service area.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>13.C-5 Increased Demand for Natural Gas and Required Extension of Natural Gas Infrastructure. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-5 described above for Alternative A. Implementation of Alternative C would increase demand for natural gas. Southwest Gas Corporation would be able to provide natural gas services to the site, provided necessary improvements are installed.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>13.C-6 Increased Demand for Telecommunications Service. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-6 described above for Alternative A. Implementation of Alternative C would result in an increased demand for telecommunications services. Although limited on- and off-site improvements would be necessary to establish service, SBC would be able to serve the level of development associated with Alternative C.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>13.C-7 Emergency Access During Construction. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-7 described above for Alternative A. Construction activities associated with Alternative C could temporarily interfere with the ability of the Placer County Sheriff’s Department and the North Tahoe Fire Protection District to provide emergency services to the project area, particularly those parcels adjacent to the site.</p>	PS	<p>13.C-7. Ensure Emergency Access During Construction. See Mitigation Measure 13.A-7 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>13.C-8 Increased Demand for Fire Protection. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-8 described above for Alternative A. Implementation of Alternative C would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for fire protection.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>13.C-9 Increased Demand for Police Services. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-9 described above for Alternative A. Implementation of Alternative C (approximately 258 residents) would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for police services, which could result in a need for the addition of 1/4 PCSD deputy to effectively maintain the existing level of service.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>13.C-10 Increased Student Enrollment in Tahoe Vista Schools. This impact is the same as Impact 13.B-10 described above for Alternative B in that it would increase student enrollment at TTUSD’s schools. Payment of the development impact fees would provide the legally maximum required level of funding under State law, and would fully mitigate school impacts associated with Alternative C. above for Alternative A. Implementation of Alternative C would result in an increased demand for postal services. Although street delivery is not available in Tahoe Vista, the TVCP contains an action element to provide home mail service throughout the area, with a specific requirement that appropriate facilities for mail delivery be provided.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>13.C-11 Increased Demand for Postal Service. This impact is the same as Impact 13.A-11 described above for Alternative A. Implementation of Alternative C would result in an increased demand for postal services. Although street delivery is not available in Tahoe Vista, the TVCP contains an action element to provide home mail service throughout the area, with a specific requirement that appropriate facilities for mail delivery be provided.</p>	<p align="center">PS</p>	<p>13.C-11. Install Appropriate Facilities for Mail Delivery. See Mitigation Measure 13.A-11 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	<p align="center">LTS</p>
<p>14 Traffic, Parking, and Circulation</p>			
<p>14.A-1 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT). Alternative A would generate approximately 299 net new daily trips during the peak summer months. Because the travel demand model forecasts future travel demand conditions for the peak Friday in August, the summer trip generation applies for VMT analysis. The Alternative A daily summer trip generation (299 trips) is considered significant based on criteria defined in TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 93.</p>	<p align="center">S</p>	<p>14.A-1a. Contribute to TRPA Air Quality Mitigation Fund to Reduce VMT. Pursuant to Chapter 93.3.D of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, an air quality mitigation fee, assessed at a rate per daily vehicle trip, is required to offset the potential traffic and air quality impacts associated with a project. The total estimated fee based on the proposed land uses and summer daily increase in vehicle trips is \$80,730. TRPA requires that the air quality impact mitigation fee be paid for any project that results in an increase of daily vehicle trips in the Tahoe Basin. Per TRPA Code of Ordinance Section 93.3.C, the Air Quality Mitigation Fund provides for regional and cumulative mitigation measures that may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Transit facility construction; ▶ Transportation Systems Management measures, including, but not limited to, bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and use of alternative fuels in fleet vehicles; or ▶ Transfer and retirement of off-site development rights. <p>Because Alternative A would result in an increase of 299 daily vehicle trips, the applicant shall contribute the required corresponding mitigation fee to the Air Quality Mitigation Fund prior to issuance of grading and construction permits for Alternative A.</p>	<p align="center">LTS</p>

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	S	<p>14.A-1b. Contribute to Placer County Road Network Traffic Limitation Zone and Traffic Fee Program.</p> <p>The project would be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Tahoe Fee District), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The project applicant would be required to pay the following traffic mitigation fee(s) to the Placer County Department of Public Works (DPW) prior to issuance of any Building Permits for the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.0140, Placer County Code <p>The total combined estimated fee is \$201,770. The fees were calculated based on the proposed land use types and square footages. If either the land use type or square footage were to change, then the fees would change accordingly. The fees to be paid shall be based on the fee program in effect at the time that the application is deemed complete.</p> <p>The Traffic Fee Program pays for improved transportation facilities that Placer County DPW deems necessary, such as roadway improvements, traffic signals, sidewalks, etc. Because of the location of the project, in Tahoe Vista, the traffic impacts fees would be utilized by the County for transportation facility improvements within the Tahoe Region.</p>	LTS
<p>14.A-2 Existing Plus Alternative A Level of Service. Alternative A would add a significant number of new trips to adjacent roadways during summer months. However, all of the study intersections are anticipated to operate at acceptable levels of service under existing plus project conditions.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>14.A-3 Vehicular Access and Circulation. The vehicular access to/from the project site would be via two driveways on SR 28. Emergency access would be via these driveways, and the internal circulation includes a looped system as required by the North Tahoe Fire Protection District.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
14.A-4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation. Alternative A would add bicycle and pedestrian trips to SR 28. The project does not include design features that would create hazards for pedestrians/bicycles or conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs related to pedestrian or bicycle circulation.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
14.A-5 Transit. Alternative A would be well served by existing transit services and convenient stops. The project would add some transit trips to TART, the Tahoe Trolley, and the Town of Truckee and other winter shuttle services; however, transit trips are encouraged. Based on conversations with TART (Peterson, pers. comm., 2006), the project would not increase transit trips above the capacity of the transit system under typical conditions.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
14.A-6 Parking Supply. Alternative A would provide parking that meets Placer County Code requirements. Parking adjacent to the existing main commercial building would be removed and the spaces would be reconstructed on the project site.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
14.A-7 Construction Traffic. Alternative A would temporarily add construction traffic on SR 28 during the construction period; however, all of the study intersections would be expected to operate at acceptable levels of service with the addition of project-related construction traffic.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>14.B-1 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT). Alternative B would generate approximately 238 net new daily trips during the peak summer months. Because the travel demand model forecasts future travel demand conditions for the peak Friday in August, the summer trip generation applies for VMT analysis. The Alternative B daily summer trip generation (238 trips) is considered significant based on criteria defined in TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 93.</p>	S	<p>14.B-1a. Contribute to TRPA Air Quality Mitigation Fund to Reduce VMT. See Mitigation Measure 14.A-1a described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply with an estimated fee of \$64,260.</p> <p>14.B-1b. Contribute to Placer County Road Network Traffic Limitation Zone and Traffic Fee Program. See Mitigation Measure 14.A-1b described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply with an estimated fee of \$180,599.</p>	LTS
<p>14.B-2 Existing Plus Alternative B Level of Service. Alternative B would add a significant number of new trips to adjacent roadways during summer months. However, all of the study intersections are anticipated to operate at acceptable levels of service under existing plus Alternative B development conditions.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>14.B-3 Vehicular Access and Circulation. This impact is the same as Impact 14.A-3 described above for Alternative A. The vehicular access to/from the project site would be via two driveways on SR 28. Emergency access would be via these driveways, and the internal circulation includes a looped system as required by the North Tahoe Fire Protection District.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>14.B-4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation. This impact is the same as Impact 14.A-4 described above for Alternative A. Alternative B would add bicycle and pedestrian trips to SR 28. Alternative B does not include design features that would create hazards for pedestrians/bicycles or conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs related to pedestrian or bicycle circulation.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>14.B-5 Transit. This impact is the same as Impact 14.A-5 described above for Alternative A. Alternative B would be well served by existing transit services and convenient stops. Alternative B would add some transit trips to TART, the Tahoe Trolley, and the Town of Truckee and other winter shuttle services; however, transit trips are encouraged. Alternative B would not increase transit trips above the capacity of the transit system under typical conditions.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>14.B-6 Parking Supply. Alternative B would provide parking that meets the Placer County Code requirements. Parking adjacent to the existing main commercial building would be removed and the spaces would be reconstructed on the project site.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>14.B-7 Construction Traffic. This impact is the same as Impact 14.A-7 described above for Alternative A. Alternative B would temporarily add construction traffic on SR 28 during the construction period; however, all of the study intersections would be expected to operate at acceptable levels of service with the addition of construction traffic associated with Alternative B.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>14.C-1 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT). This impact is the same as Impact 14.B-1 described above for Alternative B. Alternative C would generate approximately 238 net new daily trips during the peak summer months. Because the travel demand model forecasts future travel demand conditions for the peak Friday in August, the summer trip generation applies for VMT analysis. The Alternative C daily summer trip generation (238 trips) is considered significant based on criteria defined in TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 93.</p>	S	<p>14.C-1a. Contribute to TRPA Air Quality Mitigation Fund to Reduce VMT. See Mitigation Measure 14.A-1a described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply with an estimated fee of \$64,260.</p> <p>14.C-1b. Contribute to Placer County Road Network Traffic Limitation Zone and Traffic Fee Program. See Mitigation Measure 14.A-1b described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply with an estimated fee of \$183,647.</p>	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
14.C-2 Existing Plus Alternative C Level of Service. The impact is the same as Impact 14.B-2 described above for Alternative B. Alternative C would add a significant number of new trips to adjacent roadways during summer months. However, all of the study intersections are anticipated to operate at acceptable levels of service under existing plus Alternative C development conditions.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
14.C-3 Vehicular Access and Circulation. This impact is the same as Impact 14.A-3 described above for Alternative A. The vehicular access to/from the project site would be via two driveways on SR 28. Emergency access would be via these driveways, and the internal circulation includes a looped system as required by the North Tahoe Fire Protection District.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
14.C-4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation. This impact is the same as Impact 14.A-4 described above for Alternative A; however, Alternative C incorporates additional amenities to support bicycle and pedestrian activities (e.g., bicycle racks, a footpath, the bicycle/kayak rental facility, etc.). Alternative C would add bicycle and pedestrian trips to SR 28. Alternative C does not include design features that would create hazards for pedestrians/bicycles or conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs related to pedestrian or bicycle circulation.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
14.C-5 Transit. The impact is the same as Impact 14.A-5 described above for Alternative A. Alternative C would be well served by existing transit services and convenient stops. Alternative C would add some transit trips to TART, the Tahoe Trolley, and the Town of Truckee and other winter shuttle services; however, transit trips are encouraged. Alternative C would not increase transit trips above the capacity of the transit system under typical conditions.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>14.C-6 Parking Supply. Alternative C would provide parking that meets the Placer County Code requirements. Parking adjacent to the existing main commercial building would be removed and the spaces would be reconstructed on the project site. Alternative C would also allow shared day-use parking near the main 2-story building for users of the Sandy Beach Recreation Area and parking for the recreation rental uses added to the main 2-story building. Shared parking would be restricted to daytime hours (e.g., between the hours of 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM).</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>14.C-7 Construction Traffic. The impact is the same as Impact 14.A-7 described above for Alternative A. Alternative C would temporarily add construction traffic on SR 28 during the construction period; however, all of the study intersections would be expected to operate at acceptable levels of service with the addition of construction traffic associated with Alternative C.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>15 Air Quality</p>			
<p>15.A-1 Short-Term Construction Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀. Project-related construction emissions of criteria air pollutants would exceed the PCAPCD significance thresholds of 82 lbs/day for NO_x. In addition, construction emissions would potentially contribute to existing nonattainment conditions in the LTAB for PM₁₀.</p>	S	<p>15.A-1. Reduce Temporary Construction Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀.</p> <p>In accordance with the PCAPCD, the project applicant shall implement the following recommended mitigation measures (Backus, pers. comm., 2006) during construction of the proposed project. In addition to the mitigation measures identified below, construction of the project is required to comply with all applicable PCAPCD rules, including Rule 202 regarding visible emissions, Rule 228 regarding fugitive dust, Rule 218 regarding the application of architectural coating, and Rule 217 regarding cutback and emulsified asphalt paving materials.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant shall submit to the PCAPCD and receive approval of a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan prior to any groundbreaking or tree removal activities. This plan must address the minimum Administrative Requirements 	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>defined in section 300 and 400 of District Rule 228, Fugitive Dust (www.placer.ca.gov/airpollution/airpolut.htm).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Fugitive dust shall not exceed 40% opacity and not go beyond the property boundary at any time during project construction. If lime or other drying agents are utilized to dry out wet grading areas they shall be controlled as to not to exceed Rule 228 limitations. 3. Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed Rule 202 limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment that exceed opacity limits shall be immediately notified and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours. 4. The prime contractor shall submit to the PCAPCD a comprehensive inventory (i.e., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. The project representative shall provide the PCAPCD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman. The project representative shall provide a plan for approval by the PCAPCD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20% NO_x reduction and 45% particulate reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. 5. No open burning of removed vegetation shall occur during infrastructure improvements. 6. Minimize idling time to 5 minutes for all diesel-power equipment. 	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		7. Use ARB diesel fuel for all diesel-powered equipment. 8. Apply water to control dust as needed to prevent dust impacts offsite. Operational water truck(s), shall be onsite, as required, to control fugitive dust. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site. 9. Apply approved chemical soil stabilizers, vegetative mats, or other appropriate best management practices to manufacturer’s specifications, to all-inactive construction areas (previously graded areas which remain inactive for 96 hours). 10. Spread soil binders on unpaved roads and employee/equipment parking areas and wet broom or wash streets if silt is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares. 11. Utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than temporary diesel power generators. If not available, low sulfur fuel is to be used for diesel-powered generators. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 15.A-1 would reduce fugitive PM ₁₀ dust emissions a minimum of approximately 50% and prevent dispersion, thereof, beyond the property boundary. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 15.A-1 would also reduce diesel equipment exhaust emissions of ROG, NO _x , and PM ₁₀ a minimum of 5%, 20%, and 45%, respectively.	
15.A-2 Long-Term Operational (Regional) Emissions. The total of stationary, area, and mobile source emissions associated with the long-term operation of the project would not exceed the PCAPCD’s significance threshold of 82 lbs/day for ROG, NO _x or PM ₁₀ . In addition, emissions from stationary sources associated with the project would not exceed the TRPA thresholds for stationary sources. However, PCAPCD maintains a 10 lbs/day cumulative threshold for ROG and NO _x and the project would exceed the NO _x threshold.	S	15.A-2. Contribute to TRPA Air Quality Mitigation Fund to Reduce VMT Pursuant to Mitigation Measure 14.A-1a. The air quality mitigation fee implemented as part of Mitigation Measure 14.A-1a (see Chapter 14, “Traffic, Parking, and Circulation”) would provide necessary funding for projects that would offset the project’s cumulative contribution to long-term NO _x emissions. Projects that would be implemented under the TRPA program would reduce NO _x emissions by greater than 1.6 lbs/day, the amount necessary to reduce the project’s contribution to cumulative air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>The total estimated fee for Alternative A is \$80,730. Per TRPA Code of Ordinance Section 93.3.C, the Air Quality Mitigation Fund provides for regional and cumulative mitigation measures that may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Transit facility construction; ▶ Transportation Systems Management measures, including, but not limited to, bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and use of alternative fuels in fleet vehicles; or ▶ Transfer and retirement of off-site development rights. <p>As required in Mitigation Measure 14.A-1a, the applicant shall contribute the required corresponding mitigation fee to the Air Quality Mitigation Fund prior to issuance of grading and construction permits for Alternative A.</p>	
<p>15.A-3 Long-Term Operational (Local) Mobile-Source Carbon Monoxide Emissions. Long-term operational (local) mobile-source CO emissions under Alternative A would not violate an air quality standard (i.e., 1-hour CAAQS of 20 ppm, 8-hour TRPA standard of 6 ppm), contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>15.A-4 Odor Emissions. Neither project construction nor operation of Alternative A would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>15.A-5 Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions. Neither construction nor operation of Alternative A would result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial TAC emissions.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>15.B-1 Short-Term Construction Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀. Project-related construction emissions of criteria air pollutants would exceed the PCAPCD significance thresholds of 82 lbs/day for NO_x. In addition,</p>	S	<p>15.B-1. Reduce Temporary Construction Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀. See Mitigation Measure 15.A-1 described above for Alternative A.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
construction emissions would potentially contribute to existing nonattainment conditions in the LTAB for PM ₁₀ .		The same mitigation measure would apply.	
<p>15.B-2 Long-Term Operational (Regional) Emissions. The total of stationary, area, and mobile source emissions associated with the long-term operation of Alternative B would not exceed the PCAPCD’s significance threshold of 82 lbs/day for ROG, NO_x, or PM₁₀. In addition, emissions from stationary sources associated with the project would not exceed the TRPA thresholds for stationary sources. However, PCAPCD maintains a 10 lbs/day cumulative threshold for ROG and NO_x, and Alternative B would exceed the NO_x threshold.</p>	S	<p>15.B-2. Contribute to TRPA Air Quality Mitigation Fund to Reduce VMT Pursuant to Mitigation Measure 14.B-1a.</p> <p>The air quality mitigation fee implemented as part of Mitigation Measure 14.B-1a (see Chapter 14, “Traffic, Parking, and Circulation”) would provide necessary funding for projects that would offset the cumulative contribution of Alternative B to long-term NO_x emissions. Projects that would be implemented under the TRPA program would reduce NO_x emissions by greater than 0.2 lbs/day, the amount necessary to reduce the contribution to cumulative air quality impacts of Alternative B to a less-than-significant level. The total estimated fee for Alternative B is \$64,260. The applicant shall contribute the required corresponding mitigation fee to the Air Quality Mitigation Fund prior to issuance of grading and construction permits for Alternative B.</p>	LTS
<p>15.B-3 Long-Term Operational (Local) Mobile-Source Carbon Monoxide Emissions. Long-term operational (local) mobile-source CO emissions under Alternative B would not violate an air quality standard (i.e., 1-hour CAAQS of 20 ppm, 8-hour TRPA standard of 6 ppm), contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>15.B-4 Odor Emissions. Because implementation of Alternative B would result in the same type of proposed uses on the same project site as Alternative A, this impact would be the same as Impact 15.A-4. Thus, neither construction nor operation of Alternative B would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>15.B-5 Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions. Because implementation of Alternative B would result in the same type of proposed uses and on the same project site as Alternative A, this impact would be the same as Impact 15.A-5. Thus, neither construction nor operation of Alternative B would result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial TAC emissions.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>15.C-1 Short-Term Construction Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀. This impact is the same as Impact 15.B-1 described above for Alternative B. Project-related construction emissions of criteria air pollutants would exceed the PCAPCD significance thresholds of 82 lbs/day for NO_x. In addition, construction emissions would potentially contribute to existing nonattainment conditions in the LTAB for PM₁₀.</p>	S	<p>15.C-1. Reduce Temporary Construction Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀. See Mitigation Measure 15.A-1 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>15.C-2 Long-Term Operational (Regional) Emissions. Because the trip generation and the proposed land use types and sizes would be the same for Alternatives C as under Alternative B, this impact would be the same as Impact 15.B-2. The total of stationary, area, and mobile source emissions associated with the long-term operation of Alternative B would not exceed the PCAPCD's significance threshold of 82 lbs/day for ROG, NO_x, or PM₁₀. In addition, emissions from stationary sources associated with the project would not exceed the TRPA thresholds for stationary sources. However, PCAPCD maintains a 10 lbs/day cumulative threshold for ROG and NO_x and Alternative B would exceed the NO_x threshold.</p>	S	<p>15.C-2. Contribute to TRPA Air Quality Mitigation Fund to Reduce VMT Pursuant to Mitigation Measure 14.C-1a See Mitigation Measure 15.B-2 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>15.C-3 Long-Term Operational (Local) Mobile-Source Carbon Monoxide Emissions. Because the trip generation for Alternative C would be the same as under Alternative B, this impact would be the same as Impact 15.B-3. Thus, long-term operational (local) mobile-source CO emissions under Alternative C would not violate an air quality</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
standard (i.e., 1-hour CAAQS of 20 ppm, 8-hour TRPA standard of 6 ppm), contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.			
15.C-4 Odor Emissions. Because implementation of Alternative C would result in the same type of proposed uses on the same project site as Alternative A, this impact would be the same as Impact 15.A-4. Thus, neither construction nor operation of Alternative C would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
15.C-5 Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions. Because implementation of Alternative C would result in the same type of proposed uses and on the same project site as Alternative A, this impact would be the same as Impact 15.A-5. Thus, neither construction nor operation of Alternative C would result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial TAC emissions.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
16 Noise			
16.A-1 On-site Construction Noise Levels. If construction were to occur during the more noise-sensitive evening and nighttime hours, short-term construction noise could result in increased sleep disruption and interference to adjacent and nearby residents	PS	16.A-1. Reduce On-site Construction Noise Levels. The project applicant shall implement the following mitigation measures during construction to reduce on-site short-term construction noise levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Construction activity that results in increased noise levels beyond the project site’s property line, including all material haul trips, shall be limited to the hours between 8:00 AM and 6:30 PM and prohibited on Sundays and federal holidays. ▶ All construction equipment shall be equipped with properly operating mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers’ specifications. ▶ Equipment engine doors shall be kept closed during equipment operation. ▶ Inactive construction equipment shall not be left idling for 	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>prolonged periods of time (i.e., more than 2 minutes).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Stationary equipment (e.g., power generators) shall be located at the maximum distance feasible from nearby noise-sensitive receptors. <p>Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be identified by the project applicant on the construction plans and shall be located as far as is practical from existing dwellings in the area, including residences adjacent to the eastern and western boundaries of the site.</p>	
<p>16.A-2 Off-site Construction Traffic Noise Levels. Project-related construction would result in a short-term increase in traffic on the local area network. Heavy trucks accessing the project site during the more noise-sensitive nighttime and early morning hours may result in increased sleep disruption and interference to adjacent and nearby residents.</p>	PS	<p>16.A-2. Reduce Off-site Construction Traffic Noise Levels.</p> <p>The project applicant shall restrict construction-related heavy truck trips and material haul trips to the hours between 8:00 AM and 6:30 PM and prohibit such trips on Sundays and federal holidays</p>	LTS
<p>16.A-3 Stationary- and Area-Source Noise. Operation of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment associated with buildings related to Alternative A, if not properly designed or located, could generate noise levels that exceed the TVCP and/or Placer County thresholds. Trash collection activities involving large refuse dumpsters, especially those that occur during the early morning or nighttime hours, could result in increased sleep disruption to adjacent and nearby sensitive receptors.</p>	PS	<p>16.A-3. Reduce On-site Stationary and Area Source Noise Levels.</p> <p>The project applicant shall implement the following mitigation measures in the design and operation of the proposed project to reduce exposure of nearby sensitive receptors to increased noise levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Mechanical building equipment (e.g., heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment) shall be located at the farthest distance from and be shielded from nearby existing and proposed future noise-sensitive land uses. ▶ Garbage dumpsters shall be located as far as possible from sensitive receptors, including residences located adjacent to the eastern and western boundaries of the site. 	LTS
<p>16.A-4 Long-term Operational Increases in Daily Off-site Traffic Noise Levels. Project-related traffic would not result in a perceptible increase in ambient noise levels on nearby local roadways or highways.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>16.A-5 Land Use Compatibility with On-site Noise Levels. Alternative A would develop new noise-sensitive receptors (affordable/employee housing units) in a location where predicted noise levels would exceed the TVCP and/or Placer County’s thresholds for land use compatibility.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>16.A-5. Design and Construct Proposed Fence/Wall to Provide Adequate Noise Reduction to Ensure Compliance with TVCP and Placer County Land Use Compatibility Standards.</p> <p>Consistent with implementation strategies outlined in the TVCP and in the Placer County General Plan Noise Element, the project applicant shall implement the following to ensure the proposed fence/wall would provide adequate noise attenuation to reduce the exposure of proposed affordable/employee housing units to traffic noise from SR 28 and to ensure compliance with TVCP and Placer County land use compatibility standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The proposed fence or wall between the closest affordable/employee housing unit and SR 28 shall be designed and constructed to achieve a minimum exterior noise reduction of 3.3 dBA. The wall must be constructed of solid material (e.g., brick or adobe), be of sufficient density and height to minimize exterior noise levels and have sufficient durability to withstand winter conditions. The barrier shall blend into the overall landscape and have an aesthetically pleasing appearance that agrees with the color and character of nearby residences, and not become the dominant visual element of the community. The barrier shall adhere to TRPA and Placer County Design Review Guidelines. Funding for the installation of this mitigation measure shall be provided by the project applicant and final design/specifications (e.g., height above line-of-sight break measured at the base elevation of the nearest affordable/employee housing unit, distance from nearest proposed receptor) shall be developed in consultation with a qualified professional. For maximum effectiveness, the fence/wall must be continuous and relatively airtight along its length and height. To ensure that sound transmission through the fence/wall is insignificant, barrier mass should be about 4 pounds per square foot, although a lesser mass may be acceptable if the fence/wall material provides sufficient transmission loss. 	<p>LTS</p>

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>► Prior to the issuance of any building permits or as a condition of approval, the project applicant shall be required to provide verification of the effectiveness of the constructed fence/wall to comply with applicable noise standards.</p> <p>Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce on-site noise levels by 3.3 dBA CNEL (e.g., from 58.3 to 55.0 dBA CNEL under cumulative plus project conditions) at 300 feet from the edge of the roadway. Thus, on-site noise levels would not exceed 55 dBA at 300 feet or beyond, or 60 dBA at the nearest noise sensitive receptor (affordable/employee housing unit).</p>	
<p>16.B-1 On-site Construction Noise Levels. Because Alternative B would result in similar development on the same site as Alternative A though at a reduced level that includes 39 TAU units, this impact is the same as Impact 16.A-1 described above for Alternative A. If construction were to occur during the more noise-sensitive evening and nighttime hours, short-term construction noise could result in increased sleep disruption and interference to adjacent and nearby residents.</p>	PS	<p>16.B-1. Reduce On-site Construction Noise Levels. See Mitigation Measure 16.A-1 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>16.B-2 Off-site Construction Traffic Noise Levels. This impact is the same as Impact 16.A-2 described above for Alternative A. Construction associated with Alternative B would result in a short-term increase in traffic on the local area network. Heavy trucks accessing the project site during the more noise-sensitive nighttime and early morning hours may result in increased sleep disruption and interference to adjacent and nearby residents.</p>	PS	<p>16.B-2. Reduce Off-site Construction Traffic Noise Levels. See Mitigation Measure 16.A-2 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>16.B-3 Stationary- and Area-Source Noise. The impact of noise generated by stationary and area sources for Alternative B would be the same as described in Impact 16.A-3 for Alternative A. Operation of HVAC equipment associated with buildings related to Alternative B, if not properly designed or located, could generate noise</p>	PS	<p>16.B-3. Reduce On-site Stationary and Area Source Noise Levels. See Mitigation Measure 16.A-3 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<p align="center">Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives</p>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>levels that exceed the TVCP and/or Placer County thresholds. Trash collection activities involving large refuse dumpsters, especially those that occur during the early morning or nighttime hours, could result in increased sleep disruption to adjacent and nearby sensitive receptors.</p>			
<p>16.B-4 Long-term Operational Increases in Daily Off-site Traffic Noise Levels. This impact would be similar to Impact 16.A-4 above. Project-related traffic under Alternative B would not result in a perceptible increase in ambient noise levels on nearby local roadways or highways.</p>	LTS	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	LTS
<p>16.B-5 Land Use Compatibility with On-site Noise Levels. Like Alternative A, Alternative B would develop new noise-sensitive receptors (affordable/employee housing units) in a location where predicted noise levels would exceed the TVCP and/or Placer County’s thresholds for land use compatibility.</p>	PS	<p>16.B-5. Design and Construct Proposed Fence/Wall to Provide Adequate Noise Reduction to Ensure Compliance with TVCP and Placer County Land Use Compatibility Standards. See Mitigation Measures 16.A-5 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply</p>	LTS
<p>16.C-1 On-site Construction Noise Levels. Because Alternative C would result in similar development on the same site as Alternative A though at a reduced level that includes 39 TAU units and with the addition of a pedestrian footpath and a replacement facility on the main 2-story building for the bicycle/kayak rental facilities, this impact is the same as Impact 16.A-1 described above for Alternative A. If construction were to occur during the more noise-sensitive evening and nighttime hours, short-term construction noise could result in increased sleep disruption and interference to adjacent and nearby residents.</p>	PS	<p>16.C-1. Reduce On-site Construction Noise Levels. See Mitigation Measure 16.A-1 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>16.C-2 Off-site Construction Traffic Noise Levels. This impact is the same as Impact 16.A-2 described above for Alternative A. Construction associated with Alternative C would result in a short-term increase in traffic on the local</p>	PS	<p>16.C-2. Reduce Off-site Construction Traffic Noise Levels. See Mitigation Measure 16.A-2 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
area network. Heavy trucks accessing the project site during the more noise-sensitive nighttime and early morning hours may result in increased sleep disruption and interference to adjacent and nearby residents.			
16.C-3 Stationary- and Area-Source Noise. The impact of noise generated by stationary and area sources for Alternative C would be the same as described in Impact 16.A-3 for Alternative A. Operation of HVAC equipment associated with buildings related to Alternative C, if not properly designed or located, could generate noise levels that exceed the TVCP and/or Placer County thresholds. Trash collection activities involving large refuse dumpsters, especially those that occur during the early morning or nighttime hours, could result in increased sleep disruption to adjacent and nearby sensitive receptors.	PS	16.C-3. Reduce On-site Stationary and Area Source Noise Levels. See Mitigation Measure 16.A-3 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
16.C-4 Long-term Operational Increases in Daily Off-site Traffic Noise Levels. This impact is the same as Impact 16.B-4 and similar to Impact 16.A-4 above. Project-related traffic under Alternative C would not result in a perceptible increase in ambient noise levels on nearby local roadways or highways.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
16.C-5 Land Use Compatibility with On-site Noise Levels. Like Alternative A, Alternative C would develop noise-sensitive receptors (affordable/employee housing units) in a location where predicted noise levels would exceed the TVCP and/or Placer County's thresholds for land use compatibility.	PS	16.C-5. Design and Construct Proposed Fence/Wall to Provide Adequate Noise Reduction to Ensure Compliance with TVCP and Placer County Land Use Compatibility Standards. See Mitigation Measures 16.A-5 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
17 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
17.A-1 Create a Safety Hazard to Construction Workers. Demolition, excavation, and construction activities at the project site associated with Alternative A could result in the exposure of construction workers to	PS	17.A-1. Prepare Site Health and Safety Plan, Conduct Investigation for Asbestos and Lead-Based Paint, and Prepare Final Determination on USTs. ▶ To avoid health risks to construction workers, the contractor	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>hazardous materials, including asbestos, lead-based paint, and materials contained in underground storage tanks.</p>		<p>shall prepare and implement a site Health and Safety Plan. This plan will outline measures that shall be employed to protect construction workers and the public from exposure to hazardous materials during demolition and construction activities through education, physical separation, and compliance with applicable laws and regulations. These measures could include, but would not be limited to posting notices of the presence and use of hazardous materials, limiting access to the site, air monitoring, watering for dust containment, and installation of wind fences. Development contractors shall be required to comply with state health and safety standards for all demolition work. If applicable, this shall include compliance with OSHA and Cal-OSHA requirements regarding exposure to asbestos and lead-based paint.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Before demolition of any onsite buildings, the project applicant shall hire a qualified consultant to investigate whether any of these buildings contain asbestos-containing materials that could become friable or mobile during demolition activities, or materials containing lead. If found, the asbestos-containing materials and lead shall be removed by an accredited inspector in accordance with EPA and Cal-OSHA standards. In addition, all activities (construction or demolition) in the vicinity of these materials shall comply with Cal-OSHA asbestos and lead worker construction standards. The asbestos-containing materials and lead shall be disposed of properly at an appropriate off-site disposal facility. ▶ The PCDEH shall be notified if evidence of previously undiscovered soil or groundwater contamination (e.g., stained soil, odorous groundwater) is encountered during excavation. Any contaminated areas shall be remediated in accordance with recommendations made by PCDEH, LRWQCB, DTSC, or other appropriate federal, state, or local regulatory agencies. 	

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Before the start of project-related excavation or grading activities in the southeastern portion of the project site, the project applicant shall hire a licensed soils or geotechnical engineer to make a final determination as to whether the USTs would be affected by project-related activities. If the qualified professional determines that the USTs should be removed, the PCDEH shall be notified and the tanks shall be removed and the site remediated in accordance with recommendations made by PCDEH, DTSC, or other appropriate federal, state, or local regulatory agencies. 	
<p>17.A-2 Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment. Alternative A would involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials at the project site during construction activities. However, use of hazardous materials at the site would be in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. There are no nearby sources of hazardous materials or wastes that would pose a significant health risk for people at the project site. Project development would not result in increased risk of health hazards from vector-borne diseases or mosquito abatement techniques.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>17.A-3 Increased Exposure to Wildland Fire Hazard. The project site is not located in a designated wildland fire area or a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and adequate fire protection services are available to serve the proposed project. Furthermore, the project site is already developed and has been in use as a campground for more than 60 years. Therefore, Alternative A would not result in increased exposure of people or structures to significant risk of loss or injury involving wildland fires.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>17.B-1 Create a Safety Hazard to Construction Workers and Residents. This impact is the same as Impact 17.A-1. Demolition, excavation, and construction activities at the project site associated with Alternative B could result in the</p>	PS	<p>17.B-1. Prepare Site Health and Safety Plan, Conduct Investigation for Asbestos and Lead-Based Paint, and Prepare Final Determination on USTs. See Mitigation Measure 17.A-1 described above for Alternative A.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<p align="center">Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives</p>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>exposure of construction workers to hazardous materials, including asbestos, lead-based paint, and materials contained in underground storage tanks.</p>		<p>The same mitigation discussion would apply.</p>	
<p>17.B-2 Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment. This impact is the same as Impact 17.A-2. Alternative B would involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials at the project site during construction activities. However, use of hazardous materials at the site would be in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. There are no nearby sources of hazardous materials or wastes that would pose a significant health risk for people at the project site. Alternative B development would not result in increased risk of health hazards from vector-borne diseases or mosquito abatement techniques.</p>	LTS	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	LTS
<p>17.B-3 Increased Exposure to Wildland Fire Hazard. This impact is the same as Impact 17.A-3. The project site is not located in a designated wildland fire area or a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and adequate fire protection services are available to serve the proposed project. Furthermore, the project site is already developed and has been in use as a campground for more than 60 years. Therefore, Alternative B would not result in increased exposure of people or structures to significant risk of loss of injury involving wildland fires.</p>	LTS	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	LTS
<p>17.C-1 Create a Safety Hazard to Construction Workers and Residents. This impact is the same as Impact 17.A-1. Demolition, excavation, and construction activities at the project site associated with Alternative C could result in the exposure of construction workers to hazardous materials, including asbestos, lead-based paint, and materials contained in underground storage tanks.</p>	PS	<p>17.C-1. Prepare Site Health and Safety Plan, Conduct Investigation for Asbestos and Lead-Based Paint, and Prepare Final Determination on USTs. See Mitigation Measure 17.A-1 described above for Alternative A. The same mitigation discussion would apply.</p>	LTS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>17.C-2 Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment. This impact is the same as Impact 17.A-2. Alternative C would involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials at the project site during construction activities. However, use of hazardous materials at the site would be in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. There are no nearby sources of hazardous materials or wastes that would pose a significant health risk for people at the project site. Alternative C development would not result in increased risk of health hazards from vector-borne diseases or mosquito abatement techniques.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>17.C-3 Increased Exposure to Wildland Fire Hazard. This impact is the same as Impact 17.A-3. The project site is not located in a designated wildland fire area or a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and adequate fire protection services are available to serve the proposed project. Furthermore, the project site is already developed and has been in use as a campground for more than 60 years. Therefore, Alternative C would not result in increased exposure of people or structures to significant risk of loss of injury involving wildland fires.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of the Project Alternatives</p>				
Impacts	Alternative A Proposed Project	Alternative B Reduced Development	Alternative C Reduced Development with Recreation Elements	Alternative D No Project
6 Land Use				
6-1 Consistency with Regional Plan Land Use Goals and Policies and TVCP Policies.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
6-2 Potential for Conversion of Land Use.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
6-3 Potential for Division of an Existing Community (or Land Use Compatibility and Density).	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
7 Recreation				
7-1 Granting of an Easement to the NTPUD for Proposed Future Multiple Use (including bicycles) Public Trail.	B	B	B	NI
7-2 Closure of Sandy Beach Campground/Loss of Recreation Capacity.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
7-3 Increase in Use of Parks and Other Recreation Facilities.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
8 Hydrology and Water Quality				
8-1 Potential Short-Term Accelerated Soil Erosion and Sedimentation and/or Release of Pollutants to Nearby Water Bodies During Construction.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
8-2 Interception of Groundwater Table During Construction.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
8-3 Impervious Surface Area and Runoff.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
8-4 Possible Increased Urban Contaminants in Surface Runoff.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
9 Geology, Soils, and Land Capability and Coverage				
9-1 Land Coverage.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
9-2 Seismic Hazards.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
9-3 Non-Seismic Geologic Hazards.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of the Project Alternatives				
Impacts	Alternative A Proposed Project	Alternative B Reduced Development	Alternative C Reduced Development with Recreation Elements	Alternative D No Project
10 Scenic Resources				
10-1 Scenic Quality of Roadway Travel Unit 20A.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
10-2 Scenic Quality of Shoreline Travel Unit 21.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
10-3 Scenic Quality Impact from Public Recreation and Bicycle Trail Areas.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
10-4 Consistency with Plans, Policies, and Guidelines.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
10-5 Increased Light and Glare.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
11 Cultural Resources				
11-1 Effects on Known Cultural Resources.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
11-2 Previously Undiscovered Cultural Resources.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
11.3 Previously Undiscovered Burials.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
12 Vegetation and Wildlife				
12-1 Common and Sensitive Habitats.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
12-2 Vegetation Removal.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
12-3 Tree Removal.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
12-4 Wildlife Movement Corridors.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
12-5 Nesting Raptors and Migratory Birds.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
12-6 Special-Status Species and Common Wildlife.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
12-7 Bat Species.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
13 Public Services and Utilities				
13-1 Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, Distribution, and Storage.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of the Project Alternatives**

Impacts	Alternative A Proposed Project	Alternative B Reduced Development	Alternative C Reduced Development with Recreation Elements	Alternative D No Project
13-2 Increased Demand for Wastewater Service.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
13-3 Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
13-4 Increased Demand for Electricity and Required Extension of Electrical Infrastructure.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
13-5 Increased Demand for Natural Gas and Required Extension of Natural Gas Infrastructure.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
13-6 Increased Demand for Telecommunications Service.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
13-7 Emergency Access During Construction.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
13-8 Increased Demand for Fire Protection.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
13-9 Increased Demand for Police Services.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
13-10 Increased Student Enrollment in Tahoe Vista Schools.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
13-11 Increased Demand for Postal Service.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
14 Traffic, Parking, and Circulation				
14-1 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT).	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
14-2 Existing Plus Alternative A Level of Service.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
14-3 Vehicular Access and Circulation.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
14-4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
14-5 Transit.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
14-6 Parking Supply.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
14-7 Construction Traffic.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of the Project Alternatives					
Impacts		Alternative A Proposed Project	Alternative B Reduced Development	Alternative C Reduced Development with Recreation Elements	Alternative D No Project
15 Air Quality					
15-1	Short-Term Construction Emissions of ROG, NO _x , and PM ₁₀ .	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
15-2	Long-Term Operational (Regional) Emissions.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
15-3	Long-Term Operational (Local) Mobile-Source Carbon Monoxide Emissions.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
15-4	Odor Emissions.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
15-5	Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
16 Noise					
16-1	On-site Construction Noise Levels.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
16-2	Off-site Construction Traffic Noise Levels.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
16-3	Stationary- and Area-Source Noise.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
16-4	Long-term Operational Increases in Daily	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
16-5	Land Use Compatibility with On-site Noise Levels.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
17 Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
17-1	Create a Safety Hazard to Construction Workers.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
17-2	Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
17.3	Increased Exposure to Wildland Fire Hazard.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable