
18.0 RECREATION

18.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

18.1.1 Project Area

Homewood is an unincorporated community in Placer County, California, located on the west shore of Lake Tahoe. The ski resort, located a few miles south of Tahoe City, has approximately 1,200 acres of skiable terrain with views of Lake Tahoe. The resort experiences around 400 inches of snow precipitation a year and has about 300 days of sunny weather a year. Ellis Peak shields the resort from the high winds created by storms coming over the Sierra Crest.

The Project area is situated with TRPA Plan Area Statements (PAS) 157 – Homewood/Ski Homewood Area, 158 – McKinney Tract, and 159 – Homewood/Commercial. Recreation opportunities in the Project area are mostly associated with Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR). Beyond downhill alpine skiing, the Project area includes cross-country skiing trails, hiking and mountain bike trails for summer use, and fishing at Quail Lake. Adjacent to the Project area, recreation opportunities are available on USDA Forest Service (USFS) Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU) lands and waters of Lake Tahoe.

A Class III Bike Route, a roadway with shoulder and bike route signage, owned and operated by Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD) and identified by the Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition on their bike trails map, parallels SR 89 through the Project area. The trail serves up to 400 bicyclists and 100 pedestrians per day. User surveys north of Homewood recorded an average of 93 bicyclists per hour in July, with 66% of trips recreation-related and 33% non-recreation trips (Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Agency 2008). The trail is discontinuous between Fawn Street and Cherry Street, where users must travel on the street with motor vehicle traffic.

A Class I Bike Trail, a shared use separate paved trail with two travel lanes and shoulders for bike and pedestrian uses, extends from Tahoe Pines to the west to Tahoe City to the east, and south of Homewood towards Meeks Bay. A segment of Class I Bike Trail runs between the North Base and South Base areas at HMR. The trail runs along San Souci Terrace, Sans Souci Boulevard, and Prospect Avenue, which runs parallel to SR 89 one block to the east, between Fawn Street in the north to Tahoe Ski Bowl Way in the south (Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Agency 2006).

In the Madden Creek drainage on the north side of HMR two roads ascend in the westerly direction towards Lake Louise. One road extends from San Souci Terrace, while the other extends from the resorts North Base area. The roads join and follow a ridge to the south, west of Quail Lake, through USFS land and connect with the Rubicon Trail in the McKinney Creek drainage.

PAS 158 – McKinney Tract is adjacent to HMR and includes predominantly residential uses. Most of the shoreline of Lake Tahoe in PAS 158 is privately-owned, although Chambers Landing Beach provides public access to the shoreline and lake. Forest roads and the McKinney Rubicon Springs Road provide mountain biking and hiking opportunities.

PAS 159 – Homewood/Commercial includes two privately-owned marinas on the Lake Tahoe shoreline: the Homewood Marina (moorings and boat storage) and Obexer's Marina (moorings, slips and boat storage). Boating and beach recreation opportunities are available at the both marinas.

18.1.2 West Shore Area

In the Placer County portion of the west shore of Lake Tahoe, there are five public day use parks and overnight campgrounds. Quail Creek Park is located to the southeast of HMR near Quail Lake. The park is operated by the TCPUD and offers hiking, picnicking, and swimming. The USFS LTBMU operates William Kent Campground and Kaspian Campground and Picnic Area to the north of Homewood, and Meeks Bay to the south. California State Parks operates Ed Z-Berg Sugar Pine Point and D. L. Bliss State Parks to the south of Homewood.

Burton Creek State Park is located approximately 6 miles north of the Project area, Ed Z'berg Sugar Pine Point State Park located about 3 miles to the south of the Project area, and D. L. Bliss/Emerald Bay State Parks (two separate State parks managed as a single unit) are located about 12 miles south of the Project area. Burton Creek State Park is currently undeveloped – no dedicated parking is available and it receives relatively little recreational use. Ed Z'berg Sugar Pine Point State Park had 24,871 visitor days for day use and overnight camping in July 2009. D.L. Bliss/Emerald Bay State Parks had 25,107 visitor days for day use and overnight camping in July 2009 (Humphrey 2009). During peak summer demand periods, especially during weekends, parking remains available at Sugar Pine Point State Park, but campers are often turned away when the parks camping capacity is reached. At D.L. Bliss/Emerald Bay State Parks, campers are turned away when campground capacity is reached, and day use parking capacity, particularly at the Vikingsholm trailhead, is often exceeded (Lindemann 2009). Current trends of increased California population growth and increases in active outdoor life styles are anticipated to continue, increasing demand for existing State park facilities (California Department of Parks and Recreation 2005).

18.2 REGULATORY SETTING

18.2.1 Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

TRPA Regional Plan Recreation Thresholds and Plan Element

The Value Statement, a statement that describes the desired condition, established for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's (TRPA) Recreation Threshold is found in the "Study Report for the Establishment of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities" and states that recreation is to:

"Maintain opportunities and facilities for the full spectrum of outdoor recreational uses to a socially acceptable level of concentration" (TRPA 1982).

In keeping with this Value Statement, the TRPA developed performance standards known as Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities (ETCCs). For recreation resources, it is the policy of the TRPA Governing Body to:

- Preserve and enhance the high quality recreational experience including preservation of high-quality undeveloped shorezone and other natural areas;
- Consider provisions for additional access, where lawful and feasible, to the shorezone and high quality undeveloped areas for low density recreational uses; and
- Establish and ensure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation is available to the general public.

In the environmental review of projects, the TRPA defines an impact based upon whether the action will degrade the quality of the recreation experience, quantity and capacity of existing

recreational opportunities, or public access to recreational areas. The Recreation Element of the *Regional Plan* (TRPA 1986) establishes specific goals and policies to support the Recreation ETCC. The goals and policies provide for the development, utilization, and management of the recreational resources. The Recreation Element has three Subelements:

- 1) Dispersed Recreation, such as hiking, jogging, primitive camping, nature study, fishing, cross-country skiing, rafting/kayaking, and swimming;
- 2) Developed Recreation, including campgrounds, visitor information centers, and boat launching facilities; and
- 3) Urban Recreation, including day use areas, recreation centers, and participant sports facilities. Urban recreation is normally provided in urban areas and is primarily intended to serve the needs of local residents, as oppose to tourists or other visitors to the region.

Dispersed Recreation, Developed Recreation, and Urban Recreation Subelement goals and policies intend to achieve and maintain the ETCCs by ensuring that recreational opportunities keep pace with public demand, that recreational facilities remain high on the development priority list, and that the quality of the outdoor recreational experience is maintained.

Dispersed Recreation Subelement Goals

The natural landscape of the Lake Tahoe Basin provides opportunities for dispersed forms of recreation that require little or no developed facilities. The value or quality of a particular activity depends on preserving the attractiveness and ecological integrity of the use areas and managing the resources that support the activity or experience. Dispersed Recreation Subelement Goals and Policies include:

Goal 1. Encourage opportunities for dispersed recreation when consistent with environmental values and protection of the natural resources. Dispersed recreation involves such activities as hiking, jogging, primitive camping, nature study, fishing, cross-country skiing, rafting/kayaking, and swimming. These activities require a quality resource base and some degree of solitude. Achieving this goal will require commitments to develop support facilities and provide access such as trails, trailheads, restrooms in heavily used areas, and some hardening to protect the land.

Goal 2. Provide high-quality recreational opportunities. Numerous opportunities exist in the Lake Tahoe Basin to provide varied and quality recreational experiences. High-quality recreational opportunities often depend on limiting conflicts between uses and ensuring that uses are compatible with affected resources.

Developed Recreation Subelement Goals and Policies

Developed facilities in the Lake Tahoe Basin include marina/launch facilities, ski areas, campgrounds, several group facilities, a visitor information center, and beaches. The goals of the Developed Recreation Subelement relate to making sure other developments do not result in a reduced capacity of developed recreation facilities. Developed Recreation Subelement Goals and Policies include:

Goal 1. Provide a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation. This goal addresses the need to reserve capacity for recreation-oriented types of development. Capacity will be reserved in terms of water supply, land coverage, and air and water quality. Public

roads and transportation systems shall be managed to provide service to outdoor recreation areas.

Policy 1. All existing reservations of services for outdoor recreation shall continue to be committed for such purposes. The purpose of this policy is to recognize existing reserve commitments for outdoor recreation, such as the reservation of sewage capacity by the LTBMU, and to ensure such commitments are not lost or diverted to interests other than recreation.

Policy 2. When reviewing projects that commit significant resources to non-outdoor recreation uses, TRPA shall be required to make written findings that sufficient resource capacity remains to obtain the recreation goals and policies of this plan. Based on estimated recreational development permitted by the *Regional Plan*, the TRPA shall specify "fair share" estimates for the Basin and local areas of critical services and resources. Non-recreational projects may not be approved that utilize reserved capacities.

Policy 3. Provisions shall be made for additional developed outdoor recreation facilities capable of accommodating 6,114 PAOT in overnight facilities and 6,761 PAOT in summer day-use facilities and 12,400 PAOT in winter day-use facilities.

Goal 2. Provide for the appropriate type, location, and rate of development of outdoor recreational uses. The appropriate type and rate of outdoor recreational development should depend on demand. The location of facilities should be responsive to both environmental concerns and site amenities.

Policy 1. Expansion of recreational facilities and opportunities should be in response to demand. This strategy provides for expansion of existing recreational facilities and opportunity for development of new facilities if they meet ETCCs. Opportunity may be expanded to respond to public need if physical resources are available and traffic mitigation measures can be implemented.

Policy 2. Bike trails shall be expanded to provide alternatives for travel in conjunction with transportation systems. This policy encourages additional bike trail systems, emphasizing expansion near urban areas to establish alternative modes of travel to reduce vehicle miles of travel (VMT).

Policy 7. Development of day-use facilities shall be encouraged in or near established urban areas, whenever practical. Day-use facilities are generally in high demand close to urban areas, where residents can use facilities with minimal travel. This policy encourages new day-use facilities near urban areas or where the particular use or service is best suited.

Policy 8. Visitor information facilities shall be located, to the extent feasible, near entry points to the Basin or close to urban areas. These facilities serve the public by exchanging information and by providing travelers with directions to major attractions. The siting of these facilities should complement objectives to reduce the VMTs in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Policy 9. Parking along scenic corridors shall be restricted to protect roadway views and roadside vegetation. This policy would reduce roadside parking by providing off-road parking "satellites" in conjunction with roadside barriers.

Policy 10. Transit operations, including shuttle-type boat service, should serve major recreation facilities and attractions. Transit operations can reduce vehicle trips and the need for parking at recreation areas and facilities. Decreased auto use in many areas would enhance the recreational experience.

Goal 3. Protect natural resources from overuse and rectify incompatibility between uses. Overcrowding and conflicting uses can degrade recreation resources and experiences.

Policy 1. Recreation development shall be consistent with the special resources of the area. The physical and biological characteristics of the Lake Tahoe Basin create a unique variety of recreational opportunities. These qualities define the types of recreational activities that are compatible with the Basin's natural features. Avoid activities that are best served elsewhere or are incompatible with the Basin's natural qualities.

Policy 2. Regulate intensity, timing, type, and location of use to protect resources and separate incompatible uses. Regulations will be adopted and enforced dealing with the timing, types of use and PAOTs permitted for various activities to avoid conflicts with fish, wildlife, and vegetation. Incompatible activities between visitors would be separated by establishing use areas for dispersed recreation separate from developed recreation areas. This strategy would examine overall demand and planned capacity and determine site-specific areas within the Lake Tahoe Basin for the various demands to be met.

Goal 4. Provide for the efficient use of outdoor recreation resources. Some recreational areas - ski areas, beaches, campgrounds, and picnic areas - have wide fluctuations in seasonal and weekday use. This goal promotes a more balanced use of facilities and sites on a year-round and weekly basis.

Policy 1. Promote the use of underutilized recreation areas through programs that improve the public awareness of recreation opportunities and through an expanded water and inland transit system.

Policy 2. Seasonal facilities should provide opportunities for alternative uses in the off-season, wherever appropriate.

Urban Recreation Subelement Goals and Policies

Numerous outdoor recreational opportunities are conveniently located near urban areas. High-demand facilities include participant sports facilities and day-use facilities such as picnic areas, parks, and recreation centers. The demand for such public facilities must be anticipated in order to reserve sufficient capacity for future expansion or development. Urban Recreation Subelement Goals and Policies include:

Goal 1. Provide sufficient capacity for local-oriented forms of outdoor and indoor recreation in urban areas. Recreational facilities in the Lake Tahoe Basin more than accommodate the needs of residents, but these facilities are more regional in nature and cater to visitors. The specialized recreational needs of residents need to be considered apart from the more general demands of the tourist.

Policy 1. Reserve sufficient public service and facility capacity to accommodate all forms of urban recreation. Areas suitable for urban-oriented recreation facilities need to be identified,

appropriately acquired, and managed by local government or service districts. The demand for such forms of recreation must be determined by local residents and local government.

Policy 2. Urban outdoor recreational facilities located in sensitive areas should be encouraged to relocate to other suitable sites.

2006 Threshold Evaluation Report

The 2006 Threshold Evaluation Report reviews the status of the individual thresholds, including the two recreation threshold indicators: R-1 - Quality experience and additional access, and R-2 - Fair share of recreation capacity. The 2006 Threshold Evaluation Report concludes that both threshold indicators are in attainment (TRPA 2007). Several concerns are raised with regard to possible trends that could undermine threshold attainment, including a disparity between the amount of new residential development versus the amount of new recreational development measured by persons at one time (PAOT), and the loss of recreational opportunities from protection of other resource values (e.g., stream environment zones or SEZs) or from private recreational providers changing the existing use to achieve higher revenue production.

Lake Tahoe Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan

The 2006 Lake Tahoe Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (BPMP) was prepared by the TRPA Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO). In the State of California, TRPA is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA). The core mission of the TMPO is to establish a safe, efficient and integrated transportation system that reduces reliance on the private automobile, provides for alternative modes of transportation, serves the basic transportation needs of the citizens of the Tahoe Region, supports the economic base of the region in the movement of goods and people, and minimizes adverse impacts on humans and the environment. The BPMP is blueprint for developing a regional bicycle and pedestrian system that includes facilities and programs throughout the Lake Tahoe region (TMPO 2006). The following applicable goal and policy statements express the philosophy behind the BPMP and the proposed system. The BPMP Goals and Objectives evolved from the desire to provide citizens and visitors with a bicycle and pedestrian system that can accommodate a variety of trip purposes, and user types and levels with the goal of improving safety and reducing automobile dependency. Goals and Objectives include:

GOAL 1. Provide safer and more efficient bicycle facilities in the Lake Tahoe Basin that create a positive experience for residents and visitors.

OBJECTIVE. Construct bicycle facilities identified in the BPMP and provide for the maintenance of both existing and new facilities.

GOAL 2. Include bicycle facilities in all appropriate future development or redevelopment projects to facilitate bicycling with a high degree of connectivity to the existing and proposed system.

OBJECTIVE. Maximize the number of bicycle trips in existing, new, and redevelopment areas by encouraging the construction of new facilities.

GOAL 3. Develop a bicycle and pedestrian system that enhances safety and convenience of bicycling and walking to employment, recreational, and educational centers in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

OBJECTIVE. Increase bicycle and pedestrian trips to employment, recreational and educational centers to reduce vehicle congestion and improve air quality.

GOAL 4. Educate and inform residents and visitors of the Lake Tahoe Basin about how to use bicycle and pedestrian facilities safely.

OBJECTIVE. Improve bicycling and pedestrian conditions in the Lake Tahoe Basin by reducing accidents and increasing the number of bicycle and pedestrian system users.

GOAL 7. Provide a safer, more efficient pedestrian network that improves pedestrian access and mobility throughout the Lake Tahoe Basin by removing obstacles and implementing pedestrian facilities and a model education and enforcement program.

OBJECTIVE. Create a policy framework and action program to enhance walking as a viable transportation choice, particularly in pedestrian districts and areas of high pedestrian activity for commutes and errands where travel is less than $\frac{3}{4}$ mile.

GOAL 8. Improve pedestrian safety at controlled locations.

OBJECTIVE. Provide safe, frequent crossing opportunities for pedestrians at controlled locations.

GOAL 9. Improve pedestrian safety at uncontrolled locations.

OBJECTIVE. Provide safe crossings for pedestrians at uncontrolled approaches to intersections, mid-block crossings, and trail crossings.

GOAL 10. Maximize the walkability of the pedestrian districts in the Tahoe Basin.

OBJECTIVE. Provide compact intersections, pathways, and frequent crossing opportunities that are safe, accessible, functional, and useful.

GOAL 11. All new developments should provide a safe, comfortable walking environment that promotes pedestrian activity.

OBJECTIVE. New development should be accessible to all pedestrians with wide sidewalks, compact intersections, and integrated pedestrian circulation.

Plan Area Statements

The Project area includes TRPA PAS' 157 – Homewood/Ski Homewood Area, 158 – McKinney Tract, and 159 – Homewood/Commercial. The PAS' summarize permitted or compatible recreation activities and land uses, recreation policies, and PAOT allocations.

157 – Homewood/Ski Homewood Area

Land Use Classification: Recreation.

Planning Statement: This area should continue to provide opportunities for downhill skiing within guidelines prepared through ski area master plans and scenic restoration plans.

Special Policies: Access for cross-country skiing should be improved.

Permissible Uses (Recreation):

Allowed (A): Day use areas, outdoor recreation concessions, and riding and hiking trails.

Special-use provisions required (S): Cross country skiing courses, skiing facilities, and snowmobile courses.

Additional Developed Outdoor Recreation:

Summer Day Uses: 0 PAOTs.

Winter Day Uses: 4,000 PAOTs. (4,000 is listed in error – the correct number is 1,100)

Overnight Uses: 280 PAOTs.

Other: 5.0 miles of hiking trails.

158 – McKinney Tract

Land Use Classification: Residential.

Planning Statement: This area should remain residential with a density of one single family dwelling per parcel.

Permissible Uses (Recreation):

Allowed (A): Riding and hiking trails, day use areas, and beach recreation.

Special-use provisions required (S): Participant sports facilities.

Tolerance District 7 (Shorezone):

Primary Uses: Beach recreation (intensive) (A), and salvage (A).

Accessory Structures: Mooring buoys (A), piers (A), fences (S), boat ramps (S), breakwaters or jetties (S), shoreline protective structures (A), floating platforms (A), and water intake lines (S).

Additional Developed Outdoor Recreation:

Summer Day Uses: 0 PAOT.

Winter Day Uses: 0 PAOT.

Overnight Uses: 0 PAOT.

159 – Homewood/Commercial Tract

Land Use Classification: Tourist.

Planning Statement: This area should continue to be a tourist commercial area. However, there is a need for rehabilitation while maintaining the scale and character of the west shore.

Permissible Uses (Recreation):

Allowed (A): Day use areas, participant sports facilities, beach recreation, outdoor recreation concessions, and marinas.

Special-use provisions required (S): Recreation center, boat launching facilities, cross-country skiing courses, riding and hiking trails, skiing facilities, snow mobile courses, and visitor information center.

Tolerance District 7 (Shorezone):

Primary Uses: Water oriented outdoor recreation concessions (A), beach recreation (intensive) (A), and waterborne transit (A), boat launching facilities (S), tour boat (A), safety and navigation devices (A), marinas (S), and salvage (S)

Accessory Structures: Mooring buoys (A), piers (A), fences (S), boat ramps (S), breakwaters or jetties (S), shoreline protective structures (A), floating platforms (A), and water intake lines (S).

Additional Developed Outdoor Recreation:

Summer Day Uses: 0 PAOT.

Winter Day Uses: 0 PAOT.

Overnight Uses: 0 PAOT.

18.2.2 State of California

The Quimby Act (California Government Code §66477) preserves open space and parkland in urbanizing areas of the State by authorizing local governments to establish ordinances requiring developers of new subdivisions to dedicate land for parks, pay an in-lieu fee, or perform a combination of the two. The Quimby Act provides two standards for the dedication of land for use as parkland. If the existing area of parkland in a community is 3 acres or more per 1,000 persons, then the community may require dedication based on a standard of 5 acres per 1,000 persons residing in the subdivision. If the existing amount of parkland in a community is less than 3 acres per 1,000 persons, then the community may

require dedication based on a standard of only 3 acres per 1,000 persons residing in the subdivision. The Quimby Act requires a city or county to adopt standards for recreational facilities in its general plan recreation element if it is to adopt a parkland dedication/fee ordinance.

The current Placer County parks fee includes a Quimby Act fee that is collected at the final map recording and an AB 1600 fee that is collected at the building permit stage. Project Applicants pay \$555 per single family-zoned parcel, and \$405 per multifamily unit at the time of subdivision to provide for improvements to accommodate increased demand for recreational facilities.

18.2.3 Placer County Code and General Plan

Chapter 18 of the Placer County Code is the County's Environmental Review Ordinance. Appendix A of the ordinance lists impacts that are normally considered significant for a number of topics including land use, traffic, air, and cultural resources, but does not list impacts for recreation. Section 5 of the Placer County General Plan, "Recreational and Cultural Resources," includes goals and associated policies for public recreation and parks, private recreational facilities and opportunities, and recreational trails (Placer County 1994). For the Project, relevant goals and policies include:

Goal 5.A: To develop and maintain a system of conveniently-located, properly-designed parks and recreational facilities to serve the needs of present and future residents, employees, and visitors.

5.A.1. The County shall strive to achieve and maintain a standard of 5 acres of improved parkland and 5 acres of passive recreation area or open space per 1,000 population.

5.A.2. The County shall strive to achieve the following park facility standards:

- a. 1 tot lot per 1,000 residents,
- b. 1 playground per 3,000 residents,
- c. 1 tennis court per 6,000 residents,
- d. 1 basketball court per 6,000 residents,
- e. 1 hardball diamond per 3,000 residents,
- f. 1 softball/little league diamond per 3,000 residents,
- g. 1 mile of recreation trail per 1,000 residents,
- h. 1 youth soccer field per 2,000 residents,
- i. 1 adult field per 2,000 residents,
- j. 1 golf course per 50,000 residents.

5.A.3. The County shall require new development to provide a minimum of 5 acres of improved parkland and 5 acres of passive recreation area or open space for every 1,000 new residents of the area covered by the development. The park classification system shown in Table 5-1 should be used as a guide to the type of the facilities to be developed in achieving these standards.

5.A.4. The County shall consider the use of the following open space areas as passive parks to be applied to the requirement for 5 acres of passive park area for every 1,000 residents.

- a. Floodways,
- b. Protected riparian corridors and stream environment zones,
- c. Protected wildlife corridors,
- d. Greenways with the potential for trail development,
- e. Open water (e.g., ponds, lakes, and reservoirs),
- f. Protected woodland areas,
- g. Protected sensitive habitat areas providing that interpretive displays are provided (e.g., wetlands and habitat for rare, threatened or endangered species).

Buffer areas are not considered as passive park areas if such areas are delineated by setbacks within private property. Where such areas are delineated by public easements or are held as common areas with

homeowner/property owner access or public access, they will be considered as passive park areas provided that there are opportunities for passive recreational use.

5.A.5. The County shall require the dedication of land and/or payment of fees, in accordance with state law (Quimby Act) to ensure funding for the acquisition and development of public recreation facilities. The fees are to be set and adjusted as necessary to provide for a level of funding that meets the actual cost to provide for all of the public parkland and park development needs generated by new development.

5.A.8. The County shall strive to maintain a well-balanced distribution of local parks, considering the character and intensity of present and planned development and future recreation needs.

5.A.11. Regional and local recreation facilities should reflect the character of the area and the existing and anticipated demand for such facilities.

5.A.12. The County shall encourage recreational development that complements the natural features of the area, including the topography, waterways, vegetation, and soil characteristics.

5.A.13. The County shall ensure that recreational activity is distributed and managed according to an area's carrying capacity, with special emphasis on controlling adverse environmental impacts, conflict between uses, and trespass. At the same time, the regional importance of each area's recreation resources shall be recognized.

5.A.19. The County shall encourage the development of parks near public facilities such as schools, community halls, libraries, museums, prehistoric or historic sites, and open space areas and shall encourage joint-use agreements whenever possible.

5.A.22. The County shall encourage compatible recreational use of riparian areas along streams and creeks where public access can be balanced with environmental values and private property rights.

5.A.23. The County shall require that park and recreation facilities required in conjunction with new development be developed in a timely manner so that such facilities are available concurrently with new development.

5.A.24. The County shall encourage public and private park and recreation agencies to acknowledge the natural resource values present at park sites during the design of a new facility.

Goal 5.B: To encourage development of private recreational facilities.

5.B.1. The County shall encourage development of private recreation facilities to reduce demands on public agencies.

Goal 5.C: To develop a system of interconnected hiking, riding, and bicycling trails and paths suitable for active recreation and transportation and circulation.

5.C.1. The County shall support development of a Countywide trail system designed to achieve the following objectives:

- a. Provide safe, pleasant, and convenient travel by foot, horse, or bicycle;
- b. Link residential areas, schools, community buildings, parks, and other community facilities within residential developments. Whenever possible, trails should connect to the Countywide trail system, regional trails, and the trail or bikeways plans of cities;
- c. Provide access to recreation areas, major waterways, and vista points;
- d. Provide for multiple uses (i.e., pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle);
- e. Use public utility corridors such as power transmission line easements, railroad rights-of-way, irrigation district easements, and roadways;

- f. Whenever feasible, be designed to separate equestrian trails from cycling paths, and to separate trails from the roadway by the use of curbs, fences, landscape buffering, and/or spatial distance;
- g. Connect commercial areas, major employment centers, institutional uses, public facilities, and recreational areas with residential areas; and
- h. Protect sensitive open space and natural resources.

5.C.3. The County shall work with other public agencies to coordinate the development of equestrian, pedestrian, and bicycle trails.

5.C.5. The County shall encourage the preservation of linear open space along rail corridors and other public easements for future use as trails. [See also policies/programs under Goal 3.D., Non-Motorized Transportation.]

18.2.4 Placer County Zoning Ordinance

As stated in Placer County Zoning Ordinance §17.54.100(D)(1), residential planned development projects are required to provide in-tract neighborhood recreational facilities to residents of the Planned Development in excess of the 5 acres per 1,000 residents are required by County Code §16.08.100 and Recreational Facilities Fee Ordinance (Chapter 15, Placer County Code). The total recreation facilities required for a planned development project cannot be less than that needed to accommodate the total demand for such facilities created by residents of the project, as determined by the Planning Commission in consultation with the Placer County Department of Facilities Services, Parks and Grounds Division.

Under Placer Code, project applicants have multiple ways to provide adequate recreational resources:

- Develop and dedicate to Placer County, or an appropriate recreation district serving the area of the project, a public park, consistent with the park needs of the community;
- Create commonly owned, on-site park and recreational improvements and/or as a credit toward fees, as deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission;
- Pay a fee equivalent to the value of the park and recreation improved land and park improvements to provide public parks and recreation facilities in the vicinity of the planned development. (Note: this fee correlates to parks and recreation demand created by the project and is a separate issue from that related to campground capacity issues raised by closure of the campground).

18.3 EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH POINTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Table 18-1 presents the evaluation criteria for recreation. These criteria are drawn primarily from local plans, adapted where necessary to reflect CEQA and TRPA requirements. For the purpose of this analysis, the stated applicable points of significance determine whether implementing the Project will result in a significant impact. These points of significance are based upon Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines and the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist. A recreation impact is significant if implementation of the Project exceeds the point of significance shown in Table 18-1.

Table 18-1**Evaluation Criteria with Point of Significance - Recreation**

Evaluation Criteria	Significance Threshold	Justification
REC-1. Will the Project result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway, or public lands or decrease in the quality of a recreational experience?	a) Project-induced elimination of an access route or entry point to lakes, waterways, or public lands; b) Project-induced degradation of a high quality recreational experience.	TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist II (19 d); TRPA Threshold Carrying Capacities (Resolution # 82-11); TRPA Regional Plan, Goals and Policies, Chapter V, Recreation Element.
REC-2. Will the Project create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed?	a) Elimination of or significant reduction to an existing recreation use; b) Creation of new recreation use restrictions or limits in due to the Project.	TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist II (19 c); TRPA Threshold Carrying Capacities (Resolution # 82-11); TRPA Regional Plan, Goals and Policies, Chapter V, Recreation Element.
REC-3. Will the Project result in the need to construct new recreational facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	Exceedance of capacity at existing local recreation facilities.	CEQA Appendix G Checklist XV (a, b); TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist II (19 a); TRPA Plan Area Statements; TRPA Threshold Carrying Capacities (Resolution # 82-11); TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapters 21 and 33; TRPA Regional Plan Recreation Element.
REC-4. Will the Project create additional recreational capacity?	Exceedance of TRPA PAOT allocations.	TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist II (19 b).

Source: Hauge Brueck Associates 2009

18.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION

Impact: REC-1. Will the Project result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway, or public lands or decrease in the quality of a recreational experience?

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; No Project (Alternative 2)*

Under the No Project (Alternative 2), there would be no changes to existing land uses or facilities in the Project area. Consequently, access to existing public recreation areas and the quality of the recreation experience are not expected to change. The No Project (Alternative 2) is therefore expected to have a less than significant impact on access to recreation and the quality of the recreation experience.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Analysis: *Significant Impact; Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6*

The Project area is located west of SR 89 and consists of an existing winter sports area and related recreational and support uses. The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 would not affect land uses or facilities on or with direct access to Lake Tahoe. Summer uses include informal hiking and mountain bike trail use. The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 would enhance recreation facilities and access to the Project area by designating 5 miles of publicly accessible hiking trails on the mountain, providing a community swimming pool at the Mid-Mountain Base area, an ice skating rink at the North Base area, an amphitheater for the Lake Tahoe Music Festival and other events, a link to the West Shore Bike Trail, and a miniature golf course. Hiking trails established at HMR would provide enhanced access to USFS LTBMU lands in the Project vicinity.

There are no public or private access points to Lake Tahoe or any other lake or waterway that would be removed by the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6, including the existing trail access to the TCPUD Trail Creek Park and Quail Lake south of the resort. HMR recently acquired the West Shore Café and Inn located just west of the project area. The site includes a dedicated parking lot, restaurant and inn structure and outdoor seating area/pier located on the shoreline of Lake Tahoe. While this property is in the ownership of HMR, it will be available for Lake access by residents and guests of the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6. With the maintenance of access to public lands within the vicinity of the project area and the provision of dedicated Lake access for HMR residents and guest, impacts on the availability of public access to recreational resources would be less than significant.

However, there are also public access points along the west shore of Lake Tahoe including points immediately across SR 89 from the proposed residential development areas of the Project. According to Placer County Department of Facility Services/Parks, these beach access points are currently lightly used and do not require substantial maintenance efforts due to low activity in the Homewood vicinity. Many public access points in the vicinity of the Project do not currently receive routine maintenance due to low use. With the addition of new full time residents and additional visitors to the Project area, the use of these beach access points would increase and current maintenance funding would not be adequate to address increased use. A new influx of Project generated use would create the need for a new maintenance operation that is currently not included in the funding structure of local public management agencies. Consequently, development under the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) or Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 would have a significant impact on the quality of the existing recreational experience at nearby beach access points along the west shore of Lake Tahoe.

Mitigation: **REC-1a. Beach Access Maintenance Funding**

The Project Applicant shall work with Placer County to develop a Zone of Benefit, which is a geographic area formed under Placer County Service Area law to provide extended services not already being provided, or a similar mechanism to fund maintenance as a result of the Project. Funding shall cover the cost of staff time maintaining the access points, maintenance materials, and, if a Zone of Benefit is established, administration fees. The fee shall be established through an engineer's report prepared by the applicant

at the applicant's expense and approved by the County or as otherwise prescribed by law. The Zone of Benefit shall include cost of living adjustments.

After

Mitigation: *Less than Significant Impact; Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6*

Implementation of Mitigation Measure REC-1a will maintain the quality of public beach access points and therefore reduce the impact to less than significant.

Analysis: *Significant Impact; Alternative 4*

Alternative 4 will discontinue current recreational uses in the Project area by decommissioning the ski resort and creating 16 private residential parcels for the development of single-family homes. The recreational capacities (1,704 winter day use PAOTs) currently provided by the ski area for downhill and cross-country skiing in the winter, and informal hiking and mountain biking in the summer, would be eliminated. Access to LTBMU lands and other public lands through the Project area would be removed. The TRPA thresholds for recreation are to, "Preserve and enhance the high quality recreational experience including preservation of high-quality undeveloped shorezone and other natural areas" and, "Establish and ensure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation is available to the general public". Alternative 4 would not preserve existing recreational opportunities and would reduce public access to recreational uses. The removal of public access and recreational facilities in the Project area would result in a significant impact on access to recreation opportunities and the quality of the recreation experience.

Mitigation: **REC-1b. Maintain or Enhance Public Access to Public Lands.**

The Project Applicant shall consult with the TRPA and public land managers in the Project vicinity, including the LTBMU and TCPUD, to select one or more corridors for a public access easement and recreational trail (pedestrian and/or mountain bike accessible) through the HMR area to adjacent public lands. Such easements shall be permanent and recorded along with the subdivision map, and be located at appropriate site(s) to enable safe and efficient ingress and egress from the public lands while minimizing potential for conflict with private property owners.

In lieu of an easement through HMR subdivision lands, the Project Applicant may consult with the TRPA, TCPUD, and LTBMU to identify an alternative site to enhance public access to recreation opportunities on public lands. The access point shall be in the vicinity of Homewood, and provide a similar or greater level of access to recreation opportunities on public lands as existing trails in the Project area. Access enhancements may include, but are not limited to, actions such as easement acquisition, trail development, road or trail improvements, and development of trailhead facilities (e.g., parking, drinking water, restrooms, signage).

After

Mitigation: *Significant and Unavoidable Impact; Alternative 4*

Implementation of Mitigation Measure REC-1b will maintain or enhance existing levels of public access to recreation opportunities on adjacent public lands. However, implementation of Alternative 4 would cause a significant and unavoidable impact based

on the loss of the winter ski resort use and the currently assigned PAOTs for HMR. There are currently no closed ski areas in the Basin that could be re-opened to replace recreational uses at HMR, and the development of a new ski area is not considered feasible based on land ownership, environmental constraints, and land management regulations in the Basin. Consequently, no feasible mitigation measure is identified to reduce the significant impact of Alternative 4 on recreational access.

Impact: **REC-2. Will the Project create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed?**

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; No Project (Alternative 2)*

Under the No Project (Alternative 2), current recreational uses will continue and no new recreational uses would occur. Alternative 2 is not expected to result in any new recreation use conflicts. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 2 is expected to result in a less than significant impact on conflicts between recreational uses.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6*

The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 will renovate and enhance existing ski area facilities and biking and hiking trails, and provide new recreation facilities such as a West Shore Bike Trail linkage, ice skating rink, swimming pool, amphitheater, and miniature golf course. As required by Placer County and the Quimby Act, development under the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) or Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 will include enhancements in park lands and/or in lieu payments to improve local recreational facilities, improving service to existing populations and providing adequate service to meet the increased resident and guest demands. The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 are expected to increase the range of recreation facilities and opportunities in the Project area, and add facilities that are compatible with existing recreation opportunities and land uses at HMR and in the Project vicinity. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 will have less than significant impacts related to conflicts between existing or proposed recreational uses.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Analysis: *Significant Impact; Alternative 4*

Alternative 4 would remove recreation opportunities in the Project area by decommissioning HMR and subdividing the land into private residential parcels for single-family home development. This would remove recreational use at HMR and access through HMR to public lands. HMR currently has a PAOT capacity of 1,704 for winter day-use activities. As documented in REC-3 below, local park enhancements or payment of in lieu fees under Placer County ordinances would be required under Alternative 4 to offset the impacts of population growth on recreation, but the discontinuation of existing recreation use at HMR will conflict with TRPA recreation thresholds to increase the amount and quality of recreational opportunities. Therefore, this impact is considered significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is available.

After

Mitigation: *Significant and Unavoidable Impact; Alternative 4*

Implementation of Alternative 4 would cause a significant and unavoidable impact based on the loss of existing winter day use recreation facilities in the Lake Tahoe Basin. There are currently no vacant ski areas in the Basin that could be re-opened to replace uses at HMR, and the development of a new ski area is not considered feasible based on land ownership, environmental constraints, and land management regulations in the Basin. Consequently, no feasible mitigation measure is identified to reduce the significant impact of Alternative 4 on recreation use conflicts.

Impact: REC-3. Will the Project result in the need to construct new recreational facilities or expansion of existing facilities?

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; No Project (Alternatives 2)*

The No Project (Alternative 2) will not change existing recreational uses, land uses, or facilities, and would not increase demand for recreation. Consequently, Alternative 2 would have a less than significant impact on the need for new recreational facilities.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Analysis: *Significant Impact; Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6*

Development of the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 is expected to increase the population of the Project area and increase demand for recreation facilities. The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 will include new recreational facilities for visitors to the lodge and the public, such as a swimming pool, miniature golf course, West Shore Bike Trail linkage, amphitheater, and 5 miles of hiking/mountain biking trails.

Under Placer County General Plan Policy 5.A.3 and Zoning Ordinance §17.54.100(D)(1), new residential developments are required to provide a minimum of 5 acres of improved parks and 5 acres of passive parklands or open space per 1,000 new residents to offset increased demand for recreation services and opportunities (Placer County 2008). Based on the number of whole or partial ownership residential units proposed by Alternative, the following are estimates of the number of new residents that may be generated at Project buildout, and the required amount of new park land under the General Plan. The calculations assume 1.85 persons per whole or partial-ownership multi-family residential unit and 2.54 persons per single-family residential unit based on the analysis included in the Placer County Park and Recreation Facilities Impact Fee Study, Hausrath Economics Group, September 2003 (page 12).

- Alternative 1: 254 multi-family residential units equals 470 new residents, and 2.35 acres of improved parks and 2.35 acres of open space;
- Alternative 3: 254 multi-family residential units equals 470 new residents, and 2.35 acres of passive use parklands 2.35 acres of open space;
- Alternative 4: 16 single-family residential units equals 41 new residents, and 0.2 acre of improved parks and 0.2 acre of open space; and

- Alternative 5: 237 multi-family residential units and 16 single-family residential units equals 479 new residents, and 2.40 acres of improved parks and 2.40 acres of open space.
- Alternative 6: 232 multi-family residential units and 14 single-family residential units equals 465 new residents, and 2.33 acres of improved parks and 2.33 acres of open space.

If Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 do not provide adequate on-site recreation facilities, Placer County would require payment of park fees commensurate with the percentage of the shortfall. Payment of in lieu park fees to Placer County Department of Facility Services would be in addition to the standard Placer County park fees identified below, and would be established through a development agreement.

Under Placer County Code §16.08.100 and Recreational Facilities Fee Ordinance (Chapter 15, Placer County Code), recreation facilities cannot be less than that needed to accommodate the new demand for such facilities created by the Project, as determined by the Planning Commission in consultation with the Placer County Department of Facilities Services, Parks and Grounds Division. In addition, in-tract recreational facilities must be provided in accordance with Placer County Code Section 17.54.100(D) or the payment of an in-lieu fee thereof.

New residents and visitors in the Project area will increase visitation at other Basin recreational sites, increasing demand on the existing recreational facilities, especially during the peak summer months. New residents and visitors to the Project area are expected to increase usage of nearby Burton Creek, Ed Z'berg Sugar Pine Point, and D.L. Bliss/Emerald Bay State Parks. New residents and visitors will likely use local parks and recreational facilities in the vicinity such as Quail Creek Park, Chambers Landing Beach, and other access points to Lake Tahoe near the Project area. Without new facilities, the increased use will contribute to routine wear and tear on existing turf areas, recreational equipment, trails, picnic tables, and parking capacity. It is difficult to determine the extent of the wear and tear that would be attributed directly to the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) or Alternatives 3, 4, 5 or 6, because most local parks and recreational facilities are used by a combination of local residents and visitors to the region.

It should be noted that HMR recently purchased the West Shore Café, which is located across SR 89 from the resort and is outside of the Project area. The West Shore Café includes lake access and a pier, which can accommodate a water taxi and some summer recreation demand.

Placer County's per-unit assessment of park fees (including affordable housing units and tourist accommodation units or TAUs) funds improvements to existing park facilities and the construction of new park facilities (Placer County 2008). These park fees are assessed at the time of final map recordation and issuance of building permits, and are required for the development of residential units and TAU units to offset the impact of new development on community recreation. The Project fees would be earmarked for improvement of park facilities in the vicinity. Placer County, who collects and distributes these fees, would use these funds for projects at nearby recreational facilities.

The Project is also subject to the Measure C parcel tax, which provides maintenance funds for the TCPUD. This is a parcel tax that adjusts annually and is applicable to

parcels within the TCPUD district boundaries. The annual fee is determined based on the square footage of the residential units.

Because the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5 or 6 do not include the addition of new and/or improved park facilities, parks or open space to meet the increased demand for improved parks and open space, this is considered a significant impact.

Mitigation: **REC-3. Provide On-site Recreational Facilities and Park Fees to Placer County; Operate Shuttle Service to State Parks.**

To mitigate for the increased demand on recreation facilities, the Project shall develop and dedicate to the TCPUD a public park consistent with the park needs of the community (e.g., 5 acres of improved park and 5 acres of open space per 1,000 new residents). Details of recreation facilities and timing of delivery shall be established through a development agreement with Placer County. For any public recreation facilities provided in conjunction with this project, including parks and trails, maintenance funding shall be provided through the creation of a Zone of benefit (or similar mechanism). The fee shall be established through an engineer's report prepared by the applicant at the applicant's expense and approved by the County or as otherwise prescribed by law. The Zone of Benefit shall include cost of living adjustments.

The Project may provide for new or enhanced recreation facilities with an alternative method as provided under Placer County Code. Recreational alternatives may include, but are not limited to the following as approved by the County:

- Create commonly owned, on-site park and recreational improvements and/or as a credit toward a portion of the recreation fees, as deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission;
- Pay a fee equivalent to the value of the park and recreation improved land and park improvements to provide public parks and recreation facilities in the vicinity of the planned development. If the County wishes to collect such fees, the fee agreement shall be established through a development agreement between HMR and Placer County.
- Provision of public beach front property, access rights, and/or developed public beach access facilities conveyed to an appropriate public entity.
- The forgoing may be provided in whole or combination in order to fully mitigate recreational impacts in accordance with Placer County Code Sections 15.34.010, 16.08.100, and 17.54.100(D).

To reduce impacts on parking facilities at nearby State Parks while enhancing public access to the State Park system, the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 shall institute an on-call van service available to HMR residents, guests and the general public from Memorial Day Weekend through Labor Day to provide alternative transit service to Ed Z'berg Sugar Pine Point and D.L. Bliss/Emerald Bay State Parks. The HMR on-call van service will supplement existing public transit systems and reduce the reliance of private automobile usage for HMR residents, guests, and other nearby residents. HMR may charge a nominal fee to use the shuttle van service and may advertise the service to local residents and visitors of other developments. The use of the HMR on-call van service will reduce the number of private automobiles used to access

the State Parks during peak summer months, thereby maintaining access to these parks for other visitors to the Lake Tahoe Basin.

After

Mitigation: *Less than Significant Impact; Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6*

Implementation of mitigation measure REC-3 will reduce the potential impact to less than significant by providing or funding adequate new developed recreation facilities and open space, and by maintaining accessibility to heavily-used State Parks in the Project vicinity.

Impact: REC-4. Will the Project create additional recreational capacity?

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; No Project (Alternative 2)*

Alternative 2 does not involve changes to existing recreation uses of facilities, and therefore will have a less than significant impact on recreational capacity.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6*

The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 will increase recreation opportunities, but winter day-use PAOTs assigned to HMR will remain unchanged. Development under Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 will improve HMR ski area facilities and enhance other recreation opportunities in the Project area. Other new facilities include a West Shore Bike Trail connection, miniature golf, ice skating rink, swimming pool, amphitheater, and 5 miles of hiking/mountain bike trails.

New winter sports facilities will replace existing facilities and enhance the ski experience with high speed, higher capacity lifts and other improvements, but the overall PAOT capacity of the ski area will not increase under Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6. Proposed improvements include the replacement of the Madden Ski triple-chair lift with an eight-passenger high-speed gondola, which would increase lift capacity from 1,800 to 2,400 persons per hour. A new learn-to-ski (beginner) lift would be constructed at the Mid-Mountain area for beginner use. The existing South Happy Platter, North Happy Platter, and Alpine Platter lifts would be removed. The Tailings T-Bar, South T-Bar, and Spring Chair lift have already been removed and would not be replaced. The verified capacity of these removed lifts is available for use on other lift replacements or upgrades. Table 18-2 summarizes the proposed changes to the HMR ski lift capacity.

While improvements to the ski lifts are expected to increase the current operating capacity of the system from 8,646 persons per hour to 9,797 persons per hour, overall operations are expected to remain below the verified capacity of 10,653 persons per hour. Homewood's verified capacity is used to define the existing PAOT capacity assigned to HMR (1,704) by TRPA. At present, HMR does not expect to increase uphill lift capacity such that it would exceed its existing banked verified PAOT capacity of 1,704. Therefore, the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 are not expected to exceed the existing TRPA PAOT capacity for HMR or result in an adverse impact on additional recreational capacity. This is considered a less than significant impact.

Table 18-2**Existing and Proposed Ski Lift Capacity – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6**

Lift Name	Verified Capacity (pph)	Current Operating Capacity (pph)	Proposed Capacity (pph)
Madden Chair	1,800	1,800	2,400
Ellis Chair	1,500	1,500	2,400
Quad Chair	2,028	1,800	1,800
Quail Chair	818	1,637	1,637
South Happy Platter	630	630	0
North Happy Platter	500	500	0
Alpine Platter	419	419	0
Tailings T-Bar	750	0	0
South T-Bar	875	0	0
Magic Carpet	360	360	360
Spring Chair	973	0	0
Beginner @ Mid-Mountain	0	0	1,200
TOTALS	10,653	8,646	9,797

Source: HMR Needs Assessment, September 14, 2009

Notes:

pph = persons per hour

Verified lift capacity is the hourly capacity assigned to the lift by TRPA when it was constructed.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; Alternative 4*

Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in the closure of winter sports facilities at HMR, and redevelopment of HMR into private homes and commercial uses (see Impact REC-1). Alternative 4 would not create additional recreational capacity and therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

18.5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**Impact: REC-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to recreation?**Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6*

Development of enhanced winter sports recreation facilities and new tourist and residential and commercial development in the Project area, and associated increases in population associated with the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 will result in a cumulative increase in the demand for recreational facilities and would likely increase the use of existing local parks and recreational facilities in the community.

Placer County regulations require that new planned development projects contribute to Placer County park fees and incorporate on-site recreation facilities commensurate with the number of potential residents. Any shortage of the required on-site recreation facilities will require payment of park fees commensurate with the shortfall of the required on-site recreation facilities as determined by the Placer County Department of Facility Services (these fees would be in addition to the standard Placer County park fees). These requirements are implemented to offset and mitigate any imbalance that may result from new development on community recreational opportunities. Implementation of Mitigation Measures REC-1a and REC-3 and the mitigation action required for other projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin eliminates substantial contributions to cumulative impacts on recreational capacity. Therefore, the Project's contribution is not cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Analysis: *Significant Impact; Alternative 4*

Alternative 4 would result in the decommissioning of the resort and the introduction of a single-family residential development. HMR closure would cause the loss of the existing 1,704 PAOT recreational capacity in the Basin for skiing and winter sports activity. The demand for ski recreation served by the HMR facilities would be displaced to other ski resorts in the Basin, potentially impacting their ability to serve the increase under their existing PAOT allocations. This loss of recreational capacity would displace demand to other facilities, which may not be able to accommodate it. Demand for recreation opportunities and facilities in the Lake Tahoe Basin are growing based on threshold evaluations prepared by TRPA. Therefore, the loss of the existing HMR PAOT capacity is considered a cumulatively considerable impact to the recreational thresholds.

Mitigation: No mitigation is available.

After

Mitigation: *Significant and Unavoidable Impact; Alternative 4*

Implementation of Alternative 4 would cause a significant cumulative impact on other winter day use facilities based on the loss of the winter recreational use and PAOTs associated with the closure of the HMR.

REFERENCES

- California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2005. Park and Recreation Trends in California. May 13. California Department of Parks and Recreation. Sacramento, CA.
- County of Placer. 1994. Placer County General Plan Update Countywide General Plan Policy Document. August 16, 1994. Prepared by Placer County with Crawford Multari & Starr, DKS Associates-02, Psomas and Associates, Jones & Stokes Associates, Recht Hausrath & Associates, and J. Laurence Mintier & Associates. Placer County. Auburn, CA.
- County of Placer. 1998. West Shore Area General Plan. Adopted October 19, 1998. Placer County. Auburn, CA.
- Hausrath Economic Group. 2010. Placer County Park and Recreation Facilities Impact Fee Study. Placer County. Auburn, CA.

- Humphrey, Scott. 2009. California Department of Parks and Recreation. Personal communication with Brian Farris, HBA. November 12, 2009.
- Lindemann, William. 2009. California Department of Parks and Recreation. Personal communication with Brian Farris, HBA. November 12, 2009.
- Placer County. 2008. Final Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Report for the Tahoe Vista Partners Affordable Housing and Interval Ownership Development Project SCH #2006022100. June.
- Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO). 2006. Lake Tahoe Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (BPMP). Prepared by Fehr & Peers. October, 2006. TMPO. Stateline, NV.
- Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO). 2008. Mobility 2030: Transportation Monitoring Program. Status and Trends for the Lake Tahoe Basin Transportation System. December 2008. TMPO. Stateline, NV.
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). 1982. Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities. TRPA. Zephyr Cove, NV.
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). 1986. Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, Goals and Policies. TRPA. Zephyr Cove, NV.
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). Code of Ordinances. Amended 2009. . TRPA. Zephyr Cove, NV.