

---

## 7.0 POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

---

### 7.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### 7.1.1 Population Characteristics

The information below includes a variety of collected public data sources and associated calculations. The data sources include the 2000 U.S. Census, 2007 Census updates, and 2009 State of California population data for the counties and zip codes.

##### *Population*

The Lake Tahoe Basin, including the Homewood area, is traditionally a vacation or second-home area, with many homeowners maintaining their primary residency outside of the region. Consequently, the number of people occupying homes in the Basin can vary widely with seasons and holiday periods. The year-round or permanent resident population of the Lake Tahoe Basin is approximately 68,000 people as of 2007, an 8% increase since 2000. Table 7-1 shows the historic population growth by zip code area for Lake Tahoe Basin. Figure 2-1 provides a map of communities in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

From 1990 to 2007, the rate of population increase has been greater in the North Shore region than the South Shore region, although the South Shore remains more populous with 63% of the total Basin population in 2007. Homewood (zip code 96141) has the second smallest population in the Basin with 906 residents. Homewood experienced the second highest growth rate from 1990 to 2000, but then slowed considerably after 2000. More recent information (Mobility 2030, TMPO RTP) indicates that the year round population of the Tahoe Region has decreased by 7,662 residents between 2000 and 2005. Additional information suggests that the Placer County portion of the Tahoe Region has decreased by 2,310 persons over the same time frame. These estimates are supported by corresponding decreases in school enrollment, traffic volumes and unemployment rates.

Placer County's overall population was 248,399 in 2000 and increased 34% between 2000 and 2007 to 332,920 primarily within the western portions of the County outside of the Lake Tahoe region. As of January 1, 2009, the population of Placer County was 339,577 (DOF 2009).

##### *Age Distribution*

Recent age distribution data is reported by City-Data.com for 2007. Homewood has a median age of 40.5 years. By comparison, the whole of Placer County had a median age of 38.0 while the State of California had a median age of 33.3. These data indicate a larger than average proportion of older adults, which includes senior citizens, residing in the Homewood area than the rest of the county or the State as a whole.

**Table 7-1**

## Population by County, Lake Tahoe Region, 1990-2007

County	State	Community (Zip Code)	1990	2000	% Change 1990-2000	2007	% Change 2000-2007
<b>North Shore</b>							
Placer	CA	Carnelian Bay (96140)	631	1,928	205.5%	2,080	7.9%
Placer	CA	Homewood (96141)	264	840	218.2%	906	7.9%
Placer	CA	Tahoma/Meeks Bay (96142)	368	1,282	248.4%	1,383	7.9%
Placer	CA	Kings Beach (96142)	3,299	4,802	45.6%	5,185	8.0%
Placer	CA	Tahoe City/Alpine Meadows (96145)	4,744	3,997	-15.7%	4,313	7.9%
Placer	CA	Tahoe Vista	861	669	-22.3%	721	7.8%
Washoe	NV	Incline Village (89451)	7,760	9,601	28.7%	12,325	23.4%
<b>Total North Shore</b>			<b>17,927</b>	<b>23,119</b>	<b>29.0%</b>	<b>26,913</b>	<b>16.4%</b>
<b>South Shore</b>							
El Dorado	CA	South Lake Tahoe (96150)	28,955	33,024	14.1%	32,597	-1.3%
Douglas	NV	Zephyr Cove (89448)	2,116	2,498	18.1%	3,206	28.3%
Douglas	NV	Stateline (89449)	3,245	3,832	18.1%	4,919	28.4%
Douglas	NV	Glenbrook (89413)	309	365	18.1%	468	28.2%
<b>Total South Shore</b>			<b>34,625</b>	<b>39,719</b>	<b>14.7%</b>	<b>41,190</b>	<b>3.7%</b>
<b>Total Lake Tahoe Region</b>			<b>52,552</b>	<b>62,838</b>	<b>19.6%</b>	<b>68,103</b>	<b>8.4%</b>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau (1990-2000); City-Data.com (2000-2007).

**Race and Ethnicity**

Race and ethnicity in Homewood and Placer County are summarized in Table 7-2. The majority of Homewood residents are White (including Hispanic), comprising over 97% of the population, as compared to 93% of the population in Placer County. While Hispanic race/ethnicity data are combined with data for White residents in Homewood, this category is reported separately in Placer County and represents nearly 10% of the County's population, with White alone comprising over 83% of Placer County residents. Other Races and Two or More Races are the second and third largest groups in Placer County; relatively few persons report themselves to be Black, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Other Race, or Two or More Races in Homewood.

**Income**

In 2007, the estimated median household income in Homewood zip code 96141 was \$95,758, with 0.9% of the population (7 persons) below the poverty line (City-data.com 2009).

Approximately 0.9% of the population (7 persons) was below the poverty level and no persons were below 50% of the poverty line. No families or children under age 18 or seniors aged 65 or over are considered impoverished (U.S. Census Bureau 2009).

**Table 7-2**

**Placer County and Homewood (96141) Race and Ethnicity, 2000**

<b>Race</b>	<b>Placer County*</b>	<b>Homewood (94161)*</b>
White (including Hispanic)	93.1%	97.3%
Black or African American	0.8%	0.2%
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.9%	0.1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.3%	1.0%
Other Race	3.4%	0.2%
Two or More Races	3.2%	1.2%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2009, and City.data.com 2009.

\*Total could be greater than 100% because Hispanics could be counted in other races

### 7.1.2 Housing Characteristics

The number of housing units in the Lake Tahoe region grew from 43,265 in 1990 to 46,248 in 2000, an increase of 2,983 units as shown in Table 7-3. Growth occurred at a faster rate within the North Shore than in the South Shore. Vacation homes comprised 29.8% of the housing units in the Lake Tahoe region in 2000, with owner occupied units the second largest category at 32.4%, renter occupied units at 22.8%, and 5% of the housing units were vacant (U.S. Census Bureau 2009).

For the Placer County Portion of the Lake Tahoe Region, the 2000 Census counted 11,481 housing units, with 2,840 owner occupied units, 1,992 renter occupied units, and 6,271 seasonal units, and 6,649 vacant units. In Homewood, there were 1,396 single-family homes and condominium units, and 80 renter-occupied apartments in 2007. Renters occupied 21% of housing units. "Vacant" housing units in Homewood totaled 1,027 (74% of the total) indicating that a large proportion of the housing stock was either vacation homes used exclusively by their owners or seasonal rentals (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). The median house or condominium value in 2007 was \$978,426 and the median asking price for houses and condos in 2007 was \$1,204,298. The mean 2007 price for a detached house was \$918,236 while the mean price for five or more attached units was \$973,622. Median rent for rental units was estimated at \$1,000 to \$1,249 (City-data.com 2009).

### 7.1.3 Employment Characteristics

#### ***Lake Tahoe Region***

Businesses that depend primarily on travel and tourism – lodging establishments, gaming, restaurants, and recreation services – are important to the economy of the Lake Tahoe region by providing the primary source of employment and payroll earnings in the region as shown in

Tables 7-4 and 7-5. The data presented below show employment and earnings by place of work. According to the *2004 North Lake Tahoe Tourism and Community Investment Master Plan*, approximately 71% of jobs in North Lake Tahoe are within the tourist industry.

**Table 7-3**

## Lake Tahoe Region Housing Units, 1990-2000

Region	1990	2000	Change	% Change
North Shore	19,103	20,798	1,695	8.9%
South Shore	24,162	25,450	1,288	5.3%
Total	43,265	46,248	2,983	6.9%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2009.

**Table 7-4**

## Lake Tahoe Distribution of Employment, 2003

Employment Category	Number	Percent (%)*
Accommodation & Food Service	12,508	41.9%
Retail Trade	2,436	8.2%
Arts, Entertainment & Recreation	2,359	7.9%
Local Government	2,227	7.5%
Construction	2,174	7.3%
Professional & Business Services	2,056	6.9%
Education & Health Services	1,769	5.9%
Other Services	960	3.2%
Finance & Insurance	852	2.9%
All Other	816	2.7%
Real Estate, Rental & Leasing	612	2.1%
Transportation & Utilities	264	0.9%
Manufacturing	196	0.7%

Source: EDD 2009; Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation 2009.

\* – May not total 100% due to rounding

**Table 7-5**

## Lake Tahoe Distribution of Earnings, 2003

Employment Category	Annual Payroll (Millions)	Percent (%)*
Accommodation & Food Service	\$296	34.0%
Retail Trade	\$89	10.2%
Arts, Entertainment & Recreation	\$82	9.4%
Local Government	\$75	8.6%
Construction	\$73	8.4%
Professional & Business Services	\$58	6.9%
Education & Health Services	\$52	6.0%
Other Services	\$47	5.4%
Finance & Insurance	\$46	5.3%
All Other	\$26	3.0%
Real Estate, Rental & Leasing	\$12	1.4%
Transportation & Utilities	\$7	0.8%
Manufacturing	\$7	0.8%

Source: EDD 2009; Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation 2009.

\* – May not total 100% due to rounding

Note – Accommodation & Food Services includes casino hotels and the associated gaming activity.

**Homewood Area**

In 2000, the U.S. Census reported 650 residents (73.2%) over age 16 in the civilian labor force with an unemployment rate of 3.4%. Management, professional and related occupations was the primary occupational category (48.2% of persons employed); followed by sales and office occupations (27.8%); service occupations (10.6%); construction (9.0%); and production, transportation, and material moving (4.4%). Class of Worker data included private wage and salary workers (78.9%), government workers (11.7%), and self-employed workers (9.5%). The mean travel time to work was 19.4 minutes.

In September 2009, the overall unemployment rate for Placer County had risen to 11.3% - no unemployment data for 2009 are available for Homewood (EDD 2009). According to *City-data.com*, 85.7% of employed Homewood residents work at locations within Placer County. The industries located in Homewood by number of employees in 2005 were:

- Arts, Entertainment and Recreation: Skiing Facilities (100-249 employees; 1 establishment);
- Accommodation and Food Services: Full-Service Restaurants (10-19: 2, 5-9: 1, 1-4: 1);

- Construction: New Single-Family Housing Construction (except Operative Builders) (10-19:1, 1-4: 5);
- Construction: Residential Remodelers (10-19: 1, 1-4: 1);
- Other Services (except Public Administration): Other Similar Organizations (except Business, Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations) (10-19: 1);
- Construction: Roofing Contractors (5-9: 1, 1-4: 1);
- Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation: Marinas (5-9: 1);
- Accommodation and Food Services: Limited Service Restaurants (5-9: 1); and
- Wholesale Trade: Jewelry, Watch, Precious Stone, and Precious Metal Merchant Wholesalers (5-9: 1).

## 7.2 REGULATORY SETTING

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), Placer County, or other regulatory agencies in the Basin have no specific Environmental Thresholds for population. The TRPA limits construction of new housing using an allocation system defined in *TRPA Code Chapter 33 – Allocation of Development*. Transfer of existing development rights can also occur according to *TRPA Code Chapter 34 – Transfer of Development*. The *TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies* states, “Population growth in the Region is to be guided by the limitations on land use and other environmental threshold carrying capacities set forth in the Plan.” An *Economic Threshold Evaluation Report* was completed by TRPA in 2001 (*Chapter 11, Economics*), but no specific controls on population levels were defined.

The *TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 18 – Land Use* lists “employee housing” as a primary land use in the Basin, and provides the following definition: Employee Housing: Residential units owned and maintained by public or private entities for purposes of housing employees of said public or private entity. Placer County uses the term “workforce housing” for a similar land use. For the purposes of consistency with TRPA and Placer County terminology, this environmental analysis and will use the term “employee/workforce housing.”

The *1994 Placer County General Plan* and *2009 Housing Element*, and *1998 West Shore Area General Plan*, set forth goals and policies related to population, employment, and housing. An evaluation of consistency of the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives with these goals and policies is provided in Table 7-8 below. The General Plan does not specifically limit population growth. The *West Shore Area General Plan* identifies permissible uses, maximum densities, and other land use requirements for each PAS, but does not have specific growth restrictions. The Housing Element provides goals, policies, and implementation programs for the planning and development of housing to meet the County’s existing and projected housing needs in compliance with State law.

## 7.3 EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH POINTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of this analysis, an impact to population, employment, or housing is defined as a physical change to the existing employment, population, or housing conditions. An impact is determined to be significant if additional population exceeds the planned growth rate or substantially affects the available housing supply and demand.

Table 7-6 presents the evaluation criteria for population, employment, and housing. These criteria are drawn primarily from local plans, adapted where necessary to reflect California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and TRPA requirements. For the purpose of this analysis, the stated applicable points of significance determine whether implementing the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) or Alternatives 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. An employment, population, or housing impact is significant if implementation of the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) or Alternatives exceeds the point of significance shown in Table 7-6.

**Table 7-6**

Evaluation Criteria with Point of Significance –Population Employment and Housing

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Point of Significance</b>	<b>Justification</b>
PEH-1. Will the Project increase the demand for housing, thereby causing direct or indirect environmental impacts?	Increase in housing unit demand in excess of growth anticipated in the <i>TRPA Regional Plan</i>	TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist II (12a); CEQA Appendix G Checklist XII (a); <i>TRPA Regional Plan</i> Land Use Element and Plan Area Statements
PEH-2. Will the Project alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?	Increase in population in excess of growth anticipated in the <i>TRPA Regional Plan</i>	TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist II (11a); CEQA Appendix G Checklist XII (a)

Source: Hauge Brueck Associates 2009.

Note: CEQA Appendix G Checklist items XII-b (Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere) and XII-c (Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere) are not applicable to the Project. TRPA Checklist items 11-b (Include or result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents) and 12-b (Will the proposal result in the loss of housing for lower-income and very-low-income households) do not apply, as no homes would be eliminated under the Project.

## 7.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION

**IMPACT:** PEH-1. Will the Project increase the demand for housing, thereby causing direct or indirect environmental consequences?

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

The No Project (Alternative 2) will result in the continuation of resort operations under existing conditions. There are no existing tourist accommodation units or residential units on-site. Existing skier service operations at the existing North Base and South Base lodges will continue. Therefore, no new employment or demand for employee/workforce housing will be generated by implementation of the No Project (Alternative 2).

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required.

**Analysis:** *Significant Impact; Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6*

The rate of unemployment in Placer County was 11.3% in September 2009 (EDD November 2009). Based on the number of Accommodation and Food Service, Retail Trade, and Arts, Entertainment and Recreation jobs reported in 2003 (Table 7-4), up to 1,955 unemployed leisure, retail trade, and hospitality workers may currently be looking for work in the Lake Tahoe Region who have skills necessary to perform the duties sought by the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives. The jobs generated by the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 are considered a beneficial socioeconomic impact. With existing unemployment among likely qualified workers in the Basin, the recruitment of new workers from outside the region is not expected to be required, and substantial new population growth with new jobs generated by the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) or Alternatives 3, 4, 5, or 6 is not anticipated.

The workforce associated with construction will be temporary. Weather conditions and scheduling of interdependent construction activities will further affect timing of the temporary housing need. Because the work will not be permanent, construction workers unable to commute to the Project area are expected to rent living quarters based on the duration of stay. These quarters may be hotel rooms, vacation units, or longer-term rental units such as apartments, condominiums, and homes. Due to the dispersion of rental demand throughout the West Shore area and the temporary nature of this demand, construction would not result in a demand for new full-time housing. This is considered a less than significant impact on housing and no mitigation is required.

The permanent expansion of tourist accommodation units, full service condominiums, and a mix of commercial, skier and accessory services provided at HMR will result in increased permanent staffing levels within the Project area. The seasonal nature of HMR operations and the regional tourist economy leads to unemployment or underemployment of many residents. To adjust for seasonal variations in employment, employment data is presented in terms of the full-time equivalent (FTE), a standardized measure of individual jobs. One FTE is equivalent to a single full-time, 40 hour per week job for 52 weeks out of the year, or the equivalent of about 2,087 total labor hours.

JMA Ventures, LLC conducted a study to estimate the number of new FTEs generated by the Project (JMA Ventures, LLC 2008). An estimated 0.33 FTE would be generated per new residential unit or transient accommodation unit, and 2.0 FTEs would be generated per 1,000 square foot of commercial/retail area. HMR ski area operations would employ approximately 110 new staff on a seasonal basis, primarily during the 11-week peak ski season from the week of December 25<sup>th</sup> through the first week of March. The 110 new employees for 11 weeks adds up to 48,400 annual labor hours and is the equivalent of 23 new FTEs. New FTEs generated by Alternative are shown in Table 7-7.

The generation of new FTEs is important for economic planning and for determining the need for employee/workforce housing. *Placer County Housing Element Policies B-15 and C-2* require projects to develop a employee/workforce housing plan that can accommodate at least half of the new employees. Table 7-7 provides the number of employee/workforce housing units required based on a minimum occupancy rate of two (2) persons per two-bedroom unit.

This analysis assumes that new residential units will generally not be affordable to employees. The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternative 3 will provide 13 employee/workforce housing units with capacity to accommodate a minimum of two employees each, providing employee/workforce housing for 26 employees. Alternative 4 does not include the construction of employee/workforce housing units. Alternatives 5

and 6 include 12 employee/workforce units to accommodate a minimum of 24 employees each.

**Table 7-7**

Estimated Employment Generated, and Employee/Workforce Housing Required, by Alternative

Alternative	New FTEs*	Housing Element Policy C-2 Required Employee/Workforce Housing Units (Employees)	Units Provided (Employees Housed)**	Employee/Workforce Housing Unit Deficit (Employees)
Proposed Project (Alternative 1) – HMR Master Plan	182	46 (91)	13 (26)	33 (65)
No Project (Alternative 2)	0	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Alternative 3 – No Code Amendment for Building Height	182	46 (91)	13 (26)	33 (65)
Alternative 4 – Close Ski Resort – Estate Lots	35	9 (18)	0 (0)	9 (18)
Alternative 5 – Reduced Urban Boundary Amendment	177	44 (89)	12 (24)	32 (65)
Alternative 6 – Reduced Urban Boundary/Lower Height	166	42(83)	12 (24)	30 (59)

Source: Hauge Brueck Associates 2009.

\*Limited to new commercial, retail and other new Project developments; does not include the estimated 23 FTEs for ski area operations. Under Alternative 4 it is assumed that the 23 FTEs at the ski resort are removed with the closure of HMR.

\*\*Based on providing housing for 50% of new employees in 2-bedroom units, occupied by a minimum of two persons per unit, rounded to the next whole unit.

Employees not accommodated in employee/workforce housing will require housing elsewhere in the region. New jobs generated by the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) or Alternatives 3, 4, 5, or 6, would not result in substantial new population growth or demand for new housing considering the existing population and housing stock in the Placer County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Placer County has approximately 14,588 persons and 11,481 housing units in the Basin.

As documented in the Plan consistency analysis included in Table 7-8, the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 do not provide sufficient employee/workforce housing to meet the requirements of *Placer County Housing Element* Policies B-15, C-2, and other applicable policies in the *Housing Element* and *1998 West Shore Area General Plan*. The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternative 3 require up to 33 units for 65 new employees, Alternative 4 requires up to nine units for 18 employees, Alternative 5 requires up to 32 units for 65 employees, and Alternative 6 requires up to 30 units for 59 employees. As a condition of receiving 13 MRBUs from TRPA as a CEP Project, the Applicant in its acceptance letter dated January 31, 2008, indicated that it would find employee/workforce housing solutions for

the balance of new FTEs generated in excess of those served by the 13 on-site MRBUs. Following Master Plan adoption, HMR intends to identify and secure off-site employee/workforce housing for the balance of new full time equivalent employees generated by the selected alternative. Because the necessary off-site employee/workforce housing is not currently identified, this impact is considered to be significant, and mitigation is required.

Mitigation: **PEH-1: Develop Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan.**

The Project Applicant shall develop a detailed “Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan” based on the alternative selected 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 Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan shall be required prior to the issuance of building permits or recordation of final maps, whichever occurs first. The Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan shall provide an accounting of the final number of net new FTEs expected to be created by the constructed alternative 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.

After

Mitigation: *Less than Significant Impact; Proposed Project (Alternative 1), Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6*

Implementation of Mitigation Measure PEH-1 will ensure that sufficient employee/workforce housing is provided on-site and/or off-site for at least half of the expected new FTEs generated, consistent with *Placer County General Plan Housing Element* Policies B-15, C-2, and other applicable policies in the *Housing Element* and *1998 West Shore Area General Plan*. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PEH-1 reduces this impact to less than significant.

**Table 7-8**

**HMR Consistency Analysis with the 1994 Placer County General Plan and 2009 Housing Element, and 1998 West Shore Area General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards Related to Population, Employment, and Housing**

<b>Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<b>PLACER COUNTY 1994 GENERAL PLAN</b>	
<b>RESIDENTIAL LAND USE</b>	
<b>Goal 1.B: To provide adequate land in a range of residential densities to accommodate the housing needs of all income groups expected to reside in Placer County.</b>	
1.B.1. The County shall promote the concentration of new residential development in higher-density residential areas located along major transportation corridors and transit routes.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 would concentrate new housing adjacent to the major transportation route in the region, SR 89. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.
1.B.2. The County shall encourage the concentration of multi-family housing in and near downtowns, village centers, major commercial areas, and neighborhood commercial centers.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 would concentrate new multi-family housing adjacent to mixed use and commercial areas. The No Project (Alternative 2) and Alternative 4 include no multi-family housing.
1.B.3. The County shall encourage the planning and design of new residential subdivisions to emulate the best characteristics (e.g., form, scale, and general character) of existing, nearby neighborhoods.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 would consider County and TRPA Design Guidelines and aesthetic requirements in the design and location of new housing. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.
1.B.4. The County shall ensure that residential land uses are separated and buffered from such major facilities as landfills, airports, and sewage treatment plants.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 would concentrate new housing in an area buffered from major facilities. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.
1.B.5. The County shall require residential project design to reflect and consider natural features, noise exposure of residents, visibility of structures, circulation, access, and the relationship of the project to surrounding uses. Residential densities and lot patterns will be determined by these and other factors. As a result, the maximum density specified by General Plan designations or zoning for a given parcel of land may not be realized.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 would consider County and TRPA Design Guidelines and aesthetic requirements in the design and location of new housing. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.
1.B.6. The County shall require new subdivided lots to be adequate in size and appropriate in shape for the range of primary and accessory uses designated for the area.	<b>Consistent.</b> Subdivided lots under the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 would be adequate in size and shape for the range of uses. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.
1.B.7. The County shall require multi-family developments to include private, contiguous, open space for each dwelling.	<b>Consistent.</b> Multi-family housing in the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 include private, contiguous, open space for each dwelling. The No Project (Alternative 2) and Alternative 4 include no multi-family housing.
1.B.8. The County shall require residential subdivisions	<b>Consistent.</b> The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no

Goals, Policies, and Development Standards	HMR Master Plan Consistency Analysis
to be designed to provide well-connected internal and external street and pedestrian systems.	changes to existing development.  <b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 have potential to result in inadequate internal emergency vehicle access and evacuation routes. See <i>Chapter 17 – Hazardous Materials and Public Safety</i> , Impact PS-2 for discussion of required mitigation measures.
1.B.9. The County shall discourage the development of isolated, remote, and/or walled residential projects that do not contribute to the sense of community desired for the area.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 are located and designed to be integrated into the existing Homewood community. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.
1.B.10. The County shall require that all residential development provide private and/or public open spaces in order to insure that each parcel contributes to the adequate provision of light, air, and open space.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 provide open spaces for adequate provision of light, air, and open space. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.
<b>COMMERCIAL LAND</b>	
<b>Goal 1.D: To designate adequate commercial land for and promote development of commercial uses to meet the present and future needs of Placer County residents and visitors and maintain economic vitality.</b>	
<b>General Commercial Areas Policies</b>	
1.D.1. The County shall require that new commercial development be designed to encourage and facilitate pedestrian circulation within and between commercial sites and nearby residential areas rather than being designed primarily to serve vehicular circulation.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 include mixed-use or neighborhood commercial areas with pedestrian access. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.
1.D.3. The County shall require that new, urban, community commercial centers locate adjacent to major activity nodes and major transportation corridors. Community commercial centers should provide goods and services that residents have historically had to travel outside of the area to obtain.	<b>Consistent.</b> Commercial areas are located on SR 89, the major transportation route in the area, under Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.
<b>Downtown Areas/Village Centers Policies</b>	
1.D.5. The County shall encourage existing and new downtowns/village centers to provide a variety of goods and services, both public and private.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 include mixed-use or neighborhood commercial areas that provide a variety of goods and services adjacent to other commercial uses in Homewood. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.
1.D.6. The County shall promote use of first floor space in new buildings in downtowns/village centers for retail, food service, financial institutions, and other high-volume commercial uses.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 include mixed-use with first-floor retail. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.
<b>JOBS-HOUSING BALANCE</b>	
<b>Goal 1.M: To work toward a jobs-housing balance.</b>	
1.M.1. The County shall concentrate most new growth within existing communities emphasizing infill development, intensified use of existing development, and expanded services, so individual communities become more complete, diverse, and balanced.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 provides for growth and infill development within an existing community. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.
1.M.3. The County shall encourage the creation of	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and

Goals, Policies, and Development Standards	HMR Master Plan Consistency Analysis
primary wage-earner jobs, or housing which meets projected income levels, in those areas of Placer County where an imbalance between jobs and housing exists.	Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 provides for expanded commercial, retail, and mixed-uses for new employment opportunities. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.
<b>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</b>	
<b>Goal 1.N: To maintain a healthy and diverse local economy that meets the present and future employment, shopping, recreational, public safety, and service needs of Placer County residents and to expand the economic base to better serve the needs of residents.</b>	
I.N.1. The County shall promote economic expansion based on Placer County's unique recreational opportunities and natural resources.	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 provide for economic expansion related to a unique natural resource and recreational opportunity. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.</p> <p><b>Not Consistent.</b> Alternative 4 would reduce natural resource based recreational opportunities with closure of the ski area. See <i>Chapter 18 – Recreation</i>, Impact REC-2 and Impact REC-4 for discussion and analysis.</p>
<b>High Sierra Policies</b>	
I.N.15. The County shall support development of tourist and recreational facilities that extend the High Sierra's tourist season.	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 provide for economic expansion related to a unique natural resource and recreational opportunity. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.</p> <p><b>Not Consistent.</b> Alternative 4 would reduce tourist and recreational facilities that extend the High Sierra's tourist season with closure of the ski area. See <i>Chapter 18 – Recreation</i>, Impact REC-2 and Impact REC-4 for discussion and analysis.</p>
<b>Placer County General Plan 2009 Housing Element</b>	
<b>A. NEW RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION</b>	
<b>Goal A. To provide new housing opportunities to meet the needs of existing and future Placer County residents in all income categories.</b>	
A-1. The County shall maintain an adequate supply of appropriately zoned land with public services to accommodate housing needs of existing and future residents.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 focus new residential development on appropriately zoned lands. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.
A-3. The County shall encourage innovative subdivision design and a range of housing types within larger-scale development projects to encourage mixed-income communities (e.g., single-family detached homes, second units, duplexes, live-work units).	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 provide a range of housing types. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.</p> <p><b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> Alternative 4 provides only single-family housing affordable to above-moderate income households. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy A-3.</p>
A-4. The County shall encourage mixed-use and transit-	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and

Goals, Policies, and Development Standards	HMR Master Plan Consistency Analysis
oriented development projects where housing is provided in conjunction with compatible nonresidential uses.	Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 focus new residential development adjacent to transit opportunities and commercial/retail land uses. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.
A-5. The County shall encourage residential infill development through flexible development standards, and other incentives in areas of the county where adequate public facilities and services are already in place.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 focus new residential development in an infill location served by existing public services and utility infrastructure.
A-7. The County shall encourage the development of multi-family dwellings in locations where adequate infrastructure and public services are available.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 focus new residential development in an infill location served by existing public services and utility infrastructure. The No Project (Alternative 2) and Alternative 4 include no multi-family dwellings.
<b>B. AFFORDABLE HOUSING</b>	
<b>Goal B. To encourage construction and maintenance of safe, decent and sound affordable housing in the county.</b>	
B-1. The County shall give highest priority for permit processing to development projects that include an affordable residential component.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 include an employee/workforce housing component. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.  <b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> Alternative 4 provides only single-family housing affordable to above-moderate income households. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy B-1.
B-4. The County shall require housing for low-income households that is to be constructed on-site in a new residential project to be dispersed throughout the project to the extent practical given the size of the project and other site constraints.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 provide an employee/workforce housing component that will be situated on-site or nearby and accessible by transit. The No Project (Alternative 2) and Alternative 4 include no employee/workforce housing.
B-6. The County shall require low-income-housing units in density bonus, or other projects that may be required to provide affordable housing, to be developed in a timely manner with the market-rate units in the project to avoid delaying the construction of the affordable units to the end of the project.	<b>Consistent.</b> The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development, and no employee/workforce housing is required.  <b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 do not provide a sufficiently detailed employee/workforce housing plan to demonstrate compliance with Policy B-6. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy B-6.
B-7. The County shall facilitate expanded housing opportunities that are affordable to the workforce of Placer County.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 include employee/workforce housing. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development, and no employee/workforce housing is required.

Goals, Policies, and Development Standards	HMR Master Plan Consistency Analysis
	<p><b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> Alternative 4 does not provide employee/workforce housing. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy B-7.</p>
<p>B-10. On a case-by-case basis, when evaluating possible reductions in development standards to encourage affordable housing, the County shall also consider public health, safety, and other important standards such as adequate open space in developments.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development, and no employee/workforce housing is required.</p> <p><b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> Alternative 4 does not provide employee/workforce housing. The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 do not provide a sufficiently detailed employee/workforce housing plan to demonstrate compliance with Policy B-10. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy B-10.</p>
<p>B-12. The County shall continue to give highest priority in the development review process to senior housing, very low-, low- and moderate-income housing projects.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 include employee/workforce housing. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development, and no employee/workforce housing is required.</p> <p><b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> Alternative 4 does not provide employee/workforce housing. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy B-12.</p>
<p>B-13. The County shall continue to implement the following incentive programs for the construction of affordable housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow second residential units with single-family residences;</li> <li>• Allow mobile homes and manufactured housing in all residential zoning districts;</li> <li>• Allow “hardship mobile homes” as second residential units in residential and/or agricultural zones; and</li> <li>• Allow relief from parking standards and other specified development standards on developments for seniors and for low and very low-income residents.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 include employee/workforce housing. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development, and no employee/workforce housing is required.</p> <p><b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> Alternative 4 does not provide employee/workforce housing. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy B-13.</p>
<p>B-15. The County shall require that any privately-initiated proposal to amend a General Plan or Community Plan land use designation of Agricultural/Timberland, Resort and Recreation, Open Space, General Commercial, Tourist/Resort Commercial, or Business Park/Industrial to a land use designation of Residential or Specific Plan shall include an affordable housing component subject to approval by County and/or comply with any adopted County</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development, and no employee/workforce housing is required.</p> <p><b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 do not provide sufficient detail in their employee/workforce housing component to demonstrate compliance. Alternative 4 provides no employee/workforce housing.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Development Standards	HMR Master Plan Consistency Analysis
affordable housing program.	<b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy B-15.
<b>C. HOUSING IN THE TAHOE BASIN</b>	
<b>Goal C. To promote housing opportunities that meet the specific needs of residents and workers in the Tahoe Basin portion of Placer County.</b>	
<p>C-2. The County shall require new development in the Sierra Nevada and Lake Tahoe areas to provide for employee housing equal to at least 50 percent of the housing demand generated by the project. If the project is an expansion of an existing use, the requirement shall only apply to that portion of the project that is expanded (e.g., the physical footprint of the project or an intensification of the use). Employee housing shall be provided for in one of the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of on-site employee housing;</li> <li>• Construction of off-site employee housing;</li> <li>• Dedication of land for needed units; and/or</li> <li>• Payment of an in-lieu fee.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development, and no employee/workforce housing is required.</p> <p><b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 do not include sufficient employee/workforce housing for at least half of new FTEs. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy C-2 by requiring construction of sufficient on-site and off-site employee/workforce housing, dedication of sufficient land for new housing, and/or payment the appropriate in-lieu fee.</p>
<b>H. ENERGY CONSERVATION</b>	
<b>Goal H. To increase the efficiency of energy use in new and existing homes with a concurrent reduction in housing costs for Placer County residents.</b>	
<p>H-1. The County shall require that all new dwelling units meet current State requirements for energy efficiency, and encourage developers to exceed Title 24 requirements. Retrofitting of existing units shall be encouraged.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 will be designed to exceed Title 24 standards and meet LEED Certification standards for energy conservation. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.</p>
<p>H-2. The County shall promote land use patterns that encourage energy efficiency, to the extent feasible.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 will be designed to exceed Title 24 standards and meet LEED Certification standards for energy conservation. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.</p>
<p>H-4. The County shall continue to implement provisions of the Subdivision Map Act that require subdivisions to be oriented for solar access, to the extent practical.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 will be designed to provide adequate solar access. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.</p>
<b>QUANTIFIED HOUSING OBJECTIVES FOR THE 2008-2013 PLANNING PERIOD</b>	
<p>For the 2008-2013 <u>planning period</u>:</p> <p>Extremely Low Income: 150 units.            Very low-income: 490 units.            Low-income: 430 units.            Moderate Income: 365 units.  <b>Subtotal, Affordable Housing: 1,435 units</b>            Above moderate income: 128 units.            Total Units: 1,563 units.</p> <p>Tenure: 25% rentals, 75% owner-occupied.            Type: 75% single-family detached; 25% multi-family and mobile home.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 provide market rate housing affordable to above moderate-income households. The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternative 3 contribute 13 employee/workforce housing units on-site, and Alternatives 5 and 6 provide 12 units. Due to the resort setting of the Project area, new housing units are expected to be mostly multi-family vacation units or rentals with the exception of 16 single-family detached homes under Alternative 4, 16 under Alternative 5, and 14 under Alternative 6. Consequently, tenure and type ratios would not be met for the Project area housing.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Development Standards	HMR Master Plan Consistency Analysis
	The expected low ratio of owner-occupied, single-family detached homes is considered appropriate for the unique setting of the Project area.
<b>1998 West Shore Area General Plan</b>	
<b>II. Community Development/Land Use Element</b>	
<b>A. Housing Goals and Policies</b>	
2. Provide opportunities for affordable housing, including affordable senior housing in appropriate areas where public transportation is easily available, close to neighborhood serving retail facilities, and where such development will be compatible with surrounding uses.	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development, and no employee/workforce housing is required.</p> <p><b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 do not include sufficient employee/workforce housing for at least half of new FTEs. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> ensures compliance with Policy 2 by requiring construction of sufficient on-site and off-site housing, dedication of sufficient land, and/or payment of an appropriate in-lieu fee.</p>
3. Provide for employee housing in appropriate areas, through the use of the affordable housing pool, conversion of existing tourist accommodation multiple unit structures (consistent with density limitations), as a requirement of project approval for large-scale projects, and through other appropriate means.	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development, and no employee/workforce housing is required.</p> <p><b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 do not include sufficient employee/workforce housing for at least half of new FTEs. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> ensures compliance with Policy 3 by requiring construction of sufficient on-site and off-site housing, dedication of sufficient land, and/or payment of an appropriate in-lieu fee.</p>

Source: HBA 2010

**IMPACT: PEH-2. Will the Project alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?**

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and All Alternatives*

The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives are not expected to result in substantial new population growth. The existing population in the North Lake Tahoe Basin was 26,913 residents in 2007, and the population of the Placer County portion of the Basin was 14,588 and Homewood was 906 persons. As presented in *Chapter 3 – Project Description*, the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternative 3 will include up to 165 whole or partial ownership market rate multi-family dwelling units and 16 Townhomes. Assuming 2.6 persons per household (average Placer County household size in 2007), the full time resident population may increase by up to 471 persons under the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternative 3. There will be no population growth under No Project (Alternative 2). Alternative 4 includes 16 estate home sites to be developed, accommodating a population increase of up to 42 persons. Alternative 5

would build 241 single- and multi-family units developed for a population increase of up to 627 persons. Alternative 6 includes 209 single- and multi-family units with a potential population increase of up to 543 persons.

These population estimates would be worst-case scenarios because recent real estate trends show that 50 – 70% of these units would typically be sold to second homeowners not permanently residing in the units. Consequently, permanent populations in these units are expected to be no more than 50% of the estimate above, or 236 for the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternative 3, 21 for Alternative 4, 314 for Alternative 5, and 272 for Alternative 6.

The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternative 3 will include 13 employee/workforce housing units with 26 bedrooms with an additional on-site population increase of up to 52 persons. Alternatives 5 and 6 include 12 employee/workforce housing units with 24 bedrooms for an additional on-site population increase of up to 48 persons.

Additional employee/workforce housing units are required to be provided off-site as required by *Placer County General Plan Housing Element Policy C-2* for another 39 employees under the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternative 3, bringing total employment-related population growth to 91 workers. Alternative 4 requires employee/workforce housing for 18 employees. Under Alternatives 5 and 6, additional employee/workforce housing would be provided for 41 and 35 employees, bringing the total employment related population growth to 89 and 78 persons for Alternatives 5 and 6, respectively.

Employment related population growth is expected to be zero persons under No Project (Alternative 2) and up to 182 new workers under the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) or Alternative 3. A majority of the employment growth is assumed to currently reside in the region and will commute to the resort from nearby areas such as Homewood,Tahoma, and Tahoe City. Although these employees may add to commuter traffic in the area, employment increases for the Project area will not substantially alter the population growth rate or density in the Placer County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin with an existing population of 14,588 persons.

The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 will result in temporary population increases from tourists vacationing at the resort, renting housing units, or visiting the commercial facilities. This growth in visitation will not consist of permanent population and will fluctuate according to peak tourist seasons at Lake Tahoe. This population is not counted in official population census totals or planned growth rates for the area, and is not considered to be a population impact.

The increase in permanent residents, including employees in employee/workforce housing on-site and off-site, would be 327 persons under the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternative 3, 39 persons under Alternative 4, 403 persons under Alternative 5, and 355 persons under Alternative 6. This represents a range of population increase in the Placer County portion of the Basin from 2.7% for Alternative 5 to 0.3% for Alternative 4. The expected population increase resulting from the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 is expected to be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

## 7.5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

**Impact:** **PEH-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to population, employment, and housing?**

**Analysis:** *Less than Significant Impact; Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and All Alternatives*

Alternative 2 (No Project) will not substantially contribute to changes in the distribution or composition of population, employment, or housing in the Project area or vicinity and will not result in considerable population or housing changes. The growth in population, employment, and housing in the region is limited by existing land use designations and the availability of lots suitable for new construction or redevelopment.

The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 will result in population increases, including lower-income population demographic associated with the leisure, retail, and hospitality employment growth. There are multiple projects proposed for the North and West Shore Tahoe region that will expand recreation, commercial, and hospitality services. There are other projects proposed in Tahoe Vista and Kings Beach that are specifically targeted at increasing the amount of employee/workforce housing in the Lake Tahoe Region. There are other employee/workforce housing projects proposed in Kings Beach (84 units) and Tahoe Vista (162 units) that may provide an opportunity for housing new HMR employees. There is existing unmet demand, however, for employee/workforce housing in the region. The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 are required to provide housing for only half of the new project-related employee/workforce housing demand under *Placer County General Plan Housing Element* policy C-2. Consequently, the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 contribute to the existing cumulative impact of a lack of employee/workforce housing in the region.

The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3 will increase unmet demand for approximately 23 employee/workforce housing units for 91 new FTEs, Alternative 4 will increase unmet demand for five units for 18 FTEs, Alternative 5 will increase unmet demand for 23 units for 89 FTEs, and Alternative 6 will increase unmet demand for 21 units for 83 FTEs. Based on a supply of 11,481 housing units in the Placer County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin, the potential contributions of the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 to unmet demand for employee/workforce housing are not expected to be cumulatively considerable. In addition, based on existing employment and residential patterns in the area, a substantial portion of new employees at HMR are expected to be existing residents in the Placer County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Therefore, this potential cumulative impact related to population, employment and housing is considered less than significant.

The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 will contribute to a cumulative employment benefit to the region by providing tourist recreational services and vacation homes that draw visitors to the area. In addition to the refurbished and improved winter sports facilities, the added services (hotel, restaurants, retail, hiking and biking trails) and the conversion of Tourist Accommodation Units (TAUs) to residential units will provide new tourist opportunities in conjunction with other tourist features offered at other redeveloped projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Therefore, this potential cumulative impact is considered less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required.

## REFERENCES

- Department of Finance (DOF). 2009. [www.dof.ca.gov](http://www.dof.ca.gov). Site accessed November 3, 2009. State of California, Department of Finance.
- Employment Development Department (EDD). 2009. Placer County Profile. September 2009. <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov>. Site accessed November 2, 2009. State of California, Employment Development Department.
- City-data.com. 2009. <http://city-data.com>. Site accessed November 2, 2009.
- County of Placer. 1998. *West Shore Area General Plan*. Adopted October 19, 1998. Placer County. Auburn, CA.
- County of Placer. 2009. *Placer County Housing Element Policy Document*. Prepared by Mintier Harnish. Adopted May 12, 2009. Placer County. Auburn, CA.
- County of Placer. 2009. *Placer County Housing Element*. May 12, 2009. Placer County. Auburn, CA.
- JMA Ventures, LLC. 2008. FTE Employee Calculation for Homewood Development Proposal. Unpublished report for Homewood Mountain Resort. April 9, 2008.
- Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation. 2009. <http://detr.state.nv.us/>. Site accessed November 2, 2009.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2009. 2000 U.S. Census. <http://factfinder.census.gov>. Site accessed November 2, 2009.