

EXHIBIT B

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

OF THE COUNTY OF PLACER

for the

VILLAGE AT SQUAW VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN

November 2016

I.
INTRODUCTION

Placer County (“County”), as lead agency, prepared an Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) for the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan (“VSVSP” or “project”). The document consists of the May 2015 Draft EIR (“Draft EIR” or “D EIR”) and the April 2016 Final EIR (“Final EIR”) (State Clearinghouse No. 2012102023) (collectively referred to as the “EIR”). The EIR for the project presents an assessment of the reasonably foreseeable and potentially significant adverse environmental effects that may occur from adoption of the VSVSP and implementation of the associated development proposal. These findings have been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) and its implementing guidelines (“CEQA Guidelines”) (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq.). The Placer County Board of Supervisors (“Board”) is the lead agency under CEQA and local decision-making authority for the project. The Board adopts these findings in that capacity.

II.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. LOCATION

The project site is located within the 4,700-acre area commonly referred to as Squaw Valley (and also known as Olympic Valley), in northeastern Placer County and within the Sierra Nevada. Portions of the plan area are located in both the west and east sides of Squaw Valley. The Valley is located west of State Route (SR) 89, approximately nine miles south of the Town of Truckee, and seven miles northwest of Tahoe City and Lake Tahoe. Squaw Valley is located outside of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The plan area encompasses a total of approximately 94 acres, including approximately 85 acres in the main Village area on the west side of the valley and an approximately 8.8-acre area referred to as the East Parcel, located approximately 1.3 miles east of the main Village area and 0.3 mile west of the intersection of SR 89 and Squaw Valley Road, across the street from the Squaw Valley Public Service District (SVPSD) offices and fire station.

Access to the plan area is provided by Squaw Valley Road. Other internal roadways serving the main Village area include Village East Road, Far East Road, Squaw Peak Road, Squaw Peak Way, and Chamonix Place. Three bridges connect Squaw Valley Road to internal private roads and parking areas within the main Village area. The East Parcel is located immediately adjacent to Squaw Valley Road.

B. OVERVIEW

The VSVSP envisions a world-class, recreation-based, all-season resort community. Development would be focused primarily on previously disturbed/developed areas around the existing Village, and would integrate with and support existing mountain ski operations. Building designs would draw from traditional mountain architecture with rustic treatments, ample use of wood and stone, visible timbers and rafters, and broad sheltering roofs. Natural resources in Squaw Valley would be protected and enhanced, including habitat restoration within Squaw Creek to enhance the creek’s natural functions. The mixed-use development would

include hotel, resort residential, commercial, and recreation uses. A wide range of destination resort services and amenities would be provided for guests and residents to create a resort experience on par with peer world class North American ski destinations.

The topography of the main Village area is a west-to-east generally flat but sloping plain, with approximately 70 feet of elevation change from the highest to the lowest point on the site. The main Village area is generally surrounded by steep slopes that are part of the ski resort and that rise about 2,000 feet to the north and south and almost 3,000 feet to the west. The East Parcel is generally flat, with a slight slope towards Squaw Creek to the north.

The plan area drains into Squaw Creek. The Creek runs west to east through Squaw Valley, passing through the main Village area primarily in an engineered trapezoidal shaped channel before flowing into a meadow area/golf course (Resort at Squaw Creek Golf Course) to the east of the main Village area. Squaw Creek runs just to the north of the East Parcel, but is not within the parcel boundary. Most of the existing trees within the main Village area are located along the westernmost portion of Squaw Creek. The remaining trees are scattered throughout the main Village area and on the outward edges as the developed portions of the Village transition to surrounding forested areas. Trees on the East Parcel border the area previously graded for snow storage to the east, west, and north, with Squaw Valley Road bordering the southern end of the site.

Existing land uses surrounding the main Village area include single-family residences, small offices, condominiums, and retail/commercial uses located across Squaw Valley Road to the northeast; the PlumpJack restaurant and hotel located to the south and west; the Intrawest Village to the south and west; forest to the northwest; single-family residences off Granite Chief Road to the southwest; Squaw Valley Mountain and ski runs and undisturbed areas to the west and south; and the meadow and golf course to the east. The Resort at Squaw Creek is located beyond the golf course to the east. In addition, the Olympic Village Inn is located immediately adjacent to the northwest portion of the plan area and Specific Plan development would abut it on three sides. The Squaw Valley Lodge is located near the project area at 201 Squaw Peak Road, and the Squaw Valley Chapel is located adjacent to the plan area at 444 Squaw Peak Road.

The East Parcel is bordered by trees to the north, east, and west; with the area beyond the trees to the west and north containing single-family residences and the trees to the east bordering a single-family residential subdivision (the Olympic Estate Subdivision).

C. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

As set forth in the Draft EIR, the project objectives are as follows:

1. Realize a year-round destination resort, consistent with the vision and objectives of the Squaw Valley General Plan Land Use Ordinance (SVGPLUO). As stated in the SVGPLUO, that vision is to “ensure that Squaw Valley is developed into a top quality, year-round, destination resort,” “without adversely impacting the unique aesthetic and environmental assets of Squaw Valley.”

2. Create a resort facility that provides a wide range of destination resort services and amenities to guests and residents on site.
3. Focus resort related development in proximity to the existing Village and mountain ski area.
4. Provide resort facilities that integrate with and support mountain operations.
5. Focus project development primarily on previously disturbed/developed areas.
6. Protect and enhance natural resources in Olympic Valley, including habitat restoration in Squaw Creek within the plan area.
7. Provide a compact development that minimizes the overall resort footprint.
8. Provide a connected, walkable, tourist-serving mixed-use development.
9. Provide a level of development compatible with existing uses and development practices.
10. Provide a cohesive building design and circulation patterns that integrate project elements with each other, existing development, and the mountain/ski facilities.
11. Provide a comprehensive multi-modal circulation, transit, and parking plan that minimizes reliance on the automobile for movement in and out of the plan area and within the plan area.
12. Provide a specific plan that has sufficient flexibility to be responsive to future market conditions.
13. Provide a resort with sufficient size and services to be on par with peer world class North American ski destinations and that is economically sustainable.
14. Provide a resort that can fund infrastructure improvements, public services improvements, and other municipal costs.

(Draft EIR, pp. 3-9 to 3-10.)

Based on its own review of the EIR and other information and testimony received in connection with the project, the County finds these objectives to be acceptable and persuasive from a public policy standpoint. In choosing to approve the project, the County thus adopts these objectives, and accords them weight in considering the feasibility of alternatives set forth in the EIR. (See *Sierra Club v. County of Napa* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1507-1508; *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Association v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal. App. 4th 704, 715 (*Sequoyah Hills*)).

D. DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

Project approval requires the County, as lead agency, as well as certain “responsible agencies” to take discrete planning and regulatory actions to approve the overall project. In addition to adopting these findings and the associated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) (CEQA requirements), the County will consider the following actions:

- Amend the Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance (1983), as needed, to incorporate the Specific Plan and add Goal VI.E.7 and Policies VI.E.7.1 and 2 related to emergency preparedness;
- Rezone of the plan area to include the Specific Plan zoning designations;
- Adopt the proposed Specific Plan;
- Adopt the Specific Plan Development Standards and Design Guidelines;
- Approve a Development Agreement; and
- Approve a Large-Lot Tentative Subdivision Map.

- Approve a Water Supply Assessment

Other project approvals and associated entitlements may be required for specific projects in the plan area. Section 65457(a) of the California Government Code and Section 15182(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines provide that no EIR or negative declaration is required for any residential project undertaken in conformity with an adopted Specific Plan for which an EIR has been certified.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

In accordance with section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the County prepared a Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) of an EIR on October 10, 2012 and issued a Revised NOP on February 21, 2014. (References to the NOP hereafter refer to the Revised NOP unless otherwise noted.) The County circulated the NOP to responsible and trustee agencies, organizations, and interested individuals to solicit comments on the then proposed project. The County followed required procedures with regard to distribution of the appropriate notices and environmental documents to the State Clearinghouse. The NOP was received by the State Clearinghouse (SCH #2012102023) and a 30 day public review period ended on March 24, 2014. A scoping meeting was held on November 1, 2012. Concerns raised in response to the NOP were considered during preparation of the Draft EIR. The NOP and all comments received on the NOP are presented in Appendix B of the Draft EIR.

The EIR includes an analysis of the following issue areas:

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change
- Hazardous Materials and Hazards
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Forest Resources
- Noise
- Population, Employment, and Housing
- Public Services and Utilities
- Soils, Geology, and Seismicity
- Transportation and Circulation
- Visual Resources

(Draft EIR, p. 1-2.)

The County published the Draft EIR for public and agency review on May 18, 2015. A 60-day public review period was provided, ending on July 17, 2015.

Consistent with Section 15202 of the CEQA Guidelines, the County conducted a public hearing on the Draft EIR on June 25, 2015, to provide an overview of the Draft EIR and to invite public comments. During the public review period, the County received 2 comment letters from federal agencies, 5 letters from state agencies, 1 letter from the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, 6 letters from local agencies, 15 letters from organizations, and 325 letters from individual members of the general public. The County also received 5 late comment letters that were included in the Final EIR.

Those comments relevant to CEQA were addressed in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, subdivision (f). The Final EIR was circulated for a 10-day public agency review period from April 7, 2016 to April 18, 2016, in accordance with Placer County Code Section 18.20.060. Due to the regional significance of the project, the County determined that no hearings would be scheduled to consider the project entitlements or certification of the Final EIR until at least 30-days after circulation of the Final EIR.

The Final EIR includes: comments received on the Draft EIR; responses to these comments; and revisions to the Draft EIR, as necessary, in response to these comments or to amplify or clarify material in the Draft EIR; evaluation of project modifications since publication of the Draft EIR, and inclusion of new data developed since publication of the Draft EIR. As discussed in Section XIV, below, none of the changes to the Draft EIR, or information added to the Draft EIR, constitutes “significant new information” requiring recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5.

After release of the Final EIR several comments were received on the Final EIR. While the County is not required under CEQA to provide formal responses to comments received on the Final EIR, the County has prepared the same, which responses are attached and incorporated as Attachment B hereto. Based on the County’s review of these comments and the substantial evidence in the administrative record, the County concludes that none of the comments received raised significant new information or evidence of a substantial increase in the severity of an identified environmental impact or identified a feasible project alternative or mitigation measure that is considerably different from those previously analyzed in the FEIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5). As a result, the County concludes there is no evidentiary or legal basis upon which to require recirculation of the EIR prior to certification.

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 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, as well as comments received on the Final EIR;
- The comments received post-Final EIR release and responses to those comments;
- 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 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, or 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 final public hearing on the project 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;
- 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 documents constituting the record of proceedings are available for review by responsible agencies and interested members of the public during normal business hours at the Placer County Community Development, Planning Services Division, at 3091 County Center Drive Auburn, CA 95603.

V.

CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE PLANS

The Board finds that the project is consistent with the Placer County General Plan (County General Plan), the Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance (SVGPLUO), the County's zoning and development policies, as well as other applicable plans, including as amended in relation to consideration of approval of the project. The Board agrees with and is persuaded by the reasoning set forth in the EIR, including Chapter 4 (Land Use and Forest Resources) regarding the Project's consistency with applicable plans and policies and staff's analyses contained in the Board staff report pertaining to the Project's consistency with applicable plans and policies. In making these findings, the Board ratifies, adopts, and incorporates into this discussion, the reasoning and determinations of the Draft EIR, Final EIR and Board staff report relating to consistency with applicable plans and the goals and policies within those plans. The Board has reviewed the project and proposed amendments in relation to the County General Plan, the SVGPLUO, and the County's zoning and development policies, and finds that the project, as proposed for approval, will be consistent with and in furtherance of said plans and policies.

VI.

FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

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 provides that the procedures required by CEQA “are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects.” Section 21002 goes on to provide 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. For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The first such finding is that “changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.” The second permissible finding is that “such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding, and such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.” The third potential conclusion is that “specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.) 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, legal, and technological factors.” CEQA Guidelines section 15364 adds another factor: “legal” considerations. (See *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Bd. 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 410, 417.) Moreover, “feasibility” under CEQA encompasses ‘desirability’ to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.” (*Ibid.*; see also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715; *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 (“*CNPS*”).)

For purposes of these findings, the term “avoid” refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less-than-significant level. In contrast, the term “substantially lessen” refers to the effectiveness of such measure or measures to substantially reduce the severity of a significant effect, but not to reduce that effect to a less-than-significant level. These interpretations appear to be verified by the holding in *Laurel Hills Homeowners Association v. City Council* (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 519-521 (“*Laurel Hills*”), in which the Court of Appeal held that an agency had satisfied its obligation to substantially

lessen or avoid significant effects by adopting numerous mitigation measures, not all of which rendered the significant impacts in question less than significant.

Although CEQA Guidelines section 15091 requires only that approving agencies specify that a particular significant effect is “avoid[ed] or substantially lessen[ed],” these findings, for purposes of clarity, in each case will specify whether the effect in question has been reduced to a less-than-significant level, or has simply been substantially lessened but remains significant. Moreover, although section 15091, read literally, does not require findings to address environmental effects that an EIR identifies as merely “potentially significant,” these findings will nevertheless fully account for all such effects identified in the Final EIR.

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying the project lies with some other agency. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a), (b).)

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.)

The Board of Supervisors has adopted the third permissible finding with respect to all significant and unavoidable effects identified in the EIR, concluding that not all effects can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. The Board therefore must consider the feasibility of project alternatives. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; *Laurel Hills, supra*, 83 Cal.App.3d at p. 521; see also *Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 730-731; and *Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of the Univ. of Cal.* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 400-403.)

As noted above, despite mitigation, certain significant environmental impacts of the project will not be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Thus, the County is required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the project.

VII. **LEGAL EFFECT OF FINDINGS**

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. To the extent that these findings conclude that various mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR

are feasible and have not been modified, superseded or withdrawn, the County hereby binds itself to implement these measures. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when the Board adopts a resolution approving the project.

VIII.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Subdivision (a)(1) of Public Resources Code section 21081.6 requires lead agencies to “adopt a reporting and mitigation monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.” A MMRP has been prepared for the project, and is being approved by the Board by the same Resolution that has adopted these findings. The County will use the MMRP to track compliance with project mitigation measures. The MMRP provides a list of all adopted project mitigation measures, identifies the parties responsible for implementing such measures, and identifies the timing for implementing each measure. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period. The Final MMRP is attached to and incorporated into the environmental document approval resolution and is approved in conjunction with certification of the EIR and adoption of these Findings of Fact.

IX.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The potential environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the VSVSP are summarized in Table 2-2 in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR, as updated by the revisions to the Draft EIR set forth in the Final EIR (see Final EIR, pp. 2-12 to 2-28). In some cases, impacts that have been identified would be less than significant. In other instances, incorporation of the mitigation measures proposed in the Draft EIR and Final EIR would reduce the impacts to levels that are less than significant. For some impacts, there are no feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives that would reduce the impact to less than significant. Those impacts would remain as significant unavoidable adverse impacts. (See Draft EIR, § 2.2.1, pp. 2-4 to 2-5, as updated by Final EIR, § 2.3.2, pp. 2-11 to 2-12 [listing significant and unavoidable impacts].) For these impacts, the County has adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Mitigation measures appear in the Final EIR, in the MMRP, and in these Findings. The County has attempted to ensure that the measures set forth in each of these documents are consistent with one another. These measures may have been refined and clarified over time. It is possible that such revisions or clarifications have been made in one document, but not another. The Board finds that any such inconsistency is inadvertent. In the event of such inconsistency, the language of a measure in one document shall be applied in a manner that harmonizes the measure with the corresponding measure in other documents, such that the most stringent version of the measure shall apply.

The County’s findings with respect to the project’s significant and potentially significant effects and mitigation measures are set forth in **Section XII and XIII**, below. The findings set forth in these sections are hereby incorporated by reference. This section does not attempt to describe the

full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Draft EIR and Final EIR. Instead, the section 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, and states the Board's 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 in the Draft EIR or Final EIR, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in those documents supporting the Final EIR's determinations regarding mitigation measures and the project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the Board ratifies, adopts, and incorporates into these findings the analysis and explanation in the Draft EIR or Final EIR, and ratifies, adopts, and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Draft EIR or 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 has adopted all of the mitigation measures identified in these sections. To the extent any of the mitigation measures are within the jurisdiction of other agencies, the Board finds those agencies can and should implement those measures within their jurisdiction and control.

X.

FINDINGS REGARDING RECIRCULATION OF THE DRAFT EIR

The Board adopts the following findings with respect to whether 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 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. (See Final EIR, Chapter 2, Project Modifications, Updated Water Supply, and Groundwater Data, and Revisions to the Draft EIR; see also Final EIR, § 3.1.18, Master Response: Recirculation.)

As discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.1 (Project Modifications) of the Final EIR, changes to the project occurred in between the release of the Draft EIR and the Final EIR. Since release of the Draft EIR, the project applicant has worked with Placer County’s Squaw Valley Design Review Committee to improve the design features of the project to further meet the objectives of the Specific Plan as described in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR, and to enhance consistency with the vision and objectives of the SVGPLUO. There have also been minor changes to the project description made in response to comments received on the Draft EIR and new information received by the applicant. Section 2.1.2 (Evaluation of the Project Modifications) evaluates whether the modifications to the project constitute “significant new information.” (Final EIR, pp. 2-6 to 2-10.) As concluded therein, the modifications to the project do not constitute significant new information requiring recirculation of the Draft EIR.

Further, 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, many of the suggestions were found to be appropriate and feasible and were adopted in the Final EIR. Where changes have been made to mitigation measures, these changes do not change any significance conclusions presented in the Draft EIR, except that the revisions to Mitigation Measure 11-5 have changed the significance conclusions for Impact 11-5 (exposure of traffic generated noise at new sensitive receptors) and Impact 18-32 (cumulative long-term ambient noise levels) from significant and unavoidable to less than significant after mitigation.

Impact 9-3 (impacts to Caltrans intersections) was also changed from significant and unavoidable to less than significant because the installation of the planned traffic signal by Caltrans at the SR 89/Alpine Meadows intersection called for in Mitigation Measure 9-3 was completed between publication of the Draft EIR and Final EIR. Completion of this traffic signal reduces traffic impacts at this intersection to a less than significant level.

The Final EIR also includes revisions to the text of the Draft EIR (see Final EIR, § 2.3 [Revisions to the DEIR]) and updated analyses, including an updated water supply assessment and updated groundwater data (see Final EIR, § 2.2 [Updated Water Supply Assessment and

Groundwater Data]; *id.* at § 3.1.1 [Master Response: Water Supply]; *id.* at Appendices A-B [Updated Water Supply Assessment and Supporting Water-Related Data]), as well as an updated greenhouse gas (GHG) analysis (see Final EIR, § 2.3.16 [Revisions to Chapter 16, “Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change”], *id.* at § 3.1.17 [Master Response: Greenhouse Gas Analysis]; *id.* at Appendix G [Ramboll Memorandum Regarding GHG Analysis].) As discussed in the Final EIR, none of the information added to the EIR, including the textual revisions to the Draft EIR, the updated water supply/groundwater data and updated GHG analysis, altered the significance conclusions of the Draft EIR. Rather, the new information amplified and clarified the information provided in the Draft EIR. None of the revisions or updates to the Draft’s EIR’s analyses represents “significant new information” as that term is defined by CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5, subdivision (a).

The County finds that recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required: (1) because recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR (CEQA Guidelines, § 15088.5, subd. (b); and (2) because no “substantial adverse” impact would result from any of the revisions to the portions of the Draft EIR that were not recirculated (CEQA Guidelines, § 15088.5, subd. (e)). The County further finds that none of the comments received after release of the Final EIR requires recirculation of the EIR for the reasons set forth in Section III.

XI. **PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

A. BASIS FOR ALTERNATIVES-FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS

CEQA mandates that every EIR evaluate a no project alternative, plus a range of potentially feasible alternatives to the project or its location that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts of the project. (See CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6, subds. (a)(b).) The Board finds that the range of alternatives studied in the EIR reflects a reasonable range of alternatives.

These findings consider the feasibility of each alternative analyzed in the EIR. Under CEQA, “‘(f)feasible’ means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15364.) As described above, the concept of feasibility permits agency decisionmakers to consider the extent to which an alternative is able to meet some or all of a project’s objectives. In addition, the definition of feasibility encompasses desirability to the extent that an agency’s determination of infeasibility represents a reasonable balancing of competing economic, environmental, social, and technological factors. (See *CNPS, supra*, 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001.) An “alternative that ‘is impractical or undesirable from a policy standpoint’ may be rejected as infeasible.” (*Ibid.*) Additionally, an alternative “‘may be found infeasible on the ground it is inconsistent with the project objectives as long as the finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record.’” (*Ibid.*)

B. DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES AND FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT

The EIR identified and compared the significant environmental impacts of the project alternatives listed below. In accordance with the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, the following project alternatives were evaluated:

- **No Project—No Development:** assumes no new development occurs on the project site;
- **No Project—SVGPLUO Development:** includes some level of development, consistent with the SVGPLUO (which amounts to slightly less than 50 percent of the project when comparing bedroom counts and commercial square footage). This alternative reflects a continuation of non-master-planned development at similar density and site utilization as development over the last 25 years;
- **Reduced Density:** would reduce the amount of development by approximately 50 percent, but in a master-planned development;
- **Widened Squaw Valley Road:** which would widen Squaw Valley Road from two to four lanes to accommodate the increased traffic that would be generated by the project;
- **Preservation of Historical and Wetlands Resources:** would change the proposed footprint to preserve historical and wetlands resources; and
- **Alternative Water Tank Location:** would move the proposed 0.7 million gallon water storage tank to an alternative location south of the plan area.

The feasibility of each of the alternatives is addressed below.

ALTERNATIVE A: NO PROJECT—NO DEVELOPMENT

1. Description

Under the No Project—No Development Alternative, no actions would be taken and the project site would remain unchanged from its current condition; development outside of the plan area would continue as planned. Although both the SVGPLUO and County General Plan foresee development in this area, this alternative uses existing conditions as the “no project” scenario. No development of the project site would occur and existing uses on the site would continue. Although this alternative is evaluated in the Draft EIR, it is an unlikely long-term alternative for the project site. This is because the SVGPLUO identifies the project site as an area that would be ultimately developed with a mix of uses, and the County General Plan shows the site as within a community plan area, also indicating the intent that it would ultimately be developed. Further, the general area has been the subject of numerous development proposals, including approved but unbuilt phases of the existing Intrawest Village development.

2. Alternative A’s Impacts Compared to Proposed Project’s Impacts

The No Project—No Development Alternative would have fewer impacts in all areas except with respect to hydrology and water quality because in the absence of creek restoration water quality in Squaw Creek would not be improved. The impacts to soils, geology, and seismicity would be less but not a significant difference. Alternative A would avoid significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural resources, visual resources, noise, transportation and circulation, and greenhouse gases. In addition, Alternative A would not contribute to cumulative impacts.

3. Finding of Infeasibility

Under Alternative A, the No Project—No Development alternative, the VSVSP would not be approved, and the existing uses on the site would continue. Despite the fact that Alternative A would have fewer impacts in all areas, except hydrology and water quality, the implementation of the No Project Alternative would fail to achieve any of the project objectives, including the fundamental purpose to develop a year-round destination resort that is on par with peer world class North American ski destinations. This alternative also would not help implement the vision of the SVGPLUO, which includes policies that encourage additional resort development at the project site. This alternative would not provide the neighborhood-serving retail and commercial space or the recreational facilities that the proposed project would provide. This alternative would not provide for restoration of Squaw Creek. Nor would this alternative achieve any of the economic benefits of the project.

Alternative A's desirability is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social, and technological elements. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. Therefore, the Board rejects Alternative A as infeasible.

ALTERNATIVE B: NO PROJECT—SVGPLUO DEVELOPMENT

1. Description

Alternative B includes a likely development scenario, consistent with the SVGPLUO, representing another version of the CEQA No Project Alternative (i.e., what would happen with the project site if built out under the current SVGPLUO rather than the proposed Specific Plan). This alternative assumes development with similar densities as historically developed on similarly zoned properties in the project vicinity, considering such recent developments as the Intrawest Village, Resort at Squaw Creek, Squaw Valley Lodge, and Olympic Village Inn.

Development under this alternative is also assumed to occur somewhat disjointedly (as in the past; e.g., Intrawest Village, Squaw Valley Lodge, and Resort at Squaw Creek) rather than as a master planned development. The developments would be adjacent to one another, but not integrated, reducing the potential for creation of a compact, walkable development. As a result, view corridors may not be preserved and there would be fewer coordinated facilities. A smaller water tank would be constructed under this alternative. This alternative would not include many of the components included in the proposed project because smaller developments would not be able to fund such improvements. In particular, there would be no construction of the Mountain Adventure Camp or the Village open space network. Additionally, fewer recreational amenities would be provided under this alternative because there would be less of these amenities needed to meet County standards; recreational amenities would be completed individually for each project, and would likely not be coordinated. Similarly, with multiple projects/applicants implementing creek restoration independently in order to mitigate impacts generated by the individual projects, creek restoration would be more modest, and less cohesive than under the proposed project.

2. Alternative B's Impacts Compared to Proposed Project's Impacts

The No Project—SVGPLUO Development Alternative would have less impact on population, employment, and housing; transportation and circulation; air quality; noise; hydrology and water quality; public services and utilities; and greenhouse gases and climate change. The Alternative would have similar impacts to land use and forest resources; cultural resources; visual resources (although overall visual impacts may be greater); soils, geology, and seismicity; and hazards and hazardous materials. Impacts to biological resources would be potentially less, as they could avoid significant impacts depending on location, but there would be less benefit associated with channel restoration.

3. Finding of Infeasibility

The No Project—SVGPLUO Development Alternative would further some of the project objectives to a degree, but not to the extent that the proposed project would. Alternative B is anticipated to be slightly more than 50 percent smaller than the proposed project when comparing bedroom count and commercial square footage. Therefore, it would not provide a resort with sufficient size and services to be on par with peer world class North American ski destinations (see Objective # 13) such as the Park City/Canyons Village in Utah, Aspen/Snowmass Village in Colorado, Whistler/Blackcomb Village in British Columbia, Breckenridge Resort in Colorado or the Steamboat Resort in Colorado, which range from 0.4 to 0.8 units per skiable acre respectively (0.6 units per acre average) compared to Squaw Valley /Alpine Meadows Resort which has 0.2 units per skiable acre. This lodging deficit renders the Squaw Valley base area substantially less competitive than peer resort base areas because fewer lodging accommodations, resort services, and guest amenities are available to attract destination skiers. In addition, this alternative would not provide as wide a range of destination and resort services and amenities to guests and residents on site as would the proposed project (see Objective # 2).

Development under this alternative is assumed to occur somewhat disjointedly (as in the past; e.g., Intrawest Village, Squaw Valley Lodge, and Resort at Squaw Creek) rather than as a master planned development, as is proposed by the project. The developments would be adjacent to one another, but not integrated, reducing the potential for creation of a compact, walkable development (Objective #7 and #8). Therefore, Alternative B would not realize the objectives to: create a resort facility that provides a wide range of destination resort services and amenities to guests and residents on site (Objective #2); provide a cohesive building design and circulation patterns that integrate project elements with each other, existing development, and the mountain/ski facilities (Objective # 10); provide a comprehensive multi-modal circulation, transit, and parking plan that minimizes reliance on the automobile for movement in and out of the plan area and within the plan area (Objective # 11); and provide a specific plan that has sufficient flexibility to be responsive to future market conditions (Objective # 13). Due to Alternative B's lack of integration, it is unlikely to achieve, to the same degree as the proposed project, the objectives to: provide resort facilities that integrate with and support mountain operations (Objective # 4); provide a compact development that minimizes the overall resort footprint (Objective # 5); and provide a connected, walkable, tourist-serving mixed-use development (Objective # 8).

In addition, Alternative B would not provide the same degree of improvements and recreational amenities as the proposed project. A smaller water tank would be constructed under this alternative and this alternative would not include many of the components included in the project because smaller developments would not be able to fund such improvements. In particular, there would be no construction of the Mountain Adventure Camp or the Village open space network. Additionally, fewer recreational amenities would be provided under this alternative because there would be less of these amenities needed to meet County standards; recreational amenities would be completed individually for each project, and would not likely be coordinated.

Further, the East Parcel would not be developed with active resort uses or employee housing but rather would likely be developed for overflow/intercept surface parking and off-site snow storage. Thus, this alternative would not satisfy the demand for employee housing as well as the proposed project, and would not provide resort amenities to Village guests and residents to the same extent as the project.

Alternative B would not realize some of the environmental benefits of the proposed project. For instance, Alternative B is not expected to restore Squaw Creek to the same degree as the proposed project because smaller projects would proceed independently. With multiple projects/applicants implementing restoration independently in order to mitigate impacts generated by the individual projects, creek restoration would be more modest, and less cohesive than under the proposed project. It is anticipated that no earth-moving (e.g., widening the trapezoidal channel, earthwork at Olympic Channel) would be conducted, and restoration would likely be limited to vegetation plantings and a similar scale of measures by individual projects, rather than comprehensive restoration. The project also provides for more Forest Recreation and Conservation Preserve zoning that would occur under Alternative B.

Alternative B would also not realize, to the same degree, the economic benefits of the proposed project because the smaller project would generate lower tax revenues. Alternative B would construct approximately half as much employee housing and recreational improvements as the project, and it is unlikely that those improvements would be master planned and therefore would likely be of lesser overall utility. In addition, Alternative B would be carried out as multiple projects acting independently thereby substantially increasing the cost burden of developing a west valley fire station to individual developers.

For these reasons, Alternative B's desirability is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social, and technological elements. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. Therefore, the Board rejects Alternative B as infeasible.

ALTERNATIVE C: REDUCED DENSITY

1. Description

Under this alternative, the overall size of the project (e.g., unit count, commercial square footage, employee housing, parking, etc.) would be reduced by approximately 50 percent, as shown in Table 17-8 of the Draft EIR. The 50 percent reduction was based on a rough conceptual estimate

of the minimum amount of development reduction required to reduce traffic volumes sufficiently to have no significant traffic impacts. Exhibit 17-2 of the Draft EIR shows a concept plan for this alternative.

This alternative differs from the No Project-SVGLUO Alternative, which also addresses a 50 percent reduction in development, in that this alternative employs a master plan component, such that development would be unified and compact. The master planned development would include similar development standards and design guidelines as the project. Buildings would be sited and sized to minimize viewshed blockage. The Mountain Adventure Camp would be constructed, but would be reduced in size to 50,000 square feet (as opposed to 90,000 square feet under the proposed project). Fewer recreational amenities would be provided under this alternative as compared to the project because there would be less of these amenities needed to meet County standards and fewer financial resources. A smaller water tank (smaller volume and likely smaller diameter and footprint) would be constructed under this alternative. Restoration of Squaw Creek would be more modest than under the proposed project, primarily because lesser financial resources would be available.

2. Alternative C's Impacts Compared to Proposed Project's Impacts

This alternative would have similar impacts to land use and forest resources; soils, geology, and seismicity; and hazardous materials and hazards. This alternative would have potentially less effect on biological resources, and could avoid significant impacts depending on location, but would also have less benefit associated with creek restoration and consequently some of the benefits of creek restoration, primarily sediment reduction, would be reduced. The reduced density alternative would have less effect on all other resources. With cultural resources, this alternative could lessen a significant and unavoidable impact associated with removal of historic structures because the Olympic Valley Lodge would not be removed; however the Far East Center would be removed and therefore the impact would still be significant and unavoidable. With visual resources, the alternative has the potential to reduce significant impact to scenic vistas because fewer buildings would be constructed that could obscure or block views of the lower mountain. The reduced density alternative may avoid a significant air quality impact because less construction would occur and fewer lodging units would result in a corresponding decrease in emissions associated with energy demand and automobile travel, which would result in a corollary reduction in impacts to greenhouse gas emissions, though impacts resulting from GHG emissions may still be significant and unavoidable due to their cumulative nature. As to noise, it would reduce but not avoid a significant and unavoidable impact associated with project construction. The alternative may avoid potentially significant hydrology and water quality impacts because less land would be developed and therefore less soil disturbance would occur, resulting in less runoff and soil erosion. This alternative would reduce the severity of impacts to transportation and circulation, but impacts would remain significant and unavoidable even at the reduced project density.

3. Finding of Infeasibility

Alternative C would further some of the project objectives, but not to the extent that the proposed project would. As noted in the Draft EIR, this alternative would not meet the project

objectives related to providing a specific plan that has sufficient flexibility to be responsive to future market conditions (#12) with sufficient size and services to be on par with peer world class North American ski destinations and that is economically sustainable (#13), and potentially, may not meet objectives to sufficiently fund infrastructure improvements, public services improvements, and other municipal costs (#14). (Draft EIR, p. 17-25.) Similar to the No Project—SVGPLUO Development Alternative, Alternative C would be 50 percent smaller than the proposed project. At this reduced scale it would not provide a resort with sufficient size and services to be on par with peer world class North American ski destinations (see Objective # 13) because the number of units per skiable acre, which is currently 0.2 units per skiable acre, would only improve to 0.26 units per acre whereas peer resorts range between 0.4 to 0.8 units per acre. Under this alternative, this lodging deficit is not substantially improved and the Squaw Valley base area would still be substantially less competitive than peer resort base areas. In addition, this alternative would not provide as wide a range of destination and resort services and amenities to guests and residents on site as would the proposed project (see Objective # 2). Following release of the Draft EIR, Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS), on behalf of the applicant, undertook a study of the economic feasibility of the Reduced Density alternative and the Preservation of Historic and Wetland Resources alternative (Alternative E, discussed below). (*Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan CEQA Alternatives Economic Analysis* (EPS, July 29, 2016.) The County hired Goodwin Consulting Group (Goodwin) to peer review the report. (*Review of VSVSP Economic Analysis Final Report* (Goodwin, August 3, 2016.) Based on that peer review, EPS revised and released the final report on July 29, 2016. That revised final report was peer reviewed by Goodwin. These reports, cited above, are incorporated as part of the administrative record for this matter. The results of EPS’s economic evaluation are presented in the report titled *Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan CEQA Alternatives Economic Analysis* (July 29, 2016.) As found by EPS, all available evidence indicates the Reduced Density Alternative is economically infeasible, even under very optimistic assumptions. (EPS, p. 10.) The EPS report provides substantial evidence that Alternative C is economically infeasible. The Goodwin peer review concludes that the EPS analysis reflects “assumptions and methodologies that are appropriate for the project and consistent with prior studies.” (Goodwin, p.3).

As noted in the EPS report, while this alternative would reduce the overall number of units the cost of the backbone infrastructure would not be reduced to the same degree. Based on the estimates provided by the applicant, the redevelopment/relocation requirements and backbone infrastructure requirements would be virtually identical and the master development costs for plan area infrastructure would only be reduced by approximately 15 percent (*Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan CEQA Alternatives Economic Analysis* (EPS, July 29, 2016.)

As noted, the Mountain Adventure Camp would be reduced in size under Alternative C from 90,000 square feet to 50,000 square feet which would reduce the number of amenities that could be incorporated into the facility, thereby reducing the draw of the facility to destination lodgers. The project aims to diversify Squaw Valley’s customer base, amenities, and types of entertainment and activities available, which, in turn, helps achieve the objective of creating a year-round destination resort. The Mountain Adventure Camp is the key element of the project’s diversification efforts. As described by EPS, an important factor in the success of indoor-outdoor recreational facilities, such as the Mountain Adventure Camp, is the scale at which they are built. They have to be large enough to include many of the components that have become popular at

these types of facilities—wave pools, slides, and lazy rivers. Providing a combination of these popular activities in a single environment has proven to create an attraction capable of drawing new visitors and lengthening the stay and spending of returning visitors.

In addition, Alternative C may not achieve the fundamental purpose of the project to develop year-round destination resort that is on par with peer world class North American ski destinations. The potential for the project to increase resort attendance during shoulder seasons as well as increase the number of overnight guests, is hampered if the Mountain Adventure Camp is reduced to 50,000 square feet. (EPS, p. 9.)

Further, Alternative C would not restore Squaw Creek to the same degree as would occur under the proposed project and consequently some of the benefits of creek restoration would be reduced. (Draft EIR, p. 17-25.) In addition, Alternative C would not result in the same degree of economic benefits to the County as would occur under the proposed project because the smaller project would generate lower tax revenues. Alternative C would construct approximately half as much employee housing and recreational improvements as the project, and may not be able to bear the entire cost of developing a west valley fire station, which would benefit not only the project but other property owners in the Valley that would be served by the new station. For these reasons, Alternative C is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social, and technological elements. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. Therefore, the Board rejects Alternative C as infeasible.

ALTERNATIVE D: WIDENED SQUAW VALLEY ROAD

1. Description

This alternative would be the same as the proposed project except that Squaw Valley Road would be widened from two to four lanes to accommodate the increased traffic that would be generated by the project. The same amount of resort residential, commercial space, employee housing, and parking would be developed under this alternative. Additionally, this alternative would include the same recreational amenities, including the Mountain Adventure Camp, and Squaw Creek restoration as the proposed project.

Squaw Valley Road is not centered within the existing available County right-of-way, which is typically 70 feet wide. The road was constructed quickly for the 1960 Olympics and portions of the road approach the edge of the right of way. Since the road was constructed, many driveways, buildings, and other improvements have been constructed along much of the road's length that encroach into the right-of-way or are located along the edge of the right of way in locations where the road is near the edge of the right of way. Thus, under existing conditions, there is not a clear, consistent, reserved right-of-way. This alternative would include the development of a 70- to 80-foot-wide corridor, which would include lanes, shoulders, and curb and gutters where needed, along Squaw Valley Road. Additional turn lanes could also be accommodated, where needed, in this corridor (when closer to 80 feet wide). This alternative may require removal of buildings, may encroach close to residences, would require widening of a bridge over the creek, and would remove potential habitat.

2. Alternative D's Impacts Compared to Proposed Project's Impacts

This alternative would have greater impacts to land use and forest resources; population, employment, and housing; biological resources; cultural resources; air quality (construction); noise; soils, geology, and seismicity; hydrology and water quality; and greenhouse gases and climate change. This alternative would have similar impacts to visual resources and hazardous materials and hazards, and would have less impact on transportation and circulation and public services and utilities.

3. Finding of Infeasibility

Because the development components of this alternative would be the same as the proposed project, it would meet the project objectives, but not to the extent that the proposed project would. Due to the additional impact area along Squaw Valley Road, this alternative would not meet the project objectives related to focusing project development primarily on previously disturbed/developed areas (#5), protecting and enhancing natural resources in Olympic Valley (#6), and minimizing the overall resort footprint (#7). While this alternative would reduce the project's significant and unavoidable traffic impacts, it would also have greater impacts than the proposed project in a number of resource categories related to the potential increase in traffic associated with wider roads and the ecological area that would be converted to roadway. The Board finds that the traffic benefits under Alternative D do not outweigh the increased environmental impacts to other resource categories. Nor does the reduced traffic impact outweigh this alternative's inability to meet certain objectives of the project.

For these reasons, Alternative D's desirability is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social, and technological elements. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. Therefore, the Board rejects Alternative D as infeasible.

ALTERNATIVE E: PRESERVATION OF HISTORICAL AND WETLANDS RESOURCES

1. Description

This alternative would preserve the Olympic Valley Lodge (formerly Athlete's Center) and the Far East Center (formerly Nevada Spectator's Center), both of which are historically significant buildings that would be demolished under the proposed project. Additionally, this alternative would reduce effects to wetland areas on the east side of the plan area relative to the proposed project, thus reducing the need for wetland mitigation.

Under this alternative, Buildings 9 and 15, which are proposed for hotel/condo hotel uses under the proposed project, would not be built, thus reducing the number of resort residential units by 146 units compared with the proposed project. The Mountain Adventure Camp would be built; however, the expanded 20,000-square-foot Squaw Kids Ski School would not be built. This may render the resort less competitive among other ski schools in the industry. Under this alternative, the East Parcel would contain the same facilities as described for the proposed project.

2. Alternative E's Impacts Compared to Proposed Project's Impacts

The Preservation of Historical and Wetlands Resources alternative would have similar impacts to the proposed project for land use and forest resources; visual resources; noise; and hazards and hazardous materials. It would have less of an impact on population, employment, and housing; biological resources; cultural resources; transportation and circulation; air quality; public services and utilities; and greenhouse gases and climate change.

3. Finding of Infeasibility

This alternative would attain many of the project objectives, but not to the extent that the proposed project would. This alternative would partially achieve the project objective related to providing a resort with sufficient size and services to be on par with peer world class North American ski destinations, but not to the same degree as the project. Alternative E would preserve the Olympic Village Lodge; however retention of this building would require the loss of proposed Building 15, a key building on the western side of the site, which was strategically placed to provide services, retail, and food and beverage options for the western portion of the project, particularly to adjacent cabins.

Alternative E would achieve most of the basic project objectives, but not to the same degree as the proposed project nor would it provide the same degree of economic benefits to the County and the region as the proposed project. While Alternative E would result in some reduction of impacts to historical and wetland resources, it may not completely avoid all impacts because the Nevada Spectator Center may not be able to be moved due to the type of building construction of that structure, and therefore a significant impact to cultural resources would not be avoided, though it would be reduced because the Athlete's Center building would remain. In addition, while Alternative E would result in fewer impacts to existing wetlands located in the area where the Olympic Channel would be restored, overall fewer wetland resources would exist because restoration of the Olympic Channel would be more modest because existing wetlands would be avoided, and therefore reductions in harmful sediments entering Squaw Creek would not be realized to the same extent as with the project rendering the restoration effort less successful overall. Alternative E would result in lesser impacts to population, employment and housing because fewer units would be constructed; therefore fewer employee units would be needed. Impacts to greenhouse gases and climate change, air quality, noise and traffic would be less, but overall would be similar to those impacts of the project. Overall, the significant impacts of the project would not be reduced substantially and some benefits of the project (e.g. comprehensive restoration of Squaw Creek and the Olympic Channel) would be less effective, resulting in less overall benefit to hydrology and water quality.

For these reasons, the desirability of Alternative E is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social, and technological elements because the impacts of this alternative are substantially the same as the project, while overall benefits are less. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. Therefore, the Board rejects Alternative E as infeasible.

ALTERNATIVE F: ALTERNATIVE WATER TANK LOCATION

1. Description

This alternative was considered in the EIR as a result of uncertainty regarding the ability of the project applicant to reach agreement on purchasing the land encompassing the proposed tank site. This alternative would be the same as the proposed project except that the water tank would be located to the south of the project site on lands owned by Squaw Valley Resorts, LLC (SVR) instead of to the north, off of SVR-owned property. The alternative water tank location would be within an existing treed area between two existing ski slopes; Red Dog and Far East Express. The tank would be painted to match its surroundings. It would have the same capacity as the proposed tank, 0.7 million gallons, and would be 65 feet in diameter and 25-30 feet tall. The pad would be surrounded by a fence to restrict access with landscaping within the fenceline for screening. Under this alternative, the project applicant would use an existing access road to construct and maintain the water tank. Approximately 3,300 feet of water pipeline would be constructed to connect the tank with the Village water system. This is similar to what would be needed for the proposed water tank site. The same amount of resort residential, commercial space, employee housing, and parking would be developed under this alternative. Additionally, this alternative would include the same recreational amenities, including the Mountain Adventure Camp, and Squaw Creek restoration as the project.

2. Alternative F's Impacts Compared to Proposed Project's Impacts

The Alternative Water Tank Location alternative would have greater impacts to land use and forest resources; biological resources; cultural resources; visual resources; air quality; soils, geology, and seismicity; and greenhouse gases and climate change. The alternative would have similar impacts to population, employment, and housing; transportation and circulation; noise; hydrology and water quality; public services and utilities; and hazardous materials and hazards.

3. Finding of Infeasibility

Because this alternative would be substantially the same as the proposed project, it would meet the project objectives. Due to the additional impact area within the forest, this alternative would not be entirely consistent with the project objectives related to focusing project development primarily on previously disturbed/developed areas (#5) and protecting and enhancing natural resources in Olympic Valley (#6). This alternative would result in marginally increased environmental impacts than the project as proposed, but not to a degree to increase the severity of impact conclusions. This alternative is substantially the same as the project as both the project and this alternative require the construction of a 0.7 million gallon water storage tank, but on the whole is not as desirable as the proposed project from an environmental standpoint because some impacts would be greater.

For these reasons, Alternative F's desirability is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social, and technological elements. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. Therefore, the Board rejects Alternative F as

infeasible because the project would result in somewhat reduced impacts when compared to this alternative.

CEQA Section 21091 Findings

XII. Findings regarding impacts that cannot be mitigated below a level of significance

CHAPTER 7: CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact 7-1: Demolition of historically significant buildings. The proposed project would result in the demolition of 1960s Olympics-related buildings that have been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). Demolition of these historic resources would result in a significant impact because the historic resources would no longer exist.

Mitigation Measure 7-1a: Document historic buildings before removal. The project applicant shall complete documentation of the Olympic Valley Lodge (formerly Athlete's Center) and Far East Center (formerly Nevada Spectator's Center) before any construction/demolition work conducted at these buildings. Documentation shall consist of a written history of the property, plans and drawings of the historic resource, and photographs, as described below.

- **Written History.** The Carey & Co. report, Historic Resource Evaluation Report, Squaw Valley Ski Resort, shall be used for the written history of each building. The report shall be reproduced on archival bond paper.
- **Plans and Drawings.** An architectural historian (or historical architect, as appropriate) shall conduct research into the availability of plans and drawings of the Nevada Spectators' Center and the Athletes' Center as the buildings currently exist. If such plans/drawings exist, their usefulness as documentation for the two buildings shall be evaluated by the architectural historian. If deemed adequate, the plans/drawings shall be reproduced on archival mylar. If no plans/drawings are available, or if the existing plans/drawings are not found to be useful in documenting the historic resources, a historical architect shall prepare dimensioned plans and exterior elevations of each building. A combination of existing and new drawings is acceptable. All drawings shall be reproduced on archival mylar.

The architectural historian shall conduct research into the existence of the original architectural plans and drawings of the two buildings as designed for the Winter Olympics. If found, the plans shall be reproduced on archival mylar. Alternatively, the architectural plans can be scanned and saved as TIFF files. The scanning resolution shall be not less than 300 dpi.

All digital files, including drawing files, shall be saved on media and labeled following the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation Digital Photography Specifications.

- **Photographs.** Digital photographs shall be taken of the Nevada Spectators' Center and the Athletes' Center following the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation Digital Photography Standards.

The documentation shall be prepared by an architectural historian, or historical architect as appropriate, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation, Professional Qualification Standards. The documentation shall be submitted to the Placer County Library, Placer County Museums, and Squaw Valley Ski Museum Foundation.

- Consistent with Specific Plan Policy CR-3, before, or during demolition of the Nevada Spectator's Center and the Athlete's Center, significant architectural features and historic artifacts shall be salvaged and prominently displayed within the Squaw Valley Village as part of an interpretive exhibit, or made available to an appropriate historical society or museum dedicated to preservation and interpretation of data and information from the 1960 Winter Olympics.

Mitigation Measure 7-1b: Create an interpretive program, exhibit, or display. The project applicant shall prepare a permanent exhibit/display of the history of each building including, but not limited to, historic and current photographs, interpretive text, drawings, video, interactive media, and oral histories. The exhibit/display shall be developed in consultation with Placer County, local historical organizations, and those with an interest in the history of the 1960 Winter Olympics. The exhibit/display shall be displayed in a location in Squaw Valley that is accessible to the public and may be incorporated into the interpretive exhibit identified as part of Specific Plan Policy CR-3.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less-than-significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subds. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

Although historic buildings will be researched and documented before removal, and an exhibit of the buildings will be created and displayed after removal, the buildings will still be removed. The historic resource would no longer exist, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.

CHAPTER 8: VISUAL RESOURCES

Impact 8-1: Adverse effect on a scenic vista. The major scenic attribute of the west end of the Valley is the resort setting with the backdrop of mountain slopes and peaks. On-going construction activities, partially constructed buildings, and equipment would detract from the

scenic vistas of the west end of the Valley. This would be a significant impact during construction.

The project would add structures with mountain-village type architecture to an area that is largely paved and developed, and is adjacent to other resort buildings (main Village area). The increase in number and size of structures at the main Village area would increase the visibility of the built environment and would obscure the lower slopes on the mountain. However, the mountain peaks surrounding the resort would remain the primary point of visual interest and would continue to dominate the west end of the Valley. The increased prominence of structures would also be offset by the implementation of the VSVSP design guidelines, which would result in a unified architectural style and landscaping that would screen the lower portions of the new structures. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially detract from or degrade scenic vistas. This impact would be less than significant to occasional visitors to the Valley, which constitute the majority of viewers. However, long-term residents have experienced a gradual change in visual conditions, from more natural conditions to more built up, with modifications such as the Resort at Squaw Creek and the IntraWest development altering the viewshed. Because the project would obstruct some views of the lower slopes and continue a long-term development trend within an overall highly scenic area, the impact would be significant to permanent residents of the Valley.

The quality of views in the vicinity of the East Parcel is considered average within the context of the surrounding forested landscape and nearby (across the street) development, and views that incorporate this site do not present distinctive features that provide a scenic vista. Therefore, the proposed development on the East Parcel would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista. The impact to residents and occasional visitors during construction and operation would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 8-1: Install screening to reduce the visual effects of construction.

Screening fences with opaque or semi-opaque mesh screening or similar shall be strategically employed to reduce the visual effects of construction on adjacent residential and resort areas. Prior to approval of Improvement Plans or Building Permits for each phase of construction, a screening plan shall be approved by the Placer County Planning Services Division. The screening plan shall be implemented concurrent with initial ground-disturbing phases of construction and maintained through completion of exterior construction phases for buildings. The screening plan shall include details to specify construction equipment staging areas and materials storage areas. Construction staging and materials storage areas shall be located away from Squaw Valley Road and adjacent existing resort facilities to the extent feasible.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less-than-significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subs. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project's benefits outweigh the significant

and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor's Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

No mitigation measures are available that would reduce the project's construction impact on scenic vistas in the main Village area to a less-than significant level. Although screening may lessen the intrusiveness of construction, the activity would still have a considerable effect on the intactness of the view. Therefore, Impact 8-1 would remain significant and unavoidable during construction.

No mitigation measures are available that would further reduce scenic vista impacts resulting from development in the Main Village area to year-round residents of the Valley, or to part-time residents of adjacent timeshare and hotel condominium projects to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, Impact 8-1 would remain significant and unavoidable to many viewer groups, including residents, during project operation.

Impact 8-2: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. While the project site is largely developed (main Village area) and/or modified from natural conditions (East Parcel), construction activity including ground disturbance, construction material staging areas, partially constructed buildings, and construction equipment would alter the existing visual character of these areas. This impact would be potentially significant during construction.

The visual character of the project site is generally defined by existing resort development, paved parking lots, and smaller ancillary structures. The project would increase the number and size of structures on the project site and the built environment would become a more dominant aspect of the visual character of the site. This impact would be potentially significant during project operation.

Mitigation Measure 8-2a: Implement Mitigation Measure 8-1. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 8-1, which requires the installation of screening to reduce the visual effects of construction.

Mitigation Measure 8-2b: Comply with plan area development standards and obtain Design Review approval. Prior to submittal of Improvement Plans or Building Permits, the project applicant shall obtain Design Review approval from the Placer County Design/Site Review Committee (D/SRC). All project phases must be compatible with the Plan Area Development Standards prescribed in Appendix B of the VSVSP. Review and approval by the County shall apply to such project components as: colors, materials, and textures of all structures; landscaping; signs; exterior lighting; and entry features.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less-than-significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and

technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subds. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project’s benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor’s Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

With mitigation, the effects of Main Village and East Parcel construction would remain significant and unavoidable. However, the effects of Main Village and East Parcel operation would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 8-3: Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a scenic highway. Squaw Valley Road is a designated Placer County scenic route and is considered a scenic highway for the purposes of this analysis. The qualities of more distant views of the main Village area from Squaw Valley Road (i.e., views of the resort with an impressive backdrop of mountain slopes and peaks) are moderately high to high. Construction activity and equipment would detract from foreground views from Squaw Valley Road of the scenic vistas (see Impact 8-1). The changes would result in a substantial adverse effect on the scenic vistas provided from Squaw Valley Road during construction. This impact would be potentially significant for the main Village area during construction. The visual character of the East Parcel is modified from natural conditions, and construction activity would not alter important scenic resources visible from Squaw Valley Road. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant for the East Parcel during construction.

Views from Squaw Valley Road of the meadow and surrounding peaks, which are the dominant visual resources in the study area, would not be blocked or altered with project implementation. In the main Village area, addition of structures to the foreground of views that are not consistent with the character of the natural setting and do not have a unified architectural style would have a potentially significant impact on the surrounding scenic resources, as viewed from a scenic route, during project operation. Development on the East Parcel would have a less-than-significant impact on scenic resources within a scenic route during project operation.

Mitigation Measure 8-3: Implement Mitigation Measures 8-1 and 8-2b. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measures 8-1 and 8-2b, which require the installation of screening to reduce the visual effects of construction and adherence to the VSVSP design guidelines, respectively.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less-than-significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, §

21081, subs. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3.)
The County concludes, however, that the project’s benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor’s Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-3 would reduce the impact to visual resources as viewed from Squaw Valley Road due to construction; however, no mitigation measures are available that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level because construction processes are inherently inconsistent with a natural scenic environment. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable during construction. During operation, however, the impact would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of architectural and landscape design guidelines that result in unified architectural style and landscape screening of the new structures,.

Impact 8-5: Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. The addition of construction lighting may detract from views of the night sky and surrounding resort area for residents and visitors. Residents do not have open views of the project site for the most part because their views are typically screened or blocked by vegetation. However, night lighting is more visible. Construction cranes and lighting on tall structures would make these features more noticeable at night than in daytime conditions. Taking into consideration that residents, and to some extent visitors, would have extended views of the project area, and have high sensitivity to visual conditions, this impact would be potentially significant for both the main Village area and the East Parcel.

Lighting to serve the project, including employee housing and parking at the East Parcel, would create a new source of substantial nighttime lighting in the area and would potentially increase skyglow conditions in the area. This impact would be potentially significant for both the main Village area and the East Parcel.

Mitigation Measure 8-5a: Install landscaping on the north and west sides of the East Parcel to screen night lighting for adjacent residential areas. Landscaping, consisting of a mixture of evergreen and deciduous trees and shrubs, shall be installed to enhance existing vegetation in the open space buffers on the west and north sides of the East Parcel to reduce the effects of night lighting on adjacent residential neighborhoods. Landscape screening shall be installed concurrent with the first phase of development on the East Parcel and shall be reviewed for effectiveness with each successive phase of development. If after the initial installation of landscape screening it is subsequently determined that additional screening is required to improve screening effectiveness, the Development Review Committee (DRC) may require installation of additional landscaping during future construction phases.

Mitigation Measure 8-5b: Implement Mitigation Measure 8-2b. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 8-2b, which requires adherence to the VSVSP Design Guidelines.

An Improvement Plan shall be developed that includes a detailed lighting and photometric plan. Specifically, the plan must:

- Demonstrate compliance with the VSVSP Master Lighting Plan (see Appendix B of the VSVSP). This includes minimizing impacts to adjoining and nearby land uses. No lighting shall be permitted on top of structures.
- Show streetlights designed in accordance with the Caltrans Traffic Manual and Standard Plans and installed to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works. Streetlights shall be of a type, height, and design to direct lighting downward, shielding, to the greatest extent practical, light exposure beyond that needed for proper intersection lighting. Streetlights shall not exceed the minimum number required by the Department of Public Works unless otherwise approved by the DRC. Street lighting would be kept to a minimum and full cut off luminaires shall be used. Streetlights lighting vehicular and pedestrian access ways at key intersections where safety is a concern would be no more than 30 feet tall, and in the commercial core streetlights would be no more than 20 feet tall. Parking lots would be lit, but would allow gaps in lighting.
- Include the type of lighting fixtures proposed in parking areas, including pole height. All site lighting in parking lots shall be full cut-off design. The metal pole color shall be such that the pole will blend into the landscape (i.e., black, bronze, or dark bronze).
- Include building lighting that is shielded and directed downward, such that the bulb or ballast is not visible. Lighting fixture design shall complement the building colors and materials and shall be used to light entries, soffits, covered walkways and pedestrian areas such as plazas. Roof and wall pack lighting shall not be used. Lighting intensity shall be of a level that only highlights the adjacent building area and ground area and shall not impose glare on any pedestrian or vehicular traffic.
- Include landscape lighting that will not impose glare on any pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

The Improvement Plan will be submitted to the DRC for review and approval.

Mitigation Measure 8-5c: Design parking structures to block direct illumination of adjacent residential buildings. Design of parking structures will be subject to design review by the DRC to ensure that parking structures are designed to avoid direct illumination of adjacent buildings from headlights. This may include design elements such as partial walls or other screening on all floors of the structure, and orientation of ramps and access points away from adjacent residential uses.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less-than-significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and

technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subds. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor's Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

While the design guidelines and compliance with Placer County codes would keep lighting to the minimum necessary to provide for safety, the project would create a new source of substantial nighttime lighting in the area and would potentially increase skyglow conditions in the area. There are no mitigation measures available that would reduce the effects of night lighting on residential areas in the vicinity of the main Village area to a less-than-significant level. Implementing standard practices and design guidelines would reduce the effect of this lighting on day and nighttime views of the area. However, residents and visitors may consider this new light an adverse change in nighttime views of the area. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable for the main Village area.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-5a, however, lighting or glare generated by the project would have a less-than-significant impact on the day and nighttime views at the East Parcel.

CHAPTER 9: TRANSPORTATION & CIRCULATION

Impact 9-2: Impacts to Placer County intersections. The proposed project would worsen operations to unacceptable levels or exacerbate already unacceptable operations at the Squaw Valley Road/Village East Road, Squaw Valley Road/Far East Road/Christy Hill Road, Squaw Valley Road/Wayne Road, and Squaw Valley Road/Squaw Creek Road intersections during one or more analysis peak hours. This would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 9-2a: Restrict and redirect northbound movements on Far East Road. For all ski days in which the projected amount of daily traffic on Squaw Valley Road would reach or exceed 13,500 ADT (per results of predictive model described in Mitigation Measure 9-1a), the project applicant shall restrict northbound movements on Far East Road to right-turns only during the afternoon peak period, and direct those movements (via signage and coning) into the beginning of the outside of the two eastbound travel lanes (three-lane coning program from Mitigation Measure 9-1a).

Information provided by the project applicant team suggests that the configuration may already be in existence when traffic management is implemented. This mitigation measure formalizes the need for this configuration to be employed during traffic management. In addition, temporary signs would need to be placed in Lot 11 (within the Village Core) at Far East Road to advise motorists that this route only directs motorists to eastbound Squaw Valley Road.

Mitigation Measure 9-2b: Conduct traffic management at either the Squaw Valley Road/Wayne Road or Squaw Valley Road/Eric Road intersections. For all ski days in which the projected amount of daily traffic on Squaw Valley Road would reach or exceed 13,500 ADT (per results of predictive model described in Mitigation Measure 9-1a), the project applicant shall situate traffic control personnel at either the Squaw Valley Road/Wayne Road or Squaw Valley Road/Eric Road intersection during the morning and afternoon peak periods to direct traffic. Traffic control personnel shall actively control traffic by stopping motorists on Squaw Valley Road to give the right-of-way to side-street traffic. The project applicant shall publicize this traffic control plan on the internet, with temporary signage, etc. such that residents know when traffic management would occur and are aware of the preferred access to/from the areas north of Squaw Valley Road.

Residents in the area north of Squaw Valley Road who currently use Christy Hill Road, Eric Road, Wayne Road, and Russell Road to access Squaw Valley Road would be informed by the project applicant that a traffic management controlled intersection (either at Eric Road or Wayne Road) would be available on peak ski days. Traffic control personnel shall emphasize the need to balance delays for Squaw Valley Road through traffic and side-street traffic, while not causing excessive queuing along Squaw Valley Road.

Mitigation Measure 9-2c: Conduct traffic management at the Squaw Valley Road/Squaw Creek Road intersection (ski season). For all ski days in which the projected amount of daily traffic on Squaw Valley Road would reach or exceed 13,500 ADT (per results of predictive model described in Mitigation Measure 9-1a), the project applicant shall situate traffic control personnel at the Squaw Valley Road/Squaw Creek Road intersection during the morning and afternoon peak periods to direct traffic. Traffic control personnel shall actively control traffic by stopping motorists on Squaw Valley Road to give the right-of-way to side-street traffic.

Mitigation Measure 9-2d: Monitor and when warranted, conduct traffic management at the Squaw Valley Road/Squaw Creek Road intersection (summer season). Based on the analysis results, operations on the Squaw Creek Road approach are expected to degrade to LOS E upon development of approximately 50 percent of the project. The project applicant shall conduct annual summer season (for peak conditions) monitoring of delays on the Squaw Creek Road approach at such time that project buildout reaches 30 percent. Once operations are found to degrade to LOS E conditions, the project applicant shall situate traffic control personnel at the Squaw Valley Road/Squaw Creek Road intersection to direct traffic. Traffic control personnel shall actively control traffic (i.e., stop motorists on Squaw Valley Road to give the right-of-way to side-street traffic).

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less-than-significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subds. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project's benefits outweigh the significant

and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor's Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 9-2a through 9-2d would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level for all intersections within the plan area, except the Squaw Valley Road/Village East Road intersection, because these measures would restore operations to acceptable levels.

The traffic management procedures described above at the Squaw Valley Road/Far East Road/Christy Hill Road, Squaw Valley Road/Wayne Road, and Squaw Valley Road/Squaw Creek Road intersections were analyzed to determine how the level of service would change. With the use of traffic management personnel, the Squaw Valley Road/Wayne Road and Squaw Valley Road/Squaw Creek Road intersections would operate similar to a two-phased signalized intersection. Traffic conditions would be improved at the Squaw Valley Road/Far East Road/Christy Hill Road intersection by restricting turning movements on Far East Road during peak periods. Based on the existing plus project traffic volumes and anticipated right-of-way allocations, these intersections would operate at LOS C or better with traffic management.

However, after implementation of the mitigation measures provided above, the Squaw Valley Road/Village East Road intersection would continue to experience increases in delays in excess of 2.5 seconds. Adoption of Policy CP-1 within the VSVSP would allow for an LOS F standard for intersections within the plan area during peak ski/occupancy days and would therefore make peak hour/day traffic conditions at the Squaw Valley Road/Village East Road intersection acceptable. However, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable for the Squaw Valley Road/Village East Road intersection unless and until Policy CP-1 is adopted.

Impact 9-4: Impacts caused by vehicular queuing at Caltrans intersections. The proposed project would cause an adverse vehicular queuing condition at the SR 89/Squaw Valley Road intersection during the winter Saturday a.m. peak hour that would not meet applicable design standards. This would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 9-4: Lengthen northbound left-turn lane and modify the traffic signal timing at the SR 89/Squaw Valley Road intersection. Currently during the winter Saturday a.m. peak hour, the northbound left-turn phase at the SR 89/Squaw Valley Road intersection is given a maximum green time of 45 seconds per cycle. As long as vehicle demand exists, the left-turn arrow remains green for up to 45 seconds. If the maximum green time for this time period were to be increased from 45 to 55 seconds (and the maximum green time for the southbound through movement was decreased by ten seconds), the 95th percentile vehicle queue under existing plus project conditions would be reduced to 375 feet. This signal timing adjustment would not adversely affect overall delay at the intersection. To meet the applicable design

standard, the turn lane (and taper) would need to have a combined length, including bay taper, of 610 feet (375 feet + 235 feet). Because the existing turn lane is 565 feet, the applicable design standard would be met by lengthening the turn lane 50 feet and implementing this (or another equally effective) signal timing modification. As evidenced by the existing condition, turn pockets on state highways do not always provide the deceleration and storage prescribed in the Highway Design Manual.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less-than-significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subds. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project’s benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor’s Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

The concept of using signal timing adjustments as a mitigation strategy was discussed with Caltrans Traffic Operations staff who indicated they support the idea of modifying traffic signal timings in response to changes in travel demand. However, lengthening the turn pocket by 50 feet may be infeasible due to environmental conditions. The east side of the highway includes a bike path and forestry resources as well as the banks of the Truckee River. Encroachment into this area would require relocation of a portion of the bike path, tree removal, and possible encroachment on the river. The west side of the highway is also constrained by a downslope, a bikepath, and parking for Squaw Valley Park. Thus, widening of the road may not be acceptable to Caltrans and may be infeasible. Furthermore, Placer County cannot ensure these improvements are implemented in a reasonable period since they are subject to approval from Caltrans. For these reasons, Impact 9-4 is considered significant and unavoidable.

Impact 9-5: Impacts to Caltrans highways. The proposed project would exacerbate already unacceptable operations on the segments of SR 89 between Deerfield Drive and West River Street, and SR 28 east of SR 89 in Tahoe City during the summer Friday p.m. peak hour. This would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 9-5: Improve operations on select segments of SR 89 and SR 28. The State Route 89 Transportation Corridor Concept Report (Caltrans 2012b) identifies the segment of SR 89 between Deerfield Drive and West River Street as a concept four-lane conventional highway. The document lists a conceptual widening from two to four lanes. However, such a widening project is not currently included in any adopted planning documents or fee programs.

No capacity-increasing improvements are proposed for the segment of SR 28 east of SR 89 according to the State Route 28 Transportation Corridor Concept Report (Caltrans 2012c [*see Chapter 20, References and Persons Consulted, in the Draft EIR*]).

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less-than-significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subs. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project’s benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor’s Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

Because there are no available mechanisms to provide an acceptable LOS on the SR 28 and SR 89 segments in question, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CHAPTER 11: NOISE

Impact 11-1: Construction noise impacts. Existing noise-sensitive receptors are located in close proximity to proposed construction areas and, as the Specific Plan is developed, newly constructed sensitive receptors may be located adjacent to, or in close proximity to, ongoing construction. Most construction activities are proposed during the daytime hours, when construction noise is exempt by the Placer County Municipal Code. Although construction noise occurring during the exempted hours of the day would comply with the Placer County noise ordinance, the relatively large scale of construction occurring over a long period of time, and in close proximity to existing and future sensitive receptors, may result in excessive noise levels that disturb nearby sensitive receptors. Further, construction activity may be required during the night for actions such as large continuous concrete pours and to protect the construction site and buildings from anticipated storms. Proposed nighttime construction activities would exceed Placer County nighttime standards for sensitive receptors and could potentially result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels of 5 dB above current levels. This impact would be significant.

Mitigation Measure 11-1a: Implement construction-noise reduction measures. To minimize noise levels during construction activities, construction contractors shall comply with the following measures during all proposed construction work:

- All construction equipment and equipment staging areas shall be located as far as possible from nearby noise-sensitive land uses.
- 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.

- All construction equipment with back-up alarms shall be equipped with either audible self-adjusting backup alarms or alarms that only sound when an object is detected. The self-adjusting backup alarms shall automatically adjust to 5 dBA over the surrounding background levels. All non self-adjusting backup alarms shall be set to the lowest setting required to be audible above the surrounding noise levels. In addition to the use of backup alarms, the construction contractor shall consider other techniques such as observers and the scheduling of construction activities such that alarm noise is minimized.
- Individual operations and techniques shall be replaced with quieter procedures (e.g., using welding instead of riveting, mixing concrete off-site instead of on-site) where feasible and consistent with building codes and other applicable laws and regulations.
- When existing and future noise sensitive uses are within close proximity to prolonged construction noise, 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.
- Construction on the East Parcel shall be designed to avoid intrusive noise, defined as an interior noise level of 45 dBA L_{eq} /65 dBA L_{max} or greater, during the time when classroom activities take place at the Squaw Valley Academy. The applicant shall coordinate with administrators at the academy and shall achieve these performance standards either by adjusting the timing of construction, adjusting construction methods during times of classroom instruction, temporary screening, and/or improving noise attenuation at the school by replacing windows, increasing insulation, etc., as needed. The applicant shall prepare and submit to Placer County an acoustical study that demonstrates these criteria will be met prior to approval of each Small Lot Tentative Map for all construction on the East Parcel.
- The project applicant shall sponsor and create a website that includes information on construction activities and includes when, where, and for how long noise generating construction activities would occur. In addition, prior to the beginning of each construction season written notification of construction activities shall be provided to all noise-sensitive receptors located within 2,500 feet of construction activities. Additional notifications may 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.

Mitigation Measure 11-1b: Implement construction-noise reduction measures during noise-sensitive time periods. For all construction activity that is to take place outside of the Placer

County construction noise exception timeframes (i.e., 6:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Saturday and Sunday), and that is anticipated to generate more than 45 dBA Leq / 65 dBA Lmax at 50 feet, the construction contractor shall comply with the following measures:

- Consistent with Section 9.36.080 Exceptions, of the Placer County Code, obtain an exception to Article 9.36 Noise standards for nighttime construction. Implement noticing to adjacent landowners called for in Section 9.36.080 and implement conditions included in the exception, if approved.
- Install temporary noise curtains that meet the following parameters:
 - Install temporary noise curtains as close as possible to the boundary of the construction site within the direct line of sight path of the nearby sensitive receptor(s).
 - Temporary noise curtains shall consist of durable, flexible composite material featuring a noise barrier layer bounded to sound-absorptive material on one side. The noise barrier layer shall consist of rugged, impervious, material with a surface weight of at least one pound per square foot.
- Noise-reducing enclosures and techniques shall be used around stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., concrete mixers, generators, compressors).
- Operate heavy-duty construction equipment at the lowest operating power possible.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less-than-significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subds. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor's Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 11-1a and 11-1b would provide substantial reductions in day and nighttime construction noise levels by ensuring proper equipment use; locating equipment away from sensitive land uses; and requiring the use of enclosures, shields, and noise curtains (noise curtains typically can reduce noise by up to 10 dB [EPA 1971 (see Chapter 20, References and Persons Consulted, in the Draft EIR)]. Although, noise reduction would be achieved with implementation of these measures, reductions of up to 34 dB would be required during some of the more intensive night time construction (e.g., during continuous concrete pours that would occur intermittently and only during the most intense construction periods, typically during the summer months), to comply with Placer County's nighttime

standard of 45 dBA Leq. Reductions of this magnitude are not expected to be achieved under all circumstances with implementation of Mitigation Measures 11-1a and 11-1b. Further, construction activities would continue to produce disruptive daytime noise over an extended period. Thus, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

CHAPTER 16: GREENHOUSE GASES & CLIMATE CHANGE

Impact 16-2: Operational greenhouse gas emissions. GHGs associated with operation of the Specific Plan would exceed the Tier I mass-emission threshold of 1,100 metric tons of CO₂ equivalent per year (MT CO₂e/year). GHG emissions would be substantial when the project is completed. Therefore, operation of the Specific Plan has the potential to result in a substantial contribution to GHG emissions. This impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 16-2: Implement ongoing operational greenhouse gas review and reduction program. 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 in the EIR in Section 16.2.2) and in response to *Center for Biological Diversity v. California Department of Fish and Wildlife* (2015) 62 Cal.4th 204 as it relates to 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. The County shall require the following actions for all subdivision maps submitted for approval:

- In consultation with the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) and Placer County, the applicant shall demonstrate, based on currently adopted regulations and industry-accepted GHG calculation methods, whether operation of the subdivision would be consistent with GHG targets adopted by the State. "Adopted" means that a specific GHG reduction target, such as is 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.
- If the subdivision achieves or exceeds the reduction target or plan, no further actions shall be required.
- If the subdivision does not meet the target, then measures shall be incorporated into the subdivision 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:

- Actions included in Mitigation Measure 10-2 that also reduce GHG emissions (menu of options to reduce ROG and NO_x emissions to a specified level such as trip reduction and energy management; nearly all of these measures would similarly reduce GHG emissions);
- Actions specified in Specific Plan Section 7.6, “Climate Change Initiatives,” but with mandated actions (instead of “should” or “encourage” the actions, use “shall”), such as requiring that all buildings exceed Title 24 energy-efficiency requirements by 15 percent; requiring incorporation of on-site renewable energy production to meet at least 25 percent of the subdivision’s electricity needs, etc.
- 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.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less than potentially significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subs. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project’s benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor’s Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

As described in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, including the information presented in Master Response 3.1.17 (Greenhouse Gas Analysis) (Final EIR, pp. 3-90 to 3-109), the project’s GHG emissions would exceed the PCAPCD Tier I mass emissions threshold of 1,100 MTCO₂e/year, future targets are expected but have not been adopted, and compliance with future targets is unknown. Therefore, it would be speculative to determine that GHG impacts, if they were to occur, would be feasibly mitigated to future adopted GHG target levels. When considering mitigation measures and their effectiveness, it is clear that emissions can be substantially reduced, as stated in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, but the impact would remain potentially significant and unavoidable.

CHAPTER 18: OTHER CEQA SECTIONS (CUMULATIVE)

Impact 18-12: Cumulative effect on historical resources. Because the proposed project would adversely affect two buildings that are unique and non-renewable members of a finite class of resources, the project’s incremental contribution to these cumulative effects would be cumulatively considerable.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less than potentially significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subs. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor's Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

Mitigation Measure 7-1a and 7-1b would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative loss of historic resources in the Olympic Valley; however, not to a less than considerable level. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures available to reduce this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 18-14: Substantial adverse cumulative effect on a scenic vista. As a result of past, present, and reasonably probable future projects, in combination with the proposed project, residents of Olympic Valley would experience a significant cumulative visual impact to scenic vistas. The project's incremental contribution to this significant cumulative impact is cumulatively considerable.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less than potentially significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subs. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor's Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

The only means available to reduce the project's contribution to the significant cumulative impacts to the viewshed would involve substantially scaling back the size and density of development or not constructing the project at all, which would be infeasible in light of project objectives. The project's contribution to the cumulative impact would therefore be significant and unavoidable to residents of Olympic Valley.

Impact 18-15: Substantial contribution to the cumulative degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Cumulative visual impacts from

construction activity could result if other future planned construction activities were to take place in close proximity to the project, thus degrading the visual character or quality of the area. The project's incremental contribution to the cumulative degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings during construction is cumulatively considerable.

The proposed project would potentially combine with the related projects listed in Table 18-2 that are located within Squaw Valley to increase the prominence of commercial, residential, and resort structures in the viewsheds that include the project site. However, only one other project (PlumpJack) is located in the vicinity of the main Village area. The PlumpJack project is a redevelopment of an existing facility. Views of this facility would likely be blocked or screened by the proposed project.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less than potentially significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subs. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor's Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-2a would reduce the project's construction-related visual impacts, but not to a less than considerable level because elements of construction that would detract from the unity of the view coupled with the extent of proposed development and the extended development timeframe, are unavoidable. The project's contribution to the cumulative impact would therefore be significant and unavoidable during project construction.

With respect to the cumulative operational impact, implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-2b would ensure that the project is consistent with the visual character of the adjacent existing resort development and that the project would implement design standards and guidelines that would encourage maintenance of unified architectural styles. Therefore, the project would make a less-than-significant contribution to the cumulative impact during project operation.

Impact 18-16: Substantial cumulative contribution to damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a scenic highway. Construction of related projects would be potentially visible from Squaw Valley Road and would contribute to a significant cumulative impact to scenic resources visible from a scenic highway. Existing resort development and ski hill facilities detract from views of the surrounding peaks and Squaw Valley meadow. Therefore, under existing conditions there is a significant cumulative impact to scenic resources visible from the scenic highway.

The proposed project would potentially combine with the related projects listed in Table 18-2 that are located within Squaw Valley to increase the prominence of commercial, residential, and resort structures that would be visible from Squaw Valley Road. The project would make a considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to scenic resources in the main Village area.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less than potentially significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subs. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor's Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

Mitigation Measure 8-1, which requires the installation of screening to reduce the visual effects of construction, would reduce the impact, but not to a less-than-significant level because construction activities are inherently inconsistent with a natural, serene environment. Therefore, the project's contribution to this cumulative impact would remain significant and unavoidable during construction.

In the long-term, implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-2b, which requires adherence to the VSVSP design guidelines, would reduce the project's contribution to this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level during project operation because the project would be designed in a unified architectural and landscape style.

Impact 18-18: Contribute to cumulative light and glare or skyglow effects in the region. An existing significant cumulative impact related to night lighting and skyglow exists in the region. The proposed project in combination with related development projects would make a considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to night lighting and sky glow in the region.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less than potentially significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subs. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of

Supervisor’s Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 8-5a, 8-5b, and 8-5c would reduce the project’s contribution to cumulative night lighting and skyglow in the region by screening the East Parcel from adjacent residential areas with vegetation, adhering to the VSVSP Design Guidelines related to lighting, and designing parking structures to avoid direct illumination of adjacent buildings from headlights. However, there are no mitigation measures available that would reduce the effects of night lighting on residential areas in the vicinity of the main Village area to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the project’s contribution to the cumulative impact would be a significant and unavoidable for the main Village area.

Impact 18-21: Cumulative impacts to Caltrans intersections. The proposed project would cause the following significant degradations in operations under cumulative plus project conditions at intersections along SR 89, which are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans:

- SR 89/I-80 WB Ramps – operations would worsen from LOS D to E during the summer Friday p.m. peak hour.
- SR 89/I-80 EB Ramps – LOS F operations exacerbated (16 seconds increase in delay) during the winter Sunday p.m. peak hour.
- SR 89/Donner Pass Road – LOS E operations exacerbated (4 seconds increase in delay) during the summer Friday p.m. peak hour

Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts at the above intersections would be significant.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less-than-significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subds. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project’s benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor’s Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

There are no known plans to improve the I-80/SR 89 interchange. The concept of replacing the traffic signal at the SR 89/Donner Pass Road intersection with a multi-lane roundabout is discussed in the State Route 89 Transportation Corridor Concept Report, the Nevada County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and the Town of Truckee General Plan. However, there are no known fee programs

collecting funds to implement this improvement. Further, any improvements would require approval from Caltrans. Placer County cannot assure that Caltrans would agree to construct any proposed improvements. For these reasons, this cumulative impact would be significant and unavoidable because there is no timely mechanism available to achieve an acceptable LOS at the study intersections.

Impact 18-22: Cumulative impacts caused by vehicular queuing at Caltrans intersections.

Trips added by the project during the winter Saturday a.m. peak hour under the cumulative plus project condition would cause the 95th percentile queue at the SR 89/Squaw Valley Road intersection to increase from 800 to 900 feet. As shown in Table 18-5 of the Draft EIR (Draft EIR, p. 18-26) and Caltrans design standards, the northbound left-turn lane would need to provide 900 feet of vehicle storage and 235 feet of deceleration to meet the applicable design standard. Since the existing turn lane is 565 feet, the applicable design standard would not be met. Therefore, the project's contribution (of 100 additional feet of storage required) to cumulative impacts would be significant.

Mitigation Measure 18-22: Lengthen northbound left-turn lane and modify the traffic signal timing at the SR 89/Squaw Valley Road intersection. If the maximum green time for the winter Saturday a.m. peak hour were to be set to 55 seconds for the northbound left-turn movement and 40 seconds for the southbound through movement, the northbound left-turn 95th percentile queue would be reduced to 675 feet. This signal timing adjustment would not adversely affect overall delay at the intersection. To meet the applicable design standard, the turn lane (and taper) would need to have a combined length including bay taper of 910 feet (675 feet + 235 feet). Because the existing turn lane is 565 feet, the applicable design standard would be met by lengthening the turn lane 350 feet and implementing this (or another equally effective) signal timing modification. As evidenced by the existing condition, turn pockets on state highways do not always provide the deceleration and storage prescribed in the Highway Design Manual.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less-than-significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subds. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor's Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

The recommended 350-foot turn lane lengthening would need to occur on the west side of SR 89 to avoid sensitive environmental resources on the east side (including the Truckee River). However, widening on the west side may require encroachment into a steep uphill slope and potentially into a bike trail and park, which could cause secondary environmental effects, and may not be acceptable to Caltrans or the

County. Furthermore, Placer County cannot ensure these improvements are implemented in a reasonable timeframe because they are subject to approval from Caltrans. For these reasons, Mitigation Measure 18-22 would be infeasible if Caltrans or the County do not agree to this improvement and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact 18-23: Cumulative impacts to Caltrans highways. As also shown in Table 18-6 of the Final EIR (Final EIR, p. 2-86), the proposed project would cause the following cumulatively considerable degradations in operations on study segments of SR 89 and SR 28, which are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans:

- SR 89 between Deerfield Drive and West River Street – operations would worsen as follows:
 - winter Sunday p.m. peak hour: LOS E to F operations (0.07 v/c ratio increase).
 - summer Friday p.m. peak hour: LOS E operations exacerbated (0.10 v/c ratio increase).

- SR 89 between West River Street and Squaw Valley Road – operations would worsen as follows:
 - winter Sunday p.m. peak hour: LOS F operations exacerbated (0.07 v/c ratio increase).

- SR 28 east of SR 89 – operations would worsen as follows:
 - summer Friday p.m. peak hour: LOS E to F operations exacerbated (0.09 v/c ratio increase).

For each of the above segments, the proposed project would either worsen projected operations to an unacceptable level, or increase the v/c ratio by 0.05 or more at a facility projected to operate unacceptably, which would be a significant cumulative impact.

Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project’s benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor’s Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

There are no known plans to improve any of the affected segments of SR 89 and SR 28. The State Route 89 Transportation Corridor Concept Report indicates that widening of SR 89 is not feasible due to the environmental sensitivity of the area and topographic constraints. No capacity-increasing improvements are proposed for the segment of SR 28 east of SR 89 according to the State Route 28 Transportation Corridor Concept Report. Further, any improvements would require approval from Caltrans. Placer County cannot assure that Caltrans would agree to construct any

proposed improvements. For these reasons, this cumulative impact would be significant and unavoidable because there is no timely mechanism available to achieve an acceptable LOS at these highway segments.

Impact 18-31: Cumulative short-term construction-generated noise. Cumulative impacts from construction-generated noise could result if other future planned construction activities were to take place in close proximity to the project and cumulatively combine with construction noise from the project. Several approved and proposed projects within the Valley could be constructed at the same time as some phases of VSVSP construction and combine with project-related construction noise. These include the PlumpJack Hotel redevelopment and the Resort at Squaw Creek expansion, among others. Combined construction of the project and other projects would add to the overall disruptive nature of construction noise over a period lasting several years, regardless of whether the noise is exempt from ordinances. The addition of cumulative projects to the impact from the project would be relatively minor, but would still add to the overall addition of construction noise. If multiple projects were under construction simultaneously, the proposed project could make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to construction noise.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less than potentially significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subs. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project’s benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor’s Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

While the construction activities would follow various noise mitigation measures and ordinances, as outlined in Chapter 11, “Noise” of the Draft EIR (see Impact 11-1), the cumulative construction noise impact would be significant and unavoidable. This impact results from the location of the project in a relatively quiet mountain environment and the anticipated need for some nighttime construction. For this reason, additional feasible mitigation (beyond what is stated in Mitigation Measure 11-1) is not available to further reduce this impact and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact 18-43: Cumulative greenhouse gas emissions. The discussion of GHG emissions generated by the VSVSP under Impacts 16-1 and 16-2 in Chapter 16, “Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change,” of the Draft EIR, as amplified and clarified in the Final EIR, is inherently a cumulative impact analysis. GHG emissions from one project cannot, on their 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 in Chapter 16

concluded that the project would emit a substantial level of GHG emissions that could exceed future emission standards. GHG emissions associated with the VSVSP would be potentially cumulatively considerable.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that lessen, though not to a less than potentially significant level, the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subs. (a)(1) and (a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1) and (a)(3).) The County concludes, however, that the project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the project, as set forth in the Board of Supervisor's Statement of Overriding Considerations below. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

As described in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, including the information presented in Master Response 3.1.17 (Greenhouse Gas Analysis) (Final EIR, pp. 3-90 to 3-109), the project's GHG emissions would exceed the PCAPCD Tier I mass emissions threshold of 1,100 MTCO₂e/year. Future emission targets for projects that exceed this Tier I threshold are expected but have not been adopted, and compliance with future targets is unknown. When considering mitigation measures and their effectiveness, it is clear that emissions can be substantially reduced, as stated in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, but the impact would remain potentially significant and unavoidable because it would require substantial speculation to conclude whether these currently unknown future targets can be met. The cumulative GHG emissions impact is therefore significant and unavoidable.

XIII. Findings regarding impacts that are not significant or that can be mitigated below a level of significance.

CHAPTER 4: LAND USE & FOREST RESOURCES

Impact 4-1: Potential for division of an established community. The plan area is currently used as part of the Squaw Valley Ski Resort. Although a resort residential neighborhood is located northeast of the main Village area and a limited number of residences are located to the southwest of the main Village area, development of the project would not physically divide this existing community because the ski resort is already an established use in the project area. Similarly, the East Parcel is already used for resort operations, and would provide a logical location for employee housing because residential is an existing land use in the area. The project would result in some alterations to resort on-site parking locations and circulation patterns, but access to the resort would continue to be provided. Project development would include new amenities that would be available to the public, including the neighboring residents. Because the project would not divide an established community, this impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 4-2: Conflict with the Placer County General Plan, the Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance (SVGPLUO), designations or zoning, or plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The plan area is located within Squaw Valley (also known as Olympic Valley) in northeastern Placer County. With approval of the proposed policy amendments and implementation of the proposed development programs that are a part of the proposed project, the project would be consistent with relevant Placer County General Plan and SVGPLUO policies. Moreover, although a General Plan amendment is needed, the project and its programmed land uses and development standards would be consistent with the overall anticipated land uses, including density, and policy framework of the Placer County General Plan and the SVGPLUO. The proposed Specific Plan land use designations would be consistent with the land use designations of the Placer County General Plan and the SVGPLUO with approval of the proposed rezone. Conflicts would not occur if the Specific Plan is approved and implemented because land use policies for the plan area are predominantly consistent with existing Placer County General Plan and SVGPLUO policies, and minor adjustments to existing policies and reorganization of where land uses would occur would achieve consistency. Therefore, no conflicts with the overall intent of relevant plans, policies, or zoning would occur and this impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 4-3: Development of incompatible uses and/or creation of land use conflicts. The proposed Specific Plan would expand upon existing similar uses within the plan area and would not be expected to result in any new long-term land use conflicts. Project construction could result in short-term land use conflicts primarily due to intermittent lane closures/detours, parking disruptions, and construction-related noise and dust. These temporary, construction-related land use conflicts are addressed through the impact analysis and mitigation provided in appropriate resource sections (e.g., noise) of this Draft EIR. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 4-4: Result in alteration of the present or planned land use of an area. The plan area is currently used as part of the Squaw Valley Ski Resort, with developed uses such as lodging, restaurants, ski-related facilities, parking lots, and other related uses. The proposed project would develop a mixed-use development that would be compatible and complimentary with the existing skier amenities and support facilities located adjacent to and within the plan area, consistent with the Placer County General Plan and the SVGPLUO. Therefore, the project would not alter the present or planned land use of an area. This impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 4-5: Economic or social changes resulting in physical environmental changes. The project would not result in an oversupply of any land uses within the market, which includes the Squaw Valley/Alpine Meadows area, the Lake Tahoe North Shore and West Shore, Northstar, and Truckee. In the long term, demand for retail is expected to outpace supply, including with the project. Although short-term oversupply could occur if a disproportionate amount of retail is developed prior to establishment of sufficient demand, this is not expected because retail is planned to be phased in to the project in response to demand. Demand for lodging in the market area is expected to outpace the increase in supply from the project. The proposed project, therefore, would not be expected to result in competition with existing uses that could cause urban decay or deterioration. No impact would be expected.

FINDING

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.) Here, there would be no impact

Impact 4-6: Conflict with existing zoning/loss of forest land. The proposed project includes rezoning of some Forest Recreation land to another use (e.g., Village Commercial) and some Village Commercial to Forest Recreation, ultimately resulting in an increased amount of land zoned Forest Recreation. With project implementation, approximately 12.11 acres of forested land would be converted to non-forested uses, and many of the trees on this land would be harvested; however, substantial forestry resources are, and would continue to be, available in the surrounding area. In addition, the project would not affect the use or management of surrounding forestry resources. Finally, the project will comply with the County Tree Ordinance and the requirement to prepare a Timber Harvest Plan (THP) or THP exemption, if applicable. For these reasons, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact on forestry resources.

FINDING

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.)

CHAPTER 5: POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, & HOUSING

Impact 5-1: Induce substantial population growth and housing demand during construction. The project would generate a temporary increase in employment in Olympic Valley of up to an estimated 136 construction jobs during the most intense year of construction (i.e., when up to 20 percent of total project construction activity is completed in one year). The number of existing construction personnel in the region is sufficient to meet demand associated with the project; therefore, this temporary increase in employment is not expected to generate any substantial new population growth in the area or generate the need for substantial additional housing for construction workers. This impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 5-2: Induce substantial population growth and housing demand during operation. Development of the proposed project would result in construction of hotels, condo hotels, fractional ownership units, and timeshare units. The project would also include employment opportunities that would require a population increase to meet business demands. However, the types of employment available within the Specific Plan would be primarily seasonal and would not be expected to result in substantial long-term population growth. Thus, the project would have a less-than-significant impact related to population growth and housing demand during operation.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 5-3: Displace substantial numbers of housing or people. The project is expected to generate an additional 574 new FTE employees annually. To be consistent with Placer County General Plan policies, the project would be required to provide housing for 287 employees (one half of the FTE total). In addition, the project includes removal of existing structures in the main Village area (Courtside and Hostel) that currently provide employee housing for up to 99 staff. With the removal of these existing employee housing facilities, the project would need to provide housing for 386 employees (287 new employees plus 99 replacement housing facilities) to meet the Placer County policy. Under the current illustrative plan, employee housing units (in different bedroom and dormitory configurations) would be constructed on the East Parcel to house a maximum of 300 employees. This would be sufficient to replace the housing for 99 employees removed by the project, but would be less than the required number of beds to meet Placer County General Plan policies for new employee housing. Therefore, this impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 5-3: Develop VSVSP Employee/Workforce Housing Plan. The project applicant shall develop a detailed “VSVSP Employee/Workforce Housing Plan” for Placer County review and approval. Provision of sufficient housing opportunities to accommodate a minimum of half of new FTEs generated by project operation will be assured through a combination of one or more of the following:

- development of new on-site employee/workforce housing;
- development/renovation of off-site employee/workforce housing;
- dedication of sufficient land for needed units; and/or
- payment of an in-lieu fee.

The designs of applicant-provided on-site and off-site employee/workforce housing shall be reviewed and approved by the County. An approved VSVSP Employee/Workforce Housing Plan shall be approved prior to recordation of each Small Lot Final Map or approval of a building permit for any new-employee generating project that does not require a Small Lot Final Map, whichever occurs first. The VSVSP Employee/Workforce Housing Plan shall provide an accounting of the final number of net new full time equivalent (FTE) employees expected to be created by the project with identified phasing; the number, locations, and capacity of new employee/workforce housing units to be developed; location and capacity of dedicated land for new employee/workforce housing; in-lieu fees paid to the County; and implementation schedule to ensure that sufficient new housing is available for new employees as project construction is completed and operations begin. The VSVSP Employee/Workforce Housing Plan shall be updated, at the discretion of the County, by the developer concurrent with review and implementation each project or project phase that generates new FTE employees.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5-3 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level because it would ensure that sufficient employee/workforce housing is provided on-site and/or off-site for at least half of the expected new FTE employees generated, consistent with Placer County General Plan Housing Element Policy C-2.

CHAPTER 6: BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact 6-1: Removal or degradation of sensitive habitats (jurisdictional wetlands, wet meadows, and riparian vegetation). Implementation of the VSVSP through construction of buildings, roads, trails, parking lots, utilities, and creek restoration would result in direct removal and disturbance of sensitive habitats, including wet meadows, seasonal wetlands, riparian habitat, waters of the United States, and waters of the state. The construction of a bike trail along Squaw Creek and the East Parcel could also result in potential conflicts with Land Use Buffer Zones for streams and sensitive habitats in the Placer County General Plan if the County determines that impacts have not been minimized. The snow storage sites in the East Parcel could result in increased sedimentation and a decrease in water quality of stream habitat protected under Section 1602 and wetlands and other waters of the United States. Restoration of Squaw Creek would result in the permanent alteration of existing stream and riparian habitat protected under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code during construction. Over the long term, this alteration may preserve and enhance wetlands, stream, and riparian habitat protected under Section 404 of the CWA, Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code, and Placer County policies. However, additional groundwater pumping from Specific Plan Operations, if not managed appropriately, may reduce the quality or extent of sensitive habitats, including riparian and meadow habitat within and around Squaw Creek and potentially decrease water quality along the meadow reaches of Squaw Creek. Although the data analysis indicates that perennial riparian and annual meadow vegetation will not be permanently lost, the lack of specific information on bank and habitat elevation (as well as restoration impacts) prevents certainty in this conclusion; thus, there is a potential for some loss of these sensitive habitats. Removal or degradation of these sensitive habitats would result in loss of natural communities important to ecosystem functioning in the Sierra Nevada. Therefore, degradation of wetlands and waters of the United States and stream habitat during construction and operations under the Specific Plan and conflicts with General Plan policies intended to protect these resources would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 6-1a: Conduct delineation of waters of the United States, obtain authorization for fill and required permits, and compensate for regulated and unregulated wetlands. The following would apply to any potentially affected jurisdictional resources that have not been delineated or verified by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) prior to

project implementation, or those resources that have been verified as jurisdictional but cannot be avoided. As noted above, the areas that have not yet been delineated or verified consist of limited areas that would be affected by utility installation.

- Prior to the start of on-site construction activities on any potentially affected jurisdictional resource that has not been previously delineated or verified by USACE, a qualified biologist shall survey the project area 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 Clean Water Act (CWA) and other applicable regulations.
- Prior to recordation of the Final Subdivision Map(s), the wetlands report shall be field verified by USACE, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).
- If sensitive natural communities or habitats that are afforded specific consideration, based on Section 404 of the CWA, are determined to be present within 50 feet of any groundbreaking activity within the plan area, a delineation of waters of the United States, including wetlands that would be affected by the project, shall 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 (or previous delineations that have already been verified), it is determined that fill of waters of the United States cannot be fully avoided during implementation of the project, authorization for such fill will be secured from USACE through the Section 404 permitting process prior to the fill being undertaken. The project applicant shall implement all permit conditions.
- Prior to the County Improvement Plan approval, the project applicant shall furnish to DRC, evidence that CDFW, USFWS, and USACE have been notified by letter regarding the existence of wetlands or streams on the property if any are present within the area subject to the Improvement Plans. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, if permits are required, they shall be obtained and copies submitted to DRC. Any clearing, grading, or excavation work shall not occur until the Improvement Plans have been approved.
- The project applicant shall replace on a “no net loss” basis (minimum 1:1 ratio) (in accordance with USACE and/or the Lahontan RWQCB) the acreage and function of all wetlands and other waters (as well as unregulated wetlands per County policy) that would be removed, lost, or degraded as a result of project implementation or operations. Wetland habitat shall be replaced at acreage and location agreeable to USACE and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (LRWQCB) and as determined during the Section 401 and Section 404 permitting processes. Any temporarily disturbed riparian habitats, water bodies, and wetlands shall be restored to pre-project conditions.
- This project plans to construct all or a portion of replacement wetlands onsite. An Improvement Plan for habitat restoration activities shall be prepared and submitted by the project applicant to the Planning Services Division for review concurrent with

Improvement Plan review. A Mitigation Monitoring Implementation Program (MMIP) for the replacement of wetlands/riparian vegetation shall be prepared by a qualified wetlands biologist. Said MMIP shall be submitted to the Planning Services Division concurrent with, or prior to the Improvement Plan, and shall comply with Article 18.28 of the Placer County Environmental Review Ordinance. Where sediment capture is proposed in conjunction with wetlands replacement or enhancement, the monitoring program shall consider sediment removal and restoration within disturbed areas after sediment removal activities. Project construction and project monitoring shall comply with the criteria defined in the Environmental Impact Report Mitigation Monitoring Implementation Plan and the requirements of CDFW.

- An annual monitoring report for a minimum period of 5 years from the date of installation, prepared by the above-cited professional, shall be submitted to the Planning Services Division for review and approval. Any corrective action shall be the responsibility of the applicant. The report shall include baseline (pre-restoration) and post-restoration measurements of suspended sediment concentration, streamflow, and turbidity as described on page 27 of the Channel Restoration Design Basis Report (Balance Hydrologics 2014).
 - Prior to the Improvement Plan approval, a Letter of Credit, Certificate of Deposit, or cash deposit in the amount of 100 percent of the accepted proposal shall be deposited with the Placer County Planning Services Division to assure on-going performance of the monitoring program. Evidence of this deposit shall be provided to the satisfaction of the DRC prior to the approval of Improvement Plans. For the purposes of administrative and program review by Placer County, an additional 25 percent of the estimated cost of the Monitoring Program shall be paid to the County, in cash, at the time that the 100 percent deposit is made. With the exception of the 25 percent administrative fee, 100 percent of the estimated costs of implementing the monitoring program shall be returned to the applicant once the applicant has demonstrated that all 5 years of monitoring have been completed to the satisfaction of the DRC. Refunds will only be available at the end of the entire review period.
 - It is the project applicant's responsibility to ensure compliance with the MMIP. Violation of any components of the approved MMIP may result in enforcement activities per Placer County Environmental Review Ordinance, Section 18.28.080. If a monitoring report is not submitted for any one year, or combination of years, as outlined in these conditions, the County has the option of utilizing these funds and hiring a consultant to implement the MMIP. Failure to submit annual monitoring reports could also result in forfeiture of a portion of, or all of, the deposit. An agreement between the applicant and County shall be prepared which meets DRC approval that allows the County use of this deposit to assure performance of the MMIP in the event the project applicant fails to perform.
- The Mitigation and Monitoring Implementation Plan shall, at a minimum, include the following specific criteria, standards, and information:

- Baseline locations of jurisdictional habitat including species along the western and upper eastern channel of Squaw Creek (West Cells E through J and East Cells A through D) within the plan area shall be documented before initiation of construction of the VSVSP. Conduct vegetation monitoring or additional groundwater modelling as described in Mitigation Measure 6-1c below. Any jurisdictional habitat lost within the western portion of Squaw Creek from groundwater drawdown that affects streambank instability shall be replaced with native vegetation (riparian preferably) that will stabilize the streambank and prevent sediment mobilization.
 - identification of compensatory mitigation sites and criteria for selecting these mitigation sites onsite and offsite;
 - in kind reference habitats within the Tahoe-Truckee region for comparison with compensatory wetlands habitats (using performance and success criteria) to document success;
 - monitoring protocol, including schedule and annual report requirements (compensatory habitat shall be monitored for a minimum of five years from completion of mitigation or last human intervention [including recontouring and grading and irrigation], or until the success criteria identified in the approved mitigation plan have been met, whichever is longer);
 - ecological performance standards, based on the best available science and including specifications for native wetland and riparian plant densities, species composition, amount of dead woody vegetation gaps and bare ground, indicators of stress that might result in mortality, and survivorship; at a minimum, compensatory mitigation planting sites must achieve 80 percent survival of planted wetland species by the end of the five-year maintenance and monitoring period or dead and dying species shall be replaced and monitoring continued until 80 percent survivorship is achieved;
 - corrective measures if performance standards are not met;
 - responsible parties for monitoring and preparing reports; and
 - responsible parties for receiving and reviewing reports and for verifying success or prescribing implementation or corrective actions.
- The project applicant shall follow requirements outlined in the MMIP and CSRMMIP for vegetation restoration success in all areas of onsite and off-site mitigation or restoration.
 - If the project applicants elects to provide all or a part of wetland or riparian mitigation off-site, and off-site mitigation has been determined to be acceptable to the County, prior to Placer County Improvement Plan approval or recordation of the Final Subdivision

Map(s) or issuance of a Building Permit, the project applicant shall provide any of the three listed mitigation measures below:

- Provide written evidence of payment that compensatory habitat has been established through the purchase of mitigation credits at a County-qualified wetland mitigation bank. Evidence of payment shall describe the amount and type of habitat purchased at the bank site. The amount of money required to purchase credits shall be equal to the amount necessary to replace wetland or riparian habitat acreage. Evidence of payment shall describe the amount and type of habitat purchased at the bank site and resource values including compensation for temporal loss. Evidence of payment must be provided to the County prior to issuance of Improvement Plans.
 - Construct wetland and/or riparian habitat in an off-site location acceptable to Placer County and any State or Federal resource agency with jurisdiction over the habitat. A wetland/riparian mitigation plan shall be reviewed and approved by Placer County and any affected State or Federal resource agency prior to initiation of construction of any compensatory habitat.
 - Any offsite wetlands mitigation will occur in the Sierra Nevada bioregion and within the Tahoe-Truckee area to ensure that there is a no net loss of wetland, riparian, or wet meadow habitat within the Sierra Nevada or Tahoe-Truckee regions.
 - Provide a combination of mitigation bank credit purchase and off-site construction as outlined above.
- Wetlands and waters of the United States to be preserved within or adjacent to construction areas shall be fenced to insure protection from construction equipment and vehicles. Fencing shall consist of four-foot tall, brightly colored (usually yellow or orange), synthetic mesh material fence (or an equivalent approved by the DRC) outside the critical root zone of all protected trees within 50 feet of any grading, road improvements, underground utilities or other development activity. If the buffer extends beyond the boundary of property under the applicant's control, the fence will then be placed at the property boundary. Any encroachment into this fenced area must first be approved by the DRC.

Mitigation Measure 6-1b: Obtain and comply with a lake and streambed alteration agreement; compensate for unavoidable loss of stream and riparian habitat. The following measures would 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 County Policies, and further reduce potential adverse effects on riparian habitats:

- The project applicant 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 shall obtain an agreement from CDFW. The project

proponent will 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.

- The project applicant shall compensate for net permanent riparian habitat impacts at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio through contributions to a CDFW approved wetland mitigation bank in the Sierra Nevada and the Tahoe-Truckee regions or through the development and implementation of a Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (CSRMMMP) and a County approved MMIP aimed at creating or restoring in-kind habitat within the plan area and/or in the surrounding area. Stream and riparian habitat compensation, which could be provided entirely or in part by the planned Squaw Creek restoration, 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 initially and then in 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.
- This project plans to construct all or a portion of replacement riparian habitat onsite. An Improvement Plan shall be prepared by the project applicant and submitted to the Planning Services Division for review concurrent with Improvement Plan review. Prior to Improvement Plan submittal, an MMIP for the replacement of wetlands/riparian vegetation, which resembles the density and species composition of the existing wetland area, shall be prepared by a qualified wetlands biologist. Said MMIP shall be submitted to the Planning Services Division and shall comply with Article 18.28 of the Placer County Environmental Review Ordinance. The requirements listed under Mitigation Measure 6-1a will be followed as well.
- The Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall include the following:
 - Baseline locations of riparian vegetation and species along the western and upper eastern channel of Squaw Creek within the plan area shall be documented before initiation of construction of the VSVSP. Conduct riparian monitoring or additional groundwater modelling as described in Mitigation Measure 6-1c below. Any riparian habitat lost within the western portion of Squaw Creek that affects streambank instability shall be replaced with native vegetation (riparian preferably) that will stabilize the streambank and prevent sediment mobilization.
 - identification of compensatory mitigation sites and criteria for selecting these mitigation sites onsite and offsite;

- in kind reference habitats for comparison with compensatory riparian habitats (using performance and success criteria) to document success;
 - monitoring protocol, including schedule and annual report requirements (compensatory habitat shall be monitored for a minimum of 5 years from completion of mitigation or last human intervention [including recontouring and grading and irrigation], or until the success criteria identified in the approved mitigation plan have been met, whichever is longer);
 - 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, indicators of tree stress that might result in mortality, and survivorship; at a minimum, compensatory mitigation planting sites must achieve 80 percent 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;
 - corrective measures if performance standards are not met;
 - responsible parties for monitoring and preparing reports; and
 - responsible parties for receiving and reviewing reports and for verifying success or prescribing implementation or corrective actions.
- The project applicant shall follow requirements outlined in the MMIP and CSRMMMP for vegetation restoration success within any areas of proposed restoration and planting along Squaw Creek or the Olympic Channel.

Mitigation Measure 6-1c: Implement Mitigation Measure 13-4 and monitor and respond to groundwater effects. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 13-4, provided in Chapter 13, “Hydrology and Water Quality.” Mitigation Measure 13-4 reduces the uncertainty associated with management of well system design and operation by ensuring the adoption of performance standards, thresholds, and recommendations from the WSA for well system operation, and requiring consistency with applicable groundwater plans. By confirming that groundwater management is implemented in a manner that is consistent with the operational parameters described in the WSA, Mitigation Measure 13-4 would also result in confirmation that groundwater pumping and any future groundwater/vegetation impact modeling is consistent.

In addition, the project applicant shall record baseline locations and composition of species of riparian and meadow vegetation in the surrounding meadow that is hydrologically connected to the upper eastern channel of Squaw Creek (in relation to East Cells A through D) and along the western channel (in relation to West Cells E through J) before initiation of construction of the VSVSP. If sensitive plant species are found in these areas, the project proponent will follow mitigation measures outlined in Mitigation Measure 6-8 to consult with CDFW and USFWS, as

appropriate depending on species status, to determine the appropriate mitigation measures for the indirect impacts that could occur as a result of project operational groundwater drawdown.

The extent and composition of this vegetation in the western channel and associated riparian and wet meadow areas shall be monitored annually until at least 5 years after the last project element is occupied, to ensure accurate recordation of responses to groundwater level declines and any beneficial effects resulting from creek restoration. Any riparian or meadow habitat lost or degraded within these areas as that is determined to be a result of project-related groundwater level declines shall be compensated for on or off-site (within the Olympic Valley preferred) at a minimum 1:1 ratio within the Sierra Nevada bioregion and the Tahoe-Truckee region, or conditions otherwise corrected, such as through irrigation of vegetation and/or wet meadow vegetation to maintain composition and functionality of existing habitat. If monitoring shows that riparian vegetation along the streambank is not supported, other native vegetation will be planted and managed to stabilize the creek bank as per Mitigation Measure 6-1b.

In order to address the potential effects of groundwater pumping outside of the VSVSP area, the following steps shall be taken:

(a) Prior to recordation of the first Small Lot Tentative Map, conduct soil borings throughout the wet meadow east of the project boundary (see Exhibit MM 6-1c) to determine whether groundwater is available to wet meadow vegetation (i.e., there are no barriers to between groundwater and plant roots and/or moisture levels in the soil column indicate that groundwater is available to plant roots). Soil borings may be taken in multiple months and in successive seasons as needed to determine if a connection to groundwater is present. If groundwater is not available to the plants during the July-October period, then no further steps are necessary with respect to those areas. In these conditions, it is assumed that vegetation is receiving water from sources other than groundwater, such as golf course irrigation overspray.

(b) If soil borings indicate that groundwater is available to these plants in some or all portions of the study area east of the project boundary during July through October, then it is assumed that drops in groundwater levels could affect the viability of the plants and a monitoring plan shall be implemented, and shall include the following steps.

- Determine the minimum depth to groundwater needed during the critical period for existing habitat to maintain baseline conditions.
- Install groundwater monitoring wells in the riparian and wet meadow portions of the study area east of the project boundary where a potential connection to groundwater has been established. The location of the wells shall be based on the extent of the area that could be affected, based on part on the data collected by soil borings conducted as part of Item (a), and for which access is available. For example, if the entire wet meadow in the study area east of the project boundary is included, it is anticipated that 8 to 12 wells will need to be installed, including at least one well east of the study area. Existing and planned monitoring wells may be used, if appropriate, and permission is provided by the well operator/owner. Well locations shall be coordinated with plant survey transects.

- Collect data from the monitoring wells each year from July through October, at a minimum.
- Establish transects on a north-south heading every 50 meters or less.
- Determine the species that are located on each transect at one-meter intervals.
- Surveys shall be conducted at least once annually to determine whether the vegetation profile is changing along the transect and/or there is increased plant mortality.

Initial monitoring [as outlined in (b)] to establish baseline conditions of wet meadow vegetation and groundwater levels east of the VSVSP area shall be conducted annually for 5 years. The onset of monitoring may be coordinated with creek restoration efforts, but shall begin prior to or concurrent with recordation of the first Small Lot Tentative Map or within 2 years of project approval, whichever occurs first. After the initial 5 years, monitoring shall be conducted every 5 years, at a minimum, until 30 percent of VSVSP development has been completed. Upon occupancy of 30 percent of the VSVSP development, monitoring shall be conducted on an annual basis until 5 years after buildout of the project.

If access cannot be gained to survey the riparian habitat and/or wet meadow and/or to install monitoring wells east of the VSVSP area, then an assessment shall be made via photo-points or other means from the property line or other nearby publicly accessible location and/or surveys of a control site with similar characteristics that is located on property that can be accessed. In order to determine whether observed changes are due to groundwater pumping, modeling methods may be used. If adverse effects are observed and can be attributed to groundwater pumping, then mitigation would be required as described below.

If monitoring and surveys indicate that riparian and/or wet meadow vegetation is being lost and/or degraded at levels that could impair the viability and value of the wet meadow and/or riparian habitat, and that change is correlated with lowered groundwater levels as indicated by monitoring wells and pumping data, one or more of the following steps shall be undertaken to ensure that there is no net loss of acreage and/or value of wet meadow habitat:

- Work with the SVPSD to reduce potable water demand at a level commensurate to the increased irrigation demand during the dry season.
- Work with the SVPSD to adjust the pumping regime in a manner that minimizes draw down in the portion of the overall study area that is being affected;
- Irrigate the affected area during the critical period using water from a source other than the aquifer, such as fractured wells used for snowmaking at Squaw Valley;
- Provide improvements to the water system in Squaw Valley (e.g., replacement of old, leaking pipelines, replacement of high-water use fixtures) to reduce demand from other sources by an amount commensurate with the amount of irrigation water required for

riparian and/or meadow vegetation. In this case, water from the aquifer could be used for irrigation of sensitive habitats; and/or

- Provide compensation for the affected area by restoring a commensurate area of wet meadow and/or riparian habitat. Preference shall be given to areas within the Squaw Valley meadow and/or in the vicinity of Squaw Creek. Contribution to the restoration efforts for Squaw Creek east of the VSVSP would be one method of compensation, because the creek restoration would improve the function of the creek, and thereby improve habitat conditions along the creek and within the meadow. If suitable land is unavailable within the Squaw Valley meadow and/or in the vicinity of Squaw Creek, then restoration activities may occur outside of Squaw Valley but within the Tahoe-Truckee area. VSVSP would be responsible for restoring that portion which is attributable to its share of increased groundwater pumping. Such compensation shall ensure that there is no net loss in the quantity or function of such habitat.

The selection of the remediation measures shall be based in part on whether the effects on riparian and/or meadow vegetation are occurring only during certain years (e.g., particularly dry years) and the period of time that remediation would be needed to ensure vegetation viability. If irrigation is used, it shall be demonstrated that the amount of water used would be within the water demand evaluated in the 2015 Water Supply Assessment or that another source of water, such as snow making wells or reducing other demand, as discussed above, could be used. As discussed previously, water could be supplied from snow-making wells located within fractured bedrock (i.e. not drawing water from the Olympic Valley aquifer) to provide irrigation for landscaping, the creek restoration area, and riparian vegetation along East Cells A through C.

Footnotes

¹ Responsibility for funding, monitoring and carrying out this mitigation measure is the sole responsibility of the Project and imposes no burden of any kind on the Squaw Valley Public Service District. At its option and at its sole discretion, the District may choose to work directly with the Project proponent to adjust the pumping regime or make other adjustments to well field operations.

² The Squaw Valley Public Service District currently operates programs to fund and construct efficiency improvements to its water system and end users. This project may provide additional funding to augment existing programs to enhance water system efficiency and end user efficiency.

Mitigation Measure 6-1d: Implement water quality protection measures.

- The project applicant shall comply with General Plan policies pertaining to protection of water quality during construction and operation of the linear park and Class I trail.
- The project applicant shall implement the mitigation measures as required under Mitigation Measure 13-1 to protect water quality during the design, installation, and abandonment of wells and sewer lines.
- The project applicant shall implement the mitigation measures as required under Mitigation Measure 13-2a to protect water quality during construction and over the project life.

- The project applicant shall implement the mitigation measures as required under Mitigation Measure 13-2b to address potential discovery of contaminated soils and protection of groundwater quality during construction.
- The project applicant shall implement the mitigation measures as required under Mitigation Measure 13-7 to minimize the potential for snow storage and snowmelt runoff to degrade the quality of runoff discharged overland or through the storm drainage to Squaw Creek adjacent to the East Parcel.
- The following measures shall be implemented to avoid and minimize runoff and sedimentation in Squaw Creek and Meadows as a result of the installation of the Class I biking and hiking trail and other proposed trails within 100 feet of aquatic features:
 - Trail construction shall include trail tread, drainage appurtenances, clearing, seeding, and planting as necessary for erosion control. Tread width shall be a minimum of 6 feet and shall be out sloped at approximately three percent. The trail tread shall be graded and compacted and not exceed 12 percent longitudinal slope. Water must be diverted from the trail's surface before it builds up to erosive force. To divert water, use outslopes, grade reversals, grade dips, and/or lead ditches, in conjunction with inslopes or culverts.
 - The crossing of any wetland areas shall also be reviewed and approved by the Placer County Development Review Committee, Parks Division, and all appropriate state and federal regulatory agencies.
 - Vegetation clearing adjacent to trails should be minimum 10 feet above ground, and two feet on each side of the trail tread. Excessive clearing is undesirable. Removal of trees should be minimized in favor of limbing, brushing, and meandering of trails around status trees. However, dead and dying trees in proximity of the trail, in the determination of the Development Review Committee and/or a professional arborist, shall be removed prior to acceptance.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 6-1a through 6-1d would reduce significant impacts on sensitive habitats to a less-than-significant level because they would ensure that sensitive habitat is avoided to the extent feasible, that groundwater wells are installed and operated consistent with the parameters of the water supply assessment (WSA) and applicable groundwater plans, water quality degradation is avoided, and that sensitive habitats that cannot be avoided are restored following construction or compensated for in a manner that results in no net loss of these habitats.

Impact 6-2: Disturbance or loss of Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog habitat. The portion of Squaw Creek and associated meadows within the Village area provide suitable habitat for Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog and are within designated critical habitat for the species. The pools in Squaw Valley Meadow and Creek may provide aquatic refugia and food resources for dispersing or nonbreeding individuals during the spring and early summer. Construction and creek restoration activities would remove or degrade upland and creek channel habitat temporarily. If Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frogs are present within the Squaw Creek drainage and meadows, adults may be injured or killed through crushing or degraded water quality as a result of grading, excavation, or other construction activities. The degradation and removal of upland, creek and meadow habitat occupied by Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog and the injury or mortality of individuals as a result of construction and creek restoration related activities would be considered take under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Take of individuals or habitat of the Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog would be considered a significant impact.

Operations of the VSVSP, including associated disturbances from development, increased groundwater pumping, and creek restoration will not alter Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog habitat substantially or increase existing disturbance to individuals; thus, the impacts to Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog from operations would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 6-2: Avoid and minimize effects on Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog and its habitat. The following measures shall be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts on Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog and are in compliance with VSVSP policies PW-1 through PW-4:

- A preconstruction survey to determine the presence or absence of Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog on the project site shall be conducted by a qualified biologist approved by USFWS, and survey methods and timing would need to be approved by USFWS. At minimum, all areas within 82 feet of suitable habitat, defined as Squaw Creek, its tributaries and its meadows, which would be affected by construction shall be surveyed prior to construction by a qualified biologist to ensure the absence of yellow-legged frogs. 82 feet from a creek is based on the definition of upland habitat for proposed critical habitat (USFWS 2013). If a Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog is encountered during the preconstruction survey, USACE and USFWS shall be contacted immediately to determine the appropriate course of action, which may include applying for and obtaining an incidental take permit for the project. Such a permit would require compensatory measures that would fully mitigate for any impacts (avoidance, relocation, etc.).
- If Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog is determined to be present on the project site, the following measures shall apply, subject to approval and/or modification by USFWS as part of ESA consultation.
 - Construction shall only occur between July 1 and November 15 in areas within 82 feet of Squaw Creek (based on the definition of upland habitat for proposed critical habitat (USFWS 2013), its tributaries and its meadows that are not

currently developed (e.g., the timing restriction would not apply to the existing parking lot or roadways within 82 feet of Squaw Creek). Any work within the creek and its tributaries shall occur when they cease flowing and are dry. Because areas of Squaw Creek may have pools, all pools potentially affected by construction shall be mapped and monitored by a biologist for presence/absence of adult frogs prior to construction. This limited operating period and associated monitoring would ensure that construction does not begin when yellow-legged frogs have a high likelihood of being present in the construction area.

- All areas within 82 feet of suitable habitat that would be affected by construction will have a qualified biologist present during construction to ensure that no individuals are injured or killed from construction.
- Within 82 feet of suitable habitat, to avoid entrapment of frogs, all excavated steep-walled holes or trenches more than 1 foot deep will be provided with one or more escape ramps constructed of earth fill or wooden planks at the end of each workday. If escape ramps cannot be provided, then holes or trenches will be covered with plywood or similarly effective materials. Providing escape ramps or covering open trenches will prevent injury or mortality of wildlife resulting from falling into trenches and becoming trapped. A biological monitor or construction personnel designated by the contractor will be responsible for thoroughly inspecting trenches for the presence of Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog at the beginning of each workday. If any individuals have become trapped, the qualified biological monitor will be contacted to relocate the animal, and no work will occur in that area until approved by the biologist.
- Prior to the start of any ground disturbing activities within 82 feet of suitable Sierra Nevada yellow-legged habitat, exclusion fencing shall be installed between the construction area and suitable aquatic habitat. Fencing will be installed at the edge of aquatic habitat (but outside of the USACE jurisdictional area, CDFW jurisdictional streambed area, or riparian habitat) to reduce the risk of frogs dispersing onto the construction site. The fencing material will consist of silt fence (erosion cloth) that is a minimum of 4 feet tall or suitable alternative wildlife exclusion material (such as ERTECH EFence). The lower portion of the fence will be buried in a 6-inch trench such that 6 inches of the fence is buried and at least 48 inches is above ground, or weighted down by a continuous row of sandbags or similar material if on an impervious surface. Installation of the silt fence will occur under the supervision of a qualified biologist. The exclusion fencing will also be installed in a manner that is consistent with applicable water quality requirements contained within the project's storm water pollution prevention plan or water pollution control program. The fencing and a note reflecting this condition shall be shown on the final construction documents.
- No monofilament netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes within 82 feet of suitable habitat to ensure that Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frogs are not trapped. This limitation shall be communicated to the

contractor through the special provisions included in the bid solicitation package. Coconut coir matting and burlap contained fiber rolls are an example of acceptable erosion control materials.

- Any worker who inadvertently injures or kills a yellow-legged frog or finds one dead, injured, or entrapped shall immediately report the incident to the biological monitor and construction foreperson. The construction foreperson will immediately notify the project applicant, who will provide verbal notification to the USFWS Sacramento Endangered Species Office and/or the local CDFW warden or biologist within 1 working day. The qualified biologist associated with the project will follow up with written notification to USFWS or CDFW within 5 working days.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-2 would reduce significant impacts on Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog to a less-than-significant level because if found to be present in suitable habitat, frogs would be excluded from construction areas, preventing injury or mortality to individual frogs.

Impact 6-3: Disturbances to nesting raptors and special-status birds. Common and special-status raptors such as northern harrier and long-eared owl could use the project area for nesting. Other special-status birds including yellow-warbler, olive-sided flycatcher, and willow flycatcher may also nest in the project area. Proposed construction, creek restoration, and associated vegetation removal could potentially result in nest abandonment, failure, and/or mortality of adults, chicks or eggs if these species nest in the project area. This potential impact would be significant.

Potential operational impacts such as disturbances to nesting raptors as a result of increased human disturbance, reduced groundwater levels, and creek restoration would not be substantially different from existing conditions for these species and would be less than significant. Potential loss of nesting yellow warbler habitat due operational groundwater impacts would be significant.

Mitigation Measure 6-3: Avoid and minimize effects on nesting raptors and special-status birds. The following measures shall be implemented and shall avoid and minimize impacts on long-eared owl, and northern harrier, as well as to other common raptors. They are in compliance with VSVSP policies PW-1 through PW-4).

- All Improvement Plans shall include a note that includes the wording of this measure and show placement of all protective fencing for those trees identified for protection within the raptor report described below.

- Prior to any construction, grading or tree removal activities, a focused survey for raptor nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the raptor nesting season (March 1 - September 1). A report summarizing the survey shall be provided to Placer County and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) within 30 days of the completed survey. If an active raptor nest is identified, include in the report proposed mitigation measures proposed to take place between March 1 and September 1. Typically no construction activity or tree removal shall occur within 500 feet of an active nest (or lesser or greater distance, as determined by CDFW). Construction activities may only resume in the established buffer area after a follow up survey has been conducted and a report prepared by a qualified raptor biologist indicating that the nest (or nests) are no longer active, and that no new nests have been identified. A follow-up survey shall be conducted 2 months following the initial survey, if the initial survey occurs between March 1 and July 1. Additional follow up surveys may be required by the Development Review Committee, based on the recommendations in the raptor study and/or as recommended by the CDFW. Temporary construction fencing and signage shall be installed at a minimum 500 foot radius around trees containing active nests. If all project construction occurs between September 1 and March 1, no raptor surveys will be required. Trees previously approved for removal by Placer County, which contain stick nests, may only be removed between September 1 and March 1.

The following measure shall be implemented to avoid or minimize loss of yellow warbler and olive-sided flycatcher nests during construction:

- For construction activities that would occur in suitable nesting habitat for yellow warbler or olive-sided flycatcher during the nesting season (generally April 1–August 31, depending on snowpack and other seasonal conditions), a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct focused surveys for yellow warbler and olive-sided flycatcher nests no more than 14 days before construction activities are initiated each construction season. If an active nest is located during the preconstruction surveys, the biologist shall notify CDFW. If necessary, modifications to the project design to avoid removal of occupied habitat while still achieving project objectives shall be evaluated, and implemented to the extent feasible. If avoidance is not feasible or conflicts with project objectives, appropriate buffers around nests and limited operating periods will be established through consultation with CDFW to avoid disturbances during the sensitive nesting season.

The following measures shall be implemented to avoid or minimize loss of willow flycatcher nests during construction:

- For construction activities initiated in suitable breeding habitat for willow flycatcher after May 31, a preconstruction survey for nesting willow flycatchers will be conducted each construction season. The survey will follow A Willow Flycatcher Survey Protocol for California (Bombay et al. 2003). The protocol requires a minimum of two survey visits to determine presence or absence of willow flycatcher: one visit during survey period 2 (June 15–25) and one during either survey period 1 (June 1–14) or period 3 (June 26–July 15).

- If a willow flycatcher is detected and nesting is confirmed or suspected, the biologist will notify CDFW. If necessary, modifications to the project design to avoid removal of occupied habitat while still achieving project objectives will be evaluated, and implemented to the extent feasible. If avoidance is not feasible or conflicts with project objectives, construction will be prohibited within a minimum of 500 feet (or at a distance directed by the appropriate regulatory agency) of the nest to avoid disturbance until the nest is no longer active. This recommended buffer area may be reduced if approved by CDFW.

The following measures shall be implemented to minimize loss of yellow warbler habitat within the western channel of Squaw Creek:

- Implement Mitigation Measures 6-1a and 6-1b to insure replacement of riparian habitat within the project site or the surrounding area and to ensure riparian and wetland habitat restoration success.
- Implement Mitigation Measure 6-1c to minimize new well impacts to groundwater near the western channel of Squaw Creek.
- Implement Mitigation Measure 13-4 to ensure wellfield development and operations minimize potential groundwater effects on riparian vegetation.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-3 would reduce significant impacts on nesting raptors and special status birds to a less-than-significant level, because it would avoid or minimize construction and operation related disturbances, injury or mortality to nesting raptors and special status birds and their young, and construction or operational related habitat loss.

Impact 6-4: Disturbance or loss of Sierra Nevada mountain beaver and its habitat.

Approximately 0.21 acre of riparian habitat that is potentially suitable for Sierra Nevada mountain beaver would be disturbed or removed during construction activities associated with the East Parcel project elements and the sewer line corridor. These construction activities could cause the collapse or fill of mountain beaver burrows, if present, and injury or mortality to mountain beavers. This impact would be significant.

Operations under the Specific Plan are not expected to result in a substantial increase in disturbances to Sierra Nevada mountain beavers or their riparian habitat above existing levels of disturbance. Over the long term, the restoration of Squaw Creek would increase the amount and quality of riparian vegetation and wetlands along Squaw Creek and potentially enhance

burrowing and foraging habitat for Sierra Nevada mountain beaver in the Village area. Suitable habitat on the eastern portion of Squaw Creek meadows is not likely to be degraded by groundwater elevation reductions from increased pumping. Operational impacts to Sierra Nevada mountain beaver would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 6-4: Avoid and minimize effects on Sierra Nevada mountain beaver.

The following measures shall be implemented to avoid or minimize disturbances or removal of Sierra Nevada mountain beaver habitat, burrows, and mortality or injury to individuals from the Specific Plan activities and are in compliance with VSVSP policies PW-1 through PW-4:

- Pre-construction biological surveys shall be conducted no more than 30 days prior to construction activities in potential habitat for Sierra Nevada mountain beaver to identify biological resources, including burrows, which could be impacted by construction activities. All burrows shall be inspected for use by sensitive mammals, and buffers may be established based on occupation. If an area is given clearance to proceed with construction and reproductive activities subsequently occur, it shall be assumed that the individuals are acclimated to the ongoing disturbance of construction. If circumstances exist such that future activities may result in the abandonment of the burrows, as determined by a qualified biologist, an appropriate exclusionary buffer shall be established by Squaw Valley, in coordination with CDFW.
- If a potentially active mountain beaver burrow is unavoidable, the biologist shall determine the species and reproductive status of the animal. If the burrow is determined to be active and does not contain young, the biologist shall remove any nesting material and/or remove any cover that allows for a reproductive site. If the animal is determined to be raising young, the biologist shall establish a 200-foot exclusionary buffer surrounding the reproductive site until it is determined that the young have left the reproductive site completely. After it is determined that young have left, the biologist shall commence to collapse, excavate or block the burrow. The project applicant shall contact CDFW prior to any burrow excavation, collapse, or blockage.
- The biologist shall inspect all vegetation removal, excavations and areas of active construction within areas identified as potential habitat on a daily basis for trapped mountain beaver. Mountain beaver found in active construction areas shall be allowed to passively leave the site. If necessary, mountain beaver may be relocated by a qualified biologist. The construction foreperson shall notify the environmental monitor immediately if any mountain beaver enters or becomes trapped in the work area.
- All trash and food shall be removed from the site at the end of each workday in order to deter wildlife from entering the site.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-4 would avoid or minimize disturbances or removal of Sierra Nevada mountain beaver burrows, as well as avoid or minimize mortality or injury to individuals. Therefore, implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to Sierra Nevada mountain beaver to less than significant.

Impact 6-5: Disturbance or loss of Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare or its habitat. Activities related to construction of the Village area and the East Parcel could temporarily disturb snowshoe hare and/or their habitat located within the project site. The removal of trees and vegetation for the Village area and East Parcel would also result in permanent loss of habitat suitable to snowshoe hare. Because implementation of Specific Plan may cause disturbance or injury and mortality to Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, it would have a significant impact on this species.

There would be no substantial change in disturbance or habitat to Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare from operational impacts. Operational impacts due to increased human disturbance to Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 6-5: Avoid and minimize effects on Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare. The following measures shall be implemented to avoid or minimize disturbances or removal of Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare reproductive sites, and mortality or injury to individuals from the Specific Plan activities and are in compliance with VSVSP policies PW-1 through PW-4:

- Pre-construction biological surveys shall be conducted no more than 30 days prior to construction activities in snowshoe hare habitat to identify biological resources, including reproductive sites such as open nests or depressions on the ground, which could be impacted by construction activities. All reproductive sites shall be inspected for use by sensitive mammals, and buffers may be established based on occupancy. If an area is given clearance to proceed with construction and reproductive activities subsequently occur, it shall be assumed that the individuals are acclimated to the ongoing disturbance of construction. If circumstances exist such that future activities may result in the abandonment of the reproductive site, as determined by a qualified biologist, an appropriate exclusionary buffer shall be established by the project applicant, in coordination with CDFW.
- If a potentially active snowshoe hare reproductive site is unavoidable, the biologist shall determine the species and reproductive status of the animal. If the reproductive site is determined to be active and does not contain young, the biologist shall remove any 'nesting' material and/or remove any cover that allows for a reproductive site. If the animal is determined to be raising young, the biologist shall establish a 200-foot exclusionary buffer surrounding the reproductive site until it is determined that the young have left the reproductive site completely. After it is determined that young have left, the project applicant shall commence removal of the structure. The project applicant shall contact CDFW prior to any reproductive site excavation or structure removal.

- A qualified biologist shall inspect all vegetation removal, excavations, and areas of active construction within areas identified as potential habitat on a daily basis for trapped snowshoe hare. Snowshoe hare found in active construction areas shall be allowed to passively leave the site. If necessary, snowshoe hare may be relocated by a qualified biologist. The construction foreperson shall notify the environmental monitor immediately if any snowshoe hare enters or becomes trapped in the work area.
- All trash and food shall be removed from the site at the end of each workday in order to deter wildlife from entering the site.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-5 would avoid or minimize disturbances or removal to reproductive sites, as well as mortality or injury, of Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare. Therefore, implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 6-6: Disturbance or loss of spotted bat, pallid bat, western red bat, and Townsend's big-eared bat and their habitat. Implementation of Specific Plan through construction and the Squaw Creek restoration could result in the disturbance to day roosts, as well as injury and mortality of individual pallid, Townsend big-eared or western red bats through large tree removal and noise disturbance.

Disturbance to maternity roosts by construction, or construction activities that cause mortality or injury to pallid, Townsend big-eared or western red bats would be a potentially significant impact on special status bat species. Disturbance to roosting bats not associated with maternity roost and that does not cause direct mortality, or loss of their foraging habitat through VSVSP operations would not be substantial and potential impacts to special status bat species would be less than significant.

Implementation of Specific Plan construction and the Squaw Creek restoration would not disturb roosting behavior or impede foraging of spotted bats, and no individuals would be harmed from construction. Therefore, potential impacts to spotted bats would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 6-6: Avoid and minimize effects on pallid bat, western red bat, and Townsend big-eared bat. The following measures shall be implemented to avoid or minimize disturbances or removal of active roost sites for pallid bat, western red bat and Townsend big-eared bats, and mortality or injury to bats from the Specific Plan activities and are in compliance with VSVSP policies PW-1 through PW-4:

- Bat surveys shall be conducted in locations proposed for construction each year that could provide roosting habitat, in the spring, no more than 30 days prior to the start of

construction, in order to identify active bat roosting sites, such as snags. All potential roosting sites shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist in order to determine usage. All non-active roosting sites planned for removal as part of construction shall be removed within 30 days of the surveys in order to prevent new roosts from being established. If it is determined that an active roosting site would be adversely affected, the project applicant shall consult with the CDFW to acquire appropriate authorizations to remove the roosting sites. All active non-maternity roosting sites shall be fitted with passive exclusion devices, such as one-way flaps or doors, and all bats shall be allowed to leave voluntarily. Once it is confirmed that all bats have left the roost, crews shall be allowed to continue work in the area. If a maternity roosting site is discovered, the project applicant shall consult with the CDFW in order to establish appropriate exclusionary buffers until all young are determined to be Volant (i.e., able to fly and feed independently) by a qualified biologist. Once it is determined that all young are volant, passive exclusion devices shall be installed and all bats shall be allowed to leave voluntarily. Once it is determined by a qualified biologist that all bats have left the roost, crews shall be allowed to work within the buffer zone.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-6 would avoid or minimize disturbances or removal to active roost sites for pallid bat, western red bat, and Townsend's big-eared bat, as well as mortality or injury. Therefore, implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to these species to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 6-7: Disturbance or loss of animal movement and migratory corridors. The project area supports migratory deer, potentially resident deer, and may support fawning habitat within meadow and riparian habitat. If deer use habitat on the project site for fawning, deer fawning may be impacted temporarily through construction noise. Temporary impacts to fawning would be significant.

While some loss of potential fawning habitat may occur, no substantial permanent impacts to mule deer fawning, foraging, or movement habitat throughout the project area are anticipated as a result project implementation. Permanent impacts to mule deer movement, foraging and fawning would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 6-7: Avoid and minimize effects on animal movement and migratory corridors. The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to avoid impacts on mule deer fawning during construction activity:

- Pre-project surveys shall be conducted in suitable fawning habitat within the plan area boundaries and on lands controlled by the applicant within 500 feet of vegetation removal, construction, and development activities. Suitable fawning habitat is preliminarily defined here as willow, wet meadow and dense riparian. Final determination of suitability shall be determined by qualified biologist at the time of project implementation. Surveys shall occur between April 15 and July 31; these dates may be adjusted by the qualified biologist due to snowpack conditions and deer activity.
- If the qualified biologist determines that activities are occurring in or immediately adjacent to an active mule deer fawning area, they shall have the authority to temporarily halt or relocate work until the fawns move out of the project area.
- To protect deer from injury or mortality in areas of excavation such as utility line trenches, trenches shall not be left open overnight. Four-foot tall bright, orange warning fence shall be placed surrounding trenches or open trenches shall be covered with wooden planks or other equally effective covering (e.g., steel panels) to protect deer from accidentally falling into areas of deep excavations. The biologist will determine areas that require fencing or coverings. Escape ramps will be implemented in uncovered trenches to allow for any wildlife that may fall into a trench to escape independently.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-7 would reduce significant impacts on mule deer fawning to a less-than-significant level, because disturbance impacts to fawning mule deer would be minimized or avoided through preconstruction surveys and disturbance buffers.

Impact 6-8: Disturbance or loss of special-status plants. Implementing the Specific Plan could result in direct removal and disturbance of habitat occupied by alderleaf coffeeberry and habitat that could be occupied by other special-status plant species. Special-status plants that are not directly removed or physically damaged could be adversely affected by habitat modification or degradation through groundwater withdrawal or recreation. Because construction and operations could result in direct removal or disturbance to special-status species and their habitat, this impact would be significant.

Mitigation Measure 6-8: Avoid, minimize, and compensate for effects on special-status plants. The following measures shall be implemented to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts on special-status plant species, including alderleaf coffeeberry, starved Daisy, Donner Pass Buckwheat, American mangrass, Plumas ivesia, Stebbins' phacelia, Davy's sedge, Scalloped

moonwort, common moonwort, and Mingan moonwort within the project area. They are in compliance with VSVSP policies PW-1 through PW-4.

- Groundwater impacts to sensitive species associated with riparian and meadow habitat that may be lost will be minimized with Mitigation Measures 6-1a through 6-1d. These measures will reduce impacts to the western channel from pumping and ensure successful restoration/compensation of the riparian or meadow area. General mitigation measures for consultation with the state or federal agencies for known populations below will also minimize impacts to these populations.
- Prior to Improvement Plan approval, a Revegetation Plan, prepared by a licensed landscape architect or similar professional, shall be submitted and approved by the Development Review Committee (DRC) (and Parks Division if maintenance is provided through a CSA). This will ensure proper protection from weedy or non-native species that could impact special status plant populations if present. It would also be consistent with VSVSP policies (OS-3 and OS-6) to use native and naturalized vegetation in landscape buffers and green spaces and protect native vegetation in the Squaw Creek corridor.
- Before construction or development is implemented on sites with proposed removal of suitable habitat for special-status plant species, and where it has been more than two years since a previous special-status plant survey has confirmed absence, preconstruction special-status plant surveys shall be conducted in suitable habitat. Preconstruction surveys shall be performed by a qualified botanist during special status plant flowering periods (May-September). No rare plant surveys have been completed for the meadow area north of the furthest east V-CP section on Squaw Creek in the Village area and for the area west (Village Neighborhoods) and north (by the Granite Chief trailhead) of the channelized section of Squaw Creek, as well as in the utility corridors.
- If, based on current or future focused surveys, a special-status plant species is located in an area to be disturbed by project construction activities or operations (development or trails), the following mitigation measures are required to protect species from direct injury and reduce the potential for introduction of weedy species at these sites:
 - Preserved special-status species habitat shall be designated as Environmentally Sensitive Areas and shall be flagged by a qualified botanist.
 - Signage to educate the public of the sensitive nature of the area and keep them on trails and pathways around the project area shall be required after construction and for the continuation of the operation of the VSVSP.
- A 200-foot buffer shall be implemented; including protection of those areas which may be necessary to support the hydrological regime of the special-status plants is incorporated into the project design and shall include provisions for protection and management of the avoided area in perpetuity. If fencing is required, the Improvement Plans and Information Sheet(s) recorded concurrently with the Final Subdivision Map(s) shall show Permanent Protective Fencing installation. The Improvement Plans shall

include a note and show placement of Temporary Construction Fencing: The applicant shall install a four (4) foot tall, brightly colored (usually yellow or orange), synthetic mesh material fence (or an equivalent approved by the Development Review Committee (DRC) around any and all “special protection” areas, including around special status plants, as discussed in the project’s environmental review documents, prior to any construction equipment being moved on-site or any construction activities taking place. No development of this site, including grading, shall be allowed until this condition is satisfied. Any encroachment within these areas must first be approved by the DRC. Temporary fencing shall not be altered during construction without written approval of the DRC. No grading, clearing, storage of equipment or machinery, etc., may occur until a representative of the DRC has inspected and approved all temporary construction fencing. This includes both on-site and off-site improvements.

- If special-status plant species are found that cannot be avoided during construction or because of operational groundwater drawdown, the project applicant shall consult with CDFW and/or USFWS, 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 preserving and enhancing existing populations, creation of off-site 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 will be developed describing how unavoidable losses of special-status plants will be compensated.
- If relocation efforts are part of the mitigation plan, the plan will include details on the methods to be used, including collection, storage, propagation, receptor site 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.
- Success criteria for preserved and compensatory populations will include:
 - 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.
 - Compensatory and preserved populations will be self-producing. Populations will be considered self-producing when:
 - plants reestablish annually for a minimum of five years with no human intervention such as supplemental seeding; and
 - 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.

- If off-site mitigation includes dedication of conservation easements, purchase of mitigation credits, or other off-site 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.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-8 would reduce potentially significant impacts on special-status plant species to a less-than-significant level, because it would ensure that project implementation would not result in unmitigated take of special status plant species.

Impact 6-9: Tree removal. Construction of the Specific Plan would result in the removal or damage of trees for project facilities and the Squaw Creek restoration. The removal of protected trees within riparian zones or where 50 percent of trees are removed in a parcel would require a tree removal permit under Placer County Ordinance 12.16. The removal of trees >6 inches diameter breast height (dbh) to achieve a land conversion would require a tree cutting permit under Placer County Ordinance 12.20. Because project construction would remove a resource valued by the County and could conflict with County ordinances, the impact would be significant. Because tree removal during project operation would likely be limited to hazard tree removal and similar good forestry management practices explicitly permitted by County ordinances, this impact would be less than significant for project operation.

Mitigation Measure 6-9: Avoid and minimize effects on trees and compensate for tree removal. The following measures shall be implemented to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts from tree removal and are in compliance with VSVSP policies TR-1 through TR-3:

- The project applicant or its selected vendor will either conduct a tree survey or use recent tree surveys to determine the number and size of trees to be removed. The number of trees to be removed will be minimized to the extent feasible.
- Prior to the County Improvement Plan approval, the project applicant shall furnish to the DRC, a Tree Permit for removal of trees within riparian zones or greater than 6 inches diameter breast height in areas where more than fifty percent of trees are removed, or where land conversion occurs. This will ensure compliance with Tree Removal Ordinances 12.16 and 12.20 (where necessary). The plans for removal shall be forwarded to the County early enough in the process to assure that any suggested changes made by the County can be incorporated into the final design. Suggested changes may include recommendations regarding permanent structures in relation to the driplines of trees,

pruning recommendation, treat of soil within and around the dripline of trees, replacement of removed trees, revegetation, etc. “Riparian zone” means any area within fifty (50) feet from the centerline of a seasonal creek or stream, any area one hundred (100) feet from the centerline of a year round creek, stream, or river, and any area within one hundred (100) feet from the shoreline of a pond, lake or reservoir. At a minimum all streams, creeks, ponds, lakes, and reservoirs as shown on 7.5 minute USGS maps are included in this definition. (A riparian zone established in specific community or general plan may supersede this definition.)

- The following conditions shall apply to avoid conflict with Ordinance 12.16 (for removal of trees within riparian zones or removal of more than fifty percent of trees greater than 6 inches dbh on a parcel):
 - The project applicant or its selected vendor will obtain a tree permit from Placer County, as per the County’s Tree Ordinance. As stated in the Tree Ordinance (12.16.080 Replacement program and penalties), the County may condition any tree permit or discretionary approval involving removal of a protected tree upon (a) the replacement of trees in kind, (b) implementation of a revegetation plan, or (c) payment into the County’s tree preservation fund. Because a project site may not support installation of all replacement trees or the implementation of a revegetation plan, the project applicant or its selected vendor could either replace trees at an off-site location or contribute to the County’s tree preservation fund; this will be determined by the County. If the County conditions require replacement of trees the following may be required:
 - For each diameter inch of a tree removed, replacement shall be on an inch-for-inch basis. For example, if 100 diameter inches are proposed to be removed, the replacement trees would equal 100 diameter inches (aggregate).
 - If replacement tree planting is proposed, the tree replacement/mitigation plan must be shown on Improvements Plans and must be installed by the applicant and inspected and approved by the DRC. At its discretion, the DRC may establish an alternate deadline for installation of mitigation replacement trees if weather or other circumstances prevent the completion of this requirement.
 - A revegetation plan, as recommended by an ISA-certified arborist or similarly qualified professional, to provide an appropriate level of mitigation to offset the loss of trees, and as approved by the DRC, shall be established in the project area as shown on the approved Tentative Subdivision Map(s).
 - If replacement tree planting is proposed, the tree replacement/mitigation plan shall be shown on Improvements Plans and shall be installed by the applicant and inspected and approved by the DRC. At its discretion, the DRC may establish an alternate deadline for installation of mitigation replacement trees if weather or other circumstances prevent the completion of this requirement.

- In lieu of the tree planting mitigation for tree removal listed above, a tree replacement mitigation fee of \$100 per diameter inch at breast height for each tree removed or impacted or the current market value, as established by an Arborist, Forester or Registered Landscape Architect, of the replacement trees, including the cost of installation, shall be paid to the Placer County Tree Preservation Fund.
 - The unauthorized disturbance to the critical root zone of a tree to be saved shall be cause for the Planning Commission to consider revocation of this permit/ approval.
 - Exemptions can be filed by the project applicant for removal of dead, dying, or diseased trees, split products, establishing a right-of way, or removing fire hazard trees within 150 feet of a structure. There is also a one-time exemption for conversion of 3 acres to another use.
- The following conditions shall apply to avoid conflict with Ordinance 12.20:
- If the phase of the project involves a land use conversion, the project applicant shall apply for the a tree cutting permit under ordinance 12.20, follow all requirements of that permit and in addition to the general information for the permit must submit:
 - A detailed statement describing how the standards and criteria of Section 12.20.050 shall be satisfied;
 - A copy of the document approving the land use conversion issued by the applicable State Division of Forestry;
 - In lieu of the drawing required by subsection (C)(1)(f) of this section, a map acceptable to the permit-issuing authority at a scale adequate to show the location of proposed and existing buildings and driveways, the location of proposed utility trenches, and the height, species, dbh, and location of all tree over six inches dbh proposed to be cut, and a drawing or sketch indicating the general location, characteristics and densities of trees proposed to be left and planted on the site, provided, however, in the case of a subdivision, such information may be contained in the tentative map and the vegetation preservation and protection plan as required by the subdivision ordinance. (Prior code Section 20.15)
- The Improvement Plans and Information Sheet(s) recorded concurrently with the Final Subdivision Map(s) shall show Permanent Protective Fencing installation.
- The Improvement Plans shall include a note and show placement of Temporary Construction Fencing: The applicant shall install a four (4) foot tall, brightly colored (usually yellow or orange), synthetic mesh material fence (or an equivalent approved by the Development Review Committee (DRC)) at the following locations prior to any construction equipment being moved on-site or any construction activities taking place:

- At the limits of construction, outside the critical root zone of all trees six (6) inches dbh (diameter at breast height), or 10 inches dbh aggregate for multi-trunk trees, within 50 feet of any grading, road improvements, underground utilities, or other development activity, or as otherwise shown on the Tentative Subdivision Map(s).
- No development of the site, including grading, shall be allowed until this condition is satisfied. Any encroachment within these areas, including critical root zones of trees to be saved, must first be approved by the DRC. Temporary fencing shall not be altered during construction without written approval of the DRC. No grading, clearing, storage of equipment or machinery, etc., may occur until a representative of the DRC has inspected and approved all temporary construction fencing. This includes both on-site and off-site improvements. Efforts should be made to save trees where feasible. This may include the use of retaining walls, planter islands, pavers, or other techniques commonly associated with tree preservation.
- If trees proposed for removal are to be sold as timber, a Registered Professional Forester (RPF) shall prepare a THP that outlines the proposed stand removal operations, and submit this to the state (CAL FIRE). Prior to Improvement Plan approval or recordation of the Final Subdivision Map(s), if the property has been logged within six years prior to the hearing date of the Tentative Subdivision Map(s), the applicant shall provide the Development Review Committee (DRC) with a letter from the California Department of Forestry stating that all requirements of the Z' Berg-Nejedly Forest Practices Act have been met to the satisfaction of the California Department of Forestry.
- The applicant shall implement the following conditions to protect remaining trees after tree removal permits or THP approvals are obtained:
 - For those trees designated to be saved within 50 feet of any development activity within the plan area or as recommended by the arborist, or as required by the approving body, a minimum four-foot tall brightly colored synthetic fence shall be installed at the outermost edge of the protected zone of each protected tree or groups of protected trees. The fence shall not be removed until written authorization is received from the planning director. Exceptions to this policy may occur in cases where protected trees are located on slopes that shall not be graded. However, approval must be obtained from the Planning Department to omit fences in any area of the project. The fences must be installed in accordance with the approved fencing plan prior to the commencement of any grading operation or such other time as described by the approving body. The developer shall call the Planning Department for an inspection of the fencing prior to initiation of grading operations.
 - For discretionary projects, signs must be installed on the fence in four locations around each individual protected tree. The size of each sign must be a minimum of two feet by two feet and must contain the following language: "WARNING

THIS FENCE SHALL NOT BE REMOVED OR RELOCATED WITHOUT WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION FROM PLACER COUNTY.” On fencing around a grove of protected trees, the signs must be placed approximately fifty-foot intervals. Fencing shall consist of four-foot tall, brightly colored (usually yellow or orange), synthetic mesh material fence (or an equivalent approved by the DRC) outside the critical root zone of all protected trees within 50 feet of any grading, road improvements, underground utilities or other development activity. Any encroachment into this fenced area must first be approved by the DRC.

- Once approval has been obtained, the fences must remain in place throughout the entire construction period and may not be removed without obtaining written authorization from the Planning Department.
- Existing healthy trees and native vegetation on the site shall be preserved in accordance with standards contained in an agency-approved design manual, if any, and shall be protected by adequate means during any construction.
- Existing trees shall be preserved within any right-of-way when such trees are suitably located, healthy, and when approved grading allows.
- Appurtenances, except utility connections, such as television antennas, signs, and outdoor lights shall not be attached to trees.
- Tree cutting within the one hundred (100) year floodplain of a perennial or intermittent stream shall be limited to cutting diseased or hazardous trees or to thinning needed to protect the health and vigor of remaining trees.
- Damage to trees not to be cut and to residual vegetation shall be avoided. Damaged trees shall be repaired with tree sealer and any necessary tree surgery.
- No tree shall be felled into a perennial or intermittent stream without specific approval of the permit-issuing authority.
- Any stump to be left in the ground shall be treated with approved chemicals or methods to prevent the spread of forest tree diseases.
- Ground skidding shall not be allowed within the dripline of trees.
- Slash, debris, and nonmerchantable timber generated by the operation shall be disposed of in the manner and to a location approved by the permit-issuing authority.
- All tree removal sites shall be winterized before the end of the construction season, or stabilized before the end of the construction season so as to prevent erosion and soil loss from the site.

- In the case of land use conversion, approval shall be conditioned on compliance with all requirements of the timberland conversion certificate issued by the appropriate State Division of Forestry. (Prior code Section 20.20)
- For hazardous, diseased, or insect infested trees the following conditions apply:
 - In cutting trees for land use conversion, all diseased, infested, or overmature trees shall be removed prior to construction.
 - All diseased and insect-infested trees shall be treated prior to removal by approved methods to prevent the spread of such disease or infestation. (Prior code Section 20.25)

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-9 would reduce significant impacts on trees protected by local ordinances and State regulations to a less-than-significant level because impacts to trees requiring county tree permits would be minimized consistent with the County Ordinances, tree removal would be conducted in a manner that would preserve and protect surrounding natural resources, and qualifying removed trees would be compensated for through new plantings or payment of tree replacement mitigation fees.

Impact 6-10: Effects of additional trail construction and improvements identified in the Specific Plan. To meet County requirements for provision of recreational facilities, existing trails could be improved, and new trails could be developed, outside the currently defined project site. Depending on the specific locations of these trails and the types and magnitude of their effects on biological resources, this impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 6-10: Implement previous applicable mitigation measures during trail development. Once a proposed alignment and the location of specific improvements are identified, a qualified biologist shall survey the new trail route and segments of existing trails identified for improvements outside the project boundary identified in this EIR to determine the biological resources present and the impacts identified within this chapter that could occur. Based on the results of this site review, the biologist shall identify mitigation measures within this chapter applicable to the specific trail route segments and the mitigation measures shall be implemented as appropriate during trail construction/improvement.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified

in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-10 would reduce potentially significant impacts to biological resources as a result of new or additional trail improvements and operation to a less-than-significant level for the same reasons described for each mitigation measure included in this chapter.

Impact 6-11: Construction phase water quality degradation impacts to fish and aquatic resources. Implementation of the proposed project will require construction activities over multiple phases and several seasons, and include work within or adjacent to the Squaw Creek channel, the Olympic Channel, and other surface water bodies and drainage features that are vulnerable to direct and indirect discharges of sediment and other contaminants. Construction earthwork would remove vegetation and disturb surface soils, make excavations and stockpiles of material that could be eroded by stormwater (including snowmelt runoff) and conveyed to Squaw Creek and the Truckee River. Operation and servicing of construction equipment and vehicles could release contaminants directly to surface water and aquatic habitat, or degrade groundwater that supports surface water. If these activities are not properly managed through BMPs and other measures, adverse effects on water quality could result and cause substantial degradation of aquatic habitat and adverse effects to fish and other aquatic resources. This impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 6-11: Implement Mitigation Measures 13-1 and 13-2.

- The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measures 13-1 and 13-2 provided in Chapter 13, “Hydrology and Water Quality.”
- Implementation of Mitigation Measure 13-1, requires proper abandonment of sewer lines with review and approval of Placer County, helping ensure that existing codes and regulations that require measures to protect water quality are properly implemented during these activities, and
- Implementation of Mitigation Measure 13-2 (a and b), would ensure that construction phase, site-specific risks to water quality that might result from improper implementation of water quality protection measures and, discovery and disturbance of contaminated soil or water would be fully addressed and avoided.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-11 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, because it would ensure that construction phase site-specific risks

of water quality impacts on aquatic habitat and fish that might not be adequately addressed by standard permit requirements are anticipated and avoided.

Impact 6-12: Construction phase dewatering impacts to fish and aquatic resources.

Implementation of the proposed project would require construction activities within the active stream channels and dewatering and bypassing of flows around in-channel work areas. Some incidental injury or mortality of fish may occur during these activities, which could result in significant impacts to sport fisheries productivity if dewatering would result in mortality of breeding adults or suitable breeding habitat. This would be a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 6-12: Prepare and implement fish rescue plan. A fish rescue plan shall be created prior to construction, to identify areas where fish are to be rescued and the methods to be used. The fish rescue plan shall be submitted to CDFW for approval with streambed alteration agreement applications. After the rescue, a report shall be submitted to CDFW stating the species captured, the number captured, the relocation sites, and any incidental injuries or mortalities that occurred.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-12 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level because it would minimize fish injury and mortality during creek dewatering.

Impact 6-13: Potential long-term impacts to fish and aquatic resources related to increased groundwater extraction, changes in groundwater elevations and flow directions, resulting changes to surface water flow, streambed drying, and off-site channel stability. The Specific Plan development will rely on groundwater as its primary water source, and the increase in total extraction, along with continued and increased pumping in existing and new wells, particularly near the stream corridor, could reduce groundwater support to streamflow and surface water elevations and/or expand the spatial extent of dry streambed and/or the duration of zero flow within and downstream of the main Village area. Although flow changes may occur, they would be minor in the specific context of hydrology and would have little effect on water quality. However, if the wellfield is not properly managed, vegetation loss could occur in the Squaw Creek corridor, leading to potential erosion and adverse impacts to fish and fish habitat. This impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 6-13: Implement Mitigation Measures 13-4 and 6-1c. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 13-4, provided in Chapter 13, “Hydrology and Water Quality,” which requires that well-field configuration and operations are consistent with the parameters of the WSA and applicable groundwater plans. By confirming that groundwater management is implemented in a manner that is consistent with the operational parameters described in the WSA, Mitigation Measure 13-4 would also result in confirmation that

groundwater pumping does not result in losses of riparian vegetation in the west channel or upper east channel of Squaw Creek. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure 6-1c requires monitoring of riparian vegetation in the portions of the creek that would be most affected by reduction in groundwater levels, and replacement of such vegetation if it is lost.

The SVPSD and the project applicant are responsible for implementation of Mitigation Measure 13-4, but mechanisms are also included in Mitigation Measure 13-4 that require secondary approval by Placer County.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Because implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-13 would require management and monitoring of wellfield operations consistent with the parameters of the WSA, and would ensure that affected riparian habitat is protected from the adverse effects, if any, from groundwater pumping, these mitigation measures would reduce the potential adverse effects to fish and aquatic resources from potential changes in hydrologic conditions in Squaw Creek to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 6-14: Long-term changes to fish and aquatic resource habitat in the main Village reach of Squaw Creek due to creek restoration. Implementation of the proposed project would include restoration of geomorphic conditions to improve channel and overbank aquatic habitat along the segments of Squaw Creek and the Olympic Channel within the main Village area. This modification of the existing surface water features and drainage will help correct and compensate for past direct disturbances to these channels, restore more natural geomorphic conditions and channel and floodplain functions, and improve the extent and quality of aquatic habitat. This would be a beneficial impact.

FINDING

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for beneficial impacts. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

CHAPTER 7: CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact 7-2: Accidental discovery of human remains. Although unlikely, construction and excavation activities associated with project development could unearth previously undiscovered or unrecorded human remains, if they are present. This impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 7-2: Stop work if human remains are discovered. 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.

If human remains are discovered during any demolition/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 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 and NAHC's findings, the archaeologist, and the 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.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-2 would reduce potentially significant impacts to human remains because actions would be implemented to avoid, move, record, or otherwise treat the remains appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. By providing an opportunity to avoid or minimize the disturbance of human remains, and to appropriately treat any remains that are discovered, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 7-3: Disturb archaeological resources or ethnic and cultural values. Implementation of the proposed project could cause a substantial change in the significance of an archaeological resource. One archaeological resource (CA-PLA-164) on the East Parcel, but outside currently planned ground-disturbing activities, has been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR. Also, project-related ground-disturbing activities could cause a substantial change in the significance of an as yet undiscovered archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. This would be a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 7-3a: Conduct Native American monitoring. Before commencement of earth-disturbing activities within 100 feet of the most up to date identified boundary of site CA-PLA-164 (including the extension), a tribal site monitor from the Washoe Tribe shall be contacted and retained, if possible, by the project applicant. The tribal monitor shall be on site for all earth-disturbing construction and pre-construction activities within 100 feet of site CA-PLA-164. In the event that no such Native American monitor is available, persons who represent

tribal governments and/or organizations in the locale in which resources could be affected shall be consulted by the project applicant. If Native American archaeological, ethnographic, or spiritual resources are discovered, all identification and treatment of the resources shall be conducted by a qualified archaeologist and Native American representatives who are approved by the local Native American community as scholars of the cultural traditions.

Mitigation Measure 7-3b: Develop and implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program. The project applicant shall design and implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) that will be provided to all construction personnel and supervisors who will have the potential to encounter and alter heritage and cultural resources. The topics to be addressed in the WEAP will include, at a minimum:

- types of heritage and cultural resources expected in the project area;
- types of evidence that indicates 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);
- what to do if a worker encounters a possible resource;
- what to do if a worker encounters bones or possible bones; and
- penalties for removing or intentionally disturbing heritage and cultural resources, such as those identified in the Archeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA).

Mitigation Measure 7-3c: Stop work in the event of an archaeological discovery. In the event that evidence of any 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), all ground-disturbing activity in the area of the discovery shall be halted until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find. Consistent with Specific Plan Policy CR-1, the Placer County Planning Services Division and the Department of Museums will be notified of the potential find concurrent with the retention of a qualified archaeologist. If 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 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 completed avoidance is not possible, 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). Consistent with Specific Plan Policy CR-4, artifacts that are found during project development that are related to the 1960 Winter Olympics, and which the project applicant has authority over or ownership of, shall be made available to the appropriate historical society or museum

dedicated to preservation and interpretation of data and information from the 1960 Winter Olympics.

Mitigation Measure 7-3d: Prepare subsequent evaluation reports.

- Phase 2 Evaluation Report: Once the exact location of the new sewer line has been determined and before commencement of earth-disturbing activities for construction of the sewer line, a Phase 2 Evaluation Report shall be prepared for the archaeological resources as identified in the report titled Squaw Valley Sewer Line Project Heritage Resources Study: Phase 1B Preliminary Report. In the Phase 2 Evaluation Report, resources will be evaluated and recorded on standard 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 application for County construction permits.

- Phase 3 Evaluation Report: If significant 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, direction 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 shall be implemented as appropriate during project design and construction. If project redesign to completely avoid impacts is infeasible, then measures shall 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 disturbance of the resource site. 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 and Services Division with the first application for County Construction permits. 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.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 7-3a, 7-3b, 7-3c, and 7-3d would reduce potentially significant impacts to known and currently undiscovered archaeological resources because actions would be taken to avoid, move, record, or otherwise treat the resource appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. By providing an opportunity to avoid disturbance, disruption, or destruction of archaeological resources, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

CHAPTER 8: VISUAL RESOURCES

Impact 8-4: Create additional shadowing on existing structures or outdoor public gathering areas during a substantial portion of the day. The increased density of structures and increased height of structures would have the potential to increase shadows on public outdoor gathering areas, especially in the winter when the sun is at a low angle. However, because the shadow effect from the mountain to the south of the project site already covers much of the project site in the winter, the seasonal changes to shadowing conditions on adjacent public gathering places would not be worsened by the project. The project's impacts on adjacent properties due to shadowing would, therefore, be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

CHAPTER 9: TRANSPORTATION & CIRCULATION

Impact 9-1: Impacts to Placer County roadways. Vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would worsen traffic conditions along the segment of Squaw Valley Road between Squaw Creek Road and the Village Area from LOS D to F during the Saturday winter daily condition. This would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 9-1a: Conduct traffic management along Squaw Valley Road between SR 89 and the Village area. Prior to recordation of the first Small Lot Final Map, the project applicant shall prepare a traffic management plan (TMP) to the satisfaction of the Placer County Department of Public Works and the Engineering and Surveying Division. The TMP shall include but not be limited to:

- Prediction of days when traffic management is needed: The project applicant shall work with the County to develop a predictive model for identifying when the 13,500 ADT threshold is expected to be reached so that staff and equipment can be available to execute traffic management measures on the morning of ski days where the threshold is expected to be crossed. The predictive model may take into account factors such as snow conditions; weather conditions; on-line lift ticket sales; hotel/condo reservations at Squaw Valley; available data on projected lodging occupancy in Truckee, Tahoe City, and other

areas; previous day(s) traffic conditions; year-over-year data comparisons; holidays; and local/regional special events.

- Traffic management programs and implementation: The project applicant shall operate traffic management (i.e., three-lane operation with cones, signage, and traffic control personnel) along Squaw Valley Road between SR 89 and the Village Area during all ski days (including the morning peak period) in which the expected amount of daily traffic on Squaw Valley Road would reach or exceed 13,500 ADT unless, otherwise directed by the Placer County Department of Public Works that such activities are not necessary.
- A monitoring mechanism that demonstrates implementation when needed: Use of the predictive model will include a monitoring and adaptive management component to refine the accuracy of the model over time.

The use of a 13,500 ADT threshold represents a five percent increase in traffic over the existing 12,900 ADT. During the 2011-2012 ski season, the volumes on Squaw Valley Road exceeded 13,500 ADT on four days (see Table 9-4). Given the increase in traffic due to the proposed project, it is expected that this threshold could be exceeded 10 to 15 days per year.

The affected segment of Squaw Valley Road has a “per lane” capacity of 7,500 vehicles per day according to Table 9-7 (derived from the Placer County General Plan). The addition of a third lane as part of Mitigation Measure 9-1a would increase the roadway’s capacity. However, the added capacity would not represent a full 50 percent increase because the three-lane operation would not be present throughout the entire day and the use of cones with limited shoulders and medians would act to reduce capacity to some degree. For these reasons, the third lane is conservatively assumed to provide only 25 percent of the capacity (1,875 ADT) of a typical lane for the purposes of this calculation. Accordingly, this segment of Squaw Valley Road would improve to LOS D with a v/c ratio of 0.89 ($15,300 \div 16,875$ ADT). Thus, with this mitigation in place, the LOS on this segment would be restored to pre-project levels and the v/c ratio increase would be less than 0.05.

Mitigation Measure 9-1b: Develop and distribute real-time information regarding Village area parking and average travel speeds on Squaw Valley Road. Prior to recordation of the first Small Lot Final Map, the project applicant shall prepare a “real time” information system to the satisfaction of the Placer County Department of Public Works and the Engineering and Surveying Division. The system shall provide information for parking and roadway conditions, to be operated by the project applicant, which can be accessed via the internet and a smartphone app, or the equivalent in terms of access to information. The system shall be designed to display areas of available parking spaces in lots/garages in the Village Area and average travel speeds on Squaw Valley Road.

Real-time data regarding available parking and travel speeds will be made available to day-use skiers via the information system and would enable day-use skiers to make more informed decisions regarding which ski resort they would prefer to visit. Many skiers/boarders have passes that provide access to multiple resorts. Other skiers/boarders may have the flexibility to make a last-minute decision to visit one resort over another, or to select alternative modes of

transportation if continuing to Squaw Valley, if such information is available. These technologies are available and in use at other ski resorts (e.g., Vail, Colorado).

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 9-1a and 9-1b would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level as a result of the increased vehicle movement efficiency and improved traveler information. These mitigation measures are considered feasible because they are within the project applicant's control and have been shown to improve traffic conditions.

Impact 9-3: Impacts to Caltrans intersections. The proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations at the SR 89/Alpine Meadows Road intersection during all three analysis peak hours. This would be a significant impact. Since publication of the DEIR, the planned traffic signal at the SR 89/Alpine Meadows intersection has been constructed and is operational. Therefore, the project would not generate sufficient vehicle trips to generate an increase in intersection delay of more than 2.5 seconds, and this impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 9-6: Impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities. 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. This would be a less-than-significant impact.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 9-7: Impacts to transit. The proposed Specific Plan describes several planned transit service expansions, some of which are listed as policies in the Specific Plan. However, the policies and service expansions do not explicitly require that the project applicant ensure that an

adequate supply of public transit service be available to meet the anticipated demand. This would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 9-7: Contribute fair share or create a Community Service Area (CSA) or a Community Facilities District (CFD) to cover increased transit service. The project applicant shall commit to providing fair share funding to TART or forming the Department of Public Works and Facilities (DPW&F) or create a Community Service Area (CSA) or a Community Facilities District (CFD) to fund the costs of increased transit services. An Engineer's Report shall be complete prior to recordation of any Small Lot Final Map to the satisfaction of DPW&F to define the fair share or used for the creation of the CSA or CFD. If and when a CSA or CFD is formed, the project applicant shall no longer be responsible for making fair share payments to DPW&F for the increased transit service for the portion of the project covered by the CSA or CFD.

This mitigation measure meets the intent of Specific Plan Policies CP-2 through CP-4, and clarifies how the project would contribute to enhanced transit operations. Increased service may consist of more frequent headways, longer hours of operations, and/or different routes. The fee calculations shall consider both capital expenses and on-going operations and maintenance expenses.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 9-7a and 9-7b would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level because the creation of the CSA/CFD to provide additional funding and the project applicant's continued membership in the TNT/TMA would ensure that increased TART service would be supported.

Impact 9-8: Construction impacts. Project construction would generate employee and truck trips, which would use segments of SR 89 and Squaw Valley Road. These activities could cause lane closures, damage to roadways, and increased conflicts with bicyclists and pedestrians. This would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 9-8: Develop a Construction Traffic Management Plan. Prior to recordation of the first Small Lot Final Map, the project applicant shall prepare a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) to the satisfaction of the Placer County Department of Public Works and the Engineering and Surveying Division. The plan shall include (but not be limited to) items such as:

- guidance on the number and size of trucks per day entering and leaving the project site;
- identification of arrival/departure times that would minimize traffic impacts;

- approved truck circulation patterns, including coordination with the Town of Truckee if the aggregate mine in the Town is used as a material source;
- locations of staging areas;
- locations of employee parking and methods to encourage carpooling and use of alternative transportation;
- methods for partial/complete street closures (e.g., timing, signage, location and duration restrictions);
- criteria for use of flaggers and other traffic controls;
- preservation of safe and convenient passage for bicyclists and pedestrians through/around construction areas;
- monitoring for roadbed damage and timing for completing repairs;
- limitations on construction activity during peak/holiday weekends and special events;
- preservation of emergency vehicle access;
- coordinate with applicants of other projects under construction concurrently in Olympic Valley to minimize potential additive construction traffic disruptions, avoid duplicative efforts (e.g., multiple occurrences of similar signage), and maximize effectiveness of traffic mitigation measures (e.g., joint employee alternative transportation programs);
- removing traffic obstructions during emergency evacuation events; and
- providing a point of contact for Olympic Valley residents and guests to obtain construction information, have questions answered, and convey complaints.

The CTMP should be developed such that the following minimum set of performance standards is achieved throughout project construction. It is anticipated that additional performance standards will be developed once details of more project construction are better known.

1. Delivery trucks do not idle/stage on Squaw Valley Road.
2. Squaw Valley Road does not feature any construction-related lane closures on peak activity days.
3. All construction employees shall park in designated lots owned or leased by Squaw Valley Resort.
4. Roadways, sidewalks, crosswalks, and bicycle facilities shall be maintained clear of debris (e.g., rocks) that could otherwise impede travel and impact public safety.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified

in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 9-8 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level because the potential adverse effects of project construction on local vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian travel would be substantially reduced.

CHAPTER 10: AIR QUALITY

Impact 10-1: Short-term, construction-generated emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Short-term, construction-generated emissions would not exceed PCAPCD's significance threshold for ROG, NO_x, or PM₁₀. Thus, short-term operational emissions of criteria area 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. This impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 10-2: Long-term, operation-related (regional) emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors. Operation of the Specific Plan under full buildout would result in days where the mass emissions of ROG and NO_x, ozone precursors, in Placer County and the MCAB would exceed the PCAPCD-recommended mass emission threshold of 82 lb/day. Thus, long-term operational emissions of ROG and NO_x could conflict with the air quality planning efforts and contribute substantially to the nonattainment status of Placer County with respect to the NAAQS and CAAQS for ozone. This would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 10-2: Implement an ongoing ROG and NO_x emissions review and reduction program. This measure is designed to reduce the project's operational emissions of ROG or NO_x to less than PCAPCD's project-level threshold of 82 lbs/day and to less than PCAPCD's cumulative threshold of 10 lbs/day.

Mitigation measures for reducing operational emissions of ozone precursors were developed using PCAPCD guidance (PCAPCD 2012:C-1 through C-2) and mitigation guidance published by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA 2010) and the California Attorney General's Office (2010). The Lake Tahoe Sustainability Collaborative's Sustainability Action Plan was also reviewed for mitigation options as it includes multiple emission reduction measures that are well-suited to the climate and development patterns in the Sierra Nevada (Lake Tahoe Sustainability Collaborative 2013:4-1 through 4-37).

Prior to recordation of each Small Lot Final Map, the project applicant shall prepare, to the satisfaction of Placer County Planning Services Division and PCAPCD, a chart or table with supporting analysis, which demonstrates that construction and operation of the proposed phase,

combined with emissions from all past approved phases, will not result in ROG or NO_x emissions in excess of 82 lbs/day. Compliance with this threshold may be achieved through project design and/or other “on-site” measures, which may include any of the project-level reduction measures listed below. Alternatively, the project applicant may demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure, partially or wholly, through off-site measures (i.e., emission reductions not directly associated with the proposed project but funded/implemented by the applicant, such as reducing emissions associated with ski operations) and/or purchase of offset credits identified below.

Placer County Planning Services Division shall maintain a file for the charts to provide future applicants with the historical emissions record and approved tracking methodology.

The project applicant shall be responsible for the funding and implementation of all identified reduction measures. The ROG and NO_x reduction benefits achieved by all measures must occur during the ozone season (May through October). The method used to quantify the reduction or offset amount achieved by each measure must be approved by the County and PCAPCD.

Subsequent to the implementation of all selected reduction measures, the project applicant shall evaluate and report the effectiveness of the measures annually to the County and PCAPCD to verify that the suite of measures result in the combined reduction in ROG and NO_x that was expected. This annual reporting shall be completed and submitted to the County and PCAPCD within 30 days of the end of each ozone season. If it is determined that the effectiveness of reduction measures has been overestimated, then additional reduction measures must be implemented. Similarly, if it can be verified that reduction measures achieve better than anticipated results, or previous emission estimates were above actual emission levels, the overall emission reduction approach can be adjusted accordingly.

Types of reduction and offset measures implemented by the project applicant may include, but are not limited to, the measures listed below, so long as the combination of selected measures results in calculated emissions below the target threshold. Note that not all of these measures need to be implemented; rather, the project applicant will be required to implement a combination of those measures needed to reduce ROG and NO_x emissions below the 10 lbs/day threshold:

Trip Emission Reduction Measures

- Provide free or discounted transportation service between the Village and the Amtrak station in Truckee to all overnight visitors who arrive by train. This may be implemented in coordination with a local taxi service, the North Tahoe-Truckee Free Ski Shuttle, or other public or private shuttle service.
- Offer discounted overnight accommodations, meals, activities, or other incentives to visitors who arrive by train to the Amtrak station in Truckee and/or to groups who arrive by bus or some other emissions-efficient vehicle type.
- Provide preferential parking to alternatively-powered vehicles, including electric cars, natural gas vehicles, and hydrogen fuel cell vehicles.

- Provide charging stations for electric vehicles.
- Designate a location for the future installation of a hydrogen fueling station in the event that hydrogen fuel vehicles become readily available and widely used.
- Offer free, shared, or discount rental bicycles to all visitors staying in the hotel or resort residential units.
- Provide shuttle service to other key destinations in the region (e.g., North/West Shore of Lake Tahoe, casinos, Truckee) to serve guests who want to tour regional offerings.
- Provide a covered bicycle parking area near entrance of all commercial establishments.
- Provide parking for, and subsidize a car-sharing service for resort employees and/or patrons.
- Provide “end-of-trip” facilities for employees who bike to their work sites from outside of Olympic Valley including showers, secure weather-protected bicycle lockers, storage lockers for other gear, and changing spaces. This measure is consistent with measure TRT-5 in guidance published by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA 2010:234-236).
- Provide free transit passes or reimburse the transit costs of employees who commute from outside Olympic Valley using Tahoe Area Regional Transit or another transit service. This measure is consistent with measure TRT-4 in CAPCOA’s guidance (CAPCOA 2010:230-233).
- Provide adequate secure weather-protected bicycle lockers or storage area for employees living at the East Parcel. The number of lockers or size of the storage area shall be adequate to meet the demand of employee residents.
- Provide virtual and/or real bulletin boards in common areas of employee housing units and other areas where employees congregate to foster the development of carpools and other ride sharing opportunities.

Area-Source Measures

- Prohibit diesel trucks from idling more than 5 minutes at all loading docks, including those at the East Parcel. Prior to the issuance of an Improvement/Grading Plan, the project applicant shall show on the submitted building elevations that all truck loading and unloading docks will be equipped with one 110/208 volt power outlet for every two dock doors. Diesel trucks idling for more than 5 minutes shall be required to connect to the 110/208 volt power to run any auxiliary equipment. A requirement for minimum 2 foot by 3 foot signage at loading docks that indicates “Diesel engine Idling limited to a maximum of 5 minutes” shall be included with the submittal of building plans. This

measure is recommended in PCAPCD's CEQA Handbook (PCAPCD 2012:C-1) and is also consistent with measure VT-1 in the CAPCOA guide (CAPCOA 2010:300-303).

- On- and off-road service and maintenance vehicles used by the operators of land uses developed under the Specific Plan, including landscape maintenance vehicles, housekeeping vehicles, and maintenance vehicles, shall be electric, electric-hybrids, or alternatively fueled.
- Electrify new and existing well pumps.
- Design and engineer new and remodeled resort-residential, commercial, institutional, and civic construction to exceed 2014 Title 24 State energy-efficiency requirements by a designated percentage. This measure is consistent with Specific Plan Policy CC-1, which encourages that 2014 Title 24 standards be exceeded by 15 percent.
- Design all new resort-residential buildings and major renovations to meet or exceed the guidelines for the California Energy Star Certified Homes Program or similar accreditation. The Energy Star Certified Homes Program is a joint program of EPA and the Department of Energy. The program establishes criteria for energy efficiency for household products and labels energy efficient products with the Energy Star seal. Homes and residential buildings can be qualified as Energy Star homes as well if they meet efficiency standards. In California, Energy Star homes must use at least 15 percent less energy than Title 24 regulations, pass the California Energy Star Homes Quality Insulation Installation Thermal Bypass Checklist Procedures, have Energy Star windows, and have minimal duct leakage. This measure is consistent with Specific Plan Policy CC-2, which encourages this performance standard.
- Only include outdoor cooking grills or outdoor cooking appliances that are fueled by propane or natural gas, or are electrified. No charcoal grills shall be allowed. This measure is recommended in PCAPCD's CEQA Handbook (PCAPCD 2012:C-1 and C-2).
- Install all pools with integrated insulation that has a verified insulation R-value that exceeds what is required by the building code at the time of construction, or insulate walls and floor of swimming pools with insulation that has a verified insulation R-value that exceeds what is required by the building code at the time of construction.
- Incorporate solar heating into pool heating systems.
- Cover outdoor pools with a cover designed to absorb heat from the sun when pools are not open (i.e., a transparent or bubble cover).
- Equip all heated swimming pools with energy efficient pumps and automatic covers for maintaining water temperature when not in use. This measure is recommended by the California Attorney General's Office (2010).

- Install into each dwelling unit Energy Star-rated programmable thermostats that can be controlled remotely (e.g., via internet and/or phone) by property owners/overnight patrons and building management/maintenance staff. The system should allow property management staff to monitor and adjust the thermostats when the dwelling units are unoccupied. Develop a system of default interior temperatures when dwelling units are unoccupied in order to prevent freezing water pipes and maximize heating and cooling efficiently throughout the occupied portions of the multi-story, multi-unit buildings.
- Install an occupancy-sensing energy management system into residential units. This occupancy sensing system may consist of a master keycard unit that relies on a key card's presence in an electronic sensor or a Passive Infra-Red System to positively determine room occupancy status. The system must prevent the use of all light fixtures, exhaust fans, ceiling fans, and televisions when the unit is unoccupied.
- Install Energy Star-rated ceiling fans in residential units.
- Install on-demand (tankless or instantaneous) hot water heaters in residential units and commercial areas that are not served by a central water boiler in the building. Install systems that recirculate hot water.
- Renovate off-site buildings to make them more energy efficient, particularly regarding their levels of propane consumption for space and water heating.
- Prohibit the application of ROG-emitting paint or other architectural coatings as part of regular ongoing maintenance during peak activity periods when ROG emissions from other sources are the highest.

Offset Measures

- Establish mitigation off-site within the portion of Placer County that is within the MCAB by participating in an off-site mitigation program, coordinated through PCAPCD. Examples include, but are not limited to retrofitting, repowering, or replacing heavy duty engines from mobile sources (e.g., busses, construction equipment, on-road haulers, boilers, ski lift equipment, grooming equipment); or other programs that the project proponent may propose to reduce emissions.
- Participate in PCAPCD's Off-site Mitigation Program by paying the equivalent amount of fees for the project's contribution of ROG and NO_x that exceeds the 82 lbs/day. The applicable fee rates changes over time. At the time of writing this EIR, the fee rate is \$18,030 per ton emitted during the ozone season. The actual amount to be paid shall be determined, and satisfied per current California Air Resource Board guidelines, at the time of recordation of the Final Map (residential projects), or issuance of a Building Permit (non-residential projects).

Construction Measures

- Cease or substantially limit ROG- and NO_x-generating construction activity during peak operations (i.e., peak occupancy periods) of buildings and facilities that are already built and operational under the Specific Plan.
- Prior to approval of Grading or Improvement Plans, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall submit a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan to PCAPCD. The applicant shall deliver approval from the PCAPCD to the Placer County Planning Services Division.
- The prime contractor shall provide a plan for approval by PCAPCD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (50 horsepower [hp] or more) land-based, off-road vehicles to be used for project-related demolition and construction activity, including owned, leased, and subcontractor equipment, shall achieve a project wide fleet-average percent reduction in ROG and/or NO_x compared to the most current ARB fleet average that exists at the time of construction. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late-model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels (such as LNG/CNG/biodiesel), engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. The prime contract shall use SMAQMD's Construction Mitigation Calculator (SMAQMD 2012), which is approved by PCAPCD, to demonstrate that its selected equipment fleet achieves these reductions.
- During construction the contractors shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or natural gas- or propane-fueled generators that emit less ROG and NO_x rather than temporary diesel power generators.
- Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas of the construction site to remind off-road equipment operators that idling shall be limited to a maximum of 5 minutes.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Because implementation of Mitigation Measure 10-2 would require a program to ensure that the net maximum daily operational levels of ROG and NO_x emissions in combination with any project-related construction emissions do not exceed PCAPCD's thresholds of 82 lbs/day, the project would not result in emission levels that would violate or substantially contribute to a violation of the ambient air quality standards for ozone. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure 10-2 would reduce this impact to less-than-significant level.

Impact 10-3: Mobile-source CO concentrations. Though buildout of the Specific Plan would result in additional vehicle trips on the surrounding roadway network, project operation would not result in increases in traffic such that PCAPCD 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. This impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 10-4: Exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs. Construction activities would not result in substantial emissions of diesel PM, even during the most intense construction season, and would not take place in the same locations affecting the same off-site receptors in the plan area every construction season during the buildout period. TACs associated with long-term operations of the Specific Plan would also be intermittent and relatively low. Therefore, levels of TACs from project-related construction and operations would not result in an increase in health risk exposure at off-site sensitive receptors. This impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 10-5: Exposure of sensitive receptors to odors. The project would introduce new odor sources into the area (e.g., diesel exhaust emissions from delivery truck and snow removal equipment). However, these types of odor sources already operate in and near the plan area and do not result in odor complaints. Also, the Specific Plan would not locate land uses in close proximity to any existing odor sources. This impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

CHAPTER 11: NOISE

Impact 11-2: Construction vibration impacts. Pile driving could be considered as a construction method for some structures in the project area. Sensitive receptors and existing structures are located in close proximity to potential pile driving locations and could be exposed to excessive levels of vibration noise. Potential pile driving could possibly expose existing or future structures or occupied buildings to vibration in excess of 0.2 in/sec peak particle velocity (PPV) with respect to structural damage and 80 vibration decibels (VdB) with respect to human disturbance. This impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 11-2a: Implement vibration noise reduction measures. To reduce vibration and noise impacts from construction activities, the construction contractor shall comply with the following measures:

- Pile driving activities shall be limited to the daytime hours between 6:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Saturday and Sunday.
- If pile driving is used, pile holes shall be predrilled to the maximum feasible depth to reduce the number of blows required to seat a pile.
- All construction equipment on construction sites shall be operated as far away from vibration-sensitive sites as reasonably possible.
- Earthmoving and ground-impacting operations shall be phased so as not to occur simultaneously in areas close to sensitive receptors, to the extent feasible. The total vibration level produced could be significantly less when each vibration source is operated at separate times.

Mitigation Measure 11-2b: Develop and implement a vibration control plan. This mitigation measure would be applicable to pile driving activities located within 100 feet of any building or within 300 feet of an occupied residence/building.

A vibration control plan shall be developed by the project applicant and his/her construction contractors to be submitted to and approved by Placer County prior to issuance of any Improvement Plans or Grading Permits for the project. The plan shall consider all potential vibration-inducing activities that would occur within the distance parameters described above and include various measures, setback distances, precautions, monitoring programs, and alternative methods to traditional pile driving activities with the potential to result in structural damage or excessive noise. Items that shall be addressed in the plan include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Minimum setback requirements for different types of ground vibration-producing activities (e.g., pile driving) for the purpose of preventing damage to nearby structures shall be established based on the proposed pile driving activities and locations, once determined. Factors to be considered include the specific nature of the vibration producing activity (e.g., type and duration of pile driving), local soil conditions, and the fragility/resiliency of the nearby structures. Established setback requirements (i.e., 100 feet) can be breached if a project-specific, site specific analysis is conducted by a qualified geotechnical engineer or ground vibration specialist that indicates that no structural damage would occur at nearby buildings or structures.
- Minimum setback requirements for different types of ground vibration producing activities (e.g., pile driving) for the purpose of preventing negative human response shall be established based on the proposed pile driving activities and locations, once determined. Established setback requirements (i.e., 300 feet) can be breached only if a project-specific, site-specific, technically adequate ground vibration study indicates that

the buildings would not be exposed to ground vibration levels in excess of 80 VdB, and ground vibration measurements performed during the construction activity confirm that the buildings are not being exposed to levels in excess of 80 VdB.

- All vibration-inducing activity within the distance parameters described above shall be monitored and documented for ground vibration noise and vibration noise levels at the nearest sensitive land use and associated recorded data submitted to Placer County so as not to exceed the recommended FTA and Caltrans levels.
- Alternatives to traditional pile driving (e.g., sonic pile driving, jetting, cast-in-place or auger cast piles, non-displacement piles, pile cushioning, torque or hydraulic piles) shall be considered and implemented where feasible to reduce vibration levels.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 11-2a and 11-2b would ensure that pile driving would not occur during the more sensitive times of the day (i.e., late evening through early morning). Additional measures would require the construction contractor to minimize vibration exposure to nearby receptors by locating equipment far from receptors, phasing operations, and predrilling holes for potential piles. Further, if pile driving would be required in close proximity to existing structures or sensitive receptors, a vibration control plan would be required to further refine appropriate setback distances and identify and implement alternative methods to pile driving if required. These measures would ensure compliance with recommended levels to prevent structural damage and human annoyance and this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 11-3: Exposure of existing sensitive receptors to new or additional operational project-generated stationary noise sources. The project would result in the development of various land uses (e.g., residential, lodging, commercial, and retail). Noise sources associated with these land uses include Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) units, back-up emergency generators, vehicular and human activity in parking lots, loading dock and delivery activities at commercial/retail land uses, and activities at outdoor recreational land uses. Exact locations, building foot prints, and building orientation have not been finalized; it is unknown specifically where future stationary noise sources may be located. Therefore, considering the relatively large-scale of development and the close proximity to existing off-site sensitive receptors of proposed land use development, it is possible that new stationary noise sources would result in excessive noise levels at existing sensitive receptors and exceed applicable Placer County noise standards. This impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 11-3: Reduce noise exposure to existing sensitive receptors from proposed stationary noise sources. The project applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce the effect of noise levels generated by on-site stationary noise sources:

- 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.
- External mechanical equipment, including HVAC units, associated with buildings shall incorporate features designed to reduce noise emissions below the stationary noise source criteria. 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.
- Loading docks shall be located and designed so that noise emissions do not exceed the stationary noise source criteria established in this analysis (i.e., exterior daytime [7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.] standards of 55 dB L_{eq} / 70 dB L_{max} and the exterior nighttime [10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.] standards of 45 dB L_{eq} / 65 dB L_{max}) 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 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.
- Parking lots and structures shall be located and designed so that noise emissions do not exceed the stationary noise source criteria identified in this analysis (i.e., exterior daytime [7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.] standards of 55 dB L_{eq} / 70 dB L_{max} and the exterior nighttime [10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.] standards of 45 dB L_{eq} / 65 dB L_{max}) 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 parking lot noise can be achieved by locating parking lots away from noise sensitive land uses, constructing noise barriers between parking lots/structures and noise-sensitive land uses, incorporating noise barriers into parking structure designs (e.g., providing solid walls around the top levels of parking structures), 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.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 11-3 would require that all stationary noise sources are oriented, located, and designed in such a way that reduces noise exposure to ensure that stationary noise sources would comply with Placer County noise standards for sensitive receptors, reducing this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 11-4: Exposure of new sensitive receptors to existing and new stationary noise sources. The project would result in the development of mixed-use resort type land uses including new noise-sensitive receptors (e.g., resort residential units, hotels). Existing ambient noise would not exceed Placer County land use noise standards for this type of development and, 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, outdoor activity areas, parking lots, and commercial loading docks) associated with Specific Plan, which could expose these receptors to noise in excess of allowable noise levels. This impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 11-4a: Reduce stationary noise exposure to new sensitive receptors. Implement Mitigation Measure 11-3, which would also reduce noise exposure to new sensitive receptors within the Specific Plan area. In addition, the project applicant shall comply with the following noise rules and regulations:

- For the quiet enjoyment by owners and guests, any onsite activities that could generate outdoor noise levels greater than 45 dB (e.g., outdoor skating rink operations, outdoor entertainment events) should continue no later than 12 a.m./midnight each night.
- No outdoor amplified music that exceeds 65 dB at residential/transient lodging after 10:00 p.m., as measured at the exterior wall of structures.
- No ambient patio music after 11 p.m., unless special occasions warrant such and under no circumstances after 12 midnight.
- Exceptions to these noise standards can be provided on limited days for specific events through issuance of a Temporary Outdoor Event permit, subject to Placer County approval.
- The project applicant shall provide access to Placer County enforcement officers for the assessment and investigation of noise complaints and monitoring of noise generating activities, including the placement and operation of sound measurement equipment consistent with Placer County Code section 9.36.040 Sound measurement methodology.

- Should a noise complaint arise, it would be at the discretion of the individual Placer County enforcement officer at the time of noise violation to issue a fine to the band, business owner, event organizer, or other individual responsible for the noise violation. The process for addressing violations and fines would follow Placer County Code Article 9.36 Noise.

Mitigation Measure 11-4b: Conduct site-specific noise study. To ensure compliance with Placer County night time interior noise standard and the California Building Code Section 1207, Sound Transmission interior noise standards of 45 dBA L_{dn} , the project applicant shall comply with the following:

- At the time of conformity review application submittal for discretionary entitlement for a structure containing residential units, the project applicant shall provide to the County a site specific noise study prepared by a qualified acoustical engineer addressing interior noise levels in residential units.
- The noise study shall consider the types of land uses being proposed in the same building as the residential units in a mixed use structure and existing noise sources adjacent to the proposed structure.
- The noise study shall confirm, using approved calculation methodologies, that building design and materials are sufficient to maintain a maximum 45 dB L_{dn} interior noise level, with windows closed, in residential units given the reasonably foreseeable noise generation sources within the building, and existing noise sources adjacent to the building.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 11-4a would limit noise generation from stationary sources, reduce outdoor ambient noise levels, and limit activities to the less sensitive times of the day such that people would be less likely to be disturbed while sleeping. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 11-4b would ensure that all new residential units would be constructed in such a way to reduce interior noise and comply with Placer County and California noise standards for interior spaces. These actions would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 11-5: Exposure of new and existing sensitive receptors to operational project-generated transportation noise sources. Implementation of the project could expose existing and future planned sensitive receptors to transportation noise levels that exceed the Placer County noise standard of 60 dBA L_{dn} at the property line of residential land uses. Therefore, this impact would be significant.

Mitigation Measure 11-5: Reduce roadway noise levels on Squaw Valley Road.

To reduce noise levels associated with increased traffic on Squaw Valley Road, the project applicant shall install a rubberized hot mix asphalt overlay (RHMA) or equivalent surface treatment with known noise reducing properties on top of the existing conventional asphalt of Squaw Valley Road along the segment identified below. Sufficient project generated traffic resulting in a significant contribution to the exceedance of noise standards does not occur until the later portions of project implementation. Therefore, the RHMA overlay need not be installed immediately at project initiation. The RHMA overlay shall be installed when development reaches 30 percent of all proposed Hotel/Condo/Cabin Units Land uses (i.e.,255 units or more), which would be the point where current modeling indicates traffic noise may exceed standards. The RHMA overlay shall meet the following conditions:

- A RHMA overlay shall be installed on top of the existing conventional asphalt on Squaw Valley Road beginning at its' intersection with SR 89 and terminating at its intersection with Christy Lane.
- The RHMA overlay shall be designed with appropriate thickness and rubber component quantity (typically 15 percent by weight of the total blend), such that traffic noise levels are reduced by an average of 4-6 dB (noise levels vary depending on travel speeds, meteorological conditions, and pavement quality) as compared to current noise levels.
- Prior to installation of any RHMA overlay, the applicant shall hire a qualified acoustical engineer to review all design parameters to ensure that the RHMA design is adequate, based on most current technology, practices, and availability of products, such that, at a minimum, 4 dB in noise reduction relative to conditions without a RHMA overlay would be achieved.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 11-5 would result in a reduction of 4-6 dB along Squaw Valley Road, which would be a clearly noticeable reduction to nearby sensitive receptors. Assuming the more conservative value of 4dB, this reduction would reduce the 60 dBA noise contour associated with Squaw Valley Road from 170 feet to approximately 92 feet. Further, given that the highest noise increase associated with the project is 4.4 dBA L_{dn} (see Draft EIR, Table 11-11); this reduction in noise would reduce any increase associated with project-generated traffic to less than 1 dB, which is not perceptible.

Although some residences are located within 92 feet of Squaw Valley Road and therefore still exposed to exterior noise levels above (slightly) 60 dBA, the overall effect of the mitigation would minimize noise exposure, and would reduce it to a point that any increase generated by the proposed project would be imperceptible.

With regards to noise levels on SR 89, noise increases during both the winter and summer as a result of the project would not be noticeable.

Thus, the project would not result in a substantial long-term increase in noise to existing sensitive receptors and this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure 11-5, the 60 dBA contour would be reduced from 170 feet to 92 feet from the centerline of Squaw Valley Road. As per the Illustrative Concept Plan included in the VSVSP, no new development is proposed within 92 feet of the centerline of Squaw Valley Road and therefore no new receptors would be exposed to exterior noise levels that exceed 60 dBA L_{dn} .

With regard to interior noise levels, typical construction of a building with a wood frame and stucco or wood sheathing would provide, at a minimum, a 25 dB exterior-to-interior noise reduction with its windows closed (Caltrans 2002). Newly built residences would be constructed to comply with all current California and Placer County building codes, which require dual pane windows to meet energy efficiency standards. As such, newly constructed residences would likely achieve a higher exterior-to-interior noise reduction than 25 dB. Nonetheless, assuming the minimum reduction of 25 dB, a new sensitive receptor would need to be exposed to exterior noise levels of greater than 70 dBA L_{dn} for interior noise standards of 45 dBA L_{dn} to be exceeded. The 70 dBA L_{dn} noise contour with Mitigation Measure 11-5 would be 20 feet from the centerline of Squaw Valley Road. No new residences would be located this close to Squaw Valley Road and therefore no new receptors would be exposed to interior noise levels that exceed 45 dBA L_{dn} . Impacts to new sensitive receptors from traffic noise would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

CHAPTER 12: SOILS, GEOLOGY, & SEISMICITY

Impact 12-1: Exposure of structures and persons to effects of ground rupture and shaking. Implementation of the proposed project would include construction of structures in the vicinity of earthquake fault traces in the main Village area that are possibly active and in a region subject to moderately strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake on regional faults. Additionally, the steep terrain and relatively unconsolidated geologic materials surrounding and underlying the project site indicate that secondary effects could include triggered landslides that might affect structures and/or persons present. While foundations and structures would be designed based on site-specific geotechnical information and in accordance with the seismic standards of the CBC, uncertainty regarding potential activity status of on-site fault traces limits the ability of standard practices to adequately assure minimization of the risk. Therefore, this would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 12-1: Prepare final fault evaluation and implement recommendations. As recommended by Holdrege & Kull's Preliminary Fault Evaluation Report (2012) and Fault Evaluation Report (2015), a focused study of the fault traces with uncertain activity status shall

be made for any building or structure proposed within 200 feet of the mapped trace of Fault 2 or Fault 5, as identified in the Fault Evaluation Report. The focused study shall determine whether the on-site traces are ‘active’ and provide recommendations, including setbacks, or reconfigurations of building layouts if needed, and said recommendations shall be implemented during preparation of proposed Improvement Plans (see Mitigation Measure 13-2a in Chapter 13, “Hydrology and Water Quality,” for more information on the content of Improvement Plans and the submittal and review process).

- Prior to the recordation of each Small Lot Tentative Map for any parcel that proposes a habitable building or structure within 200 feet of the mapped trace of Fault 2 or Fault 5, including podium parking and parking structures, the project applicant shall prepare and submit a Final Fault Evaluation Report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer, Registered Geologist, Certified Engineering Geologist, or Geotechnical Engineer. The Final Fault Evaluation Report shall make recommendations which, at a minimum, include:
 - A written text addressing existing conditions, evidence suggesting geologically recent fault activity, all appropriate calculations, logs, cross sections, testing, and test results, fault trace location map(s) overlaid with proposed on- and off-site improvements, and site maps showing applicable building setbacks, or possible setbacks, based on various scenarios resulting from the final investigation.
 - In accordance with the Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act and standard engineering practice, appropriate setbacks shall be established to reduce any hazards related with any determined surface rupture risks.
 - The maps shall be of a suitable scale to accurately locate structure setbacks. Corresponding building setbacks shall also be shown on Final Subdivision Map(s).
- Once approved by the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD), two copies of the Final Fault Evaluation Report shall be provided to the ESD and one copy to the Building Services Division for its use.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 12-1 would provide certainty about the potential for on-site fault rupture; improve the prediction of maximum ground acceleration and shaking hazards; provide a final design guidance for building layouts, foundation engineering, and structural standards that will be consistent with and adequate for the actual seismic hazards of the project site; and ensure that construction adheres to applicable seismic codes. While these measures would not

eliminate the risks of earthquake rupture or shaking, these measures would lower the magnitude and probability of the impact to an acceptable level, consistent with other development in the region. This impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 12-2: Exposure of structures and persons to risks of liquefaction and lateral spreading due to seismic shaking. Implementation of the proposed project would include construction of structures in an area with subsurface materials subject to liquefaction and lateral spreading that could produce instability, structural damage, or risks of injury to persons if not properly anticipated and addressed. While all buildings would be constructed in accordance with seismic standards of the CBC, implementation of the project over the estimated 25-year buildout may include buildings on specific locations with varied soil conditions and a range of risks. This would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 12-2: Prepare final geotechnical engineering report and implement recommendations. The project applicant shall prepare and submit a site-specific geotechnical engineering report for each Improvement Plan submittal, to be produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer for Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) review and approval to confirm compliance with applicable seismic and building codes. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following:

- road, pavement, and parking area design;
- structural foundations, including retaining wall design;
- grading practices;
- erosion/winterization;
- special problems discovered on-site (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, etc.);
- slope stability; and
- recommendations for areas potentially subject to debris flows, which could include relocation and/or layout modifications, off-site source area control, catchment structures, and/or deflection structures.

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. The Building Services Division shall review all building permit applications to confirm that they incorporate the specifications of the corresponding Geotechnical Engineering Report. It is the responsibility of the project applicant to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 12-2 would provide certainty about the potential for on-site secondary seismic hazards and provide a final design guidance for building layouts, foundation engineering, and structural standards that will be consistent with and adequate for the actual seismic hazards of the project site. While these measures would not eliminate the risks of secondary seismic hazards, these measures would lower the magnitude and probability of the impact to an acceptable level, consistent with other development in the region. This impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 12-3: Exposure of structures and persons to effects of snow avalanche.

Implementation of the proposed project would include construction of structures within areas currently designated as snow avalanche hazard zones (PAHAs). Project implementation would also increase the frequency and number of persons present in PAHAs. Updated PAHAs developed for the proposed project are slightly smaller in extent than those adopted under the existing ordinance, in part because ongoing active avalanche control programs and related mountain operations are considered. The updated PAHAs would not encompass proposed building footprints, but would affect portions of buildable parcels designated for public uses. The project would comply with recommendations of additional studies to guide building design standards within the lower risk zone ('potential' PAHA), and prepare and implement an Avalanche Hazard Mitigation plan. However, if the proposed risk reduction measures and Avalanche Hazard Mitigation Plan are not properly developed and implemented, or current avalanche control practices and related mountain operations that affect avalanche risk are altered, project development could increase the number of persons at significant risk in the event of an avalanche. This impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 12-3: Confirm implementation of avalanche hazard mitigation actions.

Prior to approval of a Tentative Small-Lot Subdivision Map that includes lands within a PAHA, the project applicant shall provide the County a complete Avalanche Hazard Mitigation Plan. The plan shall be subject to review and approval by the County and the Squaw Valley Fire Department (SVFD), and map approval will be conditioned on ongoing implementation of the plan. The Avalanche Hazard Mitigation Plan shall be reflected in Improvement Plans for areas within PAHAs (see Mitigation Measure 13-2a in Chapter 13, "Hydrology and Water Quality," of the EIR for more information on the content of Improvement Plans and the submittal and review process) and supported by special avalanche hazard studies within the Geotechnical Engineering Report (see Mitigation Measure 12-2, above, which requires submittal of a final Geotechnical Engineering Report). The plan shall include all elements identified in the project specific Avalanche Hazard Study (Heywood 2014), as well as the following additional element:

- On-site structures: The Building Services Division shall review building permit applications for structures within moderate PAHAs to confirm that they incorporate the structural specifications of the Geotechnical Engineering Report.
- Up-slope conditions: Policy procedures and necessary agreements and permissions shall be included to ensure that operations on the ski terrain of Squaw Valley continue to implement avalanche mitigation programs and that slope development and management avoids the creation of new long continuous openings that could increase the potential for avalanche release and movement that could affect Specific Plan developments. No new large openings shall be created on slopes steeper than 30 degrees that could influence avalanche runouts leading to the Specific Plan area.
- Persons in identified PAHA areas: Policy and practices shall be included to inform and educate workers, visitors and residents congregating in identified PAHA areas about the on-site geological hazards, particular snow avalanche, and to include mapped information and physical noticing in outside areas within a PAHA as well as indoor spaces as required by the existing County ordinance. Educational information shall include preparedness guidance and specific emergency response and evacuation instructions at locations within PAHAs. Plans and measures shall be instituted to effectively provide notice of any urgent warnings, watches, or evacuation orders using multiple media and/or venues to communicate.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 12-3 would provide final design guidance for building layouts, foundation engineering, and structural standards that would be consistent with and adequate for the actual avalanche hazards of the project site; would ensure continued mountain operations that minimize and control avalanche risk; and would provide a more complete and comprehensive mitigation program to identify, inform, and instruct persons that would potentially be at additional risk due to the project. While these measures would not eliminate the risks due to snow avalanche, these measures would lower the magnitude and probability of the impact to an acceptable level. This impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

CHAPTER 13: HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

Impact 13-1: Well and sewer line construction and abandonment risks to groundwater and surface water quality. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the construction of new water supply wells and destruction of some existing wells, and abandonment of some existing sewer lines. If wells are not properly sited, constructed, or destroyed, or if sewer lines are not properly abandoned, contamination of groundwater and/or discharge of contaminated groundwater to surface water could result. Various codes and regulations address the protection

of water quality during these activities. If these codes and regulations are not properly adhered to, this impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 13-1: Implement water and sewer infrastructure water quality protection measures. The project applicant shall implement the following actions, including standard mitigation measures as required by the County, to protect water quality during the design, installation, and destruction/abandonment of wells and sewer lines:

- Prior to providing final authorization for drilling of a well (e.g., initiating an applicant directed test well, providing access to property for a well drilled by another entity, final agreement to fund a well drilled by another entity), the project applicant shall confirm that required fees are paid and a drilling permit is obtained from Environmental Health Services for each well and that the location of the well meets applicable DWR criteria for distances from utility infrastructure (e.g., stormwater, sewer, and petroleum pipelines and petroleum storage tanks).
- Prior to approval of a Final Subdivision Map, the applicant shall provide to Placer County Environmental Health Services final design drawings indicating that separation between any planned or existing wells in the map area and any planned or existing stormwater, sewer, and petroleum pipelines and petroleum storage tanks is sufficient to meet applicable DWR separation requirements.
- Prior to approval of a Final Small-Lot Subdivision Map, complete or provide for the proper destruction under permit and inspection, of existing wells and abandonment of sewer lines located within the project site.
- Prior to approval of an Improvement Plan that includes the need for well destruction or sewer line abandonment, well destruction and/or sewer line abandonment shall be shown on the Improvement Plans; the actions shall be included in the engineers' estimate of costs for subdivision improvements; and the Improvement Plan will include a Plan Note indicating proper destruction, under permit and inspection, of the existing wells and abandonment of sewer lines located within the Improvement Plan area.

The project applicant shall also implement relevant provisions of Mitigation Measures 13-2a and 13-2b.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 13-1 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level because new wells, well destruction, and sewer line abandonment would be conducted under the review and approval of Placer County, helping

ensure that existing codes and regulations that require measures to protect water quality are properly implemented during these activities.

Impact 13-2: Construction phase degradation of surface and groundwater water quality.

Implementation of the proposed project will require multiple phases and several seasons of construction activities that involve grading, earth moving, excavation, underground infrastructure installation, building construction, and crossings of the stream corridor; much of this construction activity will occur in locations overlying the unconfined aquifer. During each episode of project construction, portions of the plan area would be exposed to wind and water erosion, including stormwater and snowmelt runoff, and excavations may unearth subsurface materials, existing infrastructure, or groundwater that poses a risk of contamination to surface or groundwater water quality. This impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 13-2a: Implement standard construction water quality protection measures.

The project applicant shall implement the following standard mitigation measures as required by the County to help ensure that water quality protection measures are implemented properly and to generally protect water quality during construction and over the project life:

- 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 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 prior to submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the ESD in both hard copy and electronic versions in a format to be approved by the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.
- 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 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).

- The project applicant shall revegetate all temporarily 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.
- 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 prior to Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon the County's acceptance of improvements, and satisfactory completion of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent.
- If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.
- The project applicant shall prepare and submit a final drainage report 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 submittal, to the Engineering and Surveying Division for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: a written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. Best Management Practice measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.
- The Subsequent Conformity Review Process and the Improvement Plans shall show that water quality treatment facilities/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 ESD such as the guidance of the Erosion & Sediment Control Guidelines for Developing Areas of the Sierra Foothills and Mountains (or other similar source as approved by the ESD). Construction (Temporary) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: straw mulch, fiber rolls, silt fence, sedimentation basins, drain inlet protection, stabilized construction accesses and material management.

- There shall be no grading or other disturbance of ground between October 15 of any year and May 1 of the following year, unless a Variance has been granted by the Lahontan RWQCB and the ESD.

Mitigation Measure 13-2b: Implement additional construction water quality protection measures.

Prepare a Hazardous Materials Contingency Plan: Prior to issuance of the first grading permit, provide to EHS a hazardous materials contingency plan. The plan will describe the necessary actions that would be taken if evidence of contaminated soil or groundwater is encountered during construction. The contingency plan shall identify conditions that could indicate potential hazardous materials contamination, including soil discoloration, petroleum or chemical odors, presence of USTs, or buried building material. Compliance with the plan will be included as a requirement within all construction bid specifications.

If at any time during the course of constructing the proposed project evidence of soil and/or groundwater contamination with hazardous material is encountered, the project applicant shall immediately stop the project and contact Placer County EHS Hazardous Materials Section. The project shall remain stopped until there is resolution of the contamination problem (through such mechanisms as soil or groundwater sampling and remediation if potentially hazardous materials are detected above threshold levels) to the satisfaction of Placer County EHS and to the Lahontan RWQCB.

The plan, and obligations to abide by and implement the plan, shall be incorporated into the construction and contract specifications of the project.

Sample Excavated Site Soils Intended for Reuse in Restoration of Squaw Creek: Final design plans and specifications for creek restoration activities shall require sampling of any excavated soils taken from outside the Squaw Creek or Olympic Channel corridors that would be reapplied within the Squaw Creek or Olympic Channel corridors, or any other surface water. Only soils that do not have potentially hazardous materials in excess of regulatory thresholds will be used for creek restoration. If any contaminated materials are found, they will be separated and properly transported and disposed of at legally permitted, off-site disposal facilities.

Prepare a Construction Dewatering and Discharge Plan: A dewatering and discharge plan shall be developed and submitted to the Lahontan RWQCB for approval prior to initiating any excavation activities. The plan will be implemented during project construction to address protection of groundwater resources and surface water quality in the event that groundwater is intercepted during project activities. The dewatering and discharge plan shall provide methods to

protect groundwater during excavations from potential contaminant releases during equipment use and refueling, such as specific spill control and clean up and response measures in the vicinity of excavations.

Dewatering operations and creek and river diversions are authorized under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) California General permit as long as activities conform to the following requirements:

- Construction site dewatering waste must not be discharged to surface waters or tributaries thereto, including municipal separate storm sewer systems.
- Before conducting dewatering or clear water diversion activities, the Discharger must prepare a dewatering/diversion plan as part of the stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) for review and approval by the Lahontan RWQCB.
- The Dewatering/Diversion plan must have the following minimum elements:
 - location of the discharge area or outfall and name of receiving water;
 - a description of the discharge or diversion method and plan drawings;
 - the frequency and estimated volume and rate of discharge;
 - expected pollutants and concentration in discharge, and control measures to be applied and maintained for pollutant control; and
 - planned effluent and/or receiving water monitoring (visual and other).
 - Protect Vulnerable Far East Bridge Sewer Pipeline Crossing During Squaw Creek Restoration

Final design, specifications, and methods for the physical relocation and lowering of the existing Far East Bridge sewer pipeline crossing shall be coordinated with and implemented prior to, or concurrently with, the Squaw Creek Restoration Plan to avoid the increased potential for damage to the existing pipe during restoration implementation.

Or,

Improvement plans and specifications for the Squaw Creek Restoration Plan shall include special provisions to ensure that pre-construction verification of the existing Far East Bridge sewer crossing location, depth below ground surface, and condition across the entire proposed excavation area is performed; appropriate vertical and lateral buffers to avoid travel of heavy equipment over the pipe are specified and adhered to; specific rock placement techniques to reduce potential impact forces on the pipe are required and monitored; and, temporary limits on raw sewage conveyance and/or emergency shut off systems are in place and functional while excavations for creek restoration are underway in the vicinity of the pipe.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 13-2a and 13-2b would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level because it would ensure that construction phase, site-specific risks to water quality that might result from improper implementation of water quality protection measures, discovery and disturbance of contaminated soil or water, and ground disturbance in the vicinity of the existing Far East bridge sewer line crossing would be fully addressed and avoided.

Impact 13-3: Temporary surface water diversions and dewatering of streams.

Implementation of some of the storm drainage and sewer line improvements and the creek restoration elements of the Specific Plan may require temporary diversions of surface water within Squaw Creek and/or the Olympic Channel for short periods of time during construction. These activities would temporarily dewater portions of the stream channel(s). This hydrologic impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 13-4: Long-term land cover changes and increased groundwater production effects on groundwater patterns, recharge, and aquifer storage in the Olympic Valley

Groundwater Basin. Implementation of the proposed project would result in a net increase in the area of impervious surfaces (e.g., paved surfaces and buildings) by 0.27 acre in the main Village area, but shift impervious surface within different elevation zones, with a net 3.16 acre increase for the zone below 6,200 feet elevation, a 2.89 acre decrease in the 6,200 to 6,300 feet zone, and zero increase above 6,300 feet. This minor total increase in impervious surface and the net reduction in the intermediate elevation zone would have a less-than-significant impact on potential groundwater recharge. Excavation of sub-grade facilities and infrastructure into the groundwater aquifer and/or groundwater recharge areas could result in a net reduction of aquifer storage capacity and/or an obstruction to groundwater recharge. However, geotechnical studies indicate proposed sub-grade facilities would not be large enough, deep enough, or in a location that would generate this effect. Implementation of the proposed project would rely on groundwater as its primary water source, and is estimated to require 234 acre feet per year at buildout, a 28 percent increase over the existing average annual production volume of 842 acre feet within the Olympic Valley. While the project would increase demand and groundwater pumping and could result in changes in groundwater flow paths and cause local draw-downs of varied durations, available studies indicate that it would not substantially reduce the aquifer storage relative to capacity or result in a long-term lowering of the local groundwater table. However, this conclusion is based on evaluation and modelling of a particular wellfield

configuration with certain operating parameters as identified in the WSA. The ultimate configuration and/or operating procedures could differ from those evaluated in the WSA. Thus, there is a potential for the project to adversely affect groundwater availability and well operations. This would be a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 13-4: Verify performance of groundwater pumping system. The following mitigation measure would ensure that water supply provided to the proposed project is managed in a manner that is consistent with the system analyzed in the WSA. The WSA scenario was shown to be able to provide enough water to supply the existing, VSVSP and cumulative development within the operational parameters set by the SVPSD and without substantial adverse effects on water quality, Squaw Creek and/or biological habitat. Therefore, this measure focuses on ensuring that any changes to the scenario analyzed in the WSA are shown to have similar effects. In addition, the measure provides for coordination with the planning processes for groundwater in Olympic Valley. This measure mitigates the potential impacts addressed above, as well as other potential impacts addressed in Impact 13-5 (groundwater pumping changes to groundwater and surface water interactions), Impact 13-6 (reconfiguration of Squaw Creek and the Olympic Channel), Impact 6-1 (removal or degradation of sensitive habitats), Impact 6-3 (disturbances to nesting raptors and special-status birds), Impact 6-13 (long term impacts to fish and aquatic resources), and Impact 14-1 (increased demand for potable and irrigation water). This measure is written under the assumption that SVPSD would be the water provider to the proposed project; however, if a Mutual Water Company or other water provider is established that draws groundwater from the Olympic Valley aquifer, this mitigation measure would be applied to that entity.

The SVPSD is the agency that would operate wells providing groundwater to the VSVSP. The SVPSD is responsible for groundwater planning and management for most of the Olympic Valley, including the project area. The SVPSD currently implements a monitoring plan that includes collection and analysis of groundwater elevation and use data from monitoring and production wells throughout the western portion of the Groundwater Basin. In addition, the SVPSD is among the group of stakeholders that develops and implements the Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) for the Groundwater Basin. The existing GMP includes goals and objectives for groundwater management in the Basin. The SVPSD will include the proposed new wells in the existing monitoring plan and assess future groundwater use and conditions against the goals and objectives in the GMP. The SVPSD has also stated that it will prepare and implement a Pumping Management Plan, and may also elect to prepare a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) in accordance with the recent Sustainable Groundwater Management Act of 2014 (SGMA). Any SVPSD Pumping Management Plan will be included as a component of future updates to the GMP or new GSP for the Groundwater Basin. These plans would address, at a minimum, the following topics that relate to the adequacy of supply and the minimization of impacts due to groundwater pumping:

- Standard operating procedures for well operation;
- Criteria for new well siting and well destruction that seek to manage water supply throughout the year and in low- and high-water years;

- Criteria that prioritize expansion of the well field in the west side of the valley in areas that have less effect on surface water and streamflow;
- A monitoring and reporting program that documents the effects of groundwater pumping on Squaw Creek; and
- Use of data from the existing SVPSD monitoring program and any future monitoring.

Further, it is anticipated that, consistent with SVPSD’s existing practice, the groundwater plans would be reviewed and updated on a periodic basis as new wells are installed, monitoring data is evaluated, and when assessments of groundwater plan effectiveness, groundwater model refinement, and additional groundwater assessment reports are completed.

Future groundwater plans, whether a Pumping Management Plan, GMP update, or GSP, will guide installation and operation of groundwater wells needed to supply the proposed project. Therefore, any changes to the well field analyzed in the WSA must be consistent with and incorporated into these groundwater plans.

The project applicant will enter into a Development Agreement with the SVPSD (or other water provider), which will specify the terms of service, including the roles and responsibilities of both parties.

In order to ensure that the use of groundwater for the proposed project is consistent with applicable groundwater plans and that withdrawals are managed in a manner that maintains adequate water supply and protects water quality, Squaw Creek, and biological habitat that is affected by groundwater levels, the following measures shall be implemented.

- A. If the SVPSD (or other water provider) and/or applicant propose an individual well and/or all or a portion of a well-field to meet water demand associated with the project that would differ from the well field analyzed in the WSA, the new well(s) shall not be installed until the applicant provides additional modeling demonstrating that the following thresholds, or their functional equivalent, would be met. SVPSD shall be consulted during preparation of the analysis:
 - i. Average saturated thickness in the western well-field wells does not fall below 65 percent for more than three consecutive months or more than four times total for the entire study period;
 - ii. Drawdown from wells in proximity to the upper meadow (modelling Cells A through E) does not cause substantially more refugia pool drying than shown in the 2014 Potential Impacts of Increased Groundwater Pumping on Fisheries;
 - iii. The well placement and well-field operation would meet all applicable criteria identified in the applicable groundwater plans; and
 - iv. Any additional measures requested by the SVPSD (or other water provider) or the County to address operational concerns and protection of water quality. The SVPSD (or other water provider) and the County may alter the criteria in (i) through (iii) if it can be demonstrated that the revised criteria would maintain adequate water supply and would not result in degradation of water quality and/or

loss of riparian vegetation and/or aquatic habitat substantially greater than described in Impacts 6-1, 6-3 and 6-13.

The findings of the modeling shall be incorporated into the applicable groundwater plan(s).

- B. At a minimum, the Development Agreement between the SVPSD (or other water provider) and the applicant shall identify the roles and responsibilities for the testing, construction, verification of operational readiness and monitoring of new wells. In addition, the Development Agreement shall reflect the requirements of Item A above, and shall specify the process and funding responsibility for updating existing or future groundwater plans as needed to address new wells and/or changes to the proposed well field.
- C. Standard County procedures require the project applicant to provide a “will-serve” letter or “letter of availability” from the SVPSD (or other water provider) to Environmental Health Services prior to approval of an Improvement Plan. With the will-serve letter/letter of availability provided with each Improvement Plan, the applicant shall also provide the following:
 - i. With the first Improvement Plan containing facilities that require domestic water service, the applicant shall provide verification from the SVPSD (or other water provider) that the water demands associated with the Improvement Plan can be met with existing or planned infrastructure and that operation of that infrastructure complies with the Development Agreement and applicable groundwater plan(s).
 - ii. With all subsequent Improvement Plans the applicant shall provide a determination from the SVPSD (or other water provider) whether the water demand associated with the proposed development would require installation of a new well or wells to ensure that the overall groundwater system can be operated consistent with the assumptions of the WSA and the criteria of the applicable groundwater plan(s).

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) Implementation of the mitigation measure will require coordination with the SVPSD (or other water provider) that can and should implement the measure. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(2); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(2).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Because implementation of Mitigation Measure 13-4 would ensure that the well system design and operation would manage groundwater pumping to ensure that water supply is adequate, and that pumping effects on groundwater levels and associated resources are not substantial, the potential impact due to increased groundwater pumping would be less than significant.

Impact 13-5: Groundwater pumping changes to groundwater and surface water interactions and water quality within and downstream of the plan area. The Specific Plan development will rely on groundwater as its primary water source, and the increase in total extraction, along with continued and increased pumping in existing and new wells, particularly near the stream corridor, could reduce groundwater support to streamflow and surface water elevations and/or expand the spatial extent of dry streambed and/or the duration of zero flow within and downstream of the main Village area. Although flow changes may occur, they would be minor in the specific context of hydrology and would have little effect on water quality. However, if the wellfield is not configured or operated in a manner consistent with the WSA and applicable groundwater plans, vegetation loss could occur in the Squaw Creek corridor, leading to potential erosion. This impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 13-5: Implement Mitigation Measure 13-4. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 13-4, which directs the construction and operation of a well system that is consistent with the parameters of the WSA and applicable groundwater plans. By confirming that groundwater management is implemented in a manner that is consistent with the operational parameters described in the WSA, Mitigation Measure 13-4 would also result in confirmation that groundwater pumping does not result in losses of riparian vegetation in the west channel or upper east channel of Squaw Creek. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure 6-1c requires monitoring of riparian vegetation in the portions of the creek that would be most affected by reduction in groundwater levels, and replacement of such vegetation if it is lost. The applicant and SVPSD (or other water provider) are responsible for implementation of Mitigation Measure 13-4, but mechanisms are also included in Mitigation Measure 13-4 that require secondary approval by Placer County.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Because implementation of Mitigation Measure 13-4 would require management and monitoring of wellfield operations and Squaw Creek streamflow maintenance, this mitigation measure would reduce to a less-than-significant level the potential loss of streamside riparian vegetation and resultant effects to streambed stability, erosion, sedimentation, and water temperature.

Impact 13-6: Reconfiguration of Squaw Creek and the Olympic Channel. As part of proposed Squaw Creek Restoration, implementation of the proposed project would reconfigure the flow lines, channel shapes, sizes, and overbank areas along the segments of Squaw Creek and the Olympic Channel within the main Village area. This modification of the existing surface water features and drainage will help correct and compensate for past direct disturbances to these channels and restore more natural geomorphic conditions and channel and floodplain functions. While successful implementation would be a beneficial impact, without monitoring, adaptive management, and assurances of ongoing funding to support these activities, creek restoration

efforts might not provide the anticipated benefits and could result in greater disturbance to hydrologic conditions and water quality than benefit. This impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 13-6: Implement Mitigation Measures 6-1a and 6-1b. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measures 6-1a and 6-1b, which assure the development of performance criteria for creek restoration, monitoring and adaptive management for the restoration, and ongoing funding to support these activities.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 13-6 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level because it would reduce the uncertainty regarding the potential effectiveness of the stream restoration actions, and provide a funded means to perform necessary maintenance or adaptive response.

Impact 13-7: Long-term management of runoff volumes, peak flows, and snow storage, and risks of potential degradation to water quality. Implementation of the proposed project would enlarge the total area of impervious surfaces, upgrade the stormwater drainage system, improve the separation of mountain runoff from urban runoff, install additional traditional and Low Impact Development (LID) stormwater quality protection measures, and modify snow storage locations and practices. The restoration of Squaw Creek would include armoring of channel bed and banks to accommodate the 100-year peak flow through existing bridges without increased erosion. The VSPSD would improve protection of the sewer undercrossing of Squaw Creek and as a separate action the VSPSD will replace the off-site sewer siphon under the Truckee River before initiation of the VSVSP. This impact in the main Village area would be less than significant and the impact to the East Parcel would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 13-7: Reduction of long-term water quality degradation from snow and runoff management. To minimize the potential for snow storage and snowmelt runoff to degrade the quality of runoff discharged overland or through the storm drainage to Squaw Creek adjacent to the East Parcel, the project applicant shall submit with the first Subsequent Conformity Review Process for the East Parcel, a final snow storage plan for the parcel that either:

- relocates snow storage away from margin of the stream and wetland to an area within the core developed area (e.g., parallel to the road along the margin of the parking area); and/or
- provides specific containment and treatment features that would prevent discharge of sediment and/or urban pollutants to Squaw Creek and nearby wetland areas.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 13-7 would prevent improper or ineffective snow storage BMPs adjacent to Squaw Creek and wetlands, reducing the potential water quality impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 13-8: Exposure of people to flood hazards. Completion of the Squaw Creek corridor restoration plan, including consideration of the build out hydrology, will modify the 100-year floodplain boundaries and water surface elevations. The existing parking areas prone to flooding during the 100-year event would continue to be vulnerable to inundation until completion of the creek restoration element. After the creek restoration is complete and the Specific Plan trails are constructed, future trail users could be exposed to flood hazards on the trail segments along Squaw Creek. This would be a potentially significant impact.

The mountain systems components of the drainage network will convey the 100-year flows, while the on-site drainage components will be designed for 10-year flows, and some existing segments of the drainage network have uncertain capacity. As incremental modifications to the stormwater drainage network are designed and implemented, the design and implementation must consider and eliminate the potential for stormwater flows exceeding the system capacity to create injury hazards during large peak flows. This would be a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 13-8: Provide flood hazard prevention and signage. The following measure shall be implemented to avoid the possibility of localized flooding within the on-site portion of the existing, interim, or developed drainage system:

- During the Subsequent Conformity Review Process, the final Drainage Master Plan shall require, and all interim and final storm drainage improvements shall comply with refined, iterative modelling to properly size conveyance facilities including consideration and avoidance of potential connections of mountain system drainage segments with 100-year conveyance capacity to any existing or proposed on-site system drainage segments of 10-year conveyance capacity.

The following measure shall be implemented to avoid or minimize the risk of flood hazards to recreational trail users:

- Improvement Plans submitted to the County that include recreational facilities within the Squaw Creek 100-year flood hazard area (as identified by FEMA at the time of submittal) shall include identification of locations for installation of informational flood hazard warning signs. The signs shall include emergency response contact (e.g., 9-1-1) and shall be installed and maintained at key locations along trail segments within the 100-year floodplain boundary. The content and design of the signs shall be approved by the Placer County Office of Emergency Services.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 13-8 would reduce the potential for manhole surcharge as the various existing, proposed interim, and developed storm drainage infrastructure are activated, reducing the possibility of injury to persons and property; as well as reduce the potential for users of the recreational trails along the restored creek corridor to be affected by flood hazards. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

CHAPTER 14: PUBLIC SERVICES & UTILITIES

Impact 14-1: Increased demand for potable and irrigation water. Implementation of the project would result in additional water demand on the Olympic Valley alluvial aquifer of up to 234 AFY by 2040. By 2040, other cumulative growth is estimated to require up to 129 AFY, for a total additional demand of 363 AFY by 2040. Extracting sufficient groundwater from the Basin to meet the forecasted demands would not be expected to reduce groundwater below adopted criteria if the well field is properly designed and wells are installed accordingly. However, because the wellfield that is ultimately constructed could differ from the configuration evaluated in the WSA, this impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 14-1a: Implement Mitigation Measure 13-4. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 13-4. Mitigation Measure 13-4 would ensure that wellfield configuration and operation are consistent with the parameters of the WSA and applicable groundwater plans, so that there is adequate water supply to serve the proposed project and projected growth even in dry and multiple dry years.

Mitigation Measure 14-1b: Obtain water supply verification letter from the public service district. During the Subsequent Conformity Review Process, the project applicant shall provide written verification of the availability of a sufficient water supply from the proposed water supplier to describe whether the project would trigger construction of water supply improvements.

Mitigation Measure 14-1c: Obtain will-serve requirements letter from the public service district. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the project applicant shall submit to Environmental Health Services, for review and approval, a "will-serve" letter or a "letter of availability" from the SVPSD or the identified water supplier for domestic water service. The project applicant shall connect the project to this treated domestic water supply.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified

in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Because implementation of Mitigation Measure 14-1a would reduce the uncertainty associated with well system design and operation, and would assure that drawdown effects are managed to avoid insufficient groundwater levels, the potential impact to due to increased demand for potable and irrigation water would be less than significant. Further, implementation of Mitigation Measures 14-1b and 14-1c would ensure that a sufficient water supply is available to the project and that the applicable water supplier intends to serve the project.

Impact 14-2: Increased demand for wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment. The project would be served by existing and upgraded (as part of the project) sewer facilities that have sufficient capacity to collect, and convey wastewater through the project area. Further, the Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency (T-TSA) has sufficient capacity to treat wastewater at its treatment plant outside of Truckee. However, there may not be sufficient capacity in the Truckee River Interceptor during peak flow periods to serve existing plus project flows. The impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 14-2a: Provide sufficient on-site wastewater storage. In the event that T-TSA finds that project-generated peak wastewater flows may exceed the capacity of the TRI during peak flows, wastewater detention facilities, such as enlarged pipes, vaults, or tanks, shall be incorporated into the Specific Plan to time wastewater flows to off-peak conditions when the TRI has sufficient capacity. These facilities will be located within the plan area and will be underground or otherwise incorporated into project's development footprint (e.g., incorporated into a building podium). All facilities will be designed and maintained according to applicable design standards such that effluent would be fully contained. The project applicant shall work directly with T-TSA to determine a sufficient volume of detention capacity for the project and to define the methodology for determining when wastewater detention facilities should be used, and timing for releases from these facilities. The capacity of the on-site storage shall only be sufficient to meet the peak capacity needs associated with the project. A SVPSD representative's signature shall be provided on the Improvement Plans.

Mitigation Measure 14-2b: Obtain will-serve requirements letter from the public service district. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the project applicant shall submit to Environmental Health Services a "will-serve" letter from the SVPSD indicating that the district can and will provide sewer service to the project. Connection of each lot in this project to a public sanitary sewer is required.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 14-2a would reduce the potential impact to sewer capacity to a less-than-significant level because there would be adequate on-site storage to ensure that wastewater is released from the site at a time when the TRI has capacity to carry it. Further, implementation of Mitigation Measure 14-2b would ensure that the SVPSD can and will provide sewer service to the project.

Impact 14-3: Increased generation of solid waste. Development of new resort residential and commercial uses at the project site would increase the demand for solid waste collection and disposal; however, the solid waste generated by proposed development would not exceed the permitted capacity of the Lockwood Regional Landfill, which would receive solid waste from the project site. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 14-4: Result in inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy. Project implementation would result in increased demands for propane/natural gas and electricity. New and improved facilities are included in the project, and Amerigas and Liberty Utilities personnel have indicated that each utility would be able to adequately serve the plan area at full buildout. Further, the project would be designed to incorporate modern building code energy efficiency requirements and would include additional energy conservation and efficiency improvements. The impact would therefore be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 14-5: Result in insufficient snow removal and storage. The project would be designed to accommodate snow removal activities and provide adequate snow storage. The impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 14-6: Increased demand for parks and recreational facilities. The project includes new recreation and other facilities, the potential effects of which are addressed throughout this Draft EIR, and would not increase the use of existing facilities such that they would experience deterioration. The impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 14-7: Increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical services. The project would include development which would increase demand for fire protection and emergency medical services. If a new fire substation is not constructed to serve the west end of Squaw Valley, existing fire protection facilities and staffing may not be able to maintain targeted response times under all conditions. This impact would be significant.

Mitigation Measure 14-7a: Implement Mitigation Measure 9-7. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 9-7, provided in Chapter 9, “Transportation and Circulation,” which would require that a Construction Traffic Management Plan be developed, and that measures contained therein be implemented to maintain emergency vehicle access on area roadways.

Mitigation Measure 14-7b: Provide additional fire protection facilities and staffing. To ensure that there is sufficient funding and resources to maintain desired response times, the project applicant shall enter into a development agreement with the SVPSD containing defined benchmarks for staffing, facilities, and equipment at various phases of project development. A copy of this agreement shall be provided to Placer County prior to approval of the initial Small Lot Tentative Map. If benchmarks cannot be met with funding from development-generated fees and taxes, the project applicant shall provide the additional funding needed to meet the benchmarks to ensure that adequate levels of service are maintained.

The following development benchmarks that trigger staffing additions may occur in any order, but the staffing increases outlined in the five steps below shall be followed in order, until the fifth staffing measure is met.

- development in Lots 1 through 8 triggers a staffing mitigation phase (described below),
- a single condo hotel on Lot 1 triggers a staffing mitigation phase,
- a single condo hotel on Lot 13 triggers a staffing mitigation phase,
- both condo hotels in Lots 14 and 15 cumulatively trigger a staffing mitigation phase,
- residential development at 25 percent plus any single condo hotel triggers a staffing mitigation phase, or
- medium-density residential development in Lots 16 and 18 cumulatively trigger a staffing mitigation phase.

Fire Staffing Mitigation Phases:

1. Provide a career staffing level of four personnel on-duty 24/7/365 at the Certificate of Occupancy of the first of any of the development phases described above.
2. Provide one part-time firefighter on 52 weekends for 10 hours per day at the Certificate of Occupancy of the second of any of the development phases described above.
3. Add a second part-time firefighter on 22 weekends for 10 hours per day at the Certificate of Occupancy of the third of any of the development phases described above.
4. Add a fifth career position 24/7/365 and drop the part-time firefighter on 22 weekends for 10 hours per day at the Certificate of Occupancy of the fourth of any of the development phases described above.
5. When the last phase, that includes one or more hotels and 75 percent of the residential units, has already been built, add a sixth career position 24/7/365 and drop the part-time firefighter on 52 weekends.

Also included in the development agreement will be the provision for project applicant support of a new fire substation in the western Olympic Valley area. Support could consist of the provision of land within the Specific Plan area for the substation, provision of land elsewhere in the Village area, assistance with conversion of the “old” fire station on Chamonix Place to the substation, or other measures. The development agreement will include the condition that by the time 50 percent of any combination of the condo hotel units has been built, the SVFD will have the fire substation in place and active. The substation will, at a minimum, have the capacity to house a two-person crew on weekends and peak activity holidays. The apparatus bay shall be large enough for one quick attack unit and one fire department reserve unit or specialty unit (two bays wide, one unit deep). The developer will be responsible for funding its equitable share of any gap in financing for the new fire substation, which is more specifically defined as its pro-rata share of the cost (based on qualified assessment benefit engineering) less incremental and cumulative tax revenues earned by the SVPSD that are specifically related to development of the project that have not been employed in funding gaps for other required mitigation obligations of the project.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Fees and tax revenue generated by the resort residential units included in the project would increase funding to the SVFD. This funding could be used to increase daily staffing of the existing fire station and to develop a new substation, allowing more opportunities to have sufficient active staff on a daily basis to respond to simultaneous calls for service. To ensure there is sufficient funding and resources to maintain desired response times, the project applicant would enter into a

development agreement with the SVPSPD containing defined benchmarks for staffing, facilities, and equipment at various phases of project development, as described in Mitigation Measure 14-7. This mitigation measure codifies the timing for addition of staff and substation construction by obligating the project applicant to fund and support the provision of fire protection services that are described in Chapter 3, "Project Description," and analyzed in this DEIR. Mitigation Measure 14-7 also alleviates the potential for congestion of Squaw Valley Road to impair emergency response during project operation by both limiting the potential for construction activities to adversely affect emergency response times and locating adequate emergency staff near anticipated emergency events. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 14-7, adequate fire protection access, staffing, and facilities would be available to maintain response time goals. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 14-7 would reduce the potential impact to fire protection and emergency services to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 14-8: Increased demand for sheriff/police services. The project would not result in the need for additional or expanded sheriff/police service facilities and would not result in decreased sheriff/police service levels. The impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 14-9: Increased demand for public schools. The project would add new resident employees to the Squaw Valley area and to nearby communities, thus adding new students to the TTUSD school system. Given existing capacity associated with declining enrollment in area schools, the limited potential for employment to generate new school demand in the area, and the requirement that developers pay applicable school facility fees, this impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

CHAPTER 15: HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND HAZARDS

Impact 15-1: Use of hazardous materials. Project construction and operation would require the use of hazardous materials. All use would occur consistent with applicable federal, state, and local regulations that would minimize the potential for upset or accident conditions. Therefore, the potential for release of hazardous materials that could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 15-2: Exposure of people and the environment to hazardous materials. Construction activities associated with project development would include demolition of existing structures, grubbing/clearing of on-site areas, excavation and relocation of soil on the project site, and backfilling and compaction of soils. Hazardous materials can present a risk to people or the environment through improper handling of hazardous materials or hazardous wastes, particularly by untrained personnel; environmentally unsound disposal methods; encountering existing naturally occurring hazardous materials; and disturbing existing undocumented contaminated soils or groundwater. Implementation of applicable local, state, and federal regulations and standards would help ensure that potential public health and environmental hazards would be minimized; however, if the project resulted in upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, a potentially significant hazard to the public or environment could occur.

Mitigation Measure 15-2a: Minimize potential for accidental release of hazardous materials.

- Prior to demolition of existing structures, the project applicant shall (1) identify locations that could contain hazardous residues; (2) remove plumbing fixtures known to contain, or potentially containing, hazardous materials; (3) determine the waste classification of the debris; (4) package contaminated items and wastes; and (5) identify disposal site(s) permitted to accept such wastes. These activities will be conducted in compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws.
- Prior to demolition of existing structures, the project applicant shall provide written documentation to the County that asbestos testing and abatement, as appropriate, has occurred in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws.
- Prior to demolition of existing structures, the project applicant shall provide written documentation to the County that lead-based paint testing and abatement, as appropriate, has been completed in accordance with applicable state and local laws and regulations. Abatement shall include the removal of lead contaminated soil (considered soil with lead concentrations greater than 400 parts per million in areas where children are likely to be present). If lead contaminated soil is to be removed, the project applicant shall submit a soil management plan to Placer County EHS.

Mitigation Measure 15-2b: Implement Mitigation Measure 13-2b. Mitigation Measure 13-2b, which requires the preparation of a Hazardous Materials Contingency Plan, shall be implemented by all personnel during construction. The plan will develop a response to evidence of previously undocumented, potentially hazardous materials that includes cessation of work and notification of Placer County EHS.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementing Mitigation Measures 15-2a and 15-2b would reduce Impact 15-2 to a less-than-significant level because Mitigation Measure 15-2a would require that asbestos-containing building materials, lead-based paint, and other hazardous substances in building components are identified, removed, packaged, and disposed of in accordance with applicable state laws and regulations. This would minimize the risk of an accidental release of hazardous substances that could adversely affect human health or the environment. Implementing Mitigation Measure 15-2b would require the project applicant to comply with regulatory requirements governing the clean-up of hazardous wastes, including removing contaminated soils and groundwater, if found, to the point where there is no unacceptable risk of exposure.

Impact 15-3: Emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. Construction and operation of the proposed project would include the use of common hazardous materials, such as diesel fuel, lubricants, and detergents. These materials would be handled in a manner consistent with local, state, and federal regulations and standards. Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in a less-than-significant impact related to the potential to emit hazardous emission, substances, or wastes within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 15-4: Interference with an adopted emergency evacuation plan. The existing surface parking lots at the Squaw Valley Ski Resort are currently used as the emergency rally point during emergencies, and would continue to be used as such during project construction. In the long-term, the new parking structures on Lots 11 and 12 would serve as the emergency rally point. The applicant is also preparing an Emergency Preparedness and Evacuation Plan (EPEP), which will address the potential risks from wildfire, seismic risks, avalanches, and flooding hazards within the plan area, as well as evacuation. The completed EPEP will be submitted to the Board of Supervisors when the Board considers project approval; it will be adopted as part of the VSVSP. The EPEP is intended to provide a coherent road map for which to prepare and guide VSVSP staff in the event of an emergency. However, during project construction and peak operational days, increased traffic congestion along Squaw Valley Road and SR 89 could still interfere with the use of these main roadways for emergency evacuation routes. Although this impact would be temporary and intermittent over the 25-year construction period, this impact would nonetheless be significant.

Mitigation Measure 15-4: Implement Mitigation Measure 9-8. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 9-8, which requires the preparation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan to, among other objectives, require removing potential traffic obstructions during emergency evacuation events.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementing Mitigation Measure 15-4 would reduce the impact from the potential interference with an adopted emergency evacuation plan to a less-than-significant level because the Placer County Department of Public Works would be involved in implementing measures to ensure acceptable traffic flow and reduce the risk of impairment to emergency evacuation routes.

Impact 15-5: Potential to disturb a known hazardous materials site, which could result in impacts to the public or the environment. No active hazardous materials sites have been identified within the main Village area or at the East Parcel. Past contamination due to leaking USTs has been fully remediated. Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts to the public or the environment related to exposure to hazardous materials due to activity on known hazardous materials sites.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 15-6: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildfires. Implementation of the Specific Plan would expose people and structures to an area with a high risk of wildfire. This impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 15-6a: Verify compliance with CAL FIRE regulations, California Government Code 66474.02. To verify compliance with California Government Code 66474.02, and to support the County's ability to make findings required by 66474.01, with each application for a tentative map with land in a state responsibility area or a high fire hazard severity zone, the project applicant will provide the following information related specifically to the lands within the state responsibility area or a high fire hazard severity zone:

- Documentation that the design and location of each lot in the subdivision, and the subdivision as a whole, are consistent with any applicable regulations adopted by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection pursuant to Sections 4290 and 4291 of the Public Resources Code.

- Documentation that structural fire protection and suppression services will be available for the subdivision through any of the following entities:
 - A county, city, special district, political subdivision of the state, or another entity organized solely to provide fire protection services that is monitored and funded by a county or other public entity; or
 - The Department of Forestry and Fire Protection by contract entered into pursuant to Section 4133, 4142, or 4144 of the Public Resources Code.

- Documentation that, to the extent practicable, ingress and egress for the subdivision meets the regulations regarding road standards for fire equipment access adopted pursuant to Section 4290 of the Public Resources Code and any applicable local ordinance.

Mitigation Measure 15-6b: Implement Mitigation Measures 14-7b and 9-7. As described further in Chapter 14, “Public Services and Utilities,” the project applicant would be required to enter into an agreement with the SVFD to ensure that they will be afforded the necessary assets to maintain or improve the level of service currently provided to existing customers; this agreement would include appropriate benchmarks and thresholds to correlate infrastructure needs with phases of development (see Mitigation Measure 14-7b).

The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 9-7, provided in Chapter 9, “Transportation and Circulation,” which would require that a Construction Traffic Management Plan be developed, and that measures contained therein be implemented to maintain emergency vehicle access on area roadways.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

The Specific Plan would expose people and structures to an area with a high risk of wildfire. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures 15-6a and 15-6b, appropriate precautions would be in place so that there would not be a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from wildfire. This impact would, therefore, be less than significant.

Impact 15-7: Create or expose people to an existing source of health hazards. Construction and operation of the Specific Plan could result in additional mosquito breeding habitat, which could contribute to an existing health hazard associated with vector control. This impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 15-7: Address potential public health risks related to mosquitos.

The project applicant shall abide by the Placer Mosquito Abatement District Guidelines and Standards for Vector Prevention in Proposed Development. Prior to Final Subdivision Map(s) approval, a mosquito control management/maintenance program shall be prepared by the project applicant and approved by the Placer Mosquito Abatement District. If the District determines that the project would create new temporary or permanent mosquito breeding habitats during construction or operation, the District shall recommend design modifications and best management practices. In addition, the project applicant shall provide District technicians access to the project site to inspect and treat breeding habitats, as necessary to reduce risks to public health.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 15-7 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level because the project applicant would be required to incorporate design and best management practices to reduce the potential for mosquitos and the Placer Mosquito Abatement District would inspect and treat areas as necessary to reduce risks to public health.

CHAPTER 16: GREENHOUSE GASES & CLIMATE CHANGE

Impact 16-1: Construction-generated greenhouse gas emissions. Construction-generated GHG emissions would not exceed PCAPCD's recommended Tier I mass emission threshold. Therefore, GHG emissions from project-related construction would not be substantial. This impact would be less than significant.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 16-3: Impacts of climate change on the project. Climate change is projected to result in a variety of effects that would influence conditions in the Specific Plan area including increased temperatures, leading to increased wildland fire risk; changes to timing and intensity of precipitation, resulting in increased stormwater runoff and flood risk; and potentially changes to snow pack conditions that could be more favorable 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. This impact would be **less than significant**.

FINDING

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.)

CHAPTER 18: OTHER CEQA SECTIONS (CUMULATIVE IMPACTS)

For the reasons set forth in Chapter 18 of the Draft EIR and Final EIR, the County finds the following cumulative impacts and/or the project's contribution to cumulative impacts to be less than significant. Mitigation measures are not required.

- **Impact 18-1**: Cumulative land use effects.
- **Impact 18-2**: Cumulative effect on forestry resources.
- **Impact 18-3**: Cumulative population growth and housing demand induced by construction.
- **Impact 18-4**: Cumulative inducement of population growth.
- **Impact 18-5**: Cumulative displacement of a substantial number of housing or people.
- **Impact 18-17**: Create additional shadowing on existing structures or facilities during a substantial portion of the day.
- **Impact 18-27**: Cumulative emissions of particulate matter.
- **Impact 18-28**: Cumulative exposure to mobile-source carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations.
- **Impact 18-29**: Cumulative exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants.

- **Impact 18-30**: Cumulative exposure of sensitive receptors to odors.
- **Impact 18-36**: Cumulative impact of facility construction or abandonment to groundwater and surface water quality.
- **Impact 18-37**: Cumulative, long-term impacts to groundwater patterns, recharge, and aquifer storage in the Olympic Valley Groundwater Basin.
- **Impact 18-39**: Cumulative provision of public services and utilities.
- **Impact 18-40**: Cumulative effects on wastewater delivery infrastructure.
- **Impact 18-42**: Cumulative wildland fire hazards.
- **Impact 18-44**: Cumulative impacts of climate change on the project.

FINDING

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.)

Impact 18-6: Cumulative effects on sensitive habitats. Implementation of the project together with past, present, and reasonably probable future project, would have the potential to result in significant cumulative effects on sensitive habitats.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Based on the no net loss standard required by state and federal laws as well as County policies, and mitigation measures included in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, the Specific Plan would not contribute considerably to the overall significant cumulative effect on sensitive habitats in the Tahoe-Truckee Region. This cumulative impact would be less than significant.

Impact 18-7: Cumulative effects on special-status wildlife. When combined with other past, present, and probable future projects with similar biological effects, implementation the Specific Plan could contribute to an adverse cumulative effect on special-status wildlife.(Draft EIR, pp. 18-10 to 18-11.)

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

While project activities may occur over a 25-year period, disturbances to breeding activities, effects on reproductive success, and the potential for direct mortality or injury to special-status wildlife would be avoided or minimized through implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Chapter 6, “Biological Resources” of the Draft EIR and Final EIR. Therefore, implementation of the VSVSP would result in a less-than-significant contribution to the cumulative impact on special-status wildlife species.

Impact 18-8: Cumulative effects on wildlife movement corridors. Known animal movement corridors in the project area include the migratory route of the Loyalton-Truckee mule deer herd. Mule deer historically were in greater numbers and have decreased due to habitat loss especially critical winter use areas and fawning areas. Implementation of the VSVSP could temporarily disturb mule deer and their habitat use, especially fawning areas.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

While a small portion of potential fawning habitat will be removed, most construction activities are not occurring in or near mule deer fawning areas and Mitigation Measure 6-7 would reduce disturbance impacts to fawning mule deer in

meadow areas. Therefore, impacts to fawning are expected to be minor. Mule deer are highly mobile and adaptive, and potential effects of temporary construction and restoration activities on movement are expected to be minor. Construction of the project would not create any temporary barriers to movement that would redirect migration during non-working hours. No substantial permanent impacts to mule deer fawning, foraging, or movement habitat throughout the project area are anticipated as a result of project implementation, although some habitat loss would occur within potential fawning areas. Therefore, implementation of the VSVSP would result in a less-than-significant contribution to the cumulative impact on mule deer migration and fawning.

Impact 18-9: Cumulative effects on special-status plants. Implementing the Specific Plan would result in loss and disturbance of occupied alderleaf coffeeberry habitat and habitat that could support other special-status plant species. For some of these special-status species, there is a baseline overall significant cumulative effect in the region due to direct removal of existing populations and loss and alteration of suitable habitat. The Specific Plan could contribute toward this cumulative impact on special-status plants by removing individual listed plants, if they are present in areas to be disturbed.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-8 would minimize, avoid, and reduce potential direct and indirect impacts on special-status plants to a less-than-significant level by identifying special-status plant populations and avoiding them or compensating for losses through a CDFW approved mitigation plan. Due to the ability to avoid impacts or to fully compensate for impacts on special-status plants that cannot be avoided, the project would result in a less-than-significant contribution to the overall significant cumulative effect on special-status plants in the region.

Impact 18-10: Cumulative effects related to tree removal. There is an existing significant adverse cumulative impact associated with loss of trees and forest land. The project could potentially contribute to this significant cumulative impacts.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Depending on their location, construction of probable future projects listed in Table 18-2 may require tree removal to clear areas for construction and/or to promote the establishment of defensible space and reduction of hazardous fuels. However, tree

removal proposed as part of these projects would typically require assessment and mitigation, including compliance with the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance, which requires compensation through new plantings or payment of tree replacement mitigation fees for qualifying removed trees, reducing the project's overall contribution to cumulative tree removal effects.

Construction of the Specific Plan would result in the removal and/or damage of trees, some of which are protected by local ordinances and State regulations. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-9 would reduce significant impacts on trees to a less-than-significant level because impacts to trees requiring county tree permits would be minimized consistent with the County Ordinances, tree removal would be conducted in a manner that would preserve and protect surrounding natural resources, and qualifying removed trees would be compensated for through new plantings or payment of tree replacement mitigation fees. Because the magnitude of tree removal is expected to be low relative to the distribution and availability of forest land in the region; most tree removal would be limited to common vegetation types; many of the trees that would be removed are within, or along the edges of existing developed areas; and compensation for removed trees would be implemented; tree removal as a result of the VSVSP is not expected to contribute to changes in the composition, abundance, or regional patterns of forest resources in the region. Therefore, tree removal as a result of the VSVSP would result in a less-than-significant contribution to the overall significant cumulative effect related to tree removal in the region.

Impact 18-11: Cumulative effects on fish and aquatic habitat. Cumulative aquatic habitat loss is considered to be a significant cumulative impact because of overall habitat degradation in Squaw Creek.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

It is not anticipated that implementation of the Specific Plan, in combination with other development in Olympic Valley, would contribute substantially to the cumulative loss of aquatic habitat in the area. Project construction activities, including excavations and well construction, could result in water quality impacts on fish and aquatic resources. Additionally, if sewer line segments are not properly abandoned or removed, or if appropriate measures are not taken to protect surface waters during utility line stream crossings and other in stream work, temporary degradation of aquatic habitat and/or direct hazards to aquatic life could result. However, all projects would be subject to the same standard regulatory measures and permit conditions related to protecting groundwater and/or surface waters. In the long-term, the increase in groundwater extraction, along with continued and increased pumping in existing and new wells, particularly near the stream corridor,

could result in long-term impacts to fish and fish habitat downstream in the meadow reach of Squaw Creek nearest the well field. The cumulative effects of groundwater pumping on fish and vegetation are discussed in Impact 6-1. Mitigation has been recommended to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the project would make a less-than-significant contribution to the overall significant cumulative effect on fish and aquatic habitat in Olympic Valley.

Impact 18-13: Cumulative effect on archaeological resources and human remains. The proposed project, in combination with other development in Truckee-Tahoe Basin could contribute to the loss of significant archaeological resources. Without mitigation, implementation of the proposed VSVSP has the potential to further disturb human remains and cause a substantial change in the significance of archaeological resources that are unique and non-renewable members of finite classes. Therefore, without mitigation the project's incremental contribution to these cumulative effects would itself be potentially cumulatively considerable; therefore, this is a potentially significant cumulative impact. (Draft EIR, pp. 18-13 to 18-14.)

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures 7-2, 7-3a, 7-3b, 7-3c, and 7-3d, adverse effects on currently known archeological resources, and potentially newly discovered archeological resources and human remains would be avoided. With implementation of these measures the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulative loss of archaeological resources or human remains.

Impact 18-19: Cumulative impacts to Placer County roadways. The proposed project would add 200 daily trips during the cumulative Saturday winter condition to West River Street east of SR 89 and 2,800 daily trips to the segment of Squaw Valley Road between SR 89 and Squaw Creek Road. The West River Street east of SR 89 segment would operate at level of service (LOS) A under the cumulative no project condition and the Squaw Valley Road between SR 89 and Squaw Creek Road segment would operate at LOS B. These segments would continue to operate at acceptable levels (LOS A and D respectively) with the addition of project trips. Therefore, the addition of project trips would not have a significant adverse effect on the operation of these two Placer County roadway segments.

The proposed project would add 2,400 daily trips during the cumulative Saturday winter condition to the segment of Squaw Valley Road between Squaw Creek Road and the Village Area. This would cause this two-lane segment to worsen from LOS E to F under cumulative conditions. The v/c ratio would increase by 0.16. Since this increase is greater than the 0.05 v/c ratio increase threshold, this degradation is considered a significant cumulative impact.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 9-1a, which includes conducting traffic management when the expected amount of daily traffic on Squaw Valley Road would reach or exceed 13,500 ADT, and Mitigation Measure 9-1b, which includes developing and distributing real-time information regarding available parking spaces in lots/garages in the Village Area and average travel speeds on Squaw Valley Road, would reduce this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level as a result of the added roadway capacity the measures would provide.

Impact 18-20: Cumulative impacts to Placer County intersections. The proposed project would cause the following cumulatively considerable degradations in operations at intersections along Squaw Valley Road, which are under the jurisdiction of Placer County:

- Squaw Valley Road/Village East Road – operations would worsen as follows:
 - winter Sunday p.m. peak hour: LOS F operations exacerbated (approximately 70 second increase in delay).
- Squaw Valley Road/Far East Road/Christy Hill Road – operations would worsen as follows:
 - winter Saturday a.m. peak hour: LOS F operations exacerbated (over two minute delay increase).
 - winter Sunday p.m. peak hour: LOS F operations exacerbated (over two minute delay increase).
 - summer Friday p.m. peak hour: LOS C to F operations.
- Squaw Valley Road/Wayne Road – operations would worsen as follows:
 - winter Saturday a.m. peak hour: LOS E operations exacerbated (approximately 9 second increase in delay).
 - winter Sunday p.m. peak hour: LOS D to E operations (approximately 18 second increase in delay at worst leg).
- Squaw Valley Road/Squaw Creek Road – operations would worsen as follows:
 - winter Saturday a.m. peak hour: LOS E to F (approximately 85 second increase in delay at worst leg).
 - winter Sunday p.m. peak hour: LOS F operations exacerbated (approximately 46 second increase in delay at worst leg).
 - summer Friday p.m. peak hour: LOS B to F operations at worst leg.

Each of these intersections has a LOS C standard with the exception of the Squaw Valley Road/Squaw Creek Road intersection whose standard is LOS D since it is located within ½ mile of a state highway. At each of these intersections, projected operations under the cumulative no

project condition would already be at unacceptable levels during one or more peak hours. The project would add trips to each intersection, causing a greater than 2.5-second increase in delay. Hence, those degradations are considered cumulatively significant.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 9-2a through 9-2d, which include conducting traffic management along Squaw Valley Road, would reduce this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level because operations would be restored to acceptable levels. The traffic management procedures recommended for the Squaw Valley Road/Wayne Road and Squaw Valley Road/Squaw Creek Road intersections were analyzed to determine how the LOS would change. With the use of traffic management personnel, they would each operate similar to a two-phased signalized intersection. Traffic conditions would be improved at the Squaw Valley Road/Far East Road/Christy Hill Road intersection by restricting turning movements on Far East Road during peak periods. Based on the cumulative plus project traffic volumes and anticipated right-of-way allocations, these intersections would operate at LOS C or better with traffic management.

Impact 18-24: Cumulative impacts to transit. During peak winter conditions, up to 550 project-related employees may be expected to work in the main Village area and reside outside of Olympic Valley. About two-thirds of these employees are expected to work the day shift (i.e., 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.). During the winter season, about 8 percent of existing Squaw Valley employees use TART to commute to work. This suggests that the project could add approximately 30 riders to the morning inbound TART service to Squaw Valley. Table 9-17 (provided in Chapter 9, “Transportation and Circulation”) indicates that weekend morning TART buses between Tahoe City and Squaw Valley are approaching capacity during peak winter conditions. The addition of transit riders from existing, proposed, approved, and planned development in Olympic Valley would serve to compound this existing condition, resulting in a significant cumulative impact related to public transit. Because the project could cause a demand for public transit that exceeds what is currently provided unless expanded service is implemented, resulting in a significant contribution to this cumulative impact.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 9-7, which requires the creation of a Community Service Area (CSA) or Community Facilities District (CFD) and/or that the project pay its fair share to TART to provide additional funding to

accommodate project demand. This would ensure that that the project contribution to cumulative transit demand is not considerable would reduce this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 18-25: Cumulative construction transportation impacts. Project construction would include demolition of existing buildings and parking lots, and construction of a variety of buildings, landscaping, parking structures, and other site amenities. These activities would generate truck and employee trips, which would use SR 89 and Squaw Valley Road to access the Village area. It is anticipated that the majority of these activities would occur during summer and fall, which typically have lower traffic levels on Squaw Valley Road when compared to winter conditions. Details of the construction activity are not known at this time. Therefore, it would be speculative to conduct any type of quantitative analysis. However, because of the extent and duration of construction of the proposed project (annually during the construction season for 20+ years), the potential exists for VSVSP construction to occur concurrently with construction of other projects in Olympic Valley, and the overlapping construction activities to result in a prolonged lane closures, increased damage to roadbeds, and greater traffic hazards to bikes/pedestrians. Therefore, a significant cumulative construction transportation impact could occur, and because the proposed project is likely to generate the most construction traffic within the Olympic Valley, it would make a significant contribution to this cumulative impact.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 9-8, which requires the development and implementation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan and would include coordination of activities between the proposed project and any other construction-activities in the Olympic Valley, would reduce this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 18-26: Cumulative emissions of ozone precursors. The nonattainment designation of Placer County with respect to ozone is the result of the emissions of ozone precursors, reactive organic gasses (ROG), and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), 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 NO_x throughout the region are combined they can result in a severe ozone problem, as expressed by the nonattainment status with respect to the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and/or National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone, which is considered to be a significant cumulative impact. As described in Impacts 10-1 and 10-2, project construction emissions would not exceed significance thresholds for any pollutants, but operational emissions of ozone precursors, ROG, and NO_x, would be substantially higher than PCAPCD's cumulative thresholds. PCAPCD's cumulative threshold for operational emissions of ROG and NO_x is 10 lb/day; at buildout, project operation would emit 181.7 lbs/day of ROG and 86.5 lbs/day of NO_x during the summer ozone season. Thus, the

proposed project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Because Mitigation Measure 10-2 includes a menu of actions that, in combination, would reduce the project's net emissions of ROG and NO_x to less than 10 lb/day, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 18-32: Cumulative long-term ambient noise levels. Cumulative noise levels could be affected by additional build-out of surrounding land uses and increases in vehicular traffic on affected roadways. Several new large developments (e.g., Gregory Creek Subdivision, Coldstream Specific Plan, Joerger Ranch Specific Plan) and others (see Draft EIR Table 18-2 for a complete list) are planned in the Tahoe Basin, surrounding the project area. These projects could result in additional traffic-related noise on surrounding roadways and would contribute to an already existing cumulative traffic-noise condition (i.e., existing traffic-noise levels exceed applicable noise standards throughout the Tahoe Basin). Therefore, and as shown in Table 18-7 in the Draft EIR, roadways under the cumulative conditions exceed Placer County noise standards as well. Thus, project-generated traffic under the cumulative condition would further increase traffic noise. In addition, because the project would cause traffic-related noise increases on certain roadways during certain circumstances (i.e., Squaw Valley Road during certain peak days in the summer) to exceed applicable standards where they currently do not, the project would contribute to the cumulative impact related to traffic-noise in the Olympic Valley (i.e., traffic noise levels on Squaw Valley Road could result in noise increases of up to 4.3 A-weighted decibels [dBA] as shown in Table 18-7).

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 11-5 would require the installation of a rubberized hot mix asphalt overlay (RHMA) on portions of Squaw Valley Road that would experience the greatest noise increases. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce traffic-related noise on Squaw Valley Road (the road experiencing the highest traffic-noise increase and thus responsible for the significant impact) by at least 4 dB. As such, Mitigation Measure 11-5 would reduce the project-generated traffic-noise level increase to below 1 db, a level that is imperceptible to the human ear. Traffic noise level increases on other affected roadways would range from 0.5 to 1.6 dB (See Draft EIR Table 18-7). A 1-2 dB increase is generally not perceptible.

Further, per Placer County Municipal Code, a 5 dB increase in noise would be considered substantial. Therefore, as project-generated traffic noise levels on Squaw Valley Road would be reduced to below 1 dB and all other affected roadways would not experience a traffic-noise increase of more than 2 dB, the project would not contribute substantially to the existing cumulative traffic-noise levels. The project's traffic noise impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

With regards to stationary noise increases, the proposed project would result in land use development that typically includes stationary noise sources such as noise from HVAC units, electrical generators, parking lots, commercial loading docks, and outdoor recreational activities. However, these noise sources would be isolated to the project area and therefore would not combine with other stationary noise sources in the geographic scope of cumulative impacts. Impacts from stationary noise sources would be considered less than significant.

Impact 18-33: Cumulative, long-term exposure of structures and persons to effects of ground rupture and shaking. Olympic Valley is in a seismically active region and could be subject to low or moderate ground acceleration in the event of an earthquake on faults in the vicinity. While there are no Alquist-Priolo zones designated in the Valley, prior geologic maps and studies have identified fault traces that cross the Valley, including traces through the existing Village, near the Olympic Channel, and near the Resort at Squaw Creek. The Fault Evaluation Report (Holdrege & Kull 2015) prepared for the VSVSP recommends that additional site-specific analysis be conducted prior to formulating final conclusions about whether there are any on-site sources of fault rupture (see Mitigation Measure 12-1). No fault studies have been completed to establish the activity status, extent, or likelihood of rupture on these traces as part of project technical reports for other foreseeable projects in or adjacent to (e.g., Alpine Sierra Subdivision) Olympic Valley. Therefore, the spatial uncertainty regarding on-site fault traces could result in structures inadvertently being located and constructed over or near a previously unknown active fault. This could result in unanticipated, higher levels of seismic risks to persons visiting or residing on-site.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 12-1 would not eliminate the risks of earthquake rupture or shaking to result in structural damage or injury and death of persons, the measures would lower the magnitude and probability of the impact to an acceptable level, consistent with other development in the region. This cumulative impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 18-34: Cumulative, long-term exposure of structures and persons to risks of liquefaction and lateral spreading due to seismic shaking. Based on preliminary geotechnical information (Holdrege & Kull 2011) for the VSVSP, the subsurface conditions at the west end of

Olympic Valley are highly varied, stratified, and include areas of artificial fill, loose granular sands, and other materials that could be vulnerable to liquefaction and/or lateral spreading. While the vicinity is generally suitable for standard methods of engineering and design, the selection of appropriate approaches, methods and specific applications must be further verified after additional detailed studies to assure suitable geotechnical design guidance, foundation and structural integrity. Because some of the foreseeable projects are also in this portion of Olympic Valley, and the geologic materials throughout the Valley floor also have spatially varied characteristics that could include loose granular sands or other materials vulnerable to hazards, the same risk would apply.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 12-2 would provide certainty about the potential for on-site secondary seismic hazards and provide a final design guidance for building layouts, foundation engineering, and structural standards that would be consistent with and adequate for the actual seismic hazards of the site (as determined by Mitigation Measure 12-1). While these measures would not eliminate the risks of secondary seismic hazards to result in structural damage or injury and death of persons, the measures would lower the magnitude and probability of the impact to an acceptable level, consistent with other development in the region. This cumulative impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 18-35: Cumulative, long-term exposure of structures and persons to effects of snow avalanche. Implementation of the project and other development within the Olympic Valley, while based on sound scientific evidence regarding the likely areas at risk of avalanche hazards and incorporating measures to reduce structural risks and to minimize risks to persons, would increase risk of injury or death to persons from avalanche hazards. (See in Draft EIR, pp. 18-36 to 18-37 for further discussion.)

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 12-3 would provide final design guidance for building layouts, foundation engineering, and structural standards that would be consistent with and adequate for the actual avalanche hazards of each site and provide a more complete and comprehensive mitigation program to identify, inform, and instruct all persons that would potentially be at additional risk due to the project and other foreseeable projects in Olympic Valley. While these measures would not eliminate the risks of

avalanches to result in structural damage or injury and death of persons, the measures would lower the magnitude and probability of the impact to an acceptable level, consistent with other development in the region. This cumulative impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 18-38: Cumulative groundwater pumping changes to groundwater and surface water interactions and water quality within and downstream of the plan area. The proposed project, along with other cumulative development, is expected to generate new water demands on the Olympic Valley alluvial aquifer. The project's contribution to this cumulative impact is potentially significant. (See Draft EIR, pp. 18-42 to 18-45 for a thorough discussion.)

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 13-4, requiring development and implementation of a Pumping Management Plan with performance standards and monitoring, would reduce the potential for this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 18-41: Cumulative hazardous materials effects. Although the transport, storage, and use of hazardous materials would occur as part of the construction and operation of the proposed project, 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, interactions among multiple hazardous materials releases on a cumulative basis often require close proximity between the releases.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The effect as mitigated will be less than significant.

Given the limited potential for hazardous materials contamination to occur as a result of the proposed project, the legal requirements to clean up any releases, and the limited potential for any project generated contamination to interact on a cumulative basis with other incidents of contamination, the proposed project (with implementation of Mitigation Measures 15-2a through 15-2c) would not make a significant contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to hazardous materials. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant cumulative impact.