



MEMORANDUM
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/RESOURCE AGENCY
PLANNING SERVICES DIVISION
County of Placer

TO: Board of Supervisors
DATE: October 25, 2016

FROM: Paul Thompson
Interim Agency Director

BY: Crystal Jacobsen, Principal Planner

SUBJECT: Tahoe Basin Area Plan Update Status Report and EIR/EIS Contract Amendment

ACTION REQUESTED

1. Tahoe Basin Area Plan Update – Status update. No Board action is requested.
2. Approve a contract amendment with Ascent Environment for final preparation of the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for \$77,965, increasing the total to \$525,415 and authorize the County Executive Officer to execute the contract.

BACKGROUND

After launching the Tahoe Basin Area Plan Update work program in 2012, the Planning Services Division has completed a Draft Area Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS), and is currently working to respond to comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS and to prepare the Final EIR/EIS and Final Area Plan documents. This report provides the Board with information on the recent efforts with the Area Plan, the progress with the EIR/EIS, and outlines the timeline moving forward to adoption.

AREA PLAN UPDATE STATUS

Final Area Plan Preparation

Since the last status report to the Board in April 2016, the Planning Services Division and consultants continue to coordinate with TRPA on the preparation of the Tahoe Basin Area Plan and implementing regulations which are intended to achieve TRPA adoption and Regional Plan goals.

On June 15, 2016, in coordination with TRPA, a Draft Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Draft EIR/EIS were released for a 60-day public review comment period. The public review comment period closed on August 15, 2016. During the public review comment period, the following public meetings were conducted to receive public input on the Draft EIR/EIS and Draft Area Plan:

- July 13, 2016 TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
- July 27, 2016 TRPA Regional Plan Implementation Committee
- July 27, 2016 TRPA Governing Board
- July 28, 2016 Placer County Planning Commission
- August 11, 2016 Placer County North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council

The County and TRPA received 111 comment letters during the 60-day public review comment period. While the majority of the comments received were related to the Draft EIR/EIS, many comments received were related to the Area Plan and implementing regulations documents. In response to stakeholder input and comments received on the Area Plan documents, staff has been coordinating with TRPA and

consultants on preparing final refinements to the Area Plan. The Final Area Plan is expected to be released in early November, 2016, alongside the Final EIR/EIS.

FINAL EIR/EIS PREPARATION

As noted above, the County and TRPA received 111 comment letters on the Draft EIR/EIS, totaling approximately 450 individual comments requiring responses. The volume of comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS substantially exceeded what was anticipated by TRPA and County staff, and exceeded what was outlined in the EIR/EIS contract with Ascent Environmental. Some comments have required additional analysis which was not anticipated in the EIR/EIS contract. Accordingly, this report includes a request for an amendment to the EIR/EIS contract to cover additional analysis and time needed to coordinate and prepare responses to comments and to publish the Final EIR/EIS. A contract amendment for \$77,965 is required to fund final tasks associated with the preparation of the Final EIR/EIS as outlined in Attachment 1.

Next Steps/Timeline

Since the close of the 60-day public review comment period on the Draft EIR/EIS, staff has been coordinating with TRPA and consultants on the preparation of responses to comments and on final refinements to the Area Plan. The Final EIR/EIS and Final Area Plan are expected to be released the first week of November, 2016.

After release of the Final EIR/EIS and Final Area Plan, staff will present the Final Area Plan to North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council on November 10, 2016 for a recommendation to the Placer County Planning Commission. A tentative Placer County Planning Commission hearing on the Final Area Plan has been scheduled for November 17, 2016 in Tahoe, where the Commission will be asked to deliberate on the Final Area Plan and Final EIR/EIS and to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Following the Planning Commission hearing, it is anticipated that a Board of Supervisors hearing will be scheduled on December 6, 2016 in Tahoe, where the Board will deliberate on the Final Area Plan and Final EIR/EIS.

As previously reported to the Board, the Tahoe Basin Area Plan is a joint planning document which is required to conform to the TRPA Regional Plan and required to be adopted by the TRPA Governing Board. Accordingly, the Final Area Plan will undergo TRPA conformance review and will be presented to TRPA decision makers for consideration. Following the December 6, 2016 Board of Supervisors hearing, it is expected that the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC) will conduct a meeting on the Final Area Plan and Final EIR/EIS on December 7, 2016. In addition, a December 14, 2016 TRPA Governing Board Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC) meeting is anticipated. The TRPA APC and the TRPA Governing Board RPIC will provide recommendations on the Final Area Plan and Final EIR/EIS to the TRPA Governing Board. TRPA staff is targeting a January 25, 2016 TRPA Governing Board meeting, where the Governing Board will consider final adoption of the Area Plan and certification of the Final EIR/EIS.

In addition to the TRPA meetings noted above, a TRPA Governing Board RPIC briefing on the Tahoe Basin Area Plan is scheduled for November 16, 2016. This meeting will be similar to the status update being provided to your Board in this report. The following table provides a general overview of the **targeted** timeline to adoption of the Area Plan:

| Final EIR/EIS & Final Area Plan | First Week of November, 2016 |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| North Tahoe Regional Advisory Committee Meeting | November 10, 2016 |
| TRPA Governing Board RPIC Briefing | November 16, 2016 |
| Planning Commission Deliberations on Final Documents | November 17, 2016 |
| Board of Supervisors Deliberations on Final Documents | December 6, 2016 |
| TRPA APC Deliberations on Final Documents | December 7, 2016 |
| TRPA Governing Board RPIC Deliberations on Final Documents | December 14, 2016 |
| TRPA Governing Board Deliberations on Final Documents | January 25, 2016 |

FISCAL IMPACT

The Ascent Environmental contract amendment is for \$77,965 increasing the total contract to \$525,415. The \$77,965 will be funded from Planning Division's FY 2016-17 budget.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Ascent Environmental Contract Amendment

cc: David Boesch, County Executive Officer
David Defanti, Deputy County Executive Officer
Jennifer Merchant, Deputy County Executive Officer - Tahoe
Karin Schwab, County Counsel
Michael Profant, County Counsel
Paul Thompson, Assistant CDRA Director
E.J. Ivaldi, Deputy Planning Director
Shawna Brekke-Reed, CDRA Principal Management Analyst - Tahoe
Steve Buelna, Supervising Planner
Peter Kraatz, Deputy Public Works Director
Nanette Hansel, Ascent Environmental
Adam Lewandowski, Ascent Environmental
Lucia Maloney, TRPA

ATTACHMENT 1
SECOND AMENDMENT TO PLANNING SERVICES AGREEMENT
PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANT SERVICES – ASCENT ENVIRONMENTAL,
INC

THIS SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT is made and entered on this _____ day of _____, 2016, by and between the TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY, a bi-state regional planning agency created by Public Law 96-551 (1980), hereinafter referred to as TRPA or AGENCY, the COUNTY OF PLACER, hereinafter referred to as COUNTY, and ASCENT ENVIRONMENTAL, INC, hereinafter referred to as CONSULTANT.

WHEREAS, on June 2, 2015, TRPA, COUNTY and CONSULTANT entered into a Contract whereby consulting services would be provided to the COUNTY; and

WHEREAS, the parties have agreed to additional services to be provided by Consultant under said contract and the compensation for those additional services.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS MUTUALLY AGREED by and among the parties as follows:

1. That section IV of the original Contract shall be amended to provide for the additional services and compensation as follows:

The CONSULTANT agrees to perform the additional professional services as set forth in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and the total compensation to be paid CONSULTANT for these additional services shall not exceed SEVENTY-SEVEN THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED SIXTY-FIVE (\$77,965.00) as set out in Exhibit "A".

2. The COUNTY agrees to pay to CONSULTANT an amount not to exceed the total of FIVE HUNDRED TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED FIFTEEN DOLLARS (\$525,415.00) as the sole compensation under the Contract and as amended by the First Amendment and this Second Amendment.

EXCEPT as specifically modified above, all of the remaining terms and conditions of the said Contract shall remain and continue in full force and effect.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
(TRPA)

ASCENT ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
("CONSULTANT")

BY: _____

BY: _____

COUNTY OF PLACER COUNTY
("COUNTY")

Approved as to form – County Counsel

BY: _____
COUNTY EXECUTIVE

BY: _____
COUNTY COUNSEL

Approved as to form – TRPA

Approved as to form – Placer County

BY: _____
TRPA

BY: _____
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT RESOURCE AGENCY



September 16, 2016

Ms. Crystal Jacobsen
Principal Planner
Advanced Planning/Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 140
Auburn, California 95603

Subject: Budget Amendment Request #2 – Environmental Documentation for the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan

Dear Crystal:

Consistent with our recent discussions, Ascent is formally requesting an amendment (Amendment 2) to Contract No. 13395 (dated April 22, 2014) for the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for additional tasks identified to support the environmental review process.

The amendment addresses out of scope efforts in support of the environmental review process, including those related to 1) additional analyses conducted in preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS, 2) additional meetings and management and coordination necessary to successfully complete the project; and additional effort to respond to the volume and complexity of comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS. The specific areas of extra effort are detailed below.

The total cost of the additional environmental review work for Amendment 2 is \$77,965. If you have any questions related to this amendment request, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sydney B. Coatsworth". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Sydney Coatsworth
Principal

Amendment 2 - Scope of Services
Amending the Existing Scope of Services for the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan
and Tahoe City Lodge EIR/EIS

1. **Additional Analyses for Draft EIR/EIS**

- a. Additional Research to Support Existing Conditions. Ascent's scope of work assumed that information necessary to adequately characterize existing conditions in the project area would be readily available in the Existing Conditions Report. In many instances the Existing Conditions Report contained information that was no longer valid, excluded important regulatory setting information, or lacked sufficient information for environmental review. For example, the Existing Conditions Report had limited, incomplete, and/or outdated information for recreation, facilities, schools, and public safety, including such topics as planned upgrades and response times. The Existing Conditions Report did not include references, so citations needed to be researched and reported in the EIR, as required by CEQA. Each resource section in the Draft EIR/EIS required some level of supplemental regulatory and existing setting information. This required additional research and time not included in our executed contract.

COST: \$7,720

- b. Additional Air Quality Analyses. As described in our original scope of work, Ascent made effective use of existing air quality analyses, including those included in the RPU EIS and RTP EIR/EIS. However, as discussed with the County, there were areas that required additional project-specific analysis in this EIR/EIS, In part additional effort was required to complete a quantitative analysis of construction-generation emissions, including additional modeling and assembling and formatting additional appendix materials. Additional effort was also required to evaluate long-term operational emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. To provide emissions estimates for the Area Plan land use changes and programs that differed from the Regional Plan EIS and to account for the availability of newer updated air quality models, the analysis used updated emission factors now available in EMFAC2014, and conducted model runs for each Area Plan alternative using CalEEMod. Version 2013.2.2.

COST: \$6,690

- c. Additional GHG analyses. Because the project description evolved to include the proposed CFA to TAU conversion program, the quantity of commercial land uses and the number of TAUs differed from that contemplated in the RPU EIS and RTP EIR/EIS, precluding the ability to tier. The approach for the GHG analysis also had to evolve in accordance with the outcome of the recent Supreme Court decision, *Center for Biological Diversity vs. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Newhall Ranch)*. Providing meaningful comparisons of GHG levels under each alternative to the RPU involved many calculation adjustments beyond the level of effort contemplated in the original contract.

COST: \$4,710

- d. Additional Noise Analyses.

- i. **Traffic Volume Data.** Because traffic volume data was provided for a different set of highway segments than was used for the traffic noise analysis in the RPU EIS and RTP EIR/EIS, Ascent noise analysts could not completely rely on the traffic noise modeling

conducted for the RPU EIS and RTP EIR/EIS, and so provided additional modeling and analysis.

- ii. **Helicopter and Seaplane Noise Analysis.** Ascent's original contract did not anticipate evaluating noise from helicopters and seaplanes resulting from the added use in the Tahoe City Town Center. This required additional effort to provide a qualitative discussion of these potential impacts.

COST: \$3,720

e. Additional Public Services and Utilities Analyses.

- i. **Water and Wastewater Analyses.** It was originally contemplated that the water and wastewater analyses could tier from the RPU EIS and RTP EIR/EIS. However, it was necessary to provide updated calculations of water demand and wastewater flows specific to the proposed development in the Area Plan, and to evaluate the proposed CFA to TAU conversion program.

COST: \$1,860

- f. Additional Project Management and Coordination Effort. The purpose of this task is to effectively manage the project schedule, budget, invoicing, contracts, and subcontracts. The schedule challenge presented to the team was extraordinary. To achieve it, we needed to expand our management team from two to four people. An additional 40 hours of project management time was required for revisions to the project schedule, invoicing, and management of subconsultants over the duration of the project. The additional work also includes two half day meetings with Placer County, TRPA, and the project that included Ascent's Project Manager, Principal-in-Charge, and Senior Planner.

COST: \$11,430

2. **Additional Analyses for Administrative Final EIR/EIS**

As stated in our executed contract, the scope of the effort to respond to comments is difficult to predict in advance. For budgeting purposes, it was assumed that responses would involve explanation, clarification, or elaboration of existing analysis and findings, but not include new analysis, issues, or alternatives. An estimate of 80 technical staff hours was included in the executed contract to prepare responses to comments, plus time for document assembly and production. The scope recognized that if additional time was determined to be required due to the volume or complexity of the comments, an amendment to the scope of work and budget would be needed. We received 111 comment letters, which collectively includes over 600 pages of comments, bracketed into approximately 450 individual comments. The volume of comments substantially exceeds the that anticipated in the executed contract. We are also being asked to incorporate elements of a revised Tahoe City Lodge that will in part remove parking from the easement to the property. An additional 120 technical staff hours is necessary to adequately address the extent of comments.

COST: \$29,485

3. **Additional Area Plan Meetings and Hearings**

Ascent's Area Plan contract included participation in a total of 21 coordination meetings, dry run meetings, or public hearings, as documented in Task 13 of our contracted scope of work.

To date, Ascent has participated in 26 coordination calls, meetings, or hearings as documented in monthly progress reports to the county.

To facilitate completion of the project, including completion of the Final EIR/EIS and meetings related to EIR/EIS certification and project approval, budget has been added for an additional six coordination meetings, three dry run meetings, and five certification/project approval meetings.

COST: \$12,350



COST ESTIMATE

Amendment Request #2 for EIR/ EIS for the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge Project
 Ascent Environmental, Inc.
 September 16, 2016

| LABOR COSTS | Rate/Hour | Project | Asst. PM | Senior | Natural Res. | Senior | Recreation/PS&U | Cultural | GIS/ | Word | Total Hours | Total Dollars |
|---|-----------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| | | Principal Manager | Planner | Planner | Task Lead | Air/GHG/Noise | Pop Housing | Cultural Res. | Graphics | Processing/ Administrative | | |
| | | Coatsworth | Hansel | Kozloski | Lewandowski | Henderson | Kerr | Mitchell | Cunningham | Kashiwase | | |
| 1: Additional Analyses for Draft EIR/ EIS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Updated Existing Setting for All Resource Sections | | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 59 \$ 7,720 |
| Additional Air Quality Analyses | | 1 | 2 | | | | 36 | | | | 2 | 41 \$ 6,690 |
| Additional GHG Analyses | | 1 | 2 | | | | 24 | | | | 2 | 29 \$ 4,710 |
| Additional Noise Analyses | | 1 | 2 | | | | 18 | | | | 2 | 23 \$ 3,720 |
| Additional Public Services & Utilities Analyses | | 2 | | | | | | 10 | | 1 | 2 | 15 \$ 1,860 |
| Additional Project Management and Coordination | | 8 | 32 | 12 | 16 | | | | | 4 | 2 | 74 \$ 11,430 |
| Subtotal | | 14 | 40 | 24 | 20 | 4 | 90 | 22 | 4 | 9 | 14 | 241 \$ 36,130 |
| 2: Additional Analyses for Administrative Final EIR/ EIS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Additional Responses to Comments | | 24 | 38 | 38 | 38 | 8 | 16 | 14 | | 4 | 21 | 201 \$ 29,485 |
| Subtotal | | 24 | 38 | 38 | 38 | 8 | 16 | 14 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 201 \$ 29,485 |
| 3: Additional Area Plan Meetings and Hearings | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Additional Meetings | | 20 | 30 | | 20 | | | | | | | 70 \$ 12,350 |
| Subtotal | | 20 | 30 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 \$ 12,350 |
| Total Labor Hours | | 58 | 108 | 62 | 78 | 12 | 106 | 36 | 4 | 13 | 35 | 512 |
| Total Labor Dollars | | \$13,340 | \$17,820 | \$7,440 | \$10,920 | \$1,800 | \$17,490 | \$3,960 | \$440 | \$1,430 | \$3,325 | \$ 77,965 |
| DIRECT COSTS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Subconsultants (detailed cost estimates attached) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Printing | | | | | | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 3. Other Reproduction | | | | | | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 4. Mileage/Parking/Travel | | | | | | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 5. Maps/Supplies/Photos | | | | | | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 6. Postage/Delivery | | | | | | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 7. Miscellaneous | | | | | | | | | | | | \$ - |
| Total Direct Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | \$ - |
| TOTAL ESTIMATED FEE | | | | | | | | | | | | \$ 77,965 |

