

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>The Project's ground disturbance exceeds one-acre and is subject to the construction stormwater quality permit requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. The Project Applicant shall obtain such permit from Lahontan and shall provide to the Engineering and Surveying Department evidence of a state-issued WDID number or filing of a NOI and fees prior to start of construction.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure GEO-4f: Satisfy the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual. (LDM)</b></p> <p>The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the ESD for review and approval. The plans shall show all conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on- and off-site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on-site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees. (NOTE: Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction cost shall be paid). The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or DRC review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.</p> <p>Conceptual landscape plans submitted prior to project approval may require modification during the Improvement Plan process to resolve issues of drainage and traffic safety. Any building permits associated with this phased project shall not be</p>		<p><b>Earthwork.</b> The estimates for grading, cut, and fill volumes for the North Base, South Base and Mid-Mountain Areas are totaled in Table 14-8 of the EIR/EIS for Alternative 1A. The portions of the Project area disturbed by trenching activities will be revegetated as outlined in Chapter 3.</p> <p>Under Alternative 1A, imported fill material will not be required because fill areas in the Project area will use material that is generated from cut areas. HMR has identified additional areas suitable for the receipt of excess cut materials, including the project locations and approximate fill volume needed to remove, redesign and realign on-mountain access roads, increase vegetation cover on ski trails and improve water quality and skiing conditions within the Project area. These areas are detailed in Chapter 3.</p> <p>Placer County requires compliance with standard mitigation measures for potential impacts from earthwork. Implementation of mitigation measures GEO-4b, GEO-4f and GEO-1 assure compliance with Placer County codified regulations to reduce potential impacts from unstable soil conditions, soil disruptions, displacements and compaction.</p> <p><b>TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 64, Section 64.7.B.</b> 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. Excavations at the Mid-Mountain area are not expected to intercept groundwater movement (Holdrege and Kull 2010b). Based on building cross sections for the Proposed Project (Alternative 1/1A) prepared by Nichols for the North Base, South Base and Mid-Mountain areas (see sheets C-19, C-20 and C-21 of the Civil Plan Set), excavations will be in excess of five feet in some areas to accommodate appropriate depths for underground parking structures. Soil Hydrologic exhibits in Appendix D show the existing grade, finished floor elevations and the groundwater cross-sectional profiles. The North and South Base areas have been designed to avoid groundwater interception from hotel and skier services structures and minimize groundwater interception in the underground parking structure areas. The EIR/EIS includes information regarding the findings for TRPA Code Section 64.7.</p> <p>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. Code Section 64.7.A(2)(a-j) outlines the exceptions to the prohibition of groundwater interception or interference. Under Code Section 64.7.A(2)(i) TRPA may make exceptions if excavations are "necessary to provide below grade parking for projects, qualifying for additional height under Subsection 22.4.D, to achieve environmental goals including scenic improvements, land coverage reductions, 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>issued until the Improvement Plans for that project phase are approved by the ESD.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure GEO-4g, Final Construction Dewatering Plan</b></p> <p>The redevelopment in the Project area shall involve excavation in the North and South Base areas. The Second Revised Soils Hydrologic Scoping and Final Report (Kleinfelder 2010) suggests that groundwater will be intercepted during construction of underground parking facilities. Because groundwater will be intercepted, which is the process of diverting and/or capturing the groundwater flows, dewatering, which is the removal and disposition of the water itself, shall be implemented onsite.</p> <p>The final dewatering plan shall be further developed by the construction contractor based on the final site design of the selected alternative. The construction contractor shall demonstrate that they have a reliable plan for dewatering as well as contingency in case that plan does not function as expected. The contractor shall have demonstrable experience in dewatering operations and evidence of such experience shall be provided to TRPA and the County with the dewatering plan.</p> <p>There are a number of methods for dewatering intercepted groundwater, from drilling wells upslope to installing sheet piling to constructing temporary or permanent concrete walls with dewatering galleries installed. These decisions shall be made in collaboration with the earthwork contractor chosen to construct the Project and the earthwork contractor shall be responsible for addressing the issue effectively. Interception methods are fairly well understood. Interception strategies shall be explored and implemented in parallel with the actual dewatering strategies. Typical approaches to dewatering intercepted groundwater flows during construction shall include, but shall not be limited to the following: irrigation systems, holding tanks, low mountain feed, snowmaking line feed, distribution (sprinkler system), ground infiltration system, full treatment and surface water discharge (this option would require a temporary discharge permit from Lahontan and may require treatments for the removal of sediment, such as settling or baker tanks), groundwater recharge wells, and/or sewer</p>		<p>areawide drainage systems, and measures are included in the project to prevent groundwater from leaving the Project area as surface flow and that groundwater, if any is interfered with, is rerouted into groundwater flow to avoid adverse impacts to hydrologic conditions, SEZ vegetation, and mature trees".</p> <p>Because sub-section 22.4.D pertains to Project areas within both a TRPA adopted redevelopment plan and a TRPA adopted community plan, this exemption would not directly apply to the Project area (i.e., HMR Ski Area Master Plan Area). TRPA Code Section 64.7.A(2)(i) is proposed for amendment under the Alternative 1A to allow projects within Ski Area Master Plans to provide for below grade parking if adverse impacts to hydrologic conditions, SEZ vegetation and mature trees are avoided.</p> <p>Implementation of Placer County standard mitigation measures GEO-4a, GEO-4b, GEO-4c, GEO-4d, GEO-4e and GEO-4f assure compliance with Placer County codified regulations pertaining to potential grading and construction-related impacts within the Project area. Compliance with codified regulations and Placer County permitting conditions reduce potential impacts of construction-related erosion, loss of topsoil and unstable soil conditions to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Implementation of GEO-4g assures that construction impacts to groundwater will be reduced to a level of less than significant based on criteria for Impact GEO-4 pertaining to construction-related groundwater interception. Implementation of the groundwater protection measures approved for the Final Construction Dewatering Plan will assure that the Project complies with TRPA and State of California permit requirements to contain intercepted groundwater on-site and maintain groundwater quality throughout the construction period...</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-71 through 13-83; Master Response 18; Responses to Comments 7-3, 14a-13, 14a-74, and 93-10, 155-3 and 27-1.)</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><b>GEO-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to geologic resources?</b></p> <p><b>Geologic and Seismic Hazards.</b> Geologic impacts related to the HMR Ski Area Master Plan Project and future projects in the region will involve hazards and potential impacts related to soils conditions, erosion and seismic activity. The entire region along the west shore of Lake Tahoe is susceptible to impacts from seismic activity; however, soils and geologic influences are typically site-specific and confined to discrete spatial locations. Construction and operation of the Project will not alter the potential for seismic activity or affect the level of intensity at which a seismic event on a nearby project site is experienced. Geologic impacts require project-level planning and site-specific design to avoid and minimize potential hazards and do not combine to create cumulative impact conditions beyond Project area boundaries. The exception to this general condition would occur in areas where a large geologic feature such as a fault zone or active landslide area might affect the geology of an off-site location up or down gradient. These circumstances are not present within the Project area. Project-specific geotechnical evaluations are required as part of the project design, approval and permitting process. As such, project facilities in the Lake Tahoe Basin and throughout the region are required to utilize standard engineering practices and to comply</p>	<p>inflows (this option is not typically viable for ongoing dewatering because the Truckee Tahoe Sanitary District typically denies permits for dewatering inflow into their sewer system due to the stress additional inflow puts on their treatment facilities, but shall be considered for an emergency situation). Dewatering discharges shall be treated to a level such that they do not contain pollutants, including but not limited to sediment, before discharging to surface waters, should discharge to surface water be necessary.</p> <p>A preliminary plan shall also be submitted to Lahontan, approved and in place prior to excavation and once excavation is underway, the primary plan shall be implemented with alternative plans in queue and implementable within a short window if necessary.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-80 through 13-83.)</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 seismic design standards and adopted building codes to reduce the potential for cumulative geologic and seismic impacts during construction and operations to a less than significant level. The HMR Ski Area Master Plan Project is no exception and will not make a considerable contribution towards cumulatively significant effects to geologic hazards.</p> <p><b>TRPA Land Coverage.</b> Excess land coverage within a particular LCD, parcel or Project area is a significant impact. The Project area is presently overcovered. The Project will reduce total existing land coverage within the Project area but will still result in excess land coverage in LCDs 1a and 2. Compliance with TRPA's excess coverage mitigation program defined in Code Section 20.5 will reduce the Project's contribution to excess land coverage to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Other reasonably foreseeable projects will have individually varied effects on land coverage, increasing, maintaining or reducing impervious surfaces. Projects that propose land coverage in excess of TRPA allowable base land coverage will be required to incorporate mitigation measures and comply with TRPA's excess coverage mitigation program to limit incremental contributions and conform to TRPA land coverage restrictions. With project-level mitigations, the Project when considered in context of other reasonably foreseeable projects will not make significant contributions towards cumulative effects from land coverage.</p> <p><b>Unstable Soil Conditions.</b> Considerable cumulative impacts could result from unstable slopes and resultant erosion if multiple projects are constructed concurrently. The CWE analysis considered future development within the Project area watersheds combined with potential future development outside of the Project area and determined that the overall watersheds are below their Total Watershed TOCs, with the exception of Invervening Zone 7000 for reasons discussed above. The scenario of complete buildout within the watersheds as based on Bailey land coverage coefficients determined that even under this buildout scenario annualized total sediment would not exceed Total Watershed TOCs. The HMR CWE analysis concludes that annualized</p>			

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

145

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>total sediment will be reduced through implementation of the Alternative 1A.</p> <p>Implementation of compliance and standard mitigation measures for erosion control during construction activities (i.e. Placer County and TRPA grading plans, TRPA Erosion Control Plan, geotechnical engineering recommendations, NPDES permit conditions and SWPPP) and during operations (i.e. Permanent BMP Plan, Landscaping and Revegetation Plan, Inspection, Operations and Maintenance Plan, Compliance Monitoring for Waste Discharge Requirements) will minimize the potential project-level effects to a level of less than significant. Permitting for other reasonable and foreseeable projects will require similar plans and BMP performance standards. The possibility for BMP failure exists on any Project area, especially when extreme runoff conditions exceed BMP design capacities. The likelihood of the effects of BMP failures in one Project area combining with those of other projects is low because BMP failures are typically localized. Therefore, the Project will not make significant contributions towards cumulative effects from erosion or unstable slopes. (LS)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a, Design Water Quality Protection BMPs According to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbooks and TRPA's Handbook of BMPs.</p> <p>Water quality 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>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</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a, 1b and 1c and GEO-4a, 4b, 4c and 4e, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by assuring respectively, assure that permanent BMPs are designed to proven effectiveness levels. Compliance with Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1d, HYDRO-1e, and HYDRO-1f, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will ensure improvements to surface water quality and that stormwater treatment systems and permanent BMPs are maintained to the highest levels of effectiveness. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these 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><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> A number of compliance measures, which are required by codified regulations or law, and standard engineering features and permanent BMPs are incorporated into the Project to avoid, reduce and minimize potential impacts to surface water quality and beneficial uses.</p>
<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-83 through 14-85 )</p> <p><b>HYDROLOGY, WATER RIGHTS, SURFACE WATER QUALITY AND GROUNDWATER</b></p> <p><b>HYDRO-1:</b> Will the construction or long-term operations of the Project violate existing waste discharge permit provisions or result in discharges into surface waters (streams, SEZs or Lake Tahoe) so that beneficial uses and water quality standards are not maintained?</p> <p>Accelerated erosion potential and surface water quality impacts are present during construction phasing and occur when protective vegetative cover is removed and soils are disturbed. Site disturbance during construction could pose temporary impacts to surface water quality and beneficial uses of Project area receiving waters through increased pollutant concentrations in stormwater runoff. Runoff from disturbed and modified impervious surfaces, ski trails, roads and snow storage areas could occur as permanent long-term impacts from ski area operations. Indirect impacts from atmospheric</p>			

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

146

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>deposition of particulates could occur. If not addressed by the Project, potentially significant impacts to surface water quality could occur under Alternative 1A construction runoff, post-construction runoff, eroding slopes, atmospheric deposition, snowmelt, accidental spills, or cumulative watershed effects within the Project area. This is a potentially significant impact. (PS)</p> <p><b>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-48 through 15-74.)</b></p>	<p>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: underground water quality treatment vaults, infiltration galleries, sediment basins, bioretention areas and revegetation of disturbed areas. No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.</p> <p>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. 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. 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><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1b. Storm Drain Stenciling</b></p> <p>All storm drain inlets and catch basins within the Project area shall be permanently marked/embossed with prohibitive language such as "No Dumping! Flows to Creek" or other language as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department and/or graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping. Message details, placement, and locations shall be included on the</p>		<p><b>Construction Impacts on Water Quality.</b> Construction activities associated with Alternative 1A will involve land disturbance and earthwork, including excavation and backfill, stockpiling of soils, trenching and removal of vegetative cover. 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. The degree of disturbance is related to the amount of land coverage, which is detailed in Chapter 14, Geology, Soils and Seismicity, under Impact GEO-3 of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Alternative 1A will implement a number of compliance measures to control erosion, contain runoff and erosion on-site during construction activities and stabilize disturbed areas following construction activities to reduce potential impacts from erosion, loss of topsoil, or unstable soil conditions to a level of less than significant. Civil Sheets C15 through C18 detail the BMP Plans for the developed portions of the Project area.</p> <p>TRPA and Placer County codified regulations and Lahontan construction permit conditions require these compliance measures and plans for project-level permitting and approval and include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HMR Erosion and Sediment Control and BMP Plan (including Winterization Plans per TRPA Code Chapters 25, 64 and 81; Placer County Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance);</li> <li>• Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP – required for NPDES Construction Permit);</li> <li>• Properly Locate and Protect Stockpile Areas (TRPA Code Chapter 64 and Placer County standard mitigation measure);</li> <li>• Properly Locate and Manage Snow Storage Areas (TRPA Code Chapter 81, Lahontan WDRS);</li> <li>• Landscaping/Revegetation Plan (per TRPA Code Chapters 20 and 77 and Placer County standard mitigation measure); and</li> <li>• Conformance to TRPA and Placer County grading ordinances.</li> </ul> <p>Alternative 1A will implement effective, reasonable and appropriate measures to protect water quality and beneficial uses of Project area receiving waters and will comply with TRPA, Lahontan and Placer County codified regulations and construction permit conditions. The EIR/EIS analyses in detail the effective, reasonable and appropriate measures of Alternative 1A for the protection water quality and beneficial uses of the Project area receiving waters:</p> <p>Based on the evaluation criteria for impact HYDRO-1, the potential short-term, temporary impacts to surface water quality and beneficial uses during construction activities are reduced 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>Improvement Plans. ESD-approved signs and prohibitive language and/or graphical icons, which prohibit illegal dumping, shall be posted at public access points along channels and creeks within the project area. The Homeowners' and/or Property Owner's association is responsible for maintaining the legibility of stamped messages and signs.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1c. Stormwater Routing for Refuse Management</b></p> <p>All stormwater runoff shall be diverted around trash storage areas to minimize contact with pollutants. Trash container areas shall be screened or walled to prevent off-site transport of trash by the forces of water or wind. Trash containers shall not be allowed to leak and must remain covered when not in use.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1d. Inspection, Operations, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan for Stormwater Treatment Systems and Permanent BMPs</b></p> <p>The Project Applicant shall prepare and implement an Inspection, Operations, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan for Stormwater Treatment Systems and Permanent BMPs. This plan shall comply with TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 25 and Chapter 81 and Lahontan's updated WDRs. TRPA, Lahontan, and Placer County shall review the plan prior to issuance of final Project approval. Post-project monitoring shall include post-project BMP effectiveness monitoring and stormwater monitoring as detailed below.</p> <p><b>Post-Project BMP Effectiveness Monitoring.</b></p> <p>Revegetation/landscaping and slope stabilizing measures shall be visually monitored annually for the first five years following construction to assess adequacy and effectiveness of BMPs. Additional BMPs shall be prescribed by the TRPA if existing treatments fail to protect the site from accelerated erosion. A qualified consultant or trained HMR staff (Note: completion of the TRPA contractor certification training is recommended) shall monitor restoration progress.</p> <p>Visual monitoring of the condition and effectiveness of BMPs shall occur before and after storm events, and if necessary, corrective</p>		<p>less than significant under TRPA codified regulations and less than significant after mitigation for Placer County CEQA analysis. Placer County standard mitigation measures, detailed as HYDRO-1a GEO-4a, GEO-4b, GEO-4c and GEO-4e herein, assure compliance with Placer County codified regulations. The mitigation measures serve to protect surface water quality and beneficial uses by requiring temporary BMPs be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbooks and Improvement Plan approval to conform to the Placer County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance.</p> <p><b>Long-Term Operational Impacts and Compliance with Board Order No. 6-95-86A2.</b> Runoff from impervious surfaces and disturbed slopes can carry a variety of pollutants, such as metals, oils and grease and sediment and chemical residues, from Project area roadways, parking lots, rooftops, and other surfaces and deposit them in adjacent waterways. Pollutant concentrations vary depending on storm intensity, land use, elapsed time between storms, and the volume of runoff generated in a given area that reaches a receiving water. Upon approval of a preferred project alternative, the Project Applicant will be required to submit a Form 200 for Application/Report of Waste Discharge for new facilities and changes in design and operations from the existing WDRs. Lahontan will then process the application for updated WDRs for the Project area. Ski area operations cannot violate WDR provisions or result in discharges into surface waters (streams, SEZs or Lake Tahoe) so that beneficial uses and WQOs are not maintained. Additionally, the Project will have to meet the anti-degradation findings under State Board Resolution 68-16.</p> <p>The Project implements stormwater treatment systems, LID strategies (perVIOUS pavement and pavers, cisterns, heated walk ways, bioretention areas for stormwater treatment and slope revegetation to improve infiltration of runoff), improved snow storage and fuel storage, and revegetation and landscaping to protect beneficial uses and preserve and improve surface water quality.</p> <p><b>Winter Roadway and Snowmelt Management.</b> Snowmelt from snow disposal areas can represent not only a significant source of nutrients but also harmful hydrocarbons, metals, and biological oxygen demand. The current TRPA Code of Ordinances references the Handbook of Best Management Practices, which is Volume II of the 208 Plan and provides snow storage guidelines, including: adequate sizing of the area according to estimated snow amounts, avoidance of SEZ areas, and placement of storage areas up-gradient of stormwater treatment and BMP facilities. The TRPA CEP has a goal of improved snow storage. Alternative 1A improves upon existing snow storage and management through the location of storage areas a greater distance from SEZ areas and in areas that will drain 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>actions shall be taken. The contractor shall be required to maintain the effectiveness of the BMPs until the disturbed areas are stabilized and erosion is no longer a substantial threat. Restoration of disturbed areas shall be in accordance with the Restoration/Landscaping Plan.</p> <p><u>Post-Project Stormwater Monitoring.</u> Post-project stormwater monitoring shall be performed annually for a minimum of five years following construction or for the period required in the Lahontan permit for comparison with pre-project monitoring results and for determination of compliance with State and TRPA discharge standards. Fine sediment shall be monitored as specified by TRPA and future Lake Tahoe TMDL research directives.</p> <p>Monitoring results shall address the following components:</p> <p>Compliance of project area runoff with State and TRPA discharge standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stormwater treatment system effectiveness;</li> <li>• Permanent BMP effectiveness;</li> <li>• Revegetation/Landscaping effectiveness;</li> <li>• Assessment of performance of strategies outlined in the Stormwater treatment calculations; and</li> <li>• BMP and Stormwater treatment system maintenance regimes.</li> </ul> <p>Miscellaneous Monitoring. Performance of LID strategies (pervious pavement and pavers, cisterns, heated walk ways, bioretention areas for stormwater treatment and revegetation of slopes to improve infiltration of runoff) shall be monitored in accordance with requirements and conditions outlined in the TRPA Project Permit.</p> <p><u>Inspection and Maintenance Program.</u> All stormwater treatment systems and permanent BMPs shall be visually inspected monthly and maintained as necessary to assure optimal performance of systems. A long-term maintenance program shall be developed as based on monitoring results.</p> <p><u>Reporting.</u> Monitoring results shall be submitted to TRPA in the Post-Project Bi-Annual Monitoring</p>		<p>bioretention areas and to stormwater treatment systems. Figure 15-4 of the EIR/EIS illustrates the proposed snow storage areas in the North Base and Figure 15-4A illustrates proposed snow storage areas in the South Base under Alternative 1A. Snow storage will not occur within Placer County ROWs or SEZ setbacks.</p> <p>Sanding activities on Placer County roadways will continue between the months of October through May as dependent on weather conditions. In 2008/2009 Placer County Department of Public Works applied approximately 8.5 tons of sand in the vicinity of the Project area. In 2009/2010 approximately 21.5 tons were applied (Placer County Road Application Logs for Zone 1, Area 22 – 2008, 2009, 2010). Placer County Department of Public Works will typically send out a sweeper within 72 hours after the sand is applied and weather conditions permit removal of loose sand. Placer County Department of Public Works uses Vactor equipment each summer to clean out road culverts and remaining sand that was applied the prior winter season. Typically the amount of sand removed each year exceeds the amount applied by the County because Placer County also removes some abrasives applied to SR 89 by Caltrans as well as some incidental naturally occurring sediment/soils.</p> <p><b>Fuel Storage.</b> Under Alternatives 1A the maintenance facility currently located in the South Base area and in proximity to Homewood Creek will be relocated to the Mid-Mountain area. The existing 3,000-gallon fuel tank will remain in use at the South Base area and could be located in close proximity to the chalets to be constructed during Phase 2. The fuel tank will be upgraded to meet the requirements of the NTFPD and Lahontan, include secondary containment for accidental spills, and be located an adequate distance from Phase 2 structures to ensure safety of residents.</p> <p>New diesel fuel tanks constructed at the new Mid-Mountain area maintenance facility in Phase 1 development could also be used exclusively. If constructed, these Mid-Mountain tanks would be sized to sustain operations throughout the winter since they will be inaccessible by fuel trucks when roadways are snow covered. The estimates for winter operations total 40,000 gallons that would be stored in two 20,000-gallon above ground tanks located beneath the maintenance facility within the crawl space. The tanks will be serviced from the paved apron adjacent to the maintenance building. The use and operations are required to conform to the California Fire Code and receive approval from the North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District (NLTFPD), as discussed in Chapter 17, Public Safety and Hazards.</p> <p>Moving the maintenance facility from the South Base area, where accidental spills could reach Homewood Creek and SEZ areas, to the Mid-Mountain area, which contains no active stream channel, reduces the potential for surface water quality impacts from</p>

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

149

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Report. Recommended reporting dates are December 1st to accommodate for winterization of the project area and stormwater quality reporting according to water year (i.e. October 1, 2010 to September 30, 2011 is Water Year 2011) and June 1st during spring runoff. The report shall summarize site conditions, maintenance activities, physical observation on water quality and the degree of sedimentation, if apparent. The report will include 6 months worth of observations and corresponding field measurements and laboratory analytical results.</p> <p>Surface water that is infiltrated onto groundwater shall not exceed the TRPA and State discharge to land treatment limits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Nitrogen as N: 5 mg/L;</li> <li>• Total Phosphorus as P: 1mg/L;</li> <li>• Iron as Fe: 4 mg/L;</li> <li>• Turbidity: 200 NTU; and</li> <li>• Oil and Grease: 40 mg/L.</li> </ul> <p>Surface water runoff discharged to Homewood Creek shall not exceed the TRPA surface runoff concentrations stated in Chapter 81 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and the water quality objectives of the State for receiving waters outlined in the WDRs.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1e. Apply Project Security Fee Towards BMP and Stormwater System Improvements and/or Restoration Projects if Discharge Limits are Not Met</b></p> <p>If post-project monitoring determines that TRPA or State discharge standards are exceeded, the TRPA Security Deposit shall be used to implement additional water quality treatment needs in Madden Creek, Quail Lake Creek and Homewood Creek watersheds and portions of Intervening Zone 7000. The Project Applicant and its contractors shall make repairs or improvements to the proposed permanent BMPs, LID strategies (pervious pavement and pavers, cisterns, heated walk ways, bioretention areas for stormwater treatment, and revegetation of slopes to improve infiltration if runoff) and stormwater treatment systems to improve performance and effectiveness per TRPA and Lahontan requirements. If the repairs and/or improvements result in compliance with receiving water quality objectives and discharge to land treatment and surface water limits, then no additional mitigation</p>		<p>accidental spills. Retaining the existing fuel tank at the South Base area does not increase potential impacts to Homewood Creek, assuming the fuel tank is properly maintained and serviced.</p> <p><b>Stormwater Treatment Systems and Bioretention Areas.</b></p> <p>There are three perennial stream channels draining the Project area and potential hydraulic connections between ground and surface waters within the Project area. TRPA environmental thresholds WQ-4, which outlines tributary standards, WQ-5, which outlines runoff water quality parameters and standards, WQ-6, which addresses discharges to groundwater, and WQ-7, which requires attainment of existing water quality standards, apply to the Project area. TRPA discharge limits are listed in Table 15-4 of the EIR/EIS and Lahontan WQOS are listed in Table 15-5. As discussed in the EIR/EIS, no statistically significant degradation of surface water quality due to operations within the Project area has been measured.</p> <p>To address potential long-term effects to beneficial uses and surface water quality, Alternative 1A will revegetate disturbed areas (as discussed in Chapter 3 of the EIR/EIS and under potential construction impacts above) and install permanent BMPs, LID strategies and stormwater treatment systems as described in the EIR/EIS. The combined stormwater treatment approach will capture, treat and infiltrate runoff from the Project area for expected improvements in stormwater quality as compared to existing conditions.</p> <p>Placer County requires installation of standard mitigation measures to permanently mark/emboss with prohibitive language such as "No Dumping! Flows to Creek" or other language as approved by the ESD, and/or graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping. Diversion of stormwater runoff around trash storage areas to minimize contact with pollutants is also required. Mitigation measures to assure compliance with these Placer County codified regulations are detailed as mitigation measures HYDRO-1b and HYDRO-1c.</p> <p><b>CEP Resolution Compliance – Reduction in Land Coverage and Sediment Loading.</b> The CEP Resolution for the Project requires reductions in land coverage and sediment loading for the Project area. Alternative 1A reduces total existing land coverage within the Project area by 13, 8, 23 and 20 percent, respectively, and relocate land coverage from lower capability LCDs 1a and 1b to higher capability LCDs 2, 4, 5 and 6. Land coverage is detailed in Chapter 14, Geology, Soils and Seismicity under impact GEO-3 of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Reductions in land coverage are expected to result in reductions in sediment loading. Sediment loading was modeled for the North Base, South Base and Mid-Mountain areas and for Tahoe Ski Bowl Way (redevelopment areas).</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>is required.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1f. Restrict Development within Quail Lake Creek Watershed until Compliance with Project Area TOC</b></p> <p>The Project proposes no development or change in existing conditions within this watershed. Based on exceedance of the Quail Lake Creek Project Area TOC, no development within Project area portion of the Quail Lake Creek Watershed shall be permitted until annualized total sediment (T/Yr) is reduced to below the Project Area TOC (147 T/Yr). The Project Applicant shall identify sediment source control and land coverage removal projects within this watershed that will be completed prior to implementation of capital improvements or other actions that create soil disturbance. The Project Applicant shall monitor the effectiveness of these projects and update the HMR CWE analysis for the Quail Lake Creek watershed based on the results.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure BIO-9. Final Landscape/Revegetation Plan and Fertilizer Management Plan</b></p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for BIO-9 above.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure GEO-4a. Design Construction-related BMPs According to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbooks and TRPA's Handbook of BMPs</b></p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for GEO-4 above.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure GEO-4b. Conform to Provisions of Placer County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance</b></p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for GEO-4 above.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure GEO-4c. Identify Stockpiling and/or Vehicle Staging Areas on Improvement Plans</b></p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included</p>		<p>Table 15-8 of the EIR/EIS compares annual sediment loads between the 20-year BMP SWMP and the Project SWMP. Annual total sediment leaving the project area is connected to the amount of stormwater runoff leaving the Project area each year. The Project SWMP will capture more of the stormwater volume and thus more of the annual total sediment load as shown in Table 15-8. Appendix Z-2 presents graphs for comparisons of annual sediment loading for Alternative 1A for WYs 1994, 2003 and 2006. Under Alternative 1A and under a precipitation regime for a very wet WY, the Project SWMP for the North and South Base areas is expected to decrease annual total sediment by approximately 80 percent and 81 percent, respectively, as compared to the 20-year BMP SWMP (Table 15-8).</p> <p><b>Combined Level of Long-term Impact to Surface Water Quality and Beneficial Uses.</b> Compared to existing conditions, long-term contributions from the Project area to stormwater runoff, snowmelt and atmospheric deposition will be reduced and minimized through installation of stormwater treatment systems, bioretention areas, reductions in land coverage, and continued revegetation of disturbed areas and ski trails. Conclusive results concerning effectiveness of compliance measures cannot be adequately stated without inspection, monitoring and maintenance of the proposed treatment systems and permanent BMPs, however. As a result, the level of impact is considered potentially significant until monitoring results prove compliance with TRPA discharge standards, as outlined in the TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 81, and State WQOS, as outlined in the Lahontan Basin Plan and forthcoming updated WDRs. Mitigation measure HYDRO-1d outlines the requirements of the Inspection, Operations, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan for Stormwater Treatment Systems and Permanent BMPs. Mitigation measure HYDRO-1e outlines follow up measures to be taken should monitoring results report compromised effectiveness of permanent BMPs or stormwater treatment systems.</p> <p><b>Compliance with CWE Project Area TOCs.</b> The existing sediment yields for Intervening Zone 7000, Madden Creek, and Quail Lake Creek Project area watersheds currently exceed the Project Area TOCs, while the existing sediment yield for Homewood Creek watershed is below its Project area TOC. The HMR CWE analysis concludes that implementation of the Alternative 1A will reduce sediment yields originating within the Project area watersheds as compared to existing conditions. Three of the four sediment yields will be at or below their Project Area TOC through implementation of the Project.</p> <p><b>Combined Compliance with CWE Project Area TOCs.</b> Project Area TOCs for Madden Creek and Homewood Creek watersheds and Intervening Zone 7000 will not be exceeded under Alternative 1A. Sediment yields from the Project area are expected to decrease through implementation of these alternatives, as</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>under findings for GEO-4 above.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure GEO-4e. Obtain NPDES Permit</b></p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for GEO-4 above.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure GEO-4f. Satisfy the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual. (LDM).</b></p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for GEO-4 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-69 through 15-73.)</p>		<p>supported by the CWE analysis results and conclusions summarized above and detailed in Appendix W. Implementation of Alternative 1A will reduce sediment yield in Quail Lake Creek watershed but could still result in exceedance of the Project Area TOC.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Temporary construction-related impacts to surface water quality will be avoided and reduced through implementation of effective, reasonable and appropriate measures (compliance measures) to protect water quality as required by federal, regional, State and local regulations and TRPA and NPDES permit requirements. Revegetation and landscaping are required for all disturbed areas to protect and stabilize soils and thus minimize potential impacts to surface water quality and beneficial uses. Fertilizer management (i.e. mitigation measure BIO-9) will conform to TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 81.7 to minimize the potential for fertilizers to enter surface waters.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measures HYDRO-1a, 1b and 1c and GEO-4a, 4b, 4c and 4e, respectively, assure that permanent BMPs are designed to proven effectiveness levels identified in the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbooks, that storm drain inlets are marked to discourage illegal dumping, that stormwater runoff is diverted around trash storage areas, and that final grading plans conform to Placer County grading and erosion control ordinance.</p> <p>The degree of surface water quality improvement is based on engineering design objectives (e.g. Vortech treatment vault and Contech Stormfilter specifications), sediment models (e.g. project area LSCP base area loading and HMR CWE sediment yield exercises), BMP and stormwater treatment effectiveness ratings, and best available science (Referenced to IERS 2010; Grismer 2010; Ballesterio, T.P. et al. 2009; Clear Creek Solutions 2005; Kennedy Jenks Consultants 2007; NDOT 2006; Prall and Sokulsky 2008; Roseen et al 2009; Puget Sound Action Team 2005; USEPA 2000; Hood et al 2007; Funkhouser 2007; Montalto et al. 2007). Post-project monitoring, to be outlined as a requirement of mitigation measure HYDRO-1d, will determine the degree of predicted improvements to surface water quality and ensure that stormwater treatment systems and permanent BMPs are maintained to the highest levels of effectiveness.</p> <p>If the appropriate plans are approved and post-project monitoring (HYDRO-1d) determines compliance, project design and recommended mitigation measures are effective in reducing ski area operational impacts to surface water quality, then long-term impacts are reduced to a level of less than significant. Should post-project monitoring determine that measures are ineffective, mitigation measure HYDRO-1e shall be implemented, which requires the application of the TRPA project security fee towards replacement, expansion and/or upgrade of BMPs and stormwater treatment systems to maintain surface water quality 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><b>HYDRO-2: Will Project construction or operation alter the existing surface water drainage patterns or cause increased runoff resulting in flooding or stream bank erosion or contribute runoff in rates or volumes that will exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems so that a 20-year, 1-hour storm runoff (approximately one inch per hour) cannot be contained on the site?</b></p> <p>Alternative 1A will implement measures to improve stream bank conditions and related streambank erosion and will not cause increased runoff resulting in flooding. However, because the Preliminary Conceptual Revegetation and SEZ Restoration Plan described in Appendix C is insufficient to allow for TRPA permitting and subsequent construction, the potential impacts to existing surface water drainage patterns and stream bank erosion are considered significant. (Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-74 through 15-106.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2a. TRPA Soil Hydrologic Approval Conditions for BMPs.</b></p> <p>The TRPA soil hydrologic review does not give approval for the BMP design, but rather, evaluates the location and depths of BMPs as currently presented on the Civil Plans. As the Project is not at 100 percent design, it is understood that the design for BMPs may be modified and could potentially require an additional soil hydrologic review at the time of the project application. It is recognized that the project area has site-specific constraints related to the depth of excavations in relationship to groundwater, interception of groundwater by subterranean garages (i.e. underground parking structures) and significant amounts of stormwater and surface water that need to be treated and infiltrated as part of the proposed development. As such, the TRPA Stormwater Management Program staff has indicated that they require the bottom of all stormwater infiltrating features to be at least two (2) feet above the seasonal high water table, which will aid in achieving 'above and beyond' mitigation measures required for this Project as a participant in the CEP. These guidelines have been met under the current proposed design in all areas except "North-1". For this area, or any stormwater infiltrating areas that may have less than two (2) feet of separation to the seasonal high water table, the stormwater being infiltrated must meet TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 81 in regard to surface water discharge standards and/or be redesigned to provide the required two (2) feet separation. The</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Construction and operation of Alternative 1A will not cause increased runoff resulting in flooding or stream bank erosion or contribute runoff in rates or volumes that will exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems so that a 20-year, 1-hour storm runoff (approximately one inch per hour) cannot be beneficial uses. If monitoring shows WQOs are continually exceeded, the Project Applicant will be required to make repairs or improvements to BMPs and stormwater treatment systems to improve effectiveness per TRPA permit requirements and WDRS. If WQOs continue to be exceeded, the Project will be subject to Lahontan and TRPA directives towards the upgrade and/or expansion and/or replacement of the installed stormwater treatment systems. These additional measures, if necessary, will ensure continued efforts toward installation and maintenance of effective, reasonable and appropriate measures to protect surface water quality and beneficial uses.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 15-48 through 15-74; Chapter 23, Master Response 18; Responses to Comments 9-7, 13a-11, 13a-18, 14a-19 through 14a-26, 14a-28, 14a-30, 14a-31, 14a-33; Appendix W of the EIR/EIS.)</p> <p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2a, HYDRO-2b, HYDRO-2c, HYDRO-2d, GEO-4b, GEO-4f, and BIO-5a, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by (1) requiring compliance with TRPA Soil Hydrologic Approval conditions that a separation of 2 feet from the bottom of stormwater infiltration galleries and seasonal high water table is maintained and soil treatment remains effective; (2) requiring a drainage report for each phase of the Project that identifies water quality protection features and methods to be used during construction and post-construction to reduce erosion, water quality degradation and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable; (3) assures that stormwater treatment facilities are designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual; (4) assuring that post-development runoff is reduced to at or below pre-project conditions; (5) satisfying the requirements of the Placer County Grading Ordinance and LDM for the protection of existing drainages; and (6) improving the level of detail presented in the Preliminary Conceptual Revegetation and SEZ Restoration Plan to allow for TRPA permitting and subsequent construction. Compliance with codified regulations adequately reduces potential impacts to a level of less than significant. 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>final BMP plan to be submitted as part of the project application will be reviewed, and approved, by TRPA Stormwater Management Program staff.</p> <p>The soil hydrologic review gives conceptual approval for the depth (18 inches) and location of bioretention areas as presented on the site plans. This approval is based on the concept that bioretention areas are located over open and infiltrating matrices, but does not apply to bioretention over closed impermeable pretreatment vaults.</p>		<p>contained on the site. Stormwater treatment systems are proposed to capture, treat, and infiltrate a minimum of the 20-year, 1-hour storm volume on-site, thus removing this stormwater volume from entering existing municipal separate storm sewer systems downgradient from the North Base area and Homewood Creek in the South Base area. Stormwater treatment system capacities are maximized for measured site conditions.</p>
	<p><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2b. Submit Final Drainage Report—Conformance with Section 5 of the Placer County Land Development Manual and Stormwater Management Manual</b></p> <p>The Project Applicant shall prepare and submit with the project Improvement Plans, a Final drainage report for each project phase in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the LDM and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the Engineering and Surveying Department for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. "Best Management Practice" (BMP) measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2c. Drainage Facilities to Conform to Placer County Stormwater Management Manual</b></p> <p>Drainage facilities, for purposes of collecting runoff on individual lots, shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and shall be in</p>		<p>The current surface water drainage patterns of Homewood Creek will be altered through the removal of the existing culvert under Tahoe Ski Bowl Way in the South Base area. Alternative 1A will implement the Homewood Creek SEZ Restoration project in the South Base area for improvements to existing surface water drainage patterns and stream bank and channel conditions and to alleviate flood risk within the Project area and to private residences downstream. Figures 15-7, 15-8, and 15-9 of the EIR/EIS analyze the potential downstream impacts of removing the existing culvert crossing at Tahoe Ski Bowl Way and replace it with a bottomless arch bridge crossing. Figure 15-7 shows the calculated pre- and post-project 100-year flood plain for Homewood Creek. Removal of the culvert will improve the existing condition, which currently overlaps the roadway during a 100-year event. The proposed bridge crossing will convey the 100-year peak flow without overlapping the roadway, and there will be no downstream impacts to existing structures or property, as the creek attenuates to the 100-year water surface elevation prior to leaving the Homewood property.</p> <p>Section VI (Drainage Systems, Item 2. Design Storms) of the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual (SWMM) (Placer County 1990) requires that new development be planned and designed so that no damages occur to structures or improvements during the 100-year/1-hour storm and no inundation on private property occurs during the 10-year/1-hour event. The 10-year, 1-hour storm is the minimum design storm for new developments in drainages and dedicated drainage facilities in Placer County. The Project's systems are sized in excess of this event to meet the minimum TRPA 20-year/1-hour storm volume capacities. The development plans must identify the effects of the 100-year/1-hour storm and provision be made in the plan to prevent loss of life and damages to property during a 100-year, 1-hour storm.</p> <p><b>TRPA 20-year/1-hour Storm Volumetric Analysis (TRPA Code 25.5.A).</b> Stormwater treatment systems are proposed for the North Base, South Base and Mid-Mountain areas, Tahoe Ski Bowl Way extension, and off-site Caltrans/Placer County/HMR EIP project, as described below. The systems are considered part of the Project and are outlined as compliance measures for conformance with TRPA and Lahontan requirements for project approval and permitting. Under the Alternative 1A existing stormwater treatment systems will be replaced and expanded with systems that are located and sized to capture and treat</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>compliance with applicable stormwater quality standards, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD). These facilities shall be constructed with subdivision improvements and easements provided as required by ESD. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the Homeowners' Association.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2d. Reduce Stormwater Runoff to Pre-Project Volumes</b></p> <p>The Improvement Plan submittal and Drainage Report shall provide details showing that storm water runoff shall be reduced to pre-project conditions through the installation of detention facilities. Detention facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD). No detention facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Homewood Creek Restoration Plan</b></p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for BIO-5 above.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure GEO-4b. Conform to Provisions of Placer County Grading Ordinance</b></p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included in under findings for GEO-4 above.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure GEO-4f. Satisfy the Requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual. (LDM).</b></p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for GEO-4 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-105 through 15-106.)</p>		<p>runoff from proposed impervious coverage and contributing watershed areas in the North Base, South Base and Mid-Mountain areas and along the extended Tahoe Ski Bowl Way.</p> <p>The Project will utilize LID strategies such as porous pavers and pavement, cisterns, heated walkways, revegetation of slopes to improve infiltration of runoff, bioretention areas for stormwater treatment, and revegetation of slopes to improve source control. The bioretention areas will include soil amendments to balance infiltration rates with nutrient uptake, spreading of upland seed mixtures for revegetation, soil stabilization and vegetative uptake, as detailed in Chapter 3 and on preliminary Civil Plan Sheet C2.</p> <p>The stormwater infiltration galleries are designed to maximize separation between bottom of galleries and the seasonal high water table. TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 25.5.A requires that the bottom of infiltration facilities be a minimum of one foot (12 inches) above the seasonal high water table. The stormwater infiltration galleries are designed to maintain at least 18 to 24 inches of separation between the bottom of the galleries and the seasonal high water table as measured in 2006, 2007 and 2008 (see Appendix D of the EIR/EIS for groundwater data, modeling results and cross-sections of the North and South Base areas). Because of the complexity of the North Base area and its proximity to Lake Tahoe, TRPA Soil Hydrologic approval conditions require final stormwater systems designs to maintain a minimum two (2) foot separation between bottom of galleries and the seasonal high water table. Mitigation measure HYDRO-2a outlines the conditions for Soil Hydrologic Approval from TRPA.</p> <p>Figure 11A of the EIR/EIS illustrates Alternative 1A overall stormwater treatment design for the North Base Area and Figure 15-12A illustrates the overall stormwater treatment design for the South Base Area, noting that the South Base stormwater treatment systems have subsequently been relocated outside of the proposed Placer County ROW as updated on preliminary Civil Plan Sheet C12 (see Figure 3-9 of the EIR/EIS). North-4, North-5, South-3 and South-4 are groundwater reinjection galleries, as described in Impact HYDRO-3, and are not stormwater infiltration galleries. Table 15-9A details the calculations in support of sizing for the stormwater treatment system capacities under Alternative 1A.</p> <p><b>Underground Gallery North-1.</b> Under Alternative 1A, North-1 capacity remains 2681 cubic feet, bioretention is slightly reduced to 4,712 cubic feet, and percent above the TRPA required infiltration volume is 260 percent. The separation of the bottom of North-1 to the seasonal high water table is 1.5 feet. During stormwater infiltration, this separation decreases to 0.8 feet, which poses a potentially significant impact. Mitigation measure HYDRO-2a details the actions required to reduce this potential impact from planned stormwater treatment systems to a level of less than significant.</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><b>Underground Gallery North-2.</b> Bioretention areas are proposed around the hotel entrance road and roundabout, which will hydrologically disconnect or attenuate 4,327 cubic feet of runoff, increase the potential treatment capacity of North-2, reduce total runoff volumes entering North-2 and allow for treatment capacity that is 292 percent more than the TRPA required infiltration volume.</p> <p><b>Underground Gallery North-3.</b> Under Alternative 1A, North-3 has the capacity to infiltrate up to 14,432 cubic feet of runoff, which exceeds the TRPA Code of Ordinances requirement to capture and treat the 20-year/1-hour storm volume (12,115 cubic feet) by just over 19 percent. LID strategies, including porous pavers and pavement (321 cubic feet reduction), the cisterns (2,400 cubic feet removed and stored), bioretention areas (11,511 cubic feet reduction) serve to hydrologically disconnect or attenuate runoff volumes to North-3. The reduction and attenuation in runoff volume increases the potential treatment capacity of North-3 to 137 percent above the TRPA required infiltration volume. The separation of the bottom of North-2 to the seasonal high water table is 2 feet. During stormwater infiltration, this separation decreases to 1.5 feet, which poses a potential impact. Mitigation measure HYDRO-2a details the actions required to reduce this potential impact from planned stormwater treatment systems to a level of less than significant.</p> <p><b>Underground Gallery North-4.</b> Under Alternative 1A, North-4 has the capacity to infiltrate up to 23,089 cubic feet of runoff, which exceeds the TRPA Code of Ordinances requirement to capture and treat the 20-year/1-hour storm volume (14,427 cubic feet) by 60 percent. LID strategies, including porous pavers and pavement (545 cubic feet reduction), four cisterns (2,400 cubic feet removed and stored) and bioretention areas (5,077 cubic feet reduction) described above, serve to hydrologically disconnect or attenuate runoff volumes to North-4. This reduction and attenuation of this runoff volume subsequently increases the potential treatment capacity of North-4 to 137 percent above the TRPA required infiltration volume. The separation of bottom of North-4 to the seasonal high water table is 2.0 feet. During stormwater infiltration, this separation decreases to 1.5 feet, which poses a potential impact. Mitigation measure HYDRO-2a details the actions required to reduce this potential impact from planned stormwater treatment systems to a level of less than significant.</p> <p><b>Underground Gallery South-1.</b> Under Alternative 1A, South-1 has the capacity to infiltrate up to 9,650 cubic feet of runoff, which exceeds the TRPA Code of Ordinances requirement to capture and treat the 20-year/1-hour storm volume by 38 percent. LID strategies, including the cisterns (1,200 cubic feet removed and stored) and bioretention areas (7,850 cubic feet reduction), serve to hydrologically disconnect or attenuate runoff volumes to South-</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>1. This reduction and attenuation of runoff volume subsequently increases the potential treatment capacity of South-1 to 168 percent above the TRPA required infiltration volume.</p> <p><b>Underground Gallery South-2.</b> Under Alternative 1A, South-2 has the capacity to infiltrate up to 8,050 cubic feet of runoff, which exceeds the TRPA Code of Ordinances requirement to capture and treat the 20-year/1-hour storm volume (4,905 cubic feet) by 64 percent. LID strategies, including the cisterns (1,200 cubic feet removed and stored) and bioretention areas (6,614 cubic feet reduction), serve to hydrologically disconnect or attenuate runoff volumes to South-2. This reduction and attenuation of runoff volume subsequently increases the potential treatment capacity of South-2 to 223 percent above the TRPA required infiltration volume.</p> <p><b>Maintenance for Underground Infiltration Galleries North, 1, North-2, North-3, North-4, South-1 and South-2.</b> An Inspection, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan will be completed based on the final design of the selected alternative and as required for project approval and permitting. Underground infiltration galleries will be regularly inspected and cleaned, seasonally and following significant precipitation events, to prevent an accumulation of build up that could inhibit filtration effectiveness or reduce treatment capacities. Cleaning will be completed at the discretion of maintenance personnel to maintain proper storage and flow, preferably during a relatively dry period. The Monitoring and Reporting Program of the WDRs require sampling of discharge from the systems to measure compliance with discharge to land water quality objectives.</p> <p><b>Tahoe Ski Bowl Way Extension.</b> This project component is included as programmatic-level in the HMR Master Plan. Figure 15-13 of the EIR/EIS illustrates the stormwater treatment approach for the Tahoe Ski Bowl Way portion of the Project area, including treatment vault and bioretention area layout. Bioretention areas will infiltrate the roadway runoff after the stormwater is conveyed through pre-treatment facilities.</p> <p>Stormwater conveyance along the Tahoe Ski Bowl Way Extension is broken into two sections. The first section includes road runoff sheet flowing to a drop inlet at a low point on Tahoe Ski Bowl Way approximately half way in between the South Base Area and the proposed Townhomes. Under Alternative 1A, the bioretention areas along this portion of the roadway are expanded to infiltrate 1,935 cubic feet, which exceeds the TRPA Code of Ordinances requirement to capture and treat the 20-year/1-hour storm volume (1,649 cubic feet) by 17 percent.</p> <p>The second section includes approximately 600 linear feet of the roadway leading up to the Townhome turnaround. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the curb and gutter and flow north to the drop inlets south of the Townhomes. The bioretention areas are</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 systems are based on a design that assumes maximum allowable land coverage for each unit or a worst-case scenario for analysis to assume that at a minimum, peak runoff volumes from the TRPA design storm can be retained, treated and infiltrated on site. The proposed systems are based on a design that assumes maximum allowable land coverage for each unit or a worst-case scenario for analysis to assume that at a minimum, peak runoff volumes from the TRPA design storm can be retained, treated and infiltrated on site. Additional environmental review will occur prior to Phase 2D, Townhomes and Tahoe Ski Bowl Way Extension, project entitlement application. The secondary access road has not been analyzed for grading or water quality impacts in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p><b>Mid-Mountain Area.</b> Figure 15-14 illustrates the stormwater treatment approach for the Mid-Mountain portion of the Project area. The bioretention areas proposed at the Mid-Mountain assume a maximum depth of five feet. The layout consists of several bioretention infiltration areas, each serving the proposed buildings. Mid-Mountain roof runoff is conveyed separately for each building via stormdrain pipe to bioretention areas downhill of the proposed development for infiltration and soil treatment. The Mid-Mountain system will treat 4,000 cubic feet of runoff, which is 4 percent greater than the required 20-year/1-hour storm volume.</p> <p><b>Off-Site CEP Required EIP Project.</b> The HMR CEP resolution requires HMR to participate in an off-site EIP project in fulfillment of over and above CEP objectives. Placer County is planning to construct the Placer County-Homewood Mountain Resort Water Quality Improvement Project (WQIP) to the immediate north of the Project area in summer of 2012. The WQIP includes the collection and treatment of stormwater runoff from an existing residential and commercial area in Homewood that runs from Silver Street north to Fern Street and from SR 89 west to Sacramento Street. HMR's Tentative Map and Conditional Use Permit will be conditioned to construct frontage improvements on Silver Street to include water quality facilities for a portion of what is known as the "Silver Catchment", an area to the immediate north of HMR and bound on the northern edge by Trout Street, as illustrated in Figure 15-15. Appendix BB-1 illustrates the total WQIP project area that is delineated as four PLRM catchments areas.</p>

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

158

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>Placer County currently plans on construction of the WQIP during the summer of 2012. HMR's improvements will be included in the project's Conditions of Approval for the Specific details regarding HMR's financial contribution (timing and amount) are to be included as part of the project development agreement currently being generated with Placer County. Ultimately the contribution by HMR to the WQIP will represent a significant sediment and nutrient load reduction in the Homewood area. Existing PLRM baseline sediment loads are estimated at 3,045 pounds/year of Total Suspended Solids (TSS) and 1,755 pounds/year of Fine Sediment Particle (FSP) from the four delineated catchments within the WQIP project area. The PLRM results indicate a 74 percent reduction in TSS and a 75 percent reduction in FSP, reducing annual sediment loads from the WQIP project area to 793 pounds/year of TSS and 439 pounds/year.</p> <p>The final monetary participation by HMR to the WQIP that addresses load reduction across the four PLRM catchments will be used to determine the percentage of the total catchment-wide TSS and FSP reductions to be credited to HMR.</p> <p><b>Placer County 10-year and 100-year Peak Flow Analysis.</b> Placer County will require a final drainage report at the time of Improvement Plan review that addresses project design criteria. Typically, Placer County considers the impacts of a project altering existing drainage of the site or area" or "increasing the rate or amount of surface runoff" as significant impact requiring mitigation. Under Placer County codified regulations, the 10-year event is the minimum design storm for sizing drainage facilities and new development must be planned and designed so that no damage occurs to structures or improvements and to prevent loss of life during the 100-year storm event.</p> <p>Appendix X-1 presents the Preliminary Drainage Report for Alternative 1A. Conclusions in the Preliminary Drainage Report state that the design for the Alternative 1A incorporates current requirements by Placer County for stormwater collection and conveyance as well as the requirements by the TRPA. The SWMM post-development calculations show a cumulative reduction in peak flow from existing to proposed conditions for the 10 and 100-year storm events. The proposed stormwater treatment systems for collection, conveyance and infiltration will comply with the Placer County SWMM dated September 1, 1990.</p> <p>Placer County staff review of the Preliminary Drainage Report indicates that the report adequately demonstrates that the proposed development has a less than significant impact on peak flow runoff leaving the Project area. Therefore, Placer County does not require onsite stormwater detention capacity in excess of the systems proposed as part of the Alternative 1A.</p> <p>Although the Project will improve upon project area drainage, reduce post-project runoff volumes and maintain peak flows</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>compared to existing conditions, implementation of standard mitigation measures HYDRO-2b, HYDRO-2c and HYDRO-2d assure compliance with Placer County codified regulations to reduce impacts from drainage and stormwater runoff to a level of less than significant. Implementation of these measures minimize potential impacts to down-gradient properties and existing drainage facilities by assuring that the rate or amount of surface runoff does not exceed existing conditions and does not significantly impact downstream properties or existing drainage facilities.</p> <p><b>Existing Surface Water Drainage Patterns, Flooding, and Stream Bank Erosion.</b> Alternative 1A will not alter the existing surface water drainage patterns of Quail Lake Creek, Madden Creek or the unnamed channels within the Project area. No existing flooding impacts have been identified along these drainages. Alternative 1A does not propose changes in the Project area that will increase flood risk or stream bank erosion resulting from increased flooding along these drainages.</p> <p>Alternative 1A will daylight Homewood Creek, which is currently collected and piped under the north-south extension of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way. Downstream impacts to Homewood Creek streambanks below the Project area were identified during channel evaluations completed in 2006 and 2007 (Kleinfelder 2007).</p> <p>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 under Alternative 1A. In its existing condition, Homewood Creek is highly constrained with steep banks and a culverted section under the South Base parking area. To alleviate the Project area's contribution to downstream channel impacts and flood risk, the existing culvert in the South Base parking lot will be removed. TRPA verified existing land coverage within the SEZ and floodplain will be removed to comply with TRPA and Placer County setbacks, and SEZ and floodplain functions will be restored as described in Chapter 3 of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The FEMA flood hazard area within the Project area is estimated at 1.47 acres or 64,124 square feet and is illustrated on Figure 8-1 in Chapter 8, Biological Resources of the EIR/EIS, along with the TRPA SEZ boundaries. Figures 15-7, 15-8, and 15-9 illustrate the pre and post-project conditions associated with the Homewood Creek unmitigated 100-year floodplain, as defined in the Placer County LDM. Removal of the culvert will improve the existing condition, which currently overlaps the roadway during a 100-year event. The proposed bridge crossing will convey the 100-year peak flow without overlapping the roadway, and there will be no downstream impacts to existing structures or property, as the creek attenuates to the 100-year water surface elevation prior to leaving the Homewood property.</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 bridge will be used to cross the stream channel which will be reconstructed to increase the overall cross-sectional area and flow length to maximize stream function and connection to the floodplain. The restoration area is within the FEMA flood hazard area. The bridge span will be constructed at a height and width that accommodates the 100-year floodway. Improving channel conditions in conjunction with reducing land coverage in the FEMA flood hazard areas will reduce the Project area's contribution to downstream impacts to stream channels.</p> <p>The SEZ restoration plan for Homewood Creek (see Appendix C) 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 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. The restoration of the Homewood Creek and SEZ will likely result in improvements to the SEZ; however, TRPA staff determines that the Preliminary Conceptual Revegetation and SEZ Restoration Plan described in Appendix C is insufficient to allow for permitting and subsequent construction and does not provide sufficient detail to substantiate a conclusion that impacts will be beneficial and no negative impacts will occur to the SEZ or check channel below the Project area. This impact is considered potentially significant and implementation of mitigation measure B10-5a will be necessary to assure that potential impacts to existing surface water drainage patterns and stream bank erosion are reduced to a level of less than significant.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Alternative 1A will install stormwater treatment systems capable of containing and treating the stormwater runoff in excess of the 20-year, 1-hour storm volume, effectively removing this volume of runoff from entering existing downstream drainage systems. Based on the evaluation criteria for HYDRO-2, the level of impact from stormwater runoff and flooding is less than significant.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure HYDRO-2a assures compliance with TRPA Soil Hydrologic Approval conditions that a separation of 2 feet from the bottom of stormwater infiltration galleries and seasonal high water table is maintained and soil treatment remains effective.</p> <p>Mitigation measures HYDRO-2b, HYDRO-2c, HYDRO-2d, GEO-4b and Geo-4f are standard mitigation measures required by Placer County to assure compliance with codified regulations. HYDRO-2b requires a drainage report for each phase of 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><b>HYDRO-3. Will Project construction activities or long-term operations result in a substantial degradation of groundwater or result in a substantial change in the quality, quantity, elevation, infiltration, or movement of groundwater?</b></p> <p>Construction of Alternatives 1A involves grading, excavation and fill activities. Excavation of earth below existing ground surfaces presents the potential to intercept or interfere with seasonal groundwater movement during construction activities and long-term operations of the Project area. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-110 through 15-119.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-3a. Implement Operation Dewatering Plan/Implement Engineered Groundwater Mitigations.</b></p> <p>Groundwater intercepted as part of the drainage collection and conveyance systems for the underground parking structures shall include methods to infiltrate all collected groundwater for the purposes of groundwater recharge. The reinjection galleries for intercepted groundwater shall be separate entities from the stormwater treatment infiltration galleries and the distance between the groundwater and stormwater infiltration galleries shall be maximized to minimize potential for mixing. Collected groundwater shall be infiltrated locally in the general area where collected from. Systems shall be adequately sized to infiltrate no less than 100 percent of the collected volume. Tests and studies shall be conducted to confirm sufficient infiltration can be obtained for any and each given system with no adverse effects resulting from the infiltration/recharge activities. Prior to Improvement Plan approval for any and each project phase, a Geotechnical Evaluation Report</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Project that identifies water quality protection features and methods to be used during construction and post-construction to reduce erosion, water quality degradation and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable. HYDRO-2c assures that stormwater treatment facilities are designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual. HYDRO-2d assures that post-development runoff is reduced to at or below pre-project conditions. Compliance with codified regulations adequately reduces potential impacts to a level of less than significant. GEO-4b and GEO-4f satisfy the requirements of the Placer County Grading Ordinance and LDM for the protection of existing drainages.</p> <p>Implementation of BIO-5a will improve the level of detail presented in the Preliminary Conceptual Revegetation and SEZ Restoration Plan to allow for TRPA permitting and subsequent construction. Through adequate site-specific restoration measures, the potential impacts to existing surface water drainage patterns and streambank erosion are reduced to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-74 through 15-106; Master Response 18; Responses to Comments 13a-46 through 13a-50, 14a-31 through 14a-38, 14b-6, 152-4, through 152-7.)</p> <p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure HYDRO-3a, 3b, and 3c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by assuring that Project area contribution to groundwater impacts will be reduced to a level of less than significant and is brought into compliance with TRPA groundwater protection 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> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Groundwater flows around and within the Project area have been previously modified by the construction of parking lots, mountain access roads, SR 89, and Placer County Roads, affecting historic surface and groundwater conditions.</p> <p><b>Groundwater Movement.</b> To assure that no additional modifications to groundwater quantity and movement occur from proposed developments, TRPA requires that site-specific geotechnical investigations be completed for project permitting and approval. Potential impact to groundwater movement during construction of the Alternative 1A are analyzed in Chapter 14 of the EIR/EIS, Geology, Soils and Seismicity, and addressed in 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>certified by a Registered Civil Engineer shall be submitted to the ESD for review and approval for each groundwater infiltration/recharge system. The report shall, at a minimum, confirm the adequacy of soils to sufficiently and successfully infiltrate collected groundwater, and shall provide design recommendations based on applicable investigation and testing criteria. The report shall likewise provide evidence that proposed infiltration/recharge systems will not detrimentally affect onsite or offsite structures or properties.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-3b. Inspection, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan Groundwater Infiltration Systems for Underground Parking Structures</b></p> <p>The Project Applicant shall prepare an Inspection, Operation, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan for the groundwater infiltration systems for the underground parking structures. TRPA, Lahontan, and Placer County shall review the plan prior to issuance of final Project approval.</p> <p>The Plan shall include, but is not limited to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction, planning and design, sampling objectives and water quality objectives;</li> <li>• Well construction details and/or system sampling access points;</li> <li>• Water level data for existing and new wells;</li> <li>• Groundwater sampling and analysis, sample collection methods, decontamination, sampling frequency, sampling handling, field analysis, laboratory analysis;</li> <li>• Maintenance scheduling; and</li> <li>• Quarterly reporting.</li> </ul> <p>Sample results shall be provided to the TRPA on a quarterly basis. The report shall present site conditions, physical observations of groundwater quality and the degrees of sedimentation observed within the underground groundwater infiltration galleries, and include three months worth of observations and corresponding field measurements and laboratory analytical results.</p> <p>Single samples of groundwater shall not exceed the discharge to land treatment water quality objectives at the following concentrations: Total</p>		<p>findings for GEO-4 above. Because groundwater will be intercepted during long-term operations of the underground parking structures in the North and South Base areas, the level of impact is significant. Mitigation measure HYDRO-3a is necessary to assure that intercepted groundwater does not leave the Project area as surface flow and to assure that groundwater movement is not significantly altered.</p> <p><b>Groundwater Quality.</b> The existing groundwater quality within the Project area is not well characterized, but groundwater quality in the Lake Tahoe Basin is generally of high quality and used to supplies public drink supplies with minimal treatment for pollutants (California's Groundwater Bulletin 118 2004). The Project is not likely to violate potable water quality standards because it will utilize potable water from MCWIC and/or the TCPUD. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Robinson Engineering 2005). Reported a low-level MTBE in one of the existing groundwater monitoring wells in the North Base area. The assessment concluded that natural attenuation has reduced the MTBE concentration to levels near the California water quality objective and that additional natural attenuation will result in the groundwater reaching the water quality objective. Because the levels are low and the well is under standard monitoring by the Lahontan, this is not considered to be a significant impact.</p> <p>Alternative 1A proposes underground infiltration galleries for stormwater treatment in areas of seasonal high groundwater. TRPA Code of Ordinances Subsection 25.5.A(1) requires that the bottom of infiltration facilities, which would include underground infiltration galleries, be a minimum of one foot (12 inches) above the seasonal high groundwater table. Underground infiltration galleries in the North and South Base areas are designed to maximize this separation. Galleries North-2, North-3, and North-4 will have separations of two feet (24 inches), Galleries North-1 and South-1 will have separations of 1.5 feet (18 inches) and Gallery South-2 will have a separation of 6.5 feet (78 inches). Although the galleries maintain the separations required by TRPA Code, fluctuations in the seasonal high water table are likely and the potential for degradation of groundwater quality exists if the separation between the bottom of the galleries and the seasonal high water table intersect to negate soil treatment necessary for stormwater treatment. Mitigation is necessary to reduce this potential impact to a level of less than significant. A post-project groundwater monitoring program will also be necessary.</p> <p>Due to the increase in landscaped area within the North and South Base areas, nitrogen and phosphorus inputs or loading in the Project area could increase if components of fertilizer leach past the root uptake zone towards seasonal high groundwater. To minimize potential impacts to groundwater quality the Project proposes the use of slow-growing turf grass in high pedestrian traffic areas and has replaced much of the higher water demand</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><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-3c. Complete a Water Balance Analysis for the HMR-Operated Well and the TCPUD McKinney Well No. 1</b></p> <p>The Project Applicant shall prepare a hydrogeologic report for the HMR-operated wells and the TCPUD McKinney Well No. 1 to determine recharge, recovery and storage capacities of the aquifers. The report shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Characterize the cone of depression that will result based on maximum proposed consumption, determine if this will result in a gross adjustment of the near static deep groundwater level for this aquifer,</li> <li>• Characterize the zone of influence and determine if the proposed extractions will negatively affect other source waters,</li> <li>• Identify or characterize the hydrogeologic conditions that impose constraints on Time and Drawdown,</li> <li>• Identify the well efficiency and the expected lifetime;</li> <li>• Determine and disclose what water rights could be potentially influenced; and</li> <li>• Determine the potential impacts towards the Truckee River Operating Agreement (TROA) allocations to the State of California.</li> </ul> <p>Lahortian may require the characterization of the subsurface water chemistry to meet the general requirement for drinking water wells even though the water will be used for snowmaking. Should a decline in groundwater levels occur that exceeds seasonal fluctuations and that is attributable to the Project, pumping from the groundwater source shall cease and other supplies of water shall be utilized until groundwater levels return to historic levels.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-116 through 15-119.)</p>		<p>landscapes areas with bioretention areas, which serve to both infiltrate stormwater and uptake pollutants and nutrients.</p> <p>The Project proposes the following measures to minimize the potential for nutrients to escape the root zone and be delivered to groundwater:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of non-mowed or slow-growing turf grass species, preferably local native or naturalized species with annual fertilizer requirements that do not exceed 1.5 pounds per 1,000 square feet;</li> <li>• Implementation of a Fertilizer Management Plan that meets the requirements of Section 81.7 of TRPA Code or Ordinances;</li> <li>• Determination of appropriate fertilizer rates by a soil-revegetation specialist and based on the results of soil nutrient testing with phosphorus fertilizer use only when supported by soil testing results;</li> <li>• Incorporation of fertilizer into soils prior to seed application to prevent burning and low germination rates;</li> <li>• Use of Biosol or other organic, slow-release fertilizers that do not contain nitrate or ammonium with careful application to avoid application on hardscape;</li> <li>• Prohibit fertilizer use on bioretention areas for stormwater treatment after initial establishment; and</li> <li>• Installation of a highly controlled spray irrigation system to avoid over irrigation and overspray onto hardscape.</li> </ul> <p>Implementation of these project measures will reduce potential impacts to groundwater quality from landscaped areas. However, to assure long-term protection of groundwater quality, a post-project groundwater monitoring program will be necessary.</p> <p><b>Groundwater Quantity.</b> The Project could potentially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted).</p> <p>The North Base well has an estimated 500 gallons per minute pumping rate and the McKinney Well No. 1 has a rate of around 1,000 gallons per minute (Kleinfelder 1994). HMR proposes to use these wells to supply 60.8 million gallons/year of snowmaking water needed for with the proposed snowmaking system expansion. Although pump rates are well documented, the recharge, recovery and storage capacities of the Project area wells and the proposed TCPUD McKinney Well No. 1 are unknown, the potential impact to groundwater quality is considered significant, requiring mitigation measure HYDRO-3a to reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant. The potential impacts to groundwater quantity as related to source</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><b>HYDRO-4. Will the Project alter the course or flow of the 100-year floodwaters or expose people or structures to water related hazards such as flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occurrence or seiches?</b></p> <p>The Geologic Hazards and Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation (Kleinfelder 2007) reports that the existing development in the North and South Base areas could be inundated by waves with maximum amplitudes of approximately six meters from a lake seiche resulting from magnitude 7.2 earthquake modeled on the West Tahoe-Dollar Point Fault. Due to the proximity of the Project area to active faults and to the shoreline of Lake Tahoe, the risk of inundation from a lake seiche is considered potentially significant.</p> <p>Alternative 1A will remove existing structures in the South Base area from the FEMA 100-year floodplain, conform to TRPA and Placer County setbacks and will replace the existing culvert crossing with a bridge span across Homewood Creek to reduce the potential for flood flows to be impeded or redirected. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-119 through 15-122.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-4a. Emergency Response and Evacuation Plan.</b></p> <p>The Project Applicant shall prepare and submit an emergency response and evacuation plan to TRPA, Placer County ESD and the North Tahoe Fire Protection District (NTFPD) for review and approval before construction permits are issued. The plan shall include detailed descriptions of how emergency response and evacuation will occur in the case of a large earthquake and potential seiche, the 100-yr event, wildfire and avalanche. Emergency response and evacuation measures shall address the requirement of Placer County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan and at a minimum identifies steps that help avoid, reduce, alleviate, and mitigate disaster damages and potential loss of life. Additionally, Project area emergency access and evacuation designs shall be consistent with NTFPD's Emergency Preparedness and Evacuation Guide.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-4b: Comply with Placer County Stormwater Management Manual Section VI</b></p> <p>The Project Applicant shall show the limits of the future, unmitigated, fully developed, 100-year flood plain (after grading) for Homewood Creek on the Improvement Plans and designate same as a building setback line unless greater setbacks are required by other project conditions.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-4c: Comply with Placer County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance</b></p> <p>To comply with Placer County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Article 15.52, specifically</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>water protection are analyzed in impact HYDRO-5 below.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Implementation of HYDRO-3a, 3b, and 3c will assure that Project area contribution to groundwater impacts will be reduced to a level of less than significant based on criteria for Impact HYDRO-3. Implementation of the mitigation measures will assure that the Project is brought into compliance with TRPA groundwater protection measures.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-110 through 15-119; Master Response 18; Responses to Comments 13a-46 through 13a-50, 14a-34 through 14a-38, 14a-53,33-36, 93-11, 141-16, 235-3, and 268-12.)</p> <p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measures HYDRO-4a, 4b, and 4c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the preparation of an Emergency Response and Evacuation Plan as well as ensuring compliance with County 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><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> An alteration of the course or flow of the 100-year floodwaters constitutes a significant impact. The FEMA FIRI indicates a Zone A area located along the lower reach of Homewood Creek, which flows through the South Base area. The lower reach of Madden Creek is also mapped Zone A, but is to the north and outside of the Project area. A FEMA Zone A corresponds to the 100-year floodplain with undetermined base flood elevations.</p> <p>The Placer County FCWCD requires the submittal of a detailed pre- and post-project hydraulic analysis of Homewood Creek for project permitting. The analysis identifies increases in runoff leaving the Project area as a result of the 10-year and 100-year storm events and a determination of the Project's effects on the 100-year water surface elevations. The Preliminary Drainage Report identifies no significant increase in runoff leaving the Project area or increase in the 100-year water surface elevations as a result of Alternative 1A. Under Alternative 1A No housing or habitable structures are placed within the 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on the FIRI and no structures are proposed in the 100-yr future, unmitigated, fully developed floodplain, as defined by Placer County's LDM.</p> <p>The bridge span included in Alternative 1A is designed to comply with Placer County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance. As a result, the 100-year floodwaters will not be impeded or redirected and people or structures will not be exposed to significant risk or</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>HYDRO-5. Will the Project change the amount of surface water in any water body, substantially reduce the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies, or be located within 600 feet of a drinking water source?</p> <p>Source Water Protection. Source water 09719101/11 and source water 08502048W/11 are located in the vicinity of the Project area.</p>	<p>15.52.170 C.1 Elevation and Floodproofing, the Project Applicant shall show finished structure pad elevations 2 feet above the 100-year flood plain line for South Base buildings under Alternatives 1, 1A, 3, 4, 5 and 6 on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet filed with the Final Map. Pad elevations shall be certified by a California registered civil engineer or licensed land surveyor and submitted to the Engineering and Surveying Department. This certification shall be completed prior to construction of the foundation or at the completion of final grading, whichever comes first. No construction is allowed until this certification has been received by the ESD and approved by the Flood Plain Manager. Benchmark elevation and location shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet to the satisfaction of DRC.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-121 to 15-122.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>loss, injury or death from flooding.</p> <p>The potential impact is further reduced through compliance with Placer County codified regulations. Standard Placer County mitigation measures HYDRO-4b and HYDRO-4c reduce the potential impact to 100-yr floodwaters to a level of less than significant through delineation of adequate setbacks from and establishment of building pad elevations above the 100-year floodwater elevations.</p> <p>The Kleinfielder evaluation (2007) states that debris flows are not mapped within the Project area but may exist in the Madden Creek, Homewood Creek, Quail Lake Creek and the unnamed creek drainages. Alternative 1A does not propose changes to the Project area that would increase the potential for debris flows. The risk of debris flows is considered to be less than significant based on the existing conditions of the Project area and the absence of mapped debris flow areas.</p> <p>Seiches are normally caused by an earthquake or high wind activity, and can affect harbors, bays, lakes, rivers and canals. See Chapter 14 of the EIR/EIS, Geology, Soils and Seismicity for details on geologic hazards associated with the Project area. The preparation of an emergency response and evacuation plan, as outlined in mitigation measures HYDRO-4a, is necessary to mitigate disaster damages and avoid potential loss of life from inundation by seiche. The Project area cannot be relocated out of the potential inundation area of a seiche from Lake Tahoe, but the risk of inundation can be minimized through the proper and timely execution of an Emergency Response and Evacuation Plan. Compliance with Placer County SWMM Section VI and the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance results in the avoidance of alteration of the course or flow of the 100-year floodwaters and minimizes exposure to significant risk or loss, injury or death from flooding. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure HYDRO-4a, 4b, and 4c.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-119 through 15-122; Responses to Comments 9-44, 11-19 through 11-23, 13a-61, 13c-8, 19-24, and 33-41.)</p> <p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure HYDRO-5, HYDRO-3c, and PSU-1a, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level; by (1) assuming compliance with the forthcoming TROA regulations for the State of California allocations; (2) requiring connection and service fees approved by TCPUD and/or MCWC to ensure sufficient water to meet peak demand in the Project area; and (3) requiring confirmation that water source(s) are adequate and meet State and Federal requirements for quality and quantity. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that</p>
<p>HYDRO-5. Will the Project change the amount of surface water in any water body, substantially reduce the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies, or be located within 600 feet of a drinking water source?</p> <p>Source Water Protection. Source water 09719101/11 and source water 08502048W/11 are located in the vicinity of the Project area.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-5. Water Use/Water Rights Monitoring Program/Install meters at Points of Diversions and Application or Use</p> <p>To ensure that water from HMR's various supplies is used in appropriate quantities and locations, a Water Use/Water Rights monitoring program shall be implemented. The goal of the program shall be to measure or estimate the quantity of water</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>loss, injury or death from flooding.</p> <p>The potential impact is further reduced through compliance with Placer County codified regulations. Standard Placer County mitigation measures HYDRO-4b and HYDRO-4c reduce the potential impact to 100-yr floodwaters to a level of less than significant through delineation of adequate setbacks from and establishment of building pad elevations above the 100-year floodwater elevations.</p> <p>The Kleinfielder evaluation (2007) states that debris flows are not mapped within the Project area but may exist in the Madden Creek, Homewood Creek, Quail Lake Creek and the unnamed creek drainages. Alternative 1A does not propose changes to the Project area that would increase the potential for debris flows. The risk of debris flows is considered to be less than significant based on the existing conditions of the Project area and the absence of mapped debris flow areas.</p> <p>Seiches are normally caused by an earthquake or high wind activity, and can affect harbors, bays, lakes, rivers and canals. See Chapter 14 of the EIR/EIS, Geology, Soils and Seismicity for details on geologic hazards associated with the Project area. The preparation of an emergency response and evacuation plan, as outlined in mitigation measures HYDRO-4a, is necessary to mitigate disaster damages and avoid potential loss of life from inundation by seiche. The Project area cannot be relocated out of the potential inundation area of a seiche from Lake Tahoe, but the risk of inundation can be minimized through the proper and timely execution of an Emergency Response and Evacuation Plan. Compliance with Placer County SWMM Section VI and the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance results in the avoidance of alteration of the course or flow of the 100-year floodwaters and minimizes exposure to significant risk or loss, injury or death from flooding. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure HYDRO-4a, 4b, and 4c.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-119 through 15-122; Responses to Comments 9-44, 11-19 through 11-23, 13a-61, 13c-8, 19-24, and 33-41.)</p> <p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure HYDRO-5, HYDRO-3c, and PSU-1a, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level; by (1) assuming compliance with the forthcoming TROA regulations for the State of California allocations; (2) requiring connection and service fees approved by TCPUD and/or MCWC to ensure sufficient water to meet peak demand in the Project area; and (3) requiring confirmation that water source(s) are adequate and meet State and Federal requirements for quality and quantity. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that</p>

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING) <b>BEFORE MITIGATION)</b>	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE <b>AFTER MITIGATION</b>	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>However, TRPA Source Water Assessment maps indicate that no source waters are located within the boundary or within 600 feet of the Project area. The potential impact from Alternative 1A to source waters is less than significant.</p>	<p>supplied by each source and document the location at which the water is used or applied. Meters shall be installed to monitor the monthly pumpage from individual wells. Additionally, the monitoring shall include monthly measurements of groundwater levels in the existing and proposed wells.</p>		<p>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><b>Public Water Supply.</b> The current rate of flow is not sufficient to meet peak demand for snowmaking under Alternative 1A. HMR and the TCPUD McKinney-Quail Water Service Area would require upgraded extraction, pumping, treatment, conveyance, and storage capacity to serve the new demand of the Project area. This is considered a significant impact on public water supply and mitigation is required.</p>	<p>With the existing and proposed water supply monitoring facilities, determination of the quantity of water supplied to Homewood from each water supply source and the points of application or use of this water shall occur. By knowing the use restrictions on water from each source, the maximum water use permitted in any area shall be known, and thus water uses shall be limited to the maximum permitted.</p>		<p>Implementation of mitigation measures HYDRO-5, HYDRO-3c, and PSU-1a will assure compliance with the forthcoming TROA regulations for the State of California allocations. The payment of connection and service fees approved by TCPUD and/or MCWC will ensure sufficient water to meet peak demand in the Project area. The preparation of X to identify the quantity and source of potable and non-potable water to serve the Project must demonstrate that water source(s) are adequate and meet State and Federal requirements for quality and quantity.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b></p> <p><b>Public Water Supply.</b> A revised HMR Water Supply Assessment (NCE 2011) was prepared for the Project area and is attached in Appendix AA-1. The demand of the Alternative 1A on TCPUD and MCWC public water supplies are referenced to Impact PSU-1 in Chapter 16, Public Services and Utilities of the EIR/EIS, which analyzes the potential effects of the Project on the ability of the water purveyors (i.e. TCPUD and MCWC) to meet the public water supply needs</p>
<p><b>In-Stream Flows.</b> Alternative 1A does not propose development of existing points of diversion located within the Project area. Alternative 1A will not significantly impact the instream flows in Quail Lake, Homewood, and Madden Creeks. New wells are not proposed as part of the Project, and the existing wells that supply the Project area are not located near perennial stream channels (North Base well) or are of sufficient distance from streams and are not directly connected to surface flows. The level of impact from the Alternative 1A to TRPA instream flow thresholds is less than significant.</p> <p>(S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-122 through 15-127.)</p>	<p>The Project Applicant shall prepare an annual report indicating the quantity of water used from each of its sources and the maximum entitlement from each of its sources. The report shall be provided to TRPA and Placer County for use in ensuring compliance with existing regulations.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-3c. Complete a Water Balance Analysis for the HMR-Operated Well and the TCPUD McKinney Well</b></p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for HYDRO-3 above.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure PSU-1a. Water Supply Assessment and Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for PSU-1 below.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 15-127.)</p>		<p>Table 16-3 of the EIR/EIS presents estimated domestic and snowmaking demand rounded to the nearest acre-foot/year. Estimated annual domestic water demand for residential, commercial, and irrigation uses for Alternative 1A is 64 acre-foot/year (see Table 16-3 for water demand presented in million gallons/year). Snowmaking is estimated to require up to 187 acre-foot/year under Alternative 1A.</p> <p><b>Snowmaking.</b> Snowmaking is proposed as a programmatic-level project component and will require further environmental review prior to project conditioning and/or approvals. The EIR/EIS includes preliminary analysis, which presents a worst-case scenario for snowmaking water demand and presents quantities in units of acre-foot/year to comparison with allocations under TROA. Build out of the Project area under Alternative 1A will increase the use of surface water and groundwater for snowmaking from a current annual use of 43.6 acre-foot/year to cover 23.8 acres of ski trail to up to 187 acre-foot/year to cover 102.3 acres of ski trail (SnowMakers Inc. 2010).</p> <p>Based on the information provided in the HMR Water Supply Assessment (Nichols 2011) and the Snowmaking Planning document (Snowmakers 2010) and the HMR Ski Area Master Plan (JMA 2011) the impacts of expanding snowmaking operations on domestic water supplies of TCPUD and MCWC service districts are less than significant. Existing TCPUD 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><b>HYDRO-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to water resources?</b></p>	<p>No additional mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>MCWC water supplies can adequately serve the existing Project area water demand and future projected water demand for the service areas through 2030. The Project will be responsible for water system connections, improvements to distribution systems, and on-site storage systems for the Project area. However, because there is a possibility that public water supply will be needed to supplement future snowmaking demand under a worst-case scenario and there is uncertainty associated with forthcoming TROA allocations and the reporting requirements for water supply diverted for snowmaking use, the impact is potentially significant based on the evaluation criteria for HYDRO-5. Mitigation Measure HYDRO-5 will reduce potential impacts to public water supply from waters diverted for use in snowmaking to a level of less than significant by assuring meters are installed to monitor the monthly pumping and usage from individual wells, allowing for accurate reporting of application or use that is anticipated.</p> <p><b>Irrigation.</b> Landscaping proposed for the Project area has been designed to reduce total irrigation demand through the use of low-water use vegetation and incorporation of LID measures, such as cisterns for storage of roof runoff and bioretention areas for stormwater treatment. For Alternative 1A the total maximum irrigation demand for the Project area is estimated at 10.8 acre-feet/year or X MGY based on calculations presented in Appendix CC. Once landscaping has been established this irrigation demand is expected to decrease substantially. Irrigation demand could decrease under Alternative 1A depending on the ratio of landscaping area to bioretention area associated with each chalet. Given that TCPUD's existing McKinney/Quail supply system is inadequate to meet current peak demands during the summer and must be supplemented by interim intake from Lake Tahoe, the use of potable water for irrigation during summer months poses a potentially significant impact to public water supplies.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Implementation of mitigation measures HYDRO-5, HYDRO-3c, and PSU-1a will assure compliance with the forthcoming TROA regulations for the State of California allocations. The payment of connection and service fees approved by TCPUD and/or MCWC will ensure sufficient water to meet peak demand in the Project area. The preparation of a Water System Engineering Report to identify the quantity and source of potable and non-potable water to serve the Project must demonstrate that water source(s) are adequate and meet State and Federal requirements for quality and quantity.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-122 through 15-127; Water Responses 18 and 21; Responses to Comments 14a-28, 14a-34, 19-12, and 265-3.)</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>The geographic context for this cumulative analysis is the Homewood, California watersheds, which are tributary to Lake Tahoe through Madden, Homewood and Quail Lake Creeks and stormwater flows through Caltrans and Placer County roadways and neighborhood drainage systems. The EIR/EIS analysis considers current and foreseeable development in the entirety of the Project area watersheds and evaluates whether the Project, together with the potential effects of cumulative development, will result in a significant impact that will remain and potentially increase over time, and if so, whether the contributions of the Project will be considerable. Both conditions must apply in order for the Project's cumulative impacts to rise to the level of significant.</p> <p>Construction of the Project, other projects in the Homewood, California watersheds and projects in the western and northwestern portions of Lake Tahoe could occur concurrently and has the potential to disturb soils and create unstable slopes, which could result in sedimentation and erosion or otherwise mobilize pollutants. Excavations associated with future projects could intercept the water table and introduce pollutants into groundwater sources. The operations of future projects could increase long-term pollutant loads in urban and upland runoff. Increased impervious areas or changes in land use associated with future projects could alter drainage patterns and increase the likelihood of flooding. Combined water demands associated with future development and permissible uses could impact public water supplies.</p> <p>No significant project-level impacts to hydrology or surface water or groundwater resources from construction or long-term operation of the Project are identified that would persist after implementation of compliance measures. Placer County standard mitigation measures and impact specific mitigation measures. At present, there are no other known projects in the Madden, Homewood, and Quail Lake Creek watersheds or Intervening Zone 7000 with direct or indirect impacts to water resources with the exception of roadway improvement projects in planning by Placer County and Caltrans.</p>			<p>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>Improvement upon existing channel conditions, surface water quality and stormwater quality will result from implementation of the Project, and as such, potential incremental effects will not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to hydrology and water resources. Cumulatively the Project is expected to provide direct beneficial effects to beneficial uses and surface water quality in the Hornewood, California area through reductions in impervious surfaces and resultant runoff quantity and the active treatment of stormwater prior to infiltration to groundwater. Other benefits of the Project include: participation in the Placer County-Hornewood Mountain Resort WCQIP, reduced effects from surface parking and snowmelt from parking lots, landscaping with goals of water conservation and bioretention for stormwater treatment, along with indirect effects from improved site management that reduces airborne contaminants.</p> <p>Land use changes will occur both inside and outside of the Project area in each of the four watersheds. Four actions are assumed to occur outside of the Project area and these actions are incorporated into Alternative 1A. The land coverage changes within the Project area are detailed in Chapter 14, Geology, Soils and Seismicity. The four actions assumed for outside of the Project area include: new homes will be built, existing homes will have water quality BMP retrofits (BMP), existing commercial buildings will have water quality BMP retrofits, and environmental improvement projects will be completed by Placer County and Caltrans. Land coverage will be reduced under the Alternative 1A.</p> <p>The HMR CWE analysis modeled proposed reductions in existing land coverage to result in decreases in sediment yield from the Madden Creek, Hornewood Creek and Quail Lake Creek watersheds and Intervening Zone 7000. Figure 15-17 of the EIR/EIS illustrates the sediment yields for whole watersheds as compared to the Total Watershed TOCs. As displayed in Figure 15-17, Alternative 1A will reduce Total Watershed sediment yields from the four watersheds as compared to existing conditions. As compared to the Total Watershed TOCs, sediment yields modeled for conditions of 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>Alternative 1A will not exceed Total Watershed TOCs for Madden Creek, Homewood Creek or Quail Lake Creek watersheds and Intervening Zone 7000, noting that the modeled sediment yield in Intervening Zone 7000 approaches the TOC and is within the expected range of error for the HMR CWE analysis. The development and redevelopment actions defined by the Alternative 1A could reduce combined sediment yields to Lake Tahoe by approximately 69 T/yr for cumulatively beneficial effects to surface water quality and beneficial uses.</p> <p>As further explained in Appendix W, the HMR CWE analysis also modeled the range of proposed conditions that would be reflected under build-out of maximum allowable base land coverage as permitted under a Bailey Classification System revised by the 2007 Soil Survey (NFRCS 2007). Exceedance of the TOC for Intervening Zone 7000 is not measured under forthcoming TRPA allowable base land coverage limitations.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts to water resources are measured at a level of less than significant. Based on proposed phasing, future projects will be implemented over a number of years, minimizing the possibility for overlapping effects. Other projects in the Homewood, California watersheds and the Lake Tahoe Basin will be subject to similar programmatic requirements (TRPA and NPDES permit regulations, SWPPPs, regional and community stormwater treatment initiatives, pre- and post-project water quality and BMP effectiveness monitoring) and performance standards (revegetation success criteria, TMDL load reductions and stormwater treatment performance and BMP effectiveness) and thereby avoid, reduce and minimize the potential for cumulative adverse impacts. Mitigation measure HYDRO-1a requires post-project monitoring of BMP effectiveness, revegetation success and storm water treatment system performance. Should monitoring results measure impacts to surface or ground water resources from the Project, remedial actions have been identified to avoid, reduce or further mitigate incremental contributions to cumulative effects. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-128 through 15-132.)</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><b>PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES</b></p> <p><b>PSU-1. Will the Project increase demand or exacerbate peak period service demand of fire, law enforcement, schools, government services, water, sewage treatment and disposal, communication systems, solid waste, gas, or electric to such a degree that service standards and objectives cannot be maintained or new facilities are needed that could cause significant environmental effects?</b></p> <p><b>Water Supply.</b> Alternative 1A is expected to increase demand for domestic and raw water. The TCPUD water supply system infrastructure operates at capacity for its existing customers and does not have additional capacity available to serve the proposed South Base Area of Alternative 1A. TCPUD plans to construct a new WTP to replace the existing temporary WTP in this area.</p> <p>Calculations conducted for the MCWC indicate that MCWC facilities have water supply to serve the proposed HMR North Base area domestic water needs, but that some offsite improvements may be required to meet higher fire flows associated with the new development. The adequacy of fire flow and water storage tanks is not known, and would not be known, until the design review stage of the project. Therefore, impacts to fire flow are considered a significant impact.</p> <p>Current rate of flow is not sufficient to meet peak demand for snowmaking Alternative 1A. HMR and the TCPUD McKinney-Quail Water Service Area would require upgraded extraction, pumping, treatment, conveyance, and storage capacity to serve the total new snowmaking demand for the Project area. This is considered a significant impact on water supply and mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Wastewater Treatment.</b> Implementation of Alternative 1A includes the construction of new residences and affordable/employee housing units, and improved winter sports, recreational</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure PSU-1a: Water Supply Assessment and Infrastructure.</b></p> <p>The Project Applicant shall obtain approval from the Placer County LAFCO for any service area adjustments required to provide water for the Project prior to the approval of Improvement Plans and the first Final Map recordation for any portion of the Project requiring water supply from the TCPUD, whichever occurs first. Because a water supplier has not been selected, details regarding water supply engineering will be determined at the time the supplier is identified. The Project Applicant shall provide a detailed Water System Engineering Report approved by the selected water supplier (TCPUD and/or MCWC) for any portion of the Project requiring water supply from the TCPUD and/or MCWC prior to approval of Improvement Plans for any portion of the HMR MP Phase 1 development. The Report shall be prepared by a California Registered Civil Engineer and describe the necessary infrastructure required by the selected water provider to meet the Proposed Project's domestic, fire protection, and snow making water demands. The report shall include specific on-site distribution system design calculations and demonstrate that peak, maximum, and average demands as well as flow rate, pressure, and duration requirements will meet Placer County, TPRA and other relevant standards. The Project Applicant shall obtain a "will-serve" letter from the selected water provider(s) prior to the approval of Improvement Plans and the first Final Map recordation for any portion of the Project.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall incorporate into their project designs fire flow requirements based on the California Fire Code and other applicable requirements based on TPRA and Placer County fire prevention standards.</p> <p>TCPUD off-site water system infrastructure improvements identified by the above Report shall be designed, permitted, and constructed prior to occupancy of any portion of the Project necessitating the improvement. The Project</p>	<p>S</p> <p>LS</p>	<p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b></p> <p><b>Water Supply.</b> Comments suggest that the draft Water Supply Assessment (WSA) (Nichols Consulting Engineers 2010) circulated with the DEIR/EIS does not comply with CEQA or TRPA requirements. Senate Bill (SB) 610 (Water Code, §§ 10910-10915) requires that when a proposed development is subject to CEQA, and is a "project" within the meaning of SB 610, a WSA is required. Although the proposed Project may not qualify as a "project" within the meaning SB 610 (Water Code § 10912), a final WSA for the Project that complies with the requirements of SB 610 was prepared in response to comments on the adequacy of the water supply information in the DEIR/EIS. As noted above, this Final WSA is included as Appendix AA to the FEIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Final WSA updates the analysis included in the draft WSA to include information from Tahoe City Public Utility District's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which TCPUD adopted after the release of the DEIR/EIS. The Final WSA also updates information regarding Madden Creek Water Company (MCWC) water supplies and Project water demands, based on consultation with TCPUD and MCWD. Lastly, the Final WSA adds a discussion of snowmaking supplies and demands and an appendix discussing fire flows. The County and TPRA will consider the WSA in determining whether to approve the proposed Project.</p> <p>In addition to the WSA, the DEIR/EIS analyzed the Project's impacts on water resources and the adequacy of the proposed water supply and infrastructure to serve the Project (Draft EIR/EIS, Chapter 15.0 "Hydrology, Water Rights, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater", Chapter 16.0 "Public Services and Utilities"). The FEIR/EIS updates the DEIR/EIS's analysis based on the revisions to the Final WSA and in response to comments on the DEIR/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>and commercial facilities. Wastewater quantities generated by Alternative 1A are expected to be similar to the demand for domestic water (Beaudin Ganze Consulting Engineers, Inc. 2007). Alternative 1A require up to 70,431 gallons per day of domestic water, and are expected to generate up to that volume during peak use periods (Beaudin Ganze Consulting Engineers, Inc. 2007).</p> <p>TCPUD's and TTSA's existing wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities are considered adequate to accept wastewater from the Alternative 1A (Laliois 2009, Parker 2010). TTSA facilities are currently operating with about 20% available excess capacity. The TRI has a design capacity of 6.0 million gallons per day, and current excess capacity in the pipeline is 1.2 million gallons per day. The TTSA Water Reclamation Plant has a treatment capacity of 9.6 million gallons per day, and currently has an excess capacity of 1.92 million gallons per day. On peak demand days, Project wastewater may occupy up to 6% of available excess capacity in the TTSA conveyance and treatment systems. Excess capacities in the TRI and at the water reclamation plant are available on a first come/first serve basis.</p> <p>TCPUD requires a detailed domestic sewer study engineering report prepared by a registered civil engineer prior to Project approval. However, according to TCPUD, it is anticipated that the proposed development will connect directly to the District's West Shore Export (WSE) sewer facility. The WSE has greater than sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed project since the sewer collection and export systems were originally designed to serve a much larger population than presently exists. At this time, the District does not have any future projects planned for the WSE for which HMR would be responsible (Homoka, 12/15/10). TCPUD adopted water and sewer connection fees (Ordinance 259a) and user and service fees (Ordinance 295b) fees will apply to the Project. In addition to paying these fees, HMR will install the connections from the Project area to the TCPUD wastewater main in accordance with the District's standards, rules, and regulations.</p>	<p>Applicant shall be responsible to reimburse the TCPUD for all costs associated with the improvement.</p> <p>The identified WTP, or alternative water source solution shall be completed prior to occupancy of any portion of the Project requiring water supply from TCPUD. The Project Applicant shall be responsible to reimburse the TCPUD for their fair-share contribution to the water supply project as determined by the TCPUD.</p> <p>The Project may obtain water from a combination of TCPUD, MCWC, and on-site groundwater wells and surface water. With the water supply source identified, the Project Applicant shall determine the location and designs of infrastructure necessary to meet peak demand and overall quantity in the Project area for domestic use, fire flows, and snowmaking. If additional onsite or offsite facilities are required for snowmaking operations (e.g., facilities not included in the proposed HMR MP), then snowmaking operations will be managed to utilize available water resources until additional studies, if necessary, are completed and approved.</p> <p>The Project Applicant will be responsible for construction of infrastructure to connect to the established water system and to provide for the increased water demand of the Project. TCPUD assesses a single charge to buy into the system and fees are charged monthly for water usage based on consumption. Connection fees, however, do not accommodate additional development of the magnitude of the Proposed Project. The Project Applicant will be responsible to enter into a development agreement with TCPUD and pay costs related to onsite infrastructure and the fair share of off-site infrastructure. The Project Applicant will be required to pay the connection fee and for the construction of additional infrastructure to supply the Project with user fees charged upon connection for water usage.</p> <p>MCWC has similar requirements for connection and service fees, and the applicant will be required to construct the appropriate infrastructure to utilize MCWC water supply (Marr 2009). During the design phase of new water supply infrastructure, the lead and responsible agencies will determine if additional environmental review</p>		<p>Master Response, MR-21, provides an overview of the Project's water supply, updates the information presented in the DEIR/EIS where necessary, and provides additional background that was not available at the time the DEIR/EIS was prepared. Mitigation Measure PSU-1a has also been revised based on the Final WSA, Water Supply Overview. The Project's South Base area is within the service area of the TCPUD, specifically the TCPUD McKinney/Quail Sub-district; the North Base area is within the service area of the privately operated MCWC; the Mid-Mountain area and parcel APN 097-060-035 are currently outside of any water service area and inclusion of these areas into either the TCPUD or MCWC service area through TCPUD Board and/or MCWC approval would be required. Because no single water system serves the Project area, the information contained in the Final WSA was prepared in consultation with both TCPUD and MCWC.</p> <p>As reflected in the Final WSA, approximately 20.1 million gallons per year (MGY) of water will be required to meet the Project's residential, commercial and irrigation water demands at build-out, including fire flow. A total of 60.8 MGY will be required to meet Project snowmaking demands, for both existing and proposed terrain. Although the Project is proposed to be developed in phases, the Final WSA conservatively assumes 20.1 MGY for consumptive and irrigation demands and 60.8 MGY for snowmaking demands would be required to meet the Project's near-term (i.e., opening day) demands.</p> <p>To meet the Project's residential, commercial and irrigation water demands, the Final WSA presented two water supply alternatives. Snowmaking demands would be met identically under either water supply alternative. Under Water Supply Alternative 1 ("Alternative 1"), the Project's residential, commercial and irrigation water demands would be met exclusively with TCPUD supplies. Annexation into the TCPUD service area or TCPUD approval of a contract for water service outside its boundaries would be required for TCPUD to serve the North Base, Mid-Mountain area, and APN 097-060-035 under Alternative 1. Under Water Supply Alternative 2 ("Alternative 2"), MCWC would provide water to the North Base, as true under existing conditions. TCPUD would provide water to the South Base, APN 097-060-035 and the Mid-Mountain. Annexation or TCPUD approval of a contract for water service outside its boundaries would be required for TCPUD to serve APN 097-060-035 and the Mid-Mountain area under Alternative 2.</p> <p>Under either water supply alternative, existing and proposed snowmaking demands at Homewood would be met through the TCPUD McKinney Well No. 1 and the HMR-owned well in the North Base.</p> <p>The Final WSA concludes that with implementation of water</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>TCPUD and the TTSA finance facility improvements and expansions through connection charges, service charges, and tax revenue. Developers are assessed connection charges, based on the number of new residential units and other uses, at the time development occurs. The TTSA Connection Fee Schedule (TTSA 2010) is based on the quantity of wastewater that would be generated by type of dwelling unit or commercial use.</p> <p>Due to existing available capacity in the wastewater conveyance and treatment system, and the fee schedules in place designed to recover agency costs to upgrade and maintain systems, the impact of Alternative 1A on the wastewater system is considered less than significant.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure PSU-1b: Coordination of Construction Waste Disposal with ERSL</b></p> <p>To reduce impacts to the existing solid waste handling capacity, the Project Applicant shall coordinate with the Eastern Regional Sanitary Landfill, Inc. (ERSL) to ensure that sufficient capacity to handle demolition and construction waste is available. Coordinating waste volume with handling capacity during demolition and construction will reduce impacts to solid waste services to less than significant.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure PSU-1c: Payment of Development Impact Fee to Placer County Sheriff's Department.</b></p> <p>Based on the Alternative selected, the Project Applicant shall consult with the PCSD to develop an appropriate fair share development impact fee to offset the cost of 1.0 FTE PCSD sheriff deputy per 1,000 new residents. Payment of the impact fee is expected to go towards upgrading equipment or facilities, increasing staff, or otherwise improving response times in the Project vicinity.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 16-29 through 16-31.)</p>		<p>treatment and infrastructure to provide additional TCPUD surface water to the McKinney/Quail sub-district and to the Project area, in combination with groundwater supplies, there is a reasonable likelihood that sufficient water will be available to meet Project and existing and planned future water demands in normal, dry, and multiple dry years through 2030. This conclusion is based on the following facts:</p> <p>Alternative 1: Based on the supply projections included in TCPUD's 2010 UWMWP (UWMWP Table 4.1), within the McKinney/Quail Sub-district, TCPUD projects a supply of 35 MGY of Lake Tahoe surface water in normal, dry and multiple dry years through 2030 and a supply of 26 MGY of groundwater in normal, dry and multiple dry years through 2030 (WSA, Table 19). The 35 MGY of Lake Tahoe surface water would be made available to TCPUD through TCPUD's planned new intake (replacing existing abandoned intakes) and a new water treatment plant (TCPUD, 2011 [TCPUD 2010 UWMWP, § 4.1]). The new intake and water treatment plant are included in TCPUD's five-year Capital Improvement Program (Final WSA, Appendix D). As shown in Table 19 of the Final WSA, when added to existing and planned demand within the McKinney/Quail Sub-district, the Project would create a deficit of 18.8 MGY in 2015, 19.6 MGY in 2020, 20.4 MGY in 2025 and 21.2 MGY in 2030.</p> <p>The water supply deficit shown in Final WSA Table 19 is not based on lack of sufficient TCPUD water to meet water demands, including the proposed Project's water demands; instead, the deficit is the result of insufficient planned capacity for the proposed TCPUD McKinney/Quail WTP (Nichols Consulting Engineers, 2011). As explained in the Final WSA and based on communications with TCPUD (see Homolka 2010), TCPUD intends to modify its plans for its proposed McKinney/Quail WTP in order to accommodate the proposed Project. TCPUD is currently investigating two alternatives for the WTP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use TCPUD's existing Chamber's Landing lake intake and build a new WTP facility at one of two potential locations. This alternative could also involve approximately 1,200 feet of raw water pipe from the existing Chamber's Landing intake to the new WTP facility, as well as connections to the existing distribution system.</li> <li>2. Retrofit and use TCPUD's existing lake intake at the McKinney Shores Homeowners Beach and build a new WTP facility at Homewood Mountain Resort's (HMR) South Lodge area. This alternative could also involve approximately 2,400 feet of raw water pipe from the lake intake to the new WTP facility, as well as connections to the existing distribution system. (Final WSA, p. 23, citing Homolka, 2010)</li> </ol> <p>The offsite water treatment plant and raw water supply infrastructure improvements that may be required for the Project will be addressed through a separate environmental documentation and review process administered by TCPUD. The new WTP would be sized for TCPUD's domestic water needs</p>
<p><b>Operational Solid Waste.</b> Due to the seasonal nature of activities at HMR, solid waste generation during operation is presented for both peak days and an annual total. For planning and environmental analysis, Placer County assumes new dwelling units would be occupied by 2.6 persons, and each person generates seven pounds of trash per day. For peak daily demand, the calculations assume 2.6 persons occupy each tourist accommodation unit and dwelling unit (Placer County 2010). For annual waste generation, the calculations assume that 2.0 persons occupy each tourist accommodation unit and 2.6 persons occupy half of the residential dwelling unit. Table 16-5 presents estimates of solid waste generated by the Proposed Project and Alternatives.</p> <p>Alternative 1A will generate between 5,988 to 291 pounds per day if fully occupied. This represents a maximum of 0.37% of the TTSD's</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>daily capacity to manage solid waste stream, and up to 1.4% of the current waste handled by the TTSD. On an annual basis, up to 788 tons of solid waste would be generated, representing a 1.25% increase over the current quantity. The annual quantity is considered a conservative estimate by assuming tourist accommodation units are fully-occupied. Existing waste handling systems and landfills have sufficient capacity to handle and dispose of new waste generated by Alternative 1A. The quantity of waste is not expected to shorten the lifespan of existing landfills or induce the need to construct new or expand existing waste disposal facilities. Consequently, this is considered a less than significant impact on solid waste services.</p> <p>On-site solid waste receptacles will be bear-resistant per Placer County Ordinance 8.16.266. TTSD fees for service are based on the number of waste bins used at the Project area.</p> <p>Construction waste would include materials that are not recycled during demolition of existing structures. Excavated materials are proposed for offsite disposal at facilities that will accept clean fill material. It is also possible that excavated material would be used onsite as part of on mountain restoration activities or within the west shore area by restoration agencies (e.g. California Tahoe Conservancy). Construction wastes would be generated in the initial phases of construction and would not occur over long-term operation of the Project or Alternatives.</p> <p><b>Energy (Gas and Electricity):</b> HMR facilities will be required to comply with Title 24 of the CCR. Under Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines, the State of California sets forth goals for energy conservation, including decreasing per capita energy consumption and reliance on fossil fuels, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. Alternative 1A includes additional energy conservation measures as part of the LEED certification process at the North Base area, which requires a decrease in energy use by more than 50% per guest compared to standard construction and operation of similar facilities. The design will include solar energy us to augment</p>			<p>(constructed at TCPUD's expense) and the proposed Project's domestic needs (paid for by HMR). It is likely the facility would be sized to include some amount of regional expansion capacity to serve adjacent water companies, which would be constructed at TCPUD's expense. The new WTP is anticipated to be constructed in 2013, prior to project operations. With the new WTP in place, sufficient TCPUD water supply would be available to meet TCPUD's water demands within the McKinney/Quail Sub-district, including the proposed Project's water demands (WSA, p. 23).</p> <p>Alternative 2: Under Alternative 2, MCWC has sufficient water supplies to meet existing and planned future water demands within its service area, including the proposed Project's water demands for the North Base area. With respect to the South Base (including APN 096-060-022 and the Mid-Mountain area), with inclusion of the proposed Project, TCPUD would experience a deficit of 5.0 MGY in 2015, 5.8 MGY in 2020, 6.6 MGY in 2025, and 7.4 MGY in 2030 (Final WSA, Table 21). This deficit is associated with insufficient planned water treatment facility capacity, rather than with inadequate water supplies. For the same reasons discussed under Alternative 1 above, this deficit would be addressed through TCPUD's new McKinney/Quail WTP. With the new WTP, TCPUD would have sufficient supplies to meet its existing and planned water demands in normal, dry and multiple dry years through 2030, including the proposed Project's demands (Final WSA, pp. 23-24).</p> <p><b>Snowmaking:</b> Existing and proposed snowmaking operations at the HMR site are anticipated to require 60.8 MGY. The TCPUD McKinney Well No. 1 and the HMR can supply a total of 140.76 MGY (60.6 MGY from HMR well and 78.2 MGY from McKinney Well No. 1), which is more than sufficient to meet the existing and proposed snowmaking demands of 60.8 MGY. A portion of the water used for snowmaking would be recharged into the aquifer along with natural snow (Final WSA, p. 22).</p> <p>Placer County recognizes that there is a degree of uncertainty with respect to TCPUD's water supply as a result of the Truckee River Operating Agreement (TROA). Section 204 of the Truckee-Carson-Pyramid Lake Water Rights Settlement Act (Title II of Public Law 101-618) ("Settlement Act") limits California water diversions in the Lake Tahoe Basin to 23,000 acre-feet per year. Section 205 of the Settlement Act requires the development of an operating agreement for the Truckee River reservoirs, including Lake Tahoe. This operating agreement is referred to as the "TROA." All signatory parties signed the TROA in September 2008; however, there are a number of additional actions that must be implemented. These actions include resolution of ongoing litigation brought by the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District in the United States District Court challenging the regulation adopting the TROA and the Final Environmental Impact Statement certified</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>electrical demand and water heating. The buildings will include high efficiency insulation, windows, appliances, and building materials.</p> <p>Residential, commercial, and recreational electricity consumption was estimated using a variety of resources and methodologies. In 2007, Beaudin Ganze Inc. completed a natural gas and electric energy use estimates for Alternative 1A (Beaudin Ganze Inc. 2007). This data was therefore estimated from 2007 average consumptive data for residential and commercial customers in California (Dillard pers. comm; Energy Information Association 2009a, 2009b, and 2009c).</p> <p>The Project would receive electricity generated by NV Energy. Electricity consumption for Alternative 1A would be approximately 44,593,658 kilowatt-hours per year (Beaudin Ganze Inc. 2007), which is minor in relation to the total amount of energy supplied by NV Energy in its service area. NV Energy has a peak load of 7,152 MW. HMR currently consumes approximately 1,372,000 kilowatt-hours per year (Tirman pers. comm. [B]).</p> <p>Alternative 1A will increase electrical demand in the Project area by up to 16 MW and annual usage by 43,374,000 kilowatt-hours (Beaudin Ganze Consulting Engineers, Inc. 2007).</p> <p>The Tahoe City Substation on West Lake Boulevard supplies electricity to the Project area. The Tahoe City substation is nearing its maximum load capacity, and large additional loads will require an upgrade of the facility (Hutton 2009). Alternative 1A may hasten the need to upgrade the Tahoe City Substation. NV Energy establishes service connection and usage fees such that users pay their proportional fair share of anticipated capital improvements and expected maintenance.</p> <p>Aboveground electrical transmission lines serve the Project area. Alternative 1A includes a new underground distribution system with aboveground pad-mounted transformers, and eight miles of belowground lines to serve the snowmaking system. Off-site, new cables will be needed to provide electrical service to the site from existing transmission lines. The ultimate configuration would be approved by NV Energy in accordance with California Public</p>			<p>for the TROA, modifications to the Orr Ditch Decree, modifications to the Truckee River General Electric Decree, and petitions for changes of water rights.</p> <p>As noted in the EIR/EIS, the Settlement Act allocates 23,000 AFY diversions from the Lake Tahoe Basin to the State of California. This allocation is for use within the Lake Tahoe Basin from all natural sources, including both direct diversions from Lake Tahoe and groundwater. Other than the TCPUD, the major water purveyors on the California side of Lake Tahoe include the South Tahoe Public Utility District and the North Tahoe Public Utility District. TCPUD will be required to conform to the TROA when it is finalized. The portion to be allocated to TCPUD has not been finalized, so an exact quantification of available future supply is not possible at this time (TCPUD, 2010 UWWMP, § 4.8; DEIR/EIS, pp. 16-7, 1-15). Based on its existing water rights, however, TCPUD anticipates sufficient water supply will be available to meet future demands within its service area through 2030, including those of the proposed Project (Final WSA, pp. 23-23).</p> <p>In addition to the uncertainty created by the TROA, the fact that TCPUD has not yet approved and constructed the WTP needed to serve the McKinney/Quail Sub-district, including the proposed Project, creates a degree of uncertainty. Because the WTP is part of the TCPUD's five-year Capital Improvement Program and TCPUD has indicated a willingness to construct the WTP in a manner to serve the proposed Project, in addition to its existing and other planned future users, Placer County concludes there is a reasonable certainty the WTP will be constructed and will have sufficient capacity to meet the proposed Project's demands under either water supply alternative.</p> <p>Thus, for the reasons described herein and in the Final WSA, Placer County find there is a reasonable likelihood that sufficient water will be available to meet proposed Project water demands in the short-term and long-term under varying water year conditions.</p> <p>Although Placer County and TPRA believe there is a reasonable certainty the proposed Project's water demands can be met under the water supply alternatives discussed above, an alternative water supply to meet the Project's build-out water demands could be made available through the MCWC supplies. Under this alternative supply, MCWC would meet all the proposed Project's non-snowmaking demands. Snowmaking demands would be met in the same manner discussed above. As shown in Table 20 of the Final WSA, MCWC would have a surplus of 84.1 MGY if it were to meet the proposed Project's North Base demand of 13.9 MGY (as proposed by Water Supply Alternative 2). Adding the South Base demand (including APN 097-060-035 and the Mid-Mountain area) of 6.3 MGY to that amount would still result in a surplus of 77.8 MGY of MCWC water supplies in normal, dry, and multiple dry years through 2030.</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>Utilities Commission (CPUC) Decision 95-08-038 for the installation or upgrading of electric facilities. Belowground transmission lines will not result in additional physical disturbances beyond that currently anticipated for the Project.</p> <p>Alternative 1A is expected to demand up to 154,000 Btus (British thermal units) per hour, with an annual demand of 1,064,000 therms (one therm equals 100,000 British thermal units) (Beaudin Ganze Consulting Engineers, Inc. 2007). Annual natural gas usage for existing conditions (No Project (Alternative 2)) was provided by JMA Ventures, LLC and estimated at 11,000 therms (Timan pers. comm. [B]).</p> <p>Underground gas service will be extended to serve new structures. HMR will coordinate with Southwest Gas Corporation for the extension of on-site and off-site infrastructure with the ultimate configuration to be approved by Southwest Gas Corporation. New infrastructure will be installed in utility rights-of-way on-site. Extension of these facilities will not require upgrades to the Southwest Gas Corporation transmission system that are not currently planned for, nor will additional physical disturbances result beyond that currently anticipated. As part of the Project approval process, HMR will coordinate with and meet the requirements of Southwest Gas Corporation regarding the extension and locations of on-site infrastructure. HMR is required to pay for necessary natural gas infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Electrical and gas utility improvements and new easements on site will be identified in the final Project design and are required to comply with Placer County, NV Energy, of Southwest Gas Corporation, CPUC, and California Building Code requirements, and are expected to be sufficient to serve the Project area. New line extensions and facility construction to serve the site will occur concurrently with development phases. Off-site distribution systems and supply sources are considered adequate to serve the expected increased demand of the Project. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p> <p><b>Public Schools.</b> Alternative 1A is anticipated</p>				<p>In order to effectuate this MCWC water supply alternative, the South Base would need to be taken out of the TCPUD service area and that area, along with APN 097-060-035 and the Mid-Mountain area, would need to be added to MCWC's service through an application to the Placer County LAFCO as well as an amendment to HMR's existing contract with MCWC. Additional water distribution facilities would be needed to transmit MCWC water to the South Base, APN 096-060-035 and the Mid-Mountain area. Upgrades to MCWC's existing well could also be required. Upgrades and distribution infrastructure, if needed, would be addressed through environmental documentation prepared by MCWC. Compliance with regulatory requirements would ensure that well upgrades, if needed, would not result in adverse environmental effects. Because the Lahontan Groundwater basin is not in overdraft, this alternative would not be expected to result in adverse impacts to groundwater supplies as addressed in the Final WSA. Mitigation measures for construction related impacts required for the proposed Project would be applied to the construction of the distribution lines needed to implement this alternative and impacts would be similar to those of the infrastructure currently proposed for the Project.</p> <p><b>Water Supply Infrastructure.</b> Under both water supply alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS, additional TCPUD water supply infrastructure (WTP) is necessary to meet TCPUD's existing and planned future water demands. This is true with or without the proposed Project; however, with the proposed Project the McKinney/Quail WTP would need to have greater capacity. TCPUD is the lead agency for the proposed intake and WTP. In order to serve TCPUD demand in 2030, including the Proposed Project, a new WTP, located on approximately 0.25 to 0.5 acre of TCPUD easement, would be constructed. According to TCPUD (Homoka, September 2011), the WTP structure would measure approximately 40 feet by 60 feet and would include a small number of parking spaces for employees. Approvals or consultation required for the intake and WTP could also include a United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Section 404/10 permit, Department of Health Services (DHS) Water Supply Permit, encroachment permits (e.g., from Caltrans, Reclamation Board, Placer County), Improvement/Grading Plans, a Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board National Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and consultation with TRPA, Placer County, and Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.</p> <p>In addition to the intake and WTP proposed by TCPUD, water infrastructure would be required as part of the proposed Project for delivering domestic water from the WTP and the TCPUD/MCWC wells to the Project area. This delivery infrastructure would most likely include underground pipes within existing public road easements. Mitigation measures and BMPs included in the EIR/EIS to address the Project's construction</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>to add new students to Tahoe Lake Elementary School, Tahoe Middle School, and North Lake Tahoe High School. TTUSD calculates potential students by utilizing the Student Yield Rates from its 2006 Developer Fee Justification Study (TTUSD 2006). To estimate the maximum potential number of students associated with the Project, it is assumed that residential and worker units are 100% occupied during the school year. In actuality, at least 50% of new residential units are expected to be second homes, yielding fewer students than estimated in this impact analysis. The potential maximum number of K-12 students and potential impacts on existing school capacity is as shown in Table 16-6 of the EIR/EIS.</p>			<p>impacts would be applied to the construction of the water delivery system to ensure impacts are reduced to less than significant levels. For the infrastructure required to meet the proposed Project's snowmaking demands, further environmental analysis will be performed at a future date since this project component has been addressed in the EIR/EIS at a programmatic level only.</p> <p>Annexation into TCPUD Service Area/TCPUD Approval of Contract for Water Service Outside TCPUD Boundaries. As noted, under either of the two Water Supply Alternatives presented in the WSA, a portion of the Project area as well as other HMR parcels between the Mid-Mountain and North and South Base would need to be annexed into TCPUD's Service Area or the TCPUD would need to approve of water service outside its boundaries (see TCPUD Water Ordinance No. 263, § 2.12 ["Water service outside District boundaries may be provided by contract only at the discretion of the District"]). The Project Applicant is currently in discussions with TCPUD regarding how best to proceed in order for TCPUD to supply water to the Project area other than the South Base currently within the TCPUD service area (i.e., the North Base, Mid-Mountain area and APN 097-060-035 under Water Supply Alternative 1, and the Mid-Mountain area and APN 097-060-035 under Water Supply Alternative 2). To implement Water Supply Alternative 1, MCWC concurrence would be required. TCPUD and Placer County LACO would rely on the FEIR/EIS in determining whether to approve the annexation/service contract. Because the FEIR/EIS assumes TCPUD would supply water to the proposed Project (as proposed under Water Supply Alternative 1 or Water Supply Alternative 2) no additional environmental impacts beyond those identified in the FEIR/EIS would result as a consequence of the TCPUD annexation/service contract.</p> <p><b>Fire Flows:</b> Improvements at the South Base Area are necessary to increase fire flow capabilities to meet current residential fire flow requirements of 1,000 gallons per minute (gpm). The Project is expected to require 1,500 gpm and at least 429,000 gallons of storage (Nichols Consulting Engineers 2011). These improvements would be addressed through the new WTP as discussed in Mitigation Measure PSU-1a.</p> <p><b>Solid Waste Disposal.</b>  <b>Construction and Demolition Waste.</b> The EIR/EIS analysis of solid waste disposal is based on TTSd permitted capacity to handle waste on a daily basis, and the total lifespan capacity of disposal areas. The MRF has a permitted capacity of 800 tons of material per day and 832 vehicles per day. TTSd handled approximately 63,000 tons of solid waste in 2009 (average of approximately 210 tons per day of operation). The Lockwood Regional Landfill handles non-hazardous solid waste material and has a capacity of up to 250 years (Placer County 2008, 2010). The EIR/EIS waste generated during construction and demolition, and waste expected to be generated during project operation.</p>
<p>There is currently sufficient excess capacity in the TTUSD system to accommodate new students generated by Alternative 1A. Long-term enrollment patterns are difficult to predict, but the TTUSD does not anticipate demographic shifts in the district that would bring substantial new students to area schools. No new facilities will be needed and the Project is not expected to adversely affect school resources.</p>			
<p>Projects are required to pay the State-mandated school impact fees to TTUSD for new residential and commercial construction in the district boundaries. The fees mitigate impacts of new development and can only be used for capital outlay expenses related to development (e.g., new construction, reconstruction, portable classrooms, etc.). Under SB 50, payment of the school impact fee is considered full and adequate mitigation under CEQA (Government Code §65996). Section 65996 does not provide for remediation of existing deficiencies in school services.</p>			
<p>Alternative 1A would be required to pay the school impact fee at the time of construction. The current rates for the 2009-2010 school year are \$2.63 per square foot of new residential construction, and \$0.42 per square foot for new commercial or industrial uses. With payment of the State-mandated school impact fees to mitigate potential adverse impacts on schools, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>			
<p><b>Fire Protection Services.</b> Alternative 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
<p>would build new single- and multi-family residential units, hotel rooms, commercial floor space, skier service facilities, parking in surface, underground and parking structure facilities, and ancillary structures. New buildings will be equipped with sprinkler systems and fire hydrants will be installed at various locations in the Project area for fire protection. Specific hydrant locations and fire flow will be determined during the design phase through consultation with the NTFPD. SR 89 provides primary the emergency access route to the Project area.</p> <p>The NTFPD has provided a list of design conditions for the Project, some of which are encompassed in the requirements of local and State codes or ordinances, and some that are specific to NTFPD (NTFPD January 14, 2009). These conditions include emergency water supplies, adequate roadways and fire access roads, automatic fire sprinkler systems, automatic fire alarm systems, and main power disconnect systems. Approved non-freezing automatic sprinklers that meet or exceed NFPA (13, 13R, and 13D), CFC, and NTFPD standards will be required in many project structures. Approved automatic fire alarm systems that meet or exceed NFPA (72), CFC, and NTFPD standards will be required in many project structures. The systems must be connected to sprinkler system water flow, tamper, and other devices. Any building with an automatic sprinkler system shall have a Knox Box and 110-volt outside fire alarm properly installed. A remote main power disconnect switch may be required if the main switch is located inside or is inaccessible due to snow. The NTFPD will review the tentative Project site maps before construction begins or annexation of the Project area is completed to ensure these conditions are met. At the time of final NTFPD review and annexation, the NTFPD may place additional requirements on the Project, if needed, to meet public safety service standards.</p> <p>The potential for an increase in fires and accidents is inherent with an increase in resident population. The NTFPD expects that Alternative 1A will cause a marked increase in fire/EEMS calls for service from NTFPD. NTFPD will require measures to maintain existing</p>			<p>According to a national survey, the national average construction waste generation is 4.38 pounds per square foot for residential buildings, 3.89 pounds per square foot for non-residential buildings, and 155 pounds per square foot for demolition of non-residential structures (Franklin Associates 1998). Statewide, construction and demolition account for 22% of the total waste stream by volume, and 11.6% by weight (California Integrated Waste Management Board 2002, 2005, CalRecycle 2009).</p> <p>An estimated 60% of green buildings certified by the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) program divert over 75% percent of construction and demolition waste through reuse, recycling, and other methods (California Integrated Waste Management Board 2005). Consequently, for this analysis, it is assumed that under LEED certification standards for Alternative 1A, construction would generate approximately 25% of the average amount of waste. This reduced rate of waste generation is considered feasible because construction and demolition materials recycling centers readily divert 60% - 90% of materials from the waste stream (California Integrated Waste Management Board 2002, 2005). To provide a more conservative analysis, the analysis assumes that mixed-use structures with multi-family and tourist accommodation units would generate waste at the residential construction rate, and demolition of existing structures and hardscape surfaces would occur at the non-residential rate. Therefore, Alternative 1A demolition of existing structures and facilities would generate 38.75 pounds per square foot, construction of residential and mixed-use structures (including hotels, timeshares/fractional ownership units, townhouses, condominiums, and single family homes) would generate 1,095 pounds per square foot, and construction of non-residential structures (e.g., parking structures, maintenance buildings, skier service facilities) would generate 0.9725 pound per square foot.</p> <p>The precise square footage of structures and facilities to be removed under demolition is not known. The estimated surface area and structures to be demolished under Alternative 1A are based on existing land coverage and structures described in Chapter 3, Section 3.1. Existing land coverage is approximately 271,000 square feet at the North Base area and 117,000 square feet at the South Base area. The existing North Base lodge is 13,943 square feet. The South Base lodge is 7,300 square feet and the vehicle shop/maintenance facility located adjacent to the South Base area is 3,884 square feet. Therefore, the total demolition area therefore is estimated to be 413,127 square feet for Alternative 1A. At the rate of 38.75 pounds per square foot, demolition would generate an estimated 16,008,671 pounds (8,004 tons) of waste and debris for Alternative 1A. Alternative 1A would generate up to 1,107,919 pounds during construction. Table 16-4 of the EIR/EIS below provides estimated construction waste.</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 levels and response times with the increased calls for service, such as increased staffing, specialized apparatus because of new building heights, and station accommodations for additional staff.</p> <p>Placer County and the NTFPD require projects to pay developer impact fees based on developed living space (including garages). It is expected that this fee will fund service capacity improvements that will offset the expected increase in calls for service to maintain existing service levels and response times in the service territory.</p> <p>NTFPD review and approval of Project design plans and development impact fees will ensure that Alternative 1A will include adequate fire protection facilities, including sprinkler systems in new buildings and fire hydrants on the Project area, to meet NTFPD service standards and local and State codes. This impact is considered less than significant.</p> <p><b>Sheriff and Police Services.</b> Alternative 1A may add up to 855 new TAU and affordable/employee housing occupants to the Project area during periods of peak use. This would be in addition to the up to 321 permanent new residents generated by Alternative 1A. Police emergency response times to the Project and service area of the PCSD could increase due to increased calls for service. There is currently no developer impact fee designed to offset the costs of expanding PCSD service. This impact is considered a significant impact on police services.</p> <p><b>Telecommunications Service.</b> The Project will expand telecommunication facilities to serve new buildings and residents. HMR will place these lines underground and will coordinate with AT&amp;T on the location and capacity of new lines. Commercial buildings to be directly served by AT&amp;T require a 4-inch duct from the point of feed, and single-family residences require a 2-inch duct. Existing service lines to Homewood are considered adequate to accommodate the increased demand for service within the Project area, so no off-site construction or infrastructure improvements are expected. Payment of appropriate new service connection fees is expected to cover costs to</p>			<p>LEED certification with Alternative 1A emphasizes reuse of building materials and limiting of waste disposal for previously developed sites. Accordingly, new buildings will utilize materials from existing structures dismantled on-site. Components from old chair lifts can be used when building new chair lifts on-site or at other local ski resorts. HMR is creating a "Green Guide" or sustainability plan that addresses the concerns associated with the building process. Architectural design will consider the "life-cycle" costs of the infrastructure and buildings used at HMR. Green building principles that to be implemented during redevelopment includes the reuse and recycling of materials from de-constructed buildings.</p> <p>Up to 100,000 cubic yards of excavated materials could be generated during construction of Alternative 1A. There are opportunities for the on-site reuse of approximately 102,000 cubic yards of excavated materials that is generated during project construction to be used as fill, as identified in Chapter 3, Figure 3-12, and Table 3-6 of the EIR/EIS. If materials cannot be used on-site for construction, restoration, and revegetation, the materials would be used at nearby California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) and Placer County project sites or exported to a TRPA designated disposal site out side of the Lake Tahoe Basin. HMR will coordinate with Placer County and the CTC on the storage and use of export material for restoration projects in the Project vicinity.</p> <p>While the existing landfills are expected to have sufficient capacity to handle demolition and construction waste and debris, existing sorting and transfer facilities may not have sufficient capacity to handle a large quantity of waste on given day. Demolition of existing structures and the construction of the project are expected to occur in phases over a 10-year period. Appendix N provides a detailed estimate of the 10-year construction schedule.</p> <p><b>Sheriff and Police Services.</b> PCSD typically provides "will serve" letters to proponents of new residential projects, indicating that PCSD will serve the Project to the best of their ability. Placer County and the PCSD have a standard of providing one officer per 1,000 residents, but this ratio method is not well suited for application to the Lake Tahoe area with its large seasonal variation in the numbers of transient visitors and residents. Based on population growth analysis of new housing units in Chapter 7 – Population, Employment and Housing, Alternative 1A would require up to 0.32 new FTE of a PCSD sheriff deputy to offset the expected increased calls for service and to maintain existing service and response times.</p> <p><b>Explanation.</b> Implementation of mitigation measures PSU-1a, PSU-1b, and PSU-1c will ensure impacts to water supply, solid</p>

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

081

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>upgrade and maintain communication systems as needed. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.</p> <p><b>Other Government Services.</b> The Homewood Post Office is located near the Project area at 5375 West Lake Boulevard. Street delivery service is not available in Homewood or the Project area. Indirectly, the increase in residents may result in increased vehicle trips to the Post Office and potential safety concerns (especially in snow conditions). The increase in individual vehicle trips is considered in Chapter 11 – Transportation and Circulation. However, mail pickup from the post office will not affect postal operations. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.</p>			<p>waste disposal, and police services are less than significant.</p> <p>Mitigation measure PSU-1a requires a detailed Water System Engineering Report approved by the selected water supplier as wells as payment of connection and service fees approved by TCPUD and MCWC a to ensure sufficient water to meet peak demand in the Project area with less than significant impacts on water supply in the vicinity. Mitigation measure PSU-1b ensures coordination of demolition and construction waste disposal with the ERSU to handle and sort material will ensure sufficient capacity is available to handle solid waste. Mitigation measure PSU-1b requires the payment of a proportional far development impact fee is expected to maintain existing police services levels and reduce the potential impact to less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 16-13 through 16-31; see also Chapter 23, Master Response 21 and Responses to Comments 7-9, 9-31 through 9-46, 10-14 through 10-23, 10-30 through 10-58, 11-5 through 11-10, 13a-16, 13a-50, 19-12, 19-13, 33-33 through 33-42, 2-c, and 2-d.)</p>
<p>Library services are provided in the Homewood area by the Placer County Library Department at a branch library in Tahoe City at 740 North Lake Boulevard. Placer County does not have a developer impact fee specific to library services. The Placer County Library Department will continue to provide library services from its Tahoe City branch and no specific library service issues have been identified. The existing library facility is expected to accommodate the estimated increased demand for services, and this impact is considered less than significant.</p> <p>(S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 16-13 through 16-31; see also Chapter 23, Master Response 21.)</p>			
<p><b>PSU-2. Does the Project have the potential to damage existing utility infrastructure?</b></p> <p>Project development under Alternative 1A will replace existing on-site infrastructure as part of Project development. The existing utility infrastructure has potential to be damaged inadvertently during construction activity, or if the Project does not design for adequate capacity or connections. Designs for replacing, extending or upgrading existing utility infrastructure will be coordinated with and approved by the appropriate utility service provider. Each utility service provider will require that the Project meet equipment and installation standards for connection to existing service infrastructure to maintain existing service levels. Prior to performing excavation,</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>HMR is required to call DigAlert at 811 to mark existing underground utilities and avoid inadvertent damage. Consequently, this impact is considered less than significant. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 16-32, see also Responses to Comment 10-59.)</p> <p><b>PSU-3: Will Project construction interfere with law enforcement and fire protection services?</b></p> <p>Alternative 1A will maintain adequate access to on-site and adjacent land uses during construction such that law enforcement and fire protection services will remain unimpeded. Designs for emergency vehicle access to the construction site and temporary construction-related detours, if necessary, will be coordinated with and approved by the PCSD and NTFPD. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 16-32; see also Response to Comments 19-22, 33-40 and 128-3.)</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><b>PSU-C1. Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to public service and utility resources?</b></p> <p>The Project and other proposed, planned, or permitted projects in the Homewood area and along the West Shore of Lake Tahoe may temporarily interrupt provision of services and utilities during construction, and may reduce supplies or capacities to provide public services during operation.</p> <p>Construction and operation of Alternative 1A will result in increased demands for utilities and public services, including: water supply, treatment, and distribution; wastewater treatment and disposal; solid waste collection and disposal; electricity; natural gas; fire protection and emergency medical services; law enforcement; library, telecommunications, and postal service. Alternative 1A is not expected to result in significant impacts to these public services and utilities. The assessment of potential cumulative impacts must consider, in addition to the Project, other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects (e.g., other proposed, planned, or permitted projects). For the purpose of assessing potential cumulative impacts to public utilities and service</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>systems, a list of other past, present, and future projects that are expected to increase demand for public utilities and services, and may contribute to cumulative impacts to these resources is included in Table 20.1-1 in Chapter 20: Mandated Environmental Analysis of the EIR/EIR.</p> <p>Alternative 1A is not expected to contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact on public services and utilities. Public services and utilities either have sufficient excess capacity to provide service to the Project and cumulative projects, such as with wastewater and schools, or mitigation measures are provided to provide fees to expand or maintain service levels.</p> <p>Alternative 1A would have a significant impact on water supply and infrastructure. Mitigation Measure PSU-1a, which requires a Water System Engineering Report meeting the requirements of and approved by the TCPUD, would address cumulative impacts associated with increased water demand. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PSU-1a would ensure sufficient water supplies and service infrastructure is maintained for existing users, the Project, and would not constrain future planned uses listed in Table 20.1-1. Mitigation Measure PSU-1c ensures adequate funding is provided to maintain existing police service levels in the Project area and vicinity. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 16-33; see also Responses to Comments 33-40 and 76-18.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure PS-1: NTFPD Design Approval and Annexation.</b></p> <p>Prior to issuing Building Permits for the Project, Placer County shall require the Project Applicant to pay appropriate fair share development impact fees for Project review and to maintain existing levels of wildland fire protection service and ensure compliance with existing state and local wildland fire protection standards in the NTFPD service area. The Project Applicant shall be required to post a bond to ensure that appropriate mitigation measures are completed and in place during construction and implemented for project operation. Development impact fees shall be paid at the time the application is submitted to provide for NTFPD, Placer County Fire, and</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure PS-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by increase the level of wildland fire protection capacity available to the Project area to a level equivalent to the most current state and local standards for WUI areas and requiring design approvals to ensure that the Project incorporates measure to reduce the risk of exposure of people and structures to wildfires. 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><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-1 will increase the level of wildland fire protection capacity available to the Project area to a level</p>
<p><b>HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND PUBLIC SAFETY</b></p> <p><b>PS-1. Will the Project expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving fire hazards, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?</b></p>	<p>Construction and operation of new residential, commercial and recreational facilities in the Project area in a wildland-urban interface (WUI) setting would increase the exposure of people and structures to the risk of wildfires. Wildfires are a substantial threat to the HMR Project area and vicinity due to location of people and structures in a WUI setting with heavy fuel loads, steep terrain, summer dry conditions,</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 multiple ignition sources. Calfire classifies the Project area as a Very High Fire Hazard Area (Calfire 2009a).</p> <p>The Project area, including the NTFPD service area, is classified as SRA with Calfire having primary wildland fire suppression responsibility. Through a CFMA, the USFS conducts wildland fire suppression and fire protection activities. NTFPD serves the Project area as the agency having jurisdiction for all fire department emergencies except for wildland fires.</p> <p>(Alternative 1A includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• annexing the remaining HMR properties into the NTFPD; and</li> <li>• the adoption and implementation of a fuel reduction program;</li> <li>• and upgrading the existing snowmaking system to be compatible with wildland fire suppression needs in the Project area.</li> </ul> <p>Specific fuel reduction measures, building designs and materials, and snowmaking water delivery systems have not been designed. Project compliance with applicable building codes (CBC Chapter 7), road access, and wildland fuel management codes (PRC §4290-§4291) are not known. Consequently, the increase in exposure of people and structures to wildfire hazards in a WUI setting in the Project area is considered a significant impact. (S)</p>	<p>Calfire review and approval of a Fire Suppression and Management Plan for the Project area, including building materials and designs, fire protection systems in buildings, landscaping, fire flows to hydrants and the snowmaking system, emergency vehicle access routes and turnarounds, and vegetation treatments in the Project area to ensure compliance with the most recent CBC Chapter 7, PRC §4290-§4291, and other applicable state and local codes.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 17-14.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>equivalent the most current state and local standards for WUI areas. Design approvals will ensure that the Project incorporates measure to reduce the risk of exposure of people and structures to wildfires to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 17-13 to 17-14; see Responses to Comments 9-8 through 9-14, 9-17 through 19-29, 9-37 through 9-46, and 11-19 through 11-23.)</p>
<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 17-13 to 17-14.)</p> <p><b>PS-2. Will the Project result in an interference with emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans?</b></p> <p>Alternative 1A has the potential to impede emergency responses on a temporary basis during construction, and permanently if adequate emergency vehicle access is not providing to and throughout the Project area. Construction would occur in phases, depending on weather conditions, economic factors, and demand for new facilities. Site grading and utility work would occur in the earliest part of construction, followed by the residential and commercial structures. Alternative 1A would follow with construction of the new skier service and related recreational facilities at the North Base area. Construction activities would</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure PS-2: Ensure Emergency Access During Construction and Operation</b></p> <p>The Project Applicant shall prepare and submit an emergency access plan to TRPA, Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD), PCSD, Calfire, and the NTFPD for review and approval before construction permits are issued. The plan shall include detailed descriptions of how emergency access would be maintained during Project construction. Emergency access measures are expected to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phasing construction activities to provide continual access to emergency vehicles during construction;</li> <li>• Backfilling trenches and/or placing metal plates over the trenches at the end of each workday.</li> </ul>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure PS-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by ensuring that emergency access to the Project area and surrounding areas will not be impeded by Project-related construction activities, and will be provided and maintained during Project operation. 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><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-2 will ensure that emergency access to the Project area and surrounding areas will not be impeded by Project-related construction activities, and will be provided and maintained during Project operation. This will reduce the risk of interference with emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans to less than significant.</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>probably be continuous, except during winter months when some activities would cease due to weather and snow cover.</p> <p>Much of the construction work would not affect emergency access to the surrounding area, because construction activities would be primarily focused within the Project area. However, construction vehicles and equipment may block and/or slow through traffic in the surrounding area, especially along SR 89. This could temporarily interfere with the ability of the PCSD or NTFPD to provide emergency services to the Project area and vicinity. A temporary, construction-related impediment to emergency access is considered a significant impact.</p> <p>Alternative 1A requires emergency vehicle access and evacuation routes to provide for adequate response times and safe evacuation. With major buildings and facilities concentrated next to SR 89, Alternative 1A is expected to have adequate road access and evacuation routes, but designs will require access and circulation for emergency response vehicles to multi-story, high-occupancy buildings in the Project area. The potential for inadequate internal circulation and access for emergency vehicles in Alternative 1A results in significant impacts to emergency response or evacuation plans. (S)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scheduling deliveries and truck trips during off-peak hours;</li> <li>Using or developing alternate access routes as needed; and</li> <li>Notifying the PCSD and the NTFPD of construction activities and providing these agencies with a copy of the emergency access plan.</li> </ul> <p>Prior to issuing Building Permits for the Project, Placer County shall require the Project Applicant to pay appropriate fair share development impact fees for NTFPD review and approval of emergency vehicle access, circulation patterns, and evacuation routes. The Project shall incorporate designs, maintenance measures, and alternative emergency access routes as determined necessary by the NTFPD. The Project Applicant shall be required to post a bond to ensure that appropriate mitigation measures are completed and in place during construction and implemented for project operation.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 17-16.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><u>Finding:</u> Compliance with Mitigation Measure PS-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by ensuring the use of explosives for blasting in the Project area will be conducted to minimize adverse impacts outside the controlled blasting area. Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1a and NOI-1b (see findings relating to Impact NOI-1) will also help to reduce potential adverse effects from blasting. 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 Measure PS-3 will ensure the use of explosives for blasting in the Project area will be conducted to minimize adverse impacts outside the controlled blasting area, reducing the impact to less than significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measures</p>
<p><b>PS-3. Will the Project involve the use of explosives for trenching?</b></p> <p>Blasting may be required to excavate large rock formations in the construction of underground parking facilities, utility trenching, and preparing building sites for foundations. Blasting includes a series of small charges, detonated in sequence, that are placed in holes drilled into the rock formations. While no specific sites that require blasting are known, extensive sub-surface rock and boulders are common in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and conditions necessitating the use of explosives for removal may be encountered during construction. With the continued operation of the HMR Ski Area under Alternative 1A, any existing use of explosives to control avalanches at HMR would continue unchanged.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure PS-3: Implement Blast Management Techniques to Reduce Adverse Effects</b></p> <p>Prior to any construction blasting, the Project Applicant shall prepare and submit a blasting plan to the Placer County ESD and the NTFPD for review and approval. The Project shall incorporate blast management techniques to minimize risks to life and property in the Project area and vicinity. These measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blasting shall be allowed only on weekdays from 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM. Exceptions are allowed if it can be shown that construction beyond these times is necessary to meet other regulatory deadlines or to alleviate safety hazards.</li> <li>To the greatest extent feasible, blasting area</li> </ol>	<p>LS</p>	<p><u>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</u> Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-3 will ensure the use of explosives for blasting in the Project area will be conducted to minimize adverse impacts outside the controlled blasting area, reducing the impact to less than significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measures</p>

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

185

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>The use of explosives for blasting during construction could result in vibration damage or risk of injury from explosion or flying debris to persons present at nearby locations, or at developed and occupied uses within or adjacent to the Project area. Therefore, the potential use of blasting during construction and ski area operation is considered a significant impact. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 17-16 through 17-18.)</p>	<p>shall occur prior to the occupancy of structures. 3. In areas of controlled blasting, the contractor shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Ensure that blasting of rock shall be conducted under the guidance of a qualified blasting consultant;</li> <li>b) Give 30-day advance and 5-day advance written notices to residences, businesses and utility owners within 0.5 mile from the controlled blasting area;</li> <li>c) Inspect structures within 300 feet of the blast site no more than two weeks prior to commencement of controlled blasting to document existing conditions of the structures;</li> <li>d) Conduct post-blasting inspections of nearby structures and document any blasting-related impacts. If impacts occurred, develop remediation measures in consultation with ESD;</li> <li>e) Use best available technology, such as blast mats, replacing overburden, modifying shot timing, or other techniques to minimize noise generated by blasting; and,</li> <li>f) Require personnel in the controlled blasting area to wear ear, eye, head, and other appropriate protection during blasting excavation activities.</li> </ul> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 17-17 to 17-18.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>NOI-1a and NOI-1b (see Impact NOI-1 in Chapter 13) will also help to reduce potential adverse effects from blasting. (Final EIR/ES, pp. 17-16 through 17-18; see also Response to Comment 9-46.)</p>
<p><b>PS-4. Does the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, release of hazardous materials into the environment, or emit hazardous emissions within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</b></p>	<p>Construction would involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials typical of construction and operation of ski resort, residential, and commercial land uses projects. Commonly used hazardous materials expected to be used during construction and operation of Alternative 1A includes asphalt, gasoline, diesel, chlorine, lubricants, paints, and solvents. CHP and Caltrans regulate transportation of hazardous materials on area roadways, and the use of these materials is regulated by the DTSC as outlined in CCR 22.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</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>The Project Applicant, builders, contractors, business owners, and others would be required to use, store, and transport hazardous materials</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 compliance with local, State, and federal regulations during construction and operation. There are no existing or proposed schools located within 0.25 mile of the Project area. Compliance with mandatory State and federal standards for the transport and use of hazardous materials will reduce potential hazardous materials impacts to less than significant.</p> <p>Under Alternative 1A, the Project Applicant will be required to prepare a Hazardous Materials Business Plan and inventory of hazardous materials under the State of California Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Law of 1985 (Business Plan Act, California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 1). The Hazardous Materials Business Plan includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An inventory of hazardous materials handled;</li> <li>• Facility floor plans showing where hazardous materials are stored;</li> <li>• An emergency response plan, and;</li> <li>• Provisions for employee training in safety and emergency response procedures.</li> </ul> <p>The SWRCB regulates the storage of hazardous materials in USTs under the California CCR. The installation and monitoring of new tanks, monitoring of existing tanks, and corrective actions for removed tanks are regulated by State standards. The preparation and implementation of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan and the design, installation, and use of storage tanks to State standards are expected to result in a less than significant impacts related to the storage or use of hazardous materials in the Project area. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 17-18 to 17-19; see also Response to Comment 9-7.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure PS-5: Construction and Design Review by the Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District.</b></p> <p>Prior to approval of Improvement Plans for any phase of the Project, Placer County shall require the Project Applicant to consult with the Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District to review and approve construction plans. If the District determines that the Project would create new temporary or permanent mosquito breeding habitats during construction or operation, the</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure PS-5, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring appropriate design review and approval by the Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District to reduce potential mosquito breeding habitats, and ensuring appropriate access for technicians to inspect and treat as necessary habitats on-site. 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><b>PS-5. Does the Project have the potential to encounter contaminated soils or expose workers or the public to health hazards, including those from a known hazardous waste site?</b></p> <p>The Phase I ESA identified that the removal of older buildings at HMR may expose people to lead based paint or ACMs. Although no inventory was conducted, lead and asbestos were commonly used materials in buildings prior to the 1980s. The Phase I ESA searched</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>regulatory databases and conducted a site investigation, and did not find other potential sources of hazardous materials or waste that would pose a health hazard for residents, visitors, or construction workers in the Project area (Robinson Engineering Company 2005). In the event that previously unknown lead based paint, asbestos, contaminated soils, or buried hazardous waste is encountered during construction, the contractor is required to notify appropriate regulatory agencies and implement appropriate actions to comply with regulatory agency standards to avoid hazardous waste releases and worker exposure and provide for cleanup measures. An accredited inspector in accordance with EPA and Cal-OSHA standards under Clean Air Act §112 must remove ACMs and lead. Agency notification and compliance with applicable construction and workplace safety standards is considered sufficient to maintain potential impacts to a less than significant level, and no additional mitigation is required.</p>	<p>District shall recommend design modifications and BMPs, if needed. In addition, the Project Applicant shall provide access to District technicians to the Project area to inspect and treat breeding habitats as necessary to reduce risks to public health.  (Final EIR/EIS, p. 17-20)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-5 will ensure appropriate design review and approval by the Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District to reduce potential mosquito breeding habitats, and ensures appropriate access for technicians to inspect and treat as necessary habitats on-site, reducing the impact to public health and safety to less than significant.  (Final EIR/EIS, pp. 17-19 to 17-20; see Responses to Comments 268-12.)</p>
<p>Construction of Alternative 1A may create opportunities for water ponding – such as stockpiles of soil and materials, compacted soil, graded swales, and other features – that may temporarily increase mosquito breeding habitat. Operation of Alternative 1A includes the restoration of an SEZ, which may increase breeding habitat. The potential for temporary and permanent increases in mosquito breeding habitat is considered a significant impact on public health and safety. (S)</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. 17-19 through to 17-20.) <b>PS-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to public safety?</b>  Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-1 ensures that the Project is built and operated to current state and local standards for construction and occupation of facilities in a WUI setting. As building codes (CBC Chapter 7) and standards for emergency vehicle access, evacuation routes, and vegetation management (PRC §4290-§4291) have become more stringent, building and operating the Project to current state and local standards for WUI settings is expected to reduce wildland fire risks compared to existing conditions. Consequently, the Project is not expected to contribute to 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>cumulative impact to public safety related to wildland fire hazards.</p> <p>Other development projects in the Tahoe Basin where older structures would be demolished have a similar potential to result in health hazards related to exposure of persons to asbestos and lead-based paint. However, as with the Project, an accredited inspector in accordance with EPA and Cal-OSHA standards under Clean Air Act §112 must remove ACMs and lead, and therefore impacts would be expected to be less than significant and no cumulatively considerable contribution is expected. Other projects would have a similar less than significant impact from routine use and transport of hazardous materials commonly used during construction and operation of ski resorts, residential, and commercial uses because they are subject to the same government regulations. These hazardous materials include chlorine, gasoline, asphalt, and diesel. Transportation of hazardous materials on area roadways is regulated by the CHP and Caltrans, and the use of these materials is regulated by the DTSC, as outlined in CCR 22. The Project is not expected to directly or indirectly induce the use of hazardous materials in the Basin. Therefore, no cumulative impact to public safety is expected. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 17-20 to 17-21; see also Response to Comment 11-20.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure REC-1a. Beach Access Maintenance Funding</b></p> <p>The Project Applicant shall work with Placer County to develop a Zone of Benefit, which is a geographic area formed under Placer County Service Area law to provide extended services not already being provided, or a similar mechanism to fund maintenance as a result of the Project. Funding shall cover the cost of staff time maintaining the access points, maintenance materials, and, if a Zone of Benefit is established, administration fees. The fee shall be established through an engineer's report prepared by the applicant at the applicant's expense and approved by the County or as otherwise prescribed by law. The Zone of Benefit shall include cost of living adjustments.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure REC-1a, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by ensuring funding to maintain the quality of public beach access points. 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><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Implementation of Mitigation Measure REC-1a will maintain the quality of public beach access points and therefore reduce the impact to less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 18-12 through 18-14; see also Response to Comment 131-13.)</p>
<p><b>RECREATION</b></p> <p><b>REC-1. Will the Project result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway, or public lands or decrease in the quality of a recreational experience?</b></p> <p>The Project area is located west of SR 89 and consists of an existing winter sports area and related recreational and support uses. Alternative 1A would not affect land uses or facilities on or with direct access to Lake Tahoe. Summer uses include informal hiking and mountain bike trail use. Alternative 1A would enhance recreation facilities and access to the Project area by designating 5 miles of publicly accessible hiking trails on the mountain, providing a community swimming pool at the Mid-Mountain Base area, an ice skating rink at the North Base area, an amphitheater for 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>Lake Tahoe Music Festival and other events, a link to the West Shore Bike Trail, and a miniature golf course. Hiking trails established at HMR would provide enhanced access to USFS LTBMU lands in the Project vicinity.</p> <p>There are no public or private access points to Lake Tahoe or any other lake or waterway that would be removed by Alternative 1A, including the existing trail access to the TCPUD Trail Creek Park and Quail Lake south of the resort. HMR recently acquired the West Shore Cafe and Inn located just west of the project area. The site includes a dedicated parking lot, restaurant and inn structure and outdoor seating area/pier located on the shoreline of Lake Tahoe. While this property is in the ownership of HMR, it will be available for Lake access by residents and guests of Alternative 1A. With the maintenance of access to public lands within the vicinity of the project area and the provision of dedicated Lake access for HMR residents and guest, impacts on the availability of public access to recreational resources would be less than significant.</p> <p>There are also public access points along the west shore of Lake Tahoe including points immediately across SR 89 from the proposed residential development areas of the Project. According to Placer County Department of Facility Services/Parks, these beach access points are currently lightly used and do not require substantial maintenance efforts due to low activity in the Homewood vicinity. Many public access points in the vicinity of the Project do not currently receive routine maintenance due to low use. With the addition of new full time residents and additional visitors to the Project area, the use of these beach access points would increase and current maintenance funding would not be adequate to address increased use. A new influx of Project generated use would create the need for a new maintenance operation that is currently not included in the funding structure of local public management agencies. Consequently, development under Alternative 1A would have a significant impact on the quality of the existing recreational experience at nearby beach access points along the west shore of Lake Tahoe. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 18-12 through 18-14.)</p>	<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 18-13 through 14.)</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><b>REC-2. Will the Project create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed?</b></p> <p>Alternative 1A will renovate and enhance existing ski area facilities and biking and hiking trails, and provide new recreation facilities such as a West Shore Bike Trail linkage, ice skating rink, swimming pool, amphitheater, and miniature golf course. As required by Placer County and the Quimby Act, development under the Alternative 1A will include enhancements in park lands and/or in lieu payments to improve local recreational facilities, improving service to existing populations and providing adequate service to meet the increased resident and guest demands. Alternative 1A is expected to increase the range of recreation facilities and opportunities in the Project area, and add facilities that are compatible with existing recreation opportunities and land uses at HMR and in the Project vicinity. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 1A will have less than significant impacts related to conflicts between existing or proposed recreational uses. (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. 18-15.)</p> <p><b>REC-3. Will the Project result in the need to construct new recreational facilities or expansion of existing facilities?</b></p> <p>Development of Alternative 1A is expected to increase the population of the Project area and increase demand for recreation facilities. Alternative 1A will include new recreational facilities for visitors to the lodge and the public, such as a swimming pool, miniature golf course, West Shore Bike Trail linkage, amphitheater, and 5 miles of hiking/mountain biking trails.</p> <p>Under Placer County General Plan Policy 5.A.3 and Zoning Ordinance §17.54.100(D)(1), new residential developments are required to provide a minimum of 5 acres of improved parks and 5 acres of passive parklands or open space per 1,000 new residents to offset increased demand for recreation services and opportunities. (Placer County 2008). Based on the number of whole or partial ownership residential units proposed by Alternative, the following are estimates of the number of new</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure REC-3. Provide On-site Recreational Facilities and Park Fees to Placer County. Operate Shuttle Service to State Parks.</b></p> <p>To mitigate for the increased demand on recreation facilities, the Project shall develop and dedicate to the TCPUD a public park consistent with the park needs of the community (e.g., 5 acres of improved park and 5 acres of open space per 1,000 new residents). Details of recreation facilities and timing of delivery shall be established through a development agreement with Placer County. For any public recreation facilities provided in conjunction with this project, including parks and trails, maintenance funding shall be provided through the creation of a Zone of Benefit (or similar mechanism). The fee shall be established through an engineer's report prepared by the applicant at the applicant's expense and approved by the County or as otherwise prescribed by law. The Zone of Benefit shall include cost of living adjustments. The Project may provide for new or enhanced recreation facilities with an alternative method as</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure REC-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by providing or funding adequate new developed recreation facilities and open space, and by maintaining accessibility to heavily-used State Parks in the Project vicinity. 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><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Implementation of mitigation measure REC-3 will reduce the potential impact to less than significant by providing or funding adequate new developed recreation facilities and open space, and by maintaining accessibility to heavily-used State Parks in the Project vicinity.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 18-16 through 18-19.)</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>residents that may be generated at Project buildout, and the required amount of new park land under the General Plan. The calculations assume 1.85 persons per whole or partial-ownership multi-family residential unit and 2.54 persons per single-family residential unit based on the analysis included in the Placer County Park and Recreation Facilities Impact Fee Study, Hausrauh Economics Group, September 2003 (page 12).</p> <p>Alternative 1A includes 250 multi-family residential units equals 463 new residents, and 2.32 acres of improved parks and 2.32 acres of open space. If Alternative 1A does not provide adequate on-site recreation facilities, Placer County would require payment of park fees commensurate with the percentage of the shortfall. Payment of in lieu park fees to Placer County Department of Facility Services would be in addition to the standard Placer County park fees identified below, and would be established through a development agreement.</p> <p>Under Placer County Code §16.08.100 and Recreational Facilities Fee Ordinance (Chapter 15, Placer County Code), recreation facilities cannot be less than that needed to accommodate the new demand for such facilities created by the Project, as determined by the Board of Supervisors in consultation with the Placer County Department of Facilities Services, Parks and Grounds Division. In addition, in-tract recreational facilities must be provided in accordance with Placer County Code Section 17.54.100(D) or the payment of an in-lieu fee thereof.</p> <p>New residents and visitors in the Project area will increase visitation at other Basin recreational sites, increasing demand on the existing recreational facilities, especially during the peak summer months. New residents and visitors to the Project area are expected to increase usage of nearby Burton Creek, Ed Z'berg Sugar Pine Point, and D.L. Bliss/Emerald Bay State Parks. New residents and visitors will likely use local parks and recreational facilities in the vicinity such as Quail Creek Park, Chambers Landing Beach, and other access points to Lake Tahoe near the Project area. Without new facilities, the increased use will contribute to routine wear</p>	<p>provided under Placer County Code. Recreational alternatives may include, but are not limited to the following as approved by the County:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create commonly owned, on-site park and recreational improvements and/or as a credit toward a portion of the recreation fees, as deemed appropriate by the Board of Supervisors;</li> <li>• Pay a fee equivalent to the value of the park and recreation improved land and park improvements to provide public parks and recreation facilities in the vicinity of the planned development. If the County wishes to collect such fees, the fee agreement shall be established through a development agreement between HMR and Placer County.</li> <li>• Provision of public beach front property, access rights, and/or developed public beach access facilities conveyed to an appropriate public entity.</li> <li>• The foregoing may be provided in whole or combination in order to fully mitigate recreational impacts in accordance with Placer County Code Sections 15.34.010, 16.08.100, and 17.54.100(D).</li> </ul> <p>To reduce impacts on parking facilities at nearby State Parks while enhancing public access to the State Park system, the Proposed Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 shall institute an on-call van service available to HMR residents, guests and the general public from Memorial Day Weekend through Labor Day to provide alternative transit service to Ed Z'berg Sugar Pine Point and D.L. Bliss/Emerald Bay State Parks. The HMR on-call van service will supplement existing public transit systems and reduce the reliance of private automobile usage for HMR residents, guests, and other nearby residents. HMR may charge a nominal fee to use the shuttle van service and may advertise the service to local residents and visitors of other developments. The use of the HMR on-call van service will reduce the number of private automobiles used to access the State Parks during peak summer months, thereby maintaining access to these parks for other visitors to the Lake Tahoe Basin.</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 18-18 through 18-19.)</p>		

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

192

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>and tear on existing turf areas, recreational equipment, trails, picnic tables, and parking capacity. It is difficult to determine the extent of the wear and tear that would be attributed directly to Alternative 1A, because most local parks and recreational facilities are used by a combination of local residents and visitors to the region.</p> <p>Placer County's per-unit assessment of park fees (including affordable housing units and tourist accommodation units or TAUs) funds improvements to existing park facilities and the construction of new park facilities (Placer County 2008). These park fees are assessed at the time of final map recordation and issuance of building permits, and are required for the development of residential units and TAU units to offset the impact of new development on community recreation. The Project fees would be earmarked for improvement of park facilities in the vicinity. Placer County, who collects and distributes these fees, would use these funds for projects at nearby recreational facilities.</p> <p>The Project is also subject to the Measure C parcel tax, which provides maintenance funds for the TCPUD. This is a parcel tax that adjusts annually and is applicable to parcels within the TCPUD district boundaries. The annual fee is determined based on the square footage of the residential units.</p> <p>Because Alternative 1A does not include the addition of new and/or improved park facilities, parks or open space to meet the increased demand for improved parks and open space, this is considered a significant impact. (S)</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/ES, pp. 18-16 through 18-19)</p> <p><b>REC-4. Will the Project create additional recreational capacity?</b></p> <p>Alternative 1A will increase recreation opportunities, but winter day-use PAOTs assigned to HMR will remain unchanged. Development under Alternative 1A will improve HMR ski area facilities and enhance other recreation opportunities in the Project area. Other new facilities include a West Shore Bike Trail connection, miniature golf, ice skating rink, swimming pool, amphitheater, and 5 miles of</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>hiking/mountain bike trails.</p> <p>New winter sports facilities will replace existing facilities and enhance the ski experience with high speed, higher capacity lifts and other improvements, but the overall PAOT capacity of the ski area will not increase under Alternative 1A. Proposed improvements include the replacement of the Madden Ski triple-chair lift with an eight-passenger high-speed gondola, which would increase lift capacity from 1,800 to 2,400 persons per hour. A new learn-to-ski (beginner) lift would be constructed at the Mid-Mountain area for beginner use. The existing South Happy Platter, North Happy Platter, and Alpine Platter lifts would be removed. The Tailings T-Bar, South T-Bar, and Spring Chair lift have already been removed and would not be replaced. The verified capacity of these removed lifts is available for use on other lift replacements or upgrades. Table 18-2 summarizes the proposed changes to the HMR ski lift capacity.</p> <p>While improvements to the ski lifts are expected to increase the current operating capacity of the system from 8,646 persons per hour to 9,797 persons per hour, overall operations are expected to remain below the verified capacity of 10,653 persons per hour. Homewood's verified capacity is used to define the existing PAOT capacity assigned to HMR (1,704) by TRPA. At present, HMR does not expect to increase uphill lift capacity such that it would exceed its existing banked verified PAOT capacity of 1,704. Therefore, Alternative 1A is not expected to exceed the existing TRPA PAOT capacity for HMR or result in an adverse impact on additional recreational capacity. This is considered a less than significant impact. (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>

(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 18-19 through 18-21.)

**REC-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to recreation?**

Development of enhanced winter sports recreation facilities and new tourist and residential and commercial development in the Project area, and associated increases in population associated with Alternative 1A will result in a cumulative increase in the demand for recreational facilities and would likely

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>Increase the use of existing local parks and recreational facilities in the community. Placer County regulations require that new planned development projects contribute to Placer County park fees and incorporate on-site recreation facilities commensurate with the number of potential residents. Any shortage of the required on-site recreation facilities will require payment of park fees commensurate with the shortfall of the required on-site recreation facilities as determined by the Placer County Department of Facility Services (these fees would be in addition to the standard Placer County park fees). These requirements are implemented to offset and mitigate any imbalance that may result from new development on community recreational opportunities. Implementation of Mitigation Measures REC-1a and REC-3 and the mitigation action required for other projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin eliminates substantial contributions to cumulative impacts on recreational capacity. Therefore, the Project's contribution is not cumulatively considerable. (LS)</p>			
<b>CLIMATE CHANGE</b> (Final EIR/EIS, pp. 18-20 through 18-21.)			
<p><b>CC-1. Will the Project Result in a Significant Project-Level Impact on Climate Change?</b></p> <p>Table 19-26 of the EIR/EIS presents construction emissions. Because construction emissions are a one-time event, these emissions are considered short-term in comparison to ongoing GHG emissions associated with Project operations.</p> <p>Tables 19-27 and 19-28 of the EIR/EIS list annual GHG emissions by source under existing (2008) and future year (2021) conditions, respectively. Emission factors associated with transportation and energy usage are likely to decrease over time. Therefore, emissions calculations for Project operation under the future year (2021) likely overestimate annual emissions.</p> <p>Implementation of Alternative 1A would result in a net increase in local GHG emissions above compared to the No Project (Alternative 2). GHG emissions tend to accumulate in the</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>atmosphere because of their relatively long lifespan. As a result, their impact on the atmosphere is mostly independent of the point of emission. Therefore, GHG emissions are more appropriately evaluated on a regional, State, or even national scale than on an individual project level. Further, it is unlikely that the GHGs emitted as part of the Project would have an individually discernible effect on global climate change. Therefore, this impact is less than significant (LS)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure CC-1: Document and Verify Implementation of the Project GHG Reduction Commitments</b></p> <p>The Project Applicant shall document and verify the Project commitments outlined in Table 19-30 have been incorporated into the final Project design. Copies of the pre-certification plan (Stage 2 in the LEED-ND process) shall be provided to PCAPCD and TRPA. Once the Project is complete, the final LEED-ND certification that verifies the north base has achieved all of the prerequisites and credits required for Gold certification shall be submitted to the air districts.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure CC-2: Implement Project Design Features to Further Reduce Project Contribution to Climate Change</b></p> <p>A recent report by the California Attorney General's (AG) office, The California Environmental Quality Act: Addressing Global Warming at the Local Agency Level, identifies various example measures to reduce GHG emissions at the project level (State of California Department of Justice 2008). The following Project design features were compiled from the California AG's Office report and are intended to provide additional strategies that could be incorporated into HMR Master Plan, especially at the South Base, to further reduce GHG emissions. Note that majority of the AG's strategies have been removed from the list below as they overlapped with actions already committed to by the Project Applicant (Table 19-30), or are inapplicable to the Project because they address emissions from different types of projects.</p> <p>The final Project design shall incorporate the</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, Alternative 1A that substantially lessen Proposed Project's generation of GHG that may have a significant impact on the environment. 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 commitment to numerous GHG reduction strategies through participation in the LEED for Neighborhood Development Pilot Program, and Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2, the County finds that complete avoidance of potential cumulative effects of the project on climate change based on the criteria set forth in CC-C1 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.</p> <p><b>Overriding Considerations:</b> The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the project override the significant adverse impact of the project associated with the proposed project's generation of GHG that may have a significant impact on the environment, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p> <p><b>Finding of Fact for Cumulative Analysis of Project Generate GHG Emissions, Either Directly or Indirectly, that may Have a Significant Impact on the Environment:</b> While implementation of the Alternative 1A's commitment to numerous GHG reduction strategies through participation in the LEED for Neighborhood Development Pilot Program, and Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2 will not eliminate Project GHG emissions, their inclusion will result in lower GHG emissions levels than had they not been incorporated. For example, green buildings have the potential to reduce CO2 emissions associated with building operations by 33%-39% (GSA Public Buildings Services 2008, Kats 2003). In addition future State actions taken pursuant to AB 32 including requirements for lower carbon-content in motor vehicle fuels, improved vehicle mileage standards (provided California is not</p>
<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 19-22 through 19-49)</p> <p><b>CC-C1. Will the Project Generate GHG Emissions, Either Directly or Indirectly, that May Have a Significant Impact on the Environment?</b></p> <p>Unlike criteria pollutant impacts, which are local and regional in nature, climate change impacts occur at a global level. The relatively long lifespan and persistence of GHGs (Table 19-1 of the EIR/EIS) require that climate change be considered a cumulative and global impact. It is unlikely that that any increase in global temperature or sea level could be attributed to the emissions resulting from a single project. Rather, it is more appropriate to conclude Project-related GHG emissions will combine with emissions across California, the U.S., and the globe to cumulatively contribute to global climate change.</p> <p>To put the Project in perspective, total estimated GHG emissions under both existing (2008) and future (2021) conditions were compared to the most recent global, national, and State GHG inventories. Construction emissions, which will be produced during Project development but not during Project operation, were amortized assuming a 40-year Project lifetime and included in the emissions totals. Based on the estimates presented in Table 19-29, Alternative 1A would have a miniscule impact on State, federal, and international emissions of GHGs.</p> <p>While GHG emissions from the Project may be negligible relative to total State, national, and global emissions, scientific consensus concludes that given the seriousness of climate change, small contributions of GHGs may be cumulatively considerable. When compared 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>existing emissions, Alternative 1A would result in net increases of GHGs. Based on consultation with the PCAPCD, Placer County, and the TRPA, the magnitude of these emissions would result in the Project having a significant cumulative impact on the environment (Clark, Chang, and Landry pers. comm.).</p>	<p>following applicable AG measures. A standard note indicating these requirements will be included on building plans approved in association with this Project shall be included on building permits.</p> <p><u>Energy Efficiency</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use solar heating, automatic covers, and efficient pumps and motors for pools and spas.</li> </ul> <p><u>Renewable Energy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Install solar or wind power systems and solar hot water heaters. Educate consumers about existing incentives.</li> <li>Install solar panels on carports and over parking areas.</li> </ul> <p><u>Water Conservation and Efficiency</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Install water-efficient irrigation systems and devices, such as soil moisture-based irrigation controls.</li> <li>Restrict watering methods (e.g., prohibit systems that apply water to non-vegetated surfaces) and control runoff.</li> <li>Restrict the use of water for cleaning outdoor surfaces and vehicles.</li> <li>Provide education about water conservation and available programs and incentives.</li> </ul> <p><u>Solid Waste Measures</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide education and publicity about reducing waste and available recycling services.</li> </ul> <p><u>Transportation and Motor Vehicles</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limit idling time for commercial vehicles, including delivery and construction vehicles.</li> <li>Use low or zero-emission vehicles, including construction vehicles.</li> <li>Increase the cost of driving and parking private vehicles by, e.g., imposing tolls and parking fees.</li> <li>Institute a low-carbon fuel vehicle incentive program.</li> <li>Provide information on options for individuals and businesses to reduce transportation-related emissions.</li> <li>Provide education and information about public transportation.</li> </ul>		<p>barred due to federal action), and an increased share of renewable energy in electricity generation will serve, in time, to further reduce GHG emissions.</p> <p>The majority of development in Alternative 1A will include transferred tourist accommodation units (TAUs) and residential accommodation units (RAUs). Consequently, GHG emissions generated by these structures are not new to the Lake Tahoe Basin and would be emitted regardless of the Project. The transfer of existing TAUs and RAUs to the Project site may even reduce basin-wide GHG emissions, as the existing units are older and less efficient than those being constructed. While some new TAUs and RAUs will be required as part of the Project, they will be obtained from TRPA bonus inventory, which is analyzed in the TRPA Regional Plan. Consequently, new HMR-generated GHG emissions have been accounted for in previous planning documents. Please see Chapter 7 of the EIR/EIS—Population, Employment, and Housing for more information on TAUs/RAUs. The mitigation measures and reduction strategies identified in the EIR/EIS will reduce Project-related GHG emissions, and the Project is being developed through existing and bonus TAUs and RAUs. However, it is unknown the extent to which climate change will be affected by GHG emissions from HMR. The possibility exists that Alternative 1A will contribute to global GHG emissions and global climate change.</p> <p>No other feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts associated with GHG emissions to a less-than-significant level because it is technically infeasible to allow development activities without some GHG emissions. The project's 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 and ensure the continued viability of the ski operations. Therefore, mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the Proposed Project. Thus, because it is impossible to allow new development without GHG emissions, mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level would be factually infeasible and this impact is significant and unavoidable. As explained in the "Statement of Overriding Considerations," the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of Alternative 1A outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related to GHG emissions.</p> <p>One commenter suggested additional mitigation to reduced GHGs. The suggested measures were already included in the Proposed Project or the County has determined they are infeasible. Infeasible mitigation measures that were proposed by the commenter were using carbon credits and increased rail. The use of carbon credits and rail are not required by the County because they are determined to be infeasible for the Project. Carbon offsets are a complicated and somewhat controversial</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>2008; Kats 2003).</p> <p>The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), and San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District have published various guidance documents with pre-quantified reduction potentials for mitigation measures used in the Bay Area, Sacramento Metropolitan Area, and San Joaquin Valley (EDAW 2009; SMAQMD 2008; SJVAPCD 2009). When appropriate, Table 19-30 of the EIR/EIS lists these reductions to provide an approximation of the potential CO2 reductions that may be achieved by the identified HMR LEED-ND strategies.</p> <p>Based on the pre-applicant checklist completed for HMR, the Project is expected to achieve gold certification. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CC-1 is required to document and verify Project certification. (SU)</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 19-51 through 19-60.)</p>	<p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 19-58 through 19-59.)</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure CC-1: Document and Verify Implementation of the Project GHG Reduction Commitments</b></p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for CC-1 above.</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>source of mitigation. Offsets must be consistent with an approved and valid protocol to assure the emissions offsets would only occur due to the financing provided by purchasing of the credits (i.e., the carbon offset project would not be able to commence without the funding provided by the Proposed Project). Credits must also be purchased annually until the Project is decommissioned to offset long-term, operational emissions. The costs of carbon offsets depends on program development and may increase with time. Currently, offsets from repulable programs range between \$10 to \$30 per metric ton of CO2e. Purchasing offsets in perpetuity may therefore require the project applicant to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars over the Project lifetime. Given the controversial issues surrounding carbon offsets, as well as the economic burden, carbon credits would be infeasible for the Proposed Project. The Project area and character does not support rail, and construction of a rail system may cause secondary impacts to noise, biology, and other sensitive resources. No additional mitigation measures for the Proposed Project have been identified by state or local agencies at this time.</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 19-51 through 19-60; see also Responses to Comments 11-11, 11-14 through 11-19.)</p>
<p><b>CC-C2: Will the Project Conflict with any Applicable Plan, Policy or Regulation of an Agency Adopted for the Purpose of Reducing the Emissions of GHGs?</b></p> <p>The State has adopted several policies and regulations for reducing GHG emissions (as discussed in Section 19.2). The most stringent of these is AB 32, which is designated to reduce Statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The TMPPO has outlined a serious of goals and policies geared towards reducing VMT and GHG emission from Transportation.</p> <p>As shown in Tables 19-27 and 19-28, Alternative 1A would result in substantial net increases of GHG and vehicle trips in comparison to the No Project (Alternative 2) under both existing (2008) and future year (2021) conditions. Thus, Project-generated GHG emissions may conflict with the State goals listed in AB 32 and policies outlined in the 2008 RTP. This impact is considered significant.</p> <p>(SU)</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 19-60 through 19-61.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure CC-2: Implement Project Design Features to Further Reduce Project Contribution to Climate Change</b></p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for CC-1 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 18-18 through 18-19.)</p>		<p><b>Finding of Fact for Project's Potential to Conflict with any Overriding Considerations:</b> The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the project override the significant adverse impact of the project associated with the proposed project's potential to conflict with applicable plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p> <p><b>Finding of Fact for Project's Potential to Conflict with any</b></p>

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

891

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p><b>Applicable Plan, Policy or Regulation of an Agency Adopted for the Purpose of Reducing the Emissions of GHGs:</b> As described in the findings for Impact CC-C1, Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2 will result in lower GHG emissions levels than had it not been incorporated. However, Alternative 1A is unlikely to achieve reductions consistent with the requirements of AB 32. The possibility exists that the Project will contribute to global GHG emissions and therefore conflict with existing and future actions to reduce GHG emissions.</p> <p>No other feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts associated with GHG emissions to a less-than-significant level because it is technically infeasible to allow development activities without some GHG emissions. The project's 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 and ensure the continued viability of the ski operations. Therefore, mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the Proposed Project. Thus, because it is impossible to allow new development without GHG emissions, mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level would be facially infeasible and this impact is significant and unavoidable. As explained in the "Statement of Overriding Considerations," the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the Project outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related to GHG emissions.</p> <p>One commenter suggested additional mitigation to reduced GHGs. The suggested measures were already included in the Proposed Project or the County has determined they are infeasible. Infeasible mitigation measures that were proposed by the commenter were using carbon credits and increased rail. The use of carbon credits and rail are not required by the County because they are determined to be infeasible for the Project. Carbon offsets are a complicated and somewhat controversial source of mitigation. Offsets must be consistent with an approved and valid protocol to assure the emissions offsets would only occur due to the financing provided by purchasing of the credits (i.e., the carbon offset project would not be able to commence without the funding provided by the Proposed Project). Credits must also be purchased annually until the Project is decommissioned to offset long-term, operational emissions. The costs of carbon offsets depends on program development and may increase with time. Currently, offsets from reputable programs range between \$10 to \$30 per metric ton of CO2e. Purchasing offsets in perpetuity may therefore require the Project applicant to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars over the Project lifetime. Given the controversial issues surrounding carbon offsets, as well as the economic burden, carbon credits would be infeasible for the Proposed Project. The Project area and character does not support rail, and construction of a rail system</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>may cause secondary impacts to noise, biology, and other sensitive resources. No additional mitigation measures for the Proposed Project have been identified by state or local agencies at this time.</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 19-60 through 19-61; see also Master Response 19; and Responses to Comments 11-11, 11-13 through 11-19.)</p>

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