

ATTACHMENT A
 HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN PROJECT
 PLACER COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
 TABLE OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND CEQA FINDINGS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>LAND USE</p> <p>Impact LU-1. Will the Project be consistent with the land use plan or zoning plan, or land use goals, policies, and provisions of the TRPA Regional Plan, including the Goals and Policies, Code of Ordinances, Plan Area Statement, or Ski Area Master Plan Guidelines, and the Placer County General Plan and West Shore Area General Plan?</p> <p>The consistency analysis in Chapter 4 of the EIR reveals inconsistencies between the Alternative 1A and the TRPA Regional Plan, TRPA Plan Area Statements, the West Shore Area General Plan, and the Placer County General Plan. Alternative 1A would require changes to the boundaries and content of County and TRPA Plan Areas 157, 158, and 159, because some proposed land uses, such as interval ownership units (residential timeshares), are not permitted in Plan Area 157, but are permitted in Plan Area 159. Amendments to the TRPA Goals and Policies and the Code of Ordinances are also proposed under Alternative 1A.</p> <p>Pursuant to County Code Section 17.60.090 (G) amendments to General Plans are processed through 1) a Planning Commission Hearing and Recommendations followed by 2) a Board of Supervisors Hearing and Decision per County Code Sections 17.60.090 (A through D). As discussed in the EIR/EIS for amendments to TRPA Plan Areas, it is feasible for County amendments to occur as these changes do not alter the intent of classification of their respective plan areas and they would be in keeping with proposed TRPA mapping.</p> <p>Implementation of proposed amendments results in consistencies with policies related to transfer of development rights, plan area boundaries, height and allowable uses that would otherwise result in an inconsistency. Implementation of proposed mitigation measures eliminates the other inconsistencies</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>with policies related to noise, habitat, SEZ function, operational air quality, groundwater, fertilizer use, transportation and circulation, erosion control, species protection, scenic improvements, development fees, and affordable housing.</p> <p>Alternative 1A would be consistent with the applicable land use and zoning plans, as well as the land use goals, policies, and provisions of the TRPA Regional Plan including the Goals and Policies, Code of Ordinances, Plan Area Statements, and Ski Area Master Plan Guidelines, and the Placer County General Plan and West Shore Area General Plan as amended. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 6-15 through 6-33; see also Chapter 4, Relationship to Existing Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations; and Chapter 23, Master Responses: 1, 4, 17, and 18.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure LU-2a. Purchase and Transfer of Additional ERUs.</p> <p>Prior to permitting ERU development associated with the proposed Master Plan in excess of current entitlements, HMR shall obtain ERUs adequate for the proposed project application. At present, HMR is lacking ERUs for their proposed Phase 2 development at the South Base and the Townhouses at the North Base under Alternatives 1/1A and 3, and a portion of the proposed Phase 1 development under Alternative 6. These ERUs can be obtained by either converting excess TAUs that originated on low capability lands or by purchasing ERUs from other off-site locations. Prior to transfer, HMR shall demonstrate that the transfer of these additional units does not result in negative impacts to the Plan Area or Community Plan from which the purchased units came. Preferably, the units will be transferred from a nearby Plan Area or Community Plan area located in Placer County, and will be associated with the restoration of sensitive lands.</p> <p>If the TRPA Governing Board does not approve an increase in the number of MRBUs included in the TRPA February 2008 Governing Board resolution, then the proposed affordable housing units shall be reduced to 12 or an additional ERU may be transferred to the Project Area (Alternatives 1/1A and 3) area to accommodate the proposed 13 affordable housing units.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure LU-2a and Mitigation Measure LU-2b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring and setting forth criteria for the purchase and transfer of additional ERUs and CFA. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measures LU-2a and LU-2b will reconcile requested entitlements with those available to the Alternative 1A. The addition of additional entitlements or the reduction of the proposed project to match supply will reduce this impact to a less than significant level assuming the proposed Plan Area amendments are approved (as discussed in Impact LU-1). Mitigation Measure LU-2a also requires HMR demonstrate that the transfer of these additional units does not result in negative environmental impacts.</p> <p>Some commenters have expressed concern regarding the size, density, and massing of the project, as well as the mix of uses, will change the community character of Homewood. The Proposed Project will result in an increase in commercial, mixed-use, tourist and residential uses, clustered along SR 89 where other commercial and tourist features are currently found in the community. While the project would increase the number of uses on the site, this change does not alter the location of urbanization along SR 89 in the Homewood area. Visual elements of the new structures, including the "Old Tahoe" architectural design and</p>
<p>LU-2. Will the Project be consistent with adjacent land uses, expand/intensity existing non-conforming uses, or transfer development rights that exceed density limits?</p> <p>Alternative 1A is determined to be consistent with adjacent land uses because it proposes uses are either an appropriate expansion of facilities or are uses that will be amended to the Plan Area in support of Plan Area and community-wide goals. Alternative 1A does not expand/intensity existing non-conforming uses. Some TAU, ERU, and CFA have been allocated or purchased, however, the proposed mix of tourist, residential, and commercial uses will require the allocation of additional CFA, MFEU, and ERU before permits can be finalized. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 6-34 through 6-45; see also Chapter 23, Master Responses 4, 5, 6, and 7.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure LU-2a. Purchase and Transfer of Additional ERUs.</p> <p>Prior to permitting ERU development associated with the proposed Master Plan in excess of current entitlements, HMR shall obtain ERUs adequate for the proposed project application. At present, HMR is lacking ERUs for their proposed Phase 2 development at the South Base and the Townhouses at the North Base under Alternatives 1/1A and 3, and a portion of the proposed Phase 1 development under Alternative 6. These ERUs can be obtained by either converting excess TAUs that originated on low capability lands or by purchasing ERUs from other off-site locations. Prior to transfer, HMR shall demonstrate that the transfer of these additional units does not result in negative impacts to the Plan Area or Community Plan from which the purchased units came. Preferably, the units will be transferred from a nearby Plan Area or Community Plan area located in Placer County, and will be associated with the restoration of sensitive lands.</p> <p>If the TRPA Governing Board does not approve an increase in the number of MRBUs included in the TRPA February 2008 Governing Board resolution, then the proposed affordable housing units shall be reduced to 12 or an additional ERU may be transferred to the Project Area (Alternatives 1/1A and 3) area to accommodate the proposed 13 affordable housing units.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measures LU-2a and LU-2b will reconcile requested entitlements with those available to the Alternative 1A. The addition of additional entitlements or the reduction of the proposed project to match supply will reduce this impact to a less than significant level assuming the proposed Plan Area amendments are approved (as discussed in Impact LU-1). Mitigation Measure LU-2a also requires HMR demonstrate that the transfer of these additional units does not result in negative environmental impacts.</p> <p>Some commenters have expressed concern regarding the size, density, and massing of the project, as well as the mix of uses, will change the community character of Homewood. The Proposed Project will result in an increase in commercial, mixed-use, tourist and residential uses, clustered along SR 89 where other commercial and tourist features are currently found in the community. While the project would increase the number of uses on the site, this change does not alter the location of urbanization along SR 89 in the Homewood area. Visual elements of the new structures, including the "Old Tahoe" architectural design and</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>LU-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to land use?</p> <p>Alternative 1A would amend the list of permissible uses in the three affected Plan Areas and would increase tourist, commercial, and residential growth in these Plan Areas, particularly in the area fronting SR 89. The Proposed Project would also increase the size of urban land use boundaries. While some of these changes are promoted in the Plan Area Statement, the result is that the overall urbanization of the region increases, especially when cumulatively considered. However, by placing commercial and higher density development within the urban area, this helps to unify growth in the region instead of promoting development outside the existing tourist corridor.</p> <p>Alternative 1A includes a deed restriction on the majority of the property from future non-recreational development and also include other environmental benefits not required under existing codes and regulations. These benefits are magnified as there are other publicly-sponsored projects in the area that implement traffic improvements, water quality improvements, soil stabilization, coverage reduction or land restoration, and scenic quality improvements. The recreation benefits of the Proposed Project are considerable in that they serve both residents and tourists to the basin.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure LU-2b. CFA Reduction or Additional CFA Reservation.</p> <p>To comply with the CFA allocation reserved by TRPA under the 2008 Resolution, the project must reduce total CFA by 1,763 square feet or obtain an additional 1,763 square feet of CFA pursuant to TRPA Code Section 33.3. If additional CFA is pursued, the additional CFA must be obtained prior to the permitting of the development phase for which it will be applied.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 6-41.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Improved landscaping help maintain the "rustic" character of the area.</p> <p>Many portions of the community include residences spread throughout the landscape. The community does not have the development intensity of other Lake Tahoe areas such as South shore. However, this project does not propose to transform the community into an area that resembles South shore. In particular, the inclusion of new mixtures of uses does not disturb the community character if designed, located and placed correctly. Chapters 6.0 and 10.0 of the EIR/EIS both address the Project's compatibility with the surrounding community.</p> <p>The West shore is not as densely developed as other communities around the lake, such as the South shore referenced in many of the comments; however, the West shore includes urban features and is identified as an area appropriate for a community plan, which indicates that this is an urban area.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 6-34 through 6-45; see also Chapter 23, Master Responses 4, 5, 6, and 7.)</p> <p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>With new tourist facilities planned in the north shore, bike trail expansions, and improved access, new facilities at HMR will result in an overall improvement to the tourist and recreation experience, thereby improving the vitality and long-term viability of the area in conjunction with long-term environmental and scenic improvements. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 6-45 through 6-47; see also Chapter 23, Master Responses 4, 5, 6, 7, 17 and 18.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure PEH-1: Develop Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall develop a detailed "Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan" based on the alternative selected for Placer County review and approval. Provision of sufficient housing opportunities to accommodate a minimum of half of new FTEs generated by Project operation will be assured through a combination of one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of new on-site employee/workforce housing; • Development/renovation of off-site employee/workforce housing; • Dedication of sufficient land for needed units, and/or; • Payment of an in-lieu fee. <p>The designs of applicant-provided on-site and off-site employee/workforce housing shall be reviewed and approved by the County. An approved Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan shall be required prior to the issuance of building permits or recordation of final maps, whichever occurs first. The Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan shall provide an accounting of the final number of net new FTEs expected to be created by the constructed alternative with identified phasing; the number, locations, and capacity of new employee/workforce housing units to be developed; location and capacity of dedicated land for new employee/workforce housing; in-lieu fees paid to the County, and implementation schedule to ensure that sufficient new housing is available for new employees as Project construction is completed and operations begin. In the event that HMR chooses to proceed with in-</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure PEH-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level; by requiring development of Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan, which will ensure that sufficient housing is available for new employees as Project construction is completed and operations begin. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The Proposed Project require up to 33 additional units for 65 new employees. As a condition of receiving 13 MRBUS from TRPA as a CEP Project, the Applicant in its acceptance letter dated January 31, 2008, indicated that it would find employee/workforce housing solutions for the balance of new FTEs generated in excess of those served by the 13 on-site MRBUS. Following Master Plan adoption, HMR intends to identify and secure off-site employee/workforce housing for the balance of new full time equivalent employees generated by the selected alternative. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PEH-1 will ensure that sufficient employee/workforce housing is provided on-site and/or off-site for at least half of the expected new FTEs generated, consistent with Placer County General Plan Housing Element Policies B-15, C-2, and other applicable policies in the Housing Element and 1998 West Shore Area General Plan. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PEH-1 reduces this impact to less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 7-7 through 7-18.)</p>
<p>PEH-1. Will the Project increase the demand for housing, thereby causing direct or indirect environmental consequences?</p> <p>As documented in the Plan consistency analysis included in Table 7-8 of the EIR/EIS, Implementation of Alternative 1A would not provide sufficient employee/workforce housing to meet the requirements of Placer County Housing Element Policies B-15, C-2, and other applicable policies in the Housing Element and 1998 West Shore Area General Plan. Because the necessary off-site employee/workforce housing is not currently identified, the impact is considered to be significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 7-7 through 7-18.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure PEH-1: Develop Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The Proposed Project require up to 33 additional units for 65 new employees. As a condition of receiving 13 MRBUS from TRPA as a CEP Project, the Applicant in its acceptance letter dated January 31, 2008, indicated that it would find employee/workforce housing solutions for the balance of new FTEs generated in excess of those served by the 13 on-site MRBUS. Following Master Plan adoption, HMR intends to identify and secure off-site employee/workforce housing for the balance of new full time equivalent employees generated by the selected alternative. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PEH-1 will ensure that sufficient employee/workforce housing is provided on-site and/or off-site for at least half of the expected new FTEs generated, consistent with Placer County General Plan Housing Element Policies B-15, C-2, and other applicable policies in the Housing Element and 1998 West Shore Area General Plan. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PEH-1 reduces this impact to less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 7-7 through 7-18.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>PEH-2. Will the Project alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?</p> <p>Alternative 1A is not expected to result in substantial new population growth. The existing population in the North Lake Tahoe Basin was 26,913 residents in 2007, and the population of the Placer County portion of the Basin was 14,588 and Homewood was 906 persons. As presented in Chapter 3 of the EIR/EIS, the Proposed Project will include up to 181 multifamily residential units, including 165 whole or partial ownership market rate multi-family dwelling units and 16 Townhomes. The average household size in Placer County in 2007 was 2.6 persons. At this rate, the full time resident population may increase by up to 460 persons under Alternative 1A. (LS)</p>	<p>lieu fees paid to the County, HMR must include a detailed accounting of the actual construction cost of each unit. This will ensure that enough fees are paid to actually build employee housing. If additional environmental impacts, other than those already identified, analyzed, and mitigated (if necessary) as part of this Draft EIR/EIS are created as a result of any of the proposed on-site or off-site employee/workforce housing, the Improvement Plans shall not be approved until subsequent environmental review has been completed.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 7-10.)</p> <p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>
<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 7-18 through 7-19.)</p> <p>PEH-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to population, employment, and housing?</p> <p>Implementation of Alternative 1A will result in population increases, including lower-income population demographic associated with the leisure, retail, and hospitality employment growth. There are multiple projects proposed for the North and West Shore Tahoe region that will expand recreation, commercial, and hospitality services. There are other projects proposed in Tahoe Vista and Kings Beach that are specifically targeted at increasing the amount of employee/workforce housing in the Lake Tahoe Region. There are other employee/workforce housing projects proposed in Kings Beach (84 units) and Tahoe Vista (162</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>The Proposed Project are required to provide housing for only half of the new project-related employee/workforce housing demand under Placer County General Plan Housing Element policy G-2. Consequently, the Proposed Project contributes to the existing cumulative impact of a lack of employee/workforce housing in the region.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will increase unmet demand for approximately 33 employee/workforce housing units for 65 new FTEs. Based on a supply of 11,481 housing units in the Placer County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin, the potential contributions of the Proposed Project to unmet demand for employee/workforce housing are not expected to be cumulatively considerable. In addition, based on existing employment and residential patterns in the area, a substantial portion of new employees at HMR are expected to be existing residents in the Placer County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Therefore, this potential cumulative impact related to population, employment and housing is considered less than significant.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will contribute to a cumulative employment benefit to the region by providing tourist recreational services and vacation homes that draw visitors to the area. In addition to the refurbished and improved winter sports facilities, the added services (hotel, restaurants, retail, hiking and biking trails) and the conversion of Tourist Accommodation Units (TAUs) to residential units will provide new tourist opportunities in conjunction with other tourist features offered at other redeveloped projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Therefore, this potential cumulative impact is considered less than significant. (LS)</p>		LS	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>
<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 7-20 to 7-21.)</p>			
<p>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</p>			
<p>BIO-1. Will the Project, directly or indirectly (including through spread of noxious weeds and habitat modification), cause a loss of individuals or occupied habitat of</p>			
	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>		

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Sierra Nevada red fox (<i>Vulpes vulpes necator</i>) and California wolverine (<i>Gulo gulo luteus</i>) are both Threatened in the State of California. Bald Eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>) is Endangered in the State of California. Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog is a candidate for federal endangered status. While the Project area contains potentially suitable habitats for these species, occurrences for Sierra Nevada red fox, California wolverine and Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog have not been recorded in or adjacent to the Project area. Bald eagles have been observed foraging at Quail Lake, however no changes to the Quail Lake area will occur with implementation of the project and associated alternatives.</p> <p>Implementation of Alternative 1A would remove forested habitat that would be suitable for foraging for both the California wolverine and Sierra Nevada red fox. However, due to existing human activities associated with existing recreational and operational uses onsite, the suitability of the habitat mountain-wide is severely diminished as both species prefer habitats undisturbed by human influences. No habitat for Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog would be impacted. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 8-54; see also Response to Comments 93-9 and 131-2.)</p> <p>BIO-2. Will the Project cause loss of raptor nests, migratory bird nests, or wildlife nursery sites?</p> <p>Alternative 1A includes tree removal associated with development at the North Base and South Base areas and the Mid-Mountain Lodge and gondola. Tree removal and construction activities associated with the new buildings may result in direct removal of active nests for migratory birds, raptors, or other wildlife and may result in disturbance or abandonment of nesting, roosting, or breeding sites in adjacent habitat. While no active nests or roosting sites were detected during previous surveys, the potential exists for nests or roosts to be present before construction commences in the future;</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2. Active Raptor, Migratory Bird Nest Site, Wildlife Nursery/Den Site, and Bat Roost Protection Program.</p> <p>Pre-construction surveys, conducted during the nesting/breeding season (spring) immediately prior to initial Project construction (e.g., where excavation and tree removal is required), shall be conducted to identify active raptor nest sites, migratory bird nests, mammal den sites, and bat roost sites in the proposed construction area. If no nests, den sites or roosts are found, then mitigation requirements are complete. If nests or roosts are located within the Project area during the pre-construction surveys, additional monitoring shall be required as follows. During initial construction activities (tree removal and</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-2 will reduce project-related impacts to a less-than-significant level by requiring surveys to be performed in the season prior to construction activities and will ensure protection of any active nests, dens or roosts.</p> <p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the applicant conduct preconstruction surveys active raptor nest sites, migratory bird nests, mammal den sites, and bat roost sites and as well as provide monitoring and protective measures. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>therefore, this impact is considered to be significant. (S) (Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-54 through 8-57.)</p>	<p>excavation for the construction), a qualified biological monitor will be onsite to evaluate whether raptors are occupying trees, sensitive den sites are within the Project area or bats are occupying identified roosts. The biological monitor will have the authority to stop construction near occupied trees/den sites if he/she determines proposed activities could have a negative impact on nesting raptors, migratory birds or their young, or bats observed in the construction zone. If construction must be stopped, the monitor must consult with TRPA and CDFG staff within 24 hours to determine appropriate actions (minimum setbacks and avoidance measures appropriate to specific species present and individual situations) to restart construction while reducing impacts to identified raptors, migratory bird nests, den sites or bats. If a potential American marten den is located, an appropriate method will be used to confirm whether American marten occupy the den. This may involve placing a tracking medium at the den entrance to determine use of the den or using motion sensing camera stations. Monitoring for den occupancy shall be conducted for a minimum of two consecutive nights. Other devices such as fiber optic scope may be utilized to determine occupancy. If no marten occupy the potential den, the entrance shall be blocked to ensure no marten occupy the area during the construction period. If the den is found to be occupied by American marten, the California Department of Fish and Game shall be notified of the observation and shall be consulted regarding approach to addressing the den site. A potential option includes providing a no-disturbance buffer around the den during the breeding season (May 1 through July 31). (Final EIR/EIS, p. 8-56.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-54 through 8-57, see also Response to Comment 14a-153.)</p>
<p>BIO-3. Will the Project substantially block or disrupt major fish or wildlife migration or travel corridors?</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-3. Fish Passage Protection and Enhancement.</p> <p>Removal of the culvert within Homewood Creek located in the South Base area under Alternatives 1, 1A and 3 shall be performed in such a manner to protect fish passage during and after construction. Protection measures include installation of creek flow bypass measures to maintain flows below the Project area. The Stream Environment Zone restoration plan for Homewood Creek (Appendix C) shall be modified to include fish passage measures in the design so</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring protective measures for fish passage during construction and restoration plans. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Three perennial creeks occur in the Project area including Madden Creek, Homewood Creek and Quail Creek. Under Alternatives 1A, a</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Alternative 1A, as no corridors exist in the Project area. (S) (Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-57 to 8-58.)</p>	<p>as to not inhibit movement upstream or downstream of fish and other aquatic species. The restoration plan shall include design elements that will enhance fish habitat. Prior to finalization of the restoration plans, TRPA and Placer County staff shall review and approve the design to ensure adequate habitat improvements are included and fish passage is provided. (Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-57 through 8-58.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>new bridge would span the Homewood Creek SEZ and allow for establishment of riparian vegetation. Restoration will include design measures to allow for fish passage. Restoration would allow for enhanced functioning of the SEZ through increased diversity of riparian plant species, increased habitat for wildlife, and increased sinuosity of the stream channel thereby slowing flows. Increased suitability of habitat will allow for the riparian corridor to be better utilized for travel by wildlife species. The restored SEZ will allow for connectivity of habitats above the South Base area to habitats that exist below the existing parking area. Through widening of the SEZ and the addition of step pools, utilization of the habitats may increase and result in unhindered passage of fish and wildlife species.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-3 will reduce project-related impacts to a less-than-significant level by protecting fish access and movement in Homewood Creek during project construction. The remaining creeks in the Project area (Madden Creek and Quail Creek) would not be modified under the Proposed Project. Further, no other changes to the flow of the creeks or vegetation associated with them will occur.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-57 to 8-58; see also Response to Comment 19-40.)</p> <p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-2, BIO-4a, and BIO-4b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the applicant conduct preconstruction surveys, monitoring and protective measures, as well as a Trash Management Program to prevent wildlife access to trash and refuse. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-2 will reduce Project related impacts to less than significant level by requiring surveys to be performed in the season prior to construction activities to ensure protection of active osprey and other species nests and dens should any be detected. Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-4a will reduce potential impacts to bat species to a less than significant level by requiring preconstruction surveys, a relocation program and protective measures to ensure this impact is less than significant. Limiting the exposure of refuse and food to wildlife species is vital to protect the wildlife and humans alike and decreases the potential negative interaction between the two. Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-4b will reduce potential impacts to Wildlife species (Black bear, marten, SpERMophilus sp., Tamias sp., and many avian species) that are often attracted to trash and refuse as a food source to a less than significant level by requiring a Trash Management Program.</p>
<p>BIO-4. Will the Project cause a permanent loss of sensitive wildlife individuals or habitat, as defined by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Placer County General Plan Section 6, or California Department of Fish and Game or cause a decline in population levels below a viable population level?</p> <p>Sensitive wildlife species in the Project area include California yellow warbler, waterfowl, osprey, Townsend's big-eared bat, Sierra Nevada mountain beaver, American marten, and mule deer. Sensitive species with suitable habitat in the Project area but not observed during wildlife surveys include Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog, bald eagle, northern goshawk, cooper's hawk, sharp-shinned hawk, California spotted owl, willow flycatcher, Myotis bat species, Sierra Nevada showshoe hare, Sierra Nevada red fox, California wolverine, and Pacific fisher.</p> <p>The Proposed Project would not negatively modify other riparian, lake, or meadow habitats at HMR, so impact to the California yellow warbler species and habitat are considered less than significant for this species.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2, Active Raptor, Migratory Bird Nest Site, Wildlife Nursery/Den Site, and Bat Roost Protection Program.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for BIO-2 above. (Final EIR/EIS, p. 8-56.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-4a, Bat Roost Relocation Program</p> <p>Prior to demolition of the Homewood Lodge located at the north base, the building shall be surveyed using acoustic survey methods as well as visual searches of the building to determine the presence or absence of bat species. The survey shall determine if the roost is a maternity roost (if survey is being performed in the spring), hibernacula or day roost. If a maternity roost is present, delay of the demolition may be necessary until after the roost is vacated. If bat species are detected/observed within the building, measures shall be taken to clear the bats prior to demolition activities. Measures to disturb resident bats within may include but are not limited to: disturbance to roosting individuals through introduction of light and/or noise to create an undesirable setting and to encourage the bats to</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>new bridge would span the Homewood Creek SEZ and allow for establishment of riparian vegetation. Restoration will include design measures to allow for fish passage. Restoration would allow for enhanced functioning of the SEZ through increased diversity of riparian plant species, increased habitat for wildlife, and increased sinuosity of the stream channel thereby slowing flows. Increased suitability of habitat will allow for the riparian corridor to be better utilized for travel by wildlife species. The restored SEZ will allow for connectivity of habitats above the South Base area to habitats that exist below the existing parking area. Through widening of the SEZ and the addition of step pools, utilization of the habitats may increase and result in unhindered passage of fish and wildlife species.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-3 will reduce project-related impacts to a less-than-significant level by protecting fish access and movement in Homewood Creek during project construction. The remaining creeks in the Project area (Madden Creek and Quail Creek) would not be modified under the Proposed Project. Further, no other changes to the flow of the creeks or vegetation associated with them will occur.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-57 to 8-58; see also Response to Comment 19-40.)</p> <p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-2, BIO-4a, and BIO-4b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the applicant conduct preconstruction surveys, monitoring and protective measures, as well as a Trash Management Program to prevent wildlife access to trash and refuse. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-2 will reduce Project related impacts to less than significant level by requiring surveys to be performed in the season prior to construction activities to ensure protection of active osprey and other species nests and dens should any be detected. Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-4a will reduce potential impacts to bat species to a less than significant level by requiring preconstruction surveys, a relocation program and protective measures to ensure this impact is less than significant. Limiting the exposure of refuse and food to wildlife species is vital to protect the wildlife and humans alike and decreases the potential negative interaction between the two. Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-4b will reduce potential impacts to Wildlife species (Black bear, marten, SpERMophilus sp., Tamias sp., and many avian species) that are often attracted to trash and refuse as a food source to a less than significant level by requiring a Trash Management Program.</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Construction activities associated with installation of the mid-mountain lodge, water tanks and gondola will result in the disturbance of existing forest which is suitable foraging habitat for American marten. This minor loss of habitat will not likely have a negative impact on the local marten population but may have an impact on individuals, so this impact is considered potentially significant.</p> <p>With the introduction of a mid-mountain lodge within the Project area the opportunity arises for existing wildlife species to be impacted from increased human presence. Wildlife species (black bear, marten, Spermophilus sp, Tamias sp., and many avian species) are often attracted to trash and refuse as a food source. Potential impacts to sensitive individuals may occur due to prolonged exposure of wildlife species to refuse generated by the new development.</p> <p>The proposed stream restoration located at the South Base would impact existing riparian habitat, however this area is heavily disturbed and is not suitable for mountain beaver. As no proposed activities would impact existing riparian habitats that are suitable for mountain beavers, impacts to this species are considered less than significant.</p> <p>Suitable habitat for osprey nest sites are widespread throughout the Project area as Quail Lake and Lake Louise are suitable bodies of water containing fish for foraging. While no active or inactive nests have been located in the Project area, construction may result in the removal of suitable nesting trees for osprey. Due to the large number of trees in the Project area, and the high degree of human activity associated with the North and South Base areas proposed for a majority of the development, the loss of the large trees will not have a substantial impact on availability of nest trees for osprey. As no nests were located during surveys in the Project area, it is likely no individuals will be impacted or lost. While currently there are no active osprey nests in the Project area, the potential exists for the establishment of nests in the Project area prior to construction, therefore, this impact is considered to be potentially significant.</p>	<p>vacate the roost. Upon removal of the bats, access points to the building shall be sealed to prevent reentry of bat species. Once it has been concluded that no bat species are present, demolition may commence upon final approval of TRPA. To offset the loss of the occupied bat roost, Homewood Mountain Resort shall install bat boxes in the vicinity of the North Base to provide roosting opportunities and locations for the displaced bats. Homewood Mountain Resort shall work together with Placer County and TRPA biologists to agree upon the number of bat boxes and their respective installation locations prior to removal of the bat roost/demolition activities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-4b. Trash Management Program</p> <p>Prior to finalization of construction permits and prior to Improvement Plan Approval for the new mid-mountain lodge, HMR shall prepare a Trash Management Program for review and approval by the TRPA and Placer County. The Trash Management Program shall include measures to prevent wildlife access to trash and refuse generated by the new lodge and associated facilities. Measures to be included at a minimum are wildlife proof trash containers in all outside areas, scheduling for removal of refuse from the lodge area on a daily basis and educational signage outlining the dangers of feeding wildlife.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-60 to 8-61.)</p>		<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-58 through 8-61; see also Response to Comment 93-9 and 131-3.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Increased nighttime lighting is not expected to have an impact on wildlife species in the area as all new lighting must comply with TRPA design review guidelines that require lighting to be for illumination only and shall not be directed above the horizontal. Compliance with these design guidelines will prevent the dispersal of light into adjacent residential areas and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Alternative 1A would result in the demolition of Homewood Lodge at the north base. As there are a number of sensitive species with suitable habitat (Townsend's big-eared bat, Spotted bat, small-footed myotis bat, long-eared myotis bat, fringed myotis bat, long-legged myotis, yuma myotis bat) the potential to disturb individuals during demolition is high. Due to this potential impact to individuals and the uncertainty of species to be impacted this impact is considered potentially significant. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-58 through 8-61.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Final Homewood Creek SEZ Restoration Plan.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall modify the Homewood Creek SEZ Restoration Plan - April 3, 2010 to include supplemental information necessary for TRPA project approval and permitting. The Revised Homewood Creek SEZ Restoration Plan shall add the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of existing constraints of the Project area; • Channel location; • Channel substrate composition; • In-channel features such as logs or rocks to act as flow separators (if necessary) to encourage braiding of the channel and sediment deposition; • A profile of the restored stream channel in conjunction with existing cross sections; • A narrative of construction techniques that describe modifications to channel geometry; • A comprehensive planting plan identifying species and planting locations of riparian and wetland plants shall be incorporated into the restoration plan, including species that are known to occur in the existing 	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-5a, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR develop and implement a SEZ restoration plan. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The Project area contains SEZs associated with the streams that flow through or originate in the Project area. Streams include Madden Creek, Homewood Creek (Homewood Canyon Creek), Quail Creek, and an unnamed ephemeral drainage between the North Base and South Base areas. Implementation of Alternative 1A does not include new development in areas delineated as SEZ with the exception of the replacement of the existing roadway and culvert at the South Base area (see Impact BIO-3) and construction of an improved access roadway for the townhouse located to the west of the North Base area. The removal of the existing culvert and roadway at the South Base area will result in a reduction in total disturbance of the existing SEZ. The access roadway leading from the South Base to the townhomes located to adjacent to the North Base area will cross a narrow SEZ. The proposed paved roadway utilizes the same alignment as the existing dirt roadway that leads from the South Base area to the North Base area. BMPs for the roadway in the form of rolled curb and drainage basins will prevent stormwater from reaching the drainage. Construction will be restricted to the existing roadway, and no</p>
<p>BIO-5. Will the Project affect wetlands or waters of the U.S. and/or riparian and Stream Environment Zones (SEZ) through direct removal, filling, hydrologic interruption, encroachment, removal of streamside vegetation or other means?</p> <p>As described under Impact BIO-3 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the SEZ in the South Base area will be restored to a more natural state with the removal of the culvert and the day lighting of the stream channel. In its existing condition, Homewood Creek is highly constrained with steep banks and a culverted section under the South Base parking area. The restoration of the Homewood Creek SEZ will likely result in improvements to the SEZ however the proposed Restoration Plan included in Appendix C of the Draft EIR/EIS does not provide sufficient detail to substantiate a conclusion that impacts will be beneficial and no negative impacts will occur to the SEZ below the Project area. Therefore this impact is considered potentially significant. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-61 through 8-65.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Final Homewood Creek SEZ Restoration Plan.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall modify the Homewood Creek SEZ Restoration Plan - April 3, 2010 to include supplemental information necessary for TRPA project approval and permitting. The Revised Homewood Creek SEZ Restoration Plan shall add the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of existing constraints of the Project area; • Channel location; • Channel substrate composition; • In-channel features such as logs or rocks to act as flow separators (if necessary) to encourage braiding of the channel and sediment deposition; • A profile of the restored stream channel in conjunction with existing cross sections; • A narrative of construction techniques that describe modifications to channel geometry; • A comprehensive planting plan identifying species and planting locations of riparian and wetland plants shall be incorporated into the restoration plan, including species that are known to occur in the existing 	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-5a, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR develop and implement a SEZ restoration plan. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The Project area contains SEZs associated with the streams that flow through or originate in the Project area. Streams include Madden Creek, Homewood Creek (Homewood Canyon Creek), Quail Creek, and an unnamed ephemeral drainage between the North Base and South Base areas. Implementation of Alternative 1A does not include new development in areas delineated as SEZ with the exception of the replacement of the existing roadway and culvert at the South Base area (see Impact BIO-3) and construction of an improved access roadway for the townhouse located to the west of the North Base area. The removal of the existing culvert and roadway at the South Base area will result in a reduction in total disturbance of the existing SEZ. The access roadway leading from the South Base to the townhomes located to adjacent to the North Base area will cross a narrow SEZ. The proposed paved roadway utilizes the same alignment as the existing dirt roadway that leads from the South Base area to the North Base area. BMPs for the roadway in the form of rolled curb and drainage basins will prevent stormwater from reaching the drainage. Construction will be restricted to the existing roadway, and no</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>BIO-6. Will the Project, directly or indirectly (including through spread of noxious weeds), cause a loss of individuals or occupied habitat of endangered, threatened, or CNPS List 1b, 2, and 3, or TRPA listed plant species?</p> <p>Alternative 1A includes construction activities which may introduce additional noxious weed species or create conditions that increase the probability for the spread of existing weed populations. Catherine Schnurrenberger performed a botanical field reconnaissance for construction areas in early August 2007 (Botanical Field Reconnaissance Report, 2007). No special-status plant species were observed during the survey in the Project area. Noxious</p>	<p>undisturbed SEZ above the proposed restoration site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil stabilization and erosion control measures and other permanent BMPs, and • A long-term maintenance and monitoring plan to measure establishment of plants and to monitor the progress of restoration activities. <p>The desired condition shall mirror historic site conditions, adjacent plant community composition, and habitat value. Goals shall be identified to ensure parameters such as plant density, percent plant cover, and stage of maturity of planted plant species are achieved. The revised restoration plan shall be review and approved by appropriate permitting agencies prior to implementation to ensure restoration goals and success criteria are acceptable, sufficient and attainable for the site-specific conditions.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-63 to 64.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>riparian vegetation will be impacted due to paving.</p> <p>The SEZ restoration plan for Homewood Creek (see Appendix C of the Draft EIR/EIS) includes widening of the creek to allow for increased cross sectional area and will contain primary and secondary flood plains (IERS, April 2010). Widening of the stream cross-section results in a reduction of the kinetic energy and creates benefits to the SEZ. The restoration allows for better functioning of the SEZ habitat and will likely result in an increase of SEZ habitat in the Project area. Restoration of the Homewood Creek SEZ in the South Base area will not have negative impacts to downstream areas. The stream is currently contained by the culvert running through the parking lot. The proposed restoration will provide a connection to two day lighted areas that exist above and below the South Base development area. The restoration may have a positive impact on downstream floodplains as it will allow for increased area for groundwater recharge and also allow for the floodplain downstream to retain its character.</p> <p>Under the Proposed Project, the proposed North Base area parking garage has been designed to locate the footprint of the building completely outside of the SEZ delineated by TRPA during the HMR Land Capability Challenge (2008). While there are no plans provided by HMR for the restoration of the SEZ portions of the gravel parking lot, it is assumed that the gravel parking lot fill will be removed and restored during construction of the proposed parking garage and that the project will result in a benefit to the SEZ.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-5a will provide sufficient detail for approval of the restoration project and provide evidence on impacts to the SEZ below the Project area. This plan will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-61 through 8-65; see also Response to Comment 14a-34, 14a-53 and 14a-155)</p> <p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-6a and BIO-6b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR develop and implement a Noxious Weed Eradication and Control Program and pre-construction rare plant surveys. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measured BIO-6a and BIO-6b will reduce/eliminate known populations of noxious weeds and protect sensitive plant habitats and individuals from potential infestation and impacts associated with construction activities. These measures will reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant level.</p>
<p>BIO-6. Will the Project, directly or indirectly (including through spread of noxious weeds), cause a loss of individuals or occupied habitat of endangered, threatened, or CNPS List 1b, 2, and 3, or TRPA listed plant species?</p> <p>Alternative 1A includes construction activities which may introduce additional noxious weed species or create conditions that increase the probability for the spread of existing weed populations. Catherine Schnurrenberger performed a botanical field reconnaissance for construction areas in early August 2007 (Botanical Field Reconnaissance Report, 2007). No special-status plant species were observed during the survey in the Project area. Noxious</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-6a. Noxious Weed Risk Assessment and Eradication.</p> <p>HMR shall develop and implement a Noxious Weed Eradication and Control Program to protect suitable sensitive plant habitat and to protect future populations of sensitive plants from invasive terrestrial and aquatic noxious weeds. The plan shall identify a noxious weed coordinator for HMR and include abatement measures to decrease and eradicate known populations of noxious weeds and prevention measures as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known populations of terrestrial and aquatic noxious weeds shall be identified and a plan shall be implemented to control and eradicate 	<p>LS</p>	<p>riparian vegetation will be impacted due to paving.</p> <p>The SEZ restoration plan for Homewood Creek (see Appendix C of the Draft EIR/EIS) includes widening of the creek to allow for increased cross sectional area and will contain primary and secondary flood plains (IERS, April 2010). Widening of the stream cross-section results in a reduction of the kinetic energy and creates benefits to the SEZ. The restoration allows for better functioning of the SEZ habitat and will likely result in an increase of SEZ habitat in the Project area. Restoration of the Homewood Creek SEZ in the South Base area will not have negative impacts to downstream areas. The stream is currently contained by the culvert running through the parking lot. The proposed restoration will provide a connection to two day lighted areas that exist above and below the South Base development area. The restoration may have a positive impact on downstream floodplains as it will allow for increased area for groundwater recharge and also allow for the floodplain downstream to retain its character.</p> <p>Under the Proposed Project, the proposed North Base area parking garage has been designed to locate the footprint of the building completely outside of the SEZ delineated by TRPA during the HMR Land Capability Challenge (2008). While there are no plans provided by HMR for the restoration of the SEZ portions of the gravel parking lot, it is assumed that the gravel parking lot fill will be removed and restored during construction of the proposed parking garage and that the project will result in a benefit to the SEZ.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-5a will provide sufficient detail for approval of the restoration project and provide evidence on impacts to the SEZ below the Project area. This plan will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-61 through 8-65; see also Response to Comment 14a-34, 14a-53 and 14a-155)</p> <p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-6a and BIO-6b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR develop and implement a Noxious Weed Eradication and Control Program and pre-construction rare plant surveys. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measured BIO-6a and BIO-6b will reduce/eliminate known populations of noxious weeds and protect sensitive plant habitats and individuals from potential infestation and impacts associated with construction activities. These measures will reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant level.</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>weeds were observed in the Project area, including Klamath weed (<i>Hypochaeris perforatum</i>), bull thistle (<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>), cheat grass (<i>Bromus tectorum</i>), woolly mullein (<i>Verbascum thapsus</i>), and witchgrass (<i>Panicum capillare</i>). Eurasian watermilfoil (<i>Myriophyllum spicatum</i>) was also noted to be present in Quail Lake. HMR does not have a noxious weed management plan in place to eradicate and control weeds onsite. While there were no special-status plant species detected during surveys, the potential exists for species to colonize suitable habitat present at HMR. Vegetation removal and ground disturbance associated with construction may introduce new weed species or result in the spread of existing noxious weeds that may exclude native plant species. Therefore, this impact is considered significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-65 through 8-67.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> weed populations and restore native plant cover. Equipment used in the Project must be sanitized and free of non-native invasive species before moving into the Project area to ensure that the equipment is free of soil, seeds, vegetative material, or other debris that could contain or hold seeds of non-native invasive species. Vehicles, especially large, off-road and/or earthmoving vehicles shall be cleaned when they come into the Lake Tahoe Basin or come from a Basin area known to contain non-native invasive species. Equipment will be considered clean when visual inspection finds no soil, seeds, plant material, or other such debris. Gravel, fill, or other materials shall be "weed-free." Use onsite sand, gravel, rock, or organic matter when possible. Otherwise, obtain "weed-free" materials from gravel pits and fill sources that have been surveyed and approved by the CDFG or Nevada Department of Agriculture or by the noxious weed coordinator. Use "weed-free" mulches, and seed sources. Salvage topsoil from Project area for use in onsite revegetation, unless contaminated with non-native invasive species. Do not use soil or materials from areas contaminated by cheat grass. After construction, the noxious weed coordinator shall be notified. The Project area shall be monitored for 3 years subsequent to Project implementation to ensure additional non-native invasive species do not become established in the areas affected by the Project, that native species are established on re-seeded or restored habitats, and that known non-native invasive species do not spread. <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-6b. Pre-Construction Rare Plant Surveys.</p> <p>HMR shall hire an approved botanist/biologist to perform rare plant surveys in Project areas</p>		<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-65 through 8-67.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>BIO-7. Will the Project have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the US Fish and Wildlife Service?</p> <p>Sensitive natural communities in the Project area include SEZs as defined by TRPA. No uncommon plant communities identified by TRPA are present. As discussed under Impact BIO-5, mitigation measures BIO-5a ensures that onsite SEZs are properly restored with the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project will increase the amount and function of SEZ due to the restoration of Homewood Creek in the South Base area and restoration of a portion of the gravel parking lot located in SEZ at the North Base area. Due to construction in the SEZs at the South Base and North Base areas, the Proposed Project would have potentially significant impacts to sensitive natural communities, and mitigation is required. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 8-67.)</p>	<p>proposed for development prior to construction. The survey shall identify species observed and include locations of rare plant species identified. TRPA and Placer County staff shall be notified of the location of rare plant species present within the proposed Project area. If rare plants are identified, measures shall be taken to avoid disturbance and impacts to the plants. Protection measures shall be developed in conjunction with TRPA, CDFG and Placer County staff as necessary and shall be specific to the species present and the potential disturbance that may result from construction activities (habitat modification, direct removal, blasting activities, noxious weed introduction, etc.). If avoidance of rare plant species is not possible, compensation measures shall be developed prior to disturbance/construction activities. These compensation measures shall be tailored to the specific species to be disturbed and to the location in which the disturbance is to occur. If agency staff determines that compensation measures are not feasible, then the project shall be modified to avoid the disturbance.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-66 to 8-67.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Final Homewood Creek SEZ Restoration Plan.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for BIO-5 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-63 to 64.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><u>Finding:</u> Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-5a, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR develop and implement a SEZ restoration plan. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p><u>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</u> Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-5a will reduce Project related impacts to a less than significant level by ensuring that existing SEZ disturbance is successfully restored.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 8-67; see also Explanation/Facts in Support of Findings BIO-3 and BIO-5.)</p>
<p>BIO-8. Will the Project cause a change in diversity or distribution of species or result</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are beneficial. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>in permanent loss of sensitive native plant communities (including Stream Environment Zones (SEZ) and communities defined as sensitive in the California Natural Diversity Data Base), including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, micro flora and aquatic plants through direct removal or indirect lowering of the groundwater table?</p> <p>The Project area does not contain sensitive native plant communities as defined by the CNDDB. The Project area contains SEZs as defined by the TRPA. Implementation of Alternative 1A will improve SEZ function and habitat through the restoration of Homewood Creek in the South Base area and a portion of the gravel parking lot in the North Base area. Based on the increase of SEZ area and enhancement of riparian habitat on site (as compared to the existing conditions), this is considered a beneficial impact. The remainder of the development would occur in existing disturbed areas and/or on common upland habitat types, such as conifer forests. These common upland habitat types are not considered sensitive native plant communities. (B)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 6-68; see also Explanation/Facts in Support of Findings BIO-3 and BIO-5.)</p>	<p>BIO-9. Will the Project introduce new vegetation that will require excessive fertilizer or water, or will provide a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?</p> <p>Landscape plans and fertilizer plans have not been developed for Alternative 1A. Under Alternative 1A, landscaping and fertilizer management would be the responsibility of HMR. Therefore, the level of impact that may result due to introduction of new vegetation or types of fertilizer cannot be determined with certainty. Therefore, this impact is considered to be potentially significant and mitigation is required. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-68 through 8-71.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-9 will require the creation of a landscape plan and fertilizer management plan that complies with TRPA Code of Ordinances to retain native species where applicable and regulate the use of fertilizer. Implementation of this measure will reduce the impact to less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-68 through 8-71.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Project area and require less irrigation for establishment and upkeep.</p> <p>Bioretention areas for stormwater treatment are proposed for use throughout the project area in-line with stormwater conveyance and retention systems. Runoff shall be directed into bioretention areas, where it can pond and infiltrate into the soil. The engineered soil mix and vegetation in the bioretention areas shall provide water quality treatment and infiltration similar to undeveloped areas.</p> <p>High traffic groomed turf areas are designed and located to allow for controlled irrigation and fertilization throughout the Project area. Irrigation shall be installed and managed to minimize the potential for runoff to the stormwater treatment systems.</p> <p>Fertilizer shall be managed carefully and used in dry, slow release form when applications are necessary. Special measures to avoid over spraying onto paved surfaces, which could result in wash off of nutrient rich water to the stormwater treatment systems, shall be taken. To ensure minimal escape of nutrients, fertilizer and irrigation shall be monitored closely. The Plan shall include, but shall not be limited to the following measures to minimize the potential for nutrients entering surface water or escaping the root zone and being delivered to groundwater:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of non-mowed or slow-growing turf grass species, locally native or adapted species with annual fertilizer requirements that do not exceed 1.5 pounds per 1,000 square feet; • Implementation of a Fertilizer Management Plan that meets the requirements of Section 81.7 of TRPA Code or Ordinances; • Determination of appropriate fertilizer rates by a soil/vegetation specialist and based on the results of soil nutrient testing; • Incorporation of fertilizer into soils prior to seed application to prevent burning and low germination rates; • Use of Biosol or other organic, slow-release fertilizers that do not contain nitrate or ammonium with careful application to avoid application on hardscape. 		

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>The Revegetation Plan shall apply to areas disturbed during construction activities, the steep slopes above the North and South Base areas and the bioretention areas for stormwater treatment. The objective of the soil and revegetation treatments is to control sediment at its source, to maximize hydrologic and biological function in the soil and to develop and support a robust vegetation community. Specific treatment outcomes shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize soil infiltration rates and minimize runoff. • Protect the soil surface with functional mulch cover. • Reestablish soil nutrient cycling; and • Reestablish an appropriate, self-sustaining native plant community. <p>Bioretention areas shall receive similar treatments as disturbed areas. Bioretention areas are not expected to be wet during much of the growing season and are therefore not under the influence of a mesic or wet hydrologic regime. Soil treatments shall be the same as for the disturbed areas. Since runoff will be routed into bioretention areas for stormwater treatment, bioretention areas shall be designed such that concentrated flow will be routed through energy dissipaters using rocks or other landscape elements to eliminate scouring flows. More specific seeding and planting strategies in bioretention areas shall be developed in conjunction with the landscape architect developing the final landscaping plan, as discussed below.</p> <p>Slow-release, organic fertilizer shall be used and irrigation shall be applied so that water penetrates to at least eight inches below ground surface (bgs) within 24 hours of irrigation. The irrigation system shall be designed to meet this specification without displacing mulch or causing erosion. The final Plan shall include site-specific fertilizer and irrigation rates and a monitoring plan and shall be submitted to TRPA for project approval and permitting.</p>		

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>BIO-10. Will the Project result in the removal of any native live, dead or dying trees 30 inches or greater in diameter at breast height (dbh) in TRPA's Conservation or Recreational land use classifications, remove native vegetation in excess of the area utilized for the actual development permitted by the land capability, or cause a change in the natural functioning of an old growth ecosystem?</p> <p>Implementation of Alternative 1A involves tree removal for construction of facilities at the North Base, South Base, townhome sites, gondola alignment and Mid-Mountain Lodge. Alternative 1A will result in the removal of 27 trees that are 30 inches dbh or larger. Because a limited forest plan has not been generated for the project area, this impact is considered significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-71 through 8-74.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-10. Prepare Forest Plan and Tree Protection Plan For Homewood Mountain Resort.</p> <p>HMR shall prepare and implement a Forest Plan for the Project area that complies with TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 71 and incorporates the Fire Suppression and Management Plan compliance measure as described in Section 3.12.12 of this document. The Forest Plan shall be produced by a Registered Professional Forester and be submitted to TRPA for review and approval to confirm that the plan complies with Chapter 71. The Forest Plan and Fire Suppression Management Plan must both comply with the CA Forest Practices Act and will require a Timberland Conversion Permit to be approved by Cal Fire. The forest plan shall identify and detail trees for removal and other forested areas which may require treatment (thinning) in order to increase the overall health of the forest.</p> <p>In addition, a Tree Protection Plan shall be prepared for the Project. Included in the Tree Protection Plan shall be tree protection measures to prevent damage to trees that are proposed to remain. The Project applicant shall hire a Registered Professional Forester to develop specific measures to ensure adequate protection to trees slated for retention in the vicinity of proposed development. The tree protection measures shall include the establishment of tree protection zones, and protection measures to prevent damage to the trees (bole, roots and branches). Additionally the Tree Protection Plan shall identify areas where tree roots are to be protected and proper methods for pruning, irrigation and limb removal during construction activities. The Tree Protection Plan shall include monitoring of the trees slated for retention for a period of three years. Mortality of any of the retained trees shall require the replacement of trees lost utilizing the same species and relative location. The Tree Protection Plan shall be submitted to Placer County and the TRPA for review and approval prior to removal of any trees associated with the Project. Stump removal is not allowed without prior approval of the Development Review Committee and may require a Grading Permit for erosion control and water quality purposes.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Table 8-6 of the EIR/EIS details tree removal numbers associated with the base areas and Mid-Mountain Lodge, including the water tank. Detailed plans have not been provided for the utility corridor that would connect the North Base and the Mid-Mountain Lodge. Therefore, accurate tree removal estimates cannot be developed for utility alignments. However, it is anticipated that utilities would utilize existing roadway alignments or ski trails, which have been previously cleared of trees.</p> <p>Of the 27 trees larger than 30 inches dbh proposed for removal under the Proposed Project, a total of nine trees have been identified for potential preservation in the North Base area. However, at present, it cannot be determined with certainty that these trees can be retained based on potential modifications to construction activities or building locations. Therefore, they are included in the estimated total tree removal count. It is noted on the May 21, 2009 memo that "Trees proposed to be removed fall in the parameters of the proposed building footprint or hardscape.</p> <p>The trees to be removed are located in PAS 157 Homewood/Tahoe Ski Bowl, which is a recreational plan area. Building development location was analyzed and selected in order to minimize impacts on scenic, ground water, grading and land coverage criteria." However, no development area is considered an old growth forest. TRPA Code Section 71.2.A identifies the standards for tree removal on conservation and recreation plan areas.</p> <p>The one exception that applies to Homewood is TRPA Code Section 71.2.A(6) which states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In ski areas with existing TRPA-approved master plans, trees larger than 30 inches dbh in the westside forest types and 24 inches dbh in eastside forest types may be removed for facilities that are consistent with that master plan. For activities that are consistent with a TRPA-approved master plan, trees larger than 30 inches dbh in the westside forest types and 24 inches dbh in eastside forest types may be removed when it is demonstrated that the removal is necessary for the activity.

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>BIO-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to biological resources?</p> <p>The combined effect of Alternative 1A and reasonably foreseeable future projects on biological resources (as listed in Table 20-1-1 of the EIR/EIS) would not result in a significant impact. Many of the future projects that are proposed in the project vicinity include development projects that will not result in significant impacts to sensitive plant or wildlife species. The proposed development projects are located within and surrounded by existing urban uses and do not contain high quality habitats for sensitive wildlife and plant species. Other known erosion control project and fuels reduction projects will result in modifications to habitats but will require compliance with regulatory measures to avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive species and their respective habitats.</p> <p>Forest fuels reduction projects, restoration project and erosion control projects listed in Table 20-1 of the EIR/EIS will result in ground</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-71 through 8-74.)</p> <p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are beneficial. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>
	<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-73 to 8-74.)</p>		<p>While 71.2.A(6) may apply to the proposed project, because the Project is located on private land, TRPA Code Section 71.2.C can be applied. The removal of 27 trees larger than 30 inches dbh would be much less than 10 percent of the total large trees in the Project area and therefore Subsection 71.2.C(2) could be applied for the Project.</p> <p>A number of trees larger than 30 inches dbh are proposed to be saved and to remain onsite at the North Base area. The potential exists for these trees to be damaged during construction and result in increased loss of large mature trees onsite.</p> <p>The Project does not conflict with the Placer County Tree Preservation ordinance adopted in October of 1991. The tree preservation Ordinance applies to all projects where discretionary permit approvals are required by the County provided, however, no Landmark Tree may be removed without obtaining a tree permit pursuant to Section 12.16.060. However, there are no Landmark Trees proposed for removal within the HMR project area.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-10 will ensure Homewood Mountain Resort will comply with TRPA regulations regarding removal of trees larger than 30 inches dbh prior to construction. This impact will be less than significant after mitigation.</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

82

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>CUL-1: Will the Project adversely change the significance of an eligible or potentially-eligible National Register property, or a resource that meets the criteria for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources, or a resource on TRPA maps, including archaeological, historical, architectural, and Native American/traditional heritage resources?</p> <p>No NRHP, CRHR, or TRPA mapped properties are located in the Project area (Lindström 2007, and Marvin and Brejla 2009). Architectural resources in the North Base area of the Project area were evaluated as not eligible for listing on the NRHP under any of the criteria, or to be important historical resources for the purposes of CEQA or TRPA, primarily due to their lack of integrity (Marvin and Brejla 2009). HMR intends to relocate the existing Ski School building to the proposed on-site fishing/jice skating pond located between buildings C and D at the North Base area (area shown on Figures 3-7 and 3-8 in Chapter 3). The relocation of the existing Ski School building will not result in impacts to any eligible or potentially eligible National Register properties. (LS)</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are beneficial. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>
<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-74 through 8-76.)</p> <p>CUL-2: Will the Project cause a physical change which would adversely affect unique ethnic cultural values or restrict historic or pre-historic religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?</p> <p>No unique ethnic cultural values or historic or pre-historic religious or sacred uses are known to have occurred within the Project area</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>(Lindström 2007, and Marvin and Bregla 2009). Therefore, there are no impacts associated with Alternative 1A. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 9-10.)</p> <p>CUL-3: Will the Project disturb significant unknown archaeological resources?</p> <p>No unique archaeological features are known to exist in the Project area. Therefore, there are no known impacts associated with Alternative 1A. No immediate Native American concerns regarding the Project area were identified (Lindström 2007). The Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California was notified of survey findings and concurred with the report recommendations (Lindström 2007). As with any construction undertaking (including BMP retrofit disturbance), the potential for undiscovered subsurface archaeological features remains though it is unlikely, particularly within the existing footprint of the previously disturbed base areas. Therefore, this impact is potentially significant. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-10 through 9-11.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Identify and Protect Undiscovered Archaeological Resources.</p> <p>To assure that potential undiscovered resources are identified during site grading, a qualified archaeologist shall be on-site during initial ground disturbing construction excavation and grading operations.</p> <p>If previously undiscovered human remains, archaeological resources, exotic rock (non-native) or unusual amounts of shell or bone are discovered during construction or any subsequent activity, ground disturbing activity will cease in the vicinity of the discovery until the TRPA and Placer County Cultural Resources or Planning staff (or their qualified SOPA-certified consultants) assesses it for eligibility to the NRHP, compliance with TRPA Code Section 29, and/or (in the event of a prehistoric or ethnographic find) for Native American Heritage Commission (e.g., Washoe) values. This assessment will occur in consultation with the California SHPO, TRPA, Placer County and the Washoe Tribe, as appropriate. Cessation of applicable construction activity will continue until proper treatment can be determined and implemented by the responsible agencies.</p> <p>If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect shall be provided on the Improvement Plans for the project.</p> <p>Following a review of a new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-10 through 9-11.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 will protect potentially eligible resources that may be unearthed during project construction. Therefore, with mitigation, this impact is reduced to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-10 through 9-11.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>CUL-4: Will the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</p> <p>No unique paleontological resources or geologic features are located within the Project area. Therefore, there are no known impacts associated with any Alternative. As with any construction undertaking (including BMP retrofit disturbance), the potential for undiscovered subsurface paleontological features remains though it is unlikely, particularly within the existing footprint of the previously disturbed base areas. Therefore, this impact is potentially significant. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-11 through 9-12.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-4: Identify and Protect Undiscovered Paleontological Resources.</p> <p>Prior to submittal of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall provide written evidence to the Planning Department that a qualified paleontologist has been retained by the applicant to observe grading activities and salvage fossils as necessary. The paleontologist shall establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance and shall establish, in cooperation with the project developer, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit sampling, identification, and evaluation of fossils. If major paleontological resources are discovered, which require temporary halting or redirecting of grading, the paleontologist shall report such findings to the project developer, and to the Placer County Department of Museums and Planning Department.</p> <p>The paleontologist shall determine appropriate actions, in cooperation with the project developer, which ensure proper exploration and/or salvage. Excavated finds shall be offered to a State-designated repository such as Museum of Paleontology, U.C. Berkeley, the California Academy of Sciences, or any other State-designated repository. Otherwise, the finds shall be offered to the Placer County Department of Museums for purposes of public education and interpretive displays.</p> <p>These actions, as well as final mitigation and disposition of the resources shall be subject to approval by the Department of Museums. The paleontologist shall submit a follow-up report to the Department of Museums and Planning Department which shall include the period of inspection, an analysis of the fossils found, and identification of the repository in which the fossils are located.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 9-11.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure CUL-4, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to implement procedures for the monitoring, protection and treatment plan for undiscovered paleontological resources. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-4 will protect potentially eligible resources that may be unearthed during project construction. Therefore, with mitigation, this impact is reduced to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-11 through 9-12.)</p>
<p>CUL-5: Will the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries?</p> <p>No formal cemeteries were identified during the cultural resources study for the Project</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Identify and Protect Undiscovered Archaeological Resources.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for CUL-3 above.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure CUL-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to implement procedures to ensure proper treatment of human remain. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors,</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>(Lindstrom 2007, and Marvin and Breja 2009). No immediate Native American concerns regarding the Project area were identified (Lindstrom 2007). The Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California was notified of survey findings and concurred with the report recommendations (Lindstrom 2007). However, as with any ground-disturbing activity there is always the possibility of encountering buried resources that were not revealed during intensive surface investigations. Based on the history and movement of native peoples, the likelihood of encountering buried human remains is potentially significant. (PS)</p>	<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-10 through 9-11.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 will ensure proper treatment of human remains that may be unearthed during project construction. Therefore, with mitigation, this impact is reduced to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 9-12.)</p>
<p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 9-12)</p> <p>CUL-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to cultural or historical resources?</p> <p>The list of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects considered in this cumulative impact analysis is provided in Table 20-1 (Chapter 20 of the EIR/EIS). The Project area contains no known historic, pre-historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to affect known cultural or historical resources. Consequently, construction and operation of Alternative 1A is not expected to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulatively impact on cultural or historical resources. (LS)</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>
<p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 9-12.)</p> <p>SCENIC RESOURCES</p> <p>SCENIC-1. Will the Project be inconsistent with a County General Plan or TRPA thresholds, regulations, standards, or guidelines applicable to the Project area?</p> <p>Alternative 1A building heights do not comply with TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 22 -- Height Standards (TRPA 1987). Consequently, the Proposed Project is not consistent with existing TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies, Land Use Element, Community Design Subelement, Goal 2, Policy 1 (TRPA 1986). However, a height amendment to TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 22 is proposed that includes a new height calculation methodology for sloped areas. The buildings included in the</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-10. Prepare Forest Plan and Tree Protection Plan For Homewood Mountain Resort.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for BIO-10 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-73 through 8-74.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-10, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to develop and implement Forest Plan and Tree Protection Plan to ensure compliance with TRPA tree removal regulations. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The analysis in the EIR/EIS concludes that the Proposed Project would not result in adverse impacts on scenic quality, but would result in improvements to existing scenic quality ratings for SR 89 to help move the existing TRPA roadway travel route unit towards</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Proposed Project would be in compliance with the amended height standards.</p> <p>In addition to lighting, signage and height standards, and visual resource goals and policies, tree removal policies are also be considered in relation to visual impacts and policy compliance. Tree removal, as discussed in Chapter 8 of the EIR/EIS, is considered to be a significant impact. As explained in Chapter 8, this impact is considered significant because a limited forest plan has not been generated for the Project area. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 10-33 through 10-43.)</p>			<p>threshold attainment.</p> <p>Although specific lighting and signage materials, dimensions, and locations are not currently identified, it is assumed that the Proposed Project will comply with TRPA and Placer County standards in order to obtain necessary approvals and permits prior to construction.</p> <p>As analyzed in Chapter 4 of the EIR/EIS, the Proposed Project would be consistent with policies related to Lighting and Signs. To address compliance with height standards, Alternative 1A proposes to amend the TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 22 - Height Standards by adding new §22.4.G and amending §22.7(6) to allow additional building heights for special projects located in a Ski Area Master Plan and designated through TRPA Governing Board Resolution 2008-11. A copy of the proposed Chapter 22 amendment is provided in Appendix F of the EIR/EIS. The height amendment, if approved, will allow building heights up to 77 feet as currently measured using TRPA Code Chapter 22 height measurement methods. The proposed amendment to chapter 22 would adopt the Placer County methodology of measuring height. Revising TRPA's height calculation methodology to use the average slope to roof pitch instead of the lowest grade to roof pitch, results in a similar overall visual effect, but would allow one large building rather than smaller buildings stepped up the hillside. Therefore, the amendment will not allow greater visual impact or overall height, rather it revises the calculation methods to better reflect the true height of large footprint/attached buildings on sloped areas.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is consistent with other applicable goals and policies related to visual resources, community design, and scenic corridors in the TRPA Regional Plan, Placer County General Plan, and West Shore Area General Plan. Tables 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 in Chapter 4 of the EIR/EIS- Relationship to Existing Land Use Plans, Goals and Policies, provide evaluations of Project consistency with applicable goals and policies. The Proposed Project is consistent with the following elements of the Placer County Design Standards and Guidelines for the Lake Tahoe Region including the Community Plan Areas (Placer County 1994): 1) Site Plan, 2) Grading and Drainage, 3) Landscaping, 5) Architecture, 6) Design for Snow, 7) Energy Conservation, 8) Utility and Service Area, 9) Historic Buildings, 10) Scenic Highway Corridors, 11) Shorezone, 12) Parking, 13) Access, 14) Circulation, 15) Parking Lot Landscaping, 16) Parking for Disabled Persons, and 17) Loading (County of Placer 1994b).</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure B10-10 will ensure Homewood Mountain Resort will comply with TRPA regulations regarding removal of trees larger than 30" dbh prior to construction ensuring this impact will be less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 10-33 through 10-43; see also Chapter 4.</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>SCENIC-2. Will the Project be visible from or cause an adverse effect on foreground or middle ground views from a high volume travel way, recreation use area, or other public use area, including Lake Tahoe, TRPA designated bike trail, or State or federal highway?</p> <p>Alternative 1A includes new structures that are visible from scenic resources and include recommended actions identified by the TRPA to improve the scenic quality of the area. Development of Alternative 1A will improve the scenic quality ratings of Roadway Unit 11 (Homewood), and Recreation Areas 20 (Ski Homewood) and 21 (Tahoe Ski Bowl). The rating for Scenic Shoreline Travel Unit 12 (McKinney Bay) will not change, but the Proposed Project will increase the visibility of man-made structures at the North Base and Mid-Mountain areas as viewed from Lake Tahoe. Visibility of the Mid-Mountain lodge from distant Lake Tahoe viewpoints should be reduced to ensure it stays visually subordinate to the natural landscape. Because of the potential for the Mid-Mountain area lodge and gondola top station development to dominate the natural landscape, this impact is considered to be significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 10-67 through 10-74.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure SCENIC-2a. Slope Vegetation Management</p> <p>To reduce the prominence of man-made features as viewed from Lake Tahoe viewpoints, HMR shall implement management actions to improve the visual quality of the existing Face ski run (located just above the North Base area) as viewed from Lake Tahoe. These measures shall include vegetation management with the goal of matching vegetation patterns of the northern (dark green) portion of the ski run (as seen in Figures 10-5 through 10-7). The Face ski run has well established vegetation but is more visually prominent as viewed from Lake Tahoe when the vegetation is cut back on portions of the ski run and the vegetation color changes from dark green to light brown in color. During future permitting for vegetation management, HMR shall work with agency staff to develop procedures to ensure that the entirety of the Face ski run appears more uniform in color/texture when viewed from Lake Tahoe viewpoints.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure SCENIC-2b. Mid-Mountain Lodge Redesign</p> <p>The Mid-Mountain Lodge design shall be finalized with a goal of reducing the reflectivity of glass panes and roofing materials, and placement of landscaping to reduce its visibility from Lake Tahoe. Building materials shall be pre-approved by TRPA and Placer County planning staff consistent with existing design review guidelines. Natural materials and dark colors that conform to Chapter 30 – Design Standards (TRPA 1987) will be used on resort structures. Placement of new trees directly downslope of the structure, as feasible among existing ski trails, will reduce its visual dominance from identified lake views.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-73 to 9-74.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Relationship to Existing Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations; and Chapter 23, Master Responses 4, 7 and 8; Responses Comments 13a-15 and 13a-24, and 14a-46.)</p> <p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure SCENIC-2a and SCENIC-2b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to develop and implement Slope Vegetation Management and redesign of the Mid-Mountain Lodge Redesign. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Under Alternative 1A, the buildings located closest to SR 89 are of similar height and design and buildings farther away from SR 89 are at a similar roof top elevation, but laid out differently as depicted in Figure 10-14. As shown in Figures 10-5 through 10-8 and 10-10 through 10-13 of the EIR/EIS, the Project area is visible from Scenic Roadway Travel Unit 11 (Homewood) and Scenic Shoreline Travel Unit 12 (McKinney Bay). These units currently do not meet scenic quality thresholds for attainment (TRPA 2001, 2007). The Project area is located in TRPA Recreation Areas 20 (Ski Homewood) and 21 (Tahoe Ski Bowl). Dense conifer forest is expected to obscure views of the South Base area from Lake Tahoe and SR 89, but the North Base area is visually prominent along SR 89. From Lake Tahoe, the North Base area is mostly obscured by existing shoreline development and conifer forest, and is minimally visible. The Mid-Mountain Base area is not visible from SR 89, but is partially visible through the conifer forest from one of the four analyzed viewpoints from Lake Tahoe. The Mid Mountain lodge and gondola top station are not visible from the three closest Lake Tahoe viewpoints because of intervening topography.</p> <p>The TRPA recommends the following actions to improve scenic resources at HMR and to bring Scenic Roadway Travel Unit 11 (Homewood) and Scenic Shoreline Travel Unit 12 (McKinney Bay) into attainment (TRPA 1989a, 1993):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscaping in and around parking lots and buildings; • Reduce size and visual prominence of parking lots; • Architectural improvements and cohesiveness, including the use of materials and designs to current design standards to complement the natural landscape; • Removal of structures that do not meet design standards; • Paint ski lift towers to reduce visibility; • Relocation of maintenance facilities; • Undergrounding utilities; and • Signage improvements.

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>Table 10-9 of the EIR/EIS analyzes the consistency of the Proposed Project with these recommendations. Implementing TRPA recommendations will enhance scenic quality at HMR (TRPA 1989a, 1993). Design improvements and architectural unity along with landscaping and utility undergrounding will improve the quality along SR 89. Unified structures with cohesive architectural character will replace the barren parking lot and mismatched buildings. The integration of landscaping with the structures will create visual interest while reflecting the natural vegetation and beauty of the Project area.</p> <p>Variation in the location of the ski lifts, particularly the gondola, would not alter the visual character, particularly since many ski runs or portions of runs to remain in use would be rehabilitated and improved with vegetation. The bike path along SR 89 also would not result in a substantial visual change. The location of the path parallel to the roadway and the proposed structures would reflect the travel corridor and the urban development. The addition of landscaping along the path would improve views while expanding the public viewshed. No adverse impacts are anticipated as a result of ski lift development or removal or the development of the bike path.</p> <p>Development of Alternative 1A will improve the scenic quality ratings of Roadway Unit 11 (Homewood), and Recreation Areas 20 (Ski Homewood) and 21 (Tahoe Ski Bowl). The rating for Scenic Shoreline Travel Unit 12 (McKinney Bay) will not change, but the Proposed Project will increase the visibility of man-made structures at the North Base and Mid-Mountain areas as viewed from Lake Tahoe.</p> <p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures SCENIC-2a and SCENIC-2b will address visual quality issues identified for the shoreline unit relating to the visibility of the Mid-Mountain lodge from distant Lake Tahoe viewpoints and ensure it stays visually subordinate to the natural landscape. Therefore, these measures will reduce potential impacts to a level that is less than significant by maintaining the existing scenic quality ratings. Further, Alternative 1A would address several of the recommended actions in the SQIP to improve scenic quality, including landscaping, cohesive architecture, and undergrounding utilities. These improvements, along with avoidance or minimization of impacts from new development, will maintain or improve existing scenic quality ratings.</p> <p>Some commenters have expressed concern regarding the size, density, and massing of the project, as well as the mix of uses, will change the community character of Homewood. The Proposed Project will result in an increase in commercial, mixed-use, tourist and residential uses, clustered along SR 89 where other commercial and tourist features are currently found in the community. While the project would increase the number of uses</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>SCENIC-3. Will the Project create an unacceptable new light source or cause glare or affect day or nighttime views in the area?</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>on the site, this change does not alter the location of urbanization along SR 89 in the Homewood area. Visual elements of the new structures, including the "Old Tahoe" architectural design and improved landscaping help maintain the "rustic" character of the area.</p> <p>Many portions of the community include residences spread throughout the landscape. The community does not have the development intensity of other areas such as South shore. However, this project does not propose to transform the community into an area that resembles South shore. In particular, the inclusion of new mixtures of uses does not disturb the community character if designed, located and placed correctly.</p> <p>Chapters 6.0 and 10.0 of the EIR/EIS both address the Project's compatibility with the surrounding community.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 10-67 through 10-74; see also Master Responses 7 and 8; Responses Comments 13a-15, 13a-24, 13a-62, 14a-46, 14a-144 through 14a-150.)</p> <p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>
<p>Although a list of building materials is not defined, the Alternative 1A will pursue LEED certification and will utilize green materials for the North Base mixed development area. This will include high efficiency, low reflective windows to reduce glare on-site. In compliance with the TRPA Design Guidelines (TRPA 1989b) and Placer County West Shore Area General Plan (County of Placer 1998), non-reflective roofing materials will be used. Landscaping trees and architectural elements such as balconies, overhangs, and shutters will reduce the overall visual presence, reflectivity, and glare caused by windows.</p> <p>Windows can be reflective, and the Proposed Project could result in a higher intensity of reflection since there are very few existing windows in the Project area. To avoid or minimize this effect, the Proposed Project uses setbacks and variations in the upper floor plan of most buildings, and overhangs and other architectural details to reduce reflectivity. Non-reflective glass may also be required based on compliance with TRPA and Placer County design standards.</p>			

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Lighting fixtures will add glare and affect nighttime views in the Project area. Because the types of fixtures and materials used, as well as their placement, must comply with TRPA Code and design guidelines and Placer County standards, this impact is considered to be less than significant. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-80 through 9-81; see also Response Comments Comment 42-11.)</p> <p>SCENIC-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to scenic resources?</p> <p>Implementation of Alternative 1A will result in improvements to the west shore urban area along SR 89 and when combined with other projects in the Homewood area, has the potential to improve the overall urban character of the west shore. Existing development in the Project area detracts from the scenic quality with poorly designed and unattractive structures that reflect a lack of architectural unity and character, and that do not meet current TRPA design standards (TRPA 1989b, 1987). By redeveloping the Project area in the "Old Tahoe" style and implementing appropriate site design and landscaping, the Proposed Project will contribute to the trend toward traditional and characteristic architecture of Lake Tahoe and bring the site design into compliance with design standards and guidelines.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will include structures visible from Lake Tahoe. The Proposed Project will construct the Mid-Mountain Base area will result in new on-mountain estate residences visible from the lake. North Base area buildings will be partially screened by conifer trees and existing structures on the shoreline. However, the proposed structures will contribute to a general feeling of urbanization of the lake environment. While the visibility of one or two additional structures at one location may not result in a considerable change in the overall views from the Lake on the west shore, the increased visibility of structures around the lake creates a noticeable effect. Combined with other nearby planned, proposed, or recently completed projects that may also be visible from the lake, the urban view will intensify and the natural beauty of the area must compete with these structures. This is considered a</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure SCENIC-2a. Slope Vegetation Management</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for SCENIC-2 above.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure SCENIC-2b. Mid-Mountain Lodge Redesign</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for SCENIC-2 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-73 to 9-74.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of the Mitigation Measures SCENIC-2a and SCENIC-2b will reduce the visual presence of structures from the lake view. Through implementation of recommended actions designed to improve scenic quality in the Project area (TRPA 1989, 1993, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2007), elements of Alternatives 1A are expected to maintain and improve the scenic quality ratings in the Project area. Implementation of scenic resource mitigation measures will avoid or minimize potential adverse scenic quality impacts from new development, and therefore maintain scenic quality ratings. By making structures secondary to the natural environment and concealing their presence with appropriate design features and landscaping, Alternative 1A will not contribute to an adverse cumulative impact on scenic resources.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 10-81 to 10-82; see also Chapter 4, Relationship to Existing Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations; and Chapter 23, Master Responses 4, 7 and 8; Responses Comments 13a-15, 13a-24, 13a-62, 14a-46, 14a-144 through 14a-150.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 10-81 through 10-82.) TRANSPORTATION, PARKING AND CIRCULATION TRANS-1. Will the Project result in generation of 200 or more new Daily Vehicle Trip Ends?</p> <p>Alternative 1A will result in a reduction of 337 net new daily trips during the winter months. Therefore, Alternative 1A will not generate more than 200 net new daily vehicle trip ends during the winter months.</p> <p>During the summer months, Alternatives 1A will generate 1,456 net new daily trips. The creation of more than 200 net new daily trips during the summer months is a significant impact. The outdoor amphitheater was not included in the trip generation calculations for Alternatives 1A as it will only be used for special events and not on a regular basis. HMR currently holds the same events that will be held in amphitheater; therefore, the addition of the amphitheater will not significantly change trip characteristics to and from the site. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-63 to 11-64.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure TRANS-1. Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program.</p> <p>HMR shall pay the appropriate air quality mitigation fee in accordance with Chapter 93 – Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Fees generated by the air quality mitigation fee are used to support programs/improvements that reduce VMT, improve air quality, and encourage alternative modes of transportation.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 11-64.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to pay fees that will be used to support programs/improvements that reduce VMT, improve air quality, and encourage alternative mode of transportation. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The TRPA Code of Ordinances – Chapter 93 implements TRPA's Air Quality Plan. The TRPA Code of Ordinances defines a Significant Increase for purposes of this Chapter as "an increase of more than 200 daily vehicle trips, determined by the Trip Table or other competent technical information." According to Chapter 93, if a project results in a significant increase in daily vehicle trips, all traffic and air quality impacts must be mitigated consistent with the environmental thresholds, the Goals and Policies, the Regional Transportation Plan and the 1992 Air Quality Plan.</p> <p>As discussed in the EIR/EIS, the Project effectively mitigates air quality emissions through VMT reductions achieved through the Mitigation Program. By contributing to TRPA's Mitigation Program, Funds paid under the Air Quality Mitigation Program are used for activities that reduce VMT or otherwise reduce air pollutant emissions from automobiles. Section 93.5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances identifies permissible uses of these funds. It states:</p> <p>"Use And Distribution Of Mitigation Funds: TRPA shall deposit air quality mitigation funds in a trust account. Interest accruing to the trust account shall remain in the account until used on air quality mitigation projects. TRPA shall keep track of the amount of funds collected for each local jurisdiction, with interest, and shall disburse funds to the local jurisdiction, or to the Tahoe Transportation District, at their request, for expenditure within the jurisdiction of origin, provided TRPA finds that the expenditure is consistent with TRPA's Regional Transportation Plan or the 1992 Air Quality Plan."</p> <p>As discussed on pages 12-43 and 12-44 in the DEIR/EIS, specific regional and local VMT reduction strategies that may benefit from the mitigation include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of existing transit facilities; • Addition of bicycle lanes; • Transportation Systems Management measures such

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>TRANS-2. Will the Project result in changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure TRANS-2. Provide Adequate Parking to Meet Placer County Requirements.</p> <p>The project applicant shall implement a winter and summer Parking Management Plan, to address both during construction and post-construction, to be reviewed and approved by the Development Review Committee (DRC) prior to Improvement Plan approval for any and each subsequent</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>FINDINGS OF FACT</p> <p>as bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and use of alternative fuels in fleet vehicles; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of connectivity between multi-use paths for bicycles and pedestrians. <p>The purpose of TRPA's Mitigation Program is to generate revenue to fund projects that promote alternative modes of transportation and reduce VMT within the Lake Tahoe Air Basin (LTAB). While the payment of fees will not affect the number of Project-generated vehicle trips or associated emissions, it will contribute to cumulative regional reductions in VMT and air pollutants. Thus, by contributing to TRPA's Mitigation Program, the project effectively mitigates air quality emissions through VMT reductions achieved by alternative transportation projects supported by the Mitigation Program.</p> <p>Chapter 93 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances outlines requirements for the payment and distribution of mitigation fees from the Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program. The Project's fee will be determined in accordance with Section 93.3C of the Code of Ordinances. As determined by the TRPA, the mitigation fee will effectively offset increases in vehicle trips and emissions generated by the Project. Funds collected from the Project will be deposited into a trust account and distributed to local transportation projects, consistent with TRPA's Regional Transportation Plan or the 1992 Air Quality Plan.</p> <p>The air quality management agencies (PCAPCD and TRPA) within the Project area have acknowledged fund-based mitigation programs as acceptable methods for mitigating project-level emissions in CEQA documents. Continual contributions from projects throughout the air basin ensure adequate funds to support alternative transportation are available. Consultation with PCAPCD and TRPA confirms that payment into TRPA's Mitigation Program (Mitigation Measure AQ-2a) constitutes sufficient mitigation to reduce traffic-related emissions generated by the Project to a less than significant level.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-63 through 11-64; see also Chapter 23, Master Response 13 and Responses to Comments 13C-11 and 14a-112.)</p> <p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to develop and implement a Parking Management Program to ensure that adequate parking is provided to meeting Placer County requirements. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the</p>
<p>Alternative 1A will include 740 parking spaces at the North Base, 145 parking spaces at the South Base, and a two-car garage and two driveway spaces with each townhome (64 spaces), for a total of 949 parking spaces for the Project area, with a potential for up to 984</p>			

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>on-site parking spaces. According to Table 1 from Appendix K-3, 62 ski area employees will park off-site during peak ski weekends, resulting in an on-site parking demand of 993 parking spaces for Alternative 1A. Based on Table 11-19, Alternative 1A parking supply is less than the demand, therefore this impact is considered to be significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-64 through 11-67.)</p>	<p>project phase. The Parking Management Plan shall address the anticipated off-site peak winter ski day employee parking and any other on-site parking deficiencies. This plan shall be approved by the County and the TRPA with each project phase and will ensure that adequate parking and shuttle service operations are maintained in order to accommodate the required off-site peak ski day parking. As part of the Parking Management Plan, HMR may propose to provide Placer County Transit passes to employees to encourage their use of public transit from the Tahoe City Transit Center to the Homewood project. Off-site parking locations used by HMR shall comply with Placer County parking standards and shall be paved with required BMPs, available for winter weekend use by HMR, designed for adequate snow removal operations (e.g., include properly designed areas for snow storage) and located near SR 89 for convenient access by employees, resort guests and shuttle drivers. Types of existing parking that may be used by HMR for off-site parking needs include but are not limited to commercial establishments, churches, and private recreational facilities. Public parks, community centers or transit centers not fully utilized during winter months may be available if an agreement can be reached with the public agency responsible for the operation of the facility. Based on a review of these types of existing facilities along the SR 89 corridor near HMR and north to Tahoe City, there are hundreds of available parking spaces for potential use by HMR, subject to agreements with the property owners. The applicant shall provide shuttle service between the designated off-site parking location(s) and Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR).</p> <p>Additionally, the Parking Management Plan shall address the following: communication and management strategies for alerting people of when and where parking is available on-site and off-site (e.g. changeable message signs in Tahoe City); an employee parking plan with regulations and off-site parking locations; a boat trailer parking plan for times when boat trails from adjacent business can be parked in the parking structure, including regulations and boat trailer parking locations; special event parking plan that addresses on and off site parking locations for guests of special events; and an enforcement plan to address neighborhood parking.</p>		<p>EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-2 will insure adequate on-site and off-site parking management to eliminate any potential parking impacts.</p> <p>The parking analysis presented in the EIR/EIS presents an accurate analysis of parking supply and demand. The assumptions presented in this analysis are founded on the best data available and/or engineering judgment based on logic and specialized expertise in the field. The parking analysis was performed using national state-of-the practice methods for conducting parking studies.</p> <p>Some comments on the Draft EIR/EIS suggest that the analysis and conclusions in the EIR/EIS regarding the Project's impacts on parking, including but not limited to on-street parking in the area, are inadequate or wrong. The County has considered the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters. The Board of Supervisors finds that the analysis set forth in the EIR/EIS is reasonable and appropriate, and has been prepared by qualified experts using appropriate assumptions and methodologies in accordance with TRPA and County guidance.</p> <p>Mitigation measure TRANS-2 requires HMR to provide adequate parking to meet Placer County requirements and will insure ensure adequate on-site and off-site parking management to eliminate any potential parking impacts. HMR is proposing to park employees and day use skier overflow at off-site parking sites to meet demand on peak winter days when on-site parking spaces are not adequate to meet estimated demand. To document that adequate parking supplies are available at off-site locations, Mitigation measure TRANS-2 has been revised as follows to document the minimum standards required for off-site parking locations (e.g.; comply with Placer County land development manual regulations for paved parking, comply with TRPA BMP requirements, available for winter use, capable of being plowed, etc.) and provide a list of the type of spaces that could be utilized by HMR. By complying with the identified standards for the selection of off-site parking locations, impacts associated with the use of off-site parking locations (e.g., water quality, noise from snow removal, circulation related to access) will be less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 11-64 through 11-67; see also Chapter 23, Master Response 12 and Responses to Comments 4-2, 4-3, 13a-44, 14a-73, 14a-105, 19-20, 19-21, 33-50, 48-13, 107-33, 250-3, 328-9, 329-7and 18-f.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>TRANS-3. Will the Project result in a substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, including roadways and intersections?</p> <p>Summer LOS Analysis</p> <p>Table 11-20 of the EIR/EIS presents a summary of the LOS at the study intersections for existing summer plus project conditions for the Proposed Project and Alternatives. Figures 11-15 through 11-18 show the existing plus project traffic volumes at the study intersections. Alternative 1A will have a significant impact at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection. The overall intersection LOS is within the LOS standards (LOS C and D); however, the side-street approach (eastbound</p>	<p>If additional environmental impacts, other than those already identified, analyzed, and mitigated (if necessary) as part of this Draft EIR/EIS are created as a result of any of the proposed on-site or off-site parking areas or shuttle service operations, the Improvement Plans shall not be approved until subsequent environmental review has been completed.</p> <p>The project applicant has committed to eliminating the existing day skier parking along SR 89 and along County roadways. The Parking Management Plan, to be approved by the County and the TRPA and revised by the applicant as necessary for subsequent County/TRPA review and approval with each project phase, shall outline the measures proposed to fulfill this commitment, including signage, parking enforcement, surveys of on-street parking during peak ski days, and annual reporting to Placer County by May 1 of each year that surveys are required. Surveys shall be required until two years after completion of any new development phase of the project. All costs associated with the surveys and parking management report are the responsibility of Homewood Mountain Resort.</p> <p>Timing / Implementation: An agreement between the County, TRPA and the applicant to implement the Parking Management Program, along with the detailed plan, shall be signed before Improvement Plans for any and each subsequent project phase are approved.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-66 through 11-67.)</p>	<p>SU for Summer Queuing Impacts; LS for Summer LOS, Winter LOS, and Winter Queuing Impacts</p>	<p>Finding for Summer LOS: Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to implement following intersection improvement at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding for Summer LOS: Alternative 1A has the same land uses as Alternative 1, but fewer units. The PM peak hour trip generation for Alternative 1A is 2 fewer vehicles than the trip generation for Alternative 1. Therefore, a separate LOS analysis is not needed for Alternative 1A. A difference of 2 vehicles would not affect delay and LOS at the study intersections. Implementation of mitigation measure</p>
	<p>Mitigation Measure TRANS-3. Implement Intersection Improvements</p> <p>The Project shall construct the following intersection improvement at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection: Add an acceleration lane or two-way left-turn lane (consistent with the Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project, 2006) to SR 89 at Granlibakken Road. The mitigation measure will result in the following summer LOS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delay after mitigation: 3.4 (44.2), LOS: A (E), Project (Alternatives 1/1A) and Alternative 3 • Delay after mitigation: 3.3 (41.9), LOS: A (E), Alternative 5 • Delay after mitigation: 3.2 (40.7), LOS: A (E). 		

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>left-turn) operates at LOS F. The number of eastbound, left-turning vehicles for Alternative 1A for existing plus Project conditions is 77. The remaining study intersections will operate at acceptable LOS with the addition of the Proposed Project. (S)</p>	<p>Alternative 6</p> <p>Note: A two-way left-turn lane has been environmentally cleared through a CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration, NEPA Finding of No Significant Impact, and TRPA Programmatic Environmental Assessment, and is scheduled for construction at this location as part of the Caltrans' Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project. Figures ESL 42 and ESL 43 from the Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project show the proposed roadway improvements, and are provided in Appendix L-2. If construction of the improvement is in place prior to being needed for HMR, HMR shall no longer be responsible for the improvement.</p>		<p>TRANS-3 will improve the LOS at the SR 89/Granitbakken Road intersection to better than existing conditions for Alternative 1A. The mitigation measure will result in the following summer LOS for Alternative 1A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delay after mitigation: 3.4 (44.2), LOS: A (E). <p>This mitigation does not improve LOS to D or better at the side-street approach, but if the EIP project improves the LOS at the SR 89/Granitbakken Road intersection to "E" under existing conditions, Alternative 1A will not degrade LOS to F or E for more than four hours. Therefore, this impact is less than significant as mitigated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-3.</p>
<p>Summer Queuing Analysis</p> <p>Table 11-21 of the EIR/EIS shows the Sim Traffic queuing analysis results for the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections during the summer for existing and existing plus project conditions. The Project alternatives were analyzed during the Friday PM peak hour; however, on peak weekends during summer months there is significant congestion at the Tahoe City "Wwe", and the northbound queue can extend beyond the queue lengths shown in the analysis.</p>	<p>Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the Project applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work proposed within the State Highway right-of-way. A copy of said Permit shall be provided to the County Engineering and Surveying Department prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans. Right-of-way dedications shall be provided to the State, as required, to accommodate existing and future highway improvements.</p>		<p>Comments suggest that the analysis and conclusion in the EIR/EIS regarding the TRANS-3 are inadequate or wrong. After considering the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters, TRPA and the County accept the assumptions, evidence, and conclusions for TRANS-3 included in the EIR/EIS based on expertise and experience of the transportation consultants who prepared Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking and Circulation of the EIR/EIS. The Board of Supervisors finds that the traffic analysis in the EIR/EIS has been prepared by qualified experts, and is based on data, assumptions and methods that meet the standards of industry practice, and are consistent with County guidance.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-68 through 11-75; see also Master Responses 9, 10, and 11, Responses to Comments 13a-40, Comment 14a-106, 14a-108, 14a-109, 14a-113, 14a-115, 14a-116, 19-22, 49-2, 268-15 through 268-18, 328-8, and 11-g.)</p>
<p>Alternatives 1A will have a significant impact at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections. Although not directly represented in the queuing analysis results in Table 11-21 of the EIR/EIS, bicycle and pedestrian traffic that will contribute additional congestion to the area. Existing congestion at Fanny Bridge results in delays and vehicle queuing. The Fanny Bridge study (LSC, 2005) identifies the congestion issues, as well as improvements to alleviate the congestion. Alternatives 1A will contribute additional traffic volumes (Alternatives 1/A adds 70 vehicles to the intersection, 10 travelling northbound) to this area of known congestion during the Friday PM peak hour. The queuing analysis results indicate that the project will increase the queue lengths at the SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersection by approximately 10 feet (1 vehicle) in the northbound direction, and 15 to 20 feet in the southbound direction (1 vehicle). The increase in traffic volumes and queue lengths (of one or more vehicles) is considered a significant impact. (SU)</p>	<p>Caltrans will not issue an Encroachment Permit for work within their right-of-way for improvements (other than signals, road widening, striping and signing) without first entering into a Landscape Maintenance Agreement with the County. This agreement allows for private installation and maintenance of concrete curbs/gutters, sidewalks, trails, landscaping and irrigation within Caltrans' right-of-way. A similar agreement between the County and the applicant is required prior to the County entering into the agreement with Caltrans. If applicable, both of these maintenance agreements shall be executed prior to approval of the Improvement Plans.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-74 and 11-75.)</p>		<p>Finding for Summer Queuing: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Alternative 1A that substantially lessen summer queuing impacts. As noted above, CEQA requires public agencies to adopt feasible mitigation measures which would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of projects. All Transportation, Parking and Circulation impacts are less than significant as mitigated with the exception of impacts on summer queuing at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections, which is considered significant and unavoidable. The County finds changes or alterations to these intersections are within the responsibility of another public agency, Caltrans, which can and should implement improvements to improve existing congestion at the Tahoe City "Y" and Fanny Bridge. This impact is considered significant and unavoidable because, although improvements are planned, all of the funding requirement to implement these improvements has not been identified. Thus, although the Project is required to pay its fair share towards the cost of this improvement, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.</p>
<p>Winter LOS Analysis</p> <p>Table 11-22 of the EIR/EIS presents a summary of the LOS at the study intersections for existing winter conditions for the Project and Alternatives. Figures 11-19 through 11-22 of the EIR/EIS show the existing plus project</p>			

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Traffic volumes at the study intersections. Alternative 1A has the same land uses as Alternative 1, but fewer units. The PM peak hour trip generation for Alternative 1A is the same as the trip generation for Alternative 1. Therefore, separate LOS analysis is not needed for Alternative 1A. The LOS and delay at the study intersections is the same for Alternatives 1 and 1A.</p> <p>Alternative 1A will have a significant impact at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection. Although the overall trip generation for the Proposed Project is less than the existing HMR trip generation, the distribution of vehicle trips is expected to change, causing an increase in some turning movements at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection. It should be noted that the overall intersection LOS is A for each alternative. The remaining study intersections are expected to operate at acceptable LOS with the addition of the Proposed Project. (S)</p> <p>Winter Queuing Analysis</p> <p>Table 11-23 of the EIR/EIS shows the storage and queue lengths for the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections during the winter. The queue lengths at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections are not expected to exceed the existing storage lengths with the addition of project traffic from each alternative. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-68 through 11-86.)</p>			<p>Overriding Considerations: The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the project override the significant adverse impact of the project associated with the proposed project's impact to summer queuing, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of EIR's Summer Queuing Analysis:</p> <p>Queuing analysis was performed at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections. Queuing issues currently exist in the area, particularly near the Fanny Bridge. The SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study prepared by LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (2005) details the congestion issues on the bridge. The LSC study, as well as the LOS tables provided in this study, indicates that the congestion in the area is not caused by intersection operations, but rather by the "bottle neck" effect at the Fanny Bridge, and the high number of bicycles and pedestrians that use the bridge. As shown in Table 11-20 of the EIR/EIS, the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections operate at LOS D and LOS A, respectively, with and without the project. The SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study presents five realignment alternatives to relieve congestion on the Fanny Bridge. The queuing analysis includes the pedestrian signal on SR 89 south of the Fanny Bridge which was installed after the SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study was completed. The pedestrian signal in conjunction with a barrier chain between the Fanny Bridge sidewalk and the northbound travel lane has significantly reduced the impact of pedestrian and bicycle activity on traffic conditions. The queuing analysis accounts for the vehicle delay resulting from the pedestrian signal.</p> <p>As discussed in the EIR/EIS, other studies (e.g., SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study) have identified improvements to relieve congestion and reduce queuing on Fanny Bridge. Once these improvements are implemented the Project's impact on these intersections will be less than significant. However, funding for the improvement project (particularly state funding) has not been secured; therefore, the impacts are considered significant and unavoidable in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Fanny Bridge improvement project is identified in the Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan's Project Strategies (Short Term), and is partially funded by two sources: the Federal Transportation Improvement Program for the work being done by the Tahoe Transportation District and Placer County Capital Improvement Program traffic impact fees. More recently, following publication of the Draft EIR/EIS, the TMPO (Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization) and TRPA released the NOP for the Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Program EIR/EIS on</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>August 24, 2011. The RTP includes a long list of projects from the Tahoe Transportation District's (TTD) Capital Improvement Program. Table 1 in the NOP lists the "First Phase High Priority" CIP Projects. The Fanny Bridge improvement project is identified as a First Phase High Priority project. TTD and Caltrans have determined the Fanny Bridge improvement project will require an EIR/EIS. TTD is the lead agency under CEQA and Caltrans (under delegation authority from FHWA) will be the lead agency under NEPA. The NOP/NOI for the Fanny Bridge improvement project is currently scheduled to be released later this year. Level of service impacts at Fanny Bridge are still considered significant and unavoidable despite HMR's obligation to pay its fair share fees for the cost of this improvement because the record does not indicate sufficient funding is in place to guarantee construction of the Fanny Bridge improvement project. Construction of these improvements is likely, and the Proposed Project will contribute its share. Because these improvements are not assured, however, the impact is significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) includes an Alternative Transportation Plan (ATP) to reduce vehicle trips in the Project area and vicinity. One of a series of transportation strategies, the ATP is expected to include the following year-round, winter, and summer program elements:</p> <p><u>Year-Round</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension of TCPUD West Shore Bike Trail to the North Base area <p><u>Base area</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee Shuttle Bus • Employee Public Bus Transit Fares • Scheduled Shuttle Service • North Base-South Base Shuttle Service • Electric/Hybrid Car Rental Service • Free "Bicycle Share" Service <p><u>Winter Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter West Shore Dial-a-Ride Service • Skier Intercept Shuttle Service <p><u>Summer Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Taxi Service • Summer West Shore Dial-A-Ride Service <p><u>Additional transportation strategies will include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodate boat trailer parking during the summer at day skier parking facilities; • Day skier parking control (e.g., limit ticket sales so that parking does not exceed onsite supply); and • Transportation Information Exchange (e.g., provide information on Tahoe City electronic sign board to notify

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>day skiers when ski resort is at capacity).</p> <p>The proposed summer water taxi service is planned for operation from approximately mid-May to the end of September. The service is planned to be operated using a vessel with up to a 25-passenger capacity between Homewood and Tahoe City. There may be other periodic service between Homewood and South Shore as well dependent upon demand. This service is planned to be operated seven days a week between 9 AM and 8 PM on at least an hourly frequency. HMR residents and guests will be served at no fare, while other passengers will be served as space permits for a modest fare. This service is designed to provide an opportunity to get out on the Lake while also avoiding the existing traffic congestion in the SR 89/SR 28 Wye (e.g., Fanny Bridge) area. Should demand warrant in the future, one additional water taxi could be added with the same capacity. The plan would be to acquire a fuel efficient (possibly hybrid electric technology), low noise emitting water taxi vessel. With Homewood's recent acquisition of the lakeside West Shore Café, the water taxi would pick up passengers at the café pier, which is an existing pier structure designed to allow for passenger drop-off and pick-up. The potential use of the existing pier for use by a water taxi would be subject to any requisite regulatory approvals, but is not expected to require any additional facilities. Parking for use of the water taxi would not be required at the West Shore Café since it is intended to serve HMR guests and area residents who would walk to the pier from their accommodations. Fueling, storage and maintenance of the water taxi(s) could occur at one of the two adjacent Homewood marinas.</p> <p>Comments suggest that the analysis and conclusion in the EIR/EIS regarding the Proposed Project's impacts on Transportation, Parking and Circulation are inadequate or wrong. After considering the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters, TRPA and the County accept the assumptions, evidence, and conclusions included in the EIR/EIS based on expertise and experience of the transportation consultants who prepared Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking and Circulation of the EIR/EIS. The Board of Supervisors finds that the traffic analysis in the EIR/EIS has been prepared by qualified experts, and is based on data, assumptions and methods that meet the standards of industry practice, and are consistent with TRPA and County guidance.</p> <p>The project applicant is required to contribute a fair share contribution to the Fanny Bridge improvement alternative based on Placer County standards. As noted above even with HMR's fair share contribution and implementation of the ATP, which substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of the Proposed Projects, complete avoidance of direct and indirect effects of the project to summer queuing identified in TRANS-3 is</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>TRANS-4. Will the Project result in a substantial impact upon the existing transportation systems, including transit facilities?</p> <p>Alternative 1A includes implementation of Alternative Transportation elements, which will include year-round, winter and summer elements, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee Shuttle Bus; • Employee Public Bus Transit Fares; • Scheduled Shuttle Service; • North Base-South Base Shuttle 	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>not feasible. Therefore, this impact is significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-75 through 11-77; see also Master Responses 9, 10, and 11; Responses to Comments 13c-6, Comment 14a-64, 14a-117, and 76-13.)</p> <p>Finding for Winter LOS: Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to implement following intersection improvement at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding for Winter LOS: Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-3 will improve the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection to an acceptable LOS.</p> <p>Comments suggest that the analysis and conclusion in the EIR/EIS regarding the TRANS-3 are inadequate or wrong. After considering the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters, TRPA and the County accept the assumptions, evidence, and conclusions for TRANS-3 included in the EIR/EIS based on expertise and experience of the transportation consultants who prepared Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking and Circulation of the EIR/EIS. The Board of Supervisors finds that the traffic analysis in the EIR/EIS has been prepared by qualified experts, and is based on data, assumptions and methods that meet the standards of industry practice, and are consistent with County guidance.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-78 through 11-84; see also Master Responses 9, 10, and 11, Responses to Comments 13a-40, 14a-73, 14a-106, 14a-108, 14a-109, 14a-113, 14a-115, 14a-116, 14a-117, 19-22, 49-2, 268-15 through 268-18, 328-8, and 11-9.)</p> <p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Publ. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Service:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electric/Hybrid Car Rental Service; • Free "Bicycle Share" Service; • Summer and Winter West Shore Dial-a-Ride Service; • Skier Intercept Shuttle Service; and • Water Taxi Service. <p>Implementation of the Project's Alternative Transportation elements will result in increased access to and ridership on alternative modes of transportation. This is considered a less than significant impact.</p> <p>A northbound TART transit shelter exists on SR 89 across the street from the existing Homewood Ski Resort. HMR will install a southbound TART transit pullout on SR 89 adjacent to the North Base. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 11-86; see also Response to Comment 14a-121.)</p>		LS	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>
<p>TRANS-5. Will the Project result in a substantial impact upon the existing transportation systems, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities?</p> <p>Alternative 1A will include construction of the proposed Class I TGPUD bike trail through the North Base area, as shown on Civil Plan Sheet C10. The proposed bike trail will be designed to meet the standards of the authorizing jurisdictions. The Project and Alternatives will also include a free "Bicycle Share" program. The Project will also maintain five miles of existing hiking trails. This will improve access to and opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian uses. This is considered a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Peak hour bicycle and pedestrian trips were estimated based on the internally captured recreational trips discussed in Section 11.4.1, which include walking and bicycling recreational trips. The Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) provides signal warrant criteria for a pedestrian signal (Warrant 4, Pedestrian Volume). A pedestrian signal is not warranted based on pedestrian volumes generated by the project. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 11-87; see also Responses to Comments Comment 10-2 through 10-4, 10-24)</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>		

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>TRANS-6. Will the Project result in a temporary impact upon existing transportation systems due to construction traffic?</p> <p>Construction traffic will temporarily be present on the roadway network and study intersections. Construction traffic will access the Project area via SR 89. The heaviest construction period will occur during site grading. Because there is no existing plan for storing and future use of the cut material by restoration agencies at this time, the EIR/EIS assumed the material would be removed from the Basin, which equates to a worst case analysis for truck traffic. The total amount of excavation for Alternative 1A and is presented in Table 11-24. Table 11-24 also provides the estimated number of total trips associated with the removal of net cut material, which is the maximum amount of material that would need to be removed from site if it could not be stored and used for other projects, or reapplied to the ski resort as part of soils restoration projects.</p> <p>Trucks removing excavation material (i.e., arriving at the Project area empty and leaving with material) will generate up to approximately 146-192 trips per day. As a result, it is calculated that construction truck traffic will generate fewer trips than total vehicle trips calculated for Project operation. However, the character of the vehicles will be different. Heavy vehicles and trucks will dominate construction traffic. As required by the Traffic Control Plan (TCP), staging areas will be provided on-site and out of the public right-of-way to minimize heavy equipment trips on surrounding roadways.</p> <p>Grading activity will be limited to the TRPA grading season (May 1 – October 15), which is approximately 120 workdays, assuming a 5-day workweek.</p> <p>Based on information provided by the project applicant, the maximum number of employees on site during construction is not expected to exceed the number of full time equivalent employees when the Project is built out (approximately 182 employees). As a result, the number of construction related trips generated</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>by the site will not exceed the daily trip generation of the Project. Assuming 4 trips per day per construction employee (1 trip to the site, 1 trip from the site, and 2 lunch time trips - in/out) and 192 trips per day for grading activity, the Project can have up to 318 construction employees on site during grading activity without exceeding the daily trip generation of the Project at build out. Note that 4 trips per day per construction employee is a conservative estimate, as it is unlikely that each construction employee will drive to the site alone and many construction employees will not leave the project site for lunch. Based on TRPA standards (referenced in Section 11.2.7), level of service analysis is not required for construction activity if the estimated trip generation does not exceed the trip generation of the Project under normal operating conditions.</p>			
<p>As required by existing regulations, the project applicant will prepare a TCP for review and approval by TRPA, Placer County Department of Public Works, and Caltrans prior to construction. The TCP will address project construction traffic and parking. At a minimum, the plan will address truck haul routes, truck turning movements at the project driveway(s), traffic control signage, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, restriction of hauling activities to off-peak periods, on-site circulation and staging areas, and monitoring of the in-place traffic control to implement traffic control revisions, if necessary. The necessary encroachment and transportation permits will be obtained by the project applicant and/or a representative of the applicant prior to construction. Implementation of the TCP will result in a less than significant impact related to construction traffic for Alternative 1A. (LS)</p>			
<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-87 through 11-89; see also Response to Comment 14a-122.)</p> <p>TRANS-7. Will the Project result in alterations to the present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>
<p>Alternative 1A will provide access to the Project area via Silver Street, an exclusive Homewood Driveway, Fawn Street, and Tahoe Ski Bowl Way. Although the Project will add traffic to the</p>			

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>existing streets, it will not increase the delay to beyond acceptable levels, as shown in the LOS tables (Tables 11-20 and 11-22), and therefore will have a less than significant impact. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-89 to 11-90; see also Response to Comment 14a-123.)</p> <p>TRANS-8. Will the Project result in an increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>
<p>Alternative 1A will utilize the existing roadway network to provide access to the Project area. As shown in the LOS tables (Tables 11-20 and 11-22 of EIR/EIS), the increase in delay at the Project area access roads is less than 10 seconds during the summer, and less than 11 seconds during the winter, with the addition of the Proposed Project traffic. Alternative 1A will include an extension of the West Shore bicycle trail, providing better connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians. This will have a less than significant impact. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-90 to 11-91; see also Response to Comment 10-29, 13a-37 and 14a-124 and 16-g)</p> <p>TRANS-C1: Will the project result in a substantial impact upon cumulative transportation systems, including roadways and intersections?</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure TRANS-C1: Implement Intersection Improvements SR 89/Granibakken Road:</p> <p>The Project shall construct the following intersection improvement at SR 89/Granibakken Road: Add an acceleration lane or two-way left-turn lane (consistent with the Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project, 2006) to SR 89 at Granibakken Road. The mitigation measure will result in the following winter LOS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delay after mitigation: 2.8 (26.2), LOS: A (D), Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternative 3 • Delay after mitigation: 2.8 (25.7), LOS: A (D), Alternative 5 • Delay after mitigation: 2.9 (25.5), LOS: A (D), Alternative 6 <p>Note: A two-way left-turn lane has been environmentally cleared through a CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration, NEPA Finding of No Significant Impact, and TRPA Programmatic Environmental Assessment, and is scheduled for construction at this location as part of the</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Finding for Cumulative Summer LOS: Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-C1 and TRANS-C2, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to implement following intersection improvement at the SR 89/Granibakken Road intersection and the payment of traffic impact fees. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding for Summer LOS: Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-C1 will improve summer operations at the SR 89/Granibakken Road intersection to better than cumulative conditions. This mitigation does not improve LOS to D or better at the side-street approach, however it does improve intersection operations to better than 2030 cumulative conditions.</p> <p>Comments suggest that the analysis and conclusion in the EIR/EIS regarding the TRANS-3 are inadequate or wrong. After considering the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters, TRPA and the County accept the assumptions, evidence, and conclusions for</p>
<p>Table 11-26 of the EIR/EIS presents a summary of the LOS at the study intersections for cumulative summer plus project conditions for the Proposed Project. Alternatives 1A will have a significant impact at the SR 89/Granibakken Road intersection. Although the SR 89/Granibakken Road intersection operates at an unacceptable LOS under cumulative conditions, the project is expected to increase delay at the side-street approaches, and therefore cause a significant impact. The remaining study intersections are expected to operate acceptably with the addition of Alternatives 1A traffic volumes. (S)</p> <p>Summer Queuing Analysis</p> <p>Table 11-27 of the EIR/EIS shows the Sim Traffic queuing analysis results for the SR</p>			

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

104

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING) BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections during the summer for cumulative and cumulative plus project conditions. The Project alternatives were analyzed during the Friday PM peak hour; however, on peak weekends during summer months there is significant congestion at the Tahoe City "Wye", and the northbound queue can extend beyond the queue lengths shown in the analysis.</p>	<p>Caltrans' Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project (2006). Figures ESL 42 and ESL 43 from the Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project show the proposed roadway improvements, and are provided in Appendix L-2. If construction of the improvement is in place prior to being needed by HMR, HMR shall no longer be responsible for the improvement.</p> <p>Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the Project applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work proposed within the State Highway right-of-way. A copy of said Permit shall be provided to the County Engineering and Surveying Department prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans. Right-of-way dedications shall be provided to the State, as required, to accommodate existing and future highway improvements.</p> <p>Caltrans will not issue an Encroachment Permit for work within their right-of-way for improvements (other than signals, road widening, striping and signing) without first entering into a Landscape Maintenance Agreement with the County. This agreement allows for private installation and maintenance of concrete curbs/gutters, sidewalks, trails, landscaping and irrigation within Caltrans' right-of-way. A similar agreement between the County and the applicant is required prior to the County entering into the agreement with Caltrans. If applicable, both of these maintenance agreements shall be executed prior to approval of the Improvement Plans.</p> <p>SR 89/Fawn Street:</p> <p>The project shall construct the following intersection improvement at SR 89/Fawn Street:</p> <p>Add a left-turn pocket on Fawn Street. The pocket should have a minimum length of 140 feet (based on 95th percentile queue length presented in the Synchro analysis). This mitigation will require that Fawn Street be a minimum of 30 feet wide, and up to 36 feet wide to construct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delay after mitigation: 9.7 (41.6). LOS: A (E), Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternative 3 • Delay after mitigation: 8.2 (35.5). LOS: A (E), Alternative 5 • Delay after mitigation: 8.6 (35.8). LOS: A (E), Alternative 6 		<p>TRANS-3 included in the EIR/EIS based on expertise and experience of the transportation consultants who prepared Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking and Circulation of the EIR/EIS. The Board of Supervisors finds that the traffic analysis in the EIR/EIS has been prepared by qualified experts, and is based on data, assumptions and methods that meet the standards of industry practice, and are consistent with County guidance.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-96 through 11-104; see also Master Responses 9, 10, and 11; Responses to Comments 13a-40, Comment 14a-106, 14a-108, 14a-109, 14a-113, 14a-115, 14a-116, 19-22, 49-2, 268-15 through 268-18, 328-8, and 11-g.)</p> <p>Finding for Cumulative Summer Queuing: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, Alternative 1A that substantially lessen cumulative summer queuing impacts. As noted above, CEQA requires public agencies to adopt feasible mitigation measures which would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of projects. Even with the implementation of the Proposed Project's Alternative Transportation Plan, the County finds that complete avoidance of cumulative effects of the project to summer queuing identified in TRANS-3 is not feasible. This is because of the project objectives include constructing onsite residential and tourist accommodation units, providing year-round use of the Project site and generating sufficient revenues to support the proposed environmental and fire safety improvements while ensuring the continued viability of the ski operations. The County further notes that all Transportation, Parking and Circulation impacts are less than significant as mitigated with the exception of impacts on summer queuing at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections, which is considered significant and unavoidable. In addition, the County finds changes or alterations are within the responsibility of another public agency, Caltrans, which can and should implement improvements to improve cumulative congestion at significant congestion at the Tahoe City "Wye" and Fanny Bridge.</p> <p>Overriding Considerations: The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the project override the significant adverse impact of the project associated with the proposed project's cumulative impact to summer queuing, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of EIR's Cumulative Summer Queuing Analysis:</p> <p>Queuing analysis was performed at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections. Queuing issues currently exist in the area, particularly near the Fanny Bridge. The SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study prepared by LSC</p>
<p>Alternative 1A will have a significant impact at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections. Although not directly represented in the queuing analysis results in Table 11-27, it should be noted that the analysis does not include bicycle and pedestrian traffic that will contribute additional congestion to the area. The Project and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 will have a significant impact at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections. (SU)</p>			
<p>Winter LOS Analysis</p> <p>Table 11-28 of the EIR/EIS presents a summary of the LOS at the study intersections for cumulative winter plus project conditions for the Project. Figures 11-29 through 11-32 show the cumulative plus project traffic volumes at the study intersections. Alternative 1A has the same land uses as Alternative 1, but fewer units. The PM peak hour trip generation for Alternative 1A is the same as the trip generation for Alternative 1. Therefore, separate LOS analysis is not needed for Alternative 1A. The LOS and delay at the study intersections is the same for Alternatives 1 and 1A.</p>			
<p>Alternative 1A will have a significant impact at the SR 89/Granibakken Road and SR 89/Fawn Street intersections. Although the overall trip generation for the Proposed Project is less than the existing HMR trip generation, the distribution of vehicle trips is expected to change, causing an increase in some turning movements at the intersections. The remaining study intersections are expected to operate at acceptable LOS with the addition of the Project and Alternatives. (S)</p>			
<p>Winter Queuing Analysis</p>			

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)

MITIGATION MEASURES

SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

FINDINGS OF FACT

Table 11-29 shows the storage and queue lengths for the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing Intersections during the winter. The queue lengths at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing Intersections are not expected to exceed the existing storage lengths with the addition of project traffic under Alternative 1A.

(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-91 through 11-116.)

Note: The analysis period represents the absolute peak hour. The LOS E condition is not expected to exceed 4 hours of the day and therefore is not considered to be a significant impact after implementation of mitigation measures.

Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the Project applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work proposed within the State Highway right-of-way. A copy of said Permit shall be provided to the County Engineering and Surveying Department prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans. Right-of-way dedications shall be provided to the State, as required, to accommodate existing and future highway improvements.

Caltrans will not issue an Encroachment Permit for work within their right-of-way for improvements (other than signals, road widening, striping and signing) without first entering into a Landscape Maintenance Agreement with the County. This agreement allows for private installation and maintenance of concrete curbs/gutters, sidewalks, trails, landscaping and irrigation within Caltrans' right-of-way. A similar agreement between the County and the applicant is required prior to the County entering into the agreement with Caltrans. If applicable, both of these maintenance agreements shall be executed prior to approval of the Improvement Plans.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-C2: Payment of Countywide Traffic Impact Fees

SR 89/Granibakken Road:

This project will be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Tahoe Resort District), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) will be required and shall be paid to Placer County Department of Public Works prior to issuance of any Building Permits for the project: A) County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code. The fees are calculated using the information supplied by the applicant. If either the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.

Transportation Consultants, Inc. (2005) details the congestion issues on the bridge. The LSC study, as well as the LOS tables provided in this study indicated that the congestion in the area is not caused by intersection operations, but rather by the "bottle neck" effect at the Fanny Bridge, and the high number of bicycles and pedestrians that use the bridge. As shown in Table 11-26, the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing Intersections operate at LOS D and LOS A, respectively, with and without the project.

The SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study presents 5 realignment alternatives to relieve congestion on the Fanny Bridge. The cumulative queuing analysis accounts for the vehicle delay resulting from the pedestrian signal. Existing congestion at the Fanny Bridge results in delays and vehicle queuing. As discussed in the EIR/EIS, other studies (e.g., SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study) have identified improvements to relieve congestion and reduce queuing on Fanny Bridge. Once these improvements are implemented the Project's impact on these intersections will be less than significant. However, funding for the improvement project (particularly state funding) has not been secured; therefore, the impacts are considered significant and unavoidable in the EIR/EIS.

The Fanny Bridge improvement project is identified in the Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan's Project Strategies (Short Term), and is partially funded by two sources: the Federal Transportation Improvement Program for the work being done by the Tahoe Transportation District and Placer County Capital Improvement Program traffic impact fees. More recently, following publication of the Draft EIR/EIS, the TMP/O (Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization) and TRPA released the NOP for the Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Program EIR/EIS on August 24, 2011. The RTP includes a long list of projects from the Tahoe Transportation District's (TTD) Capital Improvement Program. Table 1 in the NOP lists the "First Phase High Priority" CIP Projects. The Fanny Bridge improvement project is identified as a First Phase High Priority project. TTD and Caltrans have determined the Fanny Bridge improvement project will require an EIR/EIS. TTD is the lead agency under CEQA and Caltrans (under delegation authority from FHWA) will be the lead agency under NEPA. The NOP/NOI for the Fanny Bridge improvement project is currently scheduled to be released later this year. Level of service impacts at Fanny Bridge are still considered significant and unavoidable despite HMR's obligation to pay its fair share fees for the cost of this improvement because the record does not indicate sufficient funding is in place to guarantee construction of the Fanny Bridge improvement project. Construction of these improvements is likely, and the Proposed Project will contribute its share. Because these improvements are not assured,

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-103 to 11-104; 11-113 through 11-115.)</p>		<p>however, the impact is significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) includes an Alternative Transportation Plan (ATP) to reduce vehicle trips in the Project area and vicinity. One of a series of transportation strategies, the ATP is expected to include the following year-round, winter, and summer program elements:</p> <p><u>Year-Round</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension of TCPUD West Shore Bike Trail to the North <p><u>Base area</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee Shuttle Bus • Employee Public Bus Transit Fares • Scheduled Shuttle Service • North Base-South Base Shuttle Service • Electric/Hybrid Car Rental Service • Free "Bicycle Share" Service <p><u>Winter Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter West Shore Diata-Ride Service • Skier Intercept Shuttle Service <p><u>Summer Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Taxi Service • Summer West Shore Dial-A-Ride Service <p><u>Additional transportation strategies will include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodate boat trailer parking during the summer at day skier parking facilities; • Day skier parking control (e.g., limit ticket sales so that parking does not exceed onsite supply); and • Transportation Information Exchange (e.g., provide information on Tahoe City electronic sign board to notify day skiers when ski resort is at capacity). <p>The proposed summer water taxi service is planned for operation from approximately mid-May to the end of September. The service is planned to be operated using a vessel with up to a 25-passenger capacity between Homewood and Tahoe City. There may be other periodic service between Homewood and South Shore as well dependent upon demand. This service is planned to be operated seven days a week between 9 AM and 8 PM on at least an hourly frequency. HMR residents and guests will be served at no fare, while other passengers will be served as space permits for a modest fare. This service is designed to provide an opportunity to get out on the Lake while also avoiding the existing traffic congestion in the SR 89/SR 28 Wye (e.g., Fanny Bridge) area. Should demand warrant in the future, one additional water taxi could be added with the same capacity. The plan would be to acquire a fuel efficient (possibly hybrid electric technology), low</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>noise emitting water taxi vessel. With Homewood's recent acquisition of the lakeside West Shore Café, the water taxi would pick up passengers at the café pier, which is an existing pier structure designed to allow for passenger drop-off and pick-up. The potential use of the existing pier for use by a water taxi would be subject to any requisite regulatory approvals, but is not expected to require any additional facilities. Parking for use of the water taxi would not be required at the West Shore Café since it is intended to serve HMR guests and area residents who would walk to the pier from their accommodations. Fueling, storage and maintenance of the water taxi(s) could occur at one of the two adjacent Homewood marinas.</p> <p>Comments suggest that the analysis and conclusion in the EIR/EIS regarding the Proposed Project's impacts on Transportation, Parking and Circulation are inadequate or wrong. After considering the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters, TRPA and the County accept the assumptions, evidence, and conclusions included in the EIR/EIS based on expertise and experience of the transportation consultants who prepared Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking and Circulation of the EIR/EIS. The Board of Supervisors finds that the traffic analysis in the EIR/EIS has been prepared by qualified experts, and is based on data, assumptions and methods that meet the standards of industry practice, and are consistent with TRPA and County guidance.</p> <p>The project applicant is required to contribute a fair share contribution to the Fanny Bridge improvement alternative based on Placer County standards. As noted above even with HMR's fair share contribution and implementation of the ATP, which substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of the Proposed Projects, complete avoidance of cumulative effects of the project to summer queuing identified in TRANS-C1 is not feasible. Therefore, this impact is significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-104 through 11-106; see also Responses to Comments 13c-6; Comment 14a-64, 14a-117, and 76-13.)</p> <p>Finding for Cumulative Winter LOS: Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-C1 and TRANS-C2, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to implement following intersection improvement at the SR 89/Grantlbackken Road intersection. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding for Winter LOS: Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-C1 will improve</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>AIR QUALITY</p> <p>AQ-1. Will the Project Generate Construction Emissions in Excess of Applicable Standards?</p> <p>PCAPCD Requirements</p> <p>The point of significance for construction emissions is the PCAPCD's thresholds of 82 pounds per day of ROG, NOX, SOX, and PM10 and 550 pounds per day of CO. Because these thresholds have been implemented to ensure that the CAAQS are met, they are also an appropriate proxy in determining if the proposed action is in compliance with TRPA standards. As shown in Tables 12-9 through 12-14, Alternative 1A would result in PM10 emissions in excess of PCAPCD's threshold of 82 pounds per day.</p> <p>TRPA Requirements</p> <p>The TRPA considers any increase in criteria pollutants above State, federal, and TRPA air quality standards to be significant.</p> <p>This is a significant impact. (S)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Implement PCAPCD Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutant emissions during construction.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall implement the following recommended mitigation measures, which were provided by the PCAPCD. These measures shall be implemented prior to and during the construction phase. In addition, construction of the Project is required to comply with PCAPCD rules and regulations (see section 12-2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dust Control Plan: The applicant shall submit a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan to the PCAPCD. This plan must address the minimum Administrative Requirements found in PCAPCD Rule 228, Fugitive Dust, Sections 300 and 400. The applicant shall not break ground prior to receiving PCAPCD approval of the Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan. Equipment Inventory: The Project Applicant shall submit a comprehensive inventory (i.e. make, model, year, emission rating) of heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or 	<p>LS</p>	<p>winter operations at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road and SR 89/Fawn Street intersections to within LOS standards.</p> <p>[Comments suggest that the analysis and conclusion in the EIR/EIS regarding the TRANS-3 are inadequate or wrong. After considering the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters, TRPA and the County accept the assumptions, evidence, and conclusions for TRANS-3 included in the EIR/EIS based on expertise and experience of the transportation consultants who prepared Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking and Circulation of the EIR/EIS. The Board of Supervisors finds that the traffic analysis in the EIR/EIS has been prepared by qualified experts, and is based on data, assumptions and methods that meet the standards of industry practice, and are consistent with County guidance.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-107 through 11-115; see also Master Responses 9, 10, and 11, Responses to Comments 13a-40, 14a-73, 14a-106, 14a-108, 14a-109, 14a-113, 14a-115, 14a-116, 14a-117, 19-22, 49-2, 268-15 through 268-18, 328-8, and 11-g.)</p> <p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring PCAPCD Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutant emissions during construction below applicable standards. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Construction emissions of ROG, NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5, were estimated using the URBEMIS2007 (version 9.2.4) model. To estimate construction emissions, URBEMIS2007 analyzes the type of construction equipment used and the duration of the construction period associated with construction of each of the land uses.</p> <p>Construction of the Alternative 1A will occur in four phases over a ten-year period (2011 through 2020). The number of residential dwellings and square feet of nonresidential facilities under construction varies by year. The Mid-Mountain Base area and the North Base area will be completed during Phase 1a and Phase 1b/c, while South Base area construction will occur during Phases 2a and 2b. Tables 12-9 through 12-14 of the EIR/EIS present construction emissions. Implementation of the Alternative 1A will generate a significant amount of PM10 during the first year of Phase 1a.</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-25 through 12-42.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> more hours for construction. Enforcement Plan: An enforcement plan shall be established and submitted to the PCAPCD for review, to evaluate weekly project-related on-and-off-road heavy-duty vehicle engine emission opacities, using standards as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2180 - 2194. Compliance with Rule 202. Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed District Rule 202, Visible Emission limitations. Compliance with Rule 228: Grading operations shall be suspended if fugitive dust exceeds PCAPCD Rule 228 (Fugitive Dust) limitations. Water shall be applied to control dust, as required by the rule, to prevent dust impacts off-site. Operational water truck(s) shall be on-site, at all times, 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. Pre-Construction Meeting: If required by the Department of Engineering and Surveying and/or the Department of Public Works, the contractor shall have a pre-construction meeting for grading activities. The contractor shall invite the PCAPCD to the pre-construction meeting in order to discuss the construction emission/dust control plan with employees and/or contractors. Maintenance of Public Thoroughfares: The Project Applicant shall keep adjacent public thoroughfares clean of silt, dirt, mud, and debris, and shall "wet broom" the streets if silt, dirt, mud or debris is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares. Dry mechanical sweeping is prohibited. Traffic Limits: Traffic speeds on unpaved surfaces shall be limited to 15 miles per hour or less. Wind Restrictions: Grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds (including instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour and dust is impacting adjacent properties. 		<p>The TRPA considers any increase in criteria pollutants above State, federal, and TRPA air quality standards to be significant. These standards are concentration values at particular locations rather than mass emissions from Project construction (Table 12-9 through Table 12-14 of the EIR/EIS). Dispersion modeling to estimate pollutant concentrations is beyond the scope of this document; as such analysis would require specific details, such as specific construction schedule, location of operating construction equipment, and location of exposed sensitive receptors, that are currently unknown. However, the mass emissions presented in Table 12-9 through Table 12-14 of the EIR/EIS are an appropriate proxy for determining if the Project complies with TRPA thresholds. Based on Table 12-9 of the EIR/EIS, increases in ROG, NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5 are expected during all phases, with the greatest increases occurring during Phase 1a. Pollutant concentrations have the potential to exceed NAAQS, CAAQS, and TRPA standards on days requiring substantial construction equipment and activity. Because specific construction details are currently unknown, it is not possible to determine the number of days in which ambient air quality standards may be exceeded. Based on the mass emissions presented in Table 12-9 of the EIR/EIS, it can be inferred that Phase 1a would result in the most frequent and severe exceedences. However, these exceedences will be short-term as pollutant concentrations will dissipate once construction is completed.</p> <p>The point of significance for construction emissions is the PCAPCD's thresholds of 82 pounds per day of ROG, NOX, SOX, and PM10 and 550 pounds per day of CO. Because these thresholds have been implemented to ensure that the CAAQS are met, they are also an appropriate proxy in determining if a proposed action is in compliance with TRPA standards.</p> <p>PCAPCD staff indicates that compliance with Mitigation Measures AQ-1 can reduce construction PM10 and PM2.5 emissions by 50%. As shown in Tables 12-9 through 12-14, implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 will reduce PM10 emissions to 79.68 pounds per day and 79.73 pounds per day for Alternative 1A, respectively. Therefore, mitigated construction emissions for Alternative 1A are below the PCAPCD's significance threshold of 82 pounds per day. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-25 through 12-42; see also Master Responses 13, 14, 15 and 18; Responses to Comments 14a-74, 14a-130, 14a-131, 107-22, 199-3, and Comment 1-a.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Idling Restrictions: Idling time shall be limited to a maximum of five minutes for diesel-powered equipment. • Open Burning Restrictions: No open burning of removed vegetation shall be allowed during construction. Removed vegetative material shall be either chipped on-site or taken to an appropriate disposal site. • Ultra-Low Diesel Fuel: ARB ultra low diesel fuel shall be used for diesel-powered equipment and low sulfur fuel shall be utilized for stationary equipment. • Clean Power Sources: Existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators shall be used rather than temporary diesel power generators. • Compliance with PCAPCD Permit Regulations: On-site stationary equipment which is classified as 50 horsepower or greater shall either obtain a State issued portable equipment permit or a PCAPCD issued portable equipment permit. Pursuant to PCAPCD Rule 501, General Permit Requirements, the Project may need a permit from the PCAPCD prior to construction. In general, any engine greater than 50 brake horsepower or any boiler with heat greater than 1,000,000 Btu per hour requires a PCAPCD permit. • Compliance with NESHAPs: The demolition or remodeling of any structure may be subject to the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs) for Asbestos. This may require that a structure to be demolished be inspected for the presence of asbestos by a certified asbestos inspector, and that asbestos materials are removed prior to demolition. • Traffic Plans: If a Traffic Plan is required the PCAPCD shall be provided receive a copy for review. PCAPCD recommendations within the plan may include, but not be limited to: use of public transportation and satellite parking areas with a shuttle service. 		

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>AQ-2. Will the Project Generate Operational Emissions or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in Excess of Applicable Standards?</p> <p>The point of significance for total operational emissions is PCAPCD's mass emissions thresholds. The TRPA's threshold of any increase in VMT and exceedences of the stationary source standards outlined in TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 91.3 are used to evaluate VMT and stationary sources, respectively.</p> <p>As shown in Tables 12-17 through 12-26 of the EIR/EIS, implementation of the Alternative 1A would not generate emissions in excess of PCAPCD's mass emissions thresholds. However, Alternative 1A would result in VMT increases compared to the No Project Alternative (Alternative 2) (Tables 12-18 and 12-23 or the EIR/EIS). Likewise, although stationary source emissions are not expected to exceed the standards outlined in the TRPA code, there is potential for future owners, operators, and residents to install wood-burning appliances that would generate substantial PM10 emissions. This is considered a</p>	<p>MITIGATION MEASURES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscaping Plan: The applicant shall provide a landscaping plan for review and approval by the Design/Site Review Committee. As required by the PCAPCD, landscaping shall include native drought-resistant species (plants, trees and bushes) and no more than 25% lawn area to reduce the demand for irrigation and gas powered landscape maintenance equipment. The Project Applicant shall include irrigation systems which efficiently utilize water (e.g., prohibit systems that apply water to non-vegetated surfaces and systems which create runoff), use applicant shall install water-efficient irrigation systems and devices, such as soil moisture-based irrigation controls, rain "shut off" valves, and other devices as reviewed and approved by the Design Site Review Committee. Limit Daily Construction Activities: Daily soil disturbance activities shall be limited to 15 acres per day. <p>(Final EIR/EIS, JP, 12-40 through 12-42.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measure AQ-2a: Contribute to the TRPA Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall pay the appropriate air quality mitigation fee in accordance with Chapter 93—Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. The TRPA adopted this program as a means of generating the revenue necessary to address air quality impacts associated with VMT. By contributing to TRPA's Mitigation Program, the Project effectively mitigates air quality emissions through VMT reductions achieved through Mitigation Program, as VMT reductions typically result in reductions of air pollutant emissions. Specific regional and local VMT reduction strategies that may benefit from the mitigation include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expansion of existing transit facilities; Addition of bicycle lanes; Transportation Systems Management measures such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and use of alternative fuels in fleet vehicles; and Provision of connectivity between multi-use paths for bicycles and pedestrians. 	<p>LS</p>	<p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</p> <p>PCAPCD or TRPA thresholds.</p> <p>Area Source Emissions</p> <p>Tables 12-17 through Table 12-21 of the EIR/EIS summarize total operational emissions assuming the project would be fully operational in 2008. Tables 12-22 through 12-26 summarize operational emissions for the build-out year (2021). Based on Tables 12-17 through 12-26 of the EIR/EIS, Alternative 1A will result in an increase of most criteria pollutants under both existing (2008) and build-out (2021) years. However, the emissions increases will not exceed PCAPCD thresholds or result in a significant impact to air quality.</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>significant impact: (S) (Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-43 through 12-61.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-2b: Prohibit Installation of Wood-Burning Appliances. There are no new wood-burning appliances included in the Alternative 1A. There is potential, however, for future owners, operators, and residents to install wood-burning appliances. However, no new wood burning appliances defined in District Rule 225 Wood-Burning Appliances shall be allowed in any residential or non-residential structures within the boundaries of the project. A standard note indicating this restriction shall be included on all building plans approved in association with this project. (Final EIR/EIS, p. 12-61.)</p>		<p>TRPA Vehicle Miles Traveled Requirement Project-related VMTs was provided by Fehr & Peers. Summer and winter traffic volumes are different due to seasonal land uses and tourist attractions. Existing VMT during the summer season is currently zero, while existing winter volumes are higher than those expected for the Proposed Project. Consequently, Project implementation would result in an increase of VMT during the summer season only. Table 12-27 of the EIR/EIS shows the VMT results compared to No Project (Alternative 2). Alternative 1A will generate 7,199, 5,176, and 4,624 new VMT compared to No Project. The TRPA considers any net increase in VMT to result in a significant impact to air quality. To reduce VMT related effects to less than significant, the Project Applicant will implement Mitigation Measure AQ-2a for 1A. This mitigation requires the payment of mitigation fees in accordance with Chapter 93—Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. By contributing to TRPA's Mitigation Program, the Project effectively mitigates air quality emissions through VMT reductions achieved through the Mitigation Program. Funds paid under the Air Quality Mitigation Program are used for activities that reduce VMT or otherwise reduce air pollutant emissions from automobiles. Section 93.5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances identifies permissible uses of these funds. The purpose of TRPA's Mitigation Program is to generate revenue to fund projects that promote alternative modes of transportation and reduce VMT within the Lake Tahoe Air Basin (LTAB). While the payment of fees will not affect the number of Project-generated vehicle trips or associated emissions, it will contribute to cumulative regional reductions in VMT and air pollutants. Thus, by contributing to TRPA's Mitigation Program, the project effectively mitigates air quality emissions through VMT reductions achieved by alternative transportation projects supported by the Mitigation Program. The purpose of TRPA's Mitigation Program is to generate revenue to fund projects that promote alternative modes of transportation and reduce VMT within the Lake Tahoe Air Basin (LTAB). While the payment of fees will not affect the number of Project-generated vehicle trips or associated emissions, it will contribute to cumulative regional reductions in VMT and air pollutants. Thus, by contributing to TRPA's Mitigation Program, the project effectively mitigates air quality emissions through VMT reductions achieved by alternative transportation projects supported by the Mitigation Program. As discussed on pages 12-43 and 12-44 in the EIR/EIS, specific regional and local VMT reduction strategies that may benefit from the mitigation include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of existing transit facilities. </p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>Chapter 93 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances outlines requirements for the payment and distribution of mitigation fees from the Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program. The Project's fee will be determined in accordance with Section 93.3C of the Code of Ordinances. As determined by the TRPA, the mitigation fee will effectively offset increases in vehicle trips and emissions generated by the Project. Funds collected from the Project will be deposited into a trust account and distributed to local transportation projects, consistent with TRPA's Regional Transportation Plan or the 1992 Air Quality Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of bicycle lanes; • Transportation Systems Management measures such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and use of alternative fuels in fleet vehicles; and • Provision of connectivity between multi-use paths for bicycles and pedestrians. <p>The air quality management agencies (PCAPCD and TRPA) within the Project area have acknowledged fund-based mitigation programs as acceptable methods for mitigating project-level emissions in CEQA documents. Continual contributions from projects throughout the air basin ensure adequate funds to support alternative transportation are available. Consultation with PCAPCD and TRPA confirms that payment into TRPA's Mitigation Program (Mitigation Measure AQ-2a) constitutes sufficient mitigation to reduce traffic-related emissions generated by the Project to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Comments suggest that the analysis and conclusion in the EIR/EIS regarding the Proposed Project's impacts on VMT are inadequate or wrong. After considering the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters, TRPA and the County accept the assumptions, evidence, and conclusions included in the EIR/EIS based on expertise and experience of the transportation consultants who prepared Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking and Circulation of the EIR/EIS. The Board of Supervisors finds that the VMT analysis in the EIR/EIS has been prepared by qualified experts, and is based on data, assumptions and methods that meet the standards of industry practice, and are consistent with TRPA and County guidance.</p> <p>TRPA Stationary Source Requirement</p> <p>TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 91.3 establishes daily emission limits for stationary sources (see Table 12-6 of the EIR/EIS). It is likely that improvements in technology and more stringent regulations will reduce future natural gas emissions below those shown in Table 12-28.</p> <p>As shown in Table 12-28 of the EIR/EIS, daily stationary source</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

114

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>AQ-3. Will the Project Expose Sensitive</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>emissions of NOX under Alternative 1A would exceed TRPA thresholds. North Base area and South Base area facilities will be constructed using U.S. Green Building LEED standards. These standards will improve energy efficiency, reducing the need for natural gas combustion for space heating. According to the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), green buildings can reduce energy consumption by 24-50% (USGBC 2009). Using the USGBC's lower bound of potential energy reductions (24%), LEED-design features will reduce NOX emissions from stationary sources under the Alternative 1A to 19.7 pounds per day. Thus, Project emissions will not exceed the TRPA's stationary source standards.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure AQ-2a will reduce impacts associated with the Alternative 1A to a less than significant level by providing the necessary funding to offset the project's contribution to long-term criteria pollutant emissions resulting from increased traffic. Mitigation Measure AQ-2a requires payment of an air quality mitigation fee assessed at a rate per daily vehicle trip to offset the potential traffic and air quality impacts associated with the project. TRPA collects the fees, which are then distributed for use within the jurisdiction from which they were paid, usually for Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) projects associated with traffic calming/mitigation. As described in Mitigation AQ-2a, measures may include, but are not limited to expansion of existing transit facilities; addition of bicycle lanes; Transportation Systems Management measures such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and use of alternative fuels in fleet vehicles; and provision of connectivity between multi-use paths for bicycles and pedestrians. Because the air quality impacts related to increases in VMT are regional in nature, they may be properly mitigated by regional EIP projects. Cooperation and contributions from the federal, state, local and private sectors support the EIP program and fund project implementation. To be included in the EIP, individual projects, or categories of projects, must meet certain criteria, that is, the projects must be shown to assist in meeting specific TRPA Threshold goals. The EIP includes tracking requirements so that, after completion of a project, identified EIP measures of progress have been met. EIP projects funded in the Basin contribute to improved regional air quality.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure AQ-2b will reduce potential impacts associated with the future owners, operators, or residents installing wood-burning appliances under the Alternative 1A.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-43 through 12-61; see also Master Responses 13, 14, and 15; Responses to Comments 13a-7, 13a-43, 13c-11, 14a-72, 14a-76, 14a-97 through 14a-113, 14a-132 through 14a-138, 19-15 through 19-21, 19-27, 19-60, 269-23, and 18-m.)</p> <p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations?</p> <p>PCAPCD Requirement On-Road Carbon Monoxide</p> <p>Modeled CO concentrations plus background CO levels from the nearest monitoring station are presented in Table 12-29 of the EIR/EIS. CO concentrations would not exceed the federal or State 1- and 8-hour standards (PCAPCD) under both existing (2008) and future (2021) conditions.</p> <p>Construction Related Diesel Particulate Matter</p> <p>Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) is a carcinogenic toxic air contaminant that will be emitted by heavy-duty equipment during construction. A number of site-specific factors, which are beyond the scope of this master plan evaluation, are required to calculate DPM concentrations caused by construction activity. For example, the specific construction schedule, location of operating construction equipment, and location of exposed sensitive receptors, are necessary to model pollutant dispersion and calculate relative DPM concentrations at receptor locations. In addition, information on the location of specific receptors is required to perform an HRA. Because a detailed construction schedule is currently unavailable, a quantitative analysis of health risks from construction is not possible.</p> <p>The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHHA) indicates that cancer health risks from DPM are typically associated with chronic exposure and recommends using a 70-year exposure period for the cancer risk analysis to represent a chronic exposure scenario. Construction is anticipated to take a maximum of ten years. This is well below the recommended 70-year analysis period. Moreover, construction-related DPM emissions will be spread between the north and south bases, rather than concentrated in one location. Tourists visiting the HMR during construction will also be transient and only exposed to elevated DPM during their visit. The first condos constructed at the resort will be completed in December of 2016. Assuming these dwellings will be occupied immediately</p>			<p>that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>TRPA Requirement As shown in Table 12-29 of the EIR/EIS, emissions of CO would not result in an increase in CO concentrations when compared to the existing conditions under future year conditions. Exposure of sensitive receptors to construction-related DPM is well below the 70 year recommended analysis period and is not anticipated to result in elevated health risks.</p> <p>Summary: The point of significance for the exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations is the TRPA threshold of any net increase in CO concentrations relative to existing conditions under future year (2021) conditions. Alternative 1A are not expected to result in increased CO concentrations. This impact is considered less than significant.</p> <p>The evaluation of DPM is based on a qualitative assessment of the construction period and type of sensitive receptors. Based on the discussion in the EIR/EIS, construction is well below OEHHA 70-year analysis period. Moreover, the actual exposure period to sensitive receptors will be even shorter given the seasonal travel patterns and construction schedule for the new residential dwellings.</p> <p>Several commenters expressed concern that implementation of the Project would generate ozone emissions, which are harmful to human health and the environment. Environmental effects of ozone are discussed on page 12-2 of the DEIR/EIS. The NAAQS and CAQS, which have been adopted by the federal and state governments, respectively, establish primary and secondary emissions standards for ozone (see Table 12-1 in the DEIR/EIS). The primary standard is designed to protect human health, including the health of "sensitive" populations such as asthmatics, children, and the elderly, within an adequate margin of safety. The secondary standard is designed to protect</p>			

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>public welfare, including protection against decreased visibility and damage to animals, crops, vegetation, and buildings.</p> <p>As discussed in MR-14, the PCAPCD's and TRPA's emissions thresholds (Table 12-7 in the DEIR/EIS) will be adopted to ensure development projects do not hinder attainment of the NAAQS and CAAQS. Projects that do not violate the appropriate air district thresholds are therefore not anticipated to exceed the NAAQS or CAAQS, which are established to protect human and environmental health.</p> <p>The Draft and FEIR/EIS evaluated mass emissions of ozone precursors (NOX and ROG) that will be generated by Project construction (Impact AQ-1) and operation (Impact AQ-2). As shown in Tables 12-9 through 12-14 in Chapter 24 of the FEIR/EIS, construction-related emissions of NOX and ROG are well below the PCAPCD's threshold of 82 pounds per day for Alternative 1A. Likewise, Tables 12-17 through 12-25 in Chapter 24 of the FEIR/EIS demonstrate that operational-related emissions of NOX and ROG will not exceed 82 pounds per day, when compared to the No Project Alternative. Because the Project-related emissions of ozone precursors (NOX and ROG) will not exceed the PCAPCD's thresholds during construction or operations, implementation of Alternative 1A will not result in a significant impact to human health or the environment from increases in ozone levels. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-62 through 12-65; see also Chapter 23, Master Responses 13, 14 and 15, and Responses to Comments 14a-133, 14a-139 through 14a-141.)</p>	<p>AQ-4. Will the Project Conflict with or Obstruction of Implementation of the Applicable Air Quality Plan?</p> <p>PCAPCD and TRPA Requirements</p> <p>The ARB adopted a revised SIP for CO for the north and south shores of Lake Tahoe. The SIP demonstrates how these areas will continue to maintain compliance with the federal 8-hour CO standard. The TRPA adopted a Regional Plan to outline how the region will achieve and maintain air quality thresholds.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Mitigation Measure AQ-1 will minimize construction related emissions generated by</p> <p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring PCAPCD Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutant emissions during construction to a level that would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable Air Quality Plans. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>A project is typically deemed inconsistent with air quality plans if it results in population and/or employment growth that exceeds growth estimates included in the applicable planning documents and therefore generates emissions not accounted for in the emissions budget. Alternative 1A would expand certain plan area uses beyond current TRPA and Placer County boundary lines and conflict with existing land use prescriptions. Boundary lines are established by the land use assumptions in the County General Plan and TRPA Code, so any boundary line violation could be inconsistent with the CO SIP and TRPA Regional Plan. An analysis of plan level-consistency was therefore conducted using the Project's potential to violate the CAAQS and NAAQS.</p> <p>Construction Emissions. Modeling presented in Impact AQ-1 indicates that Alternative 1A may result in construction emissions that exceed the CAAQS or NAAQS on days requiring sustainable construction equipment or activity. This is a significant impact.</p> <p>Operational Emissions. Alternative 1A will increase VMTs, but will not violate CO standards, the pollutant of greatest concern in the LTAB. The Project also incorporates traffic management strategies and LEED standards to reduce operation emissions. The Project Applicant will ensure HMR meets land use projections contained within TRPA and Placer County planning documents. Consequently, this impact is less than significant.</p> <p>(S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-66 to 12-67; see also Master Responses 13, 14, and 15.)</p>		LS	<p>Alternative 1A) to less than significant. Consequently, implementation of the Alternative 1A will not conflict or obstruct with implementation of the applicable air quality plans, including the CO SIP and TRPA Regional Plan.</p> <p>Construction and operational emissions generated by the Project were compared to the PCAPCD and TRPA threshold of significance as addressed above in the Findings for Impacts AQ-1 through AQ-3. Based on the Findings for AQ1 through AQ-3, Alternative 1A will not generate emissions that exceed applicable air district thresholds after implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2a, and AQ-2b. Because these thresholds are adopted to ensure attainment of regional Air Quality Plans, the Project (Alternative 1/1A) will not conflict with the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan or result in significant impacts to air quality in the LTAB.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-66 to 12-67; see also Master Responses 13, 14, and 15; Responses to Comments 14a-129 and 14a-142.)</p>
<p>AQ-5. Will the Project Generate Objectionable Odors?</p> <p>PCAPCD and TRPA Requirements</p> <p>The generation and severity of odors is dependent on a number of factors, including the nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; wind direction; and the location of the receptor(s). Odors rarely cause physical harm, but can cause discomfort, leading to complaints to regulatory agencies. Typical facilities known</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	LS	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>The existing HMR is not known to include any major facilities that produce odors. According to the PCAPCD and the TRPA, there have been no odor complaints against HMR. Consequently, continuing operation is not anticipated to generate any objectionable odors that affect a substantial number of people.</p> <p>Project implementation would not result in the addition of any major odor producing facilities. Since there have been no odor complaints against HMR, implementation of the Alternative 1A, which will not add new odor sources, is not anticipated to generate objectionable odors that affect a substantial number of people.</p> <p>Diesel emissions from construction equipment and volatile organic compounds from paving activities may create odors during construction. These odors would be temporary and localized, and they would cease once construction activities have been completed. Thus, it is not anticipated that the operation or the construction of the Proposed Project would result in odor complaints. This impact is considered less than significant. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-67 to 12-68; see also Response to Comment 138-5.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Implement PCAPCD Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutant emissions during construction.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for AQ-1 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-40 through 12-42)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring PCAPCD Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutant emissions during construction below applicable standards. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation Mitigation Measure AQ-1 will reduce PM10 emissions generated by Alternative 1A to less than significant as addressed in the Findings for AQ-1. It is anticipated that similar projects in the LTAB, including those listed in Table 20-1 of the EIR/EIS would also be required to implement similar BMPs to reduce project-level construction-related emissions. Thus, the Proposed Project would not contribute to a cumulative impact.</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>AQ-C2. Would the Project Result in a Cumulative Long-Term Regional Impact on Air Quality?</p> <p>As shown in Impact AQ-2, implementation of Alternative 1A would increase VMT in the Project area and vicinity relative to the No Project (Alternative 2). This increase in VMT may result in long-term increase in criteria pollutant emissions from traffic operations. When combined with emissions from area and stationary sources, Alternative 1A generate ROG and NOX emissions in excess of 10 pounds per day, which exceeds the PCAPCD's cumulative significance threshold. This is considered a significant impact (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 12-69.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-2a: Contribute to the TRPA Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for AQ-2 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 12-61.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Findings of Fact</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 12-68; Master Responses 13, 14, and 15; Responses to Comments 14a-143.)</p> <p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure AQ-2a, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by necessary funding to offset the project's contribution to long-term criteria pollutant emissions resulting from increased traffic. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The DEIR/EIS includes an evaluation of long-term regional impacts. This analysis compares project-level emissions to PCAPCD's 10 pounds per day cumulative threshold. Operational emissions are quantified in Table 12-17. As this table indicates, operational emissions of ROG and NOX will each exceed 10 pounds per day. The County and TRPA have consulted with PCAPCD regarding appropriate mitigation for this impact. PCAPCD staff has stated that the payment of funds under TRPA's Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program will also serve as mitigation for the Project's cumulative contribution to ROG and NOX emissions. As explained above, TRPA's program is designed to address a net increase in VMT associated with a project. Thus, in reducing VMT under TRPA's program, ROG and NOX emissions will also be reduced. To mitigate cumulative operational impacts, the PCAPCD requires the payment of fees for each pound of pollutant in excess of 10 pounds per day. Based on consultation with the PCAPCD, payment of the TRPA off-site fee (Mitigation Measure AQ-2a) will satisfy this PCAPCD fee requirement. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2a will therefore provide the necessary funding to offset the Project's contribution to long-term criteria pollutant emissions. TRPA adopted the Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program as a means of generating the revenue necessary to implement programs to reduce VMT, resulting in improvements to both traffic and traffic-related air quality. Alternative 1A will therefore not contribute to a cumulatively considerable air quality impact.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 12-69; see also Master Responses 13, 14, and 15; Responses to Comments 14a-143.)</p>
<p>AQ-C3. Would the Project Result in a Cumulative Long-Term Local Impact on Air</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Quality?</p> <p>CO modeling for the Alternative 1A showed that existing and future concentrations from idling would not exceed existing State, federal, and TRPA thresholds. This modeling is based on traffic volumes that assumed cumulative growth throughout the Lake Tahoe area. Because Alternative 1A would not exceed State, federal, or TRPA thresholds, they would not contribute to a cumulative air quality violation. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-69 to 12-70; see also Master Responses 13, 14, and 15; Responses to Comments 14a-143.)</p>			<p>CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>
<p>NOISE</p> <p>NOI-1. Will construction (including blasting activities) of the Project expose the public to high noise levels or vibration?</p> <p>Construction noise in Placer County is exempt from 6:00 AM to 8:00 PM. Construction noise outside of these hours would be significant if it exceeds 55 dBA from 8:00 PM to 10:00 PM or 45 dBA from 10:00 PM to 6:00 AM. Noise from pile driving would reach maximum levels of 93 dBA at the nearest residences to the Project area. Placer County does not have thresholds for vibration. As stated in Table 13-14, an appropriate damage potential threshold at older residential structures should be 0.3 PPV (inches per second). As stated in Table 13-15, strongly perceptible PPV would be 0.10 inches per second.</p> <p>Construction noise from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM is exempt under the TRPA Codes of Ordinances Chapter 23 – Noise Limitations.</p> <p>The results in Tables 13-19 and 13-20 of the EIR/EIS indicate that blasting with a 30 pound charge would result in a maximum of 0.501 PPV (inches per second) and 127.8 dB would occur at the nearest residence. The predicted vibration level is below the TRPA thresholds of 1.0 PPV inches per second for vibration and the recommended threshold of 133 dB for blasting. However, depending on the location of blasting and the size of the charge, there is potential for blasting to result in vibration that exceeds the 0.5 inches per second damage threshold for older buildings and residential structures indicated in Table 13-14. Consequently,</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure NOI-1a: Employ Measures to Reduce Airblast and Vibration from Blasting.</p> <p>Contractors shall retain a qualified blasting specialist to develop a site-specific blasting program report to assess, control, and monitor airblast and ground vibration from blasting. The report shall be reviewed and approved by the County prior to issuance of a blasting permit. The report shall include, at minimum, the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The contractor shall use current state-of-the-art technology to keep blast-related vibration at offsite residential, other occupied structures and well sites as low as possible, consistent with blasting safety. In no instance shall blast vibration, measured on the ground adjacent to a residential, other occupied structure, or well site be allowed to exceed the frequency-dependent limits specified in the Alternative Blasting Level Criteria contained in USBM Report of Investigations 8507. The project contractor shall use current state-of-the-art technology to keep airblast at offsite residential and other occupied structures as low as possible. In no instance shall airblast, measured at a residence or other occupied structure, be allowed to exceed the 0.013-psi (133-dB) limit recommended in USBM Report of Investigations 8485. The project contractor shall monitor and record airblast and vibration for blasts within 1,000 feet of residences and 	<p>LS</p>	<p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Noise impacts resulting from construction depend on the noise generated by construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise generating activities, and the distance and shielding between construction noise sources and noise sensitive areas. Table 13-17 of the EIR/EIS shows the calculated maximum (Lmax) and Leq sounds levels that would result from Project construction.</p> <p>The nearest residences to the North Base area are located along Sacramento Avenue south of the existing gravel parking lot, as close as 100 feet from the Project area. Residences along Silver Street are as close as 150 feet from the Project area, and residences east of SR 89 are approximately 200 feet from the Project area. As shown in Table 13-17 of the EIR/EIS, noise at these locations could reach 85 dBA, 80 dBA, and 77 dBA, respectively. The nearest residences to the South Base area are located along Tahoe Ski Bowl Way and Lagoon Road east of the existing parking lots and maintenance facility, as close as 100 feet to the Project area. As shown in table 13-17, maximum noise levels at adjacent residences could reach 85 dBA without acoustical shielding from structures or terrain. In addition, pile drivers could be used under the Proposed Project. As shown in Table 13-18, noise from pile drivers could be as loud as 93 dBA at 100 feet from the source.</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

122

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>vibration and airblast impacts from blasting are potentially significant.</p> <p>As shown in Table 13-17 of the EIR/EIS, construction noise could reach up to 85 dBA at the nearest residences, and if pile drivers are used noise could reach up to 93 dBA. Using the most stringent thresholds, noise from construction activity occurring within the hours of 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM is exempt. Therefore, if construction activity occurs outside of these hours, this impact would be considered significant and mitigation would be required. Delayed information on the construction schedule is not available. Because it is possible that construction activity could take place outside of the exempted hours, this impact is considered significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-22 through 13-26.)</p>	<p>other occupied structures to verify that measured levels are within the recommended limits at those locations. The contractor shall use blasting seismographs containing three channels that record in three mutually perpendicular axes and which have a fourth channel for recording airblast. The frequency response of the instrumentation shall be from 2 to 250 Hz, with a minimum sampling rate of 1,000 samples per second per channel. The recorded data must be such that the frequency of the vibrations can be determined readily. If blasting is found to exceed specified levels, blasting shall cease, and alternative blasting or excavation methods shall be employed that result in the specified levels not being exceeded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Airblast and vibration monitoring shall take place at the nearest offsite residential or other occupied structure. If vibration levels are expected to be lower than those required to trigger the seismograph at that location, or if permission cannot be obtained to record at that location, recording shall be accomplished at some closer site in line with the structure. Specific locations and distances where airblast and vibration are measured shall be documented in detail along with measured airblast and vibration amplitudes. <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-1b: Conduct Building Inspection prior to Blasting.</p> <p>HMR shall inspect any existing buildings located within a 500-foot radius of Planned Blasting activities. The inspection shall document preexisting conditions. The preinspection survey of the buildings shall be completed with the use of photographs, videotape, or visual inventory, and shall include inside and outside locations. All existing cracks in walls, floors, driveways, etc., shall be documented with sufficient detail for comparison during and upon completion of blasting activities to determine whether actual vibration damage has occurred. The results of both surveys shall be provided to the County for review and acceptance of conclusions. Should</p>	<p>Construction activities associated with the operation of heavy equipment may generate localized groundborne vibration. Vibration from non-impact construction activity is typically below the threshold of perception when the activity is more than 50 feet from the receptor. Additionally, vibration from these activities will be of limited duration and will end when construction is completed. Vibration from non-impact equipment would be less than 0.10 inches per second at 25 feet. Vibration from pile driving, assuming a typical pile driver (Table 13-2), would be less than 0.5 inches per second (the damage threshold for older buildings and residences in Table 13-14 of the EIR/EIS) within about 30 feet of pile driving.</p> <p>Vibration and airblast would also occur if blasting techniques are used. Tables 13-19 and 13-20 of the EIR/EIS depict calculated PPV and PSI at three distances from Project construction areas to represent potential impacts at the nearest sensitive receptors under a worst-case scenario.</p> <p>Construction would occur seasonally between May 2011 and December 2020 at various locations throughout the Project area and is anticipated to occur during normal working hours. Construction would occur at particular locations for only a fraction of the time between May 2011 and December 2020 (i.e. construction would not occur over the entire Project area for nine continuous years).</p> <p>Placer County's noise ordinance establishes a daytime (7:00 AM to 10:00 PM) construction noise limit of 55 dBA, Leg and nighttime (10:00 PM to 7:00 AM) construction noise limit of 45 dBA, Leg outside of the exempted hours of 6:00 AM to after 8:00 PM, Monday to Friday and 8:00 AM to after 8:00 PM, Saturday and Sunday. TRPA exempts construction activities during the hours of between 8:00 AM and 6:30 PM. Because of Placer County and TRPA's construction noise exemptions during daytime activities, construction noise impacts are considered less than significant during daytime activities. However, nighttime construction activities have potential to exceed Placer County's noise ordinance. Consequently, Mitigation Measure NOI-1c: Employ Noise-Reducing Construction Practices was identified to reduce construction noise to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures NOI-1a and NOI-1b reduce vibration impacts from blasting. Mitigation Measure NOI-1c reduces construction noise levels below the County thresholds of 55 dBA Leg between the hours of 8:00 PM to 10:00 PM and 45 dBA Leg between the hours of 10:00 PM to 6:00 AM on weekdays, and 55 dBA between the hours of 8:00 PM and 10:00 PM and 45 dBA between the hours of 10:00 PM and 8:00 AM on weekends.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-22 through 13-26; see also Master Response 16; Responses to Comments 13a-51 through 13a-53,</p>	

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>damage occur, construction operations shall be halted until the problem activity can be identified. Once identified, the problem activity shall be modified to eliminate the problem and protect the adjacent buildings. Any damage to nearby buildings shall be repaired back to the pre-existing condition.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-1c: Employ noise-reducing construction practices.</p> <p>HMR shall design and implement measures to reduce noise from construction. HMR will prepare a noise control plan that will identify feasible measures that can be employed to reduce construction noise, including enclosing or shielding noise-generating equipment and locating equipment as far as practical from sensitive uses would also be effective. Implementation of such measures is anticipated to provide up to 10 dB of noise reduction. The noise control plan shall employ noise-reducing construction practices such that construction noise does not exceed: (1) 55 dBA Leq between the hours of 8:00 PM to 10:00 PM and 45 dBA between the hours of 10:00 PM to 6:00 AM on weekdays; or (2) 55 dBA between the hours of 8:00 PM and 10:00 PM and 45 dBA between the hours of 10:00 PM and 8:00 AM on weekends. The plan must be approved by the TRPA and Placer County prior to issuing a Grading Permit. The noise control plan may include, and is not limited to, the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gasoline or diesel engine construction equipment shall have sound-control devices that are at least as effective as those originally provided by the manufacturer and that equipment be operated and maintained to minimize noise generation. • Prohibit gasoline or diesel engines from having unmuffled exhaust. • Locate noise-generating equipment as far as practical from noise-sensitive uses. • Use noise-reducing enclosures around noise-generating equipment. • Schedule substantial noise-generating activity, and blasting in particular, during daytime or early evening hours. • Place temporary barriers between noise sources and noise-sensitive land uses or taking advantage of existing barrier 		<p>268-7, 268-11, 268-15, and 6-e.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>NOI-2. Will operation and maintenance of the Project expose the public to high noise levels (e.g., above CNEL permitted in the applicable Plan Area Statements, Community Plan or Master Plan) from transportation sources?</p> <p>Residences are located throughout the surrounding roadway network. In addition, new residences will be built with the Proposed Project. Significant noise impacts are identified where existing noise sensitive receptors would be exposed to noise increases that exceed the noise significance thresholds.</p> <p>In Placer County, noise from mobile sources would be significant if exterior noise levels are greater than 50 dBA, Ldn/CNEL at the property line of the receiving land use. The TRPA Community Plan regulates noise for transportation corridors. For SR 89, noise is regulated to 55 dBA within 300 feet of the roadway. Noise from mobile sources would be significant if exterior noise levels are greater than 55 dBA within 300 feet of the roadway, or if the change in noise is greater than 3 dBA. In addition, for Plan Areas that are out of attainment, any increase in noise would be significant.</p> <p>Plan Areas 156, 157, and 160 have noise standards of 55, 55, and 60 dBA, respectively. As shown in Table 13-21, noise exceeds 55 dBA (the more stringent threshold) even without the Project. Based on a personal communication with TRPA staff, any increase in noise, relative to future no project conditions, would be significant because the standard is currently exceeded. Therefore, it is necessary to fully mitigate/offset the incremental increase in noise, relative to future no project conditions (Emmett, pers. comm.). Using an existing baseline indicates that traffic noise levels would</p>	<p>MITIGATION MEASURES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> features (terrain, structures, edge of trench) to block sound transmission. Cover trenches where blasting will occur. Prohibit backup alarms and provide an alternate warning system, such as a flagman or radar-based alarm that is compliant with State regulations. <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-25 through 13-26.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Employ measures to ensure Project-related traffic noise does not increase relative to existing and future no project conditions.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall design and implement measures to reduce noise from traffic related to the Proposed Project (Alternative 1). HMR will prepare a noise control plan that will identify feasible measures that can be employed to reduce traffic noise by 0.4 dBA relative to existing conditions and 1.2 dBA relative to future conditions. The noise control plan shall employ noise-reducing measures such that Project-related noise does not increase relative to future no project conditions. This is in addition to the ongoing reduction in traffic volumes observed on SR 89 (see Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking, and Circulation). The plan must be approved by the TRPA and Placer County prior to issuing a Grading Permit. The noise control plan may include, and is not limited to, the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constructing/use of barriers, berms, and acoustical shielding (reductions of 3dB to 5dB). Utilizing noise-reducing pavement (reductions of 2-5dB). Lowering speed limits, if feasible and practical (reductions of 1-2dB). Programs to pay for noise mitigation such as low cost loans to owners of noise-impacted property or establishment of developer fees (no actual noise reduction from this, reduction depends on actual measure that is implemented). Acoustical treatment of buildings (reductions of 3-5dB). <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 13-30.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measures NOI-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to develop and implement measures to ensure Project-related traffic noise does not increase relative to existing and future no project conditions. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Traffic-related noise will be generated by existing and anticipated traffic on SR 89. The Project will contribute to traffic on SR 89, and will therefore contribute to traffic-related noise. Traffic generated by the Project is a small proportion of the overall amount of traffic on SR 89 (see Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking, and Circulation of the EIR/EIS). In addition, as shown in Table 11-4 of the EIR/EIS (Historic Traffic Volumes), historic traffic volumes in the HMR area are steadily decreasing. Therefore, because traffic-related noise is a function of all traffic on the roadway (existing and Project-related traffic), the focus is on noise levels that will occur if the Project is approved, in conjunction with existing and anticipated traffic.</p> <p>Traffic noise levels on SR 89 were calculated based on traffic noise modeling using the FHWA TMM. The calculated traffic noise levels at 100 feet from the centerline of SR 89 under future traffic conditions are summarized in Table 13-21.</p> <p>The Project will generate trips from employee and ski shuttles, dial-a-rides, and water taxis. The employee shuttle buses are planned to operate during both the summer and winter seasons. The employee shuttle will be a 20-25 passenger van and will serve the employee housing areas on the North Shore, which will reduce employee vehicle traffic. Shuttle and dial-a-ride vehicles will be smaller vans, such as a 195 horsepower Chevrolet Express. Scheduled shuttle service is planned to operate between Homewood and Tahoe City seven days a week from 7:00 AM to 11:00 PM every hour.</p> <p>Dial-a-ride service will operate during the summer and winter seasons from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM. Service will be provided in the</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

125

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>increase by 0.4 dBA under Alternative 1A. Relative to future no project conditions Project-related traffic noise is predicted to increase by 1.2 dBA. Noise from the shuttles and dial-a-ride vehicles will be consistent with current noise on local roadways. Noise from the water taxi will be consistent with other boating activities in the Tahoe City and Homewood areas. Traffic noise would increase by 0.4 dBA relative to existing conditions and 1.2 dBA relative to future conditions for areas that are currently out of attainment with regards to TRPA Plan Areas. Therefore, this impact is considered to be significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-28 through 10-31.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure NOI-3a: Design new residences to reduce interior noise below 45 dBA, Ldn.</p> <p>HMR shall design and construct new residences such that interior noise from snowmaking and other sources of noise (including concerts, HVAC systems, cooling towers/evaporative condensers, loading docks, lift stations, emergency generators, and outdoor public address systems) in the area does not exceed 45 dBA, Ldn. HMR will retain a qualified acoustical consultant to design the necessary acoustical treatments. Measures that can be implemented include installing acoustically rated doors and windows, use of upgraded wall</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>winter as far north as Tavern Shores and Granlibakken, and as far south as Rubicon Bay (excluding the Talmont and Upper Ward Canyon areas). Summer service will accommodate rides to/from the HMR in an area bounded by Granlibakken Road to the north and Sugar Pine Point to the south.</p> <p>The water taxi will likely be a 20-25 passenger hybrid vehicle and will operate in the summer months between Homewood and Tahoe City. This service is planned to operate seven days a week between 9:00 AM and 8:00 PM at least every hour. Vehicle trips from the shuttles and dial-a-ride will run on local roadways. Noise from the employee shuttle can reach 45 Leq on local roadways (Federal Transit Administration 2006). The shuttles, dial-a-rides, and water taxis will help to minimize single-passenger automobile trips.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-2 reduces traffic noise levels by establishing a noise reduction performance standard (1.2dB) that must be met, while also identifying potential mitigation strategies and the effectiveness of these strategies to meet this performance standard. As a result, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 identifies the specific amount of noise reduction that must be achieved, in addition to feasible measures that may be implemented to achieve the noise reduction. The EIR/EIS concluded that noise from the shuttles and dial-a-ride vehicles would be consistent with current noise on local roadways, while noise from the water taxi will be consistent with other boating activities in the Tahoe City and Homewood areas, resulting in a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would ensure that the Project-related traffic noise impacts would not result in any increase in noise levels (CNEL) relative to existing and future no project conditions, which would mitigate the Project's impact on traffic noise.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-28 through 13-31; Master Response 16; Responses to Comments 13a-17, 13a-57, 13a-82, 269-20 and 11-h.)</p> <p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure NOI-3a, NOI-3b, and NOI-3c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by development and implement measures that would ensure noise levels from operations do not exceed applicable thresholds. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Operations and maintenance at HMR would generate noise under the Alternative 1A due to activities such as snow grooming, ski patrol activities, avalanche control, snowmaking, and concerts. Alternative 1A</p>
<p>NOI-3. Will noise from Project concerts, snowmaking, or other resort operations effect existing or proposed noise-sensitive land uses?</p> <p>Noise from operational sources would be significant if exterior noise levels were greater than the Placer County standards of 50 dBA, Ldn/CNEL at the property line of the receiving land use. Noise is regulated under the TRPA Community Plan by land use category. Noise for high density residential uses are regulated to 55 dBA, noise from hotels and commercial uses are regulated to 60 dBA, and noise for outdoor recreational uses are regulated to 55</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure NOI-3a: Design new residences to reduce interior noise below 45 dBA, Ldn.</p> <p>HMR shall design and construct new residences such that interior noise from snowmaking and other sources of noise (including concerts, HVAC systems, cooling towers/evaporative condensers, loading docks, lift stations, emergency generators, and outdoor public address systems) in the area does not exceed 45 dBA, Ldn. HMR will retain a qualified acoustical consultant to design the necessary acoustical treatments. Measures that can be implemented include installing acoustically rated doors and windows, use of upgraded wall</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>winter as far north as Tavern Shores and Granlibakken, and as far south as Rubicon Bay (excluding the Talmont and Upper Ward Canyon areas). Summer service will accommodate rides to/from the HMR in an area bounded by Granlibakken Road to the north and Sugar Pine Point to the south.</p> <p>The water taxi will likely be a 20-25 passenger hybrid vehicle and will operate in the summer months between Homewood and Tahoe City. This service is planned to operate seven days a week between 9:00 AM and 8:00 PM at least every hour. Vehicle trips from the shuttles and dial-a-ride will run on local roadways. Noise from the employee shuttle can reach 45 Leq on local roadways (Federal Transit Administration 2006). The shuttles, dial-a-rides, and water taxis will help to minimize single-passenger automobile trips.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-2 reduces traffic noise levels by establishing a noise reduction performance standard (1.2dB) that must be met, while also identifying potential mitigation strategies and the effectiveness of these strategies to meet this performance standard. As a result, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 identifies the specific amount of noise reduction that must be achieved, in addition to feasible measures that may be implemented to achieve the noise reduction. The EIR/EIS concluded that noise from the shuttles and dial-a-ride vehicles would be consistent with current noise on local roadways, while noise from the water taxi will be consistent with other boating activities in the Tahoe City and Homewood areas, resulting in a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would ensure that the Project-related traffic noise impacts would not result in any increase in noise levels (CNEL) relative to existing and future no project conditions, which would mitigate the Project's impact on traffic noise.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-28 through 13-31; Master Response 16; Responses to Comments 13a-17, 13a-57, 13a-82, 269-20 and 11-h.)</p> <p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure NOI-3a, NOI-3b, and NOI-3c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by development and implement measures that would ensure noise levels from operations do not exceed applicable thresholds. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Operations and maintenance at HMR would generate noise under the Alternative 1A due to activities such as snow grooming, ski patrol activities, avalanche control, snowmaking, and concerts. Alternative 1A</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

126

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>The new amphitheatre is planned to be the permanent home of the annual Lake Tahoe Music Festival. Sound from the amphitheatre is anticipated to result in significant impacts at new HMR proposed residential townhomes located along the north end of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way. Depending on the type of music acts and the degree of amplification there is potential for significant noise impacts to occur at existing residences as well. Concerts, which are currently held periodically throughout the year, would require a special use permit from TRPA specifying hours of activities and specific sound level limits.</p> <p>As shown in Table 13-7 of the EIR/EIS, noise from snowmaking currently exceeds these standards at the residential uses near the South Base area and residential uses near the North Base area (e.g., the eastern Project boundary). Therefore, any increase in noise from snowmaking in these locations is considered significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-37 through 13-40.)</p>	<p>and roof materials to provide additional acoustical insulation, and sealing gaps in walls and ceilings with acoustical caulking. The acoustical consultant will prepare a report for the TRPA and Placer County demonstrating compliance with noise standards inside of residential units.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-3b: Implement design and operational measures at the amphitheater to ensure compliance with the adjacent Planning Area Statement (PAS) CNEL limit at existing residences.</p> <p>HMR shall demonstrate that the amphitheater has been designed such that operational noise at existing residences will be in compliance with the adjacent Planning Area Statement (PAS) CNEL limit. An acoustical engineer with experience in the prediction and mitigation of outdoor theater sound levels, HVAC systems, cooling towers/evaporative condensers, loading docks, lift stations, emergency generators, and outdoor public address systems shall be consulted prior to design and construction of the proposed amphitheater and other stationary Project elements with the potential to generate noise. The acoustical engineer shall identify feasible mitigation measures for reducing noise-related impacts to nearby residences. Mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to, orientation and location of the amphitheater, construction of noise barriers and shielding, limitations on speaker orientation, limitations on noise-generation levels, and hours of activity. The Project Applicant shall incorporate the mitigation measures into the design and operation of the amphitheater and other stationary Project elements with the potential to generate noise.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-3c: Implement measures to ensure noise levels at existing residences are reduced to meet the adjacent Plan Area Statement (PAS) CNEL limit.</p> <p>To reduce existing and proposed snowmaking noise levels to a less than significant level, HMR must reduce noise levels to meet adjacent PAS CNEL limits. The reduction of noise to PAS CNEL levels shall be reevaluated annually to ensure that HMR is implementing all possible snowmaking measures available to work towards the attainment of the PAS CNEL noise standards for Plan Areas 157, 158, and 159 (55dB, 55dB,</p>		<p>proposes no changes to existing grooming, or ski patrol activities at HMR, so no impact would occur. Other operational noise sources include HVAC systems, cooling towers/evaporative condensers, loading docks, lift stations, emergency generators, and outdoor public address systems. Similarly, these noise sources are a part of the existing noise environment with HMR operations and noise levels associated with other noise sources are not anticipated to increase under the Alternative 1A.</p> <p>Snowmaking typically occurs at nighttime throughout the ski season depending upon the amount of natural snowfall. To represent a worst-case scenario, it was assumed that snowmaking would occur every night of the ski season from midnight until 7:00 AM, and for 3 continual days per week for two weeks in the beginning of the season (Timan pers. comm.). This is comparable to existing snowmaking operations. HMR currently uses 25 horsepower fan-gun technology for snowmaking. Fan guns include the Super Polecat, Super Wizard, and the Viking Snowlower models. There are five guns operating at the north side and 5 guns operating at the south side of HMR. The Proposed Project would add guns on both the north and south sides, but it is currently unknown how many new guns will be used and the exact locations of the guns relative to existing and proposed noise sensitive land uses. Because the number and type of guns as well as the location of each gun is currently unknown, the noise levels from snowmaking cannot be quantified. For this reason, new snowmaking activities that result in an increase in snowmaking noise would result in a significant noise impact. Mitigation Measures NOI-3a: Design New Residences to Reduce Interior Noise Below 45 dBA, Ldn and NOI-3c: Implement Measures to Ensure Noise Levels at Existing Residences are Reduced to Meet the Adjacent Plan Area Statement (PAS) CNEL Limit were identified to reduce impacts related to snowmaking activities to less than significant. These mitigation measures identify specific noise performance standards that must be met. They also identify options available in order to ensure compliance with these noise standards. Acoustical studies are required at the time specific designs are submitted in order to confirm compliance with these standards. These studies will be reviewed by TRPA and the County in order to confirm compliance.</p> <p>The new amphitheatre is planned to be the permanent home of the annual Lake Tahoe Music Festival. Amplification of voice and music, combined with applause and other audience reactions could result in audible sound at nearby residential units. The amphitheatre will be located between the base of the gondola and the hotel outdoor deck area. The nearest existing residence is on Sacramento Avenue and is located approximately 400 feet from the new amphitheatre. New residential units along Tahoe Ski Bowl Way would be as close as 250 feet to the amphitheatre, and the hotel would be immediately adjacent to the amphitheatre. Although sound levels at a rock concerts can reach 110 dBA (see</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>and 600dB, CNEL, respectively). HMR will prepare a noise control plan to design, construct/install, and operate new snowmaking equipment so that the increase in noise associated with snowmaking conditions, (see Table 13-7) is reduced to meet the appropriate PAS limit. The plan must be approved by the TRPA and Placer County prior to HMR using any new snowmaking equipment. The noise control plan may include, and is not limited to, the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Situate snowmaking equipment as far as practicable from existing noise sensitive land uses (reductions of 2-3dB). If setbacks are used to control snowmaking noise, snow could be moved from the location where it is made, and mechanically deposited in the desired location. This measure would involve the use of snow grooming equipment, which would also produce noise. In general, snow grooming equipment produces lower levels than snowmaking equipment, and the time required to move the snow would be less than the time required to make snow on a continuous basis. Typical snow grooming equipment is approximately the size of a bulldozer. Bulldozers between 100 and 250 HP can generate maximum noise levels of 81-85 dBA (Hoover & Keith, 2000). It is reasonable to assume that snowgrooming equipment would generate similar noise levels. Thus the overall noise impacts of this alternative in a given area would be lower than for continuous snowmaking using snowmaking nozzles. • Place temporary barriers between noise sources and noise-sensitive land uses or taking advantage of existing barrier features (terrain, structures, edge of trench) to block sound transmission. Barriers would be most effective where the nozzles are close to the noise sensitive land uses. The barriers should be solid and massive, and placed close to the nozzles to block line of sight to the receivers. Thick (1/2 inch) plywood or wood, and straw bales are examples of suitable materials for such an application. Where nozzles are placed in fixed, elevated positions, 		<p>Table 13-1), concerts at the amphitheatre are smaller-scale and are not anticipated to reach this level. Residential Building A is located between the amphitheatre and existing residences on Sacramento Avenue and will provide substantial acoustical shielding between the amphitheatre and existing residences. The building will also provide acoustical shielding between the amphitheatre and most of the new residential units along Tahoe Ski Bowl Way. New residential townhome units at the north end of Tahoe Ski Bowl way would not be shielded by the building. The amphitheatre will project amplified sound towards the mountain, and sound energy will primarily dissipate in that direction.</p> <p>As stated in the EIR/EIS, in Plan Areas out of attainment, any increase in noise would be significant. Mitigation Measures NOI-3a and NOI-3b would reduce impacts from the amphitheatre, and Mitigation Measures NOI-3a and NOI-3c would reduce impacts from snowmaking to meet PAS CNEL levels, and therefore would be less than significant</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-37 through 13-40; Master Response 16; Responses to Comments 13a-55, 13a-56, 13a-82, 269-20, and 11-h.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>NOISE-C1: Will the Project result in a substantial impact upon the cumulative noise environment?</p> <p>The traffic volumes in the traffic analysis in Chapter 11 – Traffic, Parking, and Circulation were based on cumulative growth in the HMR area. Consequently, the noise analysis was also based on cumulative growth and represents cumulative effect conditions. Alternative 1A would result in minor increased in noise compared to the No Project (Alternative 2) (see Tables 3.6-21 through 3.6-23). Any increase in noise, relative to future no project conditions based on TRPA criteria, would be significant and thus it is necessary to fully mitigate/offset the incremental increase in</p>	<p>barriers could consist of tower structures with plywood sides blocking line of sight to the nozzles (reductions of 3-9dB). At the South and North Base areas, the construction of proposed HMR buildings may provide permanent barriers between snowmaking operations and adjacent land uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select quieter snow making equipment (reductions of 2-3dB). HMR currently uses fan gun technology for its snowmaking system, which is quieter than compressed air/water nozzles used at other resorts. However, the latest snowmaking gun technology shall be consulted when purchasing new equipment. The new and quieter equipment shall be used in locations closest to noise sensitive land uses. Prohibit/minimize the operation of snow making activities during nighttime hours (prohibition eliminates nighttime noise that is penalized in the calculation of CNEL averages). Reduce the number of snow making equipment operating concurrently (reduction of 2-3 dB). Reducing the number of nozzles close to noise sensitive land uses. (In general, a 50 percent reduction in the number of nozzles in a given area will result in a reduction of 3 dB, which is considered to be a perceptible reduction in noise levels). <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-38 through 13-40)</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Employ measures to ensure Project-related traffic noise does not increase relative to existing and future no project conditions.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for NOI-2 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 13-30)</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-3a: Design new residences to reduce interior noise below 45 dBA, Ldn.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for NOI-3 above.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure NOI-2, NOI-3a, NOI-3b, and NOI-3c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by development and implement measures that would ensure Project-related traffic noise does not increase relative to existing and future no project conditions and noise levels from operations do not exceed applicable thresholds. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative impacts would be considered less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-2, NOI-3a, NOI-3b and NOI-3c. Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would reduce traffic noise relative to</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>noise, relative to future no project conditions</p> <p>Plan Areas 156, 157, and 160 are currently out of attainment due to traffic and snowmaking noise. Noise from traffic is anticipated to increase with Alternative 1A. Noise from snowmaking is also expected to increase. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-40 through 13-41.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure NOI-3b: Implement design and operational measures at the amphitheater to ensure compliance with the adjacent Planning Area Statement (PAS) CNEL limit at existing residences.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for NOI-3 above.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-3c: Implement measures to ensure noise levels at existing residences are reduced to meet the adjacent Plan Area Statement (PAS) CNEL limit.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for NOI-3 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-38 through 13-40.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>existing and future no-project conditions, and Mitigation Measures NOI-3a and NOI-3c would reduce snowmaking noise to PAS CNEL levels. In addition, Mitigation Measures NOI-3a and NOI-3b would reduce noise from the amphitheater at new and existing residences. Therefore, impacts from noise would be reduced to less than significant levels.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-40 through 13-41; Master Response 16; Responses to Comments 13a-17.)</p>
<p>SOILS, GEOLOGY AND SEISMICITY</p> <p>GEO-1. Will the Project expose people or structures to adverse geological hazards, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving fault rupture, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic related ground failure (e.g., liquefaction), or landslides?</p> <p>Fault Rupture. The geologic hazards and geotechnical evaluations (Kleinfelder 2007; Holdrege and Kull 2009, 2010a, 2010b) determined that two Quaternary-age faults are mapped across the Project area. Fault rupture has the potential to compromise the structural integrity of new facilities and expose a greater surface area (and more people) to fault rupture hazard. A potential hazard associated with earthquake faults across the Project area involves surface rupture.</p> <p>Ground Shaking. The potential hazard associated with earthquake faults also involves strong ground motion. The Project area is located in a region that is traditionally characterized by moderate to high seismic activity, as discussed in the Environmental Settings section of Chapter 14 of the EIR/EIS, and therefore, a large earthquake in the project vicinity could potentially cause moderate ground shaking in the Project area (Kleinfelder 2007).</p> <p>Liquefaction, Lateral Spreading and Slope</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure GEO-1. Submit Final Geotechnical Report.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall submit to the 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Road, pavement, and parking area design B. Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable) C. Grading practices D. Erosion/winterization E. Special problems discovered on-site, (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, soil creep, etc.) F. Slope stability G. Utility trench design, including seismic design for sewer and water utilities crossing fault lines <p>Once approved by the ESD, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the 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 that, if not corrected, could lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the requirements of the soils report shall be required for subdivisions, prior to approval of the Improvement Plans. It is</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</p> <p>Fault Rupture. New structures and operational improvements will result in relocated land coverage with minimal changes to the existing landscape. The area that could potentially be affected by fault rupture does not increase in size because the Project area and development footprint will not significantly change. Furthermore, Alternative 1A does not increase the surface rupture hazard that current existing within the Project area. The data gathered indicates that the North Base and Mid-Mountain areas are not subject to significant risk of rupture from this fault (Holdrege and Kull 2010a, Holdrege and Kull 2010b). Compliance with the California Building Code standards is adequate to ensure that seismic risks are addressed and potential impacts are reduced to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>The recommendations from the geotechnical engineering reports for the Phase 1, primarily North Base area and the Mid-Mountain Area structures and infrastructure (Holdrege and Kull 2010a,</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Instability. Soils most susceptible to liquefaction are saturated, loose, clean, uniformly-graded and fine-grained sand deposits. A potential for seismically-induced rock fall exists within the Project area (Kleinfelder 2007), but is considered low because these areas are not ideal for development and existing and structures and facilities are not proposed in these areas.</p> <p>The potential impact is considered significant until the completion of mitigation measure GEO-1. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-39 through 14-45.)</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-44 through 14-45.)</p>		<p>2010b), are incorporated as mitigation measures of the Project and will be included in the final design as required by Placer County Code Chapter 15 for project permitting. This mitigation measure is detailed as GEO-1.</p> <p>Ground Shaking. As addressed in the EIR/EIS, Unnamed Fault 2 is discontinuous and questionable as to presence and location. Therefore, the hazard from surface rupture on this fault is considered low. The professional opinion stated in Holdrege and Kull geotechnical engineering reports (2010a, 2010b) is that building set back distances from Unnamed Fault 2 are not warranted and no further study is necessary.</p> <p>The majority of the development is located in areas that will experience the least severity of ground shaking during an earthquake because these areas are typically underlain by shallow bedrock (Kleinfelder 2007). The area that could potentially be affected by ground shaking will not change because the Project area and the development footprint will not significantly change. Alternative 1A does not increase the ground shaking hazard that currently exists within the Project area.</p> <p>The effects of the Project related to potential structural damage and injury caused by ground shaking will be minimized through compliance with California Building Code seismic coefficients and the requirements for engineering grading plans in section 15.48.320 of Chapter 15 of the Placer County Code. Compliance with codified regulations and current building codes is mandatory for project permitting. The intentions of adopted codes and regulations are to avoid, reduce and minimize potential seismic hazards and provide for public safety. Implementation of the engineering and design recommendations of the final geotechnical report (Holdrege and Kull 2010a, 2010b) will minimize effects from ground shaking. Recommendations from the final geotechnical investigation required for project permitting will be incorporated into final project designs to address known seismic constraints, reducing the potential impact of ground shaking hazards to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Liquefaction, Lateral Spreading and Slope Instability. Soils most susceptible to liquefaction are saturated, loose, clean, uniformly-graded and fine-grained sand deposits. Lateral spreading is the lateral movement of fractured rock or soil resulting from liquefaction of adjacent materials. Seismically induced slope instability includes debris flows, rock fall and landslides.</p> <p>North Base Area. Because groundwater was encountered during October 2009 subsurface investigations, Holdrege and Kull utilized data obtained from exploratory borings, CPT probes and shear wave velocity measurements to evaluate the liquefaction potential of saturated sand and gravel in the eastern and southern portions of the North Base area. The soil profile is determined to</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>have a low potential for liquefaction. No surface manifestation (e.g. subsidence or lateral spreading) of underlying potentially liquefiable soils is expected based on the thickness and relative compacity of near-surface soils. No recent landslides, debris flows or rock fall hazards were observed and because of the granular and rocky nature of the conditions within and surrounding the North Base area, the potential for slope instability is considered low. Seismically induced rock fall is a potential hazard, similar to most areas in mountainous terrain; however, no rock outcrops are located on the slope above the North Base and the potential is low to negligible.</p> <p><u>South Base Area.</u> Results reported in the preliminary geotechnical report for the Project area (Kienfelder 2007) and the subsequent Second Revised Soils Hydrologic Scoping and Final Report (Kleinfelder 2010) indicate silty sand, gravelly sand, gravel, cobbles and boulders indicative of a colluvial environment. Shallow groundwater is measured at 1.72 and 3.72 feet bgs at the north end of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way and above the South Base area, respectively. Borings in the parking areas of the South Base did not encounter groundwater to depths of 18 feet bgs in 2007 and 2008. Locations where shallow groundwater and finer grained sandy soils are encountered could be susceptible to liquefactions.</p> <p>Placer County requires the submittal of a site-specific geotechnical engineering report for the South Base area prior to permitting of Phase 2 of the Project to comply with codified regulations to consider the impacts of a project resulting in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil as potentially significant unless mitigation measures are applied. This mitigation measure is detailed as GEO-1.</p> <p>If liquefiable soils or soils susceptible to other types of seismically-induced ground failure are determined to be present in portions of the Project area where project activities will occur, corrective actions will be taken by HMR and its contractors/engineers, including design methods, structural methods, and/or improving in situ foundation methods such as removal and replacement of soils, on-site densification, grouting, or other similar measures, depending on the extent and depth of susceptible soils. These measures reduce pore water pressure during ground shaking by densifying the soil or improving the drainage capacity.</p> <p>No recent landslides, debris flows or rock fall hazards are observed and because of the granular and rocky nature of the conditions within and surrounding the South Base area, the potential for slope instability is considered low. Seismically induced rock fall is a potential hazard, similar to most areas in mountainous terrain; however, no rock outcrops are located on the slope above the South Base and the potential is low to</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

132

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>negligible.</p> <p>Implementation of one or a series of these measures in accordance with the findings of the required final geotechnical report will reduce potential impacts of liquefaction and other types of seismic ground failure (subsidence and lateral spreading) to a level of less than significant.</p> <p><u>Mid-Mountain Area.</u> Based on the results of Holdrege and Kull's subsurface investigations, near-surface soil at the Mid-Mountain area consists of medium dense to very dense silty gravel to silty sand with gravel and cobbles, overlying surface volcanic rock. This soil profile has a low potential for liquefaction. Because the potential for liquefaction is low, the potential for lateral spreading to occur is also low.</p> <p>No landslides, debris flows of rock fall hazards are observed at the Mid-Mountain area and because of the granular and competent nature of the subsurface conditions of this portion of the Project area, the potential for slope instability is low. The Mid-Mountain area is located on a topographically high ridge, and the rock fall hazard is therefore considered to be negligible.</p> <p><u>General Upper Mountain.</u> A Quaternary landslide is mapped in the volcanic rock to the north of the Project area. The same volcanic rock is mapped within the Project area and may be prone to landsliding (Kleinfelder 2007). The possibility of landslides and seismically induced slope instability in the general Project area is considered moderate because of the steep topography of the Project area and the observed evidence of soil creep. A number of areas of rock outcrops are observed in the Project area and additional rock outcrops could be present but not yet mapped. A potential for seismically induced rock fall exists within the Project area (Kleinfelder 2007), but is considered low because these areas are not ideal for development and new structures and facilities are not proposed in these areas.</p> <p>The Project, however, proposes a replacement of the existing Madden Triple Chair Lift with a Gondola. The Gondola alignment will follow the existing lift line but will require earthwork associated with modification of or replacement of the 14 existing lift towers and footings with Gondola towers and footings that are approximately 80 square feet each. Lift tower and locations may shift slightly to accommodate changes in vertical loads in and across the lift line but are not expected to increase the risk of seismic related ground failure because excavation necessary for replacement towers, approximately 27 cubic yards per tower footing, will be localized and within the previously disturbed lift alignment. Dopplemayr engineering specifications for vertical loads within and across lift lines indicate sufficient flexibility for lift tower spacing to span or otherwise avoid rock outcrops. Load calculations indicate tower spacing can range from approximately 23 feet to just over 450 feet. Engineering specifications indicate a</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>GEO-2. Will Project facilities be located within an area of unstable soil conditions, including soils susceptible to collapse, subsidence, corrosion or expansion?</p> <p>Project-level geotechnical evaluations have been completed for the North Base and Mid-Mountain areas that will be developed during</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure GEO-1. Submit Final Geotechnical Report.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for GEO-1 above. (Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-44 through 14-45.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>range of tower height from 18.6 feet to 47 feet, which will allow for adequate ground clearance with no additional grading along the lift alignment. Four trees have been identified for removal at the slope break in proximity to the existing Madden chair lift mid-station.</p> <p>The existing lift terminals will be replaced with a 6,000 square foot base terminal at the North Base and an 18,000 square foot top terminal adjacent to the proposed Mid-Mountain Lodge. No active faults are mapped in the areas of lower or terminal replacement.</p> <p>Placer County requires a final geotechnical report as outlined in Mitigation Measure GEO-1 to determine site-specific recommendations to avoid and minimize unstable soil conditions from seismic related ground failure. The intentions of adopted codes and regulations are to avoid, reduce and minimize potential seismic hazards and provide for public safety. Implementation of the engineering and design recommendations of the final geotechnical report will minimize effects from ground shaking. Recommendations from the final geotechnical investigation required for project permitting will be incorporated into final project designs to address known seismic constraints, reducing the potential impact of ground shaking hazards and slope instability to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Dopplemayr engineering specifications for vertical loads within and across lift lines indicate sufficient flexibility for lift tower spacing to span or otherwise avoid the previously unmapped spring and areas of soil creep and thus avoid areas of potential unstable soil conditions. Load calculations indicate tower spacing can range from approximately 23 feet to just over 450 feet.</p> <p>Mitigation measure GEO-1 minimizes potential impacts within the project area to a level of less than significant by assuring compliance with Placer County codified regulations to prepare project-level geotechnical reports and incorporation of site-specific recommended geotechnical measures into Project designs to avoid, reduce and minimize effects from potential geologic hazards.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-39 through 14-45 Responses to Comments 13a-58 through 13a-60, 19-25, 93-11, 268-13.)</p> <p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure GEO-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by assuring compliance with Placer County codified regulations to prepare project-level geotechnical reports and incorporation of site-specific recommended geotechnical measures into Project designs ensure project facilities are not located on unstable soil conditions, including soils susceptible to collapse, subsidence,</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

134

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Phase 1 of the Project. Project-level geotechnical evaluations will be completed for the South Base area with Phase 2.</p> <p>No soil constraints are identified within the Project area that would preclude development and redevelopment proposed under Alternative 1A. Conformance to State and local building codes and implementation of the standard Placer County mitigation measures, along with those recommendations identified in site-specific final geotechnical reports reduce impacts of development on potentially unstable soils to a level of less than significant. Placer County considers the impacts of a Project resulting in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of soil as potentially significant unless mitigation measures are applied. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-45 through 14-48.)</p>			<p>corrosion or expansion. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Project-level geotechnical evaluations have been completed for the North Base and Mid-Mountain areas that will be developed during Phase 1 of the Project. Placer County requires the completion of a site-specific geotechnical evaluation for the Gondola lift alignment per Mitigation Measure GEO-1A to determine engineering specification for lift tower replacement in areas of potentially unstable soil conditions as discussed above under Impact GEO-1. Additionally, project-level geotechnical evaluations will be completed for the South Base area with Phase 2.</p> <p>North Base Area. Structures and facilities, including the Gondola base terminal, proposed at the North Base area under Alternative 1A will not be located within areas of unstable soils. Based on low soil risk potential reported in the Geotechnical Engineering Report for Homewood Mountain Resort North Base Lodge (Holdrege and Kull 2010a) the level of impact is less than significant.</p> <p>South Base Area. Structures and facilities proposed at the South Base area under Alternative 1A will not be located within areas of unstable soils. Based on past project investigations, records and operations, existing facilities that will be retained in the South Base area as part of the Alternative 1A are not located in areas of soils susceptible to expansion. Soil map units within the Project area are not considered expansive based on the low shrink-swell potential reported in Table 14-2. The Geologic Hazards and Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation (Kleinfelder 2007) reports a low soil risk potential for the South Base area.</p> <p>The South Base area will be developed during Phase 2 of Alternative 1A. Placer County will require the submittal of a site-specific geotechnical engineering report for the South Base area prior to permitting of Phase 2 of the Project. Should project facilities and structures be located in areas of corrosive soils based on future site-specific soil analysis, the use of corrosive resistant materials and engineering methods to protect buried pipes and infrastructure will reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Mid-Mountain Area. Structures and facilities, including the Gondola top terminal, proposed at the Mid-Mountain area under Alternative 1A will not be located within areas of unstable soils. Based on low soil risk potential reported in the Geotechnical Engineering Report for Homewood Mountain Resort Mid-Mountain Lodge (Holdrege and Kull 2010b) the level of impact is</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>GEO-3. Will the Project result in compaction or covering of the soil beyond the limits allowed in the land capability system, including coverage within sensitive Class 1a and 1b lands?</p> <p>The Project reduces total land coverage within the Project area. Because land coverage in LCDs 1a and 2 exceed allowable base land coverage for those LCDs, Alternative 1A are subject to the excess coverage mitigation</p>	<p>GEO-3: Comply with Excess Land Coverage Mitigation Program.</p> <p>Based on allowable base land coverage determinations in LCDs 1a and 2, the Proposed Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 5 and 6 shall be subject to the excess coverage mitigation program described in Code Section 20.5. The excess land coverage within the Project area shall be mitigated to comply with Code Section 20.5 through: 1) reduction of</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>less than significant.</p> <p>General Upper Mountain. Based on past project investigations, records and operations, Alternative 1A does not propose new structures and facilities in areas of moderate to high soil risk potential and the level of impact is less than significant. Based on past project investigations, records and operations, existing facilities that will be retained and the Gordola alignment are not located in areas of soils susceptible to expansion. Soil map units within the Project area are not considered expansive based on the low shrink-swell potential reported in Table 14-2 of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Some soil map units within the Project area are considered moderate to highly corrosive to steel and concrete, as detailed in Table 14-2. A site-specific soil analysis was performed for the Quad chair lift replacement in 2007. Should project facilities and structures be located in areas of corrosive soils based on future site-specific soil analysis, the use of corrosive resistant materials and engineering methods to protect buried pipes and infrastructure will reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>In summary, no soil constraints are identified within the Project area that would preclude development and redevelopment proposed under Alternative 1A. Conformance to State and local building codes and implementation of the standard Placer County mitigation measures, along with those recommendations identified in site-specific final geotechnical reports reduce impacts of development on potentially unstable soils to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Mitigation measure GEO-1 minimizes potential impacts within the project area to a level of less than significant by assuring compliance with Placer County codified regulations to prepare project-level geotechnical reports and incorporation of site-specific recommended geotechnical measures into Project designs to avoid, reduce and minimize disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of soils.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-45 through 14-48; see also Responses to Comments 19-25.)</p> <p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure GEO-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to comply with TRPA's Excess Coverage Mitigation Program. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The Project area</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Program described in TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 20.5, which is required to reduce significant land coverage impacts from excess existing land coverage to a level of less than significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-48 through 13-70.)</p>	<p>coverage onsite; 2) reduction of coverage offsite; 3) payment of excess coverage mitigation fee; 4) parcel consolidation or parcel line adjustment; or 5) combination of these options.</p> <p>Table 14-7 presents the excess land coverage mitigation fee and reductions in existing land coverage options for each of the alternatives, which are the mitigation options most applicable to the Project area. Land coverage must be permanently retired to supplement the payment of a mitigation fee. (See Table 14-7 of the EIR/EIS.)</p> <p>The impact from excess land coverage under the Proposed Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 5 and 6 can be reduced to a less than significant level through completion of the excess land coverage mitigation program as outlined in TRPA Code section 20.5. The mitigation options are listed according to alternative.</p> <p>Alternative 1A:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Payment of Excess Coverage Mitigation Fee = \$1,482,171; or 2) Permanent retirement of 174,373 square feet of onsite land coverage (offset of \$8.50/square foot assumed) in lieu of the Excess Coverage Mitigation Fee; or 3) Permanent retirement of 176,134 square feet of onsite land coverage (offset of \$8.50/square foot assumed) as required for TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 22 for building height findings and for CEP Governing Board Resolution requirements (Note that Chapter 22 requires a 10 percent reduction of verified existing land coverage, while the CEP Resolution requires a "substantial" reduction in existing land coverage but does not quantify square footage for permanent retirement. The 176,134 square feet stated above is based on 10 percent permanent retirement of verified existing land coverage.); or 4) Combination of Options 1 and 2 for permanent retirement of on or offsite land coverage (offset of \$8.50/square foot assumed) and payment of Excess Coverage Mitigation Fee that is appropriate for the amount of excess 		<p>was originally developed prior to the adoption of the TRPA Regional Plan. The Project area is approximately 1,253 acres with existing development concentrated in the North and South Base area. Table 14-4 in the Environmental Settings section above presents existing land coverage characteristics according to LCDs and the resultant totals. Appendix U contains the TRPA Land Coverage Verification letters on which the calculation of existing land coverage are based and the land capability map on which allowable base land coverage determinations are made.</p> <p>Under Alternative 1A, the Project Applicant commits to removing and restoring no less than 500,000 square feet of existing land coverage within the Project area and permanently retiring at least 10 percent of the total existing land coverage to meet the TRPA CEP resolution, which requires a significant reduction in land coverage within the Project area, and proposed height ordinance amendments, which require at least 10 percent reduction in total existing land coverage. However, resultant land coverage will still exceed TRPA allowable base land coverage limits.</p> <p>Excess land coverage is a significant impact that must be mitigated in accordance with TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 20.5. Mitigation measure GEO-3 presents the mitigation options outlined by TRPA Code of Ordinance Section 20.5 to reduce impacts from excess land coverage to a level of less than significant. Impacts from excess land coverage associated with the Proposed will be reduced to a less than significant level through completion of mitigation options outlined above in mitigation measure GEO-3.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-48 through 13-70; see also Master Responses 17; Responses to Comments 3-b through 3-d, 13a-27 through 13a-34, 13a-81, 14a-3 through 14a-13, 14a-56 and 19-33.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>land coverage that remains (assuming an offset of \$8.50/square foot).</p> <p>According to TRPA Code Section 20.5.A, the payment of the Excess Coverage Mitigation Fee mitigates excess land coverage for the Project area to a level of less than significant. Identification and permanent retirement of onsite land coverage (174,373 square feet) in lieu of payment of the remaining Excess Coverage Mitigation Fee (\$1,482,171) is considered more beneficial option for reducing impacts from excess land coverage in the Project area watersheds. A combination of the two mitigation options, described above under option four, is considered more beneficial than the payment of the excess coverage mitigation fee only. Option 3, however, would be required for Alternative 1A because although options one, two and four would legally mitigate excess land coverage on the project area to a level of less than significant, these mitigation options would not meet the proposed TRPA Chapter 22.4.G amendment requirements for additional height nor the CEP Governing Board Resolution for substantial land coverage reductions, assumed to be at least a 10 percent reduction in existing land coverage. Identification and permanent retirement of 176,134 square feet of onsite or offsite land coverage in lieu of payment of the remaining Excess Coverage Mitigation Fee (\$1,482,171) is considered the most beneficial option (Option number 3 above) for reducing impacts from excess land coverage. HMR proposes to permanently retire land coverage as part of their Master Plan as needed for additional height findings and to mitigate past development.</p> <p>Notable benefits of Alternative 1A that are over and above standard TRPA mitigation requirements reflect those described for Alternative 1. Alternative 1A will utilize pervious pavers and pervious pavement to infiltrate approximately 850 cubic feet of runoff and will install bioretention areas for stormwater treatment (approximately 121,000 square feet) across the North Base, South Base and Mid-mountain areas. Cisterns will capture a portion of roof runoff from buildings, up to 7,800 cubic feet per runoff event. These LID measures are not considered in the TRPA calculations for land coverage reductions but will provide added benefits to the Project through reductions in runoff from impervious</p>		

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>GEO-4. Will construction of the Project result in changes to native geologic substructures or cause erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography from excavation, grading or filling?</p> <p>Construction Related Erosion, Loss of Topsoil and Unstable Soil Conditions. Construction of the Proposed Project Alternative 1A will involve grading, excavation and fill activities, trenching, removal of vegetative cover, and other earthwork activities. These activities could cause temporary increases in runoff, erosion and sedimentation from the Project area if precautions and measures are not taken to contain runoff and erosion on site and to stabilize disturbed soils.</p> <p>Changes in Topography and Geologic Substructures. The Project area has been previously altered by grading and fill activities in the North Base, South Base and Mid-Mountain areas and through the construction of roadways, utilities, ski trails and lifts on the upper mountain. No unique geologic or physical features are identified within the Project area that could be destroyed, covered or modified. Grading activities necessary for the construction of Alternative 1A will not result in significant changes in the topography of the Project area that will be inconsistent with the surrounding conditions.</p> <p>To construct the Project, changes in ground surface relief could occur. As identified on preliminary grading plans Sheets C-10, 11, 12 and 13, Alternative 1A will create cut and fill slopes of up to approximately 20.5 feet maximum, as associated with the water tanks at the Mid-Mountain, and retaining walls 29 to 32 feet, as associated with the North Base underground parking structure, and 18 to 21 feet, as associated with the South Base underground parking structure. Aboveground retaining walls range from 15 feet to one foot in</p>	<p>surfaces. Table 15-8 in Chapter 15, Hydrology, Water Rights, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater, details the impact reductions specified above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-64 through 13-70)</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4a. Design Construction-related BMPs.</p> <p>According to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbooks and TRPA's Handbook of BMPs Construction-related Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD)).</p> <p>Construction (temporary) BMPs for the Project could include, but are not limited to: Fiber Rolls (SE-5), Hydroseeding (EC-4), Stabilized Construction Entrance (LDM Plate C-4), Storm Drain Inlet Protection (SE-10), Silt Fence (SE-1), revegetation techniques, dust control measures, and concrete washout areas.</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 entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the ESD. BMPs shall be designed at a minimum in accordance with the Placer County Guidance Document for Volume and Flow-Based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality Protection. Post-development (permanent) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: above and below ground onsite infiltration basin(s), stormwater treatment vaults, and sand/oil interceptors.</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. All BMPs shall be maintained as required to insure effectiveness.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</p> <p>Construction Related Erosion, Loss of Topsoil and Unstable Soil Conditions. The Geologic Hazards and Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation (Kleinfeider 2007) found no severe soil constraints that would preclude grading and construction activities in the Project area. The final geotechnical engineering reports for the Mid-Mountain area (Holdrege and Kull 2010b) and the North Base area (Holdrege and Kull 2010a) were completed in conformance to section 15.48.390 of Chapter 15 of Placer County Code and TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 61. The reports detail the geotechnical engineering recommendations to be incorporated into final project designs to assure stable soil conditions during and following construction in these portions of the Project area. Although preliminary geotechnical investigations found no severe soil constraints that preclude grading and construction activities, a similar report will be completed for the South Base area during Phase 2 of the Project. The requirements of this report are detailed in the impact analysis for GEO-1.</p> <p>The Project will implement a number of compliance measures to contain runoff and erosion onsite, minimize wind erosion, stabilize disturbed areas, and reduce potential impacts from erosion, loss of topsoil, or unstable soil conditions to a level of less than significant. These compliance measures and associated plans are required by TRPA or Placer County for project-level approval and permitting and include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TRPA Erosion and Sediment Control and BMP Plan (including Winterization Plans per TRPA Code Chapters 25, 64 and 81) • Property Locate and Protect Stockpile Areas (TRPA

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>height.</p> <p>Earthwork. The Project will result in disturbance of close to 40 acres of the 1253-acre Project area. Grading activities are associated with the installation of buildings, parking areas, retaining walls, roadway improvements and underground utilities, construction of which could significantly disrupt soils through creation of unstable soil conditions, soil disruptions, displacements and compaction.</p> <p>Placer County considers impacts from grading and earthwork potentially significant unless standard mitigation measures are applied to assure compliance with codified regulations to avoid and minimize construction-related impacts to soils.</p> <p>TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 64, Section 64.7.B, TRPA Code of Ordinances prohibits excavations in excess of five feet in depth or where there exists a reasonable possibility of interference or interception of a water table except under certain defined and permitted conditions. Alternative 1A will require excavations that exceed five feet and result in interception of groundwater movement during construction at the North and South Base area.</p> <p>Compliance with applicable sections of Article 15.48 of Chapter 15 and Article 12.32 of Chapter 12 of the Placer County Code (Placer County 2006), Placer County General Construction Specifications (Placer County 1994), goals and policies of the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin (Tahoe Regional Planning Agency 2004b), TRPA Code of Ordinances (Tahoe Regional Planning Agency 2004c), the Handbook of Best Management Practices and the Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region (TRPA 1988) and Lahontan's waste discharge requirements and construction permits serves to avoid, reduce and minimize potential impacts associated with runoff, erosion, sedimentation and unstable soils to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>The impact, however, remains significant because 1) the excavations exceeding five feet will intercept seasonal high groundwater during</p>	<p>The Project 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.</p> <p>Contractual evidence of a monthly parking lot sweeping and vacuuming, and catch basin cleaning program shall be provided to the ESD upon request. Failure to do so will be grounds for discretionary permit revocation. 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 County maintenance.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4b. Conform to Provisions of Placer County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance</p> <p>All proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the DRC. All cut/fill slopes shall be at a minimum of 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope but fill slopes shall not exceed 1.5:1 (horizontal:vertical) and the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) concurs with said recommendation.</p> <p>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 assure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas shall have proper erosion control measures</p>		<p>Code Chapter 64, Placer County standard mitigation measure)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscaping/Revegetation Plan (per TRPA Code Chapters 20 and 77); Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP – required for NPDES General Construction Permit for projects with disturbance areas greater than one acre); SEZ Protection and Restoration Plan; and Conformance to TRPA Ordinances and Placer County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance. <p>Construction activities (e.g., ground disturbance) associated with Alternatives 1A will require installation of site-specific temporary BMPs and maintenance and monitoring to ensure that disturbed soils are protected during precipitation events and for over wintering. Mitigation measure GEO-4a outlines the requirements for Placer County BMPs to control erosion and contain sediment on-site.</p> <p>Placer County considers impacts from grading and earthwork potentially significant unless standard mitigation measures are applied to assure compliance with codified regulations to avoid and minimize construction-related impacts to soils. Improvement Plan submittal is required after project permitting, and at such time final grading plans are reviewed and approved as part of the Improvement Plans as detailed in mitigation measure GEO-4b.</p> <p>Placer County requires that stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas be identified on the Improvement Plans and located as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area. If blasting is required for the installation of site improvements, the developer must comply with applicable County Ordinances that relate to blasting and use only State licensed contractors to conduct these operations. Mitigation measures GEO-4c and GEO-4d detail stockpiling and blasting requirements for compliance with Placer codified regulations.</p> <p>Ground disturbance within the Project area will exceed one acre and is subject to the construction stormwater quality permit requirements of the NPDES program. The Project Applicant must obtain this permit from Lahontan and provide evidence of a state-issued WDI/D number or filing of a Notice of Intent (NOI) and fees prior to start of construction, as outlined in mitigation measure GEO-4e. A SWPPP is required under Board Order No. R61-2011-00119 (General Permit No. CAG616002) for discharges of stormwater runoff associated with construction activity involving land disturbance in the Lake Tahoe hydrologic unit.</p> <p>The proposed landscaping plan and revegetation strategies are presented in the project description provided in Chapter 3 of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Changes in Topography and Geologic Substructures. The</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>construction of proposed underground parking structures and requires mitigation to assure that intercepted groundwater does not leave the Project area as surface flow and 2) Placer County considers impacts from grading and earthwork potentially significant unless standard mitigation measures are applied, ensuring compliance with codified regulations to avoid and minimize construction-related impacts to soils. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-71 through 13-83.)</p>	<p>applied for the duration of the construction activity as specified in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the ESD.</p> <p>The applicant shall submit to the 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 prior to Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon 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 DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4c. Identify Stockpiling and/or Vehicle Staging Areas on Improvement Plans</p> <p>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> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4d. Comply with Placer County Blasting Requirements</p> <p>If blasting is required for the installation of site improvements, the Project Applicant shall comply with applicable County Ordinances that relate to blasting and use only State licensed contractors to conduct these operations.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4e. Obtain NPDES Permit</p>		<p>Project area has been previously altered by grading and fill activities in the North Base, South Base and Mid-Mountain areas and through the construction of roadways, utilities, ski trails and lifts on the upper mountain. No unique geologic or physical features are identified within the Project area that could be destroyed, covered or modified.</p> <p>Grading activities necessary for the construction of Alternative 1A will not result in significant changes in the topography of the Project area that will be inconsistent with the surrounding conditions. These base areas are located at the termini of existing ski trails constructed on steep toeslopes. Under t Alternative 1A, the buildings at the North Base will be constructed into the toeslope and are designed to minimize and camouflage changes in topographic grades. Alternative 1A will construct a new lodge and two water tanks at the Mid-Mountain area. The lodge and water tanks will be constructed into the hillside and will create a change in topography as grades are altered to construct building pads. The change in topographic grade will be contained behind the lodge structure and water tanks and will not result in significant visible changes in topography that appear inconsistent with the surrounding conditions. Up to 14 Gondola lift towers and footings will be constructed from the Gondola base terminal at the North Base with spacing ranging from 23.5 feet to 450 feet in a westerly direction to the Gondola top terminal adjacent to the Mid-Mountain Lodge over a horizontal length of approximately 3,350 feet and a vertical rise of 1,040 feet. The Gondola will utilize the existing Madden Chair lift alignment, keep with the existing terrain and will result little impact to existing topography beyond excavations necessary for relocation of lift towers that may shift slightly to accommodate changes in vertical loads in and across the lift line.</p> <p>To construct the other Project components, changes in ground surface relief could occur. As identified on preliminary grading plans Sheets C10, 11, 12 and 13, Alternative 1A will create cut and fill slopes of up to approximately 20.5 feet maximum, as associated with the water tanks at the Mid-Mountain, and retaining walls 29 to 32 feet, as associated with the North Base underground parking structure, and 18 to 21 feet, as associated with the South Base underground parking structure.</p> <p>Aboveground retaining walls range from 15 feet to one foot in height. The Project's impacts will be reduced to a level of less than significant through compliance with Placer County codified regulations and mitigation measures GEO-4b and GEO-4f for mitigation of impacts associated with alteration of topography and relief features.</p> <p>Subsurface explorations (Kleinfelder 2007, Holdrege and Kull 2010a, Holdrege and Kull 2010b) identified no geologic substructures that would be destabilized by earthwork activities. Potential impacts from changes in topography and geologic substructures are less than significant.</p>