

# ATTACHMENT I

## CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

and

## STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS OF THE PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

for the

## MARTIS VALLEY WEST PARCEL SPECIFIC PLAN

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

\*\*\*\*\*, 2016

**ATTACHMENT H**

## I. INTRODUCTION

On May 3, 2016, the final environmental impact report (EIR) prepared on behalf of Placer County (County) was released. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, the County, acting through its Board of Supervisors, adopts the following findings for the Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan (the Project) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq.).

This document is organized as follows:

Section I provides an introduction to these findings.

Section II provides a description of the Project proposed for adoption, the environmental review process for the Project, the approval actions to be taken and the location of records.

Section III describes the environmental review process for the Project, including public scoping and review of the Project.

Section IV identifies the Record of Proceedings for this matter, including the administrative record upon which the County's approval of the Project is based.

Section V provides general guidance regarding the County's adoption of these findings.

Section VI provides the County's findings with respect to the Project's potentially significant impacts. Attachment "A" to these findings is a table setting forth each mitigation measure adopted by the County in connection with its approval of the Project. Attachment A includes the full text of each mitigation measure adopted by the County. The mitigation measures that are identified as adopted in Attachment A are hereby adopted by the County. Section VI also addresses mitigation measures and project modifications proposed by commenters, and the County's findings with respect to these proposals.

Section VII adopts and incorporates the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the mitigation measures that have been proposed for adoption. A copy of the MMRP is attached as Section 4 to the Final EIR. In adopting these findings, the County hereby adopts and commits to implement the MMRP. The measures set forth in the MMRP represent binding commitments with which the project applicant must comply.

Section VIII sets forth the County's findings with respect to recirculation of the Draft EIR. Although formal findings are not required with respect to determinations whether to recirculate a draft EIR, the County nevertheless adopts these findings to provide information regarding how the County reached its conclusions with respect to recirculation. These findings are adopted pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5.

Section IX sets forth the County's findings with respect to alternatives to the Proposed Project. These findings are adopted pursuant to Public Resources Code sections 21002 and 21081, subdivision (a)(3).

Section X sets forth the County's "statement of overriding considerations" concerning the Project. These findings are adopted pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (b).

The findings and determinations contained herein are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the project and the EIR. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations by the Placer County Board of Supervisors (Board of Supervisors) in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial

evidence in the record as a whole.

Although the findings below identify specific pages within the Draft EIR and Final EIR in support of various conclusions reached below, the Board of Supervisors incorporates by reference and adopts as its own, the reasoning set forth in both environmental documents, and thus relies on that reasoning, even where not specifically mentioned or cited below, in reaching the conclusions set forth below, except where additional evidence is specifically mentioned. This is especially true with respect to the County's approval of the mitigation measures recommended in the Final EIR, and the reasoning set forth in responses to comments in the Final EIR. The County further intends that if these findings fail to cross-reference or incorporate by reference any other part of these findings, any finding required or permitted to be made by the County with respect to any particular subject matter of the Project must be deemed made if it appears in any portion of these findings or findings elsewhere in the record.

Like the EIR itself, these findings use a number of acronyms. To make the findings easier to follow, key acronyms are defined at the end of this document. Although the findings define most such acronyms the first time they are introduced, the listing of acronyms is also provided as a means of identifying such terms. Where terms are defined in the body of these findings in a manner that differs from the list of acronyms at the end of these findings, the definition in the body of these findings shall prevail.

These Findings, along with the Statement of Overriding Considerations set forth in Section X, the table of findings set forth in Attachment A, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") set forth at chapter 4 to the Final EIR, are made with respect to the Project Approvals for the Project and state the findings of the Board of Supervisors relating to the potentially significant environmental effects of the Project in accordance with the Project Approvals. The following Findings, along with the Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program are hereby adopted by the Board of Supervisors as required by the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Sections 21002, 21081, 21081.5 and 21081.6, and CEQA Guidelines sections 15091 through 15093.

## **II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan ("MVWPSP") is a proposed Specific Plan that would establish a legislative and regulatory framework for the development of residential and commercial uses on a portion of the West Parcel and conservation of the East Parcel. The MVWPSP proposes a comprehensive set of goals and policies, project objectives and implementation measures to guide the development of the West Parcel. The Specific Plan would establish Development Standards for parcel layout, buildings and facilities, as well as Design Guidelines for architecture, landscaping and other project elements. The MVWPSP would also establish goals and policies for the preservation of the entire East Parcel as permanent open space.

The project would move the development potential assigned through the Martis Valley Community Plan from the East Parcel to the West Parcel, transferring 760 units and 6.6 acres of commercial from the allowable development of 1,360 units and 6.6 acres of commercial on the East Parcel to the West Parcel. The project would permanently retire the remaining 600 units. These findings have been prepared to comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act and the CEQA Guidelines.

See Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Chapter 2, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for a complete and detailed description of the Project. This includes figures, diagrams, and tables illustrating and describing the proposed Project. (Draft EIR, pp. 3-1 - 3-36 and Final EIR pp. 2-1 to 2-45.) The following text describes briefly the Project.

### **A. Project Location**

The MVWSP Project is located between the Town of Truckee and the north shore of Lake Tahoe in Placer County, on both sides of State Route (SR) 267. The entire Martis Valley encompasses approximately 44,800 acres in Nevada and Placer Counties, 25,570 acres of which are within Placer County. The proposed MVWSP project has two components: the West Parcel (1,052 acres) and the East Parcel (6,376 acres), both privately owned. Of this total, 6,160 acres of the East Parcel are located within Placer County, including 130 acres that are located in the Tahoe Basin (in Placer County). Approximately 216 acres of the East Parcel are located within Nevada County.

The approximately 1,052-acre West Parcel is located north of Lake Tahoe, southeast of the Northstar California Resort, and uphill and east of Sawmill Reservoir. The West Parcel is undeveloped coniferous forest that is designated Forest in the Martis Valley Community Plan (MVCP) and is zoned Timberland Production Zone (TPZ). Similar in character to the West Parcel, the approximately 6,376-acre East Parcel is undeveloped coniferous forest land, primarily designated Forest and zoned TPZ. Approximately 670 acres of the East Parcel are designated Low Density Residential and General Commercial and zoned Single-Family Residential and Neighborhood Commercial in the MVCP. This zoning allows for development of up to 1,360 dwelling units and 6.6 acres of commercial on the East Parcel. (Final EIR, pp. 3-1 - 3-5.)

## **B. Project Overview**

The project involves moving the development potential from the East Parcel to the West Parcel, transferring 760 units and 6.6 acres of commercial from the allowable development of 1,360 units and 6.6 acres of commercial on the East Parcel to the West Parcel. The project permanently retires the remaining 600 units. The entire East Parcel shall be permanently preserved as open space. The mechanism for preserving the East Parcel consists of either (1) the sale of the East Parcel to a land trust or similar organization, or (2) recordation of a conservation easement restricting its use. Development on the West Parcel will accommodate up to 760 residential units, accessory homeowner amenities (up to 22,000 square feet), and up to 6.6 acres (up to 34,500 square feet) of commercial uses, as well as the associated internal roads, a roadway connection to SR 267, an emergency vehicle access (EVA) route, utility connections, and supporting infrastructure.

Development pursuant to the MVWSP will occur in phases, and is anticipated to be built out over approximately 20 years. Depending on market demand for various lodging types and non-residential uses and changes in the development goals or financial capabilities of property owners, development may evolve in a variety of ways. In general, the phasing plan has been structured to ensure that the improvements in each phase can support its respective development in compliance with County policies and standards, and that the development in each phase can support the portion of its costs for the required improvements. (Draft EIR, p. 3-33.) Therefore, the implementation measures are intended to ensure that development of the MVWSP is comprehensive, coordinated, and responsive to changing circumstances and market conditions.

In addition to adoption of the MVWSP, certification of the EIR, amendment of the MVCP land use diagram, and rezone of the East and West Parcels, a large lot tentative map is approved for financing and sale; however, the large lot tentative map conveys no development entitlements to the resulting parcels. The EIR is intended to serve as the base environmental document for subsequent entitlement approvals within the West Parcel. The determination of whether a requested subsequent development entitlement is consistent with the MVWSP, and whether the EIR considered the project-specific effects, would be made by the County through the MVWSP conformity review process to determine consistency with the adopted MVWSP, CEQA, and other regulatory documents and guidelines. In acting to approve a subsequent project or permit, the County may impose reasonable and necessary conditions to ensure that the project is in compliance with the MVWSP and all applicable plans, ordinances, and regulations. (Refer to Section 8.3 of the MVWSP for additional details regarding the procedural steps of

implementing the Specific Plan.)

The approximately 216 acres of the East Parcel in Nevada County remains designated Forest 160 in the Nevada County General Plan. This acreage is not included in the MVWSP, as it is within Nevada County and not under Placer County's jurisdiction; however, it is part of the overall proposed project analyzed in the EIR, in that it will be preserved as open space in perpetuity as part of the East Parcel. The project does not propose development or land use changes on the 216 acres, so no action is needed from Nevada County. Similarly, the approximately 130 acres of the East Parcel owned by Sierra Pacific Industries and located in Placer County and the Tahoe Basin is not included in the MVWSP land use plan, as it is within the Tahoe Basin and under Placer County's and TRPA's jurisdiction, but it is part of the overall proposed project analyzed in the EIR. The project does not propose development or land use changes on the 130 acres co-located in the Tahoe Basin, so no action is required from TRPA.

### **C. Project Objectives**

The purpose and objectives for the Project are as follows:

- Provide new residential development consistent with the vision, goals, and policies of the MVCP, particularly:
  - Conserve large, intact and interconnected areas of natural open space that contributes to the last remaining habitat linkages between the Sierra Nevada and Mount Rose Wilderness Area in the Carson Range (Policy 1.A.6).
  - Minimize habitat fragmentation by development and roads to protect open space from human encroachment (Policy 1.A.6).
  - Consider the regional implications of development in the Martis Valley on resources outside of the Valley (i.e., Truckee River, Lake Tahoe Basin, Carson Range, and Sierra Nevada) (Policy 1.A.7).
  - Ensure that long-term conservation of important resource lands is achieved through a combination of regulatory actions, acquisition of easements, and both public and private land acquisitions (Policy 1.A.8).
  - Encourage the concentration of multi-family housing in and near village centers and neighborhood commercial centers (Policy 1.B.1).
  - Encourage the planning and design of new residential subdivisions to emulate the best characteristics (e.g., form, scale, and general character) of existing, nearby neighborhoods (Policy 1.B.2).
  - Require residential land project design to reflect and consider natural features, noise exposure of residents, visibility of structures, circulation, access, and the relationship of the project to surrounding uses (Policy 1.B.4).
  - Require that significant natural, open space, and cultural resources be identified in advance of development and incorporated into site-specific development project design (Policy 1.B.9).
  - Identify available opportunities and designate land for small commercial centers where some of the needs of local area residents can be met, eliminating the need for trips outside the area (Policy 1.C.3).
  - Encourage the sustained productive use of forestland as a means of providing open space, maintaining the quality of Martis Valley's scenic vistas and to conserve other natural resources (Policy 1.F.1).
  - Encourage the preservation of timber producing lands as regional open space, and protect these areas from urban encroachment (Policy 1.J.1).
- Implement a density transfer and retirement by permanently retiring 600 East Parcel residential units and transferring 760 residential units and 6.6 acres of commercial uses from the East Parcel to the West Parcel while preserving in perpetuity 6,376 acres in conservation lands.

- Contribute to a large, continuous expanse of open space east of SR 267 by ensuring the permanent preservation of the East Parcel.
- Minimize isolated development that leads to fragmentation of open space and natural resources by developing on lands in proximity to existing development.
- Minimize visual impacts of development by using the natural features and terrain of the project site to screen buildings.
- Limit new infrastructure and disturbance by developing on lands in proximity to existing development.
- Enhance and maintain existing trail system and associated recreational uses, such as cross-country skiing, snowshoeing, hiking, and biking trails.
- Implement a land use plan that is responsive to community concerns, such as visual character, traffic management, parking availability, recreational facilities, environmental issues, and the desire for expanded community services and amenities.
- Reduce reliance on automobiles by providing onsite services and amenities, a transit stop, and extensive cross-country skiing, hiking, and biking trails.
- Develop a project that is consistent with the planning guidelines and principles of adopted plans and policies, particularly the MVCP.
- Create a development that draws upon the historic Sierra and Tahoe regional architectural traditions.
- Develop a financially sustainable project that does not require the diminishment of services to existing residents.
- Incorporate sustainable design concepts to ensure long-term preservation, the enhancement of resources, and the reduction of site impacts.
- Reinforce the North Lake Tahoe region, including the Martis Valley, as a four-season destination resort.

(Draft EIR, pp. 3-6 to 3-7, as revised in the Final EIR, p. 2-8.)

**D. Discretionary Approvals**

Project approval requires the County, as lead agency under CEQA, as well as certain “responsible agencies” to take various planning and regulatory actions to approve the overall Project. Described below are discretionary actions necessary to carry out the Project. (See also Table 3-8, MVWSP Process and Required Permits and Authorizations, Final EIR, Response to Comment IO41-7.) In addition to the County’s certification of the Final EIR and adoption of these Findings and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (CEQA requirements), the following discretionary actions and approvals are anticipated:

<b>Expected Permits and Authorizations</b>		
<b>Agency</b>	<b>Permit/Authorization</b>	<b>Action Requiring Permit Approval or Review</b>
<b>Federal</b>		
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Section 7 Consultation (through the USFS review process)	Potential impacts to a federally listed species or its habitat
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Section 404 Permit	Potential impacts to jurisdictional wetlands or waters
<b>State</b>		
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement	Potential disturbance to the bed or bank of jurisdictional waters
	2081 Incidental Take Permit	Potential impacts to a state-listed species

<b>Expected Permits and Authorizations</b>		
<b>Agency</b>	<b>Permit/Authorization</b>	<b>Action Requiring Permit Approval or Review</b>
California Department of Forestry	Timber Harvest Plan Timber Conversion Permit	Harvesting of timber on private lands
California Board of Forestry (through CAL FIRE)	Approval of the immediate rezone from the Timberland Production Zone (TPZ)	Rezone lands from the Timberland Production Zone to SPL-MVWSP
Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board	Section 401 Water Quality Certification	Potential impacts to state water quality; required when a federal permit is issued
	Board Order No. R6T-2007-0008 – Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements Related to Timber Harvest and Vegetation Management Activities	Potential impacts to state water quality resulting from tree and vegetation removal activities
	Statewide Construction General Permit No. CAS000002 - Board Order No. WQO 2009-0009-DWQ	Discharges of stormwater runoff associated with construction activity involving land disturbance of 1 or more acres Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)
	Board Order No. R6T-2008-0023 – Renewed Waste Discharge Requirements and NPDES General Permit for Limited Threat Discharges to Surface Waters	Dewatering of excavations to surface waters (if overland discharge is not feasible)
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	Encroachment Permit	Construction, operation, and maintenance within, under, or over state highway rights-of-way
<b>Local</b>		
Placer County	Lead Agency under CEQA Legislative and Regulatory Authority for Project Entitlements	Requested changes in land uses and development entitlements for the MVWSP area: Martis Valley Community Plan Land Use Diagram Amendment Martis Valley Community Plan Text Amendment MVWSP adoption, including the adoption of the Development Standards and Design Guidelines Development Agreement Large Lot Tentative/Final Subdivision Map
Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District and Placer County Air Pollution Control District	Dust Control Plan Authority to Construct	Disturbance of more than 1 acre of topsoil Stationary sources
Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)	Annexation Application	Annexation of the West Parcel development area into the NCSD service area
Northstar Community Services District	Annexation Application	Annexation of the West Parcel development area into the NCSD service area
Truckee Sanitary District (TSD)	Contract for Service	New Contract for services between NCSD and TSD required prior to LAFCO approval of the annexation of the West Parcel development area into the NCSD service area
Source: Compiled by Ascent Environmental, 2015.		

### III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

In accordance with section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the County prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR, which was originally published on March 28, 2014. (Appendix A of the Draft EIR.) The NOP was distributed for a 30-day comment period concluding on April 28, 2014. The NOP was distributed to public agencies and interested individuals of the community, including residents within 1,000 feet of the Project area. Comments received on the NOP are contained in Appendix B to the EIR.

The County held agency and public scoping meetings on the proposed project on April 16, 2014, at the Cedar House Sport Hotel and at the North Tahoe event Center. The scoping meeting was an opportunity for agencies and the public to obtain information about the proposed project and to provide input regarding the issues they wanted addressed in the Draft EIR. Comments on the NOP received during the scoping meeting were considered in the preparation of the Draft EIR.

On February 27, 2015 the County published a Revised Notice of Preparation of an EIR, because of revisions to MVWPSP by the applicant. The revisions included removal of the portion of the West Parcel that is in the Tahoe Basin (and within the jurisdiction of TRPA), including the 112.8-acre area that was subject to the Area Plan. As a result, the Area Plan is not part of the MVWPSP. The Revised NOP was distributed for a 30-day comment period concluding on March 30, 2015. The Revised NOP was distributed to public agencies and interested individuals of the community, including residents within 1,000 feet of the Project area. Comments received on the Revised NOP are contained in Appendix C to the EIR.

The EIR includes an analysis of the following issue areas:

- Land Use and Forest Resources;
- Population, Employment, and Housing;
- Biological Resources;
- Cultural Resources;
- Visual Resources;
- Transportation and Circulation;
- Air Quality;
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change;
- Noise;
- Geology and Soils;
- Hydrology and Water Quality;
- Utilities;
- Public Services and Recreation;
- Hazards and Hazardous Material.

(See Draft EIR, pp. 1-3.)

The County distributed the Draft EIR to various public agencies, citizen groups, and interested individuals for an initial 45-day public review period, from October 22 through December 07, 2015. The comment period was subsequently extended to December 22, 2015, based on requests from the reviewing public. Comments were solicited during the public comment time frame and were incorporated into the final EIR. This period satisfied the requirement for a 45-day public review period as set forth in Section 15105 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Draft EIR was circulated to state agencies for review through the State Clearinghouse of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research. Copies of the Draft EIR were available for public review during normal business hours at the County. Copies of the Draft EIR were also available for review on the County's website.

During the review period, consistent with Section 15202 of the CEQA Guidelines, the public was invited to a public comment hearing held by the County. A public meeting was held to solicit comments on the Draft EIR on November 19, 2015, at the North Tahoe Conference Center. Oral and written comments were received from members of the public, organizations and several agencies. (See Final EIR, Chapter 23.)

On May 3, 2016, the County released the Final EIR for the Project. The Final EIR includes comments on the Draft EIR, responses to those comments, revisions to the text of the Draft EIR, and other information required by CEQA. The County distributed copies of the Final EIR to public agencies submitting comments on the Draft EIR, as required by Public Resources Code section 21092.5.

On June 9, 2016, the Placer County Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final EIR and the Project. After receiving and considering public comment, the Planning Commission recommended the Board of Supervisors approve the MVWSP and certify the Final EIR. On \_\_\_\_\_, 2016, the Board of Supervisors held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final EIR and the Project. The Board received public comment, and concluded the public hearing. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered, as a whole, the evidence and analysis presented in the Draft EIR, the evidence and analysis presented in the comments on the Draft EIR, the evidence and analysis presented in the Final EIR, the information submitted on the Final EIR, the Errata to the EIR, and the reports prepared by the experts who prepared the EIR, the County's planning consultants, and by staff, and after receiving and considering public comment, makes the findings set forth herein.

#### **IV. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

In accordance with Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e), the record of proceedings for the County's decision on the Project includes the following documents:

- The NOP and all other public notices issued by the County in conjunction with the Project;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the NOP;
- The Draft EIR for the Project (October 2015) and all appendices;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the Draft EIR;
- The Final EIR for the Project, including comments received on the Draft EIR, and responses to those comments and appendices (April 2016);
- The errata to the EIR (June 2016);
- Documents cited or referenced in the Draft EIR and Final EIR;
- The mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the Project;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors in connection with the Project and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the Project prepared by the County, consultants to the County, as well as responsible or trustee

agencies with respect to the County's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the County's action on the Project;

- All documents submitted to the County by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the Project, up through the close of the Board's public hearing on \_\_\_\_\_, 2016;
- Any minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the County in connection with the Project;
- Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the County at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings;
- The Placer County General Plan and all environmental documents prepared in connection with the adoption of the General Plan;
- The Martis Valley Community Plan and all environmental documents prepared in connection with the adoption of the Community Plan;
- The Placer County Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 17 of the County Code) and all other applicable County Code provisions cited in materials prepared by or submitted to the County;
- Any and all resolutions adopted by the County regarding the Project, and all staff reports, analyses, and summaries related to the adoption of those resolutions;
- Matters of common knowledge to the County, including, but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations;
- Any documents expressly cited in these findings, in addition to those cited above; and
- Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

The County has relied on all of the documents listed above in reaching its decision on the Project, even if not every document was formally presented to the County. Without exception, any documents set forth above not so presented fall into one of two categories. Many of them reflect prior planning or legislative decisions with which the County was aware in approving the Project. Other documents influenced the expert advice provided to Planning Department staff or consultants, who then provided advice to the Board of Supervisors. For that reason, such documents form part of the underlying factual basis for the County's decisions relating to the adoption of the Project.

The record of proceedings does not include documents or other materials subject to the attorney/client privilege, the common-interest doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, or other privileges recognized by statute or common law. Administrative draft documents that were prepared at the County's direction, but were not provided to the public or other agencies, and intra-County communications with respect to such administrative draft documents, are not part of the record of proceedings; rather, such documents reflect the County's deliberative process, and reflect initial drafts of documents that later appeared in final form in the record of proceedings. Because these initial working drafts do not reflect the final evidence and analysis relied upon by the County, they are not part of the record of proceedings. In adopting these findings, the County does not waive its right to assert applicable privileges.

The public hearing transcript, a copy of all letters regarding the Draft EIR received during the public review period, the administrative record, and background documentation for the Final EIR, as well as

additional materials concerning approval of the Project and adoption of these findings are contained in County files, and are available for review by responsible agencies and interested members of the public during normal business hours at Placer County. The custodian of these documents is the Placer County Planning Director. The documents are located at the Placer County Community Development Resource Center, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603 and/or Placer County Tahoe Planning Office, 565 West Lake Blvd, Tahoe City, CA. All files have been available to the County and the public for review in considering these findings and whether to approve the Project.

## V. FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

The California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq. and the regulations implementing that statute, Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, §§ 15000 et seq. (the “CEQA Guidelines”) (collectively, the act and the CEQA Guidelines are referred to as “CEQA”) require public agencies to consider the potential effects of their discretionary activities on the environment and, when feasible, to adopt and implement mitigation measures that avoid or substantially lessen the effects of those activities on the environment. Specifically, Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]” The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA “are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects.” Section 21002 goes on to state that “in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof.”

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code Section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a).) For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The three possible findings are:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
- (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
- (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd (a); see also CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a).)

Public Resources Code section 21061.1 defines “feasible” to mean “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors.” CEQA Guidelines section 15364 adds another factor: “legal” considerations. (See also *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (Goleta II)* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565.)

The concept of “feasibility” also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or

mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 401, 417 (*City of Del Mar*)). “[F]easibility” under CEQA encompasses ‘desirability’ to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.” (Ibid.; see also *Sequoiah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715 (*Sequoiah Hills*); see also *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 [after weighing “‘economic, environmental, social, and technological factors’ ... ‘an agency may conclude that a mitigation measure or alternative is impracticable or undesirable from a policy standpoint and reject it as infeasible on that ground’”].)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's “benefits” rendered “acceptable” its “unavoidable adverse environmental effects.” (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15093, 15043, subd. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).) The California Supreme Court has stated, “[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced.” (*Goleta II, supra*, 52 Cal.3d at p. 576.)

In making these Findings and the determination regarding the Project Approvals, the Board of Supervisors recognizes that the Project implicates a number of controversial environmental issues and that a range of technical and scientific opinion exists with respect to those issues. The Board of Supervisors has acquired an understanding of the range of this technical and scientific opinion by its review of the EIR, the comments received on the Draft EIR and the responses to those comments in the Final EIR, as well as testimony, letters and reports regarding the Final EIR and the merits of the Project. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered, as a whole, the evidence and analysis presented in the Draft EIR, the evidence and analysis presented in the comments on the Draft EIR, the evidence and analysis presented in the Final EIR, the information submitted on the Final EIR, and the reports prepared by the experts who prepared the EIR, the County’s planning consultants, and by staff, addressing these comments. In particular, the Board of Supervisors has considered the Alternatives presented in the EIR, as well as the proposed comments submitted by various commenters and the responses of the EIR preparers and staff to those comments. The Board of Supervisors has gained a comprehensive and well-rounded understanding of the environmental issues presented by the Project. In turn, that understanding has enabled the Board of Supervisors to make its decisions after weighing and considering the various viewpoints on these important issues. Accordingly, the Board of Supervisors certifies that its findings are based on a full appraisal of all of the evidence contained in the Final EIR, as well as the evidence and other information in the record addressing the Final EIR.

These findings constitute the Board of Supervisors’ best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the Project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. These findings are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that come into effect with the County’s approval of the Project. In particular, in adopting these findings, the County commits itself to ensure the implementation of the mitigation measures approved in these findings.

The Board of Supervisors is adopting these findings for the entirety of the actions described in these findings and in the Final EIR. Although the findings below identify specific pages within the Draft and Final EIR in support of various conclusions reached below, the Board of Supervisors incorporates by reference and adopts as its own, the reasoning set forth in both environmental documents, and thus relies on that reasoning, even where not specifically mentioned or cited below, in reaching the conclusions set forth below, except where additional evidence is specifically mentioned. This is especially true with respect to the Board of Supervisors’ approval of all mitigation measures, policies and implementation

programs recommended in the Final EIR, and the reasoning set forth in responses to comments in the Final EIR.

As noted, the Final EIR is incorporated into these Findings in its entirety. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of Mitigation Measures, the basis for determining the significance of impacts, the comparative analysis of alternatives, and the reasons for approving the Project in spite of the potential for associated significant and unavoidable adverse impacts. In the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has inadvertently been omitted below, such a mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language describing a mitigation measure set forth in Section VI does not accurately reflect the mitigation measures in the Final EIR due to a clerical error, the language of the policies and implementation measures as set forth in the Final EIR shall control, unless the language of the policies and implementation measures has been specifically and expressly modified by these findings. Where the language of such measures differs between the Final EIR and these findings, the more stringent language shall control. The Board of Supervisors provides this direction in order to ensure that any such discrepancy shall be regarded as inadvertent, and shall not be regarded as an effort by the Board of Supervisors to undermine its commitment to adopt mitigation measures as necessary to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects of the Project.

More generally, to the extent there are any inconsistencies in the mitigation measures identified in these findings, in Attachment A, or in the MMRP, any such inconsistencies are inadvertent and unintentional. The County intends that, in the event of such inconsistencies, such inconsistency shall be reconciled in the manner that affords the greatest possible protection to the environment, in a manner consistent with the specific terms of the mitigation measures as adopted. In the event there are any future uncertainties or disputes regarding the nature, scope or feasibility of the adopted mitigation measures, the Board of Supervisors directs staff to return to the Board of Supervisors, at a properly noticed public hearing, to consider any such uncertainties or disputes. The Board of Supervisors intends that, in the event such a hearing is necessary, the public and other agencies will have an opportunity to review and comment on the manner in which such measures are implemented, and the Board of Supervisor's resolution of such issues occurs in a manner that allows the public to understand the basis for the Board of Supervisor's decision.

These findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of the Board of Supervisors regarding the environmental impacts of the Project and the mitigation measures included as part of the Final EIR and adopted by the Board of Supervisors as part of the Project. To avoid duplication and redundancy, and because the Board of Supervisors agrees with, and hereby adopts, the conclusions in the Final EIR, these findings will not always repeat the analysis and conclusions in the Final EIR, but instead incorporates them by reference herein and relied upon them as substantial evidence supporting these findings.

In making these findings, the Board of Supervisors has considered the opinions of other agencies and members of the public. The Board of Supervisors finds that the determination of significance thresholds is a judgment decision within the discretion of the Board of Supervisors; the significance thresholds used in the EIR are supported by substantial evidence in the record, including the expert opinion of the EIR preparers and County staff; and the significance thresholds used in the EIR provide reasonable and appropriate means of assessing the significance of the adverse environmental effects of the Project. Thus, although, as a legal matter, the Board of Supervisors is not bound by the significance determinations in the EIR (see Pub. Resources Code, § 21082.2, subd. (e)), except as expressly set forth in these findings, the Board of Supervisors finds these significance thresholds persuasive and hereby adopts them as its own.

Section VI of these findings summarizes the environmental determinations of the Final EIR and Project's potentially significant impacts before and after mitigation. Section VI does not attempt to describe the full

analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, Section VI provides a summary description of each impact, sets forth the mitigation measures identified to reduce or avoid the impact, and states the Board of Supervisors' findings on the significance of each impact after imposition of the adopted MVWSP Project's provisions and the recommended mitigation measures. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Final EIR and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR supporting the Final EIR's determination regarding the Project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the Board of Supervisors ratifies, adopts and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Final EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

Because the EIR identified significant effects that may occur as a result of the project, and in accordance with the provisions of the Guidelines presented above, the County hereby adopts these findings as part of the approval of the MVWSP Project. These findings constitute the County's best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the Project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that come into effect with the County's approval of the Project.

## **VI. POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

The EIR identified a number of significant and potentially significant environmental effects (or impacts) that the Project will cause or contribute to. These significant effects can be avoided or substantially lessened through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. The Board of Supervisors' findings with respect to the Project's significant effects and mitigation measures are set forth in the table appearing at Attachment A to these findings. The findings set forth in the table are adopted and incorporated by reference.

The table at Attachment A does not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, the table provides a summary description of each impact, describes the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR or Final EIR and adopted by the Board of Supervisors, and states the Board of Supervisors' findings on the significance of each impact after imposition of the adopted mitigation measures. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found the Draft EIR and Final EIR, or elsewhere in the record of proceedings, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in those documents supporting the Final EIR's determinations regarding the Project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the Board of Supervisors ratifies, adopts, and incorporates into these findings the analysis and explanation in the Draft EIR, the Final EIR, or elsewhere in the record, and ratifies, adopts, and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Draft EIR and Final EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

The Board of Supervisors has adopted all of the mitigation measures identified in the table. Some of the measures identified in the table are also within the jurisdiction and control of other agencies. To the extent any of the mitigation measures are within the jurisdiction of other agencies, the Board of Supervisors finds those agencies can and should implement those measures within their jurisdiction and control.

Some of the comments on the Draft EIR suggested additional mitigation measures and/or modifications to the measures recommended in the Draft EIR. In considering specific recommendations from commenters, the County has been cognizant of its legal obligation under CEQA to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental effects to the extent feasible. The County recognizes, moreover, that comments frequently offer thoughtful suggestions regarding how a commenter believes that a particular mitigation

measure can be modified, or perhaps changed significantly, in order to more effectively, in the commenter's view, reduce the severity of environmental effects. The County is also cognizant, however, that the mitigation measures recommended in the Draft EIR represent the professional judgment and experience of the County's expert staff and environmental consultants. The County therefore believes that these recommendations should not be lightly altered. Thus, in considering commenters' suggested changes or additions to the mitigation measures as set forth in the Draft EIR, the County, in determining whether to accept such suggestions, either in whole or in part, has considered the following factors, among others: (i) whether the suggestion relates to a significant and unavoidable environmental effect of the Project, or instead relates to an effect that can already be mitigated to less than significant levels by proposed mitigation measures in the Draft EIR; (ii) whether the proposed language represents a clear improvement, from an environmental standpoint, over the draft language that a commenter seeks to replace; (iii) whether the proposed language is sufficiently clear as to be easily understood by those who will implement the mitigation as finally adopted; (iv) whether the language might be too inflexible to allow for pragmatic implementation; (v) whether the suggestions are feasible from an economic, technical, legal, or other standpoint; (vi) whether the proposed language is consistent with the project objectives; and (vii) whether the suggestions may result in other impacts that are more severe than the impacts that the suggestions are designed to address, such that on the whole the suggestions do not reflect an improvement over those measures identified in the EIR.

As is evident from the specific responses given to specific suggestions, County staff and consultants spent significant time carefully considering and weighing proposed mitigation language, and in many instances adopted much of what a commenter suggested. In some instances, the County developed alternative language addressing the same issue that was of concern to a commenter. In no instance, however, did the County fail to take seriously a suggestion made by a commenter or fail to appreciate the sincere effort that went into the formulation of suggestions.

Based on this review, as is evident from the Final EIR, the County modified several of the original proposed measures in response to such comments (see Final EIR, Chapter 2). The Board of Supervisors commends staff for its careful consideration of those comments, agrees with staff in those instances when staff did not accept proposed language, and hereby ratifies, adopts, and incorporates staff's reasoning on these issues.

For this project, the following impacts were identified as significant and unavoidable. That is, these impacts remain significant, despite the incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures to substantially lessen or avoid these impacts:

#### **Visual Resources, Cumulative Impact 9-9: Cumulative effects on light and glare**

The Project will result in new sources of light that may, on a cumulative basis, have a significant impact on the environment (Cumulative Impact 9-9). Specifically, the Project would result in new light sources that would be potentially visible from Martis Valley and would introduce new light sources in a portion of the view that is not already affected by light, which would contribute to the existing adverse effects on nighttime views. This impact is not significant on a project-specific level. This impact does, however, result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to this impact. Thus, the MVWSP would result in a considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant impact on nighttime views. The project has made a variety of commitments to address these impacts. These commitments are binding elements of the Project that the applicant must implement. These commitments are described in Draft EIR section 9.4.5. Under the Development Standards, the Project is required to implement measures to reduce light pollution, which would limit light sources to the minimum amount necessary to maintain nighttime safety, utility, security, and productivity. No additional mitigation has been proposed and/or found to be feasible. This impact is therefore considered significant and unavoidable.

**Transportation and Circulation, Impacts 10-1 and 10-2: Impacts to intersection operations and roadway segments**

The Project will result in substantial impact upon the existing transportation systems, including intersection operations (Impact 10-1) and roadway segments (Impact 10-2). Specifically, the project would worsen already unacceptable operations (i.e., already beyond the acceptable threshold) at the SR 267/I-80 WB Ramps, SR 267/Schaffer Mill Road/Truckee Airport Road and SR 267/Highlands View Road intersections during the winter peak hour (Impact 10-1). In addition, the Project would worsen traffic congestion on the five SR 267 segments between the Town of Truckee/Placer County Line and SR 28, resulting in a segment either degrading from acceptable LOS D to unacceptable LOS E, or exacerbating conditions on a segment operating at an unacceptable LOS E by an increase in V/C ratio of 0.05 or more, for both the summer and winter peak hours (Impact 10-2). The project has made a variety of commitments to address these impacts. These commitments are binding elements of the Project that the applicant must implement. These commitments are described in Draft EIR section 10.3.4. In addition, the Project applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measures: 10-1a, and 10-1b (coordinate with Caltrans to optimize signal timing at the intersections of SR 267 at I-80 WB and SR 267 at Schaffer Mill Road/Truckee Airport Road), 10-1c (provide signage on Highlands View Road, directing motorists to access SR 267 via Ridgeline Drive and Northstar Drive), and 10-2 (pay traffic impact fees to Placer County for future roadway improvements to SR 267). No additional feasible mitigation measures have been identified to address these impacts. These impacts are therefore considered significant and unavoidable.

**Transportation and Circulation, Cumulative Impacts 10-8 and 10-9: Cumulative Impacts to intersection operations and roadway segments**

On a cumulative basis, the Project would worsen traffic congestion at six of the SR 267 intersections between the Town of Truckee/Placer County Line and SR 28, resulting in an intersection either degrading from acceptable LOS D to unacceptable LOS F, or exacerbating conditions on a segment operating at an unacceptable LOS F by an increase in delay at the effected intersections, for both the summer and winter peak hours (Cumulative Impact 10-8). In addition, the Project would worsen traffic congestion on the five SR 267 segments between the Town of Truckee/Placer County Line and SR 28, resulting in a segment either degrading from acceptable LOS D to unacceptable LOS E, or exacerbating conditions on a segment operating at an unacceptable LOS E by an increase in V/C ratio of 0.05 or more, for both the summer and winter peak hours (Cumulative Impact 10-9). The project has made a variety of commitments to address these impacts. These commitments are binding elements of the Project that the applicant must implement. These commitments are described in Draft EIR section 10.3.5. In addition, the Project applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measures: 10-8a through 10-8d, and 10-8f (pay traffic impact fees to Placer County for future roadway improvements to SR 267, including those affected intersections), 10-8e (provide signage on Highlands View Road and pay traffic impact fee), and 10-9 (pay traffic impact fees to Placer County for future roadway improvements to SR 267, including those effected segments). No additional feasible mitigation measures have been identified to address these impacts. In particular, in paying the County’s adopted Traffic Impact Fee, the Project applicant is paying its “fair share” pursuant to an adopted fee program for the construction of the improvements listed in the County’s Capital Improvement Program. These improvements include substantial improvements to SR267. (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, 15130.) Requiring additional payments for these improvements would be in excess of the Project applicant’s “fair share.” These impacts are therefore considered significant and unavoidable.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Impact 12-2: Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

The Project will generate GHG emissions which would exceed the Tier I mass-emission threshold. GHG

emissions would be substantial when the MVWSP is built out. Therefore, operation of the project has the potential to result in a substantial contribution to GHG emissions. The Project has made a variety of commitments to address these impacts. These commitments are binding elements of the Project that the applicant must implement. These commitments are described in Final EIR section 2.2.9. The Project is required to implement the following mitigation measures: 12-2 (when submitting subdivision maps, the applicant shall insure that operation of the project would be consistent with the GHG targets adopted by the state or implement additional feasible mitigation measures). No additional feasible mitigation measures have been identified to address these impacts. These impacts are therefore considered potentially significant and unavoidable.

#### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Cumulative Impact 12-4: Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Project phasing is expected to take 20 years and the GHG emissions reduction targets and implementing regulations are not currently known. The project will generate substantial GHG emissions and it would be speculative to determine that the Project GHG emissions would be sufficiently mitigated to meet the emissions reduction targets that may be in place. The Project has made a variety of commitments to address these impacts. These commitments are binding elements of the Project that the applicant must implement. These commitments are described in Draft EIR section 12.3.5. The Project is required to implement the following mitigation measure: 12-2 (when submitting subdivision maps, the applicant shall insure that operation of the project would be consistent with the GHG targets adopted by the state, or implement additional feasible mitigation measures). No additional feasible mitigation measures have been identified to address these impacts. These impacts are therefore considered potentially significant and unavoidable.

### **VII. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

The County has prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Project. A copy of the MMRP appears at Chapter 4 to the Final EIR. The County, in adopting these findings, also approves the MMRP. The County will use the MMRP to track compliance with Project mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period. The MMRP is attached to and incorporated into the Project and is approved in conjunction with certification of the EIR and adoption of these Findings of Fact. In the event of any conflict between these findings and the MMRP with respect to the requirements of an adopted mitigation measure, the more stringent measure shall control, and shall be incorporated automatically into both the findings and the MMRP.

### **VIII. RECIRCULATION OF DRAFT EIR**

The Board of Supervisors adopts the following findings with respect to the need to recirculate the Draft EIR. Under section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, recirculation of an EIR is required when “significant new information” is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review but prior to certification of the Final EIR. The term “information” can include changes in the project or environmental setting, as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement.

“Significant new information” requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

- (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.
- (4) The Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

(CEQA Guidelines, § 15088.5.)

Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR. The above standard is “not intend[ed] to promote endless rounds of revision and recirculation of EIRs.” (*Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of the University of California* (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1112, 1132.) “Recirculation was intended to be an exception, rather than the general rule.” (*Ibid.*)

The Board of Supervisors recognizes that the Final EIR incorporates information obtained by the County since the Draft EIR was completed, and contains additions, clarifications, modifications, and other changes. As noted above, several comments on the Draft EIR either expressly or impliedly sought changes to proposed mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR as well as additional mitigation measures. As explained in the Final EIR (Text Changes and Responses to Comments), some of the suggestions were found to be appropriate and feasible and were adopted in the Final EIR and included in the MMRP. As discussed in the previous section of these findings, where changes have been made to mitigation measures to respond to comments, these changes do not change the significance of any conclusions presented in the Draft EIR.

CEQA case law emphasizes that “[t]he CEQA reporting process is not designed to freeze the ultimate proposal in the precise mold of the initial project; indeed, new and unforeseen insights may emerge during investigation, evoking revision of the original proposal.” (*Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 736-737; see also *River Valley Preservation Project v. Metropolitan Transit Development Bd.* (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 154, 168, fn. 11.) “CEQA compels an interactive process of assessment of environmental impacts and responsive project modification which must be genuine. It must be open to the public, premised upon a full and meaningful disclosure of the scope, purposes, and effect of a consistently described project, with flexibility to respond to unforeseen insights that emerge from the process.’ [Citation.] In short, a project must be open for public discussion and subject to agency modification during the CEQA process.” (*Concerned Citizens of Costa Mesa, Inc. v. 33rd Dist. Agricultural Assn.* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 929, 936.) Here, the changes made to mitigation measures are exactly the kind of project improvements that the case law recognizes as legitimate and proper.

The changes to the Project and mitigation measures are described in Final EIR chapters 2 and 4. The changes are designed to incorporate specific suggestions from commenters. These revisions do not require recirculation of the Draft EIR. (See Final EIR, chapters 2, 4; see also Master Response 1.) None of these changes involves “significant new information” triggering recirculation because the changes to the mitigation measures do not result in any new significant environmental effects, any substantial increase in the severity of any previously identified significant effects, or otherwise trigger recirculation. Instead, the modifications were either environmentally benign or environmentally neutral, and thus represent the kinds of changes that commonly occur as the environmental review process works towards its conclusion. Under such circumstances, the County finds that recirculation of the EIR is not required.

## IX. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

### A. Findings Regarding Project Alternatives

Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that “public agencies should not approve Projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such Projects[.]” The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA “are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects.”

Where a lead agency has determined that, even after the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures, a Project as proposed will still cause one or more significant environmental effects that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided, the agency, prior to approving the Project as mitigated, must first determine whether, with respect to such impacts, there remain any Project alternatives that are both environmentally superior and feasible within the meaning of CEQA. Although an EIR must evaluate this range of potentially feasible alternatives, an alternative may ultimately be deemed by the lead agency to be “infeasible” if it fails to fully promote the lead agency’s underlying goals and objectives with respect to the Project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 401, 417.) “[F]easibility’ under CEQA encompasses ‘desirability’ to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.” (*Ibid*; see also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.) Thus, even if a Project alternative will avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the Project, the decision-makers may reject the alternative if they determine that specific considerations make the alternative infeasible, or if the alternative does not meet the objectives for the Project.

All of the environmental impacts associated with the Project may be substantially lessened or avoided with the adoption of the mitigation measures set forth in these findings, with the exception of the following impacts:

- Visual Resources, Cumulative Impact 9-9 (light sources visible from Martis Valley, including portions of the view not already affected by light)
- Transportation and Circulation, Impact 10-1 (worsen already unacceptable operations at three SR 267 intersections between the Town of Truckee/Placer County Line and SR 28)
- Transportation and Circulation, Impact 10-2 (worsen traffic congestion on the five SR 267 segments between the Town of Truckee/Placer County Line and SR 28)
- Transportation and Circulation, Cumulative Impact 10-8 (worsen traffic congestion at six of the SR 267 intersections between the Town of Truckee/Placer County Line and SR 28)
- Transportation and Circulation, Cumulative Impact 10-9 (worsen traffic congestion on the five SR 267 segments between the Town of Truckee/Placer County Line and SR 28)
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Impact 12-2 (operation of the Project has the potential to result in a substantial contribution to GHG emissions)
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Cumulative Impact 12-4 (cumulative Project GHG emissions may exceed GHG reduction targets)

The Board of Supervisors’ goal in evaluating the Project alternatives was to select an alternative that

feasibly attains the Project objectives, while further reducing the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts. (Draft EIR, p. 19-1.)

As set forth in the Final EIR, the purpose and objectives for the Project are as follows:

- Provide new residential development consistent with the vision, goals, and policies of the MVCP, particularly:
  - Conserve large, intact and interconnected areas of natural open space that contributes to the last remaining habitat linkages between the Sierra Nevada and Mount Rose Wilderness Area in the Carson Range (Policy 1.A.6).
  - Minimize habitat fragmentation by development and roads to protect open space from human encroachment (Policy 1.A.6).
  - Consider the regional implications of development in the Martis Valley on resources outside of the Valley (i.e., Truckee River, Lake Tahoe Basin, Carson Range, and Sierra Nevada) (Policy 1.A.7).
  - Ensure that long-term conservation of important resource lands is achieved through a combination of regulatory actions, acquisition of easements, and both public and private land acquisitions (Policy 1.A.8).
  - Encourage the concentration of multi-family housing in and near village centers and neighborhood commercial centers (Policy 1.B.1).
  - Encourage the planning and design of new residential subdivisions to emulate the best characteristics (e.g., form, scale, and general character) of existing, nearby neighborhoods (Policy 1.B.2).
  - Require residential land Project design to reflect and consider natural features, noise exposure of residents, visibility of structures, circulation, access, and the relationship of the Project to surrounding uses (Policy 1.B.4).
  - Require that significant natural, open space, and cultural resources be identified in advance of development and incorporated into site-specific development Project design (Policy 1.B.9).
  - Identify available opportunities and designate land for small commercial centers where some of the needs of local area residents can be met, eliminating the need for trips outside the area (Policy 1.C.3).
  - Encourage the sustained productive use of forestland as a means of providing open space, maintaining the quality of Martis Valley's scenic vistas and to conserve other natural resources (Policy 1.F.1).
  - Encourage the preservation of timber producing lands as regional open space, and protect these areas from urban encroachment (Policy 1.J.1).
- Implement a density transfer and retirement by permanently retiring 600 East Parcel residential units and transferring 760 residential units and 6.6 acres of commercial uses from the East Parcel to the West Parcel while preserving in perpetuity 6,376 acres in conservation lands.
- Contribute to a large, continuous expanse of open space east of SR 267 by ensuring the permanent preservation of the East Parcel.
- Minimize isolated development that leads to fragmentation of open space and natural resources by developing on lands in proximity to existing development.
- Minimize visual impacts of development by using the natural features and terrain of the Project site to screen buildings.
- Limit new infrastructure and disturbance by developing on lands in proximity to existing development.
- Enhance and maintain existing trail system and associated recreational uses, such as cross-country skiing, snowshoeing, hiking, and biking trails.

- Implement a land use plan that is responsive to community concerns, such as visual character, traffic management, parking availability, recreational facilities, environmental issues, and the desire for expanded community services and amenities.
- Reduce reliance on automobiles by providing onsite services and amenities, a transit stop, and extensive cross-country skiing, hiking, and biking trails.
- Develop a Project that is consistent with the planning guidelines and principles of adopted plans and policies, particularly the MVCP.
- Create a development that draws upon the historic Sierra and Tahoe regional architectural traditions.
- Develop a financially sustainable Project that does not require the diminishment of services to existing residents.
- Incorporate sustainable design concepts to ensure long-term preservation, the enhancement of resources, and the reduction of site impacts.
- Reinforce the North Lake Tahoe region, including the Martis Valley, as a four-season destination resort.

(Draft EIR, chapter 3.3.)

The Draft EIR discussed several alternatives to the Project in order to present a reasonable range of options. To meet CEQA requirements for the consideration of alternatives, this environmental document evaluates the potential impacts of the Project, and four alternatives (including a No Project – No Development Alternative). The Final EIR included a fifth alternative – the East Parcel, Reduced Density Alternative.

To be suitable for consideration in the EIR, alternatives must be “potentially” feasible and “attain most of the basic objectives of the Project.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6, subd. (a).) The Alternatives, analyzed in detail in the EIR, are:

- Alternative 1 – No Project – No Development;
- Alternative 2 – No Project – Martis Valley Community Plan Alternative;
- Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative;
- Alternative 4 – Reduced Footprint, Hotel Alternative; and
- Alternative 5 – East Parcel, Reduced Density Alternative.

The Board of Supervisors finds that that a good faith effort was made to evaluate all feasible alternatives in the EIR that are reasonable alternatives to the Project and could feasibly obtain the basic objectives of the Project, even when the alternatives might impede the attainment of the Project objectives and might be more costly. As a result, the scope of alternatives analyzed in the EIR is not unduly limited or narrow. The Board of Supervisors also finds that all reasonable alternatives were reviewed, analyzed and discussed in the review process of the EIR and the ultimate decision on the Project. (See Draft EIR, pp. 19-1 to 19-38; Final EIR, pp. 2-35 to 2-43; see also Master Response 10, Response to Comment A-1-3, IO18-74, IO31-45 and 46, IO41-81 to 83, IO51-9, 15 and 16.)

### **B. Alternatives Analyzed in the Draft EIR and Final EIR**

The goal for developing a set of possible alternatives was to identify other means to attain the Project objectives while further reducing the less than significant environmental impacts caused by the Project. The EIR analyzed the Project, and Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. The EIR contains a detailed analysis of the impacts of each of these alternatives. The analysis appears throughout the Final EIR. The Board of Supervisors hereby incorporates by reference this analysis. Table 19-4 in the Draft EIR (as modified in the Final EIR, p. 2-43) summarizes the EIR’s conclusions concerning the impacts of, and mitigation measures applicable to, each alternative. This table includes the Project now proposed by the applicant.

Based on this analysis, the Board of Supervisors adopts the following findings with respect to each alternative.

These findings focus on whether the alternatives are, in fact, feasible, and attain the Project objectives. These findings are therefore distinct from the information in the Draft EIR, in which alternatives are considered if they are merely “potentially feasible,” and attain “most” of the Project objectives. Under CEQA, these two inquiries are related, but distinct. In adopting these findings, the Board has considered the information in the EIR, as well as other information in the record, to determine whether each alternative is feasible, and/or meets the Project objectives.

### **Alternative 1 – No Project, No Development**

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, no actions would be taken and both the East Parcel and West Parcel would remain unchanged from current conditions, undeveloped forested land. This alternative assumes that no development would occur on either the East or the West Parcels to allow for analysis/comparison of development alternatives to the undeveloped site conditions. It is assumed that lands zoned Forest and under Timberland Production Zone (TPZ) would remain unharvested.

The No Project, No Development Alternative would avoid all of the Project’s significant and unavoidable impacts, and overall the impacts would be less than those that would occur with the Project. In fact, all of the significant impacts would be avoided. Accordingly, Alternative 1 is the environmentally superior alternative. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6; see Draft EIR, p. 19-36.)

#### Feasibility/Ability to Meet Project Objectives

Under Alternative 1, the No Project – No Development alternative, the MVWPSP would not be approved, and no development would occur on either parcel. This would avoid the Project’s significant and unavoidable impacts, and lessen the impacts overall. However, with the exception of those goals pertaining to conservation of large, intact, and interconnected areas of natural open space and prevent fragmentation of habitat, the No Project, No Development Alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives and would not be consistent with the goals and objectives of the MVCP or the Placer County General Plan. This alternative would not enhance or maintain the existing trail system and associated recreational uses. Nor would this alternative achieve any of the economic benefits of the Project. Nor would this alternative contribute to regional transit needs.

Most important, this alternative would not result in the permanent preservation of the East Parcel as open space. As noted above, the following objectives are central to the Project:

- Conserve large, intact and interconnected areas of natural open space that contributes to the last remaining habitat linkages between the Sierra Nevada and Mount Rose Wilderness Area in the Carson Range (Policy 1.A.6).
- Minimize habitat fragmentation by development and roads to protect open space from human encroachment (Policy 1.A.6).
- Consider the regional implications of development in the Martis Valley on resources outside of the Valley (i.e., Truckee River, Lake Tahoe Basin, Carson Range, and Sierra Nevada) (Policy 1.A.7).

Under this alternative, the East Parcel would not be developed, but would retain its existing land-use designations and zoning, which authorize up to 1,360 residential units as well as up to 6.6 acres of commercial development. As the above objectives make clear, one of the central objectives of the Project is to preserve the East Parcel as a key component of a large system of open space east of SR 267. (See

Conservation Biology Institute, Landscape-scale Conservation in Martis Valley, California – A Paradigm for Collaborative Partnerships (November 2015), which explains the extent to which the Project would complement efforts to permanently protect a large swath of contiguous public and private open space stretching from Lake Tahoe to the South, west to SR 267, and north into and across the eastern half of Martis Valley.) The Board finds this Project objective compelling. Because Alternative 1 would not meet this objective, or any other Project objective, the Board rejects Alternative 1.

### **Alternative 2 – No Project – Martis Valley Community Plan Alternative**

Under Alternative 2, the No Project – MVCP Alternative, the existing Placer County MVCP land use plan and zoning would remain in place. The majority of the 6,376-acre East Parcel and all of the West Parcel are designated Forest and zoned TPZ. However, the MVCP designates approximately 670 acres of the East Parcel as Low Density Residential and General Commercial; this area is zoned Single-Family Residential and Neighborhood Commercial. Under this alternative, development would occur pursuant to the MVCP land use designations, which would include up to 1,360 dwelling units on 670 acres of the East Parcel, up to 6.6 acres of commercial land uses throughout the 670 East Parcel development area, and 5,706 acres of the East Parcel and all of the West Parcel would remain designated as Forest and zoned TPZ and would remain undeveloped forest, managed as allowed by the TPZ.

The No Project – MVCP Alternative would have similar impacts to the Project in the areas of Population, Employment, and Housing, Cultural Resources, Visual Resources (including the same significant and unavoidable impact), Geology and Soils, and Hazards and Hazardous Materials. This alternative would have similar/greater impacts compared to the Project in the areas of Land Use and Forest Resources, Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, (including the same potentially significant and unavoidable impact), Noise, Hydrology and Water Quality, Utilities, and Public Services and Recreation. The No Project, MVCP Alternative would have greater impacts in the areas of Biological Resources (including a potential for a new significant and unavoidable impact) and Transportation and Circulation (including similar significant and unavoidable impacts). These greater impacts would occur because (1) development of the East Parcel would bisect an intact swath of forest, and could have a greater impact on wildlife movement than the Project, and (2) because Alternative 2 would involve development of 1,360 residential units, there would be an increase of about 80% in the number of residential units, and a corresponding increase in trip generation, which would result in somewhat greater traffic impacts than the Project. (Draft EIR, section 19.5.)

The Board finds that the No Project – Martis Valley Community Plan alternative is not environmentally superior to the Project, and rejects this alternative on that basis.

### **Feasibility/Ability to Meet Project Objectives**

The No Project, MVCP Alternative would further some of the Project objectives to a degree, and be consistent with the MVCP and the Placer County General Plan. In other respects, however, this alternative would not meet the County's objectives for the Project. Most importantly, this alternative would not meet the conservation objectives of the Project, and would hinder efforts to establish a large, continuous expanse of open space east of SR 267. (See Conservation Biology Institute, Landscape-scale Conservation in Martis Valley, California – A Paradigm for Collaborative Partnerships (November 2015), which explains the extent to which the Project would complement efforts to permanently protect a large swath of contiguous public and private open space stretching from Lake Tahoe to the South, west to SR 267, and north into and across the eastern half of Martis Valley.)

The Board finds that the objectives aimed at permanent protection of this area are central to the Project. The Board rejects this alternative because it is inconstant with those objectives.

The Board rejects this alternative both because it is not environmentally superior to the Project, and because this alternative fails to meet objectives for the Project. The Board rejects this alternative for both of these reasons, and for each of them. Thus, even if the record supported only one of these reasons, the Board would nevertheless reject this alternative.

### **Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative**

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the majority of the same features of the MVWSP would remain in place, but with a reduction in the number of dwelling units in the West Parcel by approximately 45 percent (a reduction of 342 units). In all other respects the alternative would be the same as the proposed MVWSP as described above. Based on the potential intersection and roadway impacts, this alternative was formulated to reduce the magnitude of the significant and unavoidable impacts identified for the Project.

The Reduced Density Alternative would have similar/less impacts compared to the Project in all areas studied. This alternative would result in the same significant and unavoidable impacts in the areas of Visual Resources, Transportation and Circulation, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change. Thus, this alternative would not avoid any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project, although the extent to which this alternative contributes to these impacts would be incrementally less than for the Project. (Draft EIR, section 19.6.)

### **Feasibility/Ability to Meet Project Objectives**

The Reduced Density Alternative would further many of the Project objectives and be consistent with the MVCP and Placer County General Plan. In particular, this alternative would result in eliminating residential and commercial land-use designations and zoning on the east side of SR 267, and thus contribute to regional efforts to provide permanent protection to a large swath of open space in this area.

Mountainside Partners LLC has provided information regarding the economic feasibility of the Project compared to Alternative 3, the Reduced Density Alternative and Alternative 5, the East Parcel, Reduced Density Alternative. The results of this study are located in the report titled *Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan Economic Viability Analysis, Alternative 3 and Alternative 5* (May 2016). This study is presented as evidence that Alternative 3 is economically infeasible.

The study finds that most fixed, common costs (construction of roadways, water & sewer systems, utilities, and homeowner amenities) for buildout of the Project would be approximately \$65 million. Although the Project would be built out over 16-20 years, most of the common costs would be incurred early in the Project life cycle. The requirement for significant up-front capital investment entails considerable risk, in that the return on that up-front investment may take years, and may straddle multiple real estate cycles. Such an investment also entails risk due to the lengthy period during which the invested, up-front capital provides returns. According to the study, the high initial cost associated with the Project, combined with the 16-20 year build out (and the likely significant wait for full return on investment) places the Project in a category of high risk. The amount of risk associated with the Project necessitates an Internal Rate of Return (IRR) range of 10% to 15% to attract investors. Absent such an IRR, investment capital will instead be directed to other investments that entail less risk. The life-of-Project financial model calculated an IRR of 11% for the Project, which falls within the acceptable range of 10% to 15%.

The study determines that the common costs for Alternative 3 would be the same as the Project (\$65 million). That is because the basic infrastructure for Alternative 3 would be comparable to that required for the Project (for example, the access intersection improvements, primary access and emergency access and backbone utility lines); there is no basic infrastructure that could be down-sized or eliminated as a

result of reducing the number of units to be built. Alternative 3 would build out over 11 years, rather than over 16 years under the Project (again, due to the reduced unit count). Taking these factors into account, the study concludes that Alternative 3 would still be categorized as high risk, because it would face many of the same risks to capital as the Project. Investors would still require an IRR of 10% to 15% in order to make the investment attractive, as compared to other, lower risk alternatives. The Life-of-Project financial model determined that Alternative 3 would have an IRR of 5%. This IRR is insufficient to attract investment capital. For this reason, Alternative 3 would not be financially feasible.

For the reasons set forth herein the Board rejects Alternative 3 as infeasible.

#### **Alternative 4 – Reduced Footprint, Hotel Alternative**

Under Alternative 4, the Reduced Footprint, Hotel Alternative, the development would be reduced to 500 residential units, 14,475 square feet of recreational homeowner amenities, a 100-unit resort hotel, a 150-space recreational parking lot, and 22,000 square feet of commercial development. This would reduce the total development area to 550 acres, and provide a focus on recreation, including hiking, cycling, and cross-country skiing. Conservation of the East Parcel would occur as described in the proposed MVWSPS.

The Reduced Footprint, Hotel Alternative would have similar/less impacts compared to the Project in the areas of Land Use and Forest Resources, Population, Employment, and Housing, Cultural Resources, Visual Resources (though with the same significant and unavoidable impact), Transportation and Circulation (including the same significant and unavoidable impact), Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, Utilities, Public Service and Recreation, and Hazards and Hazardous Materials. This alternative would have similar impacts to the Project in the areas of Biological Resources, and Air Quality. The Reduced Footprint, Hotel Alternative would have similar/greater impacts compared to the Project in the areas of Noise, particularly traffic noise. However, the Draft EIR notes that attainment of the Placer County noise standard would be achieved through mitigation as necessary. (Draft EIR, section 19.7.9.)

The Draft EIR states that Alternative 4 would have similar impacts with respect to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change (significant and unavoidable impact) as compared to the Project. Operational GHG emissions are generated from a variety of sources, among them vehicular exhaust from those traveling to and from the site. The driving habits of those traveling to a hotel differ from those traveling to a single-family residence or condominium. In particular, those driving to a hotel tend to have a higher turnover rate, and thus to make more trips to and from the site, than those traveling to a single-family residence or condominium, who tend to stay at the destination for longer periods of time. These facts are reflected in the estimated “vehicle miles traveled” (“VMT”) that will result under this alternative, as compared to the Project. (See Draft EIR, Table 19-3, indicating higher daily trips under this alternative.) Transportation and Circulation impacts are slightly lower for this alternative because these impacts focus on “peak hour” trip generation, rather than on daily trip generation or VMT. The increase in VMT related Greenhouse Gas Emissions is magnified by the hotel (accounting for approximately 25% of the total vehicle trips under Alternative 4) which would generate more external trips than the Project. (Draft EIR, section 19.7.6.) This alternative thus represents a tradeoff. This alternative has a smaller “footprint,” and lower peak-hour traffic. This alternative also would generate incrementally greater GHG emissions, however.

In light of these trade-offs, the Board finds that Alternative 4 is not environmentally superior to the Project. The Board rejects this alternative on that basis.

## **Feasibility/Ability to Meet Project Objectives**

The Reduced Footprint, Hotel Alternative would further many of the Project objectives and be consistent with the MVCP and Placer County General Plan (as amended), though not to the extent the Project would be. The Reduced Footprint, Hotel Alternative fails to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the MVWSP to less than significant levels and would have potentially greater impacts in the area of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change and the same significant and unavoidable impact.

The Board finds that Alternative 4 is not environmentally superior to the Project. The Board rejects this alternative both because it is not environmentally superior to the Project, and because this alternative may not be feasible in light of the recent history of hotel development in the region. The Board rejects this alternative for these reasons, and for each of them. Thus, even if the record supported only one of these reasons, the Board would nevertheless reject this alternative.

### **Alternative 5 – East Parcel, Reduced Density Alternative**

The County received comments on the Draft EIR proposing consideration of an alternative that had not been analyzed in detail in the Draft EIR. (Comments IO31-45 and IO31-46.) The County incorporated an analysis of this alternative – “Alternative 5” – into the Final EIR in order to add further to the reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives considered. Accordingly, the text of Chapter 2, Section 2.3, “Alternatives to the Proposed Project,” on pages 2-6 and 2-7 of the Draft EIR is revised to include the East Parcel, Reduced Density Alternative (discussed in Final EIR, section 2.2.13).

Under Alternative 5, the residential development would remain on the East Parcel but would be reduced from 1,360 units to 418 units, and from 670 acres to 200 acres. The commercial development would be reduced to approximately 3.6 acres. In all other respects, this alternative would be the same as the No Project – MVCP Alternative. The entire West Parcel would remain designated Forest and zoned TPZ, and the remainder of the East Parcel, including 470 acres that had been designated Low Density Residential and General Commercial, would be rezoned as TPZ and designated Forest as well. This alternative does not include a conservation easement or sale of lands to a conservancy or land trust.

Alternative 5 would have similar/less impacts compared to the Project in the areas of Land Use and Forest Resources, Population, Employment, and Housing, Cultural Resources, Air Quality, Noise, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, Utilities, Public Services and Recreation, and Hazards and Hazardous Materials. This alternative would have similar/less impacts compared to the Project, but still have the same significant and unavoidable impacts in the areas of Visual Resources, Transportation and Circulation, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change. The East Parcel, Reduced Density Alternative would have similar/less impacts compared to the MVWSP, but have the potential for a new significant and unavoidable impact in Biological Resources (disruption to wildlife movement corridors). (Final EIR, section 2.2.13.)

As the Final EIR states: “As with the Project, the development would alter currently undeveloped forested land. Overall, impacts of this alternative would be similar in character but less in degree, as the footprint of development would be reduced. However, this alternative would have a greater chance to adversely impact wildlife movement corridors because the development would be more separated from existing development. The East Parcel development site could bisect an intact swath of forested habitat that connects large areas of undeveloped public lands to the north and south of Martis Valley.” (Final EIR, p. 2-36.)

The County finds this discussion compelling, in that it gets at the heart of one of the trade-offs associated with the Project, as compared to alternatives that would authorize development on the east side of SR 267. A key benefit of the Project is to move potential development from the east to the west side of SR

267. At present, development along the SR 267 corridor focuses on Northstar Ski Resort, on the west side of SR 267. The area east of SR 267 is largely undeveloped, and disturbance is limited to timber operations, grazing, recreation, and other open space uses. Much of the area is intact.

The Project provides for permanent preservation of the entire 6,376-acre East Parcel, which will ensure that the landscape integrity and dynamic ecological processes of the Martis Valley, together with surrounding public lands (totaling almost 50,000 acres) and the natural resources they support, will be maintained in perpetuity. When the East Parcel is combined with the ~28,000 acres of Tahoe and Toiyabe national forest land on the valley floor, this conservation area links the Mt. Rose and Granite Chief wilderness areas. The Conservation Biological Institute studied Landscape-scale Conservation in the Martis Valley, and reported a biological benefit eight times greater than fragmented conservation efforts would produce. The concept of large landscape-scale open space and wilderness conservation in the Sierra Nevada is now promoted by the US Department of the Interior, US Forest Service, State of California Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) program, Wilderness Act, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Placer Legacy Program, and the inter-state Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

Development of the East Parcel will fragment this broad swath of undeveloped land. That is true under zoning set forth in the existing MVCP. That will remain true, albeit to a slightly lesser degree, under Alternative 5.

The County disagrees with those commenters who suggest that the East Parcel is less sensitive than the West Parcel. The East Parcel is like a puzzle piece in the middle of a broad expanse of open space. The West Parcel is not; instead, the West Parcel is in the vicinity of Northstar Ski Resort and other related development, and no important wildlife corridors traverse the site. The County therefore finds that there is a compelling public interest in moving zoning authorizing development from the east side of SR 267 to the west side of SR 267. The County respectfully disagrees with those commenters who expressed a preference for Alternative 5. For this reason, the County rejects Alternative 5 on the ground that it is not environmentally superior to the Project. The County would reject Alternative 5 on this ground even if the alternative were found to be feasible.

### **Feasibility/Ability to Meet Project Objectives**

The County rejects Alternative 5 for the further and distinct reason that this alternative is infeasible. The County would make this finding even if Alternative 5 were found to be environmentally superior to the Project.

The East Parcel, Reduced Density Alternative would further some of the Project objectives to a degree, and be consistent with the MVCP and the Placer County General Plan, but not to the extent that the Project would. Importantly, this alternative would not meet the conservation objectives of the Project, and would be inapposite to the objective to contribute to a large, continuous expanse of open space east of SR 267. Further, this alternative has the potential for greater impacts, including more significant and unavoidable impacts (Biological Resources), than the Project.

Mountainside Partners LLC has provided information regarding the economic feasibility of the Project compared to Alternative 3, the Reduced Density Alternative and Alternative 5, the East Parcel, Reduced Density Alternative. The results of this study are located in the report titled *Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan Economic Viability Analysis, Alternative 3 and Alternative 5* (May 2016). This study, as summarized below, is provided as evidence that Alternative 3 is economically infeasible.

The study finds that most fixed, common costs (construction of roadways, water & sewer systems, utilities, and homeowner amenities) for buildout of the Project would be approximately \$65 million. Although the Project would be built out over 16-20 years, most of the common costs would be incurred

early in the Project life cycle. The requirement for significant up-front capital investment entails considerable risk, in that the return on that up-front investment may take years, and may straddle multiple real estate cycles. Such an investment also entails risk due to the lengthy period during which the invested, up-front capital provides returns. The high initial cost associated with the Project, combined with the 16 year build out (and the likely significant wait for full return on investment) places the Project in a category of high risk. The amount of risk associated with the Project necessitates an Internal Rate of Return (IRR) range of 10% to 15% to attract investors. Absent such an IRR, investment capital will instead be directed to other investments that entail less risk. The life-of-Project financial model calculated an IRR of 11% for the Project, which falls within the acceptable range of 10% to 15%. Thus, the Project is economically feasible.

Although both Alternative 3 and Alternative 5 contemplate reduced development of 418 residential units and 3.6 acres of commercial, Alternative 5 would be developed on the East Parcel. The study in comparing the common costs required for infrastructure and amenities on the East Parcel (at 418 units, built over 11 years), to the common costs on the West Parcel, the engineer's estimate concludes that building on the East Parcel would be substantially more expensive than the \$65 million required for the West Parcel. The risk associated with Alternative 5 would therefore be high and require an IRR range of 10% to 15% as well. Alternative 5 would have the same revenue as Alternative 3, but significantly higher costs, indicating an IRR of less than 5%. A Project with an IRR of less than 5% would be unable to attract capital and would therefore not be constructed. That is because the risk-adjusted rate of return must be significantly greater than the return available from other investments that pose far less risk. For these reasons, Alternative 5 is financially infeasible.

The County rejects Alternative 5 for the further and distinct reason that this alternative does not meet Project objectives. The County would make this finding even if Alternative 5 were found to be environmentally superior to the Project. The County would also make this finding even if Alternative 5 were determined to be feasible. In particular, this alternative would not result in the permanent preservation of the East Parcel as open space. As noted above, the following objectives are central to the Project:

- Conserve large, intact and interconnected areas of natural open space that contributes to the last remaining habitat linkages between the Sierra Nevada and Mount Rose Wilderness Area in the Carson Range (Policy 1.A.6).
- Minimize habitat fragmentation by development and roads to protect open space from human encroachment (Policy 1.A.6).
- Consider the regional implications of development in the Martis Valley on resources outside of the Valley (i.e., Truckee River, Lake Tahoe Basin, Carson Range, and Sierra Nevada) (Policy 1.A.7).

Under this alternative, the East Parcel would be developed albeit at a lower number of units than allowed under existing land-use designations. As the above objectives make clear, one of the central objectives of the Project is to preserve the East Parcel as a key component of a large system of open space east of SR 267. (See Conservation Biology Institute, Landscape-scale Conservation in Martis Valley, California – A Paradigm for Collaborative Partnerships (November 2015), which explains the extent to which the Project would complement efforts to permanently protect a large swath of contiguous public and private open space stretching from Lake Tahoe to the South, west to SR 267, and north into and across the eastern half of Martis Valley.) The Board finds this Project objective compelling. Because Alternative 5 would not meet this objective, the Board rejects Alternative 5.

In sum, the Board finds that Alternative 5 (1) is not environmentally superior, (2) is not feasible, and (3) does not meet basic Project objectives. For all of these reasons, and each of them, the Board rejects Alternative 5.

### C. Other Alternatives

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(c) provides the following guidance in selecting a range of reasonable alternatives for the Project. The range of potential alternatives for the Project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the Project, and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. Alternatives that fail to meet the fundamental Project purpose need not be addressed in detail in an EIR. (*In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings* (2008) 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1165-1167.)

In determining what alternatives should be considered in the EIR, it is important to acknowledge the objectives of the Project, the Project's significant effects, and unique Project considerations. These factors are crucial to the development of alternatives that meet the criteria specified in Section 15126.6(a).

Although, as noted above, EIRs must contain a discussion of "potentially feasible" alternatives, the ultimate determination as to whether an alternative is feasible or infeasible is made by the lead agency's decisionmaking body. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081(a)(3).) At the time of action on the Project, the decisionmaking body may consider evidence beyond that found in the EIR in addressing such determinations. The decision-making body, for example, may conclude that a particular alternative is infeasible (i.e., undesirable) from a policy standpoint, and may reject an alternative on that ground provided that the decision-making body adopts a finding, supported by substantial evidence, to that effect, and provided that such a finding reflects a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and other considerations supported by substantial evidence. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 401, 417; *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 998.)

The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but were rejected during the planning or scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. The Board adopts the following findings with respect to these alternatives.

**760-acre West Parcel Development Area.** The 760-acre West Parcel Development Area alternative was considered by Placer County but is not evaluated further in the EIR. A more detailed description of the previous proposal can be found in section 19.2.1 of the Draft EIR.

This alternative was the original MVWSP and Area Plan proposal as it was described in the March 2014 notice of preparation (NOP). This alternative would consist of a specific plan and TRPA Area Plan and various entitlements and approvals associated with approval of these plans. The 760-acre West Parcel Development Area alternative shared many of the same features as the current MVWSP, including moving the development from the East Parcel to the West, and permanently preserving the East Parcel. The main difference is that a portion of the West Parcel, and 112 residential units of the proposed development would have been within the Tahoe Basin and, therefore, within the TRPA's jurisdiction.

Comments on the NOP from agencies, stakeholders, interested parties, and environmental groups primarily focused on concerns with the Area Plan, development of 112 units within the Tahoe Basin, and concerns regarding potential effects on TRPA environmental threshold carrying capacities. The MVWSP proposal was subsequently revised to establish the MVWSP boundary at the Tahoe Basin boundary, removing the West Parcel development area from the Tahoe Basin, and suspending the proposed TRPA Area Plan from consideration with the MVWSP.

This alternative would result in slightly increased ground disturbance and tree removal, similar construction impacts, and similar operational impacts to the Project. Similar to the Project, visual simulations of this alternative indicate that, although development would occur within the Tahoe Basin, the visual impacts of this alternative would be the same, meaning that the Project would be barely visible

or not visible from surrounding vantage points because of topography, screening from forest lands, and buffers established around the development area.

**Direct Access via Highlands View Road.** Another alternative that was considered but not evaluated further is an alternative that would provide direct access to the Project from Northstar via Highlands View Road. Access directly to and from Northstar and the West Parcel development area would not be feasible because the applicant does not control the property between Northstar and the West Parcel. In addition, the MVCP contemplates a connection on SR 267 for the East Parcel; the Project shifts this connection to the north to align with the West Parcel primary access. For purposes of evaluating an alternative that would reduce impacts, such an alternative was not considered because the physical impacts of such a connection would not reduce the magnitude of significant transportation impacts because it would only shift trips between the Project and Northstar off of SR 267 for a short distance. Project residents and guests would still need to use SR 267 to access Northstar Drive, or to travel to Truckee or Lake Tahoe. Thus, the traffic-related impacts of the Project (e.g., to road segments and intersections on SR 267) would still occur. Lastly, a connection to Highlands View Drive would need to cross undeveloped land, and therefore could result in impacts on wetland or other resources that the direct connection to SR 267 would avoid. Therefore, direct access to the West Parcel development area from Northstar via Highlands View Road was not evaluated further. (Final EIR, p. 2-5; Response to Comment IO31-45.)

#### **D. Environmentally Superior Alternative**

Guidelines section 15126.6 states that an EIR should identify the “environmentally superior” alternative. Section 19.8 of the Draft EIR provides a comparison of the environmental effects of the alternatives in relation to the proposed MVWSP to assist in identifying the environmentally superior alternative.

As discussed above, Alternative 1, the No Project – No Development Alternative, is the environmentally superior alternative, as all of the significant impacts of the Project would be avoided. CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6 suggests that, “[i]f the environmentally superior alternative is the ‘no Project’ alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.”

Alternative 2, the No Project – MVCP Alternative, would result in a larger footprint of development on the East Parcel, resulting in greater impacts to forest resources; biological resources; transportation (increased vehicle trips); air quality; GHG emissions; noise; utilities; and public service and recreation. This alternative could result in additional potentially significant impacts to biological resources resulting from the disruption of a potential wildlife movement corridor. Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts related to population, employment, and housing; cultural resources; visual resources; geology and soils; and hazards and hazardous materials. This alternative would not meet the Project objectives described in Section 19.1.1 of the Draft EIR. In particular, it would not meet the following Project objectives, which are intended to provide environmental benefits:

- conserve large, intact and interconnected areas of natural open space that contributes to the last remaining habitat linkages between the Sierra Nevada and Mount Rose Wilderness Area in the Carson Range;
- minimize habitat fragmentation by development and roads to protect open space from human encroachment;
- implement a density transfer and retirement by permanently retiring 600 East Parcel residential units and transferring 760 residential units and 6.6 acres of commercial uses from the East Parcel to the West Parcel while preserving in perpetuity 6,376 acres in conservation lands;
- minimize isolated development that leads to fragmentation of open space and natural resources by developing on lands in proximity to existing development; and
- limit new infrastructure and disturbance by developing on lands in proximity to existing development.

Alternative 3, the Reduced Density Alternative, would result in similar impacts to the MVWPSP, but the reduction in development footprint, units, and population would reduce the severity of the impacts for all resources affected by the Project. Nonetheless, Alternative 3 would not avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed MVWPSP. This alternative would further many of the basic Project objectives described in Section 19.1.1 of the Draft EIR, though not to the extent the Project would.

Alternative 4, the Reduced Footprint, Hotel Alternative, would also reduce the footprint of development, the number of units, and the population, which would result in a smaller area of ground disturbance, removal of fewer trees, some reduction in peak hour vehicle trips, reduced potential for impacts to cultural resources. Therefore, Alternative 4 would reduce potential impacts related to forest resources; population, employment and housing; cultural resources; visual resources; geology and soils; hydrology and water quality; utilities; public services; and hazards and hazardous materials. However, this alternative would result in similar impacts to biological resources, air quality, transportation and circulation, and noise and it would not avoid any significant and unavoidable impacts. Further, this alternative would potentially result in greater impacts in the area of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, and have the same significant and unavoidable impacts. Alternative 4 would further many of the basic Project objectives, though not to the extent of the Project (Draft EIR Section 19.1.1).

Alternative 5, the East Parcel Reduced Density Alternative, would result in similar impacts to the MVWPSP, but the reduction in development footprint, units, and population would reduce the severity of the impacts for all resources affected by the Project. Nonetheless, a Reduced Density Alternative on the East Parcel would not avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed MVWPSP. In addition, this alternative could result in an additional potentially significant impact to biological resources resulting from the disruption of a potential wildlife movement corridor. Furthermore, this alternative would not meet the Project objectives described in Section 19.1.1 of the Draft EIR. In particular, it would not meet the following Project objectives, which are intended to provide environmental benefits:

- conserve large, intact and interconnected areas of natural open space that contributes to the last remaining habitat linkages between the Sierra Nevada and Mount Rose Wilderness Area in the Carson Range;
- minimize habitat fragmentation by development and roads to protect open space from human encroachment;
- implement a density transfer and retirement by permanently retiring 600 East Parcel residential units and transferring 760 residential units and 6.6 acres of commercial uses from the East Parcel to the West Parcel while preserving in perpetuity 6,376 acres in conservation lands;
- minimize isolated development that leads to fragmentation of open space and natural resources by developing on lands in proximity to existing development; and
- limit new infrastructure and disturbance by developing on lands in proximity to existing development.

Of the development alternatives, Alternative 3, the Reduced Density Alternative, would be the environmentally superior alternative. This alternative would meet the Project objectives and would reduce the severity of impacts to forest resources; population, employment, and housing; biological resources; cultural resources; visual resources; transportation (reduced vehicle trips); air quality; GHG emissions; noise; geology and soils; hydrology and water quality; utilities; public services and recreation; and hazards and hazardous materials. Alternative 3 would not, however, avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts identified for the proposed MVWPSP. Nor would it meet all of the Project objectives to the degree that the Project would.

## X. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to CEQA section 21081 and CEQA Guideline 15093, the Board of Supervisors hereby finds, after consideration of the Final EIR and the evidence in the record, that each of the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the Project as set forth below independently and collectively outweighs these significant and unavoidable impacts and is an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project. Any one of the reasons for approval cited below is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Thus, even if all but one of these reasons were unsupported by substantial evidence, the Board would nevertheless by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this section, and in the documents found in the Record of Proceedings.

On the basis of the above findings and the substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Board of Supervisors specially finds that there are significant benefits of the Project to support approval of the Project in spite of the unavoidable significant impacts, and therefore makes this Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Specifically, the Project will result in significant and unavoidable impacts to Visual Resources (Cumulative Impact 9-9: Cumulative effects on light and glare), Transportation and Circulation (Impact 10-1: Impacts to intersection operations, Impact 10-2: Impacts to roadway segments, Cumulative Impact 10-8: Cumulative impacts to intersection operations, and Cumulative Impact 10-9: Cumulative impacts to roadway segments), and Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change (Impact 12-2: Operational greenhouse gas emissions, and Cumulative Impact 12-4: Cumulative greenhouse gas emissions).

Although the Board of Supervisors finds that the Project will result in these significant and unavoidable impacts, the Board also finds that the Project benefits outweigh these impacts.

The Board of Supervisors finds that, as part of the process of obtaining Project approval, all significant effects on the environment from implementation of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible. All mitigation measures proposed in the FEIR that are applicable to the Project are adopted as part of this approval action. Furthermore, the Board of Supervisors has determined that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, technical, legal, social and other considerations. Any alternatives proposed by the public are rejected for the reasons set forth in the EIR and the reasons set forth herein.

The Project benefits include:

- The Project provides for permanent preservation of the entire 6,376-acre East Parcel, which will ensure that the landscape integrity and dynamic ecological processes of the Martis Valley, together with surrounding public lands (totaling almost 50,000 acres) and the natural resources they support, will be maintained in perpetuity and that the “effective conservation” at a landscape scale is greater than the sum of its parts. Moreover, when the East Parcel is combined with the ~28,000 acres of Tahoe and Toiyabe national forest land on the valley floor alone, this conservation area links the Mt. Rose and Granite Chief wilderness areas. The Conservation Biological Institute studied Landscape-scale Conservation in the Martis Valley, and reported a biological benefit eight times greater than fragmented conservation efforts would produce. (Conservation Biology Institute, Landscape-scale Conservation in Martis Valley, California – A Paradigm for Collaborative Partnerships (November 2015), which explains the extent to which the Project would complement efforts to permanently protect a large swath of contiguous public and private open space stretching from Lake Tahoe to the South, west to SR 267, and north into and across the eastern half of Martis Valley.) The Board finds that this objective is compelling,

and is a key reason why the Board is willing to approve the project, despite its significant and unavoidable effects.

- The concept of large landscape-scale open space and wilderness conservation in the Sierra Nevada is now promoted by the US Department of the Interior, US Forest Service, State of California Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) program, Wilderness Act, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Placer Legacy Program, and the inter-state Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. The Project is consistent with that vision.
- The Project will provide new residential development consistent with the vision, goals, and policies of the MVCP including conserving large, intact and interconnected areas of natural open space, and minimizing habitat fragmentation by permanently preserving the entire 6,376-acre East Parcel (discussed above), and designating approximately 390 acres of the West Parcel as Forest to remain undeveloped except for utility infrastructure. The Project will limit new infrastructure and disturbance by developing on lands in proximity to existing development without developing in the Tahoe Basin and permanently reducing the total number of allowable residential units from 1,360 to 760. The Project will emphasize an all-season pedestrian environment within the MVWSP by creating an extensive, 14 mile network of trails and passive recreation facilities, including parks and picnic areas for residents and guests.
- The Project will encourage the concentration of multi-family housing in and near village centers and neighborhood commercial centers, and designate land for small commercial centers where some of the needs of local area residents can be met, reducing the need for trips outside the area. The MVWSP will be designed to reflect and consider natural features, noise exposure of residents, visibility of structures, circulation, access, and the relationship of the Project to surrounding uses, and emulate the best characteristics (e.g., form, scale, and general character) of existing, nearby neighborhoods. The Project will minimize visual impacts of development by using the natural features and terrain of the Project site to screen buildings. In addition, the Project will encourage the sustained productive use of forestland as a means of providing open space, maintaining the quality of Martis Valley's scenic vistas and conserve other natural resources. The Project will reduce the risk of wildfire in the area through improved access to water and defensible space.
- The MVWSP will reduce reliance on automobiles by providing onsite services and amenities, a transit stop, and enhancing and maintaining existing trail system and associated recreational uses, such as cross-country skiing, snowshoeing, hiking, and biking trails. The Project will draw upon the historic Sierra and Tahoe regional architectural traditions, and reinforce the North Lake Tahoe region, including the Martis Valley, as a four-season destination resort. The Project is designed to provide a stable and significant source of tax revenue for the County, including sales tax, and property tax. Lastly, the Project will be financially sustainable, will not diminish services to existing residents, and create as many as 300 temporary construction jobs, as well as up to 122 full-time equivalent employees once the Project is built out.
- The MVWSP will provide significant benefits to the County, as set forth in the development agreement, by (1) making a substantial contribution to the County's work-force housing program, as set forth in the proposed development agreement, (2) providing well over \$5 million in park and recreation benefits, as set forth in the proposed development agreement, (3) participating in the County's program to provide financial support for regional transit, and thereby reducing reliance on the automobile, and (4) generating substantial revenue through the County's Public Facilities and Traffic Impact fees.
- The Project will pay the cost of providing public services that are needed to serve the new development and therefore will "pay its own way," and will not result in costs to the County's

existing residents and businesses.

Having considered these benefits, the Board of Supervisors finds that the benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and that the adverse environmental effects are therefore acceptable. The Board of Supervisors further finds that each of the above considerations is sufficient to approve the Project. For each of the reasons stated above, and all of them, the Project should be implemented notwithstanding the significant unavoidable adverse impacts identified in the EIR.

## ATTACHMENTS

A Table of impacts, mitigation measures

### ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Assembly Bill
afy	Acre-Feet per Year
ADWF	Average Dry Weather Flow
ARB	California Air Resources Board
ARMR	Archaeological Resources Management Reports
BLM	United States Bureau of Land Management
BMP	Best Management Practice
BOD	Biological Oxygen Demand
CAA	Federal Clean Air Act of 1970
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CalEPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CBD	Center for Biological Diversity
CC&Rs	Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions
CDF	California Department of Forestry
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFD	Community Facilities District
CHRIS	California Historic Resource Information System
CIP	Capital Improvement Plan
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO2	Carbon Dioxide
CRHR	California Register of Historic Resources
CSA	County Service Area
CWA	Clean Water Act of 1972
CWPPs	Community Wildfire Protection Plans
dB	Decibel
dba	A-weighted decibel
dbh	Diameter at Breast Height

DRC	Development Review Committee
EB	Eastbound
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
ESD	Engineering and Surveying Department
EVA	Emergency Vehicle Access
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
GHG	Greenhouse Gases
GIS	Geographic Information System
Gpm	gallons per minute
GSFLOW	Integrated surface water/groundwater model
HOA	Homeowners Association
HVAC	Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning
I-80	Interstate 80
IRR	Internal Rate of Return
LAFCO	Local Agency Formation Commission
Lahontan	Regional Water Quality Control Board-Lahontan Region
LDM	Land Development Manual
Ldn	Day-night Average Sound Level
Leq	Energy Equivalent Sound Level
LID	Low Impact Development
Lmax	Maximum Sound Level
LOP	Limited Operating Period
LOS	Level of Service
LTBMU	Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit
LU	Land Use
mgd	Million Gallons per Day
mg/kg	Milligrams per Kilogram
mg/L	Milligrams per Liter
MVGB	Martis Valley Groundwater Basin
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
MMRP	Mitigation and Monitoring Program
MRF	Materials Recovery Facility
MS4	Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit
MT CO2e	Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
MVCP	Martis Valley Community Plan
MVWSP	Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCCP	Natural Community Conservation Planning
NCSD	Northstar Community Services District
NFD	Northstar Fire Department
NO <sub>x</sub>	Oxides of Nitrogen
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Program
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Services
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSAQMD	Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District

NTFPD	North Tahoe Fire Protection District
O3	Ozone
OPR	California Governor's Office of Planning and Research
OS	Open Space
PAS	Plan Area Statements
PCAPCD	Placer County Air Pollution Control District
PM	Particulate Matter
PM10	Particulate Matter Less than 10 Microns in Diameter
PM2.5	Particulate Matter Less than 2.5 Microns in Diameter
PPM	Parts per Million
PRC	Public Resource Code
Project	Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan
psi	Pounds per square inch
PWWF	Peak Wet Weather Flows
ROG	Reactive Organic Gas
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Boards
SMARTS	Stormwater Multiple Application & Reports Tracking System
SO2	Sulfur Dioxide
SR 267	State Route 267
SRA	State Responsibility Area
SWRCB	California State Water Resources Control Board
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWQP	Storm Water Quality Plan
TACs	Toxic Air Contaminants
TART	Tahoe Area Regional Transit
TAU	Tourist Accommodation Unit
TIF	Traffic Impact Fee
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
TNT/TMA	Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Association
TPZ	Timberland Production Zone
TRI	T-TSA's sewer infrastructure
TROA	Truckee River Operating Agreement
TRPA	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
TSD	Truckee Sanitation District
T-TSA	Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency
UAIC	United Auburn Indian Community
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USFS	United States Forestry Service
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
V/C	Vehicle Congestion
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
WB	Westbound
WEAP	Worker Environmental Awareness Program
WMA	Wildlife Management Areas
WSA	Water Service Agreement
WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant
ZOB	Zone of Benefit

**MARTIS VALLEY WEST PARCEL SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT  
PLACER COUNTY, CALIFORNIA  
TABLE OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND CEQA FINDINGS**

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<b>LAND USE</b>			
<p><b>Impact 5-1. Alteration of present or planned land uses</b></p> <p>(LS) The proposed MWWPSP would establish the planning framework for development of a portion of the West Parcel, and provide for preservation of the remainder of the West Parcel, and the entirety of the East Parcel. The project would result in the redesignation of 662 acres of the West Parcel from Forest to Residential, and establish a Specific Plan zoning district (SPL-MWWPSP) on that acreage for which the MWWPSP would serve as the policy document. The remaining 390 acres of the West Parcel would remain designated Forest and zoned TPZ. Development subsequent to the MWWPSP could convert up to 651.5 acres of the West Parcel from forested land to residential, commercial, and recreational development. The 670-acre East Parcel development area, which could otherwise accommodate up to 1,360 dwelling units, would be redesignated Forest and zoned TPZ. The 6,160 acres of the East Parcel in Placer County would be preserved as permanent open space by either sale to a land trust or similar organization or by recordation of a conservation easement restricting the use of the East Parcel. The 216-acre portion of the East Parcel in Nevada County would remain designated Forest 160 in the Nevada County General Plan. While the MWWPSP project includes the entire 6,376-acre East Parcel, the MWWPSP Land Use Plan does not include the 216 acres in Nevada County or the 130 acres in the Tahoe Basin. Policies in the Specific Plan call for the preservation of the entire East Parcel (in both Placer and Nevada Counties) as permanent open space. The proposed MWWPSP land use designations and zoning would be consistent with the intent of the MVCP and the Placer County General Plan.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 5-16 to 5-19; see also Response to Comment IO26-4, IO31-15.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

314

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p><b>Impact 5-2: Compatibility with surrounding land uses</b></p> <p>(LS) Implementation of the proposed MVWPSP would result in the construction of residential uses, homeowner amenities, commercial uses, and utilities infrastructure in a forested area that has historically been used for timber harvest and recreation. The West Parcel development area is proposed approximately one mile east of the Northstar Resort, which contains similar residential uses and densities to those proposed in the MVWPSP. The MVWPSP would prevent conflicts with existing recreational uses in the surrounding area by siting development away from existing trails and using natural features to screen new buildings and noise. The remainder of the West Parcel would remain Forest, and the entire 6,376-acre East Parcel would remain or be redesignated Forest and be placed in conservation in perpetuity or sold to conservation groups, connecting approximately 50,000 acres of open space east of SR 267.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 5-19 to 5-21, see also Response to Comment IO31-16.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Impact 5-3: Conflict with the Placer County General Plan, Martis Valley Community Plan, designations or zoning, or plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect</b></p> <p>(LS) Adoption of the MVWPSP would be consistent with the overall land use and policy framework of the MVCP and Placer County General Plan. The MVWPSP objectives, policies, definition of allowable uses, Development Standards, and Design Guidelines would be consistent with the pertinent provisions of the MVCP and Placer County General Plan.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 5-21 to 5-23.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Impact 5-4: Conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land or Timberland Production Zone or involve other changes in the existing environment which, because of their location or nature, could result in substantial conversion of forest land to a non-forest use</b></p> <p>(LS) The MVWPSP would result in the</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

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>redesignation/rezoning of 662 acres of the West Parcel from Forest/ Timberland Production Zone (TPZ) to Residential/SPL-MVWPSP. The project would also redesignate/rezone 670 acres of the East Parcel from Residential and Commercial to Forest/TPZ. These actions would result in a net increase of 8 acres of timberlands zoned TPZ. In addition, project-related tree removal would be subject to a Timber Harvest Plan approved by the Board of Forestry, which includes provisions for the protection of water quality and biological habitats.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 5-23 to 5-24; see also Response to Comment IO7-4, IO16-2, 7 and 8, IO31-37.)</p>			
<p><b>Impact 5-5: Convert substantial forest land or adversely affect timber resources</b></p> <p>(LS) The MVWPSP would change the allowable land use on 662 acres of the West Parcel from Forest to Residential. Within that area, approximately 651.5 acres of forest land (per the PRC Section 12220(g) definition) could be converted to non-forested, developed uses, effectively removing that forest land from potential timber harvest. In addition, the installation of utilities could result in the conversion of up to 11.6 acres of forested land. The types of habitat that would be converted are locally and regionally common and abundant. The project-related conversion would not substantially reduce the size, continuity, or integrity of any forest habitat type in the region. The MVWPSP proposes conservation of the 6,376-acre East Parcel, which includes 5,951.2 acres of forest lands, including approximately 659.9 acres of forest land currently zoned for development under the MVCP, and approximately 275.4 acres of sensitive late seral forest nesting/denning habitat. All Forest-designated lands under the MVWPSP would be zoned TPZ, resulting in an increase of 8 acres zoned TPZ. With implementation of approved THPs, timber harvesting would be allowed on these lands.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 5-24 to 5-28; see also Response to Comment A-1-5, IO16-2, 7 and 8, IO31-37, IO40-4.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Cumulative Impact 5-6: Cumulative alteration of present or planned land uses; cumulative conflict with relevant plans,</b></p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p><b>policies, designations, or zoning</b></p> <p>(LS) The projects listed in Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-2 would alter land uses in the region. Cumulative projects consist of residential development, including single-family, multi-family, affordable housing, and tourist units; commercial development, including hotel, office, and services; recreation projects, including ski facilities, trails, and campgrounds; and other projects. Some would convert what is currently undeveloped land to developed uses, some would result in redevelopment in already urbanized areas. Transportation projects would be implemented on existing roadways to improve traffic flow, levels of service, and traffic safety. Collectively, the cumulative projects would cause a substantial alteration of land in the region, resulting in increased urban, suburban, and recreational development, and establishment of infrastructure and utilities to serve such development.</p> <p>Growth and development in the region is guided by the various land use and planning documents of Placer County, Town of Truckee, and TRPA. These documents serve as the blueprints for each community in achieving its vision of the future. In the course of environmental review, permitting, and approval, projects proposed in each jurisdiction are reviewed for consistency with adopted land use guidance documents. Projects listed in Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-2 within the jurisdiction of Placer County would be reviewed to ensure consistency with the Placer County General Plan, MVCP, and Placer County Code, including the Zoning Ordinance. Placer County projects within the Tahoe Basin would also be reviewed by TRPA for compliance with the Regional Plan, Community Plan or PAS, and TRPA Code of Ordinances. Those projects located in the Town of Truckee would be reviewed by the Town for consistency with its 2025 General Plan policies and zoning ordinances. Because individual projects would be reviewed by land use agencies in the context of their particular general plans, zoning ordinances, codes, and other guidance documents prior to approval and implementation, resulting alterations of land use would be in accord with, and would implement the vision of each community. The cumulative</p>			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>impact would be less than significant. As described in Impact 5-1, above, the County would establish the planning framework for development of the 662-acre West Parcel Residential zone through adoption of the SPL-MVWPSP; would provide for preservation of the remaining 390 acres of the West Parcel as TPZ; and would amend the MVCP land use diagram to redesignate 670 acres of the East Parcel to Forest. The Specific Plan would result in the relocation of residential and commercial land use designations from the East Parcel to the West Parcel and the rezoning 662 acres of the West Parcel from Forest/TPZ to Residential/SPL-MVWPSP, with the remainder of the West Parcel (390 acres) remaining designated Forest and zoned TPZ. Development subsequent to the MVWPSP could convert up to 651.5 acres of the West Parcel's 662-acre Residential zone from forested land to residential, commercial, and recreational development. As compared to existing land use planning guidance in the MVCP, which contemplates development of the East Parcel, the proposed West Parcel development area would be located closer to existing similar developed land uses at the Northstar Resort; the allowable number of residential units would be reduced from 1,360 to 760; and density would be reduced from approximately 2 units per acre to approximately 1 unit per acre. The existing 670 acre East Parcel development area would be redesignated Forest and zoned TPZ, and the 6,376-acre East Parcel would be placed in conservation in perpetuity either by sale to a land trust or similar organization or by recordation of a conservation easement restricting use of the East Parcel. Therefore, the proposed MVWPSP would result in less potential development on a smaller footprint than the existing MVCP, and would remain consistent with the intent of the MVCP and the Placer County General Plan.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 5-29.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 5-7: Cumulative compatibility with surrounding land uses</b></p> <p>(LS) Compatibility of land uses is inherently site-specific and focused on the land uses that surround a proposed project site. Most of the properties surrounding the MVWPSP project</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>site (Exhibit 5-1) are undeveloped coniferous forested lands that provide recreation opportunities with some scattered development. The Truckee-Tahoe Airport is located north of the East Parcel and the Northstar Resort is located northwest of the West Parcel. As described in MVWPSP Impact 5-2, implementation of the MVWPSP would result in the construction of residential uses, homeowner amenities, commercial uses, and utilities infrastructure in a forested area of the West Parcel that has historically been used for timber harvest and recreation. SR 267 borders the West Parcel to the north, and the Northstar Resort, which contains similar residential uses and densities to those proposed in the MVWPSP, lies about one mile to the west. Other lands surrounding the West Parcel to the south and southwest contain trails used for hiking, mountain biking, snowshoeing, and cross-country skiing. While proposed residential and commercial uses of the West Parcel would not be as compatible with dispersed recreation uses as would undeveloped forest the uses are not incompatible. Local trails would provide recreation opportunities for homeowners and visitors of the development, and the MVWPSP would minimize conflicts with recreational uses by siting development away from existing public trails and using natural features to screen buildings and attenuate noise. The remainder of the West Parcel would remain Forest, and the entire 6,376-acre East Parcel would remain or be redesignated Forest and be placed in conservation in perpetuity or sold to conservation groups, connecting approximately 50,000 acres of open space east of SR 267.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 5-29 to 5-30.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 5-8: Cumulative conflicts with forest land, Timberland Production Zone, or timber operations; cumulative conversion of forest land to non-forest use</b></p> <p>(LS) The Countywide General Plan EIR states that in 1986, Placer County contained approximately 423,000 acres of commercial forest land, with approximately 126,000 acres in TPZ. Much of this commercial timber harvest land is interspersed with national forest lands. The loss of commercial forest land under the General Plan Land Use Diagram was estimated to result in the conversion of 13,600 acres</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>(approximately 3 percent) of commercial forest land in the County by 2010, with additional conversion expected through 2040. With implementation of General Plan Policies (7.E.1 - 7.E.5) and Programs (7.6 -7.9), the County determined that the potential loss of production from commercial timberland would be less than significant (Placer County 1994). Within the Martis Valley, the 2003 MVCP documented that the MVCP area contains large areas of forest lands that are to be managed and protected for timberland and compatible uses, including the SPI-owned lands which are the subject of the proposed MVWSP, and U.S. Forest Service lands within the Placer County portion of Martis Valley. These Forest Service lands consist of small, isolated parcels of various sizes, all of which lie within the Tahoe National Forest. Forest land conversion over nearly three decades has occurred, and continues to occur in accordance with Placer County projections. The MVWSP would change the allowable land use on 662 acres of the West Parcel from Forest to Residential. Within that area, an estimated 651.5 acres of forest land (per the PRC Section 12220(g) definition) could be converted to non-forested, developed uses, effectively removing that forest land from potential timber harvest. The forest land affected would be primarily Sierran mixed conifer and white fir forest. These forest types are common and widely distributed throughout the region and elsewhere in the Sierra Nevada. Cumulatively, this conversion would be small, less than one percent relative to the approximately 400,000 acres available in the area (based on the anticipated conversion of 13,600 or more since 1986). This conversion would not cause regional forest conversion projections to be exceeded, and would not substantially reduce the quantity or quality of common forest habitat types in the region. Furthermore, timber harvest activities in the region would conform to applicable California Forest Practice Rules and to the specific terms and conditions of THPs for timber operations. As discussed in Impact 5-4, above, the MVWSP would result in the designation of 390 acres of the West Parcel and the entire East Parcel (6,376 acres) as Forest land, all of which would be zoned TPZ, which restricts those lands to timber harvest and compatible uses. Therefore, the MVWSP would increase land</p>			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>zoned TPZ in the Martis Valley by 8 acres. Additionally, a conservation easement would be established on the entire East Parcel or it would be sold to a land trust or similar organization, connecting an estimated 50,000 acres of open space and forested lands east of SR 267. This protection of contiguous, forested land around the proposed West Parcel development area would provide for continued availability of substantial forestry resources, and support the economic viability of surrounding forested lands. Although the MVWPSP would convert TPZ land, the total acreage of lands zoned TPZ would increase slightly, and the MVWPSP would not conflict with, or result in additional conversion of, forest land.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 5-30 to 5-31; see also Response to Comment IO7-4, IO31-37.)</p>			
<b>POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING</b>			
<p><b>Impact 6-1: Induce substantial population growth and housing demand during construction</b></p> <p>(LS) The proposed project would generate a temporary increase in employment in Martis Valley of up to an estimated 300 construction jobs during the most labor-intensive phase of construction (i.e., Phase 2 when both residential and commercial construction would occur). The number of existing construction personnel in the region is considered sufficient to meet demand associated with the proposed project; therefore, this temporary increase in employment is not expected to generate substantial new population growth or generate the need for additional housing for construction workers.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 6-9 to 6-10; see also Response to Comment IO41-79.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Impact 6-2: Induce substantial population growth during construction or operation</b></p> <p>(LS) The anticipated population at buildout of the MVWPSP, based on 760 proposed units and 2.5 persons per unit, would be 1,900 persons, which would be within the holding capacity (i.e., maximum growth anticipated) of Martis Valley (21,500± persons) and consistent with the vision identified in the MVCP.</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
(Draft EIR, pp. 6-10 to 6-11; see also Response to Comment IO18-8 and 9.)			
<p><b>Impact 6-3: Provision of employee housing</b></p> <p>(LS) The project is expected to generate between 66.58 and 122.68 new full-time equivalent (FTE) employees. Consistent with Placer County General Plan Housing Policy C-2, the project must provide housing or an in-lieu fee to support housing for half the total FTE (between 33.29 and 61.34). MVWPSP Policies LU-HS1 through LU-HS5 require the project to comply with this requirement, which is anticipated to be met by providing for workforce housing. Consistent with Placer County General Plan Policy C-2, two parcels of land within the project site will be dedicated to Placer County. Up to 21 units out of the 760 unit total for the project could be built on these parcels for employee housing.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 6-11 to 6-12; Final EIR pp. 2-1 to 2-4; see also Response to Comment LA6-1, IO41-79.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Cumulative Impact 6-4: Cumulative population growth and housing demand induced by construction</b></p> <p>(LS) During construction, the proposed MVWPSP would generate a temporary increase in employment in Martis Valley of up to 300 construction jobs during the most intense year of construction (i.e., Phase 2 when both residential and commercial development would occur). Similarly, many of the cumulative projects identified in Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-2, would also generate a temporary increase in employment associated with construction (e.g., Northstar Highlands Phase II, SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project, Village at Squaw Valley, Resort at Squaw Creek Phase 2). It is likely that at least some of these projects would be constructed concurrently with the proposed project over the estimated 20-year buildout period. However, as identified in Draft EIR Chapter 6, Table 6-3 and described in Impact 6-1, in 2010, 8,400 residents in Placer County were employed in the construction industry (Placer County 2013b). In addition, the decline in construction jobs recorded since 2000 would indicate an available labor pool of construction trades people who are under-employed.</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

322

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>This existing Placer County construction industry labor pool is expected to be sufficient to meet the demand for construction workers that would be generated by the proposed project, plus other projects in the region that could be under construction concurrently. Further, construction employees could originate in other nearby communities in Truckee (Nevada County), El Dorado County, and from the Reno area. Because construction workers serving the proposed project and other projects in the region can be expected to come from an ample available construction labor pool, substantial population growth or increases in housing demand in the region as a result of these construction jobs is not anticipated. Furthermore, even if some construction workers from outside the region were employed at local project sites, construction workers typically do not change residences when assigned to a new construction site, and substantial permanent relocation of these workers to the area is not anticipated. Therefore, the construction of the MVWPSP, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably probable future projects, would not be expected to generate the need for substantial additional housing.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 6-12; see also Response to Comment IO41-79.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 6-5: Cumulative population increase during operation</b></p> <p>(LS) As shown in Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-1, cumulative buildout of anticipated projects would result in the construction of approximately 3,516 residential units and approximately 458,000 square feet of commercial square footage in the Truckee - North Shore Lake Tahoe region in addition to the 760 units and 34,500 square feet of commercial proposed by the MVWPSP. These types of projects would foster economic and population growth through the construction of additional housing and employment opportunities. Similar to the proposed project, these projects would predominantly support a transient resort population; however, a portion of the units would be used by year-round residents. Assuming 2.5 persons per dwelling unit (per the MVCP), the cumulative projects would result in approximately 8,790 persons. With the MVWPSP population of 1,900, the</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

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 population increase would be approximately 10,690 persons. The MVCP stated that, based on the 2000 census data, the permanent population in the Placer County MVCP area was approximately 1,185. The holding capacity of Martis Valley was estimated to be 21,500±persons; the increase of 10,690 in addition to an estimated 1,185 permanent residents is within the growth anticipated in the Placer County MVCP. Further, the reduction in the number of allowable units in the Martis Valley, from the 1,360 dwelling units allowed in the MVCP to the 760 units proposed in the MVWPSP (a reduction of 600 units), would represent a reduction in the maximum anticipated population by approximately 1,500 persons. In addition, as noted above and as discussed in the MVCP, the vast majority of the housing units in the area, as well as those proposed by the MVWPSP, are second or vacation homes that would not be occupied on a year-round basis. The mix of recreation-oriented development projects and transient population is consistent with the vision of the MVCP (see Impact 6-2, above).</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 6-12 to 6-13; see also Response to Comment IO18-8 and 9.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 6-6: Cumulative provision of employee housing</b></p> <p>(LS) All proposed development projects in the Sierra Nevada region of Placer County are required to meet the 50 percent FTE employee housing requirement. In addition, the Town of Truckee (located in Nevada County) has established workforce housing requirements that, like Placer County, are intended to ensure an adequate supply of housing to meet the housing needs of all segments of the community. Article 7, Housing, of Title 18 of the Town of Truckee Development Code states that all commercial, industrial, institutional, recreational, residential resort, and other non-residential projects not identified as exempt shall include or provide workforce housing. Section 18.216.040 of Article 7 defines the ways in which workforce housing requirements may be met based on the FTE generated by projects in Truckee. Therefore, like the MVWPSP, cumulative projects (listed in Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-1) with commercial and</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>employee-generating uses, such as the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan must construct workforce housing or pay the in-lieu fee to ensure that sufficient employee housing is provided in the region.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 6-13; see also Response to Comment LA6-2, IO41-79.)</p>			
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>			
<p><b>Impact 7-1: Disturbance or loss of common vegetation communities and wildlife habitats</b></p> <p>(LS) Under the MWVWSP, up to 536.5 acres of common vegetation communities and wildlife habitats could be permanently converted to single family residential, multifamily/residential cabins, and neighborhood commercial uses on the West Parcel, and removed to construct the main access road and the EVA road. Additional disturbances to common habitats would occur as a result of constructing and maintaining the proposed offsite utilities. Because these habitats are locally and regionally common and abundant, the proposed project would not substantially reduce the size, continuity, or integrity of any common vegetation community or habitat type or interrupt the natural processes that support common vegetation communities within the MWVWSP project site. Additionally, because the East Parcel would be preserved, 665.9 acres of conifer forest and other common habitats presently zoned for potential development would be conserved in perpetuity.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 7-43 to 7-45; see also Response to Comment A-1-5, IO31-21, IO42-2.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Impact 7-2: Disturbance or loss of sensitive habitats (jurisdictional wetlands, riparian vegetation, aquatic habitat)</b></p> <p>(S) The project could result in direct removal and disturbance of sensitive habitats on the West Parcel and within offsite utilities corridors, including waters of the United States, waters of the State, and riparian habitat. The East Parcel, which includes 414.7 acres of sensitive habitats, 3.6 acres of sensitive habitats presently zoned for potential development, would be preserved. Implementation of the proposed MWVWSP would result in loss or degradation of jurisdictional waters of the U.S.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 7-2a: Conduct delineation of waters of the United States and obtain authorization for fill and required permits</b></p> <p>A preliminary wetland delineation was completed in June and October 2014 for the entire West Parcel (Ascent Environmental 2015) and the entire East Parcel; however, verification of the preliminary delineation by USACE had not occurred prior to the preparation of the Draft EIR. Potential wetlands and other waters of the U.S. within the offsite utilities corridor have not been delineated prior to the preparation of the Draft EIR. The following would apply, as applicable, to any potentially affected</p>	LS	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measures 7-2a, and 7-2b which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the applicant conduct delineation of waters of the United States, obtain authorization for fill and required permits, obtain and comply with a lake and streambed alteration agreement, and compensate for unavoidable loss of stream and riparian habitat. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Project could result in disturbance or loss of sensitive habitats, including</p>

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

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 waters of the state, and stream and riparian habitat protected under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code on the West Parcel and within the offsite utilities corridors. These riparian and wetland habitats are considered sensitive because they are declining in quantity and condition throughout the region and because they provide important habitat functions.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 7-45 to 7-47; see also Response to Comment A-1-10, IO26-22, IO42-2 and 3.)</p>	<p>jurisdictional resources that have not been delineated or verified by USACE before project implementation, including areas that would be affected by the offsite utilities facilities.</p> <p>Before Improvement Plan approval for the start of onsite construction activities on any potentially affected jurisdictional resource that has not been previously delineated or verified by the USACE, a qualified biologist shall survey the project site for sensitive natural communities. Sensitive natural communities or habitats are those of special concern to resource agencies or those that are afforded specific consideration, based on Section 404 of the CWA and other applicable regulations. If sensitive natural communities or habitats that are afforded specific consideration, based on Section 404 of the CWA are determined to be present, a delineation of waters of the United States, including wetlands that would be affected by the project, will be prepared by a qualified biologist through the formal Section 404 wetland delineation process. The delineation will be submitted to and verified by USACE. If, based on the verified delineation, it is determined that fill of waters of the United States would result from implementation of the project, authorization for such fill will be secured from USACE through the Section 404 permitting process. The acreage of riparian habitat (deciduous riparian vegetation) that would be removed or disturbed during project implementation will be quantified and replaced or restored/enhanced to meet the no net-loss standard in accordance with USACE requirements. Habitat restoration, enhancement, and/or replacement will be at a location and by methods agreeable to USACE as determined during the permitting processes for CWA Section 404.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 7-2b: Obtain and comply with a lake and streambed alteration agreement; compensate for unavoidable loss of stream and riparian habitat</b></p> <p>The following measures shall be implemented to avoid or compensate for the loss or degradation of stream or riparian habitat, ensure consistency with Fish and Game Code Section 1602, and further reduce potential adverse effects on riparian habitats:</p>		<p>jurisdictional wetlands, riparian vegetation, and aquatic habitat. Implementation of mitigation measures 7-2a and 7-2b will reduce project-related impacts to a less-than-significant level by requiring proper authorization and permits prior to construction activities and compensation for unavoidable losses which will ensure protection of sensitive habitats. Prior to the start of onsite construction activities, a qualified biologist shall survey the project site for sensitive natural communities, and, if necessary, prepare a delineation of waters of the United States. All required authorizations and required permits will be obtained by the project applicant. If construction activities trigger the need for a Streambed Alteration Agreement, the project applicant shall obtain one from CDFW before Improvement Plan approval, and conform construction activities to that agreement. The project applicant shall compensate for permanent loss of riparian habitat at a minimum 1:1 ratio through contributions to a CDFW approved wetland mitigation bank or a Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan for creating or restoring in-kind habitat in the surrounding area. This plan will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 7-45 to 7-49; see also Response to Comment A-1-10, IO26-22, IO41-13 and IO42-2 and 3.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project developer shall notify CDFW before commencing any activity within the bed, bank, or riparian corridor of any waterway. If activities trigger the need for a Streambed Alteration Agreement, the proponent will obtain an agreement from CDFW before Improvement Plan approval. The project proponent shall conduct construction activities in accordance with the agreement, including implementing reasonable measures in the agreement necessary to protect the fish and wildlife resources, when working within the bed or bank of waterways that function as a fish or wildlife resource or in riparian habitats associated with those waterways.</li> <li>• The project developer shall compensate for permanent loss of riparian habitat at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio through contributions to a CDFW approved wetland mitigation bank or through the development and implementation of a Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan for creating or restoring in-kind habitat in the surrounding area. If mitigation credits are not available, stream and riparian habitat compensation shall include establishment of riparian vegetation on currently unvegetated bank portions of streams affected by the project and enhancement of existing riparian habitat through removal of nonnative species, where appropriate, and planting additional native riparian plants to increase cover, continuity, and width of the existing riparian corridor along streams in the project site and surrounding areas. Construction activities and compensatory mitigation shall be conducted in accordance with the terms of a streambed alteration agreement as required under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code.</li> <li>• The Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall include the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ identification of compensatory mitigation sites and criteria for selecting these mitigation sites;</li> <li>○ in kind reference habitats for comparison with compensatory riparian habitats (using performance and success criteria) to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>document success;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o monitoring protocol, including schedule and annual report requirements (Compensatory habitat shall be monitored for a minimum of 5 years from completion of mitigation, or human intervention (including recontouring and grading), or until the success criteria identified in the approved mitigation plan have been met, whichever is longer.);</li> <li>o ecological performance standards, based on the best available science and including specifications for native riparian plant densities, species composition, amount of dead woody vegetation gaps and bare ground, and survivorship; at a minimum, compensatory mitigation planting sites must achieve 80% survival of planted riparian trees and shrubs by the end of the five-year maintenance and monitoring period or dead and dying trees shall be replaced and monitoring continued until 80 percent survivorship is achieved;</li> <li>o corrective measures if performance standards are not met;</li> <li>o responsible parties for monitoring and preparing reports; and</li> <li>o responsible parties for receiving and reviewing reports and for verifying success or prescribing implementation or corrective actions</li> </ul> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 7-48 to 7-49.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 7-3: Direct or indirect effect on or loss of special-status plant species</b></p> <p>(PS) Implementing the MVWPSP would result in construction of new facilities in habitats that may provide suitable habitat for special-status plants on the West Parcel and within the offsite utilities corridors. If special-status plants are present in those areas, project construction could cause the disturbance or loss of those species.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 7-49.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 7-3: Avoid, minimize, and compensate for effects on special-status Plants</b></p> <p>The project developer shall implement the following measures to reduce potential impacts on special-status plants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Before commencement of any project construction for each phase of construction and during the blooming period for the special-status plant species with potential to occur on the project site, a qualified botanist shall conduct protocol-level surveys for special-status plants in areas where potentially suitable habitat would be removed or disturbed by project activities.</li> <li>• If no special-status plants are found, the</li> </ul>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 7-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring protective measures for special-status plants during construction and restoration plans. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Project could cause disturbance or loss of special-status plants if such plants are present in the development areas. To reduce this potentially significant impact to a less than significant level, the project developer is required to conduct preconstruction surveys, and if special-status plants are found, shall consult with CDFW as to the proper mitigation, including, but not limited to, preserving and enhancing existing populations, or creating offsite populations to</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>botanist shall document the findings in a letter report to Placer County and CDFW and no further mitigation will be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If special-status plant species are found that cannot be avoided during construction, the project applicant shall consult with CDFW, as appropriate depending on species status, to determine the appropriate mitigation measures for direct and indirect impacts that could occur as a result of project construction and will implement the agreed-upon mitigation measures to achieve no net loss of occupied habitat or individuals. Mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to, preserving and enhancing existing populations, creating offsite populations on project mitigation sites through seed collection or transplantation, and/or restoring or creating suitable habitat in sufficient quantities to achieve no net loss of occupied habitat and/or individuals. Potential mitigation sites could include suitable locations within or outside of the project area. A mitigation and monitoring plan shall be developed describing how unavoidable losses of special status plants will be compensated.</li> <li>• If relocation efforts are part of the mitigation plan, the plan shall include details on the methods to be used, including collection, storage, propagation, receptor sit preparation, installation, long-term protection and management, monitoring and reporting requirements, success criteria, and remedial action responsibilities should the initial effort fail to meet long-term monitoring requirements.</li> <li>• Success criteria for preserved and compensatory populations shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The extent of occupied area and plant density (number of plants per unit area) in compensatory populations will be equal to or greater than the affected occupied habitat.</li> <li>○ Compensatory and preserved populations will be self-producing. Populations will be considered self-producing when: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ plants reestablish annually for a minimum of five years with no human intervention such as supplemental</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p>achieve no net loss of occupied habitat and/or individuals. This plan will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 7-49 to 7-51; see also Response to Comment A-1-10, IO26-22, IO41-15.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>seeding; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ reestablished and preserved habitats contain an occupied area and flower density comparable to existing occupied habitat areas in similar habitat types in the project vicinity.</li> <li>▪ If offsite mitigation includes dedication of conservation easements, purchase of mitigation credits, or other offsite conservation measures, the details of these measures will be included in the mitigation plan, including information on responsible parties for long-term management, conservation easement holders, long-term management requirements, success criteria such as those listed above and other details, as appropriate to target the preservation of long term viable populations.</li> </ul> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 7-50 to 7-51.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 7-4: Indirect effects on fish and wildlife species through introduction and spread of invasive plants</b></p> <p>(PS) Construction of residential and commercial facilities on the West Parcel, and construction and maintenance of offsite utilities, have the potential to introduce and spread terrestrial and aquatic invasive plants during construction and revegetation periods. These activities would temporarily create areas of open ground that could be colonized by nonnative, invasive weed species from inside or outside of the project site. Noxious weeds and other invasive plants could inadvertently be introduced or spread in the project area during grading and construction activities, if nearby source populations passively colonize disturbed ground, or if construction and personnel equipment is transported to the site from an infested area. Soil, vegetation, and other materials transported to the study area from offsite sources for best management practices (BMPs), revegetation, or fill for project construction could contain invasive plant seeds or plant material that could become established in the study area. Additionally, terrestrial and aquatic invasive species currently present in or near the project site have the potential to be spread by construction disturbances. The introduction and spread of terrestrial or aquatic invasive species would degrade terrestrial</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 7-4: Implement invasive plant management practices during project construction</b></p> <p>The project developer shall implement the following invasive plant management practices during project construction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A qualified biologist will conduct a preconstruction survey to determine whether any populations of invasive plants are present within areas proposed for ground-disturbing activities. This could be conducted in coordination with the focused special-status plant survey recommended above under Mitigation Measure 7-3.</li> <li>• Before construction activities begin, invasive plant infestations will be treated where feasible. Treatments will be selected based on each species ecology and phenology. Control measures may include herbicide application, hand removal, or other means of mechanical control. This would help eliminate the threat of spreading the species throughout the project site and adjacent areas. All treatment methods-including the use of herbicides-will be conducted in accordance with the law, regulations, and policies governing the land owner. In areas where treatment is not feasible, noxious weed areas will be clearly flagged or fenced to clearly delineate work</li> </ul>	LS	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 7-4, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring implementation of invasive plant management practices during project construction. 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Development and operation of the Project has the potential to introduce and spread invasive plant species. Implementation of mitigation measure 7-4 will reduce Project related impacts to less than significant level by requiring preconstruction surveys and treatment of invasive plant infestations where feasible. Vehicles and equipment will be cleaned prior to introduction to the site, fill and seeds will be certified weed-free and/or locally sourced where feasible, and post construction monitoring and treatment will be conducted where feasible. This plan will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 7-51 to 7-53; see also Response to Comment A-1-10.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>plant, wildlife, and aquatic habitats within the study area.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 7-51 to 7-52.)</p>	<p>exclusion. Treatments will be implemented by a qualified biologist or other qualified specialist approved by Placer County.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicles and equipment will arrive at the project area clean and weed-free. All equipment entering the project site from weed-infested areas or areas of unknown weed status will be cleaned of all attached soil or plant parts before being allowed into the project site. Vehicles and equipment will be cleaned using high-pressure water or air at designated weed-cleaning stations after exiting a weed-infested area. Cleaning stations will be designated by a botanist or noxious weed specialist and located away from aquatic resources</li> <li>• To ensure that fill material and seeds imported to the study area are free of invasive/noxious weeds, the project will use onsite sources of fill and seeds whenever available. Fill and seed materials that need to be imported to the study area will be certified weed-free. In addition, only certified weed-free imported materials (or rice straw in upland areas) will be used for erosion control.</li> <li>• If designated weed-infested areas are unavoidable, the plants will be cut, if feasible, and disposed of in a landfill in sealed bags or disposed of or destroyed in another manner acceptable to Placer County or other agency as appropriate. If cutting weeds is not feasible, layers of mulch, degradable geotextiles, or similar materials will be placed over the infestation area to minimize the spread of seeds and plant materials by equipment and vehicles during construction. These materials will be secured so they are not blown or washed away.</li> <li>• Locally collected native seed sources for revegetation shall be used when possible. Plant and seed material will be collected from or near the study area, from within the same watershed, and at a similar elevation when possible and with approval of the appropriate authority (e.g., USFS botanist for collection on USFS land).</li> <li>• After construction is completed for each project phase, the affected project site shall be monitored on an annual basis for infestations</li> </ul>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>of invasive weeds until the restored vegetation has become fully established. If new populations of invasive weeds are documented during monitoring, they will be treated and eradicated to prevent further spread. Monitoring by a qualified biologist shall occur for up to three years (as feasible) subsequent to project implementation.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 7-52 to 7-53.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 7-5: Direct or indirect effects on special-status wildlife species or reduction of habitats or restriction of range of wildlife species or interference with the movement of native resident or migratory wildlife species or wildlife corridors</b></p> <p>(PS) Project construction for the MVWPSP could result in the loss of individuals or nests, or disruptions to nesting attempts of yellow warbler, olive-sided flycatcher, and long-eared owl; the removal of an active roost site for, or injury to, pallid bat and western red bat; and removal or disturbances to active breeding sites of Sierra Nevada mountain beaver. For other special-status species, although project implementation would result in habitat loss and could adversely affect individuals locally, the magnitude and intensity of potential adverse effects are not expected to affect the species' distribution, active breeding sites, breeding productivity, viability, or regional populations.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 7-53 to 7-60; see also Response to Comment A-1-10, IO26-22, IO31-21, IO42-4.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 7-5a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for nesting special-status birds, and implement a limited operating period if necessary</b></p> <p>For construction activities that would occur in suitable habitat during the nesting season (generally April 1–August 31, depending on species, snowpack, and other seasonal conditions), a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct focused surveys for yellow warbler, olive-sided flycatcher, and long-eared owl nests no more than 14 days before construction activities are initiated each construction season. The preconstruction survey for active nests will be conducted using a nest-searching technique appropriate for the species, as determined by a qualified biologist. For example, for yellow warbler, an appropriate technique involves first conducting point counts in suitable riparian habitat to determine occupancy, followed by nest searching if the species is present. For long-eared owl, surveys typically involve tape playbacks of recorded long-eared owl calls.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 7-5b: Conduct preconstruction surveys for special-status bats, avoid removal of important roosts, and implement a limited operating period if necessary</b></p> <p>Bat surveys shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist within 14 days before any tree removal or clearing during each construction season. Locations of vegetation and tree removal or excavation will be examined for potential bat roosts. Specific survey methodologies will be determined in coordination with CDFW, and may include visual surveys of bats (e.g., observation of bats during foraging period), inspection for suitable habitat, bat sign (e.g., guano), or use of ultrasonic detectors (e.g.,</p>	LS	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 7-5a, 7-5b, and 7-5c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring preconstruction surveys and limited operating periods, if necessary. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Project could have direct or indirect effects on several special status wildlife species. Including the yellow warbler, olive-sided flycatcher, long-eared owl, pallid bat, western red bat, and Sierra Nevada mountain beaver. Mitigation measure 7-5a requires preconstruction surveys for yellow warbler, olive-sided flycatcher, and long-eared owl nests. Mitigation measure 7-5b requires preconstruction surveys, particularly before tree removal activities, for potential bat roosts. Removal of any significant roost sites will be avoided to the extent feasible, and passive exclusion devices will be used at affected roost sites except during periods of sensitive activity. Mitigation measure 7-5c requires preconstruction surveys for Sierra Nevada mountain beaver burrows. Limited operating periods and appropriate buffers will be put in place if active burrows/breeding sites are identified within 250 feet of project activities. This plan will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 7-53 to 7-61; see also Response to Comment A-1-10, IO26-22, IO31-21, IO41-16 and 17, IO42-4.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Sonobat, Anabat). Removal of any significant roost sites located will be avoided to the extent feasible. If it is determined that an active roost site cannot be avoided and will be affected, bats will be excluded from the roost site before the site is removed. The biologist shall first notify and consult with CDFW on appropriate bat exclusion methods and roost removal procedures. Exclusion methods may include use of one-way doors at roost entrances (bats may leave, but not reenter), or sealing roost entrances when the site can be confirmed to contain no bats. Once it is confirmed that all bats have left the roost, crews will be allowed to continue work in the area.</p> <p>Exclusion efforts may be restricted during periods of sensitive activity (e.g., during winter hibernation or while females in maternity colonies are nursing young [generally, during late spring and summer]). If a hibernation or maternity roosting site is discovered, the project developer will consult with CDFW to establish appropriate exclusionary buffers until all young are determined to be volant (i.e., able to fly) by a qualified biologist. Once it is determined that all young are volant, passive exclusion devices will be installed and all bats will be allowed to leave voluntarily. Once it is determined by a qualified biologist that all bats have left the roost, crews will be allowed to work within the buffer zone.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 7-5c: Conduct pre-construction surveys for Sierra Nevada mountain beaver and implement a limited operating period, if necessary</b></p> <p>A qualified biologist shall conduct focused surveys for the presence/absence of active burrows for Sierra Nevada mountain beaver in suitable riparian habitat within proposed impact areas and a 250-foot buffer (if feasible). The preconstruction survey for active burrows shall be conducted no more than 30 days before construction activities are initiated each construction season. Placer County shall be notified of the results of the preconstruction surveys.</p> <p>If active breeding/burrow sites are identified within 250 feet of project activities, the project applicant shall implement limited operating</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>periods (LOP) for all such burrows before commencement of any project construction activities to avoid construction or access related disturbances to breeding activities of Sierra Nevada mountain beaver. An LOP constitutes a period during which project-related activities (i.e., vegetation removal, earth moving, and construction) will not occur, and will be imposed between February 1 and July 31 within 250 feet of any active burrow sites. The period of the LOP, area within which it is implemented (e.g., 250-foot buffer), and activities allowed or prohibited within the LOP may be adjusted through consultation with CDFW and/or Placer County. Placer County shall be notified of the establishment of buffers and LOPs required to minimize or avoid impacts to Sierra Nevada mountain beaver.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 7-60 to 7-61.)</p>		
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 7-6: Disturbance or loss of common vegetation communities and wildlife habitats</b></p> <p>(LS) The proposed MWVSP together with the cumulative projects would permanently convert common vegetation communities and wildlife habitats to other uses. The majority of disturbance or loss from MWVSP would occur within three conifer forest types – Sierran mixed conifer forest, white fir forest, and white fir-red fir forest. This conversion, when combined with the cumulative projects within these forest types, could contribute to the cumulative reduction of these vegetation communities within the region. Because these habitats are locally and regionally common and abundant, and because the impact is reduced by ongoing forest restoration projects that will result in long-term improvement to the health of these forest types, the cumulative impact is less than significant. Additionally, because the East Parcel would be permanently preserved, conifer forest and other common habitats presently zoned for development on that parcel would be conserved in perpetuity. The West Parcel would also include 390 acres designated as Forest and zoned TPZ, which would remain open space.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 7-62.)</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>Cumulative Impact 7-7: Cumulative disturbance or loss of sensitive habitats</b></p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002;</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>(LS) Construction of residential and commercial development, access roads, and offsite utilities proposed under the MVWPSP in combination with other cumulative development in the region could result in permanent loss or temporary disturbance of freshwater emergent wetland, perennial stream, wet meadow, and montane riparian habitats. These potential impacts would be cumulatively significant. Construction activities for the MVWPSP and other cumulative projects would be required to comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations and permitting requirements that protect wetland, riparian, and other sensitive habitats through avoidance, restoration, enhancement, and other means such that sensitive habitat values are maintained. For MVWPSP, implementation of Mitigation Measures 7-2a and 7-2b requires that sensitive habitat is avoided to the extent feasible and that sensitive habitats that cannot be avoided are restored following construction, or if the habitat cannot be restored, that the project proponent compensates for unavoidable losses in a manner that results in no net loss of sensitive habitats. Additionally, the MVWPSP proposes to preserve the East Parcel, which includes substantial acreage of sensitive habitats (see Draft EIR Chapter 7, Table 7-13). Overall, the quality and extent of sensitive habitats is higher on the East Parcel than on the West Parcel. The East Parcel supports larger and more functional areas of riparian, wetland, meadow, and stream complexes that provide greater habitat value than those on the West Parcel.)</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 7-62; see also Response to Comment IO26-21, IO42-7.)</p>			CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 7-8: Direct or indirect effect on or loss of special-status plant species</b></p> <p>(LS) The cumulative projects include residential and commercial development, recreation facilities, resort development, and forest vegetation and fuels treatment that could affect habitat for special-status plants in the region. Habitat for most special-status plants in the region is primarily within riparian and wetland settings, and to a lesser degree within some upland conifer forest and shrub/meadow communities (see Draft EIR Chapter 7, Table 7-</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>5). Development project areas that overlap with these habitats would be expected to have some level of adverse effects on these resources; however, forest vegetation and fuels treatment projects are expected to result in long-term habitat enhancement that may benefit those special-status plant species associated with forest habitats. Overall, the effects on special-status plant species are considered cumulatively significant.</p> <p>The proposed MVWPSP would result in construction of new facilities in areas that may provide suitable habitat for special-status plants on the West Parcel and within the offsite utilities corridors. If special-status plants are present in those areas, project construction could cause the disturbance or loss of those species. When combined with the cumulative projects listed above with similar biological effects, implementation of the MVWPSP could contribute to an adverse cumulative effect on special-status plant species. However, project-specific Mitigation Measure 7-3 requires that potential loss of special-status plants is avoided or minimized or that compensation is provided. With implementation of this mitigation, the MVWPSP would not substantially affect the distribution, population viability, or the regional population of any special-status plant species; or cause a change in species diversity locally or regionally.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 7-62 to 7-63.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 7-9: Cumulative indirect effects on fish and wildlife species through introduction and spread of invasive plants</b></p> <p>(LS) Past projects and activities have resulted in the introduction and spread of various noxious weeds and invasive plant species in the Tahoe-Truckee region, resulting in habitat degradation and other adverse effects on biological resources. The current presence of noxious weeds and invasive plant species in the project region is considered a significant cumulative impact.</p> <p>Implementation of the MVWPSP together with the cumulative projects have the potential to introduce and spread noxious weeds and invasive plant species during project construction and post-construction revegetation activities. Nearby source populations could</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>passively colonize disturbed ground, or attach to personnel or equipment and be transported to the site from an infested area. Soil, vegetation, and other materials transported to the project site from offsite sources for BMP, revegetation, or fill for project construction could contain invasive plant seeds or plant material that could become established in the project area. Additionally, terrestrial and aquatic invasive plant species currently present in or near the project site have the potential to be spread by construction disturbances. Policies, regulations, and programs to eradicate invasive plants and prevent their spread are currently in place and serve to reduce the potential for their adverse effects on native fish and wildlife. Without mitigation, implementation of the proposed project could contribute to the existing significant cumulative effect. Mitigation Measure 7-4 requires the implementation of invasive plant and aquatic invasive species management practices during project construction to prevent the inadvertent introduction and spread of invasive plants and aquatic invasive species.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 7-63.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 7-10: Cumulative direct or indirect effects on special-status wildlife species or reduction of habitats or restriction of range of wildlife species or interference with the movement of native resident or migratory wildlife species or wildlife corridors</b></p> <p>(LS) Implementation of the MVWPSP and the cumulative projects in the region would result in conversion and fragmentation of habitat, introduction of additional traffic, population, sources of noise and air pollutant emissions, and other effects that could disturb the foraging and movement patterns of individuals, affect breeding activities and reproductive success, cause direct mortality or injury, and disturb or remove suitable habitat for some special-status wildlife species. However, forest vegetation and fuels treatment projects are expected to result in long-term habitat enhancement that would benefit wildlife species. When combined with the cumulative projects with similar biological effects, implementation of the MVWPSP without mitigation could have an adverse cumulative effect on special-status wildlife species.</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>However, Mitigation Measures 7-5a and 7-5b require conducting focused preconstruction surveys for special-status wildlife and, if needed, limiting construction operations during the sensitive breeding periods. Implementation of these measures would avoid the potential disturbance or loss of individuals, nests, and roost sites of these species during construction of MVWPSP.</p> <p>In terms of habitat loss, the common forest and other upland communities that would be affected (e.g., Sierran mixed conifer, Jeffrey pine, and white fir) are abundant and widely distributed locally and regionally. Because of the abundance of these habitat types, implementation of the MVWPSP, when combined with those cumulative projects that are located in these forest types, would not cumulatively threaten, regionally eliminate, or contribute to a substantial reduction in the distribution or abundance of habitat for special-status wildlife species associated with these communities in the project region (e.g., olive-sided flycatcher, long-eared owl, pallid bat).</p> <p>Riparian and wetland habitats that support special-status species are far less common in the region than the forest types listed above and may be lost or degraded by cumulative project activities. When combined with cumulative development that has similar biological effects, implementation of the MVWPSP without mitigation could have an adverse cumulative effect on the riparian and wetland habitat of special-status wildlife species. Mitigation Measures 7-2a and 7-2b require that riparian and wetland habitats, which could support yellow warbler and Sierra Nevada mountain beaver, are avoided to the extent feasible and that sensitive habitats that cannot be avoided are restored following construction; or, if the habitat cannot be restored, that the project proponent compensates for unavoidable losses in a manner that results in no net loss of sensitive habitats. Implementation of these mitigation measures for the MVWPSP would result in a no net loss of habitat for these riparian and wetland special status species.</p> <p>With recommended mitigation measures, the project would not substantially affect the distribution, breeding productivity, population</p>			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>viability, or the regional population of any special-status species; nor would it cause a change in species diversity locally or regionally, either directly through loss of individuals or indirectly through habitat modification.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 7-63 to 7-64.)</p>			
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
<p><b>Impact 8-1: Change in the significance of historical resources</b></p> <p>(NI) The record search revealed no historical resources within the MVWPSP project site and the pedestrian survey did not identify any historical resources.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 8-12; see also Response to Comment IO14-1.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Impact 8-2: Disturb unique archaeological resources</b></p> <p>(PS) Implementation of the MVWPSP could cause a substantial change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource. The records searches revealed that two archaeological resources (P-31-131 and P-31-132) have been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR. The pedestrian survey disclosed a total of 58 archeological resources (33 of which are located on the West Parcel and 13 of which were identified as part of the survey for the offsite utilities), which have not yet been evaluated for NRHP and CRHR eligibility. Also, project-related ground-disturbing activities could cause a substantial change in the significance of an as-yet-undiscovered unique archaeological resource as defined in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 8-12 to 8-13.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 8-2a: Complete and implement subsequent evaluation recommendations prior to ground disturbing activities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phase 2 Evaluation Report: Prior to the application for each small lot tentative map or conditional use permit, or approval of offsite infrastructure alignments, and prior to improvement plan approval, a Phase 2 Evaluation Report shall be prepared for the archaeological resources within the area subject to the application and identified in the Martis Valley West Parcel Phase 1B: Heritage Resources Preliminary Field Inventory Report and the Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan Offsite Utilities Connection and Fire road Heritage Resource Inventory Phase 1A and Phase 1B Preliminary Report. In the Phase 2 Evaluation Report, resources will be evaluated and recorded on standard Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Primary Record forms (Form DPR 523) in accordance with one or more national, state and/or regional criteria and a determination of eligibility/ineligibility to the NRHP and/or CRHR and/or local register will be recommended. The Phase 2 Evaluation Report shall be completed by a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's professional qualifications for archaeology and submitted to the Placer County Planning Services Division with the first submittal of improvement plans.</li> <li>Phase 3 Evaluation Report: If significant</li> </ul>	LS	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 8-2a, 8-2b, and 8-2c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring subsequent evaluations prior to ground disturbing activities, a worker environmental awareness program, and work stoppages in the event of an archeological discovery. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Project could cause a substantial change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource, or an as-yet-undiscovered unique archaeological resource. Mitigation measure 8-2a would require evaluation reports to determine if significant archaeological resources are present and the project impacts on those resources, as well as adopting appropriate avoidance measures. Mitigation measure 8-2b would require the implementation of a Worker Environmental Awareness Program to train construction personnel and supervisors on how to identify potential resources and what to do if they are discovered on site. Mitigation measure 8-2c would require halting all ground-disturbing work in the area if unique archaeological resources are discovered, and a qualified archaeologist will work with the applicant to avoid disturbing the resources to the extent feasible and follow proper procedure in recording the discovery of the resources. This plan will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 8-12 through 8-14; Final EIR, pp. 2-10 to 2-11; see also Response to Comment IO14-1.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>archaeological resources are identified in the Phase 2 Evaluation Report, an assessment of project impacts on these resources will be included in a Phase 3 Evaluation Report, as well as detailed measures to avoid impacts. Avoidance measures could include, but are not limited to, actions such as re-routing of the sewer line around the resources, directional drilling under the resource, site testing to confirm the boundary of a significant resource and avoidance of that boundary, and construction monitoring in sensitive areas to prevent disturbance of currently unknown subsurface resources. Adopted avoidance measures will be implemented as appropriate during project design and construction. If project redesign to completely avoid impacts is infeasible, then measures will be developed and implemented in coordination with Placer County Planning Services Division and appropriate Native American representatives to recover the significant information contained within these archaeological resources before the resource site is disturbed. Testing or data recovery shall be the preferred method of dealing with the affected resources. The Phase 3 Evaluation Report and any data recovery (if needed) shall be completed by a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's professional qualifications for archaeology. Mitigation or data recovery typically involves additional archival research, field excavation, photo documentation, mapping, and/or archaeological monitoring. If a Phase 3 Evaluation Report is needed, it will be submitted to the Placer County Planning Services Division concurrent with the submittal of improvement plans. Any avoidance and data recovery measures shall be developed in consultation with the archeologist and finalized in consultation with the Placer County Planning Services Division to confirm the effectiveness of the measures.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 8-2b: Develop and implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program</b></p> <p>Prior to improvement plan approval, the project applicant shall design and implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) that shall be provided to all construction</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>personnel and supervisors who will have the potential to encounter and alter heritage and cultural resources. The WEAP shall be submitted to the Planning Services Division and shall describe, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• types of heritage and cultural resources expected in the project area;</li> <li>• types of evidence that indicate heritage or cultural resources might be present (e.g., ceramic shards, trash scatters, lithic scatters, mineralized, partially mineralized, or unmineralized bones and teeth, soft tissues, shells, wood, leaf impressions, footprints);</li> <li>• what to do if a worker encounters a possible resource;</li> <li>• what to do if a worker encounters bones or possible bones; and</li> <li>• penalties for removing or intentionally disturbing heritage and cultural resources, such as those identified in the Archeological Resources Protection Act.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 8-2c: Stop work, in the event of an archaeological discovery</b></p> <p>In the event that evidence of any paleontological, prehistoric or historic-era subsurface archaeological features or deposits are discovered during construction-related earth-moving activities (e.g., ceramic shard, trash scatters, lithic scatters, mineralized, partially mineralized, or unmineralized bones and teeth, soft tissues, shells, wood, leaf impressions, footprints), all ground-disturbing activity in the area of the discovery shall be halted until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find. The Placer County Planning Services Division and the Department of Museums will be notified of the potential find and a qualified archeologist shall be retained to investigate. If the find is an archeological site, the appropriate Native American group shall be notified. If the archaeologist determines that the find does not meet the CRHR standards of significance for cultural resources, construction may proceed. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, the Planning Services Division shall be notified and a data recovery plan shall be</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>prepared. If the find is determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist (i.e., because the find is determined to constitute either an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource), the archaeologist shall work with the project applicant to avoid disturbance to the resources, and if complete avoidance is not feasible in light of project design, economics, logistics, and other factors, follow accepted professional standards in recording any find including submittal of the standard DPR Primary Record forms (Form DPR 523) and location information to the appropriate California Historical Resources Information System office for the project area (the NCIC).</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 8-13 to 8-14; Final EIR, pp. 2-10 to 2-11; see also Response to Comment IO14-1.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 8-3: Disturb undiscovered or unrecorded human remains</b></p> <p>(PS) Although unlikely, construction and excavation activities associated with development of the MVWPSP could unearth previously undiscovered or unrecorded human remains, if they are present.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 8-14.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 8-3: Stop work, if human remains are discovered</b></p> <p>California law recognizes the need to protect Native American human burials, skeletal remains, and items associated with Native American burials from vandalism and inadvertent destruction. The procedures for the treatment of Native American human remains are contained in California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 7052 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097.</p> <p>If human remains are discovered during any demolition or construction activities, potentially damaging ground-disturbing activities in the area of the remains shall be halted immediately, and the project applicant shall notify the Placer County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission ("NAHC") immediately, according to Section 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of California's Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined by the NAHC to be Native American, the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. The project applicant shall also retain a professional archaeologist with Native American burial experience to conduct a field investigation of the specific site and consult with the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), if any, identified by the NAHC. Following the coroner's findings, the archaeologist, and the</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 8-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring a halt to ground-disturbing activities if human remains are discovered, and consultation with the coroner, an archaeologist, and the Most Likely Descendant. 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The construction and excavation activities associated with development of the Project could unearth previously undiscovered, or unrecorded human remains. Mitigation measure 8-3 will require, in compliance with State law, a halt to all ground-disturbing activities in the area where human remains are discovered. The project applicant shall notify the County Coroner and the NAHC immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, a professional archaeologist will investigate the site and consult with the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains; and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human remains are not disturbed. This plan will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 8-14 to 8-15.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

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>NAHC-designated MLD shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments are not disturbed. The responsibilities for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in California Public Resources Code Section 5097.94.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 8-14 to 8-15.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 8-4: Affect unique ethnic cultural values or restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the project area</b></p> <p>(NI) The Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California and Marcos Guerrero of the UAIC were contacted regarding the project and no unique ethnic values or existing religious or sacred uses of the project site or vicinity were identified that would be affected by the project.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 8-15.)</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>Cumulative Impact 8-5: Cumulative impacts on unique archaeological resources</b></p> <p>(LS) The cumulative context for archaeological resources is the Truckee-Tahoe Basin portion of the Washoe territory. Based on previous cultural resource surveys and research, the Truckee-Tahoe Basin has been inhabited by prehistoric and historic people for thousands of years. The proposed MWWPSP, in combination with other development in the Truckee-Tahoe Basin could contribute to the loss of significant archaeological resources, such as P-31-131 and P-31-132, which have previously been recommended as eligible for listing in the NRHP. Because all significant cultural resources are unique and nonrenewable members of finite classes, meaning there are a limited number of significant cultural resources, all adverse effects erode a dwindling resource base. The loss of any one archaeological site could affect the scientific value of others in a region because these resources are best understood in the context of the entirety of the cultural system of which they are a part. The cultural system is represented archaeologically by the total inventory of all sites and other cultural remains in the region. As a result, a meaningful approach to preserving and managing cultural resources must focus on the likely distribution of cultural resources, rather</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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>than on a single project or parcel boundary.</p> <p>Proper planning and appropriate mitigation can help to capture and preserve knowledge of such resources and can provide opportunities for increasing our understanding of the past environmental conditions and cultures by recording data about sites discovered and preserving artifacts found. Federal, state, and local laws are also in place, as discussed above, that protect these resources in most instances. Even so, it is not always feasible to protect these resources, particularly when preservation in place would make projects infeasible, and for this reason the cumulative effects of past and present projects in the Truckee-Tahoe Basin could result in a potentially significant cumulative impact on cultural resources. Without mitigation, implementation of the MVWPSP has the potential to cause a substantial change in the significance of archaeological resources that are unique and nonrenewable members of finite classes. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures 8-2a, 8-2b, and 8-2c, adverse effects on currently known archeological resources and potentially newly discovered archeological resources would be avoided.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 8-15 to 8-16.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 8-6: Cumulative impacts on human remains</b></p> <p>(LS) Because of the likelihood that any undiscovered or unknown human remains would be Native American in origin, the cumulative context for human remains is the Truckee-Tahoe Basin portion of the Washoe territory. As discussed above under Cumulative Impact 8-1, the Truckee-Tahoe Basin has been inhabited by prehistoric and historic people for thousands of years. The loss of any one archaeological site or human remains could affect the scientific value of others in a region because these resources are best understood in the context of the entirety of the cultural system of which they are a part. The proposed MVWPSP, in combination with other development in the Truckee-Tahoe Basin could contribute to the disturbance of human remains due to project-related construction activities. However, with</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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-3, adverse effects on undiscovered or unknown human remains would be avoided.)</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 8-16.)</p>			
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>			
<p><b>Impact 9-1: Adverse effects on scenic vistas</b></p> <p>(LS) Implementation of the project would result in the construction of up to 760 residential units, up to 34,500 square feet of commercial building space, up to 22,000 square feet of homeowner amenities (e.g., parks, fitness centers), and new roadways accessing the structures and facilities. The project would convert portions of a 662 acre forested site into a residential neighborhood, which would modify visual characteristics through tree removal, vegetation clearing, and grading, which could affect scenic vistas. Portions of the development on the West Parcel development area would be within scenic vistas that are visible from Martis Valley and Northstar. However, the project site's topography would screen much of the development from views from public gathering spaces and recreation areas, and development would be required to comply with specific and enforceable standards that require development to be designed with colors, materials, screening, and site layouts that would blend with the natural environment. The West Parcel development area would be largely screened from view from SR 267, the Fibreboard Freeway, and the Tahoe Rim Trail, and would not affect scenic vistas from those areas. As seen from Martis Valley, project components would be largely screened by existing vegetation and topography and less visible than existing features in the foreground (e.g., Northstar ski trails, transmission lines and towers). Project features visible from Northstar would appear as partially screened, dark/earth tone-colored structures nestled in distant trees. Structures would not appear silhouetted on the ridge, nor would obvious clearings or linear or angular patterns result from the project. No structures would be visible from Lake Tahoe, and tree removal visible from Lake Tahoe would be largely obscured by remaining trees and nearly imperceptible.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 9-33 to 9-37; see also Response to Comment A-1-6, IO18-41 to 43, 50 to 57, and</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

No Impact = NI

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
59 to 75, IO25-10 to 12, and 14, IO31-11, 22 & 23, IO41-19 & 20, 25 & 26, IO51-46, and pp. B11 and B19 of Appendix B to the Draft MVWPSP.)			
<p><b>Impact 9-2: Damage to scenic resources within a Placer County-designated scenic route</b></p> <p>(LS) The MVWPSP project site is within the vicinity of two Placer County-designated scenic routes: Northstar Drive and SR 267. The West Parcel development area is not visible from Northstar Drive and would have no impact on that designated scenic route. The MVWPSP would change the land use designation adjacent to SR 267 from open space to residential, but would establish a 150-foot setback from the edge of the SR 267 right-of-way within which residential or retail commercial structures would be prohibited, with the exception for accessory structures such as bus shelter(s), the covered bridge, and entry kiosk. In addition, the MVWPSP includes Development Standards to protect scenic resources visible from SR 267, including screening requirements that would minimize visibility of project structures and protect views from SR 267 that are currently dominated by forest land and natural features.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 9-39 to 9-42; see also Response to Comment IO18-41 to 43, 50 to 57, and 59 to 75, IO25-10 to 12, and 14, IO31-11, 22 &amp; 23, IO41-19 &amp; 20, 25 &amp; 26, and pp. B11 and B19 of Appendix B to the Draft MVWPSP.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Impact 9-3: Degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings</b></p> <p>(LS) Implementation of the MVWPSP would result in visible alteration of the West Parcel development area. The project would result in the conversion of a forested site that is dominated by native vegetation to a developed site that would be characterized by human-made features. The MVWPSP includes specific and enforceable Development Standards that would limit modifications to the existing visual environment by retaining existing rock outcroppings and other natural features, minimizing grading and alterations to existing topography, and retaining trees. The MVWPSP would also require that structures be visually</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

346

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>screened, and be designed with colors, materials, and textures that blend into the existing natural environment, which would minimize alterations to the existing visual character.</p> <p>The visual character of the site from surrounding areas, including distant views and nearby recreation sites, would not be noticeably altered by buildout of the MVWPSP because of topographic screening and the implementation of required Development Standards (see Impacts 9-1 and 9-2). There would be little or no impact to public gathering areas, trails, or other public vantage points within, adjacent to, or in the immediate vicinity of the project area because views of the site from publicly available trails and roads (e.g., Tahoe Rim Trail, Fibreboard Freeway) are largely blocked by topography and vegetation, and use of onsite trails is limited to logging employees and private recreation, subject to annual renewal. Further, the resulting visual character of the plan area would be consistent with other nearby development.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 9-43 to 9-45; see also Response to Comment A-1-6, IO18-41 to 43, 50 to 57, and 59 to 75, IO25-10 to 12, and 14, IO31-11, 22 &amp; 23, IO41-19 &amp; 20, 25 &amp; 26, and pp. B11 and B19 of Appendix B to the Draft MVWPSP.)</p>			
<p><b>Impact 9-4: New sources of light and glare</b></p> <p>(LS) The MVWPSP development would result in new sources of light, including interior and exterior residential lighting, street lighting, lighting for commercial facilities and homeowner amenities, and lights from vehicle traffic. As specified in MVWPSP policies and Development Standards, these light sources would be required to implement measures to minimize light pollution. Light sources from the project would not be visible from Lake Tahoe or the Fibreboard Freeway, but they would be visible from Martis Valley. Because of the distance from likely viewpoints, screening by topography and vegetation, and requirements that limit the intensity of outdoor lighting, the new light sources visible from Martis Valley would be less prominent than existing light sources and would not modify the character of the existing nighttime views. Therefore, the project would not create a new source of</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>

347

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>substantial light or glare that would adversely affect views in the area, or contribute substantially to skyglow.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 9-45 to 9-50; see also Response to Comment , IO18-41 to 43, 50 to 57, and 59 to 75, IO31-11, 22 &amp; 23, IO41-19 &amp; 20, 26, IO51-46, and p. B19 of Appendix B to the Draft MVWSP.)</p>			
<p><b>Impact 9-5: Visual impacts during construction</b></p> <p>(LS) During construction, the visual impact of buildings, roadways, infrastructure, and other project features would be greater, because of the potential presence of construction equipment, material storage, contrasting colors, reflective materials, cleared areas, graded pads, utility trenches, and the like during construction. The construction impacts would be largely screened from public views by topography and vegetation. In addition, construction activities would be phased as the project is gradually built out over approximately 20 years, and the visual impact of constructing each phase or project component would be short-term. Construction would occur primarily during daylight hours and would not involve substantial construction lighting.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 9-51.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Cumulative Impact 9-6: Cumulative effects on scenic vistas</b></p> <p>(LS) Future projects including the Brockway Campground Project, build-out of the Martis Camp neighborhood, implementation of the Northstar Mountain Master Plan, and construction of the Northstar Highlands Phase II development would alter scenic vistas in the project vicinity. Each of these projects would be required to comply with applicable design standards, would be reviewed for impacts to scenic vistas consistent with CEQA and TRPA requirements, as applicable, and would incorporate feasible mitigation measures for any significant impacts on scenic vistas. The exact cumulative effect of these projects on scenic vistas cannot be known with specificity. However, based on the analysis in each project's environmental review, it is possible that taken together, past, present, and future projects could result in a cumulatively</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>significant impact to scenic vistas.</p> <p>As described above, the MVWPSP West Parcel development area is largely screened from public viewpoints by topography and vegetation. The MVWPSP also includes required design standards that would minimize the visibility of structures, including standards related to materials and colors; preservation of trees, rocks, and natural features; landscaping and screening of development; and the placement of structures to minimize visibility. As a result, the impacts of the project on scenic vistas are less than significant. Project elements are not adjacent to the other future projects visible from Martis Valley and Northstar, and the project would affect different views than the other future projects visible from Martis Valley and Northstar.</p> <p>Because the viewsheds for these projects are different, and the proposed project development would be largely screened by vegetation and topography and only minimally visible within scenic vistas, the MVWPSP would not make a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact on scenic vistas from Martis Valley and Northstar. The West Parcel development area would be adjacent to the Brockway Campground Project, which is proposed for the land within the Lake Tahoe Basin, immediately south of the West Parcel. The Brockway Campground Project is in the preliminary planning stages, so the impacts to scenic vistas are not known. If the Brockway Campground Project did result in significant cumulative impacts to scenic vistas, the MVPSP would not make a considerable contribution to those impacts because it is not visible from the areas from which the Brockway Campground improvements might be visible, such as Fibreboard Freeway.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 9-52; see also Response to Comment IO18-41 to 43, 50 to 57, and 59 to 75, IO25-10 to 12, and 14, IO41-19 &amp; 20, 25 &amp; 26, 28, and pp. B11 and B19 of Appendix B to the Draft MVWPSP.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 9-7: Cumulative effects on scenic resources within a Placer County-designated scenic route</b></p> <p>(LS) The Placer County-designated scenic</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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>routes were designated as scenic routes specifically because past projects have not degraded scenic resources within those routes. While present or proposed future projects may be within the SR 267 viewshed, none of the projects include substantial modifications to scenic resources within Placer County-designated scenic routes. A new, 115-foot-tall monopine cellular tower is proposed by Verizon Wireless on the West Parcel, near Brockway Summit, approximately 600 feet north of Carmelian Woods Avenue and approximately 200 feet west of SR 267. As a monopine, the tower is designed to be camouflaged and blend in with the surrounding trees. From the perspective of cumulative visual impact, the cellular tower, even if detectable, would be approximately one mile from the West Parcel development area at its closest approach, and approximately 1.2 miles from the proposed project entrance along SR 267. Because of distance, topography, and vegetative screening, no elements of the project would combine with views of the cellular tower from any location on the ground. No cumulative impact would occur. Any changes to County-designated scenic routes from other future projects would be required to be mitigated through setbacks, clustering of development, screening, density limitations and/or other measures as required by the Martis Valley Community Plan. As described under Impact 9-2, after implementation of Mitigation Measure 9-2, the MVWPSP would result in less-than-significant impacts to scenic resources within designated scenic routes.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 9-52 to 9-53; see also Response to Comment IO18-41 to 43, 50 to 57, and 59 to 75, IO25-10 to 12, and 14, IO41-19 &amp; 20, 25 &amp; 26, and pp. B11 and B19 of Appendix B to the Draft MVWPSP.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 9-8: Cumulative effects on the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings</b></p> <p>(LS) Future projects that could affect the visual character of the MVWPSP site and its surroundings include the Martis Valley Trail, CalPeco 625 and 650 Electrical Line Upgrade, Brockway Campground Project, buildout of the Martis Camp subdivision, implementation of the Northstar Mountain Master Plan, and</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>construction of the Northstar Highlands Phase II development. Because of their nature as outdoor recreation-oriented projects, maintenance of the existing visual character of the natural environment is an important component of Martis Valley Trail and Brockway Campground Projects. Therefore, these projects are not expected to substantially alter the visual character of the MVWPSP site and its surroundings. Based on the visual resource analysis in the Final EIS/EIR for the CalPeco 625 and 650 Electrical Line Upgrade, that project is not expected to result in a significant impact on the visual character of the MVWPSP site and its surroundings (USFS 2014). However, the Martis Camp, Northstar Mountain Master Plan, and Northstar Highlands Phase II projects combined with the existing residential and commercial development in Martis Valley will result in a significant cumulative impact to the visual character and quality of Martis Valley, as the natural landscape is gradually altered by residential and commercial development and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Implementation of the MVWPSP would result in visible alteration of the West Parcel development area. The MVWPSP includes specific and enforceable Development Standards that would minimize modifications to the existing visual environment by retaining existing rock outcroppings and other natural features, minimizing grading and alterations to existing topography, and retaining trees. The MVWPSP would also require that structures be visually screened, and be designed with colors, materials, and textures that blend into the existing natural environment, which would minimize alterations to the existing visual character.</p> <p>The visual character of the site from surrounding areas, including distant views and nearby recreation sites, would not be noticeably altered by buildout of the MVWPSP because of topographic screening and the implementation of required Development Standards (see Impacts 9-1, 9-2, and 9-3). The change in the visual character and quality of the MVWPSP project area would be a less-than-significant impact, because there are would be no impacts to public gathering areas, trails or other</p>			

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>public vantage points within, adjacent to, or in the immediate vicinity of the project plan area, and because use of existing trails is limited to logging employees and private recreation, which is not a permanent use, because it is subject to annual renewal.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 9-53; see also Response to Comment IO18-41 to 43, 50 to 57, and 59 to 75, IO25-10 to 12, and 14, IO41-19 &amp; 20, 25 &amp; 26, 28, and pp. B11 and B19 of Appendix B to the Draft MVWPSP.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 9-9: Cumulative effects on light and glare</b></p> <p>(S) Future projects including the Brockway Campground Project could result in new sources of light and glare from outdoor lighting, campfires, and vehicle headlights that might be visible from nearby recreation areas or the Lake Tahoe. As shown in Impact 9-4, light sources and glare from the project area would not be visible from the Lake Tahoe Basin, or nearby recreation areas such as the Fibreboard Freeway. While future projects could result in new sources of light and glare visible from nearby recreation areas or the Lake Tahoe Basin, the MVWPSP would not substantially contribute to these effects. Therefore, the MVWPSP would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts from light and glare visible from nearby recreation areas or the Lake Tahoe Basin.</p> <p>Past and present projects in the Martis Valley have created substantial sources of light that have adversely affected nighttime views in Martis Valley. These sources of light would likely increase as a result of future projects including buildout of the Martis Camp neighborhood, implementation of the Northstar Mountain Master Plan, construction of the Northstar Highlands Phase II development, and other residential development within the Martis Valley. As shown in Exhibit 9-34, above, the existing nighttime views in Martis Valley are heavily influenced by lighting from residential neighborhoods and commercial and resort development. As described in Impact 9-4, light from the project would be less prominent than existing light sources and would not, by itself, result in a significant impact. However, while it is unlikely that all buildings would be</p>	<p>No additional feasible mitigation is possible.</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report. However, the Board of Supervisors finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the Project's cumulative impacts to light and glare, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> While it is unlikely that all buildings will be illuminated at once, the Project would result in new light sources that would be clearly visible from Martis Valley and would introduce new light sources in a portion of the view that is not already affected by light, which would contribute to the existing adverse effects on nighttime views. Thus, the Project would result in a considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant impact on nighttime views. The Development Standards incorporated into the Project will substantially lessen these cumulative impacts. The Development Standards would limit light sources to the minimum amount necessary to maintain nighttime safety, utility, security and productivity. Thus, no additional mitigation is feasible and the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 9-53 to 9-55; Final EIR, p. 2-14; see also Response to Comment IO18-41 to 43, 50 to 57, and 59 to 75, IO41-19 &amp; 20, 26, and p. B19 of Appendix B to the Draft MVWPSP.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

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>simultaneously illuminated, the project would result in new light sources throughout approximately 662 acres that have no existing light sources. These new light sources from buildout of the MVWPSP would be clearly visible from Martis Valley and would introduce new light sources in a portion of the view that is not already affected by light, which would contribute to the existing adverse effects on nighttime views. Thus, the MVWPSP would result in a considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant impact on nighttime views.</p> <p>The MVWPSP includes Development Standards that require lighting practices and systems that will minimize light pollution, glare, and light trespass, and that conserve energy while maintaining nighttime safety, utility, security and productivity. In addition, the Development Standards include provisions to limit daytime glare by prohibiting reflective materials, requiring roof overhangs to shade large areas of glass, and requiring building orientation and landscaping to screen views of development from surrounding areas.</p> <p>As described above, the standards are enforceable through the design review and permitting process. As such, all lighting standards that address the design of lighting systems would be enforced through the issuance of a permit. In addition, the Development Standards require that the exterior lighting standards be incorporated into the homeowners association (HOA) Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&amp;Rs). Incorporating the standards into the CC&amp;Rs would allow the HOA to enforce standards related to the timing and operation of exterior lighting on an ongoing basis. This analysis does not rely upon the enforcement of the CC&amp;Rs by the HOA, but implementation of the CC&amp;Rs would provide additional benefits to the extent they are implemented and enforced. The Development Standards require the following measures that would reduce light pollution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interior lighting shall be designed to minimize light from spilling outdoors.</li> <li>• Exterior lighting shall use the lowest possible wattage and energy efficient luminaire for</li> </ul>			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>each application; Minimize light use during non-active hours (11PM – dawn), except as needed for safety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exterior lighting shall only illuminate the area needed for safety.</li> <li>• Outdoor light fixtures for streets, commercial and residential buildings, pedestrian areas, and roadways shall be shielded, and/or directed down to preserve the night sky and away from residential areas to minimize light and glare effects on adjacent residences.</li> <li>• Exterior lighting fixtures shall be installed and shielded in such a manner that no light rays are emitted from the fixture at angles above the horizontal plane.</li> <li>• Timers, motion-sensors, or equivalent devices on both residential and commercial buildings, shall be implemented on exterior lighting fixtures at night near buildings, where applicable, to avoid continual lighting of surfaces.</li> <li>• Yellow spectrum light sources, such as low-pressure sodium lamps and narrow-spectrum amber LEDs, shall be used for the majority of outdoor lighting. Other spectrum lighting may be used where necessary for a particular purpose, such as safety.</li> </ul> <p>Because the MVWPSP already includes requirements that would limit light sources to the minimum amount necessary to maintain nighttime safety, utility, security and productivity; no additional mitigation is feasible.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 9-53 to 9-55; Final EIR, p. 2-14; see also Response to Comment, IO18-41 to 43, 50 to 57, and 59 to 75, IO41-19 &amp; 20, 26, and p. B19 of Appendix B to the Draft MVWPSP.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 9-10: Cumulative effects on visual resources during construction</b></p> <p>(LS) Other reasonably foreseeable projects in the project vicinity would likely be constructed during the approximately 20 year construction period for the MVWPSP. These other projects could include the Brockway Campground Project, CalPeco 625 and 650 Electrical Line Upgrade Project, buildout of the Martis Camp neighborhood, the Martis Valley Trail, implementation of the Northstar Mountain</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Master Plan, Northstar at Tahoe Ski Trail Widening, and Caltrans Highway Improvement projects along SR 267. However, because of the approximately 20-year phased construction schedule for the MVWPSP, the amount of construction activity that would coincide with other nearby construction periods would be limited.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 9-55.)</p>			
<b>TRANSPORTATION, PARKING AND CIRCULATION</b>			
<p><b>Impact 10-1: Impacts to intersection operations</b></p> <p>(S) The proposed project would worsen already unacceptable operations (i.e., already beyond the acceptable threshold) at the SR 267/I-80 WB Ramps, SR 267/Schaffer Mill Road/Truckee Airport Road and SR 267/Highlands View Road intersections during the winter peak hour.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 10-27 to 10-28; see also Master Response 5, Response to Comment IO6-2 to 5, IO18-10, 14, 20 to 23, and 26, IO31-25, 32 and 33, IO41-31 to 36, 39, 43, and 44.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 10-1a: Optimize signal timing at the SR 267/I-80 WB ramps intersection</b></p> <p>Prior to the Improvement Plan approval for the initial phase, the project applicant shall coordinate with Caltrans to optimize the traffic signal operation at the SR 267/I-80 WB Ramps intersection. Evidence shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Division and Placer County Department of Public Works that the optimization will be implemented by Caltrans as warranted, or that a good faith effort has been made by the applicant to coordinate with Caltrans.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 10-1b: Optimize signal timing at the SR 267/Schaffer Mill Road/Truckee Airport Road intersection</b></p> <p>Prior to the Improvement Plan approval for the initial phase, the applicant shall coordinate with Caltrans to optimize the traffic signal operation at the SR 267/Schaffer Mill Road/Truckee Airport Road intersection. Evidence shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Division and Placer County Department of Public Works that the optimization will be implemented by Caltrans as warranted, or that a good faith effort has been made by the applicant to coordinate with Caltrans.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 10-1c: Provide signage on Highlands View Road for motorists to access SR 267 NB via Ridgeline Drive and Northstar Drive</b></p> <p>The Improvement Plans for the first development of residential units of the MVWPSP shall show the construction and installation of a message sign on Highlands View Road. The sign shall be</p>	SU	<p><b>Finding:</b> Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report. However, the Board of Supervisors finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the Project's impacts to intersection operations, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Level of Service ("LOS") at three of the intersections on SR 267 between the Town of Truckee/Placer County Line and SR 28 were already unacceptable and would worsen during the Winter peak hour as a result of the Project. Specifically, the LOS would deteriorate from LOS E to F at the SR 267/I-80 WB intersection, the SR 267/Schaffer Mill Road/Truckee Airport Road intersection, and the SR 267/Highlands View Drive intersection. The Project has incorporated Mitigation measures 10-1a, 10-1b, and 10-1c that will lessen these impacts. Specifically, 10-1a and 10-1b require the project applicant to coordinate with Caltrans to optimize the signal light timing at the SR 267/I-80, and SR 267/Schaffer Mill Road/Truckee Airport Road intersections. 10-1c requires the project applicant to provide signage on Highlands View Drive notifying motorists that access to SR 267 northbound is via Ridgeline Drive and Northstar Drive. These mitigation measures will reduce the impacts at the SR 267/Highlands View Drive intersection to a less than significant level, but Placer County cannot guarantee that Caltrans will optimize the signal light timing and therefore the impacts at the SR 267/I-80 WB and SR 267/Schaffer Mill Road/Truckee Airport Road intersections are significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 10-27 to 10-29; see also Master Response 5, Response to Comment IO6-2 to 5, IO18-10, 14, 20-23, and 26, IO31-25, 32 and 33, IO41-31 to 36, 39, 43, and 44.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>located at a sufficient distance from the Ridgeline Drive intersection to alert motorists that access to northbound SR 267 is via Ridgeline Drive (left from Highlands View Road) and Northstar Drive (right from Ridgeline Drive), so as to access the traffic signal at the SR 267/Northstar Drive intersection. The message sign and its use during the winter peak traffic conditions shall be required in perpetuity.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 10-28 to 10-29.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 10-2: Impacts to roadway segments</b></p> <p>(S) The proposed project would worsen traffic congestion on the five SR 267 segments between the Town of Truckee/Placer County Line and SR 28, resulting in a segment either degrading from acceptable LOS D to unacceptable LOS E, or exacerbating conditions on a segment operating at an unacceptable LOS E by an increase in V/C ratio of 0.05 or more, for both the summer and winter peak hours.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 10-29 to 10-30; see also Master Response 5, Response to Comment SA3-1, IO6-2 to 4, IO18-10, 14, 20 to 23, and 26, IO31-25, 27, 32 and 33, IO32-2, IO41-31 to 36, and 39.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 10-2: Pay impact fee to Placer County for future roadway improvements to State Route 267</b></p> <p>Prior to issuance of any building permits for each commercial or residential lot, the project shall be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees in effect for the Tahoe District, pursuant to applicable ordinances and resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) shall be required and shall be paid to the Placer County Department of Public Works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Countywide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code</li> </ul> <p>The current total combined estimated fee for the entire project is \$3,685,511.42 (\$4,846 per single family residential unit). The fees were calculated using the information supplied. If the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid shall be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 10-31 to 10-32.)</p>	SU	<p><b>Finding:</b> Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report. However, the Board of Supervisors finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the Project's impacts to roadway segments, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Project would worsen traffic congestion on the five segments of SR 267 between the Town of Truckee/Placer County Line and SR 28. Specifically, the LOS between the Placer County Line and Schaffer Mill Road would degrade from LOS D to E during the Summer peak hour and the existing LOS E would worsen during the Winter peak hour. The LOS between Schaffer Mill Road and Northstar Drive would degrade from LOS D to E during the Summer peak hour and the existing LOS E would worsen during the Winter peak hour. The existing LOS E between Northstar Drive and Highlands View Drive would worsen during both the Winter and Summer peak hours. The existing LOS E between Highlands View Drive and the Project Access Roadway would worsen during both the Winter and Summer peak hours. Lastly, the existing LOS E from the Project Access Roadway to SR 28 would worsen during both the Winter and Summer peak hours. The project has incorporated mitigation measure 10-2, which will lessen these impacts. Specifically, the Project shall be subject to payment of traffic impact fees to Placer County for future improvements to SR 267. The fees paid by the Project will not cover the costs of making the improvements necessary on SR 267 to reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels. However, the project will pay its "fair share" of those costs. Nevertheless, these impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 10-29 to 10-32; see also Master Response 5, Response to Comment SA3-1, IO6-2 to 4, IO18-10, 14, 20 to 23, and 26, IO31-25, 27, 32 and 33, IO41-31 to 36, and 39.)</p>
<p><b>Impact 10-3: Impacts to freeway facilities</b></p> <p>(LS) The addition of project-generated traffic to</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>existing freeway on- and off-ramps at the SR 267/I-80 interchange would not degrade operations to unacceptable levels during the summer and winter peak hours.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 10-32; see also Master Response 5, Response to Comment IO6-1 to 4, IO18-10, 14, 20 to 23, and 26, IO31-25, 32 and 33, IO41-43 and 44.)</p>			
<p><b>Impact 10-4: Impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities</b></p> <p>The proposed project would not disrupt or interfere with existing or planned bicycle/pedestrian facilities, nor would it result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists or pedestrians. Further, the project would not create an inconsistency with any adopted policies related to bicycle or pedestrian systems.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 10-32; see also Response to Comment IO3-2, IO31-29.)</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>Impact 10-5: Impacts to transit</b></p> <p>(LS) The proposed project would enhance existing transit service on SR 267 with construction of a new bus shelter within the MVWPSP near SR 267. The added transit would not create demand above the current capacity.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 10-33; Final EIR, pp. 2-14 to 2-15; see also, Response to Comment IO18-27, IO31-26, IO41-45 and 46, IO47-2.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 10-5a: Payment of annual transit fees</b></p> <p>Prior to recordation of the initial Large Lot or Small Lot Final Map, the applicant shall establish a new Zone of Benefit (ZOB) within an existing County Service Area (CSA) or annex into a pre-existing ZOB to provide adequate funding of capital and ongoing operational transit services/requirements. The applicant shall submit to the County for review and approval a complete and adequate engineer's report supporting the level of assessments necessary for the establishment of the ZOB. The report shall be prepared by a registered engineer in consultation with a qualified financial consultant and shall establish the basis for the special benefit appurtenant to the project.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 10-5b: Join and maintain membership in the Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Association</b></p> <p>Prior to Improvement Plan approval and/or recordation of the Final Map, the commercial and homeowner associations shall join and maintain membership (at a rate based on the engineering report, per Mitigation Measure 10-5a) in perpetuity in the Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Association</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Although not required to reduce a significant impact, Mitigation measures 10-5a (Payment of Annual Transit Fees) and 10-5b (Join and Maintain Membership in the TNT/TMA) would determine with specificity the project's fair-share annual contribution to ongoing operational transit services and improvements, and would require ongoing participation by the project's commercial and homeowner associations in TNT/TMA to address and improve transit and transportation conditions into the future.</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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>(TNT/TMA), whose established purpose is to improve the general traffic and transportation conditions in the Truckee/North Tahoe area, and to address situations associated with traffic congestion and transportation systems.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 10-33; Final EIR, pp. 2-14 to 2-15; see also, Response to Comment IO18-27, IO41-47 and 48, IO47-2.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 10-6: Construction-related impacts</b></p> <p>(S) Project construction would generate employee and truck trips, which would use segments of SR 267. These activities could cause lane closures, damage to roadways, and increased congestion.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 10-34 to 10-35; see also Response to Comment IO41-51.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 10-6: Develop and implement a construction traffic management plan</b></p> <p>Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the project applicant shall develop and submit for review and approval a construction traffic management plan (TMP) to the satisfaction of the Placer County Department of Public Works and Caltrans. The plan shall include (but not be limited to) items such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• guidance on the number and size of trucks per day entering and leaving the West Parcel development area;</li> <li>• identification of arrival/departure times that would minimize traffic impacts;</li> <li>• locations of staging areas;</li> <li>• locations of employee parking and methods to encourage carpooling and use of alternative transportation;</li> <li>• criteria for use of flaggers and other traffic controls;</li> <li>• preservation of safe and convenient passage for bicyclists and pedestrians through/around construction areas;</li> <li>• monitoring for roadbed damage and timing for completing repairs;</li> <li>• limitations on construction activity during peak/holiday weekends and special events;</li> <li>• preservation of emergency vehicle access;</li> <li>• removing traffic obstructions during emergency evacuation events; and</li> <li>• providing a point of contact for Martis Valley residents and guests to obtain construction information, have questions answered, and convey complaints.</li> </ul>	LS	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 10-6, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the project applicant to develop and submit a traffic management plan. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Project construction activities would generate employee and truck trips along SR 267. These activities could also cause lane closures, damage to roadways, and increased congestion. Mitigation measure 10-6 would require the project applicant to develop a traffic management plan to the satisfaction of Placer County and Caltrans. The plan will provide information to help minimize traffic congestion, damage to roadways, and limit traffic impacting construction activities during peak/holiday weekends and special events. This plan will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 10-34 to 10-36; see also Response to Comment IO41-51.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p><b>Impact 10-7: Safety-related impacts</b></p> <p>(LS) The Project Access Roadway would intersect SR 267 within the chain-controlled segment of the highway. There would be times during winter storms when chain-controls would be in effect on SR 267 and some vehicles leaving the project and entering SR 267 would need to have a safe location to install chains on their vehicles. Because the project would include parking spaces or turnouts outside of the Caltrans right-of-way for the installation of chains before cars exit the project site, and would provide through signage and/or other means (e.g., electronic media) advanced notice of chain-control requirements, the project would not result in an adverse hazard or safety-related impact relative to project design features.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 10-36; see also Response to Comment IO30-1, IO41-50.)</p>	<p>(Draft EIR, pp. 10-35 to 10-36.)</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>Cumulative Impact 10-8: Cumulative impacts to intersection operations</b></p> <p>(S) The proposed project would worsen operations to unacceptable levels or exacerbate already unacceptable operations at the intersections described below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SR 267/I-80 WB Ramps – operations would worsen as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Summer peak hour: LOS D to E (14 second increase in delay)</li> <li>○ Winter peak hour: LOS F operations exacerbated (19 second increase in delay)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SR 267/I-80 EB Ramps – operations would worsen as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Winter peak hour: LOS F operations exacerbated (10 second increase in delay)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SR 267/Brockway Road/Soaring Way – operations would worsen as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Summer peak hour: LOS F operations exacerbated (delay exceeds 200 seconds)</li> <li>○ Winter peak hour: LOS F operations exacerbated (delay exceeds 200 seconds)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SR 267/Schaffer Mill Road/Truckee Airport</li> </ul>	<p><b>Cumulative Mitigation Measure 10-8a: Pay Placer County fee for future roadway improvements, including the SR 267/I-80 WB Ramps intersection</b></p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure 10-2. The Town of Truckee TIF Program identifies the construction of a two-lane roundabout at this location. This improvement would reduce the traffic impact to a less-than-significant level during both the summer and winter peak hour under cumulative-plus-project conditions.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Mitigation Measure 10-8b: Pay Placer County fee for future roadway improvements, including the SR 267/I-80 EB Ramps intersection</b></p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure 10-2. The Truckee TIF Program identifies the construction of a two-lane roundabout at this location. This improvement would reduce the traffic impact to a less-than-significant level during the winter peak hour under cumulative-plus-project conditions.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Mitigation Measure 10-8c: Pay Placer County fee for future roadway improvements, including the SR 267/Brockway Road/Soaring Way intersection</b></p>	<p>SU</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report. However, the Board of Supervisors finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the Project's cumulative impacts to intersection operations, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Project would worsen operations to unacceptable levels or exacerbate already unacceptable operations at six of the intersections on SR 267 between the Town of Truckee/Placer County Line and SR 28. During the Winter peak hour, the current LOS F would be exacerbated at all five existing intersections and LOS F is expected at the SR 267/Project Access Roadway intersection. During the Summer peak hour, the current LOS F would be exacerbated at the SR 267/Brockway Road/Soaring Way, SR 267/Schaffer Mill Road/Truckee Airport Road, and SR 267/Highlands View Drive intersections, and LOS F is expected at the SR 267/Project Access Roadway intersection. Operations at the SR 267/I-80 WB intersection would degrade from LOS D to E during the Summer peak hour. To lessen these effects, the Project is required to implement Cumulative Mitigation Measures 10-8a through 10-8f. Specifically, the Project will provide signage on Highlands View Drive directing motorists to access SR 267 northbound via Ridgeline Drive and Northstar Drive, and shall be subject to payment of traffic impact fees to Placer County for future improvements to SR 267. The fees paid by the Project will</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Road – operations would worsen as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Summer peak hour: LOS F operations exacerbated (delay exceeds 200 seconds)</li> <li>o Winter peak hour: LOS F operations exacerbated (delay exceeds 200 seconds)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SR 267/Highlands View Road – operation would worsen as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Summer peak hour: LOS F operations exacerbated (delay exceeds 200 seconds)</li> <li>o Winter peak hour: LOS F operations exacerbated (delay exceeds 200 seconds)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SR 267/Project Access Roadway – operation would exceed LOS threshold: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Summer peak hour: LOS F operations</li> <li>o Winter peak hour: LOS F operations</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Six of the study intersections would operate at unacceptable LOS F under cumulative conditions with the proposed project, either degrading from an acceptable level of service or substantially exacerbating already unacceptable operations.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp 10-39 to 10-41; see also Master Response 5, Response to Comment SA3-1, IO6-2 to 4, and 8, IO18-23 and 33, IO31-25, 27, 32, and 33, IO41-31 to 37, 39, 43 &amp; 44, and 52.)</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure 10-2. The Truckee TIF Program identifies the construction of a roundabout or equivalent improvements at this intersection. The TIF Program also includes the widening of SR 267 on both sides of this intersection, which would essentially result in a two-lane roundabout at this intersection. This improvement would reduce the traffic impact to a less-than-significant level during the summer and winter peak hour under cumulative-plus-project conditions.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Mitigation Measure 10-8d: Pay Placer County fee for future roadway improvements, including the SR 267/Schaffer Mill Road/Truckee Airport Road intersection</b></p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure 10-2. The Placer County CIP identifies improvements to this intersection as well as the widening of SR 267 to four lanes on both sides of this intersection. The widening of this intersection with either signalization or the construction of a two-lane roundabout would reduce the traffic impact to a less-than-significant level during the summer and winter peak hours under cumulative-plus-project conditions.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Mitigation Measure 10-8e: Provide signage on Highlands View Road and pay Placer County fee for future roadway improvements</b></p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measures 10-1c and 10-2. The Placer County CIP includes the widening of SR 267 to four lanes on both sides of this intersection. The widening of this intersection, along with the project-specific mitigation of providing signage on Highlands View Road for motorists to access SR 267 northbound via Ridgeline Drive and Northstar Drive, would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level during the summer and winter peak hours under cumulative-plus-project conditions.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Mitigation Measure 10-8f: Pay Placer County fee for future roadway improvements, including the SR 267/Project Access Road intersection</b></p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure 10-2. The Placer County CIP includes the widening of SR 267 to</p>		<p>not cover the costs of making the improvements necessary on SR 267 to reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels. However, the project will pay its “fair share” of those costs. In addition, neither the TIF nor the Placer County CIP include widening SR 267 south of Brockway Summit, so SR 267 would remain a two lane road at the Project Access Roadway intersection. Therefore, these impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 10-39 to 10-43; see also Master Response 5, Response to Comment SA3-1, IO6-2 to 4, and 8, IO18-23 and 33, IO31-25, 27, 32, and 33, IO41-31 to 37, 39, 43 &amp; 44, and 52.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>four lanes on both sides of this intersection. Although the widening of this intersection plus the installation of a traffic signal or two-lane roundabout would result in acceptable levels of service. Caltrans would not support either signalization or a roundabout because of the steep grade of SR 267 (over 4 percent) at this location and the resulting potential of rear-end collisions, especially in snowy conditions (Brake, pers. comm., 2015). Therefore, LOS F conditions would remain at this intersection during both the summer and winter peak hours.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp 10-41 to 10-43.)</p>		
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 10-9: Cumulative impacts to roadway segments</b></p> <p>(S) The proposed project would exacerbate already unacceptable operations, as described below.</p> <p>Although widening of SR 267 from two to four lanes from Brockway Road to the Town of Truckee/Placer County line is included in the Town of Truckee TIF Program, and from the County line to Brockway Summit in the Placer County CIP, SR 267 was assumed to remain two lanes under cumulative conditions for reasons described in Section 10.3.5 of the Final EIR. As a two-lane highway, SR 267 would operate at unacceptable levels of service on five of the seven study segments during the summer peak hour without the proposed project, and all seven segments would operate at unacceptable levels of service during the winter peak hour without the proposed project.</p> <p>For the two SR 267 segments located in the Town of Truckee, the project would result in a significant impact on the segment from Brockway Road to the Town of Truckee/Placer County line during the winter peak, as the project would increase the V/C ratio by 0.05 (an increase by 0.05 or more is considered significant).</p> <p>For the five SR 267 roadway segments located in Placer County, the project would result in a significant impact at all five segments during both the summer and winter peak hours, in all cases because it would result in an increase in V/C ratio of 0.05 or greater than segments projected to operate unacceptably without the</p>	<p><b>Cumulative Mitigation Measure 10-9: Pay Placer County fee for future roadway improvements</b></p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure 10-2. The widening of SR 267 to four lanes from Brockway Road to Brockway Summit would result in LOS D or better traffic operations on the study segments from Brockway Road to the Project Access Roadway during the summer and winter peak hours. As previously discussed, the widening of SR 267 to four lanes from Brockway Road to Brockway Summit is identified in both the Town of Truckee TIF Program and the Placer County CIP. The project would pay traffic impact fees that could be used for those portions of SR 267 located within Placer County. The Placer County CIP does not include widening of SR 267 from Brockway Summit to SR 28; therefore, there would be no feasible mitigation for the significant impact of the project on the roadway segment from the Project Access Roadway to SR 28.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 10-43.)</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report. However, the Board of Supervisors finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the Project's cumulative impacts to roadway segments, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Project would worsen traffic congestion on the five SR 267 segments between the Town of Truckee/Placer County Line and SR 28, resulting in a segment either degrading from acceptable LOS D to unacceptable LOS E, or exacerbating conditions on a segment operating at an unacceptable LOS E by an increase in V/C ratio of 0.05 or more, for both the summer and winter peak hours. To lessen these impacts the Project is required to implement Cumulative Mitigation Measure 10-9. Specifically, the Project shall be subject to payment of traffic impact fees ("TIF") to Placer County for future improvements to SR 267. The fees paid by the Project will not cover the costs of making the improvements necessary on SR 267 to reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels. However, the project will pay its "fair share" of those costs. In addition, neither the TIF nor the Placer County CIP include widening SR 267 south of Brockway Summit, so SR 267 would remain a two lane road at the Project Access Roadway intersection. Therefore, these impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 10-37, 10-43 to 10-44; see also Master Response 5, Response to Comment SA3-1, IO6-2 to 4, IO18-23 and 33, IO31-25, 27, 32 and 33, IO41-31 to 37, 39, 43 &amp; 44, and 52.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>project.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 10-37, 10-43 to 10-44; see also Master Response 5, Response to Comment SA3-1, IO6-2 to 4, IO18-23 and 33, IO31-25, 27, 32 and 33, IO32-2, IO41-31 to 37, 39, 43 &amp; 44, and 52.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 10-10: Cumulative impacts to freeway facilities</b></p> <p>(LS) The freeway facilities analyzed in the EIR are expected to operate at acceptable levels of service under cumulative conditions. The addition of project generated traffic to the cumulative no project conditions freeway on- and off-ramps at the SR 267/I-80 interchange would not degrade operations to unacceptable levels during the summer and winter peak hours.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 10-45; see also Master Response 5, Response to Comment IO6-1, IO18-23 and 33, IO31-25, 32 and 33, IO41-31 to 36, 39, 43 &amp; 44, and 52.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Cumulative Impact 10-11: Cumulative impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities</b></p> <p>(LS) As noted under Existing Plus Project Impact 10-4, the proposed project would include pavement width for a Class II bike lane through the intersection of the project access and SR 267, as well as new multi-purpose trails to provide connections between MVWSP neighborhoods and commercial and recreational amenities. Approximately 14 miles of trails are proposed within the West Parcel, which would connect to existing and planned trails that would be constructed under cumulative conditions, including the Martis Valley Trail, the Tompkins Memorial Trail, and the Tahoe Rim Trail, providing access for residents and guests to the broader regional trails network. Class II bike lanes through the intersection of the project access and SR 267 would connect with the planned class II bike lanes on SR 267 from Truckee to Kings Beach identified in the Placer County Regional Bikeway Plan. Future projects are not expected to disrupt the construction of planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and this would be a less-than-significant cumulative impact. The proposed project would not disrupt or interfere with the implementation of planned</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>bicycle/pedestrian facilities as noted in the Placer County Regional Bikeway Plan, nor would it result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists or pedestrians. Further, the project would not create an inconsistency with any adopted policies related to bicycle or pedestrian systems.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 10-45; see also Response to Comment IO31-29.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 10-12: Cumulative impacts to transit</b></p> <p>(LS) As noted in the Existing Plus Project Impact 10-5, the proposed project would enhance transit with the construction of a bus shelter onsite near SR 267. Because the project would result in only one additional stop, any increase in the travel time of the transit route would be modest. Future transit ridership capacity would be dictated by the peak transit demand occurring in the winter season on the TART SR 267 route between Truckee and Crystal Bay. Any additional transit demand generated by the project could add to the cumulative need for additional winter peak-hour transit capacity. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 10-5a (Payment of Annual Transit Fees) and Mitigation Measure 10-5b (Join and Maintain Membership in the TNT/TMA) would contribute to the increase in transit service to meet future transit demand.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 10-45 to 10-46.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Cumulative Impact 10-13: Cumulative safety-related impacts</b></p> <p>(LS) As noted in the Existing Plus Project Impact 10-7, the proposed project would provide advanced notice of chain requirements, and space outside of Caltrans right-of-way and the main project access road easement for the installation of chains before cars exit the project site. Future nearby projects could result in additional cars entering and exiting SR 267 during chain-controlled conditions. Cars would be required to be equipped with chains or automatic traction devices, as described under Impact 10-7, on any portion of a highway that is signed for such a requirement. Residents and visitors residing and visiting chain-controlled areas during the winter would be expected to comply with existing laws and regulations and</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>could be cited by the California Highway Patrol if they are not in compliance with the California Vehicle Code and Caltrans chain-control direction. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be less than significant. The project would not result in a substantial increase in hazards due to design features or incompatible users under cumulative conditions.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 10-46.)</p>			
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>			
<p><b>Impact 11-1: Short-term, construction-generated emissions of ROG, NOX, PM10, and PM2.5</b></p> <p>(S) Short-term, construction-generated emissions would not exceed PCAPCD's threshold for ROG or PM10; however, NOX emissions would exceed PCAPCD's significance threshold during Phase 0 in 2017 and the overlap between construction phases in 2018. Thus, short-term construction emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors could violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and/or conflict with air quality planning efforts.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 11-13 to 11-16.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 11-1a: Reduce short-term construction-related NOX emissions</b></p> <p>The project applicant shall comply with the following measures onsite during construction activities to reduce emissions of NOX:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The prime construction contractor shall submit to PCAPCD a comprehensive inventory (e.g., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that would be used for 40 or more hours, in aggregate, during a construction season. If any new equipment is added after submission of the inventory, the prime contractor shall contact PCAPCD before the new equipment is used. At least three business days before the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide PCAPCD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, name, and phone number of the property owner, project manager, and onsite foreman.</li> <li>Before approval of Grading or Improvement Plans, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall submit for PCAPCD approval, a written calculation demonstrating that the heavy-duty (&gt; 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent reduction in NOX emissions as compared to ARB statewide fleet average emissions. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. The calculation</li> </ul>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measures 11-1a, 11-1b, and 11-1c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring PCAPCD Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutant emissions during construction below applicable standards. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Construction emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2013.2 computer program. Modeling found that NOX emissions would exceed the PCAPCD's significance threshold during Phase 0 in 2017 and the overlap between construction phases in 2018. Mitigation Measures 11-1a, 11-1b, and 11-1c would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Specifically, 11-1a would require the Project to achieve project wide fleet-average 20 percent reduction in NOX emissions compared to ARB statewide fleet average emissions, limit idling of diesel powered equipment to a maximum of 5 minutes, and use existing power sources or clear fuel to the extent feasible. 11-1b would require the project applicant to participate in PCAPCD's Land Use Air Quality Mitigation Fund. Finally, 11-1c requires the applicant to submit a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan to the PCAPCD for approval prior to breaking ground. This plan will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 11-13 to 11-18; Final EIR, p. 2-15; see also Response to Comment LA5-1.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>shall be provided using PCAPCD's Construction Mitigation Calculator.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During construction the contractor shall use existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel (e.g., gasoline, biodiesel, natural gas) generators rather than temporary diesel power generators to the extent feasible.</li> <li>• During construction, the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel powered equipment.</li> <li>• Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas of the construction site to remind off-road equipment operators that idling is limited to a maximum of 5 minutes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 11-1b: Participate in PCAPCD's Land Use Air Quality Mitigation Fund</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant shall participate in PCAPCD's offsite mitigation program, the Land Use Air Quality Mitigation Fund, by paying the equivalent amount of fees for the project's contribution of NOX that exceeds the 82 lbs/day threshold, or the equivalent as approved by PCAPCD. The applicable fee rates of the program change over time. The actual amount to be paid shall be determined, and satisfied per current guidelines, at the time of approval of the Grading or Improvement Plans.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 11-1c: Submit Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan to PCAPCD</b></p> <p>Prior to approval of grading or improvement plans for subsequent phases of the MVWPSP, on project sites greater than one acre, the applicant shall submit a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District. Construction contractors shall not break ground prior to receiving District approval of the Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan, and delivering that approval to the County.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 11-16 to 11-18; Final EIR, p. 2-15; see also Response to Comment LA5-1.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 11-2: Long-term, operation-related (regional) emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors</b></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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>(LS) Operation of the MWWPSP under full buildout would not exceed the PCAPCD significance threshold for ROG, NOX, or PM10. Thus, long-term operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors would not violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and/or conflict with air quality planning efforts.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 11-18 to 11-19.)</p>			
<p><b>Impact 11-3: Mobile-source CO concentrations</b></p> <p>(LS) Though buildout of the MWWPSP would result in additional vehicle trips on the surrounding roadway network, project operation would not result in increases in traffic such that quantitative screening criteria for local CO emissions would be triggered. Therefore, the project would not result in increased concentrations of CO that would expose sensitive receptors to unhealthy levels.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 11-20 to 11-21.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Impact 11-4: Exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs</b></p> <p>(LS) Construction-related activities would result in short-term project-generated emissions of diesel PM, but even during the most intense construction year, construction activities would not generate large amounts of exhaust emissions of PM2.5 and would not result in substantial emissions of diesel PM. Furthermore, onsite receptors, which include people that would be living on site during construction, would not be affected because construction activities that would occur every construction season during the buildout period would not take place in the same locations and would occur over short construction seasons. The closest offsite receptors are over a mile away and would not be exposed to substantial concentrations of diesel PM from the project. TACs associated with long-term operations of the MWWPSP would also be minimal and limited because of the small amount of commercial uses proposed that would generate diesel PM. Therefore, levels of TACs from project-related construction and operations</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

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 not result in health risk exposures at offsite and onsite sensitive receptors.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 11-21 to 11-23.)</p>			
<p><b>Impact 11-5: Exposure of sensitive receptors to odors</b></p> <p>(LS) The project would introduce new odor sources into the area through diesel exhaust emissions from delivery trucks and snow removal equipment. However, these types of odor sources would be limited and infrequent because of the small scale and types of commercial uses proposed. Also, the MWWPSP would not locate land uses in close proximity to any existing odor sources. The sewer lift station, if built, would be placed underground or enclosed to control odors.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 11-23 to 11-24.)</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>Cumulative Impact 11-6: Cumulative emissions of ozone precursors</b></p> <p>(CS) The nonattainment designation of Placer County with respect to ozone is the result of the emissions of ozone precursors, ROG and NOX, generated by cumulative development projects in the region, as well as from transport of these same pollutants from outside the region. When all sources of ROG and NOX throughout the region are combined they can result in a severe ozone problem, as expressed by the nonattainment status with respect to the CAAQS and/or NAAQS for ozone, which is considered to be a significant cumulative impact.</p> <p>As described in Impact 11-1, NOX emissions during project construction would exceed PCAPCD's significance threshold for project-specific impacts. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 11-1a and 11-1b NOX emissions would be reduced, and construction of the project would not generate emissions of ozone precursors that exceed PCAPCD's mass emission thresholds for project-specific impacts. Mitigation Measure 11-1a includes a menu of actions that, in combination, would reduce the project's net emissions of NOX during construction by 20 percent. Because mitigated emissions would still exceed the PCAPCD NOX threshold during the first two phases of construction, the applicant would be required to</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 11-6: Reduce long-term operation-related ROG and NOX emissions</b></p> <p>Participate in the PCAPCD Offsite Mitigation Program by paying fees based on the project's contribution of pollutants (ROG and NOX), as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant shall pay \$219 per residential unit to the PCAPCD's Offsite Mitigation Program (total fee due is \$166,144) to offset 6.35 tons of ROG and 2.75 tons of NOx. The payment of the fee shall be apportioned based on the number of residential lots created per each small lot final map and shall be due prior to each final map approval.</li> </ul> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 11-24 to 11-25, Final EIR, p. 2-19; see also Response to Comment LA5-2 and 3.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 11-6, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the applicant to participate in PCAPCD's Offsite Mitigation Program to offset the Project's ROG and NOx emissions. 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Operation of the project would exceed PCAPCD's cumulative impact threshold of 10 lbs. per day for ROG and NOX. Implementation Mitigation Measure 11-6 would require the project applicant to pay \$219 per residential unit to the PCAPCD's Offsite Mitigation Program, prior each small lot final map approval, to offset the Project's ROG and NOx emissions. This plan will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 11-24 to 11-25, Final EIR, p. 2-19; see also Response to Comment LA5-2 and 3.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>pay a fee towards PCAPCD's Land Use Air Quality Mitigation Fund, as outlined in Mitigation Measure 11-1b. By providing an in-lieu fee toward this fund, the proposed project's daily emissions of NOX would be offset below the recommended threshold of 82 lbs. per day. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts during construction would be mitigated through implementation of Mitigation Measures 11-1a and 11-1b.</p> <p>Long-term, operation-related emissions for the proposed project would not exceed PCAPCD's significance threshold for ROG, NOX, or PM10 for project-specific impacts. However, operation-related emissions of ROG and NOX would exceed PCAPCD's cumulative impact threshold of 10 lbs. per day. At buildout, project operation would emit 39.9 lbs. per day of NOX and 79 lbs. per day of ROG during the summer ozone season and 41.0 lbs. per day of NOX and 79 lbs. per day of ROG during the winter season. Total development proposed under the project would be within overall development allowable by current zoning and the land use designations established in the County General Plan. This is noteworthy because the amount of development anticipated by the County General Plan, as well as the general plans of other counties and cities located in the region, is used to inform air quality planning efforts, including the Ozone Attainment Plan. However, operational emissions of ozone precursors, ROG and NOX, would be substantially higher than PCAPCD's cumulative impact threshold of 10 lbs. per day. Thus, this impact would be cumulatively significant.</p> <p>It is important to note that while construction and operational activities of subsequent phases would overlap, PCAPCD has indicated that the two activities should be treated separately and emissions from both activities should not be considered together when compared with the thresholds. This is meant to allow that construction and operational activities be appropriately mitigated, as necessary (Green, pers. comm., 2015).</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 11-24.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 11-7: Cumulative emissions of particulate matter</b></p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002;</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>(LS) Placer County is designated as attainment/unclassified with respect to the NAAQS for particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less (PM10) but as nonattainment with respect to the CAAQS. Like ozone, PM10 has a similar cumulative, regional emphasis when particulate matter emitted by multiple projects are entrained into the atmosphere and build to unhealthful levels over time. Emissions of PM10 from both project construction and operation were determined to be less than significant as discussed in Impact 11-1 and because operations would not exceed PCAPCD's recommended threshold of 82 lbs./day as discussed under Impact 11-2. The threshold of 82 lbs./day is considered to represent the allowable incremental contribution of PM10 by a project while still progressing toward overall attainment within Placer County. Because emissions-generating construction activity would be short-term and intermittent, and because most of the operational emissions of PM10 would be from mobile sources and therefore dispersed among area roadways, project-generated emissions of PM10 would not be cumulatively considerable.</p> <p>Construction-generated PM10, however, also has the potential to cause significant local problems during periods of dry conditions accompanied by high winds, and during periods of heavy earth disturbing activities. PM10 may have cumulative local impacts if, for example, several grading or earth-moving projects are underway simultaneously at nearby sites. Of the reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects (Draft EIR Chapter 11, Table 11-2), only construction of the Brockway Campground Project and Northstar Highlands Phase II could involve substantial earth moving and PM10 emissions in close proximity to construction that would take place under the MVWPSP and be constructed at the same time. However, the Brockway Campground Project, which proposes to develop campsites and associated facilities, would require relatively minor earth disturbance; major grading, excavation, and utility construction is not anticipated. Dust emissions from the Northstar Highlands Phase II would likely have dissipated because the project is 3 miles away from the MVWPSP area. Additional project construction would</p>			<p>CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

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>comply with dust regulations as outlined by PCAPCD Rule 228 and other projects would be required to do the same. Therefore, even if some construction of the land uses proposed under the MVWPSP occurred simultaneously with the Brockway Campground Project and Northstar Highlands Phase II, and PM10 from the MVWPSP area reached a local sensitive receptor concurrently with PM10 generated by construction of the other projects, the contribution from the MVWPSP would be minor and would not make a substantial contribution to the cumulative PM10 emissions.</p> <p>Because project-generated PM10 emissions would not interfere with progress toward overall attainment of the CAAQS and NAAQS for PM10 within Placer County, or contribute to high localized concentrations in combination with simultaneous, nearby construction projects, they would not be cumulatively considerable and therefore would be less than significant.</p> <p>Placer County is designated as attainment/unclassified with respect to the CAAQS for PM2.5 and nonattainment-partial with respect to the NAAQS for PM2.5. Because PCAPCD does not recommend a mass emission thresholds for evaluating PM2.5 emissions but does so for PM10, the analysis of PM2.5 generally follows the analysis of PM10. For the reasons described above for PM10, the project would not make a significant contribution to a significant regional or local cumulative PM2.5 impact</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 11-25 to 11-26.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 11-8: Cumulative exposure to mobile-source carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations</b></p> <p>(LS) As stated under Impact 11-3, mobile-source carbon monoxide (CO) generation is less of a concern today as in prior decades; CO has been reduced to such an extent by modern vehicles and the total state vehicle fleet that CO "hotspots" (CO emissions above air quality standards adopted for the purpose of protecting against exposure concentrations that can affect oxygen levels in blood leading to chronic and acute health risks, see Draft EIR Chapter 11, Table 11-1) are rare. The potential for hotspots</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

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 associated with large, highly congested intersections, such as at two major, multi-lane highways. Under future conditions, when traffic from cumulative development is considered (see Cumulative Impacts to Intersection Operations from Chapter 10, "Transportation"), six signalized intersections, SR 267/I-80 Westbound (WB) Ramps, SR 267/I-80 Eastbound (EB) Ramps, SR 267/Brockway Road/Soaring Way, SR 267/Schaffer Mill Road/Truckee Airport Road, SR 267/Highland View Road, and SR 267/Project Access Roadway (Plus Project Only), would operate at maximum acceptable levels of service. However, SR 267 itself is a two-lane highway with turn pockets at intersections to roads or ramps that are one or two lanes. Therefore, these intersections are not indicative of the type of intersection that would experience a CO hotspot, given it has one travel lane and turn pockets in each direction. The volume of traffic at these intersections would not be sufficient to create a CO hotspot.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 11-26.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 11-9: Cumulative emissions of sensitive receptors to toxic air Contaminants</b></p> <p>(LS) As stated under Impact 11-4, the project would not generate significant health risks associated with toxic air contaminants; it would not expose any single receptor to a level of cancer risk that exceeds an incremental increase of 10 in one million, or to a non-carcinogenic Hazard Index of 1. This conclusion is based on the fact that construction generated emissions of diesel PM would be short-term and intermittent, and would not occur for an extended period of time near any potential onsite receptors. Also, back-up diesel generators would only be operated during power failures and periodic testing and idling time of delivery trucks would be limited to 5 minutes by the California airborne toxics control measure incorporated in Title 13, Section 2485 of CCR. The same conclusion would apply to diesel PM emissions associated with the construction of other residential development projects outlined in Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-2. Brockway Campground Project and Northstar Highlands Phase II could involve 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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>use of diesel equipment that would generate diesel PM emissions in close proximity to construction that would take place under the MVWPSP and be constructed at the same time. However, the Brockway Campground Project would require fairly minimal construction activities to build 600 campsites and the Northstar Highlands Phase II project is 3 miles away—a distance sufficient to allow substantial PM dispersal and dilution. Also, the use of off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment would occur only during construction, which would be limited to the period between May 1 and October 15 of each construction year. Other projects would also be subject to such construction period limitations. Therefore, project-generated emissions of diesel PM would not make a significant contribution to a significant cumulative impact, if one were to occur. For the reasons described above, it is not anticipated that the levels of health risk exposure from the proposed MVWPSP, in combination with health risk exposure of any other toxic air contaminant-emitting sources, would reach levels which would be considered a significant cumulative impact.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 11-26 to 11-27.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 11-10: Cumulative emissions of sensitive receptors to odors</b></p> <p>(LS) The project would not generate significant odors, as discussed under Impact 11-5. There are no existing facilities in the project vicinity typically considered as sources of objectionable odors such as wastewater treatment facilities, landfills, food processing facilities, and livestock operations. While a sewer lift station might be constructed in the northeast portion of the project site, near SR 267 and at the edge of where residential development is proposed, it would either be placed underground in a large manhole/vault or would be enclosed in an aboveground structure, which would provide both noise attenuation and odor control. None of the cumulative projects identified in Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-2 include land uses that would generate objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people or that would travel far enough to interact with other potential odor sources. There are no facilities or activities in the vicinity of the MVWPSP project site that would interact to create a significant</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>

372

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>cumulative odor impact, and neither the proposed project nor reasonably foreseeable future projects would generate objectionable odors that would change this condition.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 11-27.)</p>			
<b>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE</b>			
<p><b>Impact 12-1: Construction-generated greenhouse gas emissions</b></p> <p>(LS) Annual GHG emissions from project construction would range from a low of 431 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to a high of 1,070 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e over an estimated 16 year period. Peak-year construction-generated GHG emissions would not exceed PCAPCD's recommended Tier I mass emission threshold of 1,100 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e, and in most years, would be well below the threshold. Therefore, GHG emissions from project-related construction would not be substantial.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 12-11 to 12-12; see also Master Response 7, Response to Comment IO41-56.)</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>Impact 12-2: Operational greenhouse gas emissions</b></p> <p>(PS) Annual GHG emissions from project operation would exceed the Tier I mass-emission threshold of 1,100 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/year. GHG emissions would be substantial when the MVWPSP is built out. Therefore, operation of the Specific Plan has the potential to result in a substantial contribution to GHG emissions.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 12-13 to 12-16, Final EIR, pp. 2-20 to 2-25; see also Master Response 6 and 7, Response to Comment RA1-1 to 3, IO41-56 to 63.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 12-2: Implement ongoing operational greenhouse gas review and reduction program</p> <p>The state legislature or Governor's Office may establish new GHG targets or other programs or metrics that apply both before and after 2020, as discussed in the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan, released by ARB in May 2014 (and discussed above in Section 12.2.2) and in response to CBD v CDFW as it relates to connecting Scoping Plan targets to individual projects. Any projects processed by the County will be required to reduce, to the extent needed and feasible, GHG emissions such that the project operates within the targets or adopted plan established at the time the project is submitted for approval, as explained below.</p> <p>The County shall require the following actions for all MVWPSP subdivision maps submitted for approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In consultation with the PCAPCD and Placer County, the applicant shall demonstrate, based on currently adopted regulations and industry-accepted GHG calculation methods, whether operation of the project would be</li> </ul>	<p>SU</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report. However, the Board of Supervisors finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the Project's impacts to greenhouse gas emissions, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Project would exceed the Tier I mass-emission threshold of 1,100 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/year. GHG emissions would be substantial when the MVWPSP is built out, and has the potential to result in a substantial contribution to GHG emissions. To lessen this potentially significant effect, the Project is required to implement Mitigation Measure 12-2, which will require the project applicant to demonstrate consistency with GHG targets or plans adopted by the state when submitting subdivision maps. If the project does not meet the GHG targets, additional feasible mitigation measures will be required, though the Project can choose from the options listed in Mitigation Measure 12-2, as long as the overall target is met. However, given the 20-year buildout, it is unknown whether the project would achieve threshold targets because they do not yet exist and it would be speculative to assume what they might be and what regulations may be in place to help achieve them. Therefore, this impact is considered potentially significant and unavoidable.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>consistent with GHG targets adopted by the State. "Adopted" means that a specific GHG reduction target, such as that currently specified in the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (achieve 1990 levels by 2020), is required by state legislative action, state administrative action, by legislative action of Placer County, or an applicable qualified Climate Action Plan or similar GHG reduction plan approved by Placer County. The target or plan shall be based on a substantiated linkage between the project (or Placer County projects in general if a countywide qualified GHG reduction plan is approved) and statewide GHG reduction goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the project achieves or exceeds the reduction target or plan, no further actions shall be required.</li> <li>• If the project does not meet the target, then measures shall be incorporated into the project to reduce GHG emissions to the target or plan level and to the extent feasible. Emissions reductions provided by these measures shall be calculated to determine if targets can be achieved. These measures may include any combination of GHG reduction actions needed to achieve the target, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Actions specified in MWWPSP Section 7.9, "Air Quality &amp; Climate Change" but with mandated actions (instead of "should" or "encourage" the actions, use "shall"). A project can choose from the options shown below as long as the overall target is met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Requiring that all buildings exceed Title 24 energy-efficiency requirements by 15 percent.</li> <li>▪ All new residential buildings shall meet or exceed the guidelines for the California ENERGY STAR® Homes Program (Policy ER-AQ5).</li> <li>▪ Selecting a building's orientation, massing and fenestration design to maximize effective day lighting to reduce building energy requirements, without increasing glare and/or electric lighting loads that off set glare is required. The selection and extent of window glazing should vary, depending</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p>(Draft EIR, pp. 12-13 to 12-17, Final EIR, pp. 2-20 to 2-27; see also Master Response 6 and 7, Response to Comment RA1-1 to 3, IO41-56 to 63.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>on the criteria required by the window's location, including solar heat gain, energy performance, day lighting, views and glare factors. Exterior sun controls (including porches, overhangs, trellises, balconies and shutters) shall be integrated into the building's fenestration design to effectively admit and block sun penetration as required (Policy ER-AQ6).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Retain a Commissioning Agent (a professional qualified to evaluate and certify that a building is designed, constructed and functions in accordance with the building's specified operational requirements). Owners may choose to have the Commissioning Agent produce a re-commissioning manual for the building to assure it continues to meet established standards such as energy conservation and indoor air quality (Policy ER-AQ11).</li> <li>▪ Efforts to reduce and recycle construction waste are required as well as regional procurement of construction materials when feasibly possible in order to reduce transport (Policy ER-AQ14).</li> <li>▪ Installation of state-of-the-art energy efficient interior lighting (Policy ER-AQ17).</li> <li>▪ Commercial retail buildings shall use automatic fixture sensors and low-consumption fixtures (Policy ER-AQ19).</li> <li>○ Payment of GHG offset fees to an ARB-approved GHG reduction program. Project applicant will consent to any GHG reduction fees that may be applicable after January 1, 2020.</li> </ul> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 12-16 to 12-17, Final EIR, pp. 2-25 to 2-27; see also Master Response 7, Response to Comment IO41-63.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 12-3: Impacts of climate change on the project</b></p> <p>(LS) Climate change is projected to result in a variety of effects that would influence conditions in the MVWPSP project area including increased temperatures, leading to increased</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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>wildland fire risk; changes to timing and intensity of precipitation, resulting in increased stormwater runoff and flood risk; and changes to snowpack conditions that could be more conducive to avalanche formation. However, there are numerous programs and policies in place to protect against and respond to wildland fire, as well as to protect new land uses and facilities from flooding and avalanche exposure.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 12-17 to 12-19.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 12-4: Cumulative greenhouse gas emissions</b></p> <p>(PS) The discussions of GHG emissions generated by construction and operation of the MVWPSP under Impacts 12-1 and 12-2 are inherently cumulative. GHG emissions from one project cannot, on its own, result in changes in climatic conditions; therefore, the emissions from one project must be considered in the context of their contribution to cumulative global emissions. The analyses above concludes that the level of GHG emissions generated by the project would not conflict with the ARB Climate Change Scoping Plan (ARB 2011) and First Scoping Plan Update (ARB 2014b), which contain the strategies California will implement to achieve the GHG reduction goals mandated by AB 32. However, MVWPSP buildout would not occur until after 2020, the horizon year for AB 32, and additional and stricter GHG target levels may be adopted. Important factors are not currently known, such as the GHG emissions target in effect at the time that projects are submitted after 2020; the effectiveness of regulatory actions already adopted as part of the implementation of AB 32 (effectiveness has been calculated, but the update to the First Scoping Plan Update suggests they may be more effective than needed to achieve 2020 target levels); and the potential for new regulations and their effectiveness. Therefore, it would be speculative to determine that GHG impacts, if they were to occur, would be feasibly mitigated to any future adopted GHG targets beyond 2020. For this reason, and because the MVWPSP would generate substantial GHG emissions, the project contribution to cumulative GHG emissions would be considerable.</p>	<p>No feasible mitigation is available.</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report. However, the Board of Supervisors finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the Project's cumulative greenhouse gas emissions impacts, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> As discussed above, the Project would exceed the GHG efficiency-based Tier I threshold. Project phasing is expected to take 20 years and it would be speculative to determine that the Project GHG emissions would be sufficiently mitigated to meet the emissions reduction targets that may be in place. To lessen this potentially significant effect, the Project is required to implement Mitigation Measure 12-2, which will require the project applicant to demonstrate consistency with GHG targets adopted by the state when submitting subdivision maps. If the project does not meet the GHG targets, additional feasible mitigation measures will be required. Nevertheless, because the GHG targets and implementing regulations are unknown at this time, and because the Project would emit a substantial level of GHG emissions, this impact is considered potentially significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 12-19, Final EIR, pp. 2-20 to 2-27; see also Master Response 6 and 7, Response to Comment RA1-1 to 3, IO41-56 to 63.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
(Draft EIR, p. 12-19; see also Master Response 6 and 7, Response to Comment RA1-1 to 3, IO41-56 to 63.)			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 12-5: Cumulative impacts of climate change on the project</b></p> <p>(LS) The discussion of the impacts of climate change on the project under Impact 12-3 concludes that the MVWPSP would include sufficient design features to increase the development's resiliency to elevated risk of wildfires, flooding, and avalanches that may become more prevalent with climate change. Because the MVWPSP contains goals and policies that enhance its resiliency to these potential effects from climate change, buildout of the MVWPSP would not make a considerable contribution to any potential significant cumulative impact related to the effects of climate change on existing and future projects.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 12-19.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)
<b>NOISE</b>			
<p><b>Impact 13-1: Construction noise impacts</b></p> <p>(S) The project site is currently undeveloped and no sensitive land uses currently exist in close proximity to proposed construction areas. However, as development under the MVWPSP is constructed, new sensitive receptors may be located adjacent to, or in close proximity to, ongoing construction. Because road construction, site preparation (including potential blasting, if any), and utilities installation would occur in the initial phases of the project and before the construction and occupancy of residences, there would be no impact from these activities on future sensitive receptors. Although daytime construction noise is exempt by the Placer County municipal code and a majority of the construction would take place during the exempt hours, construction activities would occur for an extended period of time, would be located in close proximity to future planned sensitive receptors, and would result in relatively high noise levels, with temporary increases over ambient noise levels. For these reasons, construction-related noise during the daytime (Placer County exempted hours) may result in excessive noise levels that disturb future sensitive receptors.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 13-1: Implement construction-noise reduction measures</b></p> <p>To minimize noise levels during construction activities, construction contractors shall comply with the following measures during construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All construction equipment and equipment staging areas shall be located as far as possible from nearby noise-sensitive land uses.</li> <li>• All construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation.</li> <li>• When future noise-sensitive uses are within close proximity to noise-generating construction activity that will take place for more than three days, noise attenuating buffers such as structures, truck trailers, temporary noise curtains or sound walls, or soil piles shall be located between noise sources and the receptor to shield sensitive receptors from construction noise. The sound barrier, whatever the type, shall be tall</li> </ul>	LS	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 13-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring noise reduction equipment, including mufflers and barriers, and notification to nearby noise-sensitive land uses. 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Construction of Phase 0 of the project would not result in noise impacts because the site is currently undeveloped and there are no noise-sensitive land uses in close proximity. As the project gets built out, construction activities would occur for extended periods of time near future noise-sensitive land uses. Mitigation Measure 13-1 would substantially lessen this impact to less-than-significant by requiring equipment be located as far as possible from noise-sensitive land uses, the use and proper maintenance of mufflers and engine shrouds on construction equipment. Mitigation Measure 13-1 also requires the use of noise barriers when construction activities occur within close proximity to noise-sensitive land uses and notification to those noise-sensitive land uses when construction activities will occur nearby. This plan will reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p>

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

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
(Draft EIR, pp. 13-14 to 13-17.)	<p>enough to block the line of site between the noise sources and the affected receptors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least one week before the beginning of each construction phase written notification of construction activities shall be provided to all noise-sensitive receptors located within 2,500 feet of construction activities. Additional notifications shall be provided if there are substantive changes in construction operations or noise generating activities (e.g., need for nighttime construction, special notice for blasting). Notification shall include anticipated dates and hours during which construction activities are anticipated to occur and contact information, including a daytime telephone number, for the project representative to be contacted in the event that noise levels are deemed excessive.</li> </ul> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 13-17.)</p>		(Draft EIR, pp. 13-14 to 13-17.)
<p><b>Impact 13-2: Short-term construction vibration impacts</b></p> <p>(LS) Blasting could be required if a rock outcropping or shallow bedrock were encountered that could not be avoided. Vibration levels from blasting activities could result in structural damage and/or human disturbances at distances within 250 feet of blasting activities. However, there are no existing sensitive receptors or structures located within this distance to the project site or any area within the site. Further, blasting would only occur during the initial phases of site preparation and therefore would not occur in close proximity to future planned development. Therefore, blasting would not result in structural damage to existing or future buildings or vibration impacts to existing or future sensitive receptors.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 13-17 to 13-18.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Impact 13-3: Exposure of new sensitive receptors to existing and new operational stationary noise sources</b></p> <p>(PS) The project would result in the development of a mix of residential and commercial/retail land uses, including new noise-sensitive receptors (e.g., single- and multi-family residences, condominiums). Existing ambient noise would not exceed Placer County</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 13-3: Reduce noise exposure to future sensitive receptors from new stationary noise sources</b></p> <p>At the time of the permit application that includes any stationary sources of noise, the project applicant shall demonstrate that noise levels will meet applicable County standards at the nearest existing or planned sensitive receptor (e.g., residence). This may be done by providing the</p>	LS	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 13-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by development and implement measures that would ensure noise levels from operations do not exceed applicable thresholds. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>land use noise standards for this type of development; therefore, new sensitive receptors would not be exposed to excessive noise levels from existing sources. However, new sensitive receptors would be located in close proximity to new stationary noise sources (e.g., HVAC units, electrical generators, parking lots) associated with development of the MVWPSP, which could expose these receptors to noise in excess of allowable noise levels.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 13-19 to 13-21.)</p>	<p>specifications of the noise source and/or a noise study to the County. In addition, the following measures shall be implemented to reduce the effect of noise levels generated by onsite stationary noise sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Routine testing and preventive maintenance of emergency electrical generators shall be conducted during the less sensitive daytime hours (i.e., 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.), per the Placer County Noise Ordinance. All electrical generators shall be equipped with noise control (e.g., muffler) devices in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.</li> <li>• External mechanical equipment, including HVAC units, associated with buildings shall incorporate features designed to reduce noise emissions below the stationary noise source criteria (i.e., 50 dB Ldn exterior / 45 dB Ldn interior, exterior daytime [7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.] standards of 55 dB Leq/ 70 dB Lmax and the exterior nighttime [10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.] standards of 45 dB Leq / 65 dB Lmax). These features may include, but are not limited to, locating equipment within equipment rooms or enclosures that incorporate noise reduction features, such as acoustical louvers, and exhaust and intake silencers. Equipment enclosures shall be oriented so that major openings (i.e., intake louvers, exhaust) are directed away from nearby noise-sensitive receptors.</li> <li>• Loading docks shall be located and designed so that noise emissions do not exceed the stationary noise source criteria described in this analysis (i.e., 50 dB Ldn exterior / 45 dB Ldn interior, exterior daytime [7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.] standards of 55 dB Leq/ 70 dB Lmax and the exterior nighttime [10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.] standards of 45 dB Leq / 65 dB Lmax) at any existing or planned sensitive receptor. At the time of conformity review application submittal for discretionary entitlement, the project applicant shall provide to the County a specialized noise study to evaluate specific design and ensure compliance with Placer County noise standards. Reduction of loading dock noise can be achieved by locating loading docks as far away as possible from noise-sensitive land uses, constructing noise barriers between loading docks and noise-sensitive</li> </ul>		<p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Operations and maintenance of the project could result in operational noise sources near future noise-sensitive land uses, including HVAC systems, cooling towers/evaporative condensers, loading docks, lift stations, and emergency generators. Mitigation Measure 13-3 addresses this impact by requiring design features to reduce operation noise impacts, such as acoustical louvers, exhaust and intake silencers, and using building design to place operational noise sources as far away as possible from noise-sensitive land uses. This plan will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 13-19 to 13-22.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>land uses, or using buildings and topographic features to provide acoustic shielding for noise-sensitive land uses. Final design, location, and orientation shall be dictated by findings in the noise study, if applicable.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 13-21 to 13-22.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 13-4: Exposure of new and existing noise-sensitive receptors to operational project-generated transportation noise sources</b></p> <p>(PS) Implementation of the project would result in a maximum traffic noise increase of 0.8 dBA on affected roadway segments. Noise increases of less than 1 dBA would not be perceptible and would be substantially below the Placer County allowed noise increase of 5 dBA. No existing sensitive receptors would be exposed to substantial increases in noise. Implementation of the project would result in new sensitive receptors in close proximity to SR 267, potentially within the 60 dBA Ldn contour of the roadway. These receptors could be exposed to noise levels that exceed the Placer County exterior noise standard of 60 dBA Ldn for transportation-related noise.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 13-22 to 13-24.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 13-4a: Reduce exterior noise levels at potential future sensitive receptors along SR 267</b></p> <p>The following design measures shall apply to new sensitive receptors developed as part of the MVWSP that would be located within 350 feet of the centerline of SR 267 (i.e., the distance from the centerline that is conservatively estimated, based on the noise modeling, to result in exceedance of the Placer County transportation-related exterior noise standard of 60 dBA Ldn) or the 60 dBA Ldn noise contour, whichever is greater:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orient new sensitive receptors such that outdoor activity areas (e.g., balcony, porch, backyard) are on the opposite side of the structure from SR 267, such that noise attenuation by the structure itself is sufficient to achieve the exterior noise standard; and/or</li> <li>• Achieve, through building design and choice of building materials, a minimum, 20 dBA of exterior-to-interior noise attenuation, so that interior noise levels comply with the Placer County interior noise standard of 45 dBA Ldn.</li> </ul> <p>Or,</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 13-4b: Demonstrate compliance with Placer County noise standards through refined noise analysis</b></p> <p>Alternatively, the project developer shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of Placer County, through refined, project specific modeling or other appropriate analysis, that interior and exterior noise levels at a given proposed residential site will meet Placer County noise standards. Such analysis shall consider then-current traffic levels, building design and orientation, and noise attenuating features, such as topography, intervening forest or other vegetation, and other noise barriers. The analysis shall be prepared by a qualified</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 13-4a or 13-4b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by development and implement measures that would ensure noise-sensitive land uses are protected from operational project-generated transportation noise. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that one of these mitigation measures 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Project would result in new sensitive receptors in close proximity to SR 267, potentially exposing them to noise levels that exceed the Placer County exterior noise standard of 60 dBA Ldn for transportation-related noises. Mitigation Measure 13-4a would require the project to use materials to achieve a 20 dBA of exterior-to-interior noise attenuation and design outdoor activity areas such that they are on the opposite side of the structure from SR 267, to reduce the exposure of sensitive receptors to transportation noise sources. Alternatively, Mitigation Measure 13-4b requires the project applicant to demonstrate compliance with the Placer County noise standard through refined noise analysis. This plan will reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 13-22 to 13-25.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	acoustic professional using methods approved by Placer County.  (Draft EIR, pp. 13-24 to 13-25.)		
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 13-5: Cumulative Short-term construction noise</b></p> <p>(LS) The nature of construction noise effects are such that project-related construction activities would have to occur simultaneously and in close proximity to those of other projects for a cumulative effect to occur. Because the West Parcel development area is relatively isolated and, with the exception of the Brockway Campground Project, is substantially distant from the sites of related and foreseeable projects (see Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-2), MVWPSP-generated construction noise would not combine with those of other projects. With regard to the Brockway Campground Project, although timing of environmental review, approval, and construction of the project is unknown, it is possible that if campground construction were to occur simultaneously with future phases of the MVWPSP, construction noise from vehicles and heavy equipment could cumulatively combine. However, the nature of the campground project would be such that substantial grading, excavation, trenching, or blasting would not be necessary for construction of campsites and support facilities, and construction noise would not be substantial. Further, Mitigation Measure 13-1 would ensure that project-generated construction noise would not exceed applicable noise standards or cause excessive noise during the sensitive time of the day.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 13-25 to 13-26.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Cumulative Impact 13-6: Cumulative Short-term construction vibration</b></p> <p>(LS) The nature of construction vibration effects are such that project-related construction activities would have to occur simultaneously and in close proximity to those of other projects for a cumulative effect to occur. Because the West Parcel development area is relatively isolated and, with the exception of the Brockway Campground Project, is substantially distant from the sites of related and foreseeable projects (see Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-2),</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>MVWPSP-generated construction vibration would not combine with those of other projects. With regard to the Brockway Campground Project, although timing of environmental review, approval, and construction of the project is unknown, it is possible that if campground construction were to occur simultaneously with future phases of the MVWPSP, construction noise from vehicles and heavy equipment could cumulatively combine. However, the nature of the campground project would be such that it would be unlikely that substantial vibration-inducing activities (e.g., pile driving, blasting) would occur, and construction vibration would not be substantial.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 13-26)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 13-7: Cumulative Long-term ambient stationary source noise levels</b></p> <p>(LS) At buildout, stationary noise sources would be added throughout the project site; however, Mitigation Measure 13-3 would be required to reduce noise from new stationary sources. Mitigation Measure 13-3 would ensure that proper design considerations and noise reduction features are constructed, as necessary, to reduce exterior noise levels to receptors on the project site and off (e.g., The Brockway Campground project located to the south of the MVWPSP). Therefore, these sources would not combine with any noise sources from existing or future planned projects.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 13-26.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Cumulative Impact 13-8: Cumulative Long-term ambient traffic-related noise levels</b></p> <p>(LS) Cumulative noise levels could be affected by additional buildout of surrounding land uses and increases in vehicular traffic on affected roadways. Several new large developments (e.g., Pollard Station, Joerger Ranch Specific Plan, Canyon Springs Subdivision) and others (see Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-2 for a complete list) are planned in the project area, including areas within the Tahoe Basin.</p> <p>These projects in conjunction with project-generated traffic would result in additional traffic-related noise on surrounding roadways and would contribute to a cumulative traffic-</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>noise condition. However, because of the logarithmic nature of noise sources, a doubling of existing traffic would be required to result in a perceptible increase in noise (i.e., 3 dB). As discussed under Impact 13-4, implementation of the MVWPSP would result in additional traffic on roadways that currently experience relatively high traffic volumes, and the incremental increase in traffic as a result of the project would not result in a perceptible increase in noise (i.e., a maximum of 0.6 dB as shown in Draft EIR Chapter 13, Table 13-11). However, because future sensitive receptors could potentially be located within the 60 dBA Ldn contour of SR 267, Mitigation Measure 13-4a or 13-4b would be required to demonstrate compliance with Placer County noise standards.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 13-26 to 13-27.)</p>			
<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>			
<p><b>Impact 14-1: Exposure of people or structures to risk of loss, injury or death resulting from rupture of a known earthquake fault or strong seismic shaking</b></p> <p>(LS) The MVWPSP project site is not located within or adjacent to an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone; however, there are many faults in the vicinity of the project site, and two short fault traces are located within the project site, one on the West Parcel and one on the East Parcel. These faults could subject project components to ground shaking and ground failure. Proposed project structures would be designed and constructed in accordance with the current minimum seismic safety and structural design requirements set forth in the California Building Code. In addition, the MVWPSP includes policies pertaining to potential development in proximity to the West Parcel fault trace. Therefore, there would be no substantial risk of loss, injury, death, or property damage from strong seismic shaking or rupture of a known fault.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 14-15 to 14-16.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Impact 14-2: Exposure of people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving avalanche</b></p> <p>(LS) The West Parcel contains slopes steep enough to create an avalanche hazard;</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

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>however implementation of the MVWPSP would not result in development within these areas. The potential avalanche risk associated with development on the West Parcel would be further limited by MVWPSP Policy ER-AG1, which would require that tree removal on slopes that could generate avalanches be overseen by a qualified avalanche consultant. It is unknown how the conservation of the East Parcel would affect recreational use, including winter sports. No formal trails would be created by the proposed project, but it is assumed that use of the existing informal trails would continue with no change in the number of recreationalists on the East Parcel.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 14-16 to 14-17.)</p>			
<p><b>Impact 14-3: Risk to life or property through exposure to expansive or unstable soils, including soils that may become unstable as a result of the project</b></p> <p>(PS) The MVWPSP project site contains steep slopes, ancient landslides, moderately expansive soils, and soils that could subside. Although the extent of these areas within the West Parcel development area is limited, potential development on land associated with the proposed project could result in the exposure of people and property to risks associated with unstable soils.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 14-17 to 14-18.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-3: Submit a geotechnical investigation for all areas of planned development</b></p> <p>The Improvement Plan submittal shall include a final geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer for Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) review and approval. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Road, pavement, and parking area design;</li> <li>B. Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable);</li> <li>C. Grading practices;</li> <li>D. Erosion/winterization;</li> <li>E. Special problems discovered onsite, (e.g., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils); and</li> <li>F. Slope stability.</li> </ul> <p>Once approved by the ESD, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the ESD and one copy to the Building Services Division for its use. It is the responsibility of the developer to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report. If the soils report indicates the presence of critically expansive or other soils problems that, if not corrected, could lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the requirements</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 14-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the project applicant to submit a geotechnical report to the ESD and comply with the recommendations in the report. 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Project site contains steep slopes, ancient landslides, moderately expansive soils and soils that could subside. Development in these areas will be limited, but development could result in the exposure of people and property to risks associated with unstable soils. Mitigation Measure 14-3 addresses this impact by requiring the project applicant to submit a geotechnical report, from a registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer, to the ESD. Following approval, the applicant shall comply with the recommendations in the report. This plan will reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 14-17 to 14-18.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>of the soils report will be required for subdivisions, before issuance of Building Permits. This certification may be completed on a Lot by Lot basis or on a Tract basis. This requirement shall be so noted on the Improvement Plans, in the CC&amp;Rs, in the Development Notebook, and on the Informational Sheet filed with the Final Subdivision Map(s).</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 14-18.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 14-4: Potential for substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil</b></p> <p>(S) Development on the West Parcel would involve grading and excavation activities that could increase the potential for soil erosion because of vegetation removal, soil disturbance, and soil compaction. The construction activities resulting from the proposed project would create ground disturbance within soil units that have a moderate to very severe erosion hazard rating. This indicates that erosion is likely to occur and may be significant in some areas, potentially resulting in loss of soil productivity and offsite damage.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 14-18 to 14-20.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-4a: Prepare and implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan</b></p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure 15-1. As a condition of the SWRCB Statewide Construction General Permit, the project applicant shall prepare and implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP will be prepared by a qualified SWPPP practitioner and/or a qualified SWPPP developer, will specify water quality controls consistent with Lahontan RWQCB requirements, and will ensure that runoff quality maintains beneficial uses of Middle Martis Creek. The site-specific SWPPP developed for each construction phase will describe the site controls, erosion and sediment controls, means of waste disposal, implementation of project specific plans required by local regulations, control of post-construction sediment and erosion control measures, and other impact reduction strategies unrelated to stormwater.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-4b: Prepare and submit required plan materials to Placer County</b></p> <p>The project 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 Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) for review and approval. The plans shall show all physical improvements as required by the 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</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 14-4a, 14-4b, 14-4c, 14-4d, 14-4e, 14-4f, 14-4g, and 14-4h, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by assure compliance with Placer County codified regulations pertaining to potential grading and construction-related impacts as well as assuring that construction impacts to groundwater will be reduced to a less than significant level. 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Project's construction activities would create ground disturbance within soil units that have moderate to very severe erosion hazard ratings, indicating that erosion is likely to occur and may be significant in some areas, potentially resulting in loss of soil productivity and offsite damage. Mitigation Measures 14-4a, 14-4b, 14-4c, 14-4d, 14-4e, 14-4f, 14-4g, and 14-4h will require the project applicant to implement an stormwater pollution prevention plan, identify ground disturbance areas and develop a revegetation plan, use approved design standards for Best Management Practices ("BMPs") to mitigate erosion impacts, install source control and low impact development standards, comply with grading season prohibitions, and verify NPDES stormwater pollution prevention plan compliance with Placer County. This plan will reduce impacts to less than significant levels.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 14-18 to 14-23.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. It is the project 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 Development Review Committee (DRC) review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed before submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the ESD in both hard copy and electronic versions in a format to be approved by the ESD before acceptance by the County of site improvements.</p> <p>Building Permits associated with this project shall not be issued until, at a minimum, the Improvement Plans are approved by ESD.</p> <p>Before the County's final acceptance of the project's improvements, submit to the ESD two copies of the Record Drawings in digital format (on compact disc or other acceptable media) in accordance with the latest version of the Placer County Digital Plan and Map Standards along with two blackline hardcopies (black print on bond paper) and two PDF copies. The digital format is to allow integration with Placer County's Geographic Information System (GIS). The final approved blackline hardcopy Record Drawings will be the official document of record.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-4c: Identify ground disturbance areas and develop revegetation plan</b></p> <p>The Improvement Plans shall show all proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the Development Review Committee (DRC). All cut/fill slopes shall</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>be at a maximum of 2:1 (horizontal: vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the ESD concurs with said recommendation. Fill slopes shall not exceed 1.5:1 (horizontal: vertical).</p> <p>The project applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation, undertaken from April 1 to October 1, shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas shall have proper erosion control measures applied for the duration of the construction as specified in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the ESD.</p> <p>The project applicant shall submit to the ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110 percent of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work before Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon the County's acceptance of improvements, and satisfactory completion of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent.</p> <p>If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals before any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-4d: Provide Placer County with verification of compliance with NPDES SWPPP</b></p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Prior to construction commencing, the applicant shall provide evidence to the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Division of a Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number generated from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board's Stormwater Multiple Application &amp; Reports Tracking System (SMARTS). This serves as the Regional Water Quality Control Board approval or permit under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction stormwater quality permit.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-4e: Use approved design standards for BMPs</b></p> <p>The Improvement Plans shall show that water quality treatment facilities/best management practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and for Industrial and Commercial (or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) such as the Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions).</p> <p>Construction (temporary) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: Hydroseeding (EC-4), Straw Mulch (EC-6), Velocity Dissipation Devices (EC-10), Silt Fencing (SE-1), Fiber Rolls (SE-5), Storm Drain Inlet Protection (SE-10), Wind Erosion Control (WE-1), and Stabilized Construction Entrances (TC-1).</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-4f: Installation of source control and Low Impact Development standards</b></p> <p>This project is located within the permit area covered by Placer County's Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit No. CAS000004, Order No. 2013-0001-DWQ), pursuant to the NPDES Phase II program. Project-related stormwater discharges are subject to all applicable requirements of said permit.</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>The project shall implement permanent and operational source control measures as applicable. Source control measures shall be designed for pollutant generating activities or sources consistent with recommendations from the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Stormwater BMP Handbook for New Development and Redevelopment, or equivalent manual, and shall be shown on the Improvement Plans.</p> <p>The project is also required to implement Low Impact Development (LID) standards designed to reduce runoff, treat stormwater, and provide baseline hydromodification management.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-4g: Comply with grading season prohibitions</b></p> <p>There shall be no grading or other disturbance of ground between October 15 of any year and May 1 of the following year, unless an extension has been granted by the ESD.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-4h: Comply with grading season prohibitions</b></p> <p>Per the State of California NPDES Phase II MS4 Permit, the MVWPS project is a Regulated Project that creates and/or replaces 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface. A final Storm Water Quality Plan (SWQP) shall be submitted, either within the final Drainage Report or as a separate document that identifies how the project will meet the Phase II MS4 permit obligations. Site design measures, source control measures, and Low Impact Development (LID) standards, as necessary, shall be incorporated into the design and shown on the Improvement Plans. In addition, per the Phase II MS4 permit, projects creating and/or replacing one acre or more of impervious surface are also required to demonstrate hydromodification management of stormwater such that post-project runoff is maintained to equal or below pre-project flow rates for the 2-year, 24-hour storm event, generally by way of infiltration, rooftop and impervious area disconnection, bioretention, and other LID measures that result in post-project flows that mimic pre-project conditions.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 14-20 to 14-23.)</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 14-5: Cumulative, long-term exposure of people or property to rupture of a known fault or strong seismic shaking</b></p> <p>(LS) The proposed project and the cumulative projects described above would be located in seismically active areas with known faults and could subject persons or property to strong seismic shaking. Ground shaking could result in the collapse of buildings and other structures and structures can be damaged or destroyed by ground rupture at an active fault. Without mitigation, the development of the West Parcel and of other cumulative projects could create a significant additive increase in the number of persons or properties exposed to potential ground rupture and seismic shaking. Overall, the potential cumulative impact is minimized through compliance with the California Building Code which contains protective provisions for structure placement and design. Additionally, the geotechnical investigations required for projects in Placer County include site specific geological analysis that may identify small or previously unmapped faults that could be significant to individual projects. Although there are no known active faults within the proposed development area, the proposed project would allow development in the vicinity of a small fault that has been recently determined to be inactive. The potential for the proposed project to contribute to cumulative seismic impacts would be fully mitigated through implementation of MVWPSP Policy ER-AG4, which states that any development proposed in proximity to the West Parcel fault trace would require a reevaluation of the fault to determine its precise location and its level of activity. If new, more detailed evaluation determines that the fault is potentially active, structures would be set back and engineered, in accordance with recommendations by the geotechnical engineer, to withstand a seismic event based on the potential strength of the fault (Holdrege &amp; Kull 2013).</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 14-23 to 14-24.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Cumulative Impact 14-6: Cumulative, long-term exposure of persons or property to avalanche hazards</b></p> <p>(LS) Portions of the rugged high elevation</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>terrain in the upper portions of the Martis Creek watershed have the potential to generate avalanches. The expansion of development and recreational uses in these areas could result in a significant cumulative increase in avalanche exposure. Placer County has mitigated this potential risk by identifying geologic hazard districts (which include areas subject to avalanche). Any permit application for a project located within a geologic hazard district with an avalanche risk must be accompanied by a report prepared by a recognized avalanche expert approved by the planning director. This report must identify potential threats to the project and recommend design modifications or setbacks that reduce the risk to an insignificant level (Placer County Code 17.52.100). Additionally, in areas outside a mapped hazard district, avalanche risk would be identified and addressed by the geotechnical report prepared for a project. While compliance within these regulations cannot eliminate the risk associated with avalanche, it can reduce the probable impact to an acceptable level. Finally, the MVWSP proposes a conservation easement or sale to a conservancy of the entire East Parcel. As a result, no development would occur on the East Parcel. Although the East Parcel contains areas of avalanche terrain, it is assumed for purposes of analysis that post-project use of informal trails would continue in a manner consistent with existing use. The project would not change any exposure of recreationalists to avalanche hazards. The MVWSP would comply with Placer County regulations, reducing the project's potential risk to an acceptable level.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 14-24.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 14-7: Cumulative, long-term exposure of people or property to landslides or unstable soils</b></p> <p>(LS) The mountainous terrain within the Martis Creek Watershed contains many steep slopes that may be subject to slope instability, debris flows, and rock fall. In addition, areas of expansive soils and soils that could be vulnerable to liquefaction and lateral spreading exist within the watershed (NRCS 2015). Development and recreational projects within the watershed, including the MVWSP, could increase the number of people that live, work,</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>or recreate in these areas, potentially resulting in a significant cumulative increase in exposure of persons or property to the risks associated with unstable soils. However, existing regulations (the California Building Code and Placer County Code of Ordinances) require evaluation of soil and geological hazards and design accommodation to address any potential hazards before approval of a building permit. While compliance within these regulations cannot eliminate the risk associated with unstable soils, it can reduce the potential impact to an acceptable level. Although the potential for a significant cumulative impact exists by virtue of the steep slopes and soil characteristics in the region, the proposed project would implement Mitigation Measure 14-3, which would reduce the potential for exposure of life and property to unstable or expansive soils by requiring site-specific geotechnical investigations for all project development and requiring specialized design of any structures located within the area of the ancient landslide.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 14-24 to 14-25.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 14-8: Cumulative impacts of erosion or loss of topsoil</b></p> <p>The proposed MVWPSP and other projects within the Martis Creek Watershed would create ground disturbance and expose soils to erosion by wind and water. Increased erosion could lead to the loss of top soil and a decrease in vegetative productivity within the watershed. Invasive species could colonize disturbed areas and replace native vegetation. Additionally, sediments carried in stormwater can be deposited into surface waters and can negatively impact water quality.</p> <p>The MVWPSP in combination with individual ground disturbance projects throughout the watershed could have an additive or cumulative adverse effect on the ecosystem of the watershed and on Martis Creek itself. However, the proposed MVWPSP and the cumulative projects listed above would be subject to the same regulatory measures and permit conditions that require the stabilization and revegetation of disturbed areas, erosion control features, and water quality BMPs. In addition, the proposed project and cumulative projects</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>would be subject to standard Placer County permit conditions described in Mitigation Measures 14-4a through 14-4h. Implementation of these mitigation measures would minimize ground disturbance and require installation of temporary and permanent erosion control BMPs, revegetation of disturbed areas, and compliance with Placer County construction oversight provision. Placement of the East Parcel (which encompasses one quarter of the Martis Creek watershed land area) into a conservation easement or sale to a Land Trust would further protect areas of steep slopes and unstable soils from development.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 14-25.)</p>			
<b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>			
<p><b>Impact 15-1: Violate any water quality standard or water discharge requirement, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality: Construction impacts</b></p> <p>(PS) Implementation of the MVWPSP would require multiple phases and several seasons of construction that would involve grading, earth moving, excavation, underground infrastructure installation, and building construction. Sediments carried in runoff from construction sites and disturbed areas could be carried into surface water. Additionally, potential leakage or spills of construction related contaminants could affect the water quality of Middle Martis Creek and the groundwater basin.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-17 to 15-18; see also Response to Comment IO31-12, IO41-77, SA2-3 and 4.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-1: Prepare and Implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for each construction phase</b></p> <p>Each construction phase of the project shall be subject to the Statewide Construction General NPDES Permit from Lahontan RWQCB. As a condition of the NPDES permit, the project applicant shall develop a Stormwater Pollution Prevent Plan (SWPPP) prepared by a qualified SWPPP practitioner and/or a qualified SWPPP developer, which specifies water quality controls consistent with Lahontan RWQCB requirements and ensures that runoff quality maintains beneficial uses of Middle Martis Creek. The site-specific SWPPP developed for each construction phase shall describe the site controls, erosion and sediment controls, means of waste disposal, implementation of project specific plans required by local regulations, post-construction sediment and erosion control measures, and other impact reduction strategies unrelated to stormwater. BMPs identified in the SWPPPs shall be implemented during all development activities. Required elements of the SWPPPs include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Temporary BMPs to prevent the transport of earthen materials and other construction waste materials from disturbed land areas, stockpiles, and staging areas during periods of precipitation or runoff, including: filter fences, fiber rolls, erosion control blankets, mulch (such as pine needles and wood chips); and temporary drainage swales and</li> </ul>	LS	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 15-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for each phase of development. 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Project's construction activities could result in sediments and contaminants affecting the water quality of Middle Martis Creek and the groundwater basin. Mitigation Measure 15-1 will require a Stormwater Prevention Plan, outlining best management practices ("BMPs") for each phase of construction to ensure that runoff quality maintains beneficial uses of Middle Martis Creek. Specifically, BMPs to prevent transport of sediments and contaminants from disturbed land areas, avoiding riparian areas, preventing wind erosion, a spill prevention and contamination plan, establishing construction activity boundaries to limit disturbance outside the project area, containment of runoff, drilling spoils, and protective fencing to limit tree and vegetation loss. In addition, Mitigation Measures 14-4a through 14-4h also address control of stormwater runoff and contaminants within the project area. This plan will reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-17 to 15-19; see also Response to Comment IO31-12, IO41-77, SA2-3 and 4.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>settling basins.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designated contractor staging areas for materials and equipment storage outside of riparian areas. Designated staging and storage areas would be protected by construction fencing and/or silt barriers, as appropriate. Following project completion, all areas used for staging would be stabilized or revegetated.</li> <li>• Temporary BMPs to prevent the tracking of earthen materials and other waste materials from the project site to offsite locations, including stabilized points of entry/exit for construction vehicles/equipment and designated vehicle/equipment rinse stations, and sweeping.</li> <li>• Temporary BMPs to prevent wind erosion of earthen materials and other waste materials from the project site, including routine application of water to disturbed land areas and covering of stockpiles with plastic or fabric sheeting.</li> <li>• A spill prevention and containment plan to minimize the potential for soil and groundwater contamination during construction. Project contractors would be responsible for proper storage of onsite materials and installation and maintenance of temporary BMPs capable of capturing and containing pollutants from fueling operations, fuel storage areas, and other areas used for the storage of hydrocarbon-based materials. This would include maintaining materials onsite for the cleanup of accidental spills (such as oil absorbent booms and sheets), maintaining drip pans beneath construction equipment, training site workers in spill response measures, immediate cleanup of spilled materials in accordance with directives from the Lahontan RWQCB, and proper disposal of waste materials at an approved offsite location that is licensed to receive such wastes.</li> <li>• Temporary BMPs to capture and contain pollutants generated by concrete construction including lined containment for rinsate to collect runoff from washing concrete delivery trucks and equipment.</li> <li>• Protective fencing to prevent damage to</li> </ul>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>trees and other vegetation to remain after construction, including tree protection fencing and individual tree protection such as protective casings of wood slats around the bases of trees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Temporary BMPs for the containment or removal of drilling spoils generated from construction of bridge foundations and abutments.</li> <li>• Daily inspection and maintenance of temporary BMPs to ensure proper function. The prime contractor would be required to maintain a daily log of Temporary Construction BMP inspections and keep the log onsite during project construction, available for review by Lahontan RWQCB and Placer County.</li> <li>• Tree removal activities, including the dropping of trees, would be confined to the construction limit boundaries.</li> <li>• Construction boundary fencing to limit disturbance and prevent access to areas not under active construction.</li> </ul> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-18 to 15-19.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 15-2: Violate any water quality standard or water discharge requirement, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality: Operational impacts</b></p> <p>(S) The project would result in residential and commercial development of the West Parcel. The operational activities associated with these land uses could result in accidental or illicit discharges of household or commercial products or misuse of pesticides or fertilizers which can lead to contamination of surface and groundwater. In addition, urban stormwater runoff could carry pollutants into adjacent surface waters.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-19 to 15-20; see also Response to Comment IO31-12, IO41-77.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-2a: Install permanent water quality BMPs</b></p> <p>The Improvement Plans shall show that water quality treatment facilities/best management practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development/Redevelopment, and for Industrial and Commercial (or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) such as the Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions).</p> <p>Storm drainage from on- and offsite impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, infiltration basins, water quality basins, filters, etc. for entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD).</p>	LS	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 15-2a, 15-2b, 15-2c, 15-2d, and 15-2e, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring permanent water quality best management practices ("BMPs"), source control and low impact development measures, discouraging illegal dumping, proper storage of potential contaminants and isolation of trash and storage areas away from stormwater flows. These measures will adequately reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Project's operational activities, including household and commercial product, pesticide, and/or fertilizer uses could lead to the contamination of surface and groundwater. Mitigation Measure 15-2a, 15-2b, 15-2c, 15-2d, and 15-2e requires the project applicant to install permanent water quality BMPs including catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, basins, etc. according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development/Redevelopment, and for</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>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: Vegetated Swales (TC-30), Infiltration Trenches (TC-10), Water Quality Inlets (TC-50), Pervious Pavements (SD-20), Storm Drain System Signs (SD-13), and Detention Basins (TC-22). No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.</p> <p>All BMPs shall be maintained as required to insure effectiveness. The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation. Proof of ongoing 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. Before Improvement Plan or Final Subdivision 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 15-2b: Identify storm drain inlets to discourage illegal dumping</b></p> <p>The Improvement Plans shall include the message details, placement, and locations showing that 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 and/or graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD). 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</p>		<p>Industrial and Commercial. The applicant shall identify storm drain inlets and discourage illegal dumping, install source control and Low Impact Development measures, isolate trash and storage areas away from stormwater flows, and store potential contaminants in enclosures approved by the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department. This plan will reduce impacts to less than significant levels.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-19 to 15-21; see also Response to Comment IO31-12, IO41-77.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>project area. The Homeowners'/Property Owners' association is responsible for maintaining the legibility of stamped messages and signs.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-2c: Install source control and Low Impact Development measures</b></p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure 14-4f. The project shall comply with the Placer County MS4Permit, pursuant to the NPDES Phase II program. This includes the installation of source control and LID measures to reduce the volume of runoff generated by the project.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-2d: Isolate trash and storage areas from stormwater flows</b></p> <p>The Improvement Plans shall show that 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 offsite 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 15-2e: Store potential contaminants in approved enclosures</b></p> <p>The Improvement Plans shall show that materials with the potential to contaminate stormwater that are to be stored outdoors shall be placed in an enclosure such as, but not limited to, a cabinet, shed, or similar structure that prevents contact with runoff or spillage to the stormwater conveyance system, or protected by secondary containment structures such as berms, dikes, or curbs. The storage area shall be paved to contain leaks and spills and shall have a roof or awning to minimize collection of stormwater within the secondary containment area.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-20 to 15-21.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 15-3: Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge: use of existing NCSD water system</b></p> <p>(LS) One option for water supply for the West Parcel development area would be expansion</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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>of the existing NCS D water system, which includes two springs, a reservoir, and two groundwater wells in the Martis Valley Groundwater Basin. This groundwater basin has been shown to have an average annual recharge rate of more than 32,000 acre feet per year (afy), which substantially exceeds the projected total water use at buildout of all development within the Martis Valley Groundwater Basin, estimated at 21,000 afy (Kaufman 2011).</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-21 to 15-22; see also Master Response 8, Response to Comment IO41-74.)</p>			
<p><b>Impact 15-4: Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge: Use of new onsite wells</b></p> <p>(PS) A second option for water supply for the MVWSP development would be installation of groundwater wells on the West Parcel. By virtue of the elevation, topography, and subsurface geology of the project site, onsite wells would not directly access the Martis Valley Groundwater Basin. Rather, they would penetrate moderate permeability volcanic rock aquifers more typical of mountainous terrain. These aquifers have limited storage capacity and are more sensitive to pumping and climatic fluctuations. The groundwater recharge rates and surface/groundwater interactions within the West Parcel, specifically, are not well understood.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-23 to 15-24; see also Master Response 8, Response to Comment IO41-74, IO18-35 and 37.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-4a: Verify adequacy of groundwater supplies through modeling and supplement supplies, if necessary</b></p> <p>The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the Desert Research Institute have developed an integrated surface water/groundwater model (GSFLOW) specific to the MVGB. The GSFLOW model uses a hydrologic framework specific to the Martis Valley, and shall be used to determine potential groundwater recharge rates for the West Parcel and to develop a calibrated water budget for the MVWSP project. Groundwater modeling shall be completed by a qualified hydrologist and shall incorporate the surface water mapping completed for the MVWSP, as it reflects the most accurate source of hydrologic data. The modeling results shall be used to estimate the quantity of groundwater that can be sustainably extracted from aquifers beneath the West Parcel. Modeling shall be completed before construction of the proposed wells. If the groundwater modeling determines that the water demand (325 afy) from project buildout exceeds that which can be sustainably withdrawn using onsite wells, supplemental water shall be provided via connection to the existing NCS D system.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-4b: Monitor surface and groundwater resources within the project area</b></p> <p>Before the start of groundwater pumping, the project applicant and NCS D shall develop a long-term monitoring program for the surface and groundwater resources within the West Parcel. The goal of the monitoring plan will be to detect and assess long-term changes and trends</p>	LS	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measures 15-4a and 15-4b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring verification of adequate groundwater supplies and supplementing those supplies if necessary, as well as monitoring surface and groundwater resources in the project area. Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> If the Project's water supply is provided by groundwater wells, the elevation, topography, and subsurface geology would require the wells to access aquifers in moderate permeability volcanic rock, instead of the Martis Valley Groundwater Basin. These aquifers have limited storage capacity and are more sensitive to pumping and climatic fluctuations. Mitigation Measure 15-4a and 15-4b would require the use of the GSFLOW surface/groundwater modeling computer software to estimate the quantity of groundwater that can be sustainably extracted from the aquifers beneath the West Parcel, and if that amount is exceeded by demand (325 afy), supplemental water shall be provided via the existing NCS D system. In addition the project applicant shall develop a long term surface and groundwater monitoring plan, in cooperation with the NCS D. The purpose of the monitoring will be to detect and assess the long term changes in hydrology because of pumping for municipal water supply, and to provide reasonable assurance of long-term pumping at sustainable rates. This plan will reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-23 to 15-25; see also Master Response 8, Response to Comment IO41-74, IO18-35 and 37.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>in the hydrologic system because of pumping for municipal water supply, and to provide reasonable assurance of long-term pumping at sustainable rates. Surface waters shall be monitored to identify long-term trends and potential interactions between surface water volumes and groundwater pumping. The monitoring program shall identify drawdown and recovery threshold limits based on the performance of completed production wells. As an operational goal, the drop in groundwater elevation in the aquifer at each well shall not exceed a 20 percent drawdown of the water column for a period of time extending beyond three months. Aquifer responses shall be monitored by dedicated monitoring wells, and natural seasonal variance in water levels based pre-pumping monitoring will be factored into consideration. Monitoring wells may include test wells TW-3 and TW-5. As a component of its larger monitoring program, NCSD will be responsible for long-term monitoring of the performance of groundwater production wells on the project site, and adjusting pumping distributions between onsite or offsite water sources, if necessary. Surface waters shall be monitored to identify long term trends and potential interactions between surface water volumes and groundwater pumping. Reporting shall be completed annually or as otherwise dictated depending on the schedule of existing NCSD monitoring operations.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-24 to 15-25.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 15-5: Substantially alter drainage patterns or increase surface runoff in a manner that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems</b></p> <p>(PS) Implementation of the MVWPSP would result in the development of new impervious surfaces such as buildings and roads, leading to an increased potential for stormwater runoff. Because the project would result in new urban development over a large area that is currently undeveloped forest, it would substantially increase the peak flow and volume of stormwater runoff leaving the site.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-25 to 15-26; see also Response to Comment IO31-12, IO41-77, and</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-5a: Prepare and implement a final drainage report</b></p> <p>As part of the Improvement Plan submittal process, the preliminary Drainage Report provided during environmental review shall be submitted in final format. The final Drainage Report may require more detail than that provided in the preliminary report, and will be reviewed in concert with the Improvement Plans to confirm conformity between the two. 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 proposed improvements, all appropriate calculations, watershed maps, changes in flows and patterns, and proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage</p>	LS	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 15-5a and 15-5b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring a final drainage report as part of the Improvement Plan and that the applicant reduce runoff to pre-project conditions. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Development of the project would result in new impervious surfaces, such as buildings and roads, leading to an increased potential for stormwater runoff. Mitigation Measure 15-5a and 15-5b, would require the project applicant to prepare a final drainage report which will address the effects of the proposed improvements, and all proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage</p>

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

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
SA2-3.)	<p>easements to accommodate flows from the MVWPSP project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used during construction, as well as long-term post-construction water quality measures. The final Drainage Report shall be prepared in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of Improvement Plan submittal.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-5b: Reduce runoff to pre-project conditions</b></p> <p>The Improvement Plan submittal and final Drainage Report shall provide details showing that stormwater run-off shall be reduced to pre-project conditions through the installation of retention/detention facilities. Retention/detention facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD), and shall be shown on the Improvement Plans. The ESD may, after review of the project final drainage report, delete this requirement if it is determined that drainage conditions do not warrant installation of this type of facility. Maintenance of detention facilities by the homeowner's association, property owner's association, property owner, or entity responsible for project maintenance shall be required. No retention/detention facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 15-27; Final EIR, p. 2-15; see also Response to Comment SA2-3.)</p>		<p>easements to accommodate the increased stormwater flows from the Project. In addition, the project applicant must reduce runoff to pre-project conditions through the installation of retention/detention facilities, unless the Engineering and Surveying Department does not believe the drainage conditions require retention/detention facilities. This plan will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-26 to 15-27; Final EIR, p. 2-15; see also Response to Comment IO31-12, IO41-77 and SA2-3.)</p>
<p><b>Impact 15-6: Placement of housing or structures within a 100-year flood hazard area, redirection 100-year flood flows, or exposure people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding</b></p> <p>(PS) Although there are no FEMA-regulated 100-year flood hazard areas within the project area, the proposed project would result in the construction of a bridge over Middle Martis Creek and residential and commercial</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-6a: Delineate 100-year floodplain on subdivision maps</b></p> <p>On the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s) filed with the appropriate Large Lot or Small Lot Final Subdivision Map(s), show the limits of the future, unmitigated, fully-developed 100-year floodplain (after grading) for Middle Martis Creek and designate same as a building setback line, unless greater setbacks are required by other conditions contained herein.</p>	LS	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 15-6a, 15-6b, 15-6c, 15-6d, 15-6e, and 15-6f, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring a final drainage report as part of the Improvement Plan and that the applicant reduce runoff to pre-project conditions. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Project will</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>structures that could be located within the 100-year floodplain of Middle Martis Creek.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-27 to 15-28.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-6b: Demonstrate that all building pad elevations are a minimum of 2 feet above the 100-year floodplain line</b></p> <p>The Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s) filed with the appropriate Large Lot or Small Lot Final Subdivision Map(s) shall show finished building pad elevations to be a minimum of two feet above the 100-year floodplain line (or finished floor three feet above the 100-year floodplain line). The final pad elevation 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 done before construction of the foundation or at the completion of final grading, whichever comes first. No construction is allowed until the certification has been received by the Engineering and Surveying Department and approved by the floodplain manager. Benchmark elevation and location shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet (s) to the satisfaction of Development Review Committee.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-6c: Construct Middle Martis Creek Bridge to span 100-year floodplain limits</b></p> <p>The Improvement Plans for the construction of the main access road shall include the construction of a roadway bridge spanning the 100-year floodplain limits of Middle Martis Creek near the encroachment with SR 267.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-6d: Prohibit activities or construction that would increase the 100-year floodplain water surface elevation</b></p> <p>The project applicant shall prepare a final drainage report at the time of submittal of the project's initial improvement plans that demonstrates that the project will not increase the limits or water surface elevation of the 100-year floodplain of Middle Martis Creek upstream or downstream of the project site. The report shall be submitted with the project's initial Improvement Plans, and shall be reviewed and approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department and the Placer County Flood Control District. The floodplain analysis shall be prepared in conformance with the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual that is in effect</p>		<p>result in a bridge over Middle Martis Creek and residential and commercial structures that could be located within the 100-year floodplain of Middle Martis Creek. However, there are no FEMA-regulated 100-year flood hazard areas within the project area. Mitigation Measure 15-6a, 15-6b, 15-6c, 15-6d, 15-6e, and 15-6f will require subdivision maps to delineate the 100-year floodplain of Middle Martis Creek, that all building pad elevations are a minimum 2 feet above the 100-year floodplain line, and the roadway bridge be constructed to span the 100-year floodplain of Middle Martis Creek. In addition, the drainage report prepared by the applicant shall prohibit construction or other activities that would increase the 100-year floodplain water surface elevation, and prohibit all grading activity within the 100-year floodplain. Lastly, the applicant shall maintain or if necessary construct, adequate flood storage within the 100-year floodplain of Middle Martis Creek. This plan will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-27 to 15-29.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>at the time of submittal.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-6e: Maintain or construct adequate flood storage within the 100-year floodplain of Middle Martis Creek</b></p> <p>The applicant shall maintain or construct adequate flood storage within the 100-year floodplain of Middle Martis Creek to the satisfaction of the ESD and the Placer County Flood Control District. This replacement storage shall only be associated with the construction fills associated with the roadway infrastructure required for development of the project.</p> <p>The applicant shall prepare an analysis to demonstrate the amount of storage to be replaced, the effect on flood flows of the replacement area, any effects on flood conveyance and methods to minimize any maintenance of the replacement storage. The size (volume) of this replacement shall be based on the volume of storage lost by project construction.</p> <p>Any required storage area shall be designed and shown on the applicable set of Improvement Plans for the project after the above analysis is approved by ESD and the Flood Control District. It shall be constructed concurrent with any grading taking place within the existing 100-year floodplain.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-6f: Prohibit grading within the 100-year floodplain</b></p> <p>To protect site resources, no grading activities of any kind may take place within the 100-year floodplain of the stream/drainage way unless otherwise approved as a part of this project. All work shall conform to provisions of the County Flood Damage Prevention Regulations (Section 15.52, Placer County Code). A standard note to this effect shall be included on the Improvement Plans. The location of the 100-year floodplain shall be shown on the Improvement Plans.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, 15-28 to 15-29.)</p>		
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 15-7: Cumulative impacts that would violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements</b></p> <p>(LS) Historic activities such as logging, milling,</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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>mining, and overgrazing within the Middle Truckee River Watershed combined with runoff from urban and recreational developments, have degraded the water quality of the Truckee River and its tributaries, resulting in an existing cumulative adverse condition. Currently, at high stream flows, the concentrations of suspended sediment in the Truckee River exceed the water quality limits for protection of aquatic life (Lahontan RWQCB 2008). The 2008 Truckee River TMDL was developed to address sediment levels and as a result, Placer County has developed a stormwater management program. Additionally, numerous publicly and privately funded projects have been implemented to restore disturbed areas of the watershed and reduce this adverse condition.</p> <p><b>Construction Impacts</b></p> <p>The MVWPSP in combination with other projects in the Truckee River Watershed would involve construction activities that would create ground disturbance and increase the potential for soil erosion and sediment pollution of waterways. The equipment required for construction would use fuel, solvents, lubricants, and other potentially hazardous materials that could degrade surface and groundwater quality through accidental spills. Without mitigation, the construction activities of the proposed project and the cumulative projects described above would have the potential to create a significant cumulative impact to water quality. However, the project's potential impacts would be fully mitigated through implementation of Mitigation Measures 15-1. These mitigation measures reflect standard Placer County development permit conditions which would be applicable to the proposed project as well as the other cumulative projects. Buildout of the MVWPSP and other foreseeable development projects would be required to comply with Lahontan RWQCB NPDES permit conditions that include the development of a SWPPP and a Hazardous Materials Spill Response Plan and to comply with all Placer County stream setbacks. Because the MVWPSP and all other projects within the Truckee River Watershed would be required to comply with these protective regulations, the project's potential contribution to the existing cumulatively adverse water</p>			

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>quality condition would not be cumulatively considerable, and the project would not result in a considerable contribution to a cumulative impact.</p> <p><b>Operational Impacts</b></p> <p>After development projects are completed, the everyday use of household and commercial products and the improper use of pesticides and fertilizers could allow pollutants to be carried in stormwater runoff or discharged into the soil to reach surface and groundwater resources. Without mitigation, the operational activities of the proposed project and the cumulative projects described above would create a significant cumulative impact to water quality. However, the potential impacts would be fully mitigated through implementation of Mitigation Measures 15 15-2a through 15-2e. These mitigation measures are standard Placer County permit conditions, which are applicable to all projects in the county and require proper containment of potential contaminants, installation of permanent water quality BMPs, and identification of storm drain inlets. Although the cumulative impact is significant, the project's contribution to the cumulative effect would be fully mitigated, such that the project would not contribute to the cumulative impact.</p> <p>(Final EIR, pp. 15-29 to 15-30; see also Response to Comment IO31-12.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 15-8: Cumulative impacts that would substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge</b></p> <p>(LS) The MVWSP and other development projects within the Middle Truckee River watershed would rely on the Martis Valley Groundwater Basin and its tributary groundwater basins for their water supply. Overuse of groundwater resources can lower the groundwater table, affecting flow volumes in connected surface waters and springs. The proposed project would draw from existing NCSD groundwater wells within the Martis Valley Groundwater basin, or it would develop new groundwater wells within the West Parcel.</p> <p><b>Use of Existing NCSD Groundwater Wells</b></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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p><b>within the Martis Valley Groundwater Basin</b></p> <p>Groundwater within the MVGB has been extensively studied and is regularly monitored (Placer County 2007). It is constrained by the 2008 TROA, which was born out of litigation surrounding the declining water quantity and quality in Pyramid Lake and the resulting impacts to threatened and endangered species. TROA protects surface water flows by limiting the volume of diversions and groundwater withdrawal from the Truckee River Watershed, ensuring the quality and quantity of surface waters that reach Pyramid Lake. The limits set on the total amount of groundwater that can be pumped from the Martis Valley Groundwater Basin have been established to prevent overdrafting. The MVWPSP and all future projects that draw from the Martis Valley Groundwater Basin would only be permitted if they do not cause groundwater use to exceed established limits. The total estimated water demand at the time of maximum development within the area served by the Martis Valley Groundwater Basin is 21,000 afy, while the maximum pumping limit for the Basin is set at 32,000 afy. In addition, all wastewater generated by the proposed project would be treated at the T-TSA regional wastewater treatment plant in Truckee, and eventually infiltrated back into the Martis Valley Groundwater Basin. This would allow recycling rather than depletion of groundwater. Additionally, the Martis Valley Groundwater Management Plan (Placer County 2007) includes an extensive groundwater monitoring component. The existing protections against groundwater depletion within the Martis Valley Groundwater Basin have been established to prevent the development of a cumulative adverse impact to groundwater quantity.</p> <p><b>Development of New Groundwater Wells within the West Parcel</b></p> <p>In general, the tributary groundwater aquifers in the mountainous upper portions of the Middle Truckee River Watershed have not been well studied and their storage capacity, rate of recharge, and connectivity to surface waters is not well understood. Implementation of the proposed project and other development projects involving groundwater wells drilled in</p>			

Less than Significant = LS      No Impact = NI      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>these smaller aquifers could result in a potentially significant cumulative impact related to depletion of groundwater resources. Although the cumulative impact is potentially significant, the proposed project's contribution would be fully mitigated through implementation of Mitigation Measures 15-4a and 15-4b. These mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts to groundwater resources though more precise modeling of groundwater recharge rates within the West Parcel, adjusting groundwater production levels to match sustainable pumping rates indicated by the calibrated water budget, and supplementing water supplies through connection to NCSD's existing water supply system, if onsite groundwater supplies prove insufficient. In addition, implementing a long-term monitoring program would support compliance with drawdown and recovery thresholds and protect groundwater resources from overdraft.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-30 to 15-31; see also Master Response 8, Response to Comment IO41-74, IO18-35 and 37.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 15-9: Cumulative impacts that would substantially alter drainage pattern or increase surface runoff in a manner that would result in erosion, siltation, and flooding, or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems</b></p> <p>(LS) Development pursuant to the MVWPSP and development of the related in the Middle Truckee River Watershed would result in an increase in impervious surfaces and a corresponding increase in stormwater runoff. Without the installation of stormwater BMPs, the increase in runoff could exceed the capacity of existing stormdrain systems and cause localized flooding. Concentrated runoff that cannot be accommodated by stormdrains could also cause erosion of unprotected areas.</p> <p>This increase in area stormwater flows would be a significant cumulative impact and development of the MVWPSP would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to this cumulative impact. However, the potential impact of the proposed project would be minimized through mitigation imposed by the CEQA environmental review process for</p>	No mitigation is required	LS	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.)

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

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>individual projects, Placer County Code requirements, the NPDES permitting system, and/or through application of project-specific mitigation measures. The NPDES permitting system requires that Placer County implement Stormwater Management Plans that control stormwater runoff and protect the quality of receiving waters. Finally, Mitigation Measures 15-5a and 15-5b require that all development resulting from the implementation of the proposed project would implement LID practices and stormwater infiltration facilities so that development does not result in an increase in runoff leaving the site.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 15-31 to 15-32; see also Response to Comment IO31-12.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 15-10: Cumulative impacts to 100-year floodplains or exposure of people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding</b></p> <p>(LS) Development associated with the proposed project and other cumulative projects could place structures within 100-year floodplains or alter the flow of flood waters from 100-year storm events. Residential and commercial structures within the floodplain would create a direct risk to people and property from flood waters. Other structures placed in the floodplain could raise the water surface elevation of the 100-year flood creating a risk to properties that were previously unaffected by floodwaters. Although each project may only create a small change in water surface elevation, cumulatively these small changes could result in a significant increase in the risk to people and structures from 100-year flood events. Federal regulations restrict development within the 100-year floodplains mapped by FEMA, however no floodplains have been mapped for Middle Martis Creek. Without mitigation, the proposed project would contribute to a significant cumulative impact to the 100-year floodplain environment within the Middle Truckee River Watershed. The potential floodplain impacts of the proposed project would be fully mitigated through implementation of Mitigation Measures 15-6a through 15-6f would require the delineation of the 100-year floodplain of Middle Martis Creek, would prevent encroachment into the floodplain that could result in an increase in the 100-year base</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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>flood elevation, and would require that all buildings are located above 100-year flood flows.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 15-32.)</p>			
<b>UTILITIES</b>			
<p><b>Impact 16-1: Increased demand for water supply</b></p> <p>(LS) Existing water demand from users within the NCSD service boundary is 538 afy and existing supply for NCSD users is 3,181 afy. Existing demand for groundwater from all groundwater users in the MVGB is 8,839 afy. Implementation of the proposed project would result in additional water demand from the MVGB of up to 325 afy by 2034. The additional water demand could be met by NCSD's existing water supplies and entitlements. Project-generated demand of 325 afy at buildout plus forecasted demand from future growth in the Martis Valley is estimated to be 18,955 afy in 2034. Extracting sufficient groundwater from the MVGB to meet forecasted demand would fall within the sustainable yield of the groundwater basin and within the 32,000 afy (including groundwater and surface water diversions) allowed to be extracted/diverted pursuant to TROA. Additionally, the water supplied to the proposed MVWSP development would be filtered and treated either at the new well heads on the project site or at the NCSD water treatment plant to meet drinking water standards.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 16-18 to 16-22; Final EIR, p. 2-17; see also Master Response 8, Response to Comment LA1-3, IO13-1, IO41-74.)</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>S 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>Impact 16-2: Increased demand for wastewater collection and conveyance services</b></p> <p>(LS) The proposed project would be served by new facilities that would collect and convey wastewater from the West Parcel development area to the existing NCSD, TSD, and T-TSA collection systems. The NCSD golf course siphon lines have a capacity of 2,100 gpm and the 267 to TSD siphon lines have a total capacity of 2,550 gpm. The proposed project would generate peak wastewater flows of approximately 520 gpm. T-TSA has indicated that the TRI has capacity to accommodate 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

No Impact = NI

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>addition of wastewater flows generated by the proposed project. Therefore, existing capacity in the wastewater collection systems would be adequate to serve the proposed project.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 16-22 to 16-24; Final EIR, pp. 2-16 to 2-18; see also Response to Comments IO41-73, LA7-16 to LA7-18, and LA7-25 to LA7-28.)</p>			
<p><b>Impact 16-3: Increased demand for wastewater treatment services</b></p> <p>(LS) Wastewater generated by the project would be treated at the T-TSA wastewater treatment plant. The proposed project would generate wastewater flows of 0.29 mgd under ADWF conditions and 0.76 mgd under PWWF conditions. The applicant would be required to obtain approval from T-TSA before issuance of building permits. The capacity of the T-TSA wastewater treatment plant is 9.6 mgd and currently receives on average 6.41 mgd. The facility has sufficient capacity to treat wastewater generated by the proposed project and would not require construction of any additional facilities.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 16-24.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Impact 16-4: Result in inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy</b></p> <p>(LS) Implementation of the MWWPSP project would result in increased demand for electricity and natural gas. New infrastructure would connect new residential units, homeowner amenities, and commercial uses on the West Parcel development area to existing electrical and natural gas lines. Liberty Utilities and Southwest Gas have each indicated that it would be able to adequately serve the development at buildout. The proposed project's energy use would be similar to that of typical of residential and commercial projects, with energy consumption associated with use of lighting, heating, cooling, and appliances. In accordance with MWWPSP Policies ER-AQ4, ER-AQ5, ER-AQ6, ER-AQ7, ER-AQ9, ER-AQ13, ER-AQ15, and ER-AQ16, the proposed project would be designed to incorporate energy efficiency requirements and would include additional energy conservation and efficiency features.</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>(Draft EIR, pp. 16-25 to 16-26.)</p> <p><b>Impact 16-5: Increased demand for solid waste services</b></p> <p>(LS) Development of new residential and commercial uses under the MVWPSP would increase the demand for solid waste collection and disposal and construction of the project would temporarily generate construction waste. Construction activities would generate a total of 400 tons of solid waste over the course of the construction period. Solid waste generated at buildout of the MVWPSP would be approximately 7 tons of solid waste per day and a total of 2,561 tons per year. The Eastern Regional Landfill MRF is permitted to receive 800 tons of solid waste daily. The Lockwood Regional Landfill is permitted to accept solid waste at current and projected volumes for 150 years. The solid waste generated during construction and operation of the proposed project would not exceed the permitted capacity of the Eastern Regional Landfill MRF and Transfer Station, which would receive the waste for sorting and capture of recyclables, or Lockwood Regional Landfill, which would receive solid waste from the project for permanent disposal.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp 16-27 to 16-28.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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>(Draft EIR, p. 16-29.)</p> <p><b>Impact 16-6: Increased demand for snow removal and storage</b></p> <p>(LS) Future development under the MVWPSP would be designed with predetermined areas of adequate size and space along roadways, parking areas, pathways, and other areas, such as the designated open space areas on the West Parcel to accommodate snow removal activities and provide adequate snow storage.</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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><b>Cumulative Impact 16-7: Cumulative increase in demand for water supply</b></p> <p>(LS) The geographic area considered for assessing cumulative demand for water supply is the Martis Valley Groundwater Basin and the NCS D service boundary. Cumulative plus project conditions for water supply are evaluated within the project-specific impact analysis in Impact 16-1. As indicated in Impact 16-1, the WSA prepared for the project</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>concludes that NCSD has sufficient and available water supplies to meet its current and planned future demands. Because WSAs require consideration of anticipated development over a 20-year period in addition to the project, the WSA considered cumulative development at buildout of the project in 2034. Future demand in 2034 for all users of the Martis Valley Groundwater Basin, including project demand, is 18,955 afy. The WSA identifies available supply of groundwater in the Martis Valley Groundwater Basin of 32,000 afy. These results indicate that the cumulative demand can be met from water supplied from the Martis Valley Groundwater Basin. When completed, the proposed onsite wells would be dedicated to NCSD and would be maintained and operated by NCSD. NCSD has sufficient water supply to meet projected demand in addition to that of the proposed project.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 16-29; see also Master Response 8.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 16-8: Cumulative increase in demand for wastewater collection and conveyance services</b></p> <p>The geographic area that is considered for wastewater collection system includes the NCSD service boundary and the portion of the TSD wastewater collection lines extending between the NCSD outfall at Truckee Tahoe Airport Road and the T-TSA Truckee River Interceptor (TRI). For cumulative impacts on T-TSA wastewater conveyance, the area considered is the TRI between the TSD outfall pipeline and the wastewater treatment plant. As discussed under Impact 16-2, the West Parcel development area is currently outside the NCSD service boundary, but proposed to be annexed, and a new service contract between NCSD and TSD would be required following annexation.</p> <p>As mentioned under Impact 16-2, an independent evaluation of the capacity of the wastewater collection system and the potential impacts from MVWPSP development in combination with buildout in the NCSD service area was prepared for NCSD (NCSD 2015b). This analysis considered existing NCSD flows, flows from buildout of the NCSD service area, and the addition of flows from the proposed</p>	<p><b>Cumulative Mitigation Measure 16-8a: Increase capacity of the NCSD wastewater collection and conveyance system</b></p> <p>Prior to Placer County's environmental determination for each subsequent development entitlement, the project applicant shall coordinate with NCSD to determine the wastewater conveyance demand at buildout of each proposed development entitlement and provide the County with a copy of this coordination (e.g., will-serve letter or the equivalent). If the wastewater conveyance demand for an individual phase cannot be met with existing capacity in the NCSD collection and conveyance system, then prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant and NCSD shall develop plans for and construct improvements that would provide additional capacity in the NCSD system downstream from the point at which MVWPSP flows would enter the system. The wastewater conveyance and collection improvement plans developed by the project applicant and NCSD shall also identify the timing of such improvements, and that the capacity of the lines will be available when needed by project development. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the project applicant shall provide evidence of payment to NCSD for fair share funding or show the construction of the</p>	LS	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 16-8a and 16-8b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring increased capacity of the NCSD wastewater collection and conveyance system and by ensuring sufficient capacity in the TSD wastewater lines. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The Project would not make a considerable contribution to a cumulative impact related to T-TSA's sewer infrastructure (TRI). However, because future buildout in NCSD's and TSD's service areas would result in an exceedance of future wastewater conveyance system capacity, and because the exact timing for reaching capacity in the NCSD and TSD portions of the sewer infrastructure are unknown, the project would result in a considerable contribution to a cumulative impact related to wastewater collection and conveyance systems. Cumulative Mitigation Measure 16-8a and 16-8b, would require the project applicant to coordinate with NCSD to determine the wastewater conveyance demand for each development entitlement phase. If the demand for any individual phase exceeds the NCSD capacity, the applicant shall coordinate with NCSD to construct improvements to provide additional capacity, timed to meet the demand posed by development of the Project. In addition, the project applicant shall coordinate with TSD to determine the wastewater conveyance</p>

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>project. While not assessed in the Sewer Capacity Analysis Technical Memorandum, the proposed 22,000 square feet of recreation/homeowner amenities for the MVWVPWP would generate wastewater flows of approximately 6 gpm under ADWF conditions and approximately 15 gpm under PWWF conditions. The addition of sewer flows from recreation/homeowner amenities would represent less than 3 percent of the overall flows from development under the MVWVPWP. The siphon lines and sizes recommended in the capacity analysis would not be affected by these small additional flows (Hunt, pers. comm., 2015).</p> <p>Under existing conditions, NCSD is able to operate either of the 8-inch or 12-inch siphon lines to satisfy system demand. Under NCSD buildout conditions, the remaining available capacity of the siphon lines under PWWF is 443 gpm. The PWWF at buildout of the NCSD service area would require use of both siphon lines run in parallel and operation of both pumps at the lift station for short periods of time. With the addition of project-generated wastewater to the NCSD wastewater collection system at manhole 237, in combination with flows from existing and NCSD buildout development, the golf course siphon section would not be able to meet the capacity requirements under PWWF conditions. Also, with the addition of MVWVPSP flows, in combination with flows from existing and NCSD buildout development, the 267 to TSD siphon line section would essentially be at 100 percent capacity under PWWF conditions. The 267 lift station is also a key asset in the NCSD collection system. As equipped, the lift station has two 225 gpm pumps. Modeling simulations indicate that as flows increase with development, flows into the lift station will be up to 520 gpm, exceeding the capacity of a single pump.</p> <p>Cumulative projects that would contribute flows to the portion of the TSD system serving the project site include Joerger Ranch, North Highlands II, Northstar Mountain Master Plan, and Martis Camp. The TSD system at this point was designed and constructed to handle sewer flows from buildout of the NCSD service boundary, which includes Northstar Highlands II</p>	<p>improvements that would provide sufficient capacity for buildout of that phase to the satisfaction of NCSD. Improvements shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With MVWVPSP sewer flows into the golf course siphon at manhole 237 under Sewer Option 1, and Sewer Option 2, upsize approximately 6,450 linear feet of the existing 8-inch siphon line through the golf course to 16-inch, and upsize approximately 11,500 linear feet of the existing 8-inch 267-TSD siphon line to 16-inch; and</li> <li>• With MVWVPSP sewer flows into the 267 to TSD siphon line downstream of the 267 Lift Station under Sewer Option 1 and Sewer Option 2, upsize approximately 11,500 linear feet of the existing 8-inch line to 16-inch; or</li> <li>• Under Sewer Option 3, construct a direct sewer line from the West Parcel development area, along SR 267, to the TSD connection manhole at Truckee Tahoe Airport Road. This option would run parallel to the existing system.</li> </ul> <p><b>Cumulative Mitigation Measure 16-8b: Ensure sufficient capacity in TSD lines</b></p> <p>Prior to the Placer County Subsequent Conformity Review Process environmental determination for each development entitlement following Specific Plan approval, the project applicant shall coordinate with TSD to determine the wastewater conveyance demand at buildout of each proposed development entitlement and provide the County with a copy of the coordination. If TSD finds that project-generated peak wastewater flows exceed the capacity of the TSD line between the NCSD outfall at Truckee-Tahoe Airport Road and the TRI, NCSD and TSD shall develop plans for and construct improvements that would allow for conveyance of buildout wastewater flows. The improvements shall be constructed to meet peak wet weather flows of 520 gpm, or flows determined by final design plans, in the sewer line from the NCSD outfall to the TRI. The plans shall identify the timing of the improvements, and that the capacity of the lines will be available when needed by project development. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the project applicant shall provide evidence of payment to</p>		<p>demand for each development entitlement phase. If the demand for any individual phase exceeds the TSD capacity, TSD shall coordinate with NCSD to construct improvements to provide additional capacity, timed to meet the demand posed by development of the Project. The project applicant shall provide fair share funding for the improvements or construct the improvements necessary in coordination with the TSD and NCSD. This plan will reduce significant impacts to less than significant levels.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 16-29 through 16-32; Final EIR, pp. 2-19 to 2-23; see also Response to Comments IO41-73, LA7-29 to LA7-33 and LA7-35 to LA7-38.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>and Northstar Mountain Master Plan (Tresan, pers. comm., 2015). Preliminary results from modeling of the demand for wastewater conveyance from buildout conditions in this portion of the TSD system indicate that future development could result in some portions of the sewer lines reaching capacity during peak flows but would not result in an overflow.</p> <p>The TSD wastewater conveyance system in this area is currently able to serve existing wastewater flows during ADWF and PWWF. The preliminary results from modeling of project flows in addition to flows from buildout of other cumulative projects indicate that additional segments of the TSD system would reach capacity, and there could be overflow in some pipes. Although cumulative projects and the proposed project would be required to comply with terms and conditions of the applicable service contract, which would include, among other things, payment of one-time fees for connection to the TSD system, as well as regular user fees and surcharges in lieu of property taxes for ongoing operation and maintenance, this would be a significant cumulative impact. Because it is not known at exactly what point during development of the project when the TSD system would reach capacity, additional flows from the proposed project could be added to the TSD system when it is near or at capacity, resulting in overflows prior to buildout of the project. The project would make a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact on wastewater conveyance in the TSD system.</p> <p>The PDWF at buildout of the NCSD service area, the TSD service area served by the MVI, and MVWPSP is 2,743 gpm (Tresan, pers. comm., 2015c). The PWWF at buildout of the NCSD service area, the TSD service area served by the MVI, and MVWPSP is 3,842 gpm. Flows from buildout of the existing service area for the MVI and from the MVWPSP would result in approximately 5,500 linear feet of the MVI surcharging or overflowing. The existing agreement for conveyance via TSD infrastructure only allows for wastewater flows generated from development within the existing NCSD service boundary (TSD 2014). To provide wastewater collection and conveyance services to the MVWPSP, NCSD would enter</p>	<p>NCSD and TSD for fair share funding or show the construction of the improvements, to be determined in coordination with NCSD and TSD, which would provide sufficient capacity to the satisfaction of NCSD and TSD. Fair share funding or construction of the improvements by the project applicant shall also account for any additional permanent and/or temporary easements. Improvements shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing onsite wastewater detention facilities, such as enlarged pipes, vaults, or tanks, such that conveyance can be timed to coincide with off-peak conditions when the TSD line has sufficient capacity; or</li> <li>• Replacing the existing TSD line with a larger sewer line that increases capacity to serve future demand for wastewater conveyance; or</li> <li>• Installing an additional line parallel to the existing TSD line that increases capacity to serve future demand for wastewater conveyance.</li> </ul> <p>The developer of any project within the MVWPSP area shall be required, as part of the Placer County Subsequent Conformity Review Process and/or tentative map approval process, to submit a will-serve letter from TSD prior to the issuance of any building permit.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 16-31 through 16-32; Final EIR, pp. 2-21 to 2-23; see also Response to Comments LA7-35 to LA7-38.)</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>into a new contract with TSD to include collection and conveyance of wastewater from the West Parcel development area. The West Parcel development area is currently outside the NCSD service boundary, but proposed to be annexed, and The West Parcel development area is currently outside the NCSD service boundary, but proposed to be annexed, and a new service contract between NCSD and TSD would be required following annexation. The proposed project would also be required to comply with terms and conditions of the new service contract between NCSD and TSD, which would include, among other things, payment of one-time fees for connection to the TSD system, as well as regular user fees and surcharges in lieu of property taxes for ongoing operation and maintenance. Under the service contract between NCSD and TSD for service to the project area, NCSD would collect these fees and transfer them to TSD. Based on TSD's capacity analysis, project-generated flows along with flows from other anticipated developments would exceed the capacity of the existing TSD MVI pipeline.</p> <p>Cumulative projects that would contribute flows that could affect the TRI below the TSD outfall include Joerger Ranch, North Highlands II, Northstar Mountain Master Plan, Martis Camp, Brockway Campground, Homewood Mountain Master Plan, and projects in Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows. The population generated by the proposed project was planned for as part of the Martis Valley Community Plan (MVCP), which is considered and incorporated by reference into the Placer County General Plan. The project would result in a reduction in population size from that proposed in the MVCP. The TRI is designed to address buildout of its service area which includes cumulative projects located within the Town of Truckee and Placer County (Placer County 1994, Town of Truckee 2006). Additionally, T-TSA emergency overflow ponds located between Riverview Park and the Truckee River are designed to handle additional flows that may be experienced during peak periods and storm events (T-TSA 2009). Because there is adequate capacity within this segment of the TRI, and it was designed to meet buildout demand, this is a less than significant cumulative impact.</p>			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>In summary, the project would not make a considerable contribution to a cumulative impact related to T-TSA's sewer infrastructure (TRI). However, because future buildout in NCSD's and TSD's service areas would result in an exceedance of future wastewater conveyance system capacity, and because the exact timing for reaching capacity in the NCSD and TSD portions of the sewer infrastructure are unknown, the project would result in a considerable contribution to a cumulative impact related to wastewater collection and conveyance systems.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 16-29 to 16-31; Final EIR, pp. 2-19 to 2-21; see also Response to Comments IO41-73, and LA7-29 to LA7-33.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 16-9: Cumulative increase in demand for wastewater treatment services</b></p> <p>(LS) The geographic area that is considered for cumulative impacts on wastewater treatment services consists of the T-TSA service area. Currently, the wastewater treatment plant has adequate capacity to serve existing wastewater treatment demand.</p> <p>Cumulative projects that would contribute demand for wastewater treatment in the T-TSA wastewater treatment plant include Joerger Ranch, North Highlands II, Northstar Mountain Master Plan, Martis Camp, Homewood Mountain Master Plan, and projects in Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows. The T-TSA wastewater treatment plant is designed to address buildout of its service area which includes cumulative projects located within the Town of Truckee and Placer County (Placer County 1994, Town of Truckee 2006). Additionally, TTSA emergency overflow ponds located between Riverview Park and the Truckee River are designed to hold additional flows until the treatment plant could process those flows (T-TSA 2009). Similar to wastewater conveyance, these cumulative projects are required to pay connection fees that are used to cover the operations and maintenance costs of these additional flows.</p> <p>The population generated by the proposed project was planned for as part of the Martis Valley Community Plan (MVCP), which is</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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>considered and incorporated by reference into the Placer County General Plan. The project would actually result in a reduction in population size from that proposed in the MVCP. As described above, the T-TSA water treatment plant is designed to address buildout of its service area, which includes the proposed project and cumulative projects located within the Town of Truckee and Placer County. Because of this and the additional storage provided by T-TSA overflow ponds, there would be sufficient capacity in the T-TSA wastewater treatment plant to meet the wastewater treatment demand of future buildout.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 16-32 to 16-33.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 16-10: Cumulative inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy</b></p> <p>(LS) The geographic area considered for cumulative impacts related to energy use includes the service areas for Liberty Energy and Southwest Gas. These providers employ various programs and mechanisms to support provision of these services to new development; various utilities charge connection fees and re-coup costs of new infrastructure through standard billings for services. There is currently sufficient infrastructure and energy supply to support existing demand.</p> <p>Cumulative projects identified in Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-2 that would be served by these energy providers include the Brockway Campground Project, Northstar Mountain Master Plan, Northstar Highlands Phase II, Joerger Ranch Specific Plan, Canyon Springs Subdivision, and buildout of Martis Camp. Through its established process to provide connections and natural gas supply to new development, Southwest Gas uses plans provided by the developer to determine if or when upgrades in the system would be required to meet demand (Echeverria, pers. comm., 2015). To ensure redundancy in its electricity system to customers in the Northstar, Kings Beach, and Truckee areas, Liberty Utilities will begin construction in summer 2015 on the 650 Electrical Line Upgrade Project, which will upgrade the system serving these areas to improve reliability and accommodate planned</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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>growth, including the proposed project and other nearby similar projects listed above (Liberty Utilities 2015b). Additionally, these projects would contribute to increased energy demand; however, these projects would be required to implement energy efficiency measures in accordance with the Title 24 to reduce energy demand. For this reason and because Liberty Utilities and Southwest Gas have procedures to plan for system improvements to keep pace with projected demand, cumulative energy impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>As described in Impact 16-4, the demand for energy from buildout of the proposed project would result in an increase in demand for energy, when combined with other cumulative projects, all of which are subject to Title 24 energy efficiency requirements, would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact. Implementation of the proposed project would include a number of energy saving features required by MVWPSP Policies ER-AQ4, ER-AQ5, ER-AQ6, ER-AQ7, ER-AQ9, ER-AQ13, ER-AQ15, and ER-AQ16 that would result in additional reductions in energy use beyond those required by Title 24. The project's implementation of Mitigation Measures 12-2 and 13-2 would further ensure that non-renewable energy use during construction would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary by minimizing vehicle idling time and use of late model engines.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 16-33.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 16-11: Cumulative increase in demand for solid waste services</b></p> <p>(LS) The geographic area considered for cumulative impacts related to energy use includes the service area for Tahoe Truckee Sierra Disposal. They currently have sufficient staffing and facilities, including capacity at the Eastern Regional Landfill MRF and Lockwood Landfill. The transfer station sorts out recyclable materials and ships the remaining solid waste to Lockwood Landfill. On average, the Eastern Regional Landfill MRF is operating at approximately 23 percent of permitted capacity. Operational waste from the proposed project would result in less than a four percent increase in daily waste received at the MRF. As</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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>permitted, the life of the landfill is 150 years and has sufficient capacity to meet existing demand (Anderson, pers. comm., 2015).</p> <p>Other approved and foreseeable projects identified in Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-2 that propose new residential, commercial, and recreation development, including the Brockway Campground Project, Northstar Mountain Master Plan, Northstar Highlands Phase II, Joerger Ranch Specific Plan, Canyon Springs Subdivision, and buildout of Martis Camp, would contribute to increased demand for solid waste services. Total capacity and life of the Eastern Regional Landfill MRF and Lockwood Landfill were planned to include demand for the Sierra-portion of Placer County and the Town of Truckee, including the cumulative projects. Additionally, these projects must meet waste reduction requirements set forth by AB 939 and AB 341. Consequently, solid waste demand from the cumulative projects is a less-than-significant cumulative impact. Additionally, these projects do not create the need for new or expanded facilities or infrastructure.</p> <p>As described under Impact 16-5, construction waste generated by the proposed project would account for approximately 0.01 percent of the total landfill capacity and operational waste generated by the proposed project would account for a 0.17 percent increase in daily waste received at Lockwood Landfill. The proposed project's operational solid waste would represent a 3.7 percent increase in daily waste received at the Eastern Regional Landfill MRF. Additionally, the development proposed by the MVWPSP was planned for in the Martis Valley Community Plan. The combined demand for solid waste generated by the proposed project and other cumulative projects would result in a substantial increase in solid waste demand; however, the Eastern Regional Landfill MRF and Lockwood Landfill have sufficient capacity available to meet the demands of these planned projects. Additionally, solid waste generation would be reduced by State solid waste reduction requirements. For these reasons, the proposed project when combined with other cumulative projects result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact. The project-level analysis to determine the solid waste generated by the</p>			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>proposed project assumed full occupancy; however, the project is estimated to contain only 20 percent permanent residents and 80 percent second-home residents. Consequently, the estimated solid waste demand is considered to be a conservative estimate and the actual solid waste demand would be much lower than identified in Impact 16-5. Additionally, the analysis does not take into account state requirements to reduce solid waste, which would further reduce the amount of solid waste generated by the project. For these reasons, the proposed project's contribution to a cumulative impact on solid waste services would be reduced.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 16-34.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 16-12: Cumulative increase in demand for snow removal and storage</b></p> <p>(LS) The geographic area considered for cumulative impacts on increased need for snow removal and storage would be limited to the West Parcel. As described in Impact 16-6, snow storage areas would be incorporated into the design and construction of the proposed project and the project site would be annexed into the NCSD service boundaries, resulting in NCSD providing road clearing and snow removal on the project site.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 16-34.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)
<b>PUBLIC SERVICE AND RECREATION</b>			
<p><b>Impact 17-1: Impacts on existing recreation facilities</b></p> <p>(LS) The MVWPSP is located in an area containing recreation facilities, such as trails, that provide year-round opportunities for hiking, mountain biking, cross country skiing, snowshoeing, and snowmobiling. Important recreation trails near the MVWPSP project site include the Tahoe Rim Trail, Fibreboard Freeway, and Northstar trails. Implementation of the MVWPSP would not interfere with use of these recreation facilities. The proposed project would provide 14 miles of multi-use recreation trails on the West Parcel, some of which could connect to the nearby regional trail system. Additionally, MVWPSP proposes conservation of the East Parcel, which would connect 50,000 acres of contiguous undeveloped forested land</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>east of SR 267 through the Mount Rose wilderness. Implementation of the MVWPSP would increase the use of existing trails and recreation facilities by introducing new residents and visitors to the West Parcel. The East Parcel contains approximately 40 miles of existing informal and unauthorized user-created trails that are assumed to be retained. If the East Parcel is acquired by a conservancy, the new owner would decide whether to maintain existing trails and/or create new trails. However, it is not known at this time whether the East Parcel would be placed under a conservation easement or acquired by a conservancy and what, if any improvements, a conservancy might implement. Any formalized or expanded use is not proposed as part of the project, and this EIR assumes that no changes are made to East Parcel trails or other elements, and that the existing level of use of these trails will remain at current levels. Because the project would result in a permanent and seasonal population increase, it would result in an increase in use of existing recreation resources; however, because there are ample recreation resources available and the project would include additional recreation opportunities, no substantial physical deterioration of existing recreation resources and facilities would occur.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 17-13 to 17-15; see also Response to Comment IO3-2, IO31-38, IO45-2 to 5.)</p>			
<p><b>Impact 17-2: Increased demand for parks and recreation facilities</b></p> <p>(LS) The MVWPSP would include recreational facilities to serve future residents of the project site, including open space areas and recreation amenities that could include a swimming pool, tennis courts, basketball court, fitness center, and other amenities. Additionally, the MVWPSP proposes approximately 14 miles of multi-use trails throughout the West Parcel that would connect to regional trail networks. The physical effects of constructing these facilities (e.g., tree removal, site preparation, excavation, construction noise, generation of fugitive dust), are substantially similar to those of the residential and commercial buildings and are addressed respective chapters of this EIR. (e.g., Chapter 7, "Biological Resources," Chapter 9, "Visual Resources," Chapter 13,</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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>"Noise," Chapter 15, "Hydrology and Water Quality.") The MVWPSP would provide recreational facilities that would meet or exceed the Placer County General Plan recreational facilities standards and as such, would not have a substantial adverse impact on existing nearby recreational facilities such that physical deterioration of those facilities would occur.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 17-15 to 17-16; see also Response to Comment IO45-2 to 5.)</p>			
<p><b>Impact 17-3: Increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical services</b></p> <p>(PS) The MVWPSP would include development that would increase demand for fire protection and emergency medical services. The West Parcel development area would be annexed into, and fire protection services would be provided by, Northstar Community Services District (NCSD) along with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE). The Northstar Fire Department (NFD), which is part of NCSD, currently maintains a minimum daily staff of four firefighters. Based on project size, population, and distance from the fire stations, project development would result in the need for an additional one to three firefighters over the course of project construction and occupancy to maintain adequate levels of fire protection. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in physical impacts because of the need for new or physically altered facilities. However, the demand from the proposed project could adversely affect response times and NFD's ability to respond to multiple emergency calls, which would be an impact on public health and safety.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 17-16 to 17-18; see also Master Response 9, Response to Comment IO41-71.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 17-3: Provide additional fire protection staffing</b></p> <p>Before recordation of the Large Lot Final Map or the initial Small Lot Final Map (or any commercial development), the project applicant shall develop and implement a funding plan that would sufficiently supplement tax revenue from the MVWPSP to add fire protections staff. Such funding shall remain in place until the funding stream from property tax revenue is sufficient to maintain fire protection standards of service. If this does not occur, an Assessment District would be necessary. In consultation with NFD, the fire protection staffing increases shall be tied to project occupancy such that level of service is maintained as level of risk is increased as the development is built out.</p> <p>The funding plan would provide for revenue to initially employ one additional full-time firefighter and then, over time as development occurs, to add another additional full-time firefighter to properly respond to a serious building fire that could occur in the vicinity of 5 miles from the fire station.</p> <p>The funding plan shall include the following framework for the trigger points for increased staffing. The trigger points for adding daily staffing above the current minimum of four should be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With the certificate of occupancy of the first dwelling unit or any of the commercial space, the project developer shall provide the project's fair share contribution to overtime funds to the Northstar Fire Department to provide a minimum of five firefighters on duty 24/7/365.</li> <li>2. With the certificate of occupancy of the 100th dwelling unit, or 50 percent of the commercial</li> </ol>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 17-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by providing additional fire protection staffing. 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Development of the Project would increase demand for fire protection and emergency medical services. NCSD and CALFIRE would provide fire protection and emergency medical services to the project area. Based on project estimates, an additional one to three full time fire protection staff members will be needed over the course of project development. Mitigation Measure 17-3 requires the project applicant to develop and implement a funding plan that would sufficiently supplement tax revenue from the MVWPSP to add the needed fire protection staff. This plan will reduce the potential impacts to less than significant levels.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 17-16 to 17-19; see also Master Response 9, Response to Comment IO41-71.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>space, the project developer shall provide to the Department the added revenue to add two permanent full-time firefighters, one each to two shifts, raising the minimum staffing to six career firefighters 24/7/365. At this point, all three duty shifts will have six firefighters each.</p> <p>3. With the certificate of occupancy of the 200th dwelling unit, or 75 percent of the commercial space, the project developer shall pay the project's fair share contribution to ensure the Department has the overtime funds to maintain a minimum of six career firefighters on duty 24/7/365.</p> <p>4. With the certificate of occupancy of the 300th dwelling unit, or 100 percent of the commercial space, the project developer shall pay the project's fair share contribution to ensure that the department has the funds to add three additional firefighters, one per duty platoon, raising each to seven firefighters.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 17-18 to 17-19.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 17-4: Increased demand for law enforcement services</b></p> <p>(LS) The MVWPSP would add new residents in the Martis Valley area. Based on data from other developments in the vicinity, the project is expected to generate approximately 380 fulltime, permanent residents in 20 percent of the dwelling units; the remainder would be second homes, with periodic occupancy. Based on consultation with the Placer County Sheriff's Department, the project would not result in the need for additional or expanded law enforcement service facilities and would not result in decreased law enforcement service levels.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 17-19 to 17-20.)</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>Impact 17-5: Increased demand for public schools</b></p> <p>(LS) At buildout, the MVWPSP would add 760 new residences in the Martis Valley region. As described in Chapter 6, "Population, Employment, and Housing," it is anticipated that the MVWPSP would have approximately 20 percent permanent residents and approximately</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      No Impact = NI      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>80 percent transient/seasonal visitors. This would result in an estimated permanent resident population of approximately 380 persons and a student yield of approximately 49 students.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 17-20 to to 17-21.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 17-6: Cumulative demand for recreation facilities and opportunities</b></p> <p>(LS) The geographic area for cumulative recreation impacts includes the southeastern portion of the Town of Truckee, Martis Valley, and the north shore of Lake Tahoe extending from Kings Beach to Tahoe City. Recreation demand in the Truckee-Tahoe region is met with a wide variety and amount of recreational facilities and opportunities. Additionally, a number of the cumulative projects identified in Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-2, including the Martis Valley Trail, Northstar Mountain Master Plan, Northstar at Tahoe Ski Trail Widening, Truckee River Corridor Access Plan, Dollar Creek Shared-Use Trail, and Brockway Campground would provide new recreation opportunities, improve public access to recreation, and enhance the potential for recreational experiences in the region. The Martis Valley area and the north shore of Lake Tahoe near Kings Beach and Tahoe Vista contain thousands of acres of public lands and lands in permanent conservation that provide open space accessible to the public for recreation activities that include hiking, mountain biking, skiing, snowshoeing, snowmobiling, and wildlife viewing. These resources include, among others, the Tahoe Rim Trail, Burton Creek State Recreation Area, Tahoe National Forest, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Fibreboard Freeway, and Martis Creek Lake Recreation Area. The Northstar resort area also includes a trail system and ski resort. These recreation resources are monitored by their respective management entities, and maintenance is conducted as necessary. These resources provide ample opportunities for recreating to meet the existing and future demand.</p> <p>Cumulative projects that would increase the demand for recreation resources include</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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Brockway Campground, Truckee Railyard Master Plan, Pollard Station, Joerger Ranch Specific Plan, Canyon Springs Subdivision, Martis Camp, Northstar Highlands Phase II, Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan, Squaw Valley Ranch Estates, PlumpJack Squaw Valley Inn, and Alpine Sierra Subdivision. Because many of these projects are proposed specifically to improve access to recreation and the recreation experience (Brockway Campground, ski resort accommodations), are required to comply with local agency requirements for provision of active and passive recreation (e.g., Town of Truckee General Plan Policy COS-P8.1), and are in a location with abundant existing and proposed recreation opportunities and facilities, the cumulative recreation impact would be less than significant.</p> <p>Cumulative projects that would increase the demand for recreation resources include Brockway Campground, Truckee Railyard Master Plan, Pollard Station, Joerger Ranch Specific Plan, Canyon Springs Subdivision, Martis Camp, Northstar Highlands Phase II, Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan, Squaw Valley Ranch Estates, PlumpJack Squaw Valley Inn, and Alpine Sierra Subdivision. Because many of these projects are proposed specifically to improve access to recreation and the recreation experience (Brockway Campground, ski resort accommodations), are required to comply with local agency requirements for provision of active and passive recreation (e.g., Town of Truckee General Plan Policy COS-P8.1), and are in a location with abundant existing and proposed recreation opportunities and facilities, the cumulative recreation impact would be less than significant.</p> <p>As described above, implementation of the MVWPSP would result in increased permanent and seasonal population, and would thereby increase the demand for recreation opportunities and facilities. The MVWPSP project itself includes policies that identify new recreation facilities, such as trails, to be constructed on the West Parcel and provide measures to address visual quality and noise effects (MVWPSP Policies CP-5, OS-1 through OS-10, ER-SR4, ER-SR5, ER-N2, and ER-N3). The project would include recreational facilities to serve future residents of the project</p>			

Less than Significant = LS

No Impact = NI

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>site, including open space areas and recreation amenities that could include a swimming pool, tennis courts, basketball court, fitness center, and other amenities. Because the project would provide substantial onsite recreation opportunities and because ample recreation resources are available in the vicinity, the project would not contribute to substantial cumulative demand for recreation resources, nor would it contribute to substantial physical deterioration of existing recreation facilities.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 17-21 to 17-22.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 17-7: Cumulative demand for fire protection and emergency medical services</b></p> <p>(LS) The geographic area for cumulative effects related to fire protection and emergency medical services includes the area within the Northstar Community Services District service area, which includes the Northstar Resort area and is served by the Northstar Fire Department (NFD). NFD has two stations, Station 31 located on Northstar Drive and Station 32 located on Highlands View Road. Fire protection and emergency medical services for the MVWPSP project would be provided by NFD Station 31.</p> <p>Currently, NFD has sufficient staffing and facilities to address existing demand for fire protection and emergency medical services. Cumulative projects that would increase demand for fire protection and emergency medical services include Northstar Highlands Phase II and Northstar Mountain Master Plan. NFD has indicated that Northstar's projected residential and commercial development would increase demand for emergency services by NFD (NFD n.d.). However, the Northstar Highlands Phase II project is within an established Community Facilities District (CFD), which provided funding for Station 32. Additionally, the NFD has a fire mitigation fee program under which new development is required to pay for its fair share cost of planned capital improvement needs. With the tax revenue generated by Northstar development, funding through Highlands CFD, and revenue from the fire mitigation fee program, sufficient funding is available to provide the future capital improvements necessary to maintain services</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>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>levels. As discussed above, the project would provide additional funding in accordance with the NCSD fire mitigation fee program, and in accordance with MVCP Policy 6.H.3, and NCSD would receive additional funding from tax revenue generated by the MVWPSP development to support adequate fire protection services within the NCSD boundary. The fire mitigation fee collection program is used for infrastructure upgrades, which includes future plans for expansion of the Northstar Drive Station (Station 31) and one additional engine that would be required to maintain adequate response times and accommodate projected new development through buildout of the existing NCSD service boundary (NFD n.d.). The NFD 2014-2015 Capital Facilities Plan identifies a need for expansion of the Northstar Drive Station to accommodate buildout of the existing service boundary. The fire mitigation fee collection program may not be used for staffing (Shadowens, pers. comm., 2015a).</p> <p>As identified in the NFD Capital Facilities Plan, the fire mitigation fee program would fund expansion and remodel of Station 31 and acquisition of an additional engine for the District. The Capital Facilities Plan does not identify the timing at which the physical changes to Station 31 would be needed, but such station expansion would likely involve minor grading, site preparation, and construction that would result in impacts typical of such activities, including short-term increases in noise levels, generation of fugitive dust and other construction emissions, and construction vehicles and equipment on local roadways. At such time such expansion and remodeling of Station 31 is proposed, NCSD would evaluate the project in accordance with CEQA and implement measures to address potential adverse physical effects on the environment. It is reasonable to expect that construction would be short-term, localized, and would not result in significant cumulative construction-related impacts.</p> <p>The MVWPSP would be subject to the NFD fire mitigation fee program and defensible space requirements. An FPP prepared to the satisfaction of Placer County and NFD would be required, as would demonstration of sufficient water supply to provide reasonable protection</p>			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>from wildfire without disruption of domestic water use. The proposed project would also implement other design features, including two emergency vehicle access routes, which would promote fire and public safety. No additional or expanded facilities would be needed to meet the demand for the fire and emergency services. Because the project has the potential to increase demand for emergency services such that response times reach unacceptable levels, Impact 17-3 concludes that, without mitigation, buildout of the MVWPSP would result in a significant impact on fire and emergency response services. In combination with the other cumulative projects served by NFD (i.e., Northstar Highlands Phase II and Northstar Mountain Master Plan), this would result in a cumulative impact on public health and safety. The proposed project would implement Mitigation Measure 17-3 that would provide funding for adequate fire protection staffing to enable adequate response to fire emergencies and maintain public health and safety.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 17-22 to 17-23; see also Response to Comment IO41-71.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 17-8: Cumulative demand for law enforcement services</b></p> <p>The geographic area for cumulative impacts on law enforcement services is the area served by the Placer County Sheriff substation in Tahoe City. Other cumulative projects that could affect law enforcement services include the Northstar Highlands, Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan, Squaw Valley Ranch Estates, Plumpjack Squaw Valley Inn, Alpine Sierra Subdivision, and Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan. These projects would primarily add hotels, vacation rentals, and second homes as well as some commercial and recreation amenities, resulting in incremental increases in the permanent and visitor population.</p> <p>As described in Impact 17-4, the proposed project would result in a small increase of permanent full-time residents. During holidays and other periods of high tourist visitation (e.g., ski season, summer weekends), the proposed project population would be expected to increase, which, in combination with other nearby similar development, could affect</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Placer County Sheriff service ratios and response times. However, because it would be periodic, in a manner consistent with the periodic peak visitation that already occurs in the region, it would not be anticipated to result in physical deterioration of existing facilities or require additional facilities. Additional staff on duty during these peak periods are accommodated in existing facilities and with existing equipment. The proposed project would be required to obtain a will-serve letter from the Placer County Sheriff's Department and pay Placer County fees that would cover the project's public safety costs. The proposed project, in combination with other cumulative development, would not result in the need for new facilities or alterations to existing facilities. (Draft EIR, p. 17-23.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 17-9: Cumulative demand for school services</b></p> <p>The geographic area for cumulative impacts on schools is the school enrollment boundaries for Truckee Elementary School, Alder Creek Middle School, and Truckee High School. The cumulative projects in Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-2 that could contribute to a cumulative impacts on schools that would serve the MVWPSP development include Joerger Ranch Specific Plan on Truckee Elementary School, and Joerger Ranch Specific Plan and Canyon Springs Subdivision on Alder Creek Middle School and Truckee High School. All three schools have available capacity to serve these projects. The project developers for these projects would be required to pay development fees for schools in proportion to the number of new students estimated to be generated by each project.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 17-23 to 17-24.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)
<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>			
<p><b>Impact 18-1: Expose people or the environment to hazards due to the routine use, storage, or transport of hazardous materials or from accidental release or upset</b></p> <p>(LS) Construction and operation of residential and commercial facilities pursuant to the MVWPSP, as well as the continuance of timber harvest and fuels management activities, would involve the use, storage, and transport of</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>hazardous materials. All such hazardous materials and activities would be typical for such uses, and would occur in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations, which would minimize the potential for upset or accident conditions.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 18-14 to 18-16.)</p>			
<p><b>Impact 18-2: Exposure to recognized environmental conditions</b></p> <p>(PS) The MVWPSP project site is undeveloped forested lands and the potential to encounter hazardous materials contaminated soils associated with mining, logging, and motor vehicle use is low. However, the MVWPSP project site is located in an area with a moderate potential for naturally occurring radon gas, exposure to which has the potential to cause lung cancer. In addition, aerially deposited lead could be present on and near the shoulders of SR 267. Through construction of the proposed project, it is possible that previously unidentified contaminants could be disturbed or encountered.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 18-16 to 18-17.)</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 18-2a: Conduct surveys for aerially deposited lead</b></p> <p>Prior to Improvement Plan approval (or issuance of an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for construction within the SR 267 right-of-way), surface and shallow soils (up to two feet below ground surface), shall be surveyed for lead contamination. All sampling shall be conducted consistent with applicable Caltrans requirements. If aerially deposited lead contaminated soil is discovered, with total lead measuring greater than 1,000 mg/kg or soluble lead measuring greater than 5.0 mg/l, survey recommendations on soil management shall follow Caltrans protocol and shall be incorporated into the construction hazardous materials management plan described in Mitigation Measure 18-2c.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 18-2b: Conduct investigation and implement radon resistant construction techniques</b></p> <p>Prior to the occupancy of residential units, the applicant or construction manager shall retain a licensed radon contractor to determine if radon is detected beyond the 4 pCi/L threshold. If the amount of radon exceeds the established threshold, the applicant shall retain a licensed radon contractor to reduce the radon in the affected residences to below the established threshold. Methods include, but are not limited to, the soil suction radon reduction system, which entails the installation of a vent pipe system and fan that pull radon from beneath the house and vent it to the outside. The radon contractor shall develop clear instructions for proper maintenance of the radon monitoring systems that would be installed in each residence, as well as the radon monitoring and reduction system, if required. The maintenance instructions shall be included in the proposed project's covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&amp;Rs). The property disclosure statements</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 18-2a, 18-2b, and 18-2c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by surveying for aerially deposited lead, implement radon resistant construction techniques and investigate for radon prior to occupancy, and prepare and implement a construction hazardous materials management plan. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures 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.</p> <p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> The potential for exposure to hazardous materials contaminated soils associated with mining, logging, and motor vehicle use is low, but there is a potential for exposure to naturally occurring radon gas, and aerially deposited lead could be present on and near the shoulders of SR 267. Mitigation Measure 18-2a, 18-2b, and 18-2c requires the project applicant to survey the surface and shallow soils for lead contamination. If lead contamination greater than 1.00 mg/kg or soluble lead greater than 5.0 mg/l is discovered then soil management per Caltrans protocol shall be incorporated into the construction hazardous materials management plan. Prior to occupancy of residential units, the applicant shall measure for radon gas in concentrations higher than 4 pCi/L, if such levels are detected, the radon must be reduced below that threshold. Radon monitoring systems must be put in place and maintained as well. Lastly, the applicant shall include a construction hazardous materials management plan in any improvement plans, to be approved by the Placer County Environmental Health and Protection Services. The plan should cover worker safety as well as procedure for dealing with the discovery of contaminated soil or water. These measures will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 18-16 to 18-19.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>shall indicate that the site is within an area with a moderate potential for indoor radon levels.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 18-2c: Prepare and implement a construction hazardous materials management plan</b></p> <p>Improvement plans shall include a construction hazardous materials management plan to be prepared, reviewed, and approved by Placer County Environmental Health and Protection Services. The management plan shall include measures to reduce potential hazards to workers, the public, and the environment associated with use of hazardous materials, exposure to potentially contaminated soil, and blasting activities during project construction. The management plan shall include provisions for agency notification, managing impacted materials, sampling and analytical requirements and disposal procedures. The Plan shall cover the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A hazardous materials contingency plan that describes the necessary actions to be taken if evidence of contaminated soil or groundwater is encountered during construction. The contingency plan shall describe the types of evidence that could indicate potential hazardous materials contamination, such as soil discoloration, petroleum or chemical odors, or buried building materials. The plan shall include measures to protect worker safety if signs of contamination are encountered (e.g., stopping work in the vicinity of the potential contamination), identify sampling and analysis protocols for various substances that might be encountered (e.g., volatile organic compounds, hydrocarbons, heavy metals), and list required regulatory agency contacts if contamination is found. The contingency plan shall include recommendations on soil management in the event that ADL is discovered in the SR 267 right-of-way. The plan shall also identify legal and regulatory processes and thresholds for cleanup of contamination.</li> <li>• The project applicant shall retain the services of a qualified environmental contractor to prepare the contingency plan.</li> <li>• The plan, and obligations to abide by and</li> </ul>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>implement the plan, shall be incorporated into the construction and contract specifications for the project.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, 18-17 to 18-19.)</p>		
<p><b>Impact 18-3: Interfere with an emergency evacuation plan</b></p> <p>(LS) Construction of the proposed project would occur in phases and would involve truck traffic and temporary lane/shoulder closures in work zones that could result in temporary and intermittent traffic congestion on SR 267 and local roadways. Although construction would result in additional vehicles, trucks, and equipment on local roadways, it would be temporary and not extensive enough at any one time to result in the obstruction of an evacuation route or impair implementation of an emergency response or evacuation plan. Construction of the whole project would occur in smaller increments over a buildout period of approximately 20 years. Any roadway constraint or construction-related congestion would be easily removed or cleared in the event of an emergency. As part of project operation, adequate emergency access routes to and from the West Parcel development area would be established. Under existing-plus-project conditions at buildout, operation-related trips would represent an incremental increase in existing traffic volumes, but would not be great enough to substantially affect emergency response plans (see Chapter 10, "Transportation and Circulation," for further discussion of trip generation and traffic flow expected under buildout of the MVWPSP). Because the project would include two emergency access points in addition to the primary access road, adequate emergency ingress or egress would be provided.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 18-19 to 18-20; see also Master Response 9, Response to Comment IO41-67 to 70.)</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>Impact 18-4: Expose people or structures to wildland fire hazards</b></p> <p>(PS) Implementation of the MVWPSP would expose people and structures to an area with high to very high risk of wildfire. Adherence to International Building Code standards for fire prevention during construction, incorporation of</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 18-4: Provide additional fire protection staffing</b></p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure 17-3 (see Chapter 17, "Public Services and Recreation"), which requires the project proponent to develop a mitigation plan to provide funding to supplement the projected fire mitigation fees and</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><b>Finding:</b> Compliance with Mitigation Measure 18-4, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by providing addition fire protection staffing. 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.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>fire resistant building materials, defensible space, and compliance with local regulations would reduce the wildland fire threat to workers and residents.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 18-20 to 18-21; see also Master Response 9, Response to Comment IO41-66 and 69.)</p>	<p>property taxes generated by the MVWPSP. The additional funding would support the addition of staffing to properly handle a serious building fire occurring within five miles of NFD Station 31. The mitigation plan includes trigger points for the increased staffing. Alternatively, the mitigation measure states that if a mitigation plan is not developed then a small Assessment District would be necessary to achieve the same objective.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 18-21.)</p>		<p><b>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</b> Development of the Project would increase demand for fire protection and emergency medical services. NCSO and CALFIRE would provide fire protection and emergency medical services to the project area. Based on project estimates, an additional one to three full time fire protection staff members will be needed over the course of project development. Mitigation Measure 17-3 requires the project applicant to develop and implement a funding plan that would sufficiently supplement tax revenue from the MVWPSP to add the needed fire protection staff. This plan will reduce the potential impacts to less than significant levels.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 17-16 to 17-19, and 18-21; see also Master Response 9, Response to Comment IO41-66 and 69.)</p>
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 18-5: Cumulative exposure of people or the environment to hazards due to the routine use, storage, or transport of hazardous materials or from accidental release or upset</b></p> <p>(LS) Although some hazardous materials releases can cover a large area and interact with other releases (e.g., atmospheric contamination, contamination of groundwater aquifers), incidents of hazardous materials contamination are more typically isolated to a small geographic area. These relatively isolated areas of contamination typically do not combine in a cumulative manner with other sites of hazardous materials contamination. On the project site and in its vicinity, there are no identified incidents of widespread hazardous materials contamination with different sources of contamination interacting on a cumulative basis. Future projects that would include construction activities and add new residences, commercial uses, and infrastructure, similar to those identified for the proposed project (see Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-2), may use, store, and generate hazardous materials. However, these projects would be subject to existing federal, state, and local hazardous materials regulations, limiting the potential for releases and contamination and requiring clean-up when such events occurred. Given these conditions, there would not be a significant cumulative impact related to hazardous materials.</p> <p>The proposed project would result in the transport, storage, and use of hazardous materials as part of the construction and</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>

432

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>operation of the proposed project. The proposed project would be required to comply with existing federal, state, and local hazardous materials regulations would apply, limiting the potential for releases and contamination and requiring clean-up when releases/contamination do occur. Also, as described above, interactions among multiple hazardous materials releases on a cumulative basis often require close proximity between the releases. In addition, the potential for the proposed project to expose people or the environment to hazardous materials would be reduced through proper safety precautions and compliance with applicable regulations as described in Impact 18-1.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 18-22.)</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 18-6: Cumulative exposure to recognized environmental conditions</b></p> <p>(LS) The geographic area for cumulative impacts related to exposure to recognized environmental conditions would be limited to the West Parcel and areas immediately adjacent to the West Parcel. There are no identified incidents of widespread hazardous materials contamination with different sources of contamination on the project site or in its vicinity that would combine to create a cumulative impact.</p> <p>While Impact 18-2 identifies a potentially significant impact related to exposure to RECs or encountering previously unknown contaminants onsite, the impact associated with encountering onsite RECs or unknown contaminants is site-specific and would be limited to the West Parcel. There are no nearby similar conditions that would interact with conditions on the West Parcel. Consequently, there would be no cumulative impact related to exposure to recognized environmental conditions. The proposed project's potentially significant project-level impacts related to recognized environmental conditions would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measures 18-2a, 18-2b, and 18-2c.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 18-22.)</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>Cumulative Impact 18-7: Cumulative interference with an emergency evacuation</b></p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002;</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p><b>plan</b></p> <p>(LS) The geographic area for cumulative impacts related to emergency evacuation would be the area between the North Shore of Lake Tahoe near Kings Beach to the southeastern portion of the Town of Truckee. Roadways identified in the Placer Operational Area East Side Emergency Evacuation Plan to be used as evacuation routes include SR 28, SR 267, and I-80. Evacuation centers are identified in the Town of Truckee and in Kings Beach. In the event of an emergency that would require evacuation from this area, evacuees could be directed to Truckee or Kings Beach. Cumulative projects in Draft EIR Chapter 4, Table 4-2 that would also be subject to emergency evacuation plans in the project vicinity include Northstar Highlands, Northstar Mountain Master Plan, Joerger Ranch Specific Plan, and Brockway Campground. In the event of an emergency, evacuation from these areas would occur via local roads to SR 267. From there, evacuees could be routed to evacuation centers located to the north or south ends of SR 267. While conditions on local roadways and SR 267 during an emergency evacuation could be congested, no known element of the proposed project or cumulative projects would prevent or impede evacuation, or result in physical interference with an evacuation plan such that evacuation could not occur. The cumulative impact with regard to emergency evacuation would be less than significant. The proposed project would include a primary access road, and a primary and secondary EVA, providing sufficient egress in the event of an emergency evacuation.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, p. 18-23; see also Master Response 9, Response to Comment IO41-67 to 70.)</p>			CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 18-8: Cumulative exposure of people or structures to wildland fire hazards</b></p> <p>(LS) The geographic area for cumulative impacts related to wildland fire hazards encompasses the southeastern portion of the Town of Truckee, the Martis Valley, and the area around the North Shore of Lake Tahoe. The MVVWSP project site is within a high to very high fire hazard area. Past fires in the region have resulted in loss of life, significant</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	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.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>losses of property, and substantial damage to habitat and environmental resources. Historic fire suppression and other forest land management practices have allowed fuels to accumulate in many areas, contributing to the severity of wildfires when they do occur. Additionally, past development in the forested landscape has increased the risk to life and property when fires do occur, and increased the potential for ignition of wildland fires through increased human presence and activity.</p> <p>Future related cumulative projects will continue this trend to varying degrees, including Joerger Ranch Specific Plan, Martis Camp, Martis Valley Trail, Northstar Mountain Master Plan, Northstar Highlands Phase II, and Caltrans' Highway Improvement Projects. Past and future fuels management projects serve to reduce wildland fire risk, including the fuels management activities on the MVWSP project site and on adjacent LTBMU lands, NCSD lands, and the Carnelian and Incline Fuels Reduction and Healthy Forest Restoration Projects. Although developments have placed additional structures and people within a fire hazard zone, the projects have also extended water service, roadways, and fire clearance measures that allow for improved wildland fire response in the region. In addition, there are CWPPs on neighboring lands, including the Town of Truckee in Nevada County and Northstar, which direct the implementation of wildfire protection measures such as defensible space. All habitable structures that can be used as residential space are also assessed a SRA Fire Prevention Fee by the State, which funds State efforts at fire prevention. The combination of these cumulative projects, including projects that would manage fuels and reduce wildland fire risk, would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact related to exposure of people and structures to wildland fires.</p> <p>The proposed project would result in additional development in a high to very high fire hazard area, which could increase the risk to life and property where fires do occur and increase the potential for ignition of wildland fires through increased human presence and activity. However, similar to other nearby projects, the proposed project would also comply with fire protection regulations and practices, contribute</p>			

Less than Significant = LS      No Impact = NI      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 the NCSD fire mitigation fee program, develop and implement a FPP, pay the SRA Fire Prevention Fee, and implement Mitigation Measure 18-4, which provides for funding additional fire protection staffing to reduce the potential exposure to wildfire hazards. Therefore, with mitigation the cumulative condition related to wildland fire hazard due to the combination of effects from the proposed project with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects is less than significant.</p> <p>As identified in Impact 18-4, the proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact related to wildland fire hazards by creating additional demand for fire protection services that could be limited when NFD has to respond to multiple emergencies. Longer response times could result in larger fires, which could require more firefighting resources. The MWWPSP proposes construction of residences, commercial uses, and utilities infrastructure and facilities in accordance with fire protection regulations and practices including the fire mitigation fee collection program for new development, to minimize the opportunity for ignition, provide defensible space around structures, and help maintain adequate response times by the NFD through the project's contributions to the fire mitigation fee collection program. Additionally, the West Parcel development area would be subject to a FPP prepared for the proposed project and would be annexed into the NCSD service area, and would be served by the NFD and CAL FIRE.</p> <p>(Draft EIR, pp. 18-23 to 18-24; see also Master Response 9, Response to Comment IO41-66 to 69.)</p>			