Chapter 8 - Visual Resources

Background and Setting

The 85-acre main Village area is located at the west end of Olympic Valley at the existing ski resort base area. The 8.8-acre East Parcel is located at the east end of Olympic Valley approximately 1.5 miles east of the main Village area and 0.3 miles west of SR 89. The area surrounding the main Village is developed with existing lodging uses, ski resort facilities, ski support services, and residential uses to the north. The area surrounding the East Parcel is abutted by developed and partially developed single-family residential uses to the west and north, and Squaw Valley Road to the south and east. The Squaw Valley Public Services District offices and fire station are located across from the East Parcel on Squaw Valley Road and the Squaw Valley Academy, a preparatory school, and the Tavern Inn condominiums are located further to the east on Squaw Valley Road.

Primary access through Olympic Valley is provided by Squaw Valley Road, and views along the road are dominated by highly scenic forested slopes with granite outcrops intermixed with resort, commercial, and residential development. In some instances, development is complementary to the visual character of the Valley while in other instances it detracts. However, the overall impression is of a high quality and dramatic viewshed. The visual character of the project site and its immediate surroundings is of a moderate-intensively developed area with resort facilities.

Squaw Creek within the main Village area has been channelized, but a narrow band of riparian vegetation lines either side of the channel. Squaw Valley Meadow to the east of the project site is the dominant naturalized feature on the Valley floor where Squaw Creek meanders in a natural channel through the meadow. A major portion of the meadow is modified by a golf course with tees, fairways, and greens that are interspersed among the meadow's natural wetland and riparian areas.

Impact 8-1: Adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The major scenic attribute of the west end of the Valley is the resort setting with the backdrop of mountain slopes and peaks to the south and west, and Squaw Meadow with Squaw Creek and the developed golf course to the east. On-going construction activities, partially constructed buildings, and equipment would detract from the scenic vistas of the west end of the Valley and would be a significant impact during construction.

East Parcel – Construction and Operation

Construction and operation of the East Parcel would be visible to anyone entering Olympic Valley on Squaw Valley Road. The quality of views in the vicinity of the East Parcel are considered average within the context of the surrounding forested landscape, and views that incorporate this site do not present distinctive features that provide a scenic vista. Construction would be underway for a relatively shorter period of time when compared to the main Village, and completed buildings and structures would not exceed two to three stories. Therefore, construction and operation on the East Parcel would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista in this location and the impact here would be less than significant.

Main Village - Construction

The construction period for the project would occur over a period of up to 25 years. During this time period, construction equipment including cranes, haul trucks, and excavators, materials stockpiles, and partially constructed buildings would be visible on the project site. Construction could occur concurrently at different locations on the

project site, and consequently residents and visitors might view a number of construction projects in various stages of development at any one time. During the summer, surface parking lots would be used for staging and stockpile areas. On-going construction activities, partially constructed buildings, and equipment would detract from the scenic vistas of the west end of the Valley by reducing intactness of views, introducing structural elements that detract from the resort setting, and interrupting views of the surrounding slopes and peaks. The changes to the visual resources would result in a substantial adverse effect on the scenic vistas provided from various viewpoints in the project vicinity. This impact would be significant. To reduce this impact, the project would implement Mitigation Measure 8-1 to install screening fences with opaque or semi-opaque mesh screening to reduce the visual effects of construction on adjacent residential and resort areas. Although screening may lessen the intrusiveness of construction, the activity would still have a considerable effect on the intactness of the view and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable during project construction. No mitigation measures are available that would further reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Main Village - Operation

Long-term residents have experienced a gradual change in visual conditions within Olympic Valley, from more natural conditions to more built up conditions, with modifications such as the Resort at Squaw Creek and the IntraWest development altering the viewshed. Because some views of the lower slopes would be obstructed, and because the project would result in a continuation of long-term development trend within an overall highly scenic area, the impact would be significant to permanent residents of the Valley. To reduce this impact, the project would implement Mitigation Measure 8-1 to install screening fences with opaque or semi-opaque mesh screening to reduce the visual effects of construction on adjacent residential and resort areas. However, no mitigation measures are available that would reduce the project's operational impact on scenic vistas in the main Village area to a less-than significant level for permanent residents. Although screening may lessen the intrusiveness of construction, project operation would have a considerable effect on the intactness of the view and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable during project operation.

Impact 8-2: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Construction activity including ground disturbance, construction material staging areas, partially constructed buildings, and construction equipment would alter the existing visual character of these areas. Construction would also lower the visual quality of views of the site and surrounding area. This impact would be potentially significant for both the main Village and the East Parcel during project construction.

The visual character of the project site is generally defined by existing resort development, paved parking lots, and smaller ancillary structures. The project would increase the number and size of structures in the main Village and the built environment would become a more dominant aspect of the visual character of the site. Without design review and adherence to guidelines, additional development in the main Village could result in more incongruous development with the potential to degrade the visual character of the project site or its surroundings. The visual character of the East Parcel development would be similar to existing visual character of the commercial and office development on the south side of Squaw Valley Road that consists of commercial uses such as the Tavern Inn Condominiums, the Squaw Valley Academy preparatory school, the SVPSD offices, and Fire Station 21. Visitors, residents, and employees

driving past the site would have views that incorporate commercial structures on the south and north side of the road with forested views in the background. This impact would result in a potentially significant for both the main Village and the East Parcel during project operation. To reduce this impact, the project would implement Mitigation Measure 8-2a (i.e. implement Mitigation Measure 8-1) to install screening to reduce the visual effects of construction, and Mitigation Measure 8-2b to comply with the VSVSP Design Guidelines and obtain Design Review approval. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-2a would reduce the impacts of construction on visual resources, but not to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable during construction.

Impact 8-3: Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a scenic highway.
Squaw Valley Road is a designated Placer County scenic route and is considered a scenic highway. Construction activity and equipment would detract from foreground views from Squaw Valley Road of the scenic vistas. These changes would result in a substantial adverse effect on the scenic vistas from Squaw Valley Road during construction and would be potentially significant for the main Village area during project buildout. The visual character of the East Parcel, which includes a reclaimed gravel quarry in the location where most of the improvements would be constructed, is modified from natural conditions and construction activity on the East Parcel would not alter important scenic resources visible from Squaw Valley Road. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant for the East Parcel during construction.

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

To reduce these impacts the project would implement Mitigation Measure 8-3 (i.e. implement Mitigation Measures 8-1 and 8-2b), to require the installation of screening to reduce the visual effects of project construction and adherence to the VSVSP Design Guidelines, which will ensure that the project is developed with a unified architectural theme. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-3 would reduce the impact to visual resources as viewed from Squaw Valley Road due to construction, but not to a less-than-significant level because construction processes are inherently inconsistent with a natural, scenic environment. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable during construction of the main Village. However, with implementation of architectural and landscape design guidelines that result in unified architectural style, and landscape screening of the new structures, this impact would be less than significant during project operation.

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

have high sensitivity to visual conditions, this impact would be potentially significant for both the main Village area and the East Parcel.

Lighting to serve the project would create a new source of substantial nighttime lighting in the area and would potentially increase skyglow conditions in the area. This impact would be potentially significant for both the main Village area and the East Parcel. To reduce these impacts, the project would implement Mitigation Measures 8-5a through 8-5c to install landscaping on the north and west sides of the East Parcel to screen night lighting for adjacent residential areas; implement Mitigation Measure 8-2b to comply with the VSVSP Design Guidelines Master Lighting Plan to ensure that the effects of night lighting on the project area would be minimized; and, to design parking structures to ensure that parking structures are designed to avoid direct illumination of adjacent buildings from headlights.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-5a would reduce the effects of night lighting from the East Parcel on adjacent residential areas by screening with vegetation. With this mitigation measure, lighting or glare generated by the project would have a less-than-significant impact on the day and nighttime views of the East Parcel. However, there are no mitigation measures available that would reduce the effects of night lighting on residential areas in the vicinity of the main Village area to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable for the main Village area.

Chapter 9 - Transportation and Traffic

Impact 9-2: Impacts to Placer County intersections.

The proposed project would worsen operations to unacceptable levels or exacerbate already unacceptable operations at the Squaw Valley Road/Village East Road, Squaw Valley Road/Far East Road/Christy Hill Road, Squaw Valley Road/Wayne Road, and Squaw Valley Road/Squaw Creek Road intersections during one or more analysis peak hours. As discussed under the section of this report titled "Summary of Impacts Requiring Mitigation", implementation of Mitigation Measures 9-2a through 9-2d would reduce impacts to these intersections to a less than significant level with the exception of the Squaw Valley Road/Village East Road intersection.

Even with the application of Mitigation Measures 9-2a through 9-2d, the Squaw Valley Road/Village East Road intersection would continue to experience increased delays that would exceed acceptable service levels during peak usage periods. The project proposes adoption of Specific Plan Policy CP-1, which would allow for an LOS F standard for intersections within the plan area during peak ski/occupancy days and would therefore make peak hour, peak day traffic conditions at the Squaw Valley Road/Village East Road intersection acceptable. However, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable for the Squaw Valley Road/Village East Road intersection until Policy CP-1 is adopted.

Impact 9-3: Impacts to Caltrans intersections.

The proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations at the existing SR 89/Alpine Meadows Road intersection during all three analysis peak hours, and therefore would result in a significant impact. Vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would add traffic to the SR 89/Alpine Meadows Road intersection, which currently operates at LOS F during the winter Saturday a.m., winter Sunday p.m., and summer Friday p.m. peak hours.

Placer County has been working with Caltrans to construct a traffic signal at this intersection prior to proposal of this project, which does not have a role in constructing this signal. Although the precise timing of the signal's installation is not known at this time, the plans and

specifications have been approved by the Placer County Board of Supervisors and the contract for construction has been awarded as of April 2015. It is anticipated that construction of the signal by the County and Caltrans will occur in 2015 and that construction will be completed in one construction season. Once this traffic signal is in place, operations would improve to an acceptable LOS D or better during all three analysis periods, and no mitigation would be required of the project.

Nonetheless, impact 9-3 would be considered significant and unavoidable in the short-term if the planned traffic signal at the SR 89/Alpine Measures intersection is not constructed prior to the proposed project generating sufficient vehicle trips to generate an increase in intersection delay of more than 2.5 seconds. However, once the signal is operational, the effect of added vehicle trips from the proposed project would be less than significant.

Impact 9-4: Impacts caused by vehicular queuing at Caltrans intersections.
The proposed project would cause an adverse vehicular queuing condition at the SR 89/Squaw Valley Road intersection during the winter Saturday a.m. peak hour that would not meet applicable design standards. This would be a significant impact. The northbound left-turn lane from SR 89 to westbound Squaw Valley Road would need to provide 525 feet of vehicle storage and 235 feet of deceleration. The combined length of the turn lane and bay taper would need to be 760 feet. Because the existing turn lane is 565 feet (including taper), the applicable design standard would not be met. Therefore, this would be a significant impact for the northbound left-turn lane.

To reduce project impacts to Caltrans facilities, the project would implement Mitigation Measure 9-4 to lengthen the northbound left-turn lane of SR 89 and to modify the traffic signal timing at the SR 89/Squaw Valley Road intersection from 45 seconds to 55 seconds. In addition, the applicable design standard for the northbound left turn lane would be met by lengthening the turn lane to from 565 feet to 610 feet.

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

Impact 9-5: Impacts to Caltrans highways.
The proposed project would add 161 vehicles in the critical northbound direction of SR 89 between West River Street and Deerfield Drive in Truckee during the summer Friday p.m. peak hour, which currently operates at an unacceptable LOS E. The project would cause the volume to capacity (v/c) ratio to increase by 0.11. Because this increase is greater than the 0.05 v/c ratio increase threshold, this degradation would be significant.

The proposed project would add 160 vehicles (both directions combined) during the summer Friday p.m. peak hour to the segment of SR 28 east of SR 89 in Tahoe City, which currently operates at an unacceptable LOS E. The project would cause the v/c ratio to increase by 0.09. Because this increase is greater than the 0.05 v/c ratio increase threshold, this degradation would be significant.

To reduce project impacts to Caltrans facilities, the project would implement Mitigation Measure 9-5 to improve operations on select segments of SR 89 and SR 28. The *State Route 89 Transportation Corridor Concept Report* (Caltrans 2012b) identifies the segment of SR 89 between Deerfield Drive and West River Street in Truckee as a concept four-lane conventional highway. The document lists a conceptual widening from two to four lanes. However, such a widening project is not currently included in any adopted planning documents or fee programs. No capacity-increasing improvements are proposed for the segment of SR 28 east of SR 89 according to the *State Route 28 Transportation Corridor Concept Report* (Caltrans 2012c). Because there are no available mechanisms to provide an acceptable LOS on the SR 28 and SR 89 segments in question, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Chapter 11 - Noise

Existing noise-sensitive receptors, such as residential uses, are located in close proximity to proposed construction areas and, as the Specific Plan is developed, newly constructed sensitive receptors may be located adjacent to ongoing construction. Most construction activities are proposed during the daytime hours, when construction noise is exempted by the Placer County Noise Ordinance. Although construction noise occurring during the exempted hours of the day would comply with the Noise Ordinance, due to the relatively large scale of construction, the long period of time over which it would occur and the close proximity to existing and future sensitive receptors, project construction could result in excessive noise levels that disturb nearby sensitive receptors. Further, construction activity may be required during the night for actions such as large continuous concrete pours and to protect the construction site and buildings from anticipated storms. Proposed nighttime construction activities would exceed Placer County nighttime standards for sensitive receptors and could potentially result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels of five decibels above current levels, which would result in a potentially significant impact.

Impact 11-1: Construction Noise Impacts

The Specific Plan would be developed over an estimated 25-year buildout period, with some construction proposed to begin as early as spring of 2016. It is anticipated that during the single most active possible construction year, up to 20 percent of the total Specific Plan construction could occur.

Typical construction activities would include demolition and removal of existing pavement and structures, grubbing/clearing of on-site areas, excavation and relocation of soil and rock on the site, backfilling and compaction of soils, construction of utilities, and construction of proposed buildings. Construction staging areas would be located on existing and future surface lots in the main Village Area and a staging area would be established on the East Parcel. In addition, it is expected that some nighttime construction activities would occur. This would be a **significant** impact.

To reduce project impacts the project would implement Mitigation Measures 11-1a and 11b to implement construction-noise reduction measures such as locating construction equipment and equipment staging areas as far as possible from nearby noise-sensitive land uses; requiring that all construction equipment be equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and

engine shrouds; requiring that all construction equipment with back-up alarms be equipped with either audible self-adjusting backup alarms or alarms that only sound when an object is detected; use of temporary noise curtains or sound walls, or soil piles shall be located between noise sources and the receptor to shield sensitive receptors from construction noise; and, for all construction periods where compliance with the 6:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Saturday and Sunday, construction periods is not possible, the project shall comply with Section 9.36.080 of the Placer County Code, to obtain an exception to the Noise Ordinance in order to permit nighttime construction.

Although implementation of Mitigation Measures 11-1a and 11-1b would provide substantial reductions in day and nighttime construction noise levels, reductions of up to 34 dB would be required during some of the more intensive night time construction to comply with Placer County's nighttime standard of 45 dB. Reductions of this magnitude are not expected to be achieved under all circumstances with implementation of Mitigation Measures 11-1a and 11-1b. Further, construction activities would continue to produce disruptive daytime noise over an extended period. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact 11-5: Exposure of new and existing sensitive receptors to operational project-generated transportation noise sources.
Project-generated traffic noise levels during the summer peak would cause noise levels to exceed the Placer County exterior noise standard of 60 dB for transportation noise sources along the segment of Squaw Valley Road located between SR 89 and Squaw Creek Road. This impact would be potentially significant. Existing residences in this area likely already have dual pane windows and insulation that effectively attenuates noise to below the 45 dB noise standard for interior spaces, and therefore impacts to interior spaces is not expected to occur.

Future Planned Sensitive Receptors
New sensitive receptors would be located throughout the Specific Plan area. Although exact locations of future sensitive receptors within these land uses are unknown at this time, new sensitive receptors within the VC-N land use could potentially be located as close as 100 feet to the intersection of Squaw Valley Road and Squaw Peak Road. Therefore, new sensitive receptors could be exposed to noise levels that exceed the 60 decibel exterior noise standard for transportation noise sources. This impact would be potentially significant.

To reduce these impacts, the project would implement Mitigation Measure 11-5 to reduce transportation noise exposure to new sensitive receptors that would be developed as part of the proposed project and that would be located within 170 feet of the centerline of Squaw Valley Road to design and construct buildings that would achieve a minimum 25 dB interior noise attenuation in order to comply with the Placer County interior noise standard of 45 dB. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce exposure of traffic-generated noise at new sensitive receptors. However, no feasible mitigation is available for existing sensitive receptors and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Chapter 16 – Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change
Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change – Through 2020 Regulatory Period
Chapter 16.0, Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change, identifies the project's potential contribution to global climate change consistent with the California Air Resources Board 2020 Scoping Plan developed to implement the requirements of AB 32, also known as the California

Global warming Solutions Act of 2006, which requires reduction of statewide GHG production to 1990 levels by 2020.

The analysis relies upon a two-tier approach recommended by the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPD). The Tier I analysis consists of determining the gross operational emissions of a project. Under a Tier II analysis, a project that is able to demonstrate a 21.7 percent or greater reduction from a "no action taken" (NAT) scenario, which assumes that a project would be built and operated in compliance with regulations in effect at the time when a project is initiated (project baseline), would not result in a significant impact to production of Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change.

The project, while it would exceed the Tier I mass emission threshold of 1,100 MT CO_2e/year, if built out and operated prior to 2020, would reduce greenhouse gases by 24.7 percent when compared to the NAT scenario. Therefore, the project would be consistent with AB 32, which regulates GHG production through 2020, and the project's contribution to production of greenhouse gases and climate change would be Less Than Significant.

Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change – Post 2020 Regulatory Period
Operational GHG emissions of the project would be substantial and may be less efficient than needed to achieve GHG reduction targets that could be in place after 2020, when the project is completed. Therefore, operation of the Specific Plan has the potential to result in a substantial contribution to GHG emissions. This impact would be potentially significant.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is working toward recommending additional GHG reduction goals that extend beyond 2020. New legislation is proposed to establish post-2020 goals, but no action on the legislation has been taken as of the date of this report. While project design and Specific Plan policy implementation contribute to reducing potential GHG emissions from the project, achievement of unknown future GHG efficiency standards is largely dependent on regulatory controls applied to all sectors of the California economy.

Thus, the ability of this project—and all land use development—to achieve any goals beyond 2020 is partially out of the control of the project because a specific goal has not been established. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 10-2, which requires construction and operation of land uses and facilities developed under the Specific Plan to not generate emission of ozone precursors that exceed PCAPCD's mass emission thresholds, would likely have the co-benefit of reducing project-related GHG emissions as well. Also, the Specific Plan contains many policies that, if strictly implemented, would result in additional GHG reductions, including the requirement that a minimum of 25 percent of new shuttle services within the Olympic Valley will use alternative fuels (Policy CP-5), that individual buildings would be designed to a level equivalent to at least the Silver rating of the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) certification program or other comparable rating, and other actions are taken to reduce GHG emissions (Policies CC-13 and CC-15). The efficacy of the Specific Plan policies cannot be predicted, in large part because several are not mandatory. The implementation of these policies, as well as Mitigation Measure 10-2, would result in additional GHG efficiency beyond what was modelled for this project. While the proposed project would meet the GHG efficiency standard tied to the current 2020 statewide GHG emissions target, at this time it cannot be determined if the project would meet future thresholds that have not been established. Because the project would generate substantial GHG emissions, and because it is not known if the project would be consistent with future GHG reduction targets, the impact would be potentially significant.

To reduce this potentially significant impact the project would implement Mitigation Measure 16-2 to require implementation of an ongoing operational greenhouse gas review and reduction program, which would require that any projects processed by the County after 2020 will be required to reduce, to the extent needed and feasible, GHG emissions such that the project operates within the targets established at the time the project is submitted for approval. Because it is not known whether the proposed project would achieve threshold targets identified for the years after 2020, because such targets do not yet exist, it would be speculative to determine that GHG impacts, if they were to occur, would be feasibly mitigated to adopted GHG target levels beyond 2020. For this reason, and because the project would emit a substantial level of GHG emissions, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Chapter 18 – Cumulative Impacts

The Cumulative Impacts analysis describes whether the incremental effects of this project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects. After implementation of the recommended mitigation measures for the project, most of the impacts associated with development of the project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The following impacts would be cumulatively considerable. In addition, because no additional feasible mitigation measures beyond those described for the project exist that would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level, the following cumulative impacts would be potentially significant and unavoidable:

- Impact 18-12: Cumulative effect on historical resources.
- Impact 18-14: Substantial adverse cumulative effect on a scenic vista.
- Impact 18-15: Substantial contribution to the cumulative degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
- Impact 18-16: Substantial cumulative contribution to damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a scenic highway.
- Impact 18-18: Contribute to cumulative light and glare or skyglow effects in the region.
- Impact 18-21: Cumulative impacts to Caltrans intersections.
- Mitigation Measure 18-22: Lengthen northbound SR 89 left-turn lane and modify the traffic signal timing at the SR 89/Squaw Valley Road intersection.
- Impact 18-23: Cumulative impacts to Caltrans highways (SR 28 and SR 89).
- Impact 18-31: Cumulative short-term construction-generated noise.
- Impact 18-32: Cumulative long-term ambient noise levels.
- Impact 18-43: Cumulative greenhouse gas emissions (post 2020).

ALTERNATIVES:

This section presents a summary of the alternatives considered for the proposed project and their ability to achieve or partially achieve the fundamental project objectives. In determining what alternatives should be considered in the EIR, it is important to consider the objectives of the project, the project's significant effects, unique project considerations, and the feasibility of proposed alternatives. The alternatives evaluated for this project include the following, which are described below:

- No Project - No Development Alternative;
- No Project - SVGPLUO Development Alternative;
- Reduced Density Alternative;
- Widened Squaw Valley Road Alternative;
- Preservation of Historical and Wetlands Resources Alternative; and

- Alternative Water Tank Location

No Project – No Development Alternative

CEQA requires the evaluation of the comparative impacts of the "No Project" alternative (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[e]). Analysis of the No Project Alternative "[...] shall discuss [...] existing conditions [...] as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services." (*Id.*, subd. [e][2]) "If the project is other than a land use or regulatory plan, for example a development project on identifiable property, the 'no project' alternative is the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Here the discussion would compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in the property's existing state versus environmental effects that would occur if the project were approved." (*Id.*, subd. [e][3][B])

Because the existing SVGPLUO land use designations allow for and encourage additional resort development, and due to the large interest in continued development of Squaw Valley, future development interest in the project site is likely. The regional economic base will continue to expand as a result of this and other development projects in the region, and the associated growth in resort and lodging demand will increase the development pressure on the project site. For these reasons, it is not reasonable to assume that the site would remain in its current condition on a long-term basis.

Consistent with CEQA, the No Project - No Development Alternative is nevertheless evaluated in the DEIR. The No Project - No Development Alternative would not result in any of the impacts that would occur if the project were constructed and operated because, under this scenario, the project would not be built. Overall, this project would not result in any of the project impacts and the beneficial impacts of stream restoration would not occur. The No Project - No Development Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives. This alternative also would not be consistent with the goals and objectives of the SVGPLUO or the *Placer County General Plan*, which calls for resort development at the project site and restoration of streams and waterways that have been adversely altered by past development activities.

No Project - SVGPLUO Development Alternative

This alternative represents another version of the CEQA No Project Alternative, which evaluates what would happen with the project site if the Specific Plan were not approved and the project site was instead built out under the current Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance (SVGPLUO). This alternative assumes development with similar densities as historically developed on similarly zoned properties in the project vicinity. The total projected level of development for this alternative mirrors the previous 25 years in terms of site utilization and therefore assumes demand and absorption of new development would continue at the historic pace in Olympic Valley. This alternative would be slightly more than 50 percent smaller than the proposed project when comparing bedroom counts and commercial square footage.

Development under this alternative is assumed to occur somewhat disjointedly, similar to past development that has occurred, rather than as a master planned development. Developed projects would be adjacent to one another, but not integrated, reducing the potential for creation of a compact, walkable development. As a result, view corridors may not be preserved and there would be fewer coordinated facilities. A smaller water tank would be constructed under this alternative. This alternative would not include many of the components included in the proposed project because smaller developments would not be able to fund such improvements. In particular, there would be no construction of the Mountain Adventure Camp or the Village open space network. Additionally, fewer recreational amenities would be provided under this alternative

because fewer amenities would be needed to meet County standards, and recreational amenities would be completed individually for each project, and likely would not be master planned.

The SVGPLUO includes a policy to restore the Trapezoidal Channel of Squaw Creek. Accordingly, some restoration of Squaw Creek would be required by individual projects that would have frontage on the Trapezoidal Channel. However, with potentially multiple project applicants implementing restoration independently, creek restoration would be more modest and less cohesive than under the proposed project.

The East Parcel would not be developed with active resort uses or employee housing, but rather would likely be developed for overflow/intercept surface parking and off-site snow storage.

Overall this alternative would result in fewer impacts than the project, though many impacts would be similar to the project. Significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural resources, visual resources, transportation and traffic, and noise would remain significant and unavoidable under this alternative, though the impacts would be less than with the project. The No Project - SVGPLUO Development Alternative would further some of the project objectives, but not to the extent that the proposed project would.

Reduced Density Alternative

The project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to cultural resources, visual resources, transportation and circulation, noise, and greenhouse gases emissions. The purpose of the Reduced Density Alternative would be to avoid or substantially reduce each of these impacts.

Under this alternative, the overall size of the project would be reduced by approximately 50 percent. The 50 percent reduction was based on a rough estimate of the minimum amount of development reduction required to reduce traffic volumes sufficiently to have no significant traffic impacts.

This alternative differs from the No Project-SVGPLUO Alternative, which also addresses a 50 percent reduction in development, in that this alternative employs a master plan component, such that development would be unified and compact. The master planned development would include similar development standards and design guidelines as the project. Buildings would be sited and sized to minimize viewshed blockage. The Mountain Adventure Camp would be constructed. Fewer recreational amenities would be provided under this alternative as compared to the project because there would be fewer of these amenities needed to meet County standards and fewer financial resources. A smaller water tank would be constructed under this alternative.

Restoration of Squaw Creek would be more modest than under the proposed project, primarily because lesser financial resources would be available. Similar to the project, the East Parcel would be developed with employee housing, parking, and shipping and receiving. Under this alternative, capacity to house 177 employees would be included in the East Parcel to serve 50 percent of the estimated 354 full-time equivalent employees (FTE's) generated by this alternative. This would meet County employee housing standards for new FTEs, but would not address existing employee housing removed under this alternative.

It is assumed that this alternative would be constructed over a roughly 15-year timeframe, or slightly more than half as long as the 25-year buildout associated with the project.

This alternative would lessen most all of the project impacts as the reduced scale of the project would result in a corresponding decrease to project impacts and would substantially lessen

some of the project's significant and unavoidable impacts. Significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural resources and scenic vistas (visual resources) would be reduced to a potentially less than significant level through application of many of the same mitigation measures as the project. Significant and unavoidable impacts to transportation and traffic and noise would still occur under this alternative, though the impacts would be less than with the project. Given that this alternative is 50 percent smaller than the project, it would generate fewer emissions than the project. However, it is not known whether this alternative would eliminate a significant and unavoidable GHG impact.

Overall, this alternative would avoid and substantially lessen the project's significant and unavoidable impacts. This alternative would further some of the project objectives, but not to the extent that the proposed project would.

Widened Squaw Valley Road Alternative

This alternative would be the same as the proposed project except that Squaw Valley Road would be widened from two to four lanes to accommodate the increased traffic that would be generated by the project. This alternative would include the development of a 70- to 80-foot-wide corridor, which would include lanes, shoulders, and curb and gutters where needed, along Squaw Valley Road. To accommodate road widening, this alternative may require removal of buildings, may encroach close to residences, would require widening of a bridge over the creek, and would remove potential habitat.

This alternative would result in significantly greater impacts in the areas of Land Use and Forest Resources, Population, Employment and Housing, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources and Noise. This alternative would result in similar impacts to the project, though somewhat greater in magnitude, in the areas of Visual Resources, Air Quality, Soils, Geology and Seismicity, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change. This Alternative is carried forward for analysis in this DEIR because it would reduce the project's significant and unavoidable traffic impacts, though not to a less than significant level. Because the development components of this alternative would be the same as the proposed project, it would meet the project objectives, but not to the extent that the proposed project would.

Preservation of Historical and Wetland Resources Alternative

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

Under this alternative, buildings on Lot 9 and Lot 15 would not be built. Not constructing these buildings would reduce the number of resort residential units by 146 units compared with the proposed project. The Mountain Adventure Camp would be built. However, the expanded 20,000-square-foot Squaw Kids Ski School would not be built and the school would remain in its current location to the east of the Red Dog Lift. Under this alternative, the East Parcel would contain the same facilities as described for the proposed project.

This alternative would lessen most all of the project impacts as the reduced scale of the project would result in a corresponding decrease to project impacts. In addition, this alternative would avoid significant unavoidable impacts to Cultural Resources and would substantially lessen potentially significant impacts to Biological Resources and to Hydrology and Water Quality because fewer wetlands resources would be impacted and less soil would be disturbed. Benefits resulting from restoration of the Olympic Channel would occur, but would be less than

under the proposed project because the restoration effort would be more modest in order to preserve some existing wetlands.

This alternative would attain many of the project objectives, but not to the extent that the proposed project would. This alternative would avoid and substantially lessen some of the project's significant and unavoidable impacts.

Alternative Water Tank Location

This alternative is being considered as a result of uncertainty regarding the ability of the project applicant to reach agreement on purchasing the land encompassing the proposed offsite tank site. This alternative would be the same as the proposed project except that the water tank would be located to the south of the project site on lands owned by Squaw Valley Resort, LLC. The alternative water tank location would be within an existing treed area between two existing ski slopes; Red Dog and Far East Express. The tank would be painted to match its surroundings. It would have the same capacity as the proposed tank, 0.7 million gallons, and would be 65 feet in diameter and 25-30 feet tall.

The project would use an existing ski mountain access road to construct and maintain the water tank. Approximately 3,300 feet of additional water pipeline would be constructed to connect the tank with the Village water system. This is similar to what would be needed for the proposed water tank site. The same amount of resort residential, commercial space, employee housing, and parking would be developed under this alternative.

This alternative would have similar impacts as the project, though several impact areas including, but not limited to, Land Use and Forrest Resources, Biological Resources and Visual Resources could be greater under this alternative due to the increased level of disturbance associated with the alternative water tank location. Because this alternative would be substantially the same as the proposed project, it would meet the project objectives.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

To determine the environmentally superior alternative, all alternatives were evaluated with respect to their ability to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of the proposed project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) indicates that an environmentally superior alternative shall be identified in an EIR and that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives.

Based on the analysis contained in the DEIR, the environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project is the No Project – No Development Alternative, which assumes that no development would occur within the project area and consequently none of the project impacts would occur. Because no development would occur, the stream would not be restored and the beneficial impacts from stream restoration would not occur. After the No Project – No Development Alternative, the Reduced Density Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative, which assumes that approximately half as much development would occur in comparison to the project and that development would be master planned in the same fashion as the project (i.e. through implementation of a Specific Plan). Under this alternative, significant impacts to housing, biological resources, cultural resources, visual resources, traffic, air quality (operations), noise, and greenhouse gases would be reduced or avoided when compared to the project. However, this alternative would not meet project objectives to the same extent as the Project, and its financial feasibility is not known.

TIME FRAMES:
The 60-day public comment period for the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Draft EIR will close at 5:00 p.m. on July 17, 2015.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Environmental Review Committee recommends that the Planning Commission receive public comments on the Draft EIR and direct staff to respond to all written and oral comments in the Final EIR.

Respectfully submitted,

Alex Fisch, Chairperson
Environmental Review Committee

Attachments:

Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (under separate cover)

cc: EIR file
Gary Jakobs, Ascent Environmental
Sean Bechta, Ascent Environmental
Chevis Hosea, Squaw Valley Real Estate LLC
Michael Johnson, Agency Director
Paul Thompson, Assistant Agency Director
EJ Ivaldi, Deputy Planning Director
Richard Eiri, Deputy Director of Engineering & Surveying
Karin Schwab, County Counsel
Crystal Jacobsen, Environmental Coordinator
Sarah Gillmore, Engineering and Surveying
Richard Moorehead, Public Works
Justin Hansen, Environmental Health Division
Andy Fisher, Parks Department
Christina Hanson, Facilities Services
Squaw Valley Municipal Advisory Council
NOP commenters