DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION
13760 Lincoln Way
AUBURN, CA 95603
(530) 889-0111
Website: www.fire.ca.gov

1

January 31, 2011

TO: Maywan Krach
Placer County Community Development Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

RE: Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan (DEIR) SCH #2008092008

This project will require a Timberland Conversion and Timber Harvest Plan as per the following:

1 *California Code of Regulations, per section 1103, and Public Resources Code 4581 requires a Timberland Conversion Permit and/or Timber Harvest Plan be filed with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection if the project involves the removal of a crop of trees of commercial species (regardless of size of trees or if trees are commercially harvested).*

The Timberland Conversion Permit shall address the following:

a. The decrease in timber base in the county as a result of the project.
b. The cover type, including commercial species, density, age, and size composition affected by the project.
c. The ground slopes and aspects of the area affected by the project.
d. The soil types affected by the project.
e. Any significant problems that may affect the conversion.

If you require further clarification, please contact Forester Jeff Dowling at (530) 587-8926.

Sincerely,

Brad Harris
CAL FIRE
Unit Chief

Jeff Dowling
Truckee Area Forester

jd

DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION
Northern Region Headquarters
6105 Airport Road
Redding, CA 96002
Website: www.fire.ca.gov

2

RECEIVED
APR 22 2011
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES

April 15, 2011

TO: Placer County Community Development Agency
ATTN: Maywan Krach
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

TO: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
128 Market Street
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

RE: Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan (DEIR) SCH #2008092008

Dear Planners,

CAL FIRE respectfully submits the following comments regarding the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan (DEIR). Our comments consist of state law requirements regarding tree removal and timberland conversion under the California Forest Practices Act and its Rules and Regulations (Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Chapters 4, 4.5, and 10), state fire laws detailed within California Public Resource Code (PRC) 4290 and 4291, California Building Code Chapter 7A Wildland Urban Interface building standards, as well as corrections of inaccuracies contained within the document relating to these items. Please note that California laws regarding tree removal and vegetation management are in addition to TRPA requirements.

1 CAL FIRE requests Placer County and/or the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) implement and enforce as per county and/or TRPA code all applicable State Responsibility Area (SRA) Fire Safe Regulations. Construction, installation and/or development of structures and/or facilities on the parcels shall comply with the most recent California State Responsibility Fire Safe Regulations (Public Resource Code 4290) and all other applicable State and County code, ordinances and regulations in effect at the time of application for improvement permits. Exceptions from the provisions of the county code which implement the SRA Fire Safe Regulations may be made by the Building Official and/or TRPA after consultation with CAL FIRE, which administers State Responsibility Area (SRA) fire protection in this area of Placer County, as well as with North Tahoe Fire Protection District, the local fire protection agency.

Beginning January 2008, the new 2007 California Building Code (CBC) became effective. These new codes include provisions for ignition resistant construction standards within the wildland urban interface. CAL FIRE requests Placer County implement and enforce as per county code Chapter 7A of the California Building Code (Wildland Urban Interface building codes). For products to be used in the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), such as within the Project area, regulations exist that require building products to comply with specific standards. 2

Page 3-18 3.5.2 North Base Area

Last paragraph This paragraph states that Tahoe Ski Bowl Way will be extended but does not state the overall proposed length. Does the dead-end road length exceed 1,320 feet? As per PRC 4290 of the California Fire Safe Regulations, the maximum length of dead-end roads, including all dead-end roads accessed from that dead-end road, must not exceed a cumulative length of 1,320 feet for those parcels between 1 and 5 acres in size, and must have a turnaround at its terminus. The maximum length of dead-end roads, including all dead-end roads accessed from that dead-end road, must not exceed a cumulative length of 2,640 feet for those parcels between 5 and 20 acres in size, and must have a turnaround at its terminus. The turnaround area at the end of dead-end roads must be improved with sub base and base as required by the road classification for a diameter of 80 feet and must be provided with shoulders as required for the class of road served. The turnaround area at the end of dead-end paved roads must be paved for a diameter of 60 feet. Right of Way turnarounds must be at least 20 feet more than the diameter of the required surfaced area and shoulder. *Please note these are minimum standards and local codes may exceed these minimum standards.* 3

Page 3-19 South Base Area, second paragraph: This paragraph discusses Tahoe Ski Bowl Way minimum road width and turnaround. CAL FIRE requests that proposed construction changes to Tahoe Ski Bowl Way meet PRC 4290 requirements. *Please note that PRC 4290 states minimum standards and local codes may exceed these standards.* 4

Page 3-76 Fire Suppression and Management Plan

Please remove "Local Responsibility Area". Local Responsibility Area (LRA) does not exist within the Project area. The land is all State Responsibility Area (SRA) classified. The SRA land is USFS Direct Protection Area (DPA) through the Cooperative Wildland Fire Management Agreement (CFMA). This area of SRA lands assumed by the USFS for wildland fire protection is known as federal Direct Protection Area (DPA) (but not Federal Responsibility Area (FRA). The term FRA denotes federal lands having federal agency wildland fire jurisdiction). See next issue below for further explanation. 5

Pages 3-47 and 3-69, Amendments to North Tahoe Fire Protection District Boundary (NTFPD): The last sentence is inaccurate. CAL FIRE does not have jurisdiction as stated for the Mid-Mountain lodge area and therefore is not required to approve any such boundary change from LAFCO. 6 All of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District is within SRA land classification. There is no LRA within the NTFPD boundaries. 7 The jurisdiction for wildland fires within SRA lands in California is CAL FIRE. However, through the Cooperative Wildland Fire Management Agreement (CFMA), wildfire protection within various areas of California is assumed by the USFS. The Lake Tahoe Basin, including the Project area, is one such area. As stated above, the SRA lands are federal DPA for wildland fire protection responsibility only. The USFS is the protecting agency for wild fires within the NTFPD boundaries. The North Tahoe Fire Protection District is the agency having jurisdiction for all fires (structure, vehicle, etc) and rescue emergencies within its boundaries, *except* wild fires which are the jurisdiction of CAL FIRE but protected by the USFS by agreement through the CFMA. 8

9 **Page 8-72, BIO-10, Analysis, 71.2C(2) Private Landowners may prepare a Limited Forest Plan When There is Limited Proposed Impact to Large trees:**
Please state within this section that such a plan shall require a state permit to be approved by CAL FIRE, shall be prepared by a California Registered Professional Forester, and shall follow the rules and regulations of the California Forest Practices Act and all other applicable state laws. Regarding State of California requirements, please strike item 71.2C(2)(b)((v) which states that such a plan can last 10-50 years as this allowance does not exist under state law.

10 **Page 8-73, BIO-10. Prepare Forest Plan and Tree Protection Plan for Homewood Mountain Resort:**
First paragraph, first sentence: Please include CAL FIRE within the first sentence for review and approval of the Forest Plan, including the Fire Suppression and Management Plan. CAL FIRE is the agency having jurisdiction under California State law for forest plans and fire suppression plans.

11 Second paragraph, second sentence: Please remove Certified Arborist" and replace with "Registered Professional Forester". A Certified Arborist is not authorized under State Law to perform the duties described for preparing a Tree Protection Plan. Doing so constitutes practicing forestry without a license, a violation of PRC 752 of the California Professional Foresters Law.

12 **Page 10-25, 10.2 Regulatory Setting**. Please add the State of California, CAL FIRE regarding Tree Removal, Vegetation Protection, and Revegetation. Specifically, the following text should be added:

> Title 14 California Code of Regulations §1103, and Public Resources Code §4581 requires a Timberland Conversion Permit and, in this case, a Timber Harvest Plan be filed with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) if the project involves the removal of a crop of trees of commercial species (regardless of size of trees or if trees are commercially harvested). Timberland is defined as land supporting the growth of commercial timber species. A Timberland Conversion also requires a Timber Harvest Plan, whether or not the timberland owner plans to sell the logs. If the converted land is zoned as Timber Production Zone (TPZ), the property may also require rezoning by local government with the approval of CAL FIRE.
>
> The project applicant must include within the Timberland Conversion Permit at a minimum a soil, slope, and watershed analysis. In addition, pursuant to §1105 and §1105.3 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, an archaeological addendum, discussion of the cumulative effects of the loss of timberland and timber supply, erosion control plan, and environmental checklist must also be provided.
>
> The following is a specific listing of those items the project applicant must include and discuss within the EIR in order for CAL FIRE to accept the application and make further determinations as per our regulatory authorities. The specific items required by CAL FIRE for inclusion to the EIR for evaluation and disclosure include:
>
> 1. General Site Evaluation
> a. Timber site classification map.

b. Current timber stocking levels in basal area per acre.
c. Quantitative and qualitative analysis detailing how sustained yield of timber growth will be achieved.
d. Total project acres and amount of acreage in timberland.
e. Erosion Hazard Rating(s) map per §932.5, Title 14 California Code of Regulations.
f. Soil description/map(s).
g. Watercourse classification map as per Table 1, §936.5, Title 14 California Code of Regulations.
h. Road construction/reconstruction plan.
i. Road abandonment/obliteration plan, if any
j. Silvicultural prescriptions and interim measures to be applied based upon the proposed management objectives.

2. Discussion of the cumulative effects of the loss of timberland and timber supply.

3. Map indicating the land use of parcels adjoining lands to be converted to a non-timber growing use.

4. Erosion control plan for the development, or an explanation detailing why such a plan is not necessary.

5. Discussion of past and future timber management and harvesting activities.

6. Archaeological addendum of the project area.

7. Description of special measures to be conducted after completion of timber harvesting operations (if applicable), including road and skid trail construction and use to prevent erosion, protect soil, and to protect watercourses, ponds, or lakes on or near the areas to be converted to non-timber growing uses.

8. Description detailing how the project area will be prepared for the new use(s) after completion of timber harvesting. Include description of methods of slash disposal and woody vegetation treatment, and any additional land treatment measures to be taken.

9. Name of the fire protection jurisdiction to supply protection to the developed areas/features.

10. Explanation detailing how the project shall meet fire protection standards of the fire protection jurisdiction or of the safety element of the Placer County General Plan and the county's adopted State Responsibility Area Fire Safe Regulations.

13 **Page 16-17, Section 16.4 Environmental Impacts and Recommended Mitigation, Water Supply**
Third Paragraph: fire flow inadequate . CAL FIRE requests that all proposed water supplies for fire emergencies meet the minimum fire flow requirements of PRC 4290.
Please note these are minimum standards and local codes may exceed these minimum standards.

Page 17-13, Section 17.4 Environmental Impacts and Recommended Mitigation, PS-1 Analysis.

14 First Paragraph: Construction of the new residential, commercial, and recreational facilities shall comply with all State fire codes for construction, including Chapter 7 of the Wildland Urban Interface Building Code.

15 Second paragraph: Please correct this section as follows: "NTFPD serves the Project area as the agency having jurisdiction for all fire department emergencies except for wildland fires. Wildland fires within the Project Area, including the Mid-Mountain lodge area, are the jurisdiction of CAL FIRE but protected by the USFS through the Cooperative Wildland Fire Management Agreement with CAL FIRE.

If you require further clarification, please contact Brad Harris, Nevada-Yuba-Placer Unit Chief at (530) 889-0111.

Sincerely,

Bill Holmes

Bill Holmes
CAL FIRE Northern Region Chief

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 3
703 B STREET
MARYSVILLE, CA 95901
PHONE (530) 634-7616
FAX (530) 741-5346
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov

3

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

March 10, 2011

032011- TAH0002
Homewood Mountain Resort Area Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Report
SCH# 2008092008

Maywan Krach
County of Placer
Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Ms. Krach

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Homewood Mountain Resort Area Master Plan. The project proposes to redevelop mixed-uses at the North Base area, residential uses at the South Base area and a lodge at the Mid-Mountain Base area. Our comments are as follows:

Transportation and Circulation Section

- 1 We request that the draft marketing plan, referenced on page 11-61, be sent to Caltrans for review as it will be attempting to control parking along State Route 89.
- 2 On page 11-80, eliminating the gap on the West Shore Bike Trail in the Homewood area should be allowed as part of any redevelopment in this area. Requiring construction of at least part of the trail should be required for Alternative 1 or 3.
- 3 On page 11-104, the widening of Fawn Street approach to provide another lane approaching the highway will require an encroachment permit from Caltrans. 4 We also recommend providing a right-turn only lane instead of a left-turn only lane.
- 5 The site plan and any proposed frontage improvements along SR 89 in the Homewood area should be sent to Caltrans for review in the early stages of preparation. 6 A specific pedestrian facilities plan for the ski area and the community should be required for Alternatives 1 and 3.

An Encroachment Permit will be required for any work conducted in the State's

right of way such as sign placement, traffic control, light installation, culvert maintenance, drainage pattern changes, or sidewalk installation. A cost estimate for the work within the State's right of way will be reviewed to determine whether it triggers the need for a 'project funded by others' designation. **Maintenance of landscaping or sidewalks built within the State's right of way becomes the responsibility of the local jurisdiction.** To secure an application, please contact the Encroachment Permits Central Office at (530) 741-4403.

Please provide our office with copies of any further actions regarding this project. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please do not hesitate to contact Jennifer Duran at (530) 740-4992.

Sincerely,

RICHARD HELMAN, Chief
Office of Transportation Planning—East

State of California | Business, Transportation and Housing Agency

4

Memorandum

Date: January 25, 2011

Clear 4/21/11 e

RECEIVED MAR 16 2011 3pm STATE CLEARING HOUSE

To: Truckee Area (222)

From: **DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL**
Special Projects Section

File No.: 063.A07471.noc.doc

Subject: ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT REVIEW AND RESPONSE
SCH#2008092008

Special Projects Section (SPS) recently received a "Notice of Completion" environmental document from the State Clearinghouse outlining the information contained in the attached profile.

After a preliminary review, we believe this project will not have a significant impact on statewide departmental operations. However, because of your geographical proximity to the site, you are in a better position to provide a more accurate assessment of any traffic-related matters that may affect your local Area operations. Information and procedures outlined in the *Transportation Planning Manual,* HPM 41.1, Chapter 6, "Environmental Impact Documents," should serve as a guideline when reviewing transportation-related documents.

If you determine departmental input is advisable, please provide your written comments referencing the above SCH number to the State Clearinghouse, 1400 Tenth Street, Room 121, Sacramento, CA 95814. Your comments must be received no later than March 21, 2011. Please forward a copy of your written comments to SPS.

If you have any questions, please call Special Projects Section at (916) 843-3370.

R. M. NANNINI, SSM III
Commander

RECEIVED
APR 25 2011
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES

Attachment

cc: Valley Division
Assistant Commissioner, Field

Safety, Service, and Security

Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) special projects.

Summary: Special Projects Section (SPS) reviewed an environmental impact study for proposed changes to HMR. SPS concluded 'this project will not have a significant impact on statewide departmental operations." SPS forwarded the study for the Truckee Area to review and submit any comments.

Comments are to be forwarded to the State Clearinghouse by Mar. 21, 2011.

After reviewing the study, I believe the proposed projects would have the following impact on the Truckee CHP operations.

However, after reviewing all six of the proposed plans this is what I have concluded.

The current configuration of the HMR is a north base parking and lodge area and a south base parking and lodge area. The North Base is adjacent to SR-89. The South base is at the termination point of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way.

The six proposed plans range from doing nothing, closing the ski area to accommodate private estates on the mountain, to building several large structures to both the South Base and North Base areas. Those changes include the building of several residential buildings including townhouses, condominiums and low income housing. These structures would be built in current parking areas.

Two of the alternatives mention different parking situations. One is a four story 272 parking space garage. Another is a 156 space parking structure. Parking is not addressed in the other alternatives.

Based on my experience of working in the area and my familiarity with HMR, I have concluded the following impact for the area:

1. 2 Currently on busy ski days, parking from HMR North Base area spills onto SR-89. Parking from the South Base area spills onto Tahoe Ski Bowl Way. Current Placer County Ordinance prohibits parking on any roadway Nov. 1 through Apr. 1.

2. 3 By using the existing parking areas for the new construction of buildings, this displaces the ski area parking. This leaves the question of where will the ski area parking be located?

3. 4 With the additional residential units, how many will be full time residents? Will there be additional children in the area? Will there be a need for additional school bus stops? 5

I have highlighted the details to all 6 alternatives. **Please advise additional comments and if you would like me to forward them to the State Clearing House.**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA Edmund G. Brown Jr., *Governor*

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION
915 CAPITOL MALL, ROOM 364
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
(916) 653-4082
(916) 657-5390 - Fax

5

RECEIVED
FEB 24 2011
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES

February 22, 2011

Maywan Krach
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

RE: SCH#2008092008 Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan Project; Placer County.

Dear Ms. Krach:

The Native American Heritage Commission has reviewed the Notice of Completion (NOC) regarding the above referenced project. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) states that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, which includes archeological resources, is a significant effect requiring the preparation of an EIR (CEQA guidelines 15064(b)). To adequately comply with this provision and mitigate project-related impacts on archaeological resources, the Commission recommends the following actions be required:

✓ Contact the appropriate Information Center for a record search to determine:
1
- If a part or all of the area of project effect (APE) has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
- If any known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
- If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
- If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

✓ If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
2
- The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measurers should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure.
- The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center.

✓ Contact the Native American Heritage Commission for:
3
- A Sacred Lands File Check. **Sacred Lands File check completed, no sites indicated.**
- A list of appropriate Native American Contacts for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in the mitigation measures. **Native American Contacts List attached**

✓ Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence.
- Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5(f). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
- Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
- Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains in their mitigation plan. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, CEQA §15064.5(e), and Public Resources Code §5097.98 mandates the process to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

Sincerely,

Katy Sanchez

Katy Sanchez
Program Analyst
(916) 653-4040

CC: State Clearinghouse

Native American Contact List
Placer County
February 22, 2011

Rose Enos
15310 Bancroft Road
Auburn , CA 95603
(530) 878-2378

Maidu
Washoe

Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California
Waldo Walker, Chairperson
919 Highway 395 South
Gardnerville , NV 89410
waldo.walker@washoetribe.
775-265-4191
775-265-6240 Fax

Washoe

Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California THPO
Darrel Cruz, Cultural Resources Coordinator
919 Highway 395 South
Gardnerville , NV 89410
darrel.cruz@washoetribe.
(775) 265-4191 ext 1212
(775) 546-3421 - cell
(775) 265-2254 FAX

Washoe

April Wallace Moore
19630 Placer Hills Road
Colfax , CA 95713
530-637-4279

Nisenan - So Maidu
Konkow
Washoe

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH# 2008092008 Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan Project; Placer County.

6

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE *of* PLANNING AND RESEARCH

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT

JERRY BROWN
GOVERNOR

April 22, 2011

RECEIVED
APR 25 2011
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES

Maywan Krach
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan Project
SCH#: 2008092008

Dear Maywan Krach:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on April 21, 2011, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

> "A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

1400 10th Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044
(916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH# 2008092008
Project Title Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan Project
Lead Agency Placer County

Type EIR Draft EIR

Description Note: 60 Day Review

Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) seeks the study and approval of a Master Plan to develop and upgrade a mixed-use base area to the north, a residential base area to the south, and a mid-mountain lodge and support facilities. The Master Plan would require amendments to TRPA and Placer County Plan documents. Key project components include: 181 multi-family residential condominiums/townhomes: 155 tourist accommodation units consisting of traditional hotel units, fractional ownership units, and condo-hotel units: 25,000 square feet of commercial floor area: 30,000 square feet of accessory floor area (to the ski resort): 13 units of onsite employee housing: a gondola and mid-mountain lodge: and up to 910 parking spaces including a four-story day skier parking structure.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Maywan Krach
Agency Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
Phone (530) 745-3132 **Fax**
email
Address 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
City Auburn **State** CA **Zip** 95603

Project Location

County Placer
City
Region
Lat / Long 39° 5' 48.4" N / 120° 10' 7.38" W
Cross Streets State Route 89 (West Lake Blvd.) & Fawn Street
Parcel No. 097-130-05
Township 14N **Range** 16E **Section** 1 **Base** MDB&M

Proximity to:

Highways SR 89
Airports No
Railways No
Waterways Lake Tahoe
Schools No
Land Use

Project Issues Aesthetic/Visual; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Drainage/Absorption; Economics/Jobs; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects

---

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Game, Region 2; Cal Fire; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Office of Emergency Management Agency, California; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 3; Department of Housing and Community Development; CA Department of Public Health; State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights; Regional Water Quality Control Bd., Region 6 (So Lake Tahoe); Native American Heritage Commission; Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

Date Received 01/21/2011 ***Start of Review*** 01/21/2011 ***End of Review*** 04/21/2011

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

7

California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Lahontan Region

Linda S. Adams
Acting Secretary for Environmental Protection

2501 Lake Tahoe Boulevard, South Lake Tahoe, California 96150
(530) 542-5400 • Fax (530) 544-2271
www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan

Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor

April 21, 2011

County of Placer
Community Development Resource Agency
Environmental Coordination Services
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
Attn: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
Sent Via email: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

COMMENTS ON HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN CEP PROJECT, DRAFT ENVIRNMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/STATEMENT, PLACER COUNTY (SCH# 2008092008)

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Lahontan Region (Lahontan Water Board) provides these comments on the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the above-referenced project, located within the Lake Tahoe Hydrologic Unit. The DEIR evaluates the environmental effects of six potential alternatives (including no project) for the site currently occupied by the Homewood Mountain Resort. General comments are provided first followed by specific comments on the document.

General Comments

1 The DEIR adequately identifies potential environmental impacts from the six project alternatives and describes the mitigation measures needed to minimize and reduce adverse effects to insignificant levels with regard to water quality. Depending on the project alternative that is selected, the Water Board will need to make determination in accordance with the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board) "Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California" (State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16), enclosed, which applies to both surface and ground waters. The DEIR includes an analysis of the cumulative watershed effects associated with each project alternative and information sufficient to inform the Lahontan Water Board to make an anti-degradation analysis determination.

2 Throughout the document, there are various references to the Lahontan Water Board's construction stormwater permit for the Lake Tahoe Basin, Order No. R6T-2005-0007. On April 14, 2011, the Lahontan Water Board adopted an updated permit that replaces Order No. R6T-2005-0007 with Order No. R6T-2011-0019. The final EIR should reference the current construction permit.

Specific Comments

3 **Section 14.4, subheading GEO-4g, page 14-78, third paragraph:** The document indicates that a dewatering discharge option is to discharge to surface waters and that it "may require treatments for the removal of sediment...." Other pollutants are also of concern and waste discharges to surface waters in the Lake Tahoe Hydrologic Unit are prohibited by the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region* (Basin Plan); therefore, dewatering discharges must be treated to a level such that they do not contain pollutants, including but not limited to sediment, before discharging to surface waters.

4 **Section 15.1.5, page 15-20:** The last sentence under the North Base Area subheading indicates that overflows from the existing stormwater infiltration system "are routed to the Caltrans and Placer County stormwater treatment systems along State Route (SR) 89." There are plans to install stormwater treatment systems along this segment of roadway, but those systems are not yet in place. The language should be modified to represent the actual existing conditions. An adequate general description would be to "municipal separate storm sewer systems" of Caltrans and Placer County.

5 **Section 15.2.3, subheading California Regional Water Quality Control Board's Basin Plan for the Lahontan Region, page 15-34:** This section should also reference the waste discharge prohibitions contained in section 5.2 of the Basin Plan, including the waste discharge prohibitions on discharges to floodplains and stream environment zones (SEZs).

6 **Section 15.2.3, subheading Waste Discharge Requirements and Anti-Degradation Findings, page 15-35:** The section references Board Order No. 6-95-86 as the current waste discharge requirements. The Board Order has been amended twice and the current correct reference is Board Order No. 6-95-86A2, adopted on March 13, 2002.

7 **Section 15.2.3, subheading National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System – Lake Tahoe Basin, page 15-36:** The last paragraph in this section states "the SWPPP outlines erosion control measures to be taken as well as BMPs to prevent to the maximum extent practicable the discharge of pollutants to surface waters and groundwater." The language should be revised by replacing maximum extent practicable with best available technology. This is the appropriate standard for storm water controls on construction sites. "Maximum extent practicable" is the standard that applies to municipal separate storm sewer systems, based on the federal Clean Water Act.

8 **Section 15.4, page 15-49, first two paragraphs:** The section refers to both Board Order Nos. R6T-2005-0007 and 6-95-86A2 as applicable requirements for site operations. However, the discussion only pertains to the operational requirements set under Board Order No. 6-95-86A2. The reference to the construction permit does not apply to the discussion provided in this section and the reference should be deleted.

9 **Section 16.1.2, page 16-2**: The section describes the characteristics of the wastewater treatment facilities servicing the project site. The section should analyze or provide information on whether the existing treatment facilities have the capacity to accept additional wastewater flows that may be generated by the redevelopment alternatives. Similarly, the final EIR should discuss whether the sewage collection/export systems are adequate at the proposed flows, or disclose the need for any modifications or new facilities.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DEIR. If you have any questions, please contact me at 530-542-5463 or (bamorfini@waterboards.ca.gov).

Bud Amorfini
Engineering Geologist

Enclosure: State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16

cc: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Via email: homewooddeiscomments@trpa.org

BA/clhT: Homewood Redevelopment EIR Comments.com
File Name: Homewood Mountain Resort - 6A310023700

8

BRIAN SANDOVAL
Governor

STATE OF NEVADA

ANDREW K. CLINGER
Director

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
209 E. Musser Street, Room 200
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4298
(775) 684-0222
Fax (775) 684-0260
budget.state.nv.us

April 18, 2011

Jeff Cowen
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Re: SAI NV # **E2011-095** Reference:

Project: **Homewood Mountain Resort draft EIR/EIS, Lake Tahoe**

Dear Jeff Cowen:

The following agencies support the above referenced document as written:
State Historic Preservation Office

This represents the comments provided to the State Clearinghouse regarding the referenced document, but does not purport to represent an exhaustive list of requirements that may be imposed by state agencies on this undertaking. Further, this document does not supersede existing regulatory requirements that may apply to your undertaking. If you have questions, please contact me at (775) 684-0213.

Sincerely,

R. Tietje
Nevada State Clearinghouse

3/5

Rebecca Palmer

From: Nevada State Clearinghouse
Sent: Wednesday, January 26, 2011 10:02 AM
To: Rebecca Palmer
Subject: E2011-095 Homewood Mountain Resort draft EIR/EIS, Lake Tahoe -

NEVADA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE
Department of Administration, Budget and Planning Division
209 East Musser Street, Room 200, Carson City, Nevada 89701-4298
(775) 684-0213 Fax (775) 684-0260

TRANSMISSION DATE: 1/26/2011

State Historic Preservation Office

Nevada SAI # E2011-095

Project: Homewood Mountain Resort draft EIR/EIS, Lake Tahoe

Follow the link below to download an Adobe PDF document concerning the above-mentioned project for your review and comment.
E2011-095

Please evaluate it with respect to its effect on your plans and programs; the importance of its contribution to state and/or local
areawide goals and objectives; and its accord with any applicable laws, orders or regulations with which you are familiar.

Please submit your comments no later than Monday, March 14, 2011.

Use the space below for short comments. If significant comments are provided, please use agency letterhead and include the Nevada SAI number and comment due date for our reference.

Clearinghouse project archive

Questions? Reese Tietje, (775) 684-0213 or clearinghouse@state.nv.us

✓ No comment on this project ____Proposal supported as written

AGENCY COMMENTS:

Rebecca Palmer 2/22/11

9

NORTH TAHOE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT **Duane Whitelaw, Chief**

P.O. Box 5879
300 North Lake Boulevard
Tahoe City, CA 96145
530.583.6913
Fax 530.583.6909
whitelaw@ntfire.net

9

April 20, 2011

Subject: JMA Ventures
Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan
Homewood, CA
DEIR SCH#2008092008

Maywan Krach
Placer County Community Development Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, California 95603

David Landry
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
128 Market Street
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, Nevada 89449

Re: Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan EIR/EIS

Dear Planners:

The North Tahoe Fire Protection District has reviewed the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan EIR/EIS with respect to future impact(s) during the development and construction phases of the project. North Tahoe Fire Protection District (NTFPD) has previously submitted documentation dated January 14, 2009 that responded to the Notice of Preparation (September 2008) for the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan. This letter addressed the primary requirements for the project and is included in the reference section of the EIR/EIS Section 17.6.

In response to new information gathered regarding the project, NTFPD respectfully submits these additional comments to the EIR/EIS and the January 14, 2009 letter. This correspondence is not intended as an approval or Will Serve letter. Additional conditions may be necessary as this project moves forward for final approval by the NTFPD.

Environmental Impacts and Recommended Mitigations

3.5.23 Building Height, Scenic Improvements and Compliance with Design Guidelines

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: Architectural features include hipped and gabled roofs, dormers, exposed timber, and natural materials. Buildings are clustered to conserve natural areas and reduce the visual prominence of structures. Two story structures are located along SR 89, with three to four story buildings set back from the roadway and behind shorter structures and a pedestrian plaza.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:** All construction materials shall be consistent with the requirements of the building construction type per the California Building Code. Exposed timber will necessitate careful review by NTFPD with the Design Team to ensure code compliance. All exterior materials shall be appropriate for a wildland urban interface area. The overall building height and access necessitates the need for an aerial fire apparatus and staffing for that apparatus that was discussed in the NTFPD January 14, 2009 NOP response letter.
- Reference Page: 3-41; 4-10, References 17.6

3.5.25 Code of Ordinance/Plan Area Statement/Goals and Policies Amendments

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: Amend NTFPD service boundary to include the Mid-Mountain area. Currently this area is served by Cal Fire. The amendment must be processed through the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO).
- **NTFPD Recommendation:** The Mid-Mountain area of the project is not under the jurisdiction of CAL FIRE, but falls under the jurisdiction of Placer County Fire. Historically NTFPD has provided service to this area by default as Placer County fire does not have resources close to the area. NTFPD currently does not have jurisdiction over the area of annexation. Annexation is required in order for NTFPD to respond to emergency incidents and be in compliance with State law regarding district boundaries, sphere of influence, and municipal services review (Cortese, Knox, Hertzberg, 2000). In addition, an annexation increases the service demands on NTFPD operations including station allocation, staffing levels, and response procedures.
- Reference page: 3-47, Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000

3.5.4, Mid-Mountain Area/Emergency Cache Room:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: A Mid-Mountain Lodge Cache room is proposed for firefighting equipment for NTFPD.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:** NTFPD will work with the Design Team to determine the size and equipment requirements for the cache room, including the maintenance of any equipment proposed to be located in the room. NTFPD will need to continue discussions with the Design Team to determine the specific needs related to firefighting operations at the Mid-Mountain Lodge. The ability for NTFPD personnel to access the Mid-Mountain Lodge in winter conditions will necessitate equipment for firefighting and the ability to transport firefighters/equipment from the base area of the project to the Mid-Mountain Lodge.
- Reference: 3-25

3.5.8 Utilities/Mid-Mountain Diesel Storage Tanks:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: Two diesel storage tanks are proposed at the Mid-Mountain area. It is indicated that the proposed two 20,000 gallon tanks will be above ground, but located underneath the maintenance facility within the crawl space.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:** The diesel fuel storage was discussed in a preliminary meeting with the Design Team. As a result of this meeting it is unclear whether the storage tanks will be part of any of the project alternatives. NTFPD has concerns regarding the location of large quantities of

diesel fuel beneath an occupied building. The proposed approach was not approved or disapproved by NTFPD and will require more information. NTFPD will continue to work with the Design Team regarding this approach, demonstrate compliance with the all applicable standards, codes, laws, and regulations.

- Reference pages: 3-28, 3-29

Table 3-6, Potential Fill Areas within the Project Area:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: Table 3-6 provides road infill descriptions
- **NTFPD Recommendation:** NTFPD is involved in the determination of road infill requirements utilizing Public Resource Code (PRC) 4290, California Fire Code, Placer County Fire Safe Ordinance, and the North Tahoe Fire Protection District ordinance. NTFPD will continue to work with the Design Team regarding the impacts on emergency access and roadways within the project.
- Reference Table 3-6, page: 3-37

8

3.11, Intended Uses of the EIR/EIS:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: NTFPD is not recognized as an agency subject to the permitting process for the Project at this time.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:** The inclusion of NTFPD in all aspects of the permitting process pertaining to fire protection and safety is vital to the safety of visitors and citizens in the community.
- Reference page: 3-71

9

3.12.9, Fire Suppression and Management Plan:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: Requires the development of a fire suppression and management plan involving all Responsibility Areas involved during construction.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:** As a point of clarification, the project area and the NTFPD district does not have Local Responsibility Areas and therefore does have jurisdiction over wildland fire in the area. However NTFPD has a vested interest in management of all fire related incidents including fire precaution, pre-suppression, and suppression measures. NTFPD will work with the Design Team and Site Safety Supervisor to develop, implement, and maintain an acceptable Fire Suppression and Management Plan during project construction.
- Reference page: 3-76; 21-11

10

3.12.10 Impact Fees and Design Approval and Annexation:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: Requires payment of development impact fees for project review and to maintain existing levels of fire protection service. Addresses annexation and NTFPD requirements for entering into mutual aid agreements.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:** NTFPD will conduct additional review of all aspects of building designs, building materials, landscaping, and vegetation clearance fire related to the project that fall under jurisdictional responsibility. This review may trigger established fees and costs to the developer as a result. These fees include but are not limited to: mitigation fees for residential and commercial occupancies, cost recovery fees; Pre-TRPA review, sprinkler and standpipe plan checks, hood and duct as well as design review and consultant meetings among others listed on the North Tahoe Fire Protection District Cost Recovery Sheet.
- Reference page:3-76;4-37; 21-11

11

4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.9, Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: The referenced items relate to ISO ratings, response times, and fire suppression operations.

- **NTFPD Recommendation:**
  - 12 Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards are consistent with NTFPD Goals and Policies. Within NTFPD jurisdictional responsibility the district attempts to meet of exceeds Placer County Goals, Policies, and Development Standards.
  - 13 **4.1.1:** Refer to 16.1.8 Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services for more information on NTFPD policies related to ISO.
  - 14 **4.1.2:** NTFPD has an established response time policy that is consistent with these standards.
  - 15 **4.1.3:** NTFPD supports these goals and standards.
  - 16 **4.1.9:** NTFPD supports these goals and standards.
- Reference page: 4-97

Table 4.3-1, West Shore Goals, Policies and Development Standards Items 6, 7, and 8:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: The referenced items relate to fire safety and plan review requirements.
- 17 **NTFPD Recommendation:** There are inaccuracies in several references. Errors in fire district reference may be typographical and it is possible that no additional action is necessary. NTFPD, not NLTFPD, is the accurate description that should be reflected in these items. Additionally, refer to 17.4, PS-1, NTFPD Design Approval and Annexation for further information on the specific code sets that will be used on this project that are absent in Table 4.3-1.
- Reference page: 4-55

8.C.1 to 8.C.12, Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards Items:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: The referenced items describe the "fire hazards" mitigation, including fuels reduction in wildland urban interface; approved construction materials, provision of automatic sprinkler protection and fire extinguishers, and Mid-Mountain Annexation. Assigns NTFPD as the review agency.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:**
  - 18 Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards are consistent with NTFPD Goals and Policies. Within NTFPD jurisdictional responsibility the district attempts to meet or exceeds Placer County Goals, Policies, and Development Standards.
  - 19 All of these goals, policies, and development standards are addressed in other comments in the correspondence. NTFPD will remain the lead agency on all fire related plan and project review that fall under NTFPD jurisdiction. The goals, policies, and development standards will require that compliance be met for all applicable standards, codes, laws, and regulations.
  - Reference pages: 4-114 and 4-115;17-9

8.G.3 to 8.G.6, Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards Items:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: Assigns review of hazardous materials issue to Placer County.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:**
  - 20 Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards are consistent with NTFPD Goals and Policies. Within NTFPD jurisdictional responsibility the district attempts to meet or exceeds Placer County goals, policies, and development standards.
  - 21 Placer County Environmental Health is the lead agency for these goals, policies, and development standards.
  - 22 NTFPD responds in a limited operational role to hazardous material incidents.
  - 23 NTFPD provides direction on storage, handling, and application of applicable standards, codes, laws, and regulations that fall under NTFPD jurisdiction.
  - Reference pages: 4-116

9.0, Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards, General Plan Amendments:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion:** The referenced item addresses the requirements for public infrastructure.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:** NTFPD has a vested interest in ensuring that the all aspects of fire fighting operations are required and funded for the project. NTFPD supports Placer County in instituting General Plan amendments that require the project developers to upgrade and/or create infrastructure that ensures NTFPD operations will be adequate for service delivery needs. 24
- **Reference page:** 4-121

16.1.8 Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services (16.1.8 and 16.2.5):

- **EIR/EIS Discussion:** A description of NTFPD service capabilities is provided as well as an indication of the ISO classification for HMR.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:** NTFPD service capabilities have been described accurately in the EIR/EIS except for these items:
  - 25 CALFIRE have wildland fire suppression responsibility on all areas of the project.
  - 26 NTFPD provides all other services to the project area that is within the current district boundary.
  - 27 Placer County Sheriff Department no longer provides dispatch services for NTFPD. CAL FIRE/Grass Valley ECC now provides all dispatch services for NTFPD.
  - 28 NTFPD has mutual aid agreements in place with all local agencies, state, and federal fire agencies.
  - 29 Station 51 and other NTFPD stations and personnel are utilized for all emergency calls in the Station 53 area (Homewood). Due to low staffing levels of Station 53 this is required, not an "if needed" scenario as described.
  - 30 The Insurance Service Organization (ISO) is an independent agency of NTFPD and therefore NTFPD cannot comment on particular Public Protection Classification (PPC) ratings for the project area or the NTFPD jurisdiction. This policy was instituted at NTFPD due to the inability to accurately determine ISO classifications. NTFPD advises all individuals with ISO PPC ratings questions to contact ISO for clarification or questions.
- **Reference page:** 16-6 and 16-11

16.4, PSU-1, Fire Protection Water Storage and Fire Flow:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion:** The referenced water supply assessment attempts to address the issue of fire flow requirements and infrastructure needs related to fire protection water supplies. Two 250,000-gallon water storage tanks are proposed for construction at Mid-Mountain
- **NTFPD Recommendation:** Discussions with the Design Team have not progressed enough to determine accurate fire protection water storage requirements or the fire flow demand. In addition, the different projects alternatives (1, 3, 4, 5, or 6) may require changes to occur in fire flow requirements due to occupancy, building construction, and/or square footage. It is not specified if the proposed two 250,000-gallon water storage tanks will be dedicated for fire protection purposes or serves other domestic/irrigation requirements. As a result, even if the two 250,000-gallon tanks are dedicated for fire protection water storage, it is unknown if the total 500,000 gallons is sufficient to meet the fire flow demands. NTFPD will continue to work with the Design Team to determine the required fire protection water storage and fire flow demand for the site that meets all applicable standards, codes, laws, and regulations. 31
- Reference: 3-25;3-75 and 3-76;4-37;4-90;6-34;16-1;16-17;21-11

16.4, PSU-1, Fire Protection Services

- **Fire Protection Services (16.4):** The section describes new buildings will be provided with automatic sprinkler systems and hydrants will be located in the Project area. Details are not provided. It is also stated that NTFPD provided a list of design conditions dated January 14, 2009 regarding emergency water supplies, adequate roadways and fire access roads, automatic fire sprinkler systems, automatic fire alarm systems and main power disconnect systems.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:**
  - 32 An automatic fire sprinkler system will be required in many of the project buildings. The sprinkler system must be maintained in an operable condition. The fire sprinkler system for this project must meet or exceed the established standards set forth in the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) National Fire Code, the California Fire Code (CFC) and the North Tahoe Fire Protection District (NTFPD) ordinance. Specific fire district requirements for the system are available from NTFPD. *The sprinkler system* shall be installed in accordance with the latest edition of NFPA 13, 13R, or 13D as applicable. *The system* shall be of an approved non-freezing type.
  - 33 An automatic fire alarm system will be required in many of the project buildings. The system for this project shall meet or exceed the established standards set forth in the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) National Fire Code, the California Fire Code (CFC), and the North Tahoe Fire Protection District (NTFPD) ordinance. Specific fire district requirements for the system are available from NTFPD. The system shall be installed to NFPA 72, latest edition. Sprinkler system water flow, tamper, and other devices are required to be connected to the fire alarm system.
  - 34 Any building or complex of buildings, in which an automatic sprinkler system is installed, shall be provided with a Knox Box® and an outside fire alarm bell (110 volt) mounted in a street facing location approved by NTFPD. The Knox Box® shall contain two sets of appropriate keys for fire department access throughout the building access ramp.
  - 35 If the main electrical power disconnects at the electric meter are located at an interior location, or are inaccessible due to heavy snow conditions, then a remote main power disconnect switch shall be required. If a back-up power generator is utilized, additional requirements shall be made in its operation.
- Reference: 16-26 and 16-27

17.1.7, Wildland Fire Hazards:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: HMR is identified as a Very High fire hazard area. The risk from adjoining forest lands and cooperative agreements are referenced.
- 36 **NTFPD Recommendation:** CALFIRE has wildland fire suppression responsibility on all areas of the project. NTFPD does possess any Local Responsibility Area lands within the project area or within the NTFPD boundaries. However, NTFPD realizes the importance of preparing for and ultimately responding to wildland fire incidents in the project area. NTFPD is committed to maintaining alliances with the agencies responsible for wildland fire suppression in the NTFPD jurisdiction.
- Reference: 17-4, 17-5

17.2.5, State of California – Building Codes in Wildland-Urban Interface:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: Specifies compliance with the 2007, California Building Code Chapter 7A.
- 37 **NTFPD Recommendation:** Due to the inability to determine when the Project construction will be initiated, it is difficult to confirm that the 2007 California Building Code Chapter 7A will be

37 utilized as a new edition maybe in place at time of construction. However for planning purposes the 2007 California Building Code Chapter 7A cab be utilized by NTFPD and the Design Team.

- Reference: 17-4, 17-5

17.4, PS-1, Project impact on risk related to fire hazards

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: The EIR/EIS states the Alternative 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 project will cause a significant impact and will expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving fire hazards, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.
- 38 **NTFPD Recommendation:** This project will cause a marked increase in all calls for service from NTFPD that may include fire, medical services, hazardous materials and other emergency incidents. Mitigation measures by the applicant will be required to offset the increased calls for service. These mitigation measures may take the form of increased staffing, station accommodations for increased staffing, specialized apparatus due to project heights and or winter access, and station accommodations for specialized fire apparatus. Generally, the North Tahoe Fire Protection District must ensure new development won't detract from services provided elsewhere in the District. As well, our policy is to ensure new development is extended as good or better service as exists today. The cost of these new services must be provided by the developer with partial credit for newly paid property tax, special tax and fire suppression fees.
- Reference; 2-30, Table 2-1: PS-1, PS-3; 4-37, 17-13-16

17.4, PS-1, NTFPD Design Approval and Annexation:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: NTFPD design approval and applicable annexation (Mid-Mountain) is specified to limit risk or loss, injury or death involving fire hazards where wildlands are adjacent to urban areas.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:**
  - 39 Design approval: Public Resource Code (PRC) 4290, 4291 and the Placer County Fire Safe Ordinance shall apply in full. Any deviations from the Public Resource Code (PRC) 4290 and the Placer County Fire Safe Ordinance will be considered based upon corresponding mitigating factors. Furthermore, it is understood that any exceptions and mitigating measures for this project are specific to the project presented. The California Fire Code as amended and adopted by Placer County and the North Tahoe Fire Protection District ordinance shall apply to the project. The most current editions of these standards, codes, laws, and regulations will be utilized during and after project completion.
  - 40 Annexation: The majority of this project is within the boundaries of and is served by NTFPD. Part of the project, including the Mid-Mountain Lodge, is outside the fire district. Any areas of the project outside the fire district boundaries must be immediately annexed into the NTFPD including all tax entitlements due NTFPD.
  - 41 Mutual Aid: North Tahoe Fire Protection District has the primary responsibility for structure fire protection and related emergency services. These responsibilities do not include suppression of wildland fires within the project boundaries or the potential annexation area of the project. The project is also within the boundaries of the land classified as State Responsibility Area (SRA). The United States Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit provides wildland fire protection via cooperative agreement with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire). NTFPD does not possess Local Responsibility Areas (LRA) in the project boundaries or throughout the current fire district. NTFPD is referenced as having LRA in several areas of the EIR/EIS (pg. 3-47, 3-69, and 3-76)
  - Reference; 2-32: Table 2-1: PS-1; 3-47; 3-71; 17-13 through 17-16

17.4, PS-2, Will the Project result in an interference with emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans? /Emergency Access during construction and Operation:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 have potential to impede emergency responses on a temporary basis during construction, and permanently if adequate emergency vehicle access is not providing to and throughout the Project area.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:** NTFPD will need to work with the Design Team to develop an acceptable emergency access plan, including traffic control measures, throughout the project construction and at completion of the project. The crucial aspects of these measures will target two components; emergency access of the resort, water supply for firefighting operations while project is under construction and emergency evacuation procedures. Public Resource Code (PRC) 4290, California Fire Code, Placer County Fire Safe Ordinance, and the North Tahoe Fire Protection District ordinance will be referenced throughout the design of these measures. Water supplies must also be capable of providing needed fire flow while the project under construction. NTFPD has established a public education pamphlet, *Emergency Preparedness and Evacuation Guide* that discusses the current recommendations to the public for evacuation procedures. This guide is available at the district website, http://www.ntfire.net/Images/Images/ca%20website%20pdf.pdf and would be utilized for any impacts generated by this project.
- Reference: 2-32: Table 2-1: PS-2; 3-74; 16-30; 17-14 through 17-16; 21-9

42

17.4, PS-2, Dead-end roadway@ Tahoe Ski Bowl Way:

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: Placer County indicates a secondary access road is required to be constructed to serve the structures at the end of Tahoe Ski Bowl.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:** This issue has been discussed with the design team. However, no clarification or design resolution has been addressed, reviewed or approved by NTFPD. NTFPD will continue to work with the Design Team to eliminate the lengthy dead-end road condition as discussed above through the use of secondary access/egress or similar measures.
- Reference: Page 3-16;4-84;17-13-16

43

21.5 Recommended Mitigation Measures, HYDRO-4a. Emergency Response and Evacuation Plan

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: The development of an emergency response and evacuation plan is required in the event of large earthquake/flood. NTFPD is recognized as one of three lead agencies.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:** NTFPD has established a public education pamphlet, *Emergency Preparedness and Evacuation Guide* that discusses the current recommendations to the public for evacuation procedures. This guide is available at the district website, http://www.ntfire.net/Images/Images/ca%20website%20pdf.pdf and would be utilized for any impacts generated by this project.
- Reference: Page 21-59

44

21.5 Recommended Mitigation Measures, PS-1. NTFPD Design Approval and Annexation

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: This section specifies NTFPD shall review and approve building designs/fire protection systems and annex into the NTFPD a portion of the project area. The section also specifies that prior to issuing Building Permits for the Project, Placer County shall require the Project Applicant to pay appropriate fair share development impact fees for Project by posting of a bond to ensure that appropriate mitigation measures are completed and in place during construction and implemented for project operation. References to mutual aid agreements is also discussed.

- **NTFPD Recommendation:** Refer to 17.4, PS-1, NTFPD Design Approval and Annexation for all recommendations.
- Reference: Page 21-62

21.5 Recommended Mitigation Measures, PS-3. NTFPD Design Approval and Annexation

- **EIR/EIS Discussion**: The section requires the Project applicant to develop and submit for review and approval to NTFPD a blasting plan incorporating blast techniques to minimize risks to life and property.
- **NTFPD Recommendation:** NTFPD will need to work with the design team to ensure all applicable standards, codes, laws, and regulations are met when utilizing blasting during the construction phase of the Project. Utilization of a Blasting Plan may also trigger the need for a *Fire Menace Standby* for portions of the blasting operation. This may also trigger a fee structure for staffing of fire equipment with NTFPD personnel.
- Reference: Page 21-63 and 21-64

For communication pertaining to the fire requirements for this project, contact Tim Alameda, Fire Marshall at (530) 583-6911.

DUANE WHITELAW
Fire Chief

TIM ALAMEDA
Battalion Chief/Fire Marshal Fire
and Life Safety

CC: David Tirman, JMA Venture
File

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
ERIK HENRIKSON
DAN WILKINS
RON TREABESS
LOU REINKENS
JUDY FRIEDMAN

10

CINDY GUSTAFSON
GENERAL MANAGER

Tahoe City Public Utility District

10

April 19, 2011

David Landry, Project Manager
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89448

Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
County of Placer
Community Development Resource Agency
Environmental Coordination Services
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

RE: Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan (Homewood Project), Community Enhancement Program Project, Draft EIR/EIS

Dear Mr. Landry and Ms. Krach,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft EIR/EIS (DEIR/S) for the Homewood Project. The Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD) has the following comments regarding this document:

General

1. The TCPUD would like to register its disagreement with TRPA's and Placer County's decision to not include local governmental agencies in the development of this DEIR/S. Many of the following comments are simple corrections or clarifications that could have been addressed during the Administrative Draft stage prior to the public DEIR.

1

2. Throughout the DEIR/S reference is made to integrating the extension of the existing TCPUD bike trail in to the North Base area. We do not feel the language used in the DEIR/S conveys the current situation. The TCPUD owns and operates the West Shore Bike Trail. There is currently a gap in the West Shore Bike Trail extending from the intersection of SR 89 and Cherry Street south to the intersection of Fawn Street and the Sans Souci right of way. This gap encompasses the Homewood Project's North Base Area. TCPUD is currently designing and permitting the Homewood Bike Trail Gap Closure. However, construction funding has not been secured for this work. TCPUD relies exclusively on grants and mitigation fees paid to Placer County for construction of new trail segments and as of this response, sources for construction funding have not been fully identified or secured. Construction could begin as early as 2012 subject to funding and coordination with

2

P.O. Box 5249, 221 Fairway Drive, Tahoe City, California 96145 (530)583-3796 • FAX (530)583-1475

Caltrans' water quality project. This comment is provided in support of more detailed comments below on the subject.

3. Throughout the DEIR/S the language should be modified to state that the Homewood Project will *construct/relocate* the *proposed* TCPUD bike trail through the North Base Area. Specific locations in the document we found are:

3

   a. Table 2-2, p.2-41, p.2-42, Table 3-4, p.3-17, p.3-30, p.3-47, p.11-15, Figure 11-6, Table 11-8, p.11-25, p.11-30, p.11-80, and p.11-83.

4. As discussed above, the TCPUD requires construction funding to complete the Homewood Bike Trail Gap Closure project. The Homewood Mountain Resort Project has identified the trail as integral part of its transportation and recreational elements. We feel that, in some way, this project should provide some portion of the funding required to complete the bike trail. We are not a planning agency and do not have "mitigation fees" to require. As such, we believe that Placer County should identify transportation mitigation or recreation mitigation (eg. Park Dedication Fees) requiring some element of funding to the bike trail project.

4

Chapter 2

5 5. Table 2-1 – Summary of Impacts and Mitigations may require changes based on comments below.

6 6. Table 2-2 – Summary of Environmental Benefits lists the connection to the TCPUD bike trail as a benefit under a number of categories. The section included in the Project does not connect to the TCPUD bike trail to the North and therefore is only a benefit for trail users from the Project heading southbound from the project area.

7 7. Section 2.4 – Areas of Known Controversy – Suggest that first bullet under "Public Services and Utilities" be revised to read "Water supply *and distribution* volume and capacity adequacy;"

Chapter 3

8 8. Section 3.5 – The proposed project description contains no description regarding the relocation/construction of the TCPUD's proposed West Shore Bike Trail through the project area. This is acceptable to the TCPUD as we feel this work should be included as a mitigation measure (see Chapter 11 comments). If the work is not included as a mitigation measure, the project description should be modified to include the following specifics: 9

   a. Construction of a Class 1 Bike Trail along the frontage of the project from the TCPUD's existing trail on Fawn Street (at San Souci right of way) to the TCPUD's proposed trail at the intersection of Silver and San Souci streets.
   b. Meeting the requirements of Caltrans and the TCPUD.
   c. Granted to TCPUD at construction completion with all required permits and entitlements in the name of TCPUD.
   d. At developer's expense including reimbursement of TCPUD expenses.

10 9. Figure 3-8, p. 3-23 – The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) North Base Area Site Plan should be revised to show a Class 1 Bike Trail connecting between the TCPUD's existing trail on Fawn Street (at San Souci right of way) to the TCPUD's proposed

trail at the intersection of Silver and San Souci streets. The Figure shows a trail that does not connect to the existing/proposed facility and crosses the main driveway in an unacceptable manner.

11 10. Section 3.5.6, p. 3-27 – Please note that the Green building principle related to Water Conservation should reference that HMR will also need to comply with the TCPUD's Water and Sewer Ordinances, specifically the TCPUD's Ordinance 264 Water Conservation and Drought Response Standards.

12 11. Section 3.5.6, p. 3-27 – Please note that the Green building principle related to Water Use and the capture, treatment and re-use of roof runoff will require compliance with TCPUD's Water Ordinance, specifically Section 7 Cross-Connection Control.

13 12. Section 3.5.8, 2nd Paragraph 2 (p. 3-29) – Revise the last sentence to read, "Water distribution *and sewer collection* system installation within the Homewood Mountain Resort project development will be completed with the construction of each phase of the Master Plan."

14 13. Section 3.5.9, 5th Paragraph (p.3-29) – Provide a citation for the potential flow rate of 1,000 gpm quoted. We believe this information came from a report: *Kleinfelder, Inc. 1994. Summary of Phase IV Municipal Well Installation and Aquifer Testing of McKinney Well No. 1. Report prepared for Tahoe City Public Utility District.* The TCPUD provided this report; we cannot confirm the potential flow rate.

15 14. Section 3.12.7, 1st paragraph (p.3-75) – The correct name of the TCPUD is Tahoe City Public ***Utility*** District. Also, NV Energy is now Liberty Energy.

16 15. Section 3.12.8, 1st paragraph (p.3-75) – States that the "WSA shall demonstrate that Project infrastructure for water delivery volume, rate, pressure, and schedule meets the snow-making demand of HMR."

a. Shouldn't the WSA also address the domestic and fire protection water demands of the Homewood Project?

17 b. If so, the Draft WSA should be revised to include an assessment of the TCPUD's water distribution system's capability to provide the required flow rates, pressure, and duration for domestic and fire protection at the South Base Area.

18 16. Section 3.12.8, 3rd paragraph (p.3-76) – This paragraph is incorrect:

a. The project applicant will be responsible for construction of infrastructure to connect to the established water system *and to provide for the increased water demand of the Project.*

19 b. TCPUD Connections fees do not have two components. The connection fee is a single charge to buy in to the existing water system capacity. Water user fees are service charges and are charged monthly for water usage based on consumption.

20 c. The connection fees do not accommodate additional development of this magnitude. The project applicant will be responsible to enter in to a development agreement with the TCPUD and pay all costs related to onsite

infrastructure and their fair-share of offsite infrastructure required to meet the Project's demand.

21 d. The project will be required to pay the connection fee and for the construction of additional infrastructure to supply the project. User fees are charged upon connection for water usage.

22 17. Section 3.12.10, p. 3-76 – The TCPUD will also need to review the building plans for compliance with TCPUD ordinances and determination of fees prior to issuance of Building Permits.

23 18. Section 3.13, p.3-80; This section does not include any local agency permitting requirements. TCPUD commercial service permits will be required for the Project.

Chapter 11

24 19. Section 11.1.7, 1st Paragraph (p.11-15) – Because the trail gap mentioned in the last sentence is in the Homewood Project area, we feel it deserves more explanation and background as described above in our General Comments.

25 20. Section 11.4.1, subsection *Alternative Modes of Travel*, last paragraph (p.11-30) – The language regarding the bike path is confusing. As described above, the nearest connection point to the existing northbound bike trail is located at Cherry Street (nearly a mile north of the Project). We assume from the language that the Project traffic analysis makes the assumption that the TCPUD will have completed the proposed the West Shore Trail Gap closure and the Homewood Project will only need to connect to the proposed trail at Silver/Sans Souci. If this is correct, this should be stated more clearly.

26 21. IMPACT TRANS-5, (p.11-80) – The TCPUD feels this impact should be categorized as Significant and the construction of a bike trail through the North Base area meeting the following requirements should be included as a mitigation measure: 27

a. Construction of a Class 1 Bike Trail along the frontage of the project from the TCPUD's existing trail on Fawn Street (at San Souci right of way) to the TCPUD's proposed trail at the intersection of Silver and San Souci streets.
b. Meeting the requirements of Caltrans and the TCPUD.
c. Granted to TCPUD at construction completion with all required permits and entitlements in the name of TCPUD.
d. At developer's expense including reimbursement of TCPUD expenses.

28 If not included as a mitigation measure, the above details must be included in the project description per our Chapter 3 comments above.

29 22. IMPACT TRANS-8, (p.11-80) – Does the categorization of this impact as Less than Significant rely upon the connection to the TCPUD's propose West Shore Bike Trail Gap Closure project at Silver/Sans Souci streets? This should be clarified in the analysis portion. If so, the Homewood Project should be conditioned upon the successful completion of the TCPUD's West Shore Bike Trail Gap Closure.

Chapter 15

30 23. Section 15.1.4, Subsection *Quail Lake Creek Watershed*, 2nd paragraph (p.15-17) – This paragraph is incorrect. The TCPUD does not divert its water rights in Homewood Creek to fill Quail Lake. If it was ever the case, it is not now.

31 24. Section 15.1.10, 4th Paragraph (p.15-25) – Provide citation for the quoted potential discharge rate of "over 1,000 gpm" per Comment No. 13 above. Provide citation for second to last sentence regarding the lack of connection to Quail Lake Creek. 32

33 25. Section 15.1.11,– This paragraph states that the TCPUD provides domestic and irrigation water to the Mid-Mountain operations at Homewood. However, we believe this to be an incorrect statement. The TCPUD provides water to a service connection at the South Base area, and after the water leaves the TCPUD's system, we do not know where it is used.

34 26. Section 15.2.1, Subsection *Public Water* Supply, 2nd paragraph (p.15-31) – This paragraph refers to source water 09719101/11, operated by TCPUD. However, we are not familiar with this number, as it does not match any water rights number provided by the State Water Resources Control Board. Is it a TRPA number? Please clarify.

35 27. Section 15.2.1, Subsection *Public Water* Supply, 2nd paragraph (p.15-31) – This paragraph refers to source water operated by Agate Bay Water Company which we believe to be incorrect, given that the Agate Bay Water Company is located in Carnelian Bay. Please clarify.

Chapter 16

36 28. Section 16.1.1, 4th paragraph (p.16-1) – The second sentence is incomplete and unclear. Revise to read: "The Crystal Way Well produces 500 gallons per minute from *groundwater* and *the lake intake* pumps provide up to 300 gallons per minute *from Lake Tahoe*."

37 29. Section 16.1.1, 4th paragraph (p.16-1) – Tank size in the last sentence is incorrect. Revise to read: "The system has a *0.34 million gallon (1.04 acre-feet)* storage tank (TCPUD 2009)."

38 30. Section 16.1.1, 5th paragraph (p.16-1) – The last two sentences are no longer correct. Design and permitting have not yet begun on the WTP project and it is uncertain when construction will begin. The WTP project (or some alternative water supply project) must be completed before the TCPUD will be able to meet the water supply needs of the South Base Area of the Homewood Project.

39 31. Section 16.1.1, 6th paragraph, first bullet, (p.16-2) – The correct name of the well is McKinney Well *No. 1*. The well was tested by Kleinfelder, not TCPUD. Provide citation for the quoted potential discharge rate of 1,000 gpm per Comment No. 13 above.

40 32. Section 16.2.1 – The Homewood Project will be subject to the TCPUD's rules and regulations in effect at the time of application.

41 33. Section 16.2.1, Subsection *Local* (p.16-8) – The references to the TCPUD's Water Ordinances are not correct:

a. Where §3 is referred to, it should be §4, which describes Customer Responsibilities.

42 b. Where §9 is referred to, it should be §6, which establishes requirements for the size, alignment, materials of construction, and construction methods of water supply infrastructure.

43 c. Ordinance 106 should be Ordinance No. 264 – Conservation and Drought Response Standards

44 34. Section 16.2.1 (p.16-8) – The bullets summarizing the plumbing fixture low flow requirements should match TCPUD's Water Ordinance 264, which requires plumbing fixtures for new construction to meet the following low flow requirements:

- Showerheads must be 2.5 gpm or less;
- Toilets must be ultra low-flow (ULFT) or high-efficiency (HET);
- Dual flush toilets qualify as HET;
- Faucets must be 2.2 gpm or less;
- Water pressure shall not exceed 60 psi within residential or non-residential structures.

45 35. Section 16.2.2, 2nd paragraph (p.16-9) – Revise this paragraph to refer to the TCPUD's current Sewer Ordinance No. 255, adopted April 17, 2006.

46 36. IMPACT PSU-1, Page 16-14, 4th paragraph – Ordinance 106 is incorrect; TCPUD's current Water Conservation Ordinance is No. 264.

47 37. IMPACT PSU-1, Page 16-16, 1st paragraph – See Comment No. 30 above regarding the updated schedule for the Water Treatment Plant.

48 38. IMPACT PSU-1, Page 16-17, 1st paragraph – The last sentence of this paragraph should clarify that the "TCPUD did not identify the need for any additional offsite infrastructure improvements ***relative to water supply*** to accommodate the proposed HMR MP implementation." The TCPUD did identify significant offsite improvements necessary for water distribution, which are described later in the DEIR/S section.

49 39. IMPACT PSU-1, Page 16-17, 3rd paragraph – Revise the first sentence to read: "TCPUD's fire flow capabilities are also deficient in the area adjacent to the South Base Area and require improvements to meet current ***residential*** fire flow requirements of 1,000 gallons per minute."

50 40. IMPACT PSU-1, Page 16-17, 3rd paragraph – It should be noted that all of alternative improvements may be constructed by the TCPUD but will be funded completely by the Developer.

51 41. IMPACT PSU-1, Page 16-17, 4th paragraph – Revise the fourth sentence to read: "The water system plans show a connection of the Mid Mountain area water tanks to the North Base area and the MCWC existing connection, but ***do not*** intertie to the South Base area and the TCPUD service area."

52 42. IMPACT PSU-1, Page 16-18, 1st paragraph – The correct name of the well is McKinney Well ***No. 1***. The well was tested by Kleinfelder, not TCPUD. Provide

citation for the quoted potential discharge rate of 1,000 gpm per Comment No. 13 above.

53 43. MITIGATION PSU-1a, Page 16-28 – The mitigations listed do not adequately reduce the identified impact. The following three additional mitigation measures should be added to reduce TCPUD water supply impacts.

54 44. MITIGATION PSU-1a, Page 16-28 – Add mitigation measure: The Developer shall provide a detailed Water System Engineering Report meeting the requirements of and approved by the TCPUD. The Report shall be approved prior to the issuance of any portion of the Project requiring water supply from the TCPUD. This requirement was included in our NOP comments of September 30, 2008. The Report should address:

a. Project domestic, fire protection, and snow making water demands. This should include an assessment of peak, maximum, and average demands as well as flow rate, pressure, and duration requirements.
b. Prepared by a California registered civil engineer.
c. An assessment of the TCPUD'S McKinney-Quail Water System's ability to provide adequate domestic and fire flows at appropriate pressures.
d. A detailed analysis of off-site water system improvements (and alternatives) necessary to supply the Project.
e. Specific on-site distribution system design calculations.

55 The *Water Supply Assessment* is not acceptable, as written, to meet the above requirement.

56 45. MITIGATION PSU-1a, Page 16-28 – Add mitigation measure: All TCPUD off-site water system infrastructure improvements identified by the above Report shall be designed, permitted, and constructed prior to occupancy of any portion of the Project necessitating the improvement. The Developer shall be responsible to reimburse the TCPUD for all costs associated with the improvement.

57 46. MITIGATION PSU-1a, Page 16-28 – Add mitigation measure: The identified water treatment plant, or alternative water source solution shall be completed prior to occupancy of any portion of the Project requiring water supply from the TCPUD. The Developer shall be responsible to reimburse the TCPUD for their fair-share contribution to the water supply project as determined by the TCPUD.

58 47. MITIGATION PSU-1a, 2nd paragraph (p.16-28) – This paragraph is incorrect. See Comment No. 16 above.

59 48. IMPACT PSU-2, Page 16-30 – The analysis or mitigation should include statement that prior to performing excavation associated with the Homewood Project, HMR is required to call DigAlert at 811, in order to have existing underground utility infrastructure marked and to avoid inadvertent damage.

Should you have any questions about the contents of this letter or require further information, please feel free to contact me at 530-583-3796 ext. 49.

Sincerely,

Matt Homolka, P.E.
District Engineer

C: Cindy Gustafson, General Manager
Tony Laliotis, Director of Utilities
David Tirman, JMA Ventures, LLC
Paul Pettersen, Nichols Consulting Engineers

11

California Clean Energy Committee

RECEIVED
APR 20 2011
TAHOE REGIONAL
PLANNING AGENCY

April 19, 2011

Mr. David Landry, Project Manager
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
128 Market Street
Stateline, Nevada 89448

Mrs. Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
County of Placer
Community Development Resource Agency
Environmental Coordination Services
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, California 95603

Re: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report
Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan
(SCH # 2008092008)

Dear Mr. Landry and Mrs. Krach:

This letter will constitute comments by the California Clean Energy Committee regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report on the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan (EIR).

The Committee is a California non-profit corporation headquartered in Davis which seeks to promote energy conservation, greenhouse gas reduction, and the development of clean-energy resources in California. It actively supports the application of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to energy conservation and to related impacts.

Over 60 individuals in the Tahoe area have joined the California Clean Energy Committee's campaign to request that the environmental impact report on the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan require robust energy conservation and environmental stewardship.

All notices regarding this project are requested to be sent to 3502 Tanager Avenue, Davis, California 95616-7531. Please feel free to contact the undersigned for additional information.

1. Internal Capture

1 The EIR does not support the conclusion that building a larger resort will reduce vehicle traffic. The analysis of internal capture should not be used unless it complies with proce-

California Clean Energy Committee | 3502 Tanager Avenue, Davis, CA 95616-7531
Voice: 530-756-6141 | Facsimile: 530-756-5930

dures published by the Institute of Traffic Engineers. This requires that the analysis be based on studies of similar projects or local data that reflect the distinctive trip purposes that characterize a ski resort. Internal capture variations between winter and summer capture must be accurate and supported. The internal capture credit must be limited by the smaller of the land use generating the internal trip and the land use receiving the internal trip. In the absence of reliable data to support the internal capture analysis, it must be omitted from the traffic analysis. The analysis must use iterative, balancing steps that constrain internal trip making to what is realistic given the mix of land uses.

2. Increased Tourism

Implementation of the project will increase tourism in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Thousands of people already drive from distant locations to visit the slopes of Lake Tahoe for downhill skiing and other recreational activities. The EIR must evaluate the environmental impacts caused by the increased long-distance travel to the Tahoe basin resulting from increased tourism.

3. Alternatives Analysis

The EIR does not support the proposition that the only feasible alternative is to build the large residential development and resort the applicant proposes. It relies entirely on data received from the project applicant who has a considerable vested financial interest in expanding the project. This is a conflict of interest and deprives interested parties of due process. The considerable increases in weekend and holiday visits should be accounted for in the analysis of "sustainable revenues." Feasible alternatives should be developed without the imposition of the developer's preferences. Alternatives 1, 2, 4 and 6 do not constitute feasible alternatives. Alternative 5 does not address a significant impact. And alternative 3 addresses an impact that will necessarily be mitigated in any case. The community and decision-makers are entitled to a neutral and productive alternatives analysis. At least one alternative should be developed that would minimize energy impacts and GHG emissions.

4. Energy Resources

Artificial ski slopes are notoriously energy intensive. The EIR should contain an analysis of energy impacts and a significance determination. The analysis should consider the full range of alternative energy supplies including solar, geothermal, wind, hydro, and biogas.

Peak period demand reduction strategies should be considered including smart grid and storage technologies such as pumped hydro with snow-making infrastructure and V2G.

6 The energy setting should be addressed including an evaluation of the impacts caused by the resources used and the risk of reliance on uncertain energy supplies. NV Energy, for example, relies on coal generation units which produce not only CO2 but soot, sulfur dioxide, mercury, methane, hydrochloric acid, and other emissions known to be environmental and health hazards. The impacts of infrastructure required to import energy to the site should be evaluated including energy lost or expended in transport.

7 Substantial evidence should support the EIR's feasibility conclusions with respect to energy conservation. Feasibility should be considered in light of energy costs saved over the lifetime of the project. Where energy conservation measures are rejected, the reasons should be fully supported.

8 The EIR should take into account the preempting effect of long-term investment into fossil-fuel generation plants, the related transmission systems, as well as less efficient community and building designs that impose the high costs of retrofitting clean energy resources and efficiency measures and redesigning and rebuilding community-scale energy systems that could have been designed and installed more economically when the project was originally implemented.

5. Energy Efficiency

9 The EIR should evaluate how, in the particular local climate and environment of the Tahoe Basin, energy efficiency measures could conserve energy using an integrated approach that considers both energy efficiency and clean energy resources and includes a per capita energy analysis. The EIR should evaluate how close to net zero the design can feasibly be. The obstacles to achieving net zero should be clearly explained and fully supported. To the extent design details cannot be finalized, the EIR should adopt fully-supported performance standards.

10 A full range of energy efficiency and alternative energy sources should be considered for each use including sewage treatment, solid waste, snow-making, heating, and water supplies. Technologies such as geothermal heat pumps, solar thermal water heating, fuel cells, absorption chillers, and passive solar design should be considered. Building control systems such as those installed at Mammoth Mountain and in Walmarts should be incorporated into the design.

6. Climate Mitigation

11 The climate impacts of the project should be fully mitigated. Mitigation can include carbon credits, forest conservation projects, increased funding for transit service, increased funding for biking and pedestrian infrastructure, marketing for rail packages, subsidies for sustainable energy projects, increased development of on-site energy and storage resources, employee transit incentives, parking pricing, on-site public education, transit fare subsidies, new transit service, car-sharing programs, SOV reduction programs, support for electric vehicles, on-line ride matching, etc.

7. Conflicts with Existing Plans

12 The EIR does not provide support for the conclusion that the project is consistent with the Transportation Element of the TRPA Regional Plan, which calls for projects that provide for infill of existing areas, making use of existing transportation facilities, and promoting the use of alternative transportation. 13 The EIR should address AB 32, Executive Order S-03-05, and the CARB Scoping Plan, and the TRPA year 2020 per capita GHG reduction target of 7 percent for transportation. (EIR 19-16.) The project does not comply with these standards. 14 The EIR must establish a sound basis before deviating from these standards. The project should be evaluated for potential adverse impacts to alternative modes including bicycling, pedestrian, transit, and train.

8. Climate Adaptation Impacts

Increased temperatures are expected to reduce the ski season resulting in greater use of snow making. The Homewood base is 6240 feet making it subject to warming trends. The environmental analysis must consider how climate change will increase energy consumption, 16 water consumption and supply, 17 GHG impacts, and 18 wildfire risk to the proposed commercial and residential development.

9. Disaster Preparedness

19 The EIR should determine whether the project will have an impact on evacuation safety on the West Shore. It should evaluate the total number of residents, businesses and tourists that can be safely evacuated from the West Shore, without impeding emergency vehicle access, in the event of wildfire, earthquake or seiche and 20 evaluate the cumulative impact of the project on natural disaster evacuation and emergency vehicle access to the West Shore. Evacuation of the West Shore is limited two exit routes in the summer and one during portions of the winter when SR 89 is closed southbound. 21 Residents of the

21 West Shore are entitled to evacuation that meets National Fire Protection Association standard 1141. The Safety Element of the general plan must be updated for non-
22 compliance with state law due to the lack of planning for evacuation routes from the West Shore. Seiche impacts must be evaluated.
23

10. Mitigation

24 All mitigation proposed in the EIR must be practical and enforceable. The transportation mitigation which consists in various programs that would be instituted by the resort such 25 as restrictions on ticket sales, shuttles, and other services is not enforceable.

11. Solid Waste

26 The demolition of the existing resort and the operation of the new resort will create solid waste which will have to be recycled, reused or hauled to a landfill. The related impacts during both construction and operation of the resort from extraction and discard of natural resources should be evaluated including impacts from increased energy use, impacts caused by increased resource extraction, and impacts resulting from the commitment of
27 nonrenewable natural resources to landfills that future generation will probably be unable to reverse. These impacts should be mitigated through a recycling which should be planned and through the use of recycled materials during construction and operation. 28

12. General Plan

29 The general plan fails to comply with AB32 due to a lack of greenhouse gas emission analysis and planning. The implementation of the general plan as written would not satisfy the terms of AB32, SB375, and the related regulations which require a reduction in GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene S. Wilson

California Clean Energy Committee | 3502 Tanager Avenue, Davis, CA 95616-7531
Voice: 530-756-6141 | Facsimile: 530-756-5930

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 California Air Resources Board, Climate Change Scoping Plan (December 2008).

Appendix 2 Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization. Mobility 2030: Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan (August 27, 2008).

Appendix 3 Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Code of Ordinances, Chapter 93: Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program.

Appendix 4 Transportation Research Board, Driving and the Built Environment: Effects of Compact Development on Motorized Travel, Energy Use, and CO2 Emissions (2009).

Appendix 5 California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection, Placer County Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map (November, 2007).

Appendix 6 California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection, California Fire Siege '07, Appendix III: Evacuations

Appendix 7 California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection, Fact Sheet: California's Fire Hazard Severity Zones (May, 2007).

Appendix 8 Lincoln County, Montana. Lincoln County Subdivision Regulations: Fire Risk Assessment.

Appendix 9 National Fire Protection Association. NFPA 1141:Standard for Fire Protection Infrastructure for Land Development in Suburban and Rural Areas (2008).

Appendix 10 California-Nevada Tahoe Basin Fire Commission, The Emergency California-Nevada Tahoe Basin Fire Commission Report (May, 2008).

Appendix 11 Cova, T. Public Safety in the Urban-Wildland Interface: Should Fire:Prone Communities Have a Maximum Occupancy?. Natural Hazards Review (August 2005).

Appendix 12 CalEPA. Forest Accounting, Assessment, and Greenhouse Gas Exchange (July 24, 2009).

Appendix 13 Oregon Department of Forestry. Report: Environmental Effects of Forest Biomass Removal (December 1, 2008).

Appendix 14 North Tahoe Fire Protection District. Emergency Preparedness and Evacuation Guide.

Appendix 15 Wikipedia, Tsunamis in Lakes.

Appendix 16 California Travel and Tourism Commission. 2007-2013 Strategic Marketing Plan (May 15, 2007)

Appendix 17 California Ski Industry Assocition. California Resorts Taking Action.

Appendix 18 California Air Resources Board, Biodiesel.

Appendix 19 National Ski Areas Association. Sustainable Slopes: The Environmental Charter for Ski Areas (Dec. 2005).

Appendix 20 National Ski Areas Association. 2005 Assessment Tool

Appendix 21 National Ski Areas Association. Are You Up to the Climate Challenge: New Sustainable Slopes competition Targets Carbon Emissions Reduction, NSAA Journal at p. 13 (December 2010/January 2011).

Appendix 22 Natural Gas Vehicles for America, NGVs and the Environment.

Appendix 23 Stanchak, Y., Are You Snow White of Faux Green? Ski Area Management (November, 2010).

Appendix 24 New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services. Cranmore's Jimmy Mersereau to Receive U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Lifetime Achievement Award Posthumously

Appendix 25 Cranmore Mountain Resort, Biodiesel Program.

Appendix 26 National Ski Areas Association, Sustainable Slopes Annual Report (July, 2008).

Appendix 27 National Ski Areas Association, Taking Sustainable Slopes to the Next Level (Dec. 2008).

Appendix 28 Ski Area Management, About Us.

Appendix 29 North Lake Tahoe Visitor Association, Fact Sheets.

Appendix 30 North Lake Tahoe Visitor Association, North Lake Tahoe Tourism and Community Investment Master Plan (Sept. 2004).

Appendix 31 Wikipedia, Lake Tahoe.

Appendix 32 World Tourism Organization. From Davos to Copenhagen and Beyond: Advancing Tourism's Response to Climate Change (2009).

Appendix 33 Kelly J. & Williams P., Modelling Tourism Destination Enegy Consumption and Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Whistler, British Columbia, Canada, Journal of Sustainable Tourism (2007).

Appendix 34 Second International Conference on Climate Change and Tourism, Davos Declaration: Climate change and Tourism Responding to Global Challenges (Oct. 2007).

Appendix 35 Bolton Valley, Bolton Valley Receives To Ski Industry Environmental Award.

Appendix 36 Mt. Rose - Ski Tahoe Using Wind Power to Go Green

Appendix 37 Tahoe Arts and Mountain Culture, Tahoe's Wind Powered Ski Resorts (Nov. 29, 2010).

Appendix 38 VirtualTahoe.com. Ski & Snowboard Resorts.

Appendix 39 Wikipedia, NV Energy.

Appendix 40 NV Energy, Where Our Power Comes From.

Appendix 41 California Natural Resources Agency, 2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy (December 2009).

Appendix 42 Dakin, B., Hoeschele, M., Davis Energy Group, Idrees, O., Chevron Energy Solutions. Zero Energy Communities: UC Davis' West Village Community.

Appendix 43 California Energy Commission, New Solar Homes Partnership: Home Builder's Case Study.

Appendix 44 US Department of Energy. Case Study: Shaw Construction, Burlingame Ranch Phase 1, Aspen, CO.

Appendix 45 University of Colorado at Boulder. Renewable Energy in Tourism Initiative: Best Practices in Ski Resort Sector (June, 2008).

Appendix 46 Aspen-Snowmass, ISO 14001.

Appendix 47 Aspen-Snowmass, Aspen Skiing Company Makes Largest Purchase of Wind Energy Certificates in the U.S. Ski Industry (March 1, 2006).

Appendix 48 Aspen-Snowmass, Environmental Commitment Overview.

Appendix 49 Mote, P., Hamlet, A, Clark, M., & Lettenmaier, P., Declining Snowpack in Western North America, American Meteorological Society (Jan. 2005).

Appendix 50 Schendler, Snowmass Ski Area Gets Hydro, Sustainable Skiing (February/March, 2006).

Appendix 51 Wikipedia, Grid Storage.

Appendix 52 Ski Area Citizens' Coalition, How Are Ski Areas Graded?.

Appendix 53 Squaw Valley USA, Environmental Programs.

Appendix 54 Source Watch, North Valmy Station.

Appendix 55 Wikipedia, NV Energy.

Appendix 56 Wikipedia, Seiche.

Appendix 57 U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, Saving Energy in U.S. Transportation, (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, July 1994).

Appendix 58 Urban Land Institute, Moving Cooler (July 2009).

Appendix 59 Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation Handbook (March 2001).

Appendix 60 Ichinose, G. et al., The Potential Hazard from Tsunami and Seiche Wave Generated by Future Large Earthquakes within the Lake Tahoe Basin, California-Nevada (Mar. 8, 1999).

Appendix 61 Bochner, B. & Sperry, B., Internal Trip Capture Estimator for Mixed-Use Developments (Feb. 2010).

Appendix 62 Sperry, B., Comparing Methodologies to Estimate Internal Trip Capture at Mixed-Use Developments.

Appendix 63 California Energy Commission. The Role of Land Use in Meeting California's Energy and Climate Change Goals (June 2007).

Appendix 64 Milam, R. Transportation Impact Analysis Gets a Failing Grade When It Comes to Climate Change and Smart Growth.

Appendix 65 California Natural Resources Agency. Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action (Dec. 2009).

Appendix 66 California Energy Commission, New Solar Homes Partnership: Home Builder's Case Study.

Appendix 67 California Energy Commission, Home Builder's Case Study: Laureate, Ironcrest and Wayfarer - Roseville, CA

Appendix 68 California Energy Commission, Home Builder's Case Study: Wisteria - Rocklin, CA

Appendix 69 Building Industry Research Alliance, Seastar Communities: Sonata

Appendix 70 U.S. Department of Energy, Premier Oaks - Roseville, California.

Appendix 71 U.S. Department of Energy, Vista Montana, Watsonville, California - Moving Toward Zero Energy Homes.

Appendix 72 Galvin Electricity Initiative, Understanding Microgrids.

Appendix 73 Finkelor, B., et al., West Village: A Process & Business Model for Achieving Zero-Net Energy at the Community-Scale.

Appendix 74 California Energy Commission, Success Story: Madera Valley Water Company.

Appendix 75 California Energy Commission, Fuel Cells.

Appendix 76 California Energy Commission, Cogeneration Optimization.

Appendix 77 Nelson/Nygaard Consulting. Crediting Low-Traffic Developments: Adjusting Site-Level Vehicle Trip Generation Using URBEMIS (Aug. 2005)

Appendix 78 Federal Highway Administration. The Bicycle Compatibility Index: A Level of Service Concept Implementation Manual (1998).

Appendix 79 City of San Diego, Trip Generation Manual (May, 2003).

Appendix 80 Clean Air Force, The Toll from Coal: An Updated Assessment of Death and Disease fromAmerica's Dirtiest Energy Source (Sept. 2010).

Appendix 81 Federal Energy Management Program, Energy Savings from Small Near-Zero Energy Houses.

Petition for Energy Efficient Design
Homewood Resort Draft EIR

Page 1 of _____

We, the undersigned, support the effort of the California Clean Energy Committee that Placer County and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency require robust energy conservation and environmental stewardship in the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan Project:

Name	Address	Email
Kathy Sweger Date: 2/23/11	Box 1870 KB	Doggy29a hotmail.com.
GREG WILLIAMS Date: 2-23-12	BOX 1354 96143	TAHOE GUIDES @ YAHOO
Marie Walther Date: 2-23-11	Box 2859 KB	———
William M Turner Date: 2-23-11	8355 CRYSTAL WAY HOMEWOOD	WTRAINOR@SORBNET.NET
Ann Nichols Date: 2/23-11	Bx 4 Crystal Bay NV 89402	preserve@NTPAC.COM
2/23/11 Date: [illegible]	PO Box 7443 S. Lake Tahoe, CA 96158	lewis@watershednetwork
19 april 11 Date: m.landerson	POBX 6828 tahoe city ca 96145	matimberland@yahoo.c
Monica Grigolet Date:	PO BOX 1088 TC, Ca 96145	m.grigolete yahoo.com

Petition for Energy Efficient Design
Homewood Resort Draft EIR

We, the undersigned, support the effort of the California Clean Energy Committee that Placer County and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency require robust energy conservation and environmental stewardship in the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan Project:

Name	Address	Email
Elizabeth Saft Date: 4/19/11	835 N. Ampus Davis 95616	lizsaft@yahoo.com
Pat Neary Date: 4/19/11	8120 Watson Drive Tahoe City CA 96145	johnneary2@ yahoo.com
LAURA TURNER Date: 4/19/11	P.O. Box 44 Tahoma, CA 96142	—
LAURSON HAUPTER Date: 4/19/11	Po Box 7682 TAHOE CITY CA 96145	—
Timothy Keenan Date: 4/19/11	10063 Winter Creek Loop Rd Truckee 96161	—
Linda Sheldon Date: Linda Sheldon	Box 1358 C.B. Ca 96140	—
Kenneth Kenneth Date:	Box 1292 TC CA 96145	—
[illegible] Date:	[illegible]	

Petition for Energy Efficient Design
Homewood Resort Draft EIR

We, the undersigned, support the effort of the California Clean Energy Committee that Placer County and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency require robust energy conservation and environmental stewardship in the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan Project:

Name	Address	Email
Karen Gallaher Date: 4.19.11	PO 691 Carnelian Bay CA 96140	tmgallaher@gmail.com
LESLEY CLONE Date:	PO BOX 3445 OLYMPIC VALLEY, CA.	LELCTONE@YAHOO.COM
Sherry Guzzi Date: 4-19-11	PO Box 7763 Tahoe City, CA 96145	tahoeguzzi@gmail.com
Diana Thale Date:	PO BOX 9112 Truckee, CA 96162	tahoeflorildesign.@yahoo.com
Joanne h. Mathis Date:	PO Box 1037 Homewood, CA 96141	—
Janeth Herrera Date:	P.O. BOX 234 Tahoe Vista CA 96148	—
Guadalupe Bermudez Date:	P.O. BOX 2053 Kings Beach CA 96143	—
Yvette Shipman Date:	PO Box 474 Homewood CA 96141	yvette@yourtahoehome.c

Petition for Energy Efficient Design
Homewood Resort Draft EIR

We, the undersigned, support the effort of the California Clean Energy Committee that Placer County and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency require robust energy conservation and environmental stewardship in the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan Project:

Name	Address	Email
Robyn Miller Date: 4/19/11	PO BOX 1665 Tahoe City, CA, 96145	millervin2000@yahoo.com
Karey Todd Date: 4/19/11	Po Box 1075 T.C. 96145	Kareytodd@hotmail.com
Gregg Visineau Date: 4/19/11	3101 Lakeforest Dr #13 T. C. 96145	gvisineau@yahoo.com
JESSICA Repp Date: 4/19/11	PO BOX 7293 T.C CA 96145	Jessrepp@hotmail.com
Janis [illegible] Date: 4/19/11	PO Box 1878 Crystal Bay NV.	[illegible]
Nancy Mumbert Date: 4/19/11	P.O Box 5457 TC	nancymumbert@hotmail.com
Julia Younger Date: 4. 19. 2011	PO Box 1311 Tahoe City CA 96145	—
Stephanie Anderson Date: 4-19-11	PO B. 5041 T.C. CA 96145	stephanderson5@yahoo.com

Petition for Energy Efficient Design
Homewood Resort Draft EIR

We, the undersigned, support the effort of the California Clean Energy Committee that Placer County and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency require robust energy conservation and environmental stewardship in the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan Project:

Name	Address	Email
Karen Jones Date: 4-19-2011	P.O. Box 5751 Tahoe City	—
Joan Harris Date: 4/19/2011	PO Box 694 Carnelian Bay CA	—
Ellen Nelson Date: 4/19/11	PO Box 2713 Kings Beach, CA	—
Inga Jewell Date: 4/19/11	P.O Box 232 TIC, Ca 96145	
[illegible] Date: 4-19-11	Box 68 TAHOMA CA 96142	—
[illegible] Date: 4-19-11	PO BOX 1925 Placer City	—
[illegible] Date: 4-20-11	PO Box 7981 Tahoe City, CA 96145	—
Elyse Chapman Date: 4/20/11	PO Box 2749 Kings Beach CA, 96143	emchapman@live.com

Petition for Energy Efficient Design
Homewood Resort Draft EIR

We, the undersigned, support the effort of the California Clean Energy Committee that Placer County and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency require robust energy conservation and environmental stewardship in the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan Project:

Name	Address	Email
Date: 4-20-11	P.O. BOX 6532 Tahoe City CA 96145	N/A
Cathleen Perkins Date: 4/20/11	Box 557 TahoeCity, CA 96145	NA
MARIM BURGUES Date: 4-20-11	PO BOX 345 Homewood CA	
melissa Daniels Date: 4/20/11	P.O. Box 1120 Tahoe City	N/A
JOSH SCHULTZ Date: 4/20/11	PO BOX 972 TAHOE CITY	N/A
Wilma J Dowden Date: 4-20-11	Box 1377 Tahoe City	
Kim Bombay Date: 4/20/11	434 Lewis Tahoma	—
Jesse Hildebrandt Date: 4/20/11	PO BOX 6432 96145	—

Petition for Energy Efficient Design
Homewood Resort Draft EIR

Page 7 of _____

We, the undersigned, support the effort of the California Clean Energy Committee that Placer County and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency require robust energy conservation and environmental stewardship in the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan Project:

Name	Address	Email
Marielle Russack Date: 04/20/2011	P.O. Box 6693 Tahoe City, CA 96145	marellerussack@yahoo.com
Donna Lerch Date: 4-20-11	P O Box 1291 T.C.	Donna Lerch@yahoo.com
Anne Pennington Date:	P.O. Box 225 T.C.	
AK Atwood Date: 4/20/11	P.O. BOX 1025 T.C	
Dave Spencer Date: 4.20.2011	PO 1496 T.City CA 96145	—
Deniz Tuncer Date: 4/20/11	3436 Edgewater Dr. Tahoe City, CA 96146	deniztuncer@gmail.com
Shirley Hale Date: 4/20/11	695 Fairway Dr T.C	
MARK PINEDO Date: 4/20/11	125 LASSEN DR Unit V Tahoe City, CA 96145	

Petition for Energy Efficient Design
Homewood Resort Draft EIR

We, the undersigned, support the effort of the California Clean Energy Committee that Placer County and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency require robust energy conservation and environmental stewardship in the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan Project:

Name	Address	Email
Scheyer Anzar Date: 4/20/11	P.O Box 422 Homewood CA	Shyanzar@gmail
Bev Wilson Date: 4/20/11	PO Box 3501 CA Olympic Valley 96146	Bdhwilson@gmail
Date: 4/20/11	Box 5312 T.C. CA 96145	—
Date: 4/20/11	PO Box 458 Tahoe City 96145	
Date:	PO Box 242 Kings Beach CA	—
Date: 4/20/11	Box 2732 Olympic Valley CA 96146	—
Date:		
Date:		

CALIFORNIA ALLIANCE FOR JOBS

928 2nd St., Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: 916.446.2259
Fax: 916.446.2253
www.rebuildca.org

12

Advocate for the Heavy Construction Industry

12

April 12, 2011

David Landry
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Homewood CEP
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Dear Mr. Landry:

I am writing on behalf of the California Alliance for Jobs and the more than 2,500 heavy construction companies and 80,000 union construction workers it represents in Northern California to express support for the Homewood Mountain Resort and Ski Area Project (HMR Project). This Project will provide a significant public benefit in the region and is consistent with many of the environmental, quality of life and economic benefit goals established in the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's Community Enhancement Program (CEP).

One of the main HMR Project goals is to implement an environmentally sensitive form of land use with an emphasis on restoration, rehabilitation and redevelopment. To meet these goals, the HMR Project will capitalize on new technologies and materials to improve current environmental conditions. Specifically, the HMR Project will:

- Improve lake clarity by utilizing new storm water management methods that capture fine sediment before it enters the lake;
- Reduce energy consumption and GHG emissions through the construction of LEED Gold certified buildings;
- Decrease tail-pipe emissions and traffic congestion and improve road safety by providing residents and guests with alternative transportation such as shuttle, bike and pedestrian paths, and water taxi.

Equally important as the environmental improvements are the local economic benefits that the HMR Project will generate. While the unemployment level in the Reno/Tahoe area is near 14 percent, unemployment amongst the local construction trades exceeds 30 percent. It should not be lost on us that many locally unemployed construction workers, unable to find work in the Tahoe Basin are traveling up and down the mountain in an effort to find or keep their jobs. This situation exacerbates traffic congestion, generates air pollutants and greenhouse gases and increases public safety concerns on the roads – all of which would be mitigated if they had more job prospects locally.

Getting people back to work and increasing the local tax base are keys to jump-starting the local economy. Capital investment in the HMR Project will:

- Create more than 200 full time jobs and an estimated 500 local construction jobs
- Provide an estimated $7 million annually in new public services
- Generate up to $20 million annually in visitor spending

The Alliance believes that redevelopment projects should provide comprehensive benefits to the environment, quality of life and the economy—criteria the HMR Project surpasses in every respect. Therefore, I urge you to certify the EIR and approve the preferred environmental alternative outlined in the HMR Project CEP application. Thank you.

Sincerely,

James Earp, Executive Director
California Alliance for Jobs