

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## ES.1 INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Forest Service (Forest Service) and Placer County (County) have prepared a joint environmental document for the proposed Squaw Valley | Alpine Meadows Base-to-Base Gondola Project (project). The document is an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Forest Service prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S. Code 4321-4347), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations Implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500-1508), and Forest Service Handbook 1909.15; and an environmental impact report (EIR) for the County pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 15000 et seq.). Both agencies have determined that an EIS/EIR is needed to review, analyze, and document the potential effects on the human, physical, and biological environment anticipated to result from construction, operation, and maintenance of the project. Squaw Valley Ski Holdings, LLC (SVSH) is the project proponent.

This EIS/EIR will be used by the Forest Service and Placer County to render decisions regarding approval of project elements within their jurisdiction and selection of an alternative.

### ES.1.1 Project Area and Background

The Squaw Valley Ski Area (Squaw Valley) and Alpine Meadows Ski Area (Alpine Meadows) are separate ski facilities northwest of Lake Tahoe. They are proximate to each other, and are both under ownership of, and operated by, the project proponent. One lift ticket (or season pass) provides access to both facilities. Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows each offer a different winter sports and resort amenity experience. Between the two ski areas, Squaw Valley has a higher percentage of advanced/expert terrain and more resort amenities (e.g., accommodations, restaurants, shopping, entertainment). Alpine Meadows, however, has more beginner and intermediate terrain and limited amenities. A shuttle bus currently provides roadway access between the ski areas throughout the day. This interresort access is often considered inconvenient because it requires skiers/boarders to exit the mountain, walk with their equipment to the shuttle stop, wait up to 30 minutes for the shuttle, and travel approximately 15 minutes to the shuttle stop at the other ski area. The project is being proposed to enhance the visitor experience at both Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows by providing more direct access to existing ski terrain and/or resort amenities via a gondola lift system with limited waiting times to board the gondola and an approximately 16-minute transit time between ski areas. The more direct access would also allow the Squaw Valley ski and snowboard schools improved access to the beginner terrain at Alpine Meadows.

In September 2015 and October 2015, the Tahoe National Forest (TNF) and County, respectively, accepted applications from SVSH to install, operate, and maintain an aerial ropeway system (gondola) connecting the Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows ski areas. The original proposal also included an alteration of current avalanche mitigation techniques through the installation of eight Gazex exploders along or near a segment of the Alpine Meadows side of the proposed gondola alignment. (Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, the proposed Gazex avalanche mitigation system was removed from all action alternatives. See Chapter 1, "Introduction," for additional details.) Implementation of the proposal would require an amendment to the existing Forest Service special use permit (SUP) issued for the operation and maintenance of Alpine Meadows. The proposal is consistent with the *Alpine Meadows Ski Area Master Development Plan* (Tahoe National Forest 2015) and passed the screening criteria for consideration to use National Forest System (NFS) lands and amend the existing permit consistent with Forest Service land use regulations. Permitting from the County includes a conditional use permit and General Plan amendment to the *Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance* (SVGPLUO) (Placer County 2006) to allow for a new ski lift.

Alpine Meadows conducts its operations—including the lift and trail network, guest service facilities, infrastructure, and other assets—on private, state, and NFS lands administered by TNF in Placer County. Located in the Lake Tahoe region, Alpine Meadows is approximately 3.3 miles west of State Route (SR) 89, about 7 miles northwest of Tahoe City, and about 13 miles south of Truckee.

Squaw Valley conducts its operations—including the lift and trail network, guest service facilities, infrastructure, and other assets—almost entirely on private lands in Placer County. Approximately 195 acres of Squaw Valley’s operation are under Forest Service SUP on NFS lands. No portions of the infrastructure and improvements included in the alternatives would be located on NFS lands at Squaw Valley. Squaw Valley is approximately 2.5 miles west of SR 89, about 9 miles northwest of Tahoe City, and about 11 miles south of Truckee. At the closest point, Squaw Valley is approximately 1.2 miles from Alpine Meadows.

## ES.1.2 Purpose, Need, and Objectives

### ES.1.2.1 FOREST SERVICE PURPOSE AND NEED

The Forest Service’s purpose for the project is to improve developed winter recreation opportunities in the Scott Management Area, consistent with the Forest Plan. SUPs, and amendments to SUPs, are issued by the Forest Service and are required by law to be consistent with the Forest Plan. Desired future conditions for recreation management in the Forest Plan relevant to the alternatives direct the TNF to “provide a variety of opportunities for developed and dispersed recreation experiences” (U.S. Forest Service 1990:V-5). The Alpine Meadows SUP, which applies to the Scott Management Area, allows for development of additional winter sports facilities and support services as part of the desired future condition of the management area (U.S. Forest Service 1990:V-446–449).

The TNF needs to respond to SVSH’s land use application, which proposes amendment of its SUP to improve connectivity between Alpine Meadows and Squaw Valley. The need, as expressed by SVSH, for improved connectivity between the ski areas is based on several factors. The developed snow sports trail network at Squaw Valley has limited terrain suitable for beginners and teaching; Alpine Meadows has additional intermediate and beginner terrain. Squaw Valley has more resort amenities (e.g. accommodations, restaurants, shopping, entertainment); Alpine Meadows, in contrast, has limited amenities. Although guests can currently access both ski areas on the same lift ticket, they must drive or ride a shuttle bus between the two areas to access all the different terrain and amenities offered at both locations.

### ES.1.2.2 CEQA PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Placer County’s responsibility under CEQA is predicated upon the review of an application for a conditional use permit and SVGPLUO amendment. Consideration of these actions is a discretionary decision by the County and qualifies as a project under CEQA. Under CEQA, an EIR must include a statement of objectives of the proposed project.

The overall purpose of the project is to enhance the visitor wintertime experience at both Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows by providing direct connection between the ski areas for more convenient access to skiable terrain and resort amenities.

The project has the following objectives<sup>1</sup>:

1. Enhance the visitor experience at Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows by providing easy, and potentially faster, interresort access to terrain and amenities at both ski areas.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Draft EIS/EIR included a 6<sup>th</sup> project objective related to avalanche mitigation technology (Gazex); however, that objective was removed from the Final EIS/EIR because the project was modified to remove the proposed Gazex facilities from the proposal.

2. Reduce visitor and resort shuttle system travel on roadways between the resorts.
3. Provide opportunities for skiers to offload at mid-stations to provide easier access to existing skiable terrain.
4. Provide a system where the gondola segment between the Squaw Valley base terminal and mid-station can operate independently from the remainder of the gondola so that this segment can potentially function as a ski lift if the remainder of the gondola is not operational because of weather, maintenance, or other factors.
5. Use a facility alignment that allows vehicles and equipment to reach gondola cabins from the ground to evacuate people from the cabins, if necessary, during an emergency situation.

## ES.2 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

### ES.2.1 Scoping Process

In accordance with NEPA regulations (40 CFR Section 1508.22), the Forest Service initiated the scoping comment period by publishing a notice of intent in the *Federal Register* on April 29, 2016, with a designated scoping period ending on May 31, 2016. In accordance with CEQA (14 CCR Section 15082), Placer County published a notice of preparation (NOP) with the State Clearinghouse on April 22, 2016, with a 30-day review period ending on May 23, 2016.

The Forest Service prepared and distributed a scoping package to individuals and organizations. Placer County prepared the CEQA Initial Study Checklist for the project, which, along with the NOP, was posted on the Placer County project website and mailed to individuals and organizations on the mailing list.

Two joint Forest Service and Placer County public scoping meetings were held on May 9, 2016. Both meetings were held at the Resort at Squaw Creek, Monument Peak Room, 400 Squaw Creek Road, Olympic Valley, California. The first meeting was held from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m., and the second was held from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Individuals were able to obtain information and submit comments at this public scoping meeting. Scoping comments were also accepted through mail, fax, telephone, and email to both agencies and through the Forest Service project website.

Following the close of the public scoping period, the Forest Service and Placer County decided to combine the NEPA/CEQA processes and produce a joint EIS/EIR. The Forest Service and Placer County announced this change through a press release and revised NOP published on September 2, 2016, and Placer County accepted additional scoping comments until October 3, 2016.

The notices and scoping materials are included in Appendix A.

### ES.2.2 Resources Addressed in the EIS/EIR

Based on the results of public scoping and analysis contained in the initial study, specific areas of concern have been identified and classified as being “*key issues*,” “*issues*,” or “*resources/issues dismissed from further documentation*.” Both *key issues* and *issues* generally require in-depth analysis and disclosure, and *key issues* may warrant the generation of an alternative. *Resources/issues dismissed from further documentation* are described in Section 1.7.2, “Resources/Issues Dismissed from Further Documentation in This EIS/EIR.” The Forest Service Handbook directs the Forest Service to focus the analysis on *key issues* and include brief rationale for other topics not analyzed in detail. Similarly, the State CEQA Guidelines directs lead agencies to focus an EIR discussion on significant environmental effects and may limit discussion on other effects to brief explanations about why they are not significant (PRC Section 21002.1, CCR Section 15128).

The Forest Service and the County have determined that the project has the potential to result in significant environmental impacts on the following resources, which are addressed in detail in this Final EIS/EIR (see Sections 4.1 through 4.17):

- ▲ Recreation;
- ▲ Visual Resources;
- ▲ Wilderness;
- ▲ Land Use;
- ▲ Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice;
- ▲ Public Safety;
- ▲ Transportation and Circulation;
- ▲ Utilities;
- ▲ Noise;
- ▲ Air Quality;
- ▲ Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change;
- ▲ Vegetation;
- ▲ Botany;
- ▲ Wildlife and Aquatics;
- ▲ Wetlands;
- ▲ Soils, Geology, and Seismicity; and
- ▲ Hydrology and Water Quality.

“Key issues” that helped inform the development of alternatives include visual resources, wilderness, and Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog. For example, Alternative 3 addresses issues such as proximity to the Granite Chief Wilderness and proximity to occupied habitat for Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog at Barstool Lake. Alternative 4 likewise addresses issues such as proximity to the Granite Chief Wilderness and proximity to occupied habitat for Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog at Barstool Lake, as well as visibility of the project, and proximity to residences. Other issues, including those in the above bulleted list, were also considered in the development of alternatives. See Chapter 2, “Description of Alternatives,” for additional details.

### ES.2.3 Areas of Controversy

Based on the comments received during the scoping period, the major areas of interest associated with the project, and which warrant further analysis, are:

- ▲ scenic values,
- ▲ Granite Chief Wilderness,
- ▲ botanical, wildlife, and aquatic resources,
- ▲ relationship with federal and local planning documents,
- ▲ cumulative effects,
- ▲ recreation,
- ▲ alternatives,
- ▲ traffic and parking,
- ▲ noise,
- ▲ air quality and greenhouse gas emissions,
- ▲ avalanche hazards,
- ▲ project purpose and need,
- ▲ water and wetlands, and
- ▲ health and safety.

A more detailed description of the comments received is provided in Appendix A. All of the substantive environmental issues raised in the scoping comment letters and at the scoping meetings have been addressed or otherwise considered during preparation of this Final EIS/EIR.

### ES.2.4 Issues to Be Resolved

As it relates to Forest Service approvals, the Responsible Official, the Forest Supervisor for the TNF, will decide whether to select Alternative 2 (Proposed Action Alternative provided by the applicant), one of the other action alternatives (i.e. Alternatives 3 or 4), or the No Action Alternative. Selection of one of the action alternatives would be a decision by the Forest Supervisor to amend Alpine Meadows’ existing SUP to authorize the project. In

addition, the Forest Supervisor will decide whether to amend the Forest Plan. Other decisions to be made by the Forest Service are described in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” in Section 1.9.1, “Forest Service Decisions.”

As the CEQA lead agency, Placer County is responsible for considering the adequacy of the environmental analysis and determining whether the overall project should be approved. Other actions and planning entitlements requested by the project applicant from the County are listed in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” in Section 1.9.2, “Placer County Decisions.”

Other federal, state, and local agencies may also need to grant permits or approvals for the project as well; these are listed in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” in Section 1.10, “Other Necessary Permits, Licenses, and/or Consultation.”

## **ES.2.5 Public Review of the Draft EIS/EIR**

The Draft EIS/EIR was distributed to interested agencies, stakeholder organizations, and individuals for a comment period of 45 days, from April 27, 2018, to June 11, 2018. This distribution was meant to ensure that interested parties had an opportunity to express their views regarding the environmental effects of the project and to ensure that information pertinent to permits and approvals was provided to decision makers. The Draft EIR/EIS was available for review by the public during normal business hours at the Tahoe City and Truckee libraries, Placer County offices in Auburn and Tahoe City, and Tahoe National Forest offices in Nevada City and Truckee. The document was also available online.

A public hearing on the Draft EIS/EIR was conducted on May 24, 2018, as part of the Placer County Planning Commission meeting in Kings Beach, California. A Forest Service open house was conducted on May 22, 2018 at the Truckee Ranger District Office in Truckee, CA.

All comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR during the public comment period, as well as several comments received within two weeks after the close of the comment period, are included along with written responses in Volume 2 of this Final EIS/EIR. An additional letter was received in December 2018, more than 6 months after the end of the comment period, and is not responded to in this Final EIS/EIR.

## **ES.3 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES**

NEPA and CEQA require the analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives that meet the purpose and need/objectives of the project (40 CFR Section 1502.14[a] and 14 CCR Section 15126.6[a]). The Forest Service and Placer County have identified the following four alternatives: Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative, Alternative 2 – Proposed Action Alternative, Alternative 3, and Alternative 4. These alternatives are described in greater detail in Chapter 2, “Description of the Alternatives.”

As noted above, alternatives were developed, in part, in response to issues identified internally by the Forest Service and Placer County, and externally by the public during the scoping process.

### **ES.3.1 Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative**

The No Action/No Project Alternative, required by NEPA and CEQA (40 CFR 1502.14 and 14 CCR Section 15126.6[e]), provides a baseline for comparing the effects of the action alternatives. NEPA uses the term “No Action Alternative,” and CEQA uses the term “No Project Alternative.” For the purposes of this EIS/EIR, the term “No Action Alternative” is used for both NEPA and CEQA. Under the No Action Alternative, neither the Forest Service nor Placer County would provide authorizations to SVSH to construct a gondola. The No Action Alternative essentially reflects a continuation of existing interresort transportation management practices without changes, additions, or upgrades. The existing shuttle system between Squaw Valley and Alpine

Meadows would continue to operate. The gondola connecting Alpine Meadows and Squaw Valley would not be implemented under the No Action Alternative, and existing conditions would not be changed at the project site.

### ES.3.2 Alternative 2 – Proposed Action Alternative

Alternative 2 includes amendment of the Alpine Meadows SUP, issuance of a conditional use permit, rezone to accommodate the Alpine Meadows base terminal, and amendment of the SVGPLUO to authorize construction, operation, and maintenance of a gondola connecting Alpine Meadows and Squaw Valley (total length of approximately 13,000 feet) with mid-stations for Alpine Meadows and Squaw Valley located above the *Buttress* area and on the Squaw Saddle, respectively.

### ES.3.3 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 includes a gondola connecting Alpine Meadows and Squaw Valley in a different alignment (segments of which would be located further to the east of Alternative 2; total length of approximately 12,600 feet) with a mid-station for Alpine Meadows located on the Caldwell property (private lands located between Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows ski resorts) and a mid-station for Squaw Valley located on the Squaw Saddle. Alternative 3 includes amendment of the Alpine Meadows SUP, issuance of a conditional use permit, rezone to accommodate the Alpine Meadows base terminal, and amendment of the SVGPLUO.

### ES.3.4 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 includes a gondola connecting Alpine Meadows and Squaw Valley in a different alignment (the entire alignment further to the east than Alternatives 2 and portions of Alternative 3; total length of approximately 11,700 feet) with a mid-station for Alpine Meadows located on the Caldwell property (private lands located between Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows ski resorts) and a mid-station for Squaw Valley located on the Squaw Saddle. Alternative 4 includes amendment of the Alpine Meadows SUP, issuance of a conditional use permit, rezone to accommodate the Alpine Meadows base terminal, and amendment of the SVGPLUO.

## ES.4 COMPARATIVE FEATURES OF THE ALTERNATIVES

Chapter 2, “Description of Alternatives,” provides a detailed description of each of the alternatives under consideration. Table ES-1 provides a comparison of key project elements associated with each alternative, including length of the aerial ropeway system (gondola), and number of towers and terminals; this information is further divided by whether it would occur on private or NFS land.

**Table ES-1 Comparison of Alternatives**

	Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative	Alternative 2 – Proposed Action Alternative	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<b>Aerial Ropeway System (length)</b>				
Private Land	0	9,700 feet	10,200 feet	9,400 feet
NFS Land	0	3,300 feet	2,400 feet	2,300 feet
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13,000 feet</b>	<b>12,600 feet</b>	<b>11,700 feet</b>
<b>Towers</b>				
Private Land	0	25	29	28
NFS Land	0	10	5	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>33</b>

**Table ES-1 Comparison of Alternatives**

	Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative	Alternative 2 – Proposed Action Alternative	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<b>Terminals</b>				
Private Land	0	1 base terminal, 1 mid-station	1 base terminal, 2 mid-stations	1 base terminal, 2 mid-stations
NFS Land	0	1 base terminal, 1 mid-station	1 base terminal	1 base terminal
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2 base terminals, 2 mid-stations</b>	<b>2 base terminals, 2 mid-stations</b>	<b>2 base terminals, 2 mid-stations</b>
<b>Avalanche Mitigation System</b>				
Private Land	0	0	0	0
NFS Land	0	Removes seven existing 105-mm Howitzer targets	Removes two existing 105-mm Howitzer targets	Removes two existing 105-mm Howitzer targets
Notes: mm = millimeter; NFS = National Forest System				

Table ES-2 provides a comparison of the amount of ground disturbance that would occur from the installation of key project elements associated with each alternative.

**Table ES-2 Comparison of Disturbance of Alternatives**

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative	Alternative 2 – Proposed Action Alternative	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<b>Alpine Meadows Base Terminal (permanent ground disturbance)</b>			
0 acre	1.9 acre	1.5 acre	1.5 acre
<b>Alpine Meadows Mid-Station (permanent ground disturbance)</b>			
0 acre	0.5 acre	0.9 acre	0.5 acre
<b>Squaw Valley Mid-Station (permanent ground disturbance)</b>			
0 acre	1.5 acre	1.6 acre	0.6 acre
<b>Squaw Valley Base Terminal (permanent ground disturbance)</b>			
0 acre	1 acre	1 acre	0.4 acre
<b>Gondola Corridor (overstory vegetation removal, temporary construction disturbance)</b>			
0 acre	11.2 acres	8 acres	7.9 acres
<b>Gondola Tower Disturbance (permanent tower footing, temporary construction disturbance)</b>			
0 acre	0.4 acre	0.4 acre	0.4 acre
<b>Access Route (temporary ground disturbance)</b>			
0 acre	3.3 acres	1.1 acre	2.7 acres
Note: Slight differences in acreage between project disturbance and resource disturbance is due to GIS shapefiles and rounding			

## ES.5 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Chapter 4, “Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences,” of this Final EIS/EIR describes in detail the environmental effects that would result from implementation of the project alternatives. For the NEPA analysis, environmental effects are concluded to be: (1) no effect, (2) adverse when there are detrimental or negative effects, or (3) beneficial when there are positive effects. For some NEPA effects conclusions, “minorly” is used to characterize adverse and beneficial effects (i.e., minorly adverse or minorly beneficial), in an effort to further distinguish the effects of the action alternatives. For the CEQA analysis, environmental effects are determined to be: (1) no effect; (2) less than significant; (3) significant or potentially significant (mitigation measures are required); and (4) significant and unavoidable (changes in the environment that cannot be feasibly reduced to a less-than-significant levels with mitigation measures).

The project includes resource protection measures (RPMs) developed to avoid, minimize, or compensate for the potential environmental effects of the project. These RPMs are listed in Appendix B and are more comprehensively discussed in Chapters 2, “Description of Alternatives,” and 3, “Approach to the Analysis.” The RPMs are considered part of the project and will be conditions of approval of the Placer County Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Where effects are identified that are not addressed by these RPMs, or where the RPMs are not adequate to reduce effects to less-than-significant levels, the EIS/EIR recommends mitigation measures. RPMs will be incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program developed for this project.

Table ES-3 (at the end of this chapter) summarizes the potential environmental effects that would result from implementation of the alternatives; describes RPMs and mitigation measures to address significant and potentially significant environmental effects; and identifies the significance of effects both before and after mitigation.

## ES.6 ENVIRONMENTAL SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA calls for the identification of an environmentally superior alternative in an EIR but gives no specific definition for the term (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2)); however, the term can be generally defined as the alternative that results in the least amount of environmental impact. CEQA further specifies that if the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

From the standpoint of minimizing environmental effects, Alternative 1 - No Action Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative. Under Alternative 1, no construction would take place and the project site would remain consistent with existing conditions. No change to the existing environment would occur under Alternative 1. However, Alternative 1 would not meet any of the basic project objectives related to providing a connection between the Alpine Meadows and Squaw Valley base areas.

Table 2-3 in Chapter 2, “Description of Alternatives,” identifies the significant and potentially significant impacts of each alternative for each environmental issue area evaluated in this EIS/EIR. As shown in Table 2-3, based solely on impact significance conclusions, there is little difference in effects among the action alternatives. Using this coarse comparison method, the primary difference between alternatives is that Alternative 3 has one CEQA noise impact that does not occur under Alternatives 2 and 4 and results from the Alpine Meadows mid-station under Alternative 3 being located in close proximity to existing residences. This impact is significant and is reduced to a less-than significant level with mitigation. Without a clear distinction between alternatives in Table 2-3, a more detailed evaluation of the differences in effects among alternatives is necessary.

For several environmental issue areas, the same effects occur for each action alternative. For example, each action alternative is assumed to result in the same potential increase in visitation; therefore, each action alternative results in the same generation of utility demand. Consequently, there is no difference in utility impacts across the three action alternatives. For the following issue areas, environmental effects are the same for all action alternatives and these issue areas were not considered in the determination of the environmentally superior alternative:

- Section 4.4, “Land Use,”
- Section 4.5, “Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice,”
- Section 4.7, “Transportation and Circulation,”
- Section 4.8, “Utilities,”
- Section 4.10, “Air Quality,” and
- Section 4.11, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.”

Further information on why effects were considered the same across action alternatives for each environmental issue area is provided in the referenced sections of this EIS/EIR.

## ES.6.1 Alternative 2

Due to its location, Alternative 2 results in several different, or more severe environmental effects than Alternatives 3 and 4. The key significant environmental effects of Alternative 2 concern the alternative's close proximity to both the Granite Chief Wilderness (GCW) and known occupied habitat for the Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog (SNYLF). Other environmental issue areas where Alternative 2 would have different or more severe effects than Alternatives 3 and 4 include biological resources, land use conflicts, and public safety. All are described in greater detail below.

As described in Chapter 2, "Description of Alternatives," and shown in Exhibit 2-2, the central portion of the Alternative 2 alignment, between the Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows mid-stations, is located just east of the GCW and would cross private lands within the Congressionally-Mapped GCW. This close proximity to the GCW would result in effects related to visual resources, noise, and wilderness. This middle segment would traverse a distance of approximately 3,000 feet along or near the ridgeline between the two resorts, and therefore has the greatest effect on visual character among the three action alternatives (see Section 4.2, "Visual Resources"). Due to the close proximity of Alternative 2 to the GCW, this alternative would have the greatest noise effect on the GCW during project construction.

With the Alpine Meadows mid-station near Barstool Lake, Alternative 2 is the only action alternative with facilities in close proximity (within 100 feet) to known occupied habitat for SNYLF (see Section 4.14, "Wildlife and Aquatics"). As the SNYLF is an endangered species and Alternative 2 is the only alternative that would have a significant impact on SNYLF, Alternative 2 would have a greater effect on SNYLF than would Alternatives 3 or 4.

Alternative 2 would result in approximately 21 acres of ground disturbance, which is greater than the amount that would be disturbed by Alternatives 3 or 4. This greater area of ground disturbance, results in an increased potential for the introduction and establishment of invasive plant species (see Section 4.13, "Botany") and for erosion (see Section 4.17, "Hydrology and Water Quality") compared with Alternatives 3 and 4.

Finally, among the action alternatives, the gondola as proposed under Alternative 2 would also be the most difficult to evacuate in the event of an emergency (see Section 4.6, "Public Safety").

In some areas, Alternative 2 has less environmental effect than Alternatives 3 and 4, such as the least exposure to avalanche risk due to the location near the top of the ridgeline (see Sections 4.6, "Public Safety," and 4.16, "Soils, Geology, and Seismicity") and least effect on aquatic habitats and associated aquatic and botanical species (see Sections 4.13, "Botany," 4.14, "Wildlife and Aquatics," and 4.15, "Wetlands"). However, this difference in habitat effects is small, ranging from a fraction of an acre to approximately 1 acre depending on the alternative and habitat types being compared.

While Alternative 2 may have lesser impacts compared to Alternatives 3 and 4 for the limited environmental issue areas discussed above, these areas of less effect are not sufficient to counterbalance the areas where Alternative 2 has greater adverse effects, or adverse effects unique to this alternative. Alternative 2's greater impacts on the resources discussed above, and in particular those related to visual effects, the GCW, and SNYLF, are sufficient to eliminate it from further consideration as the environmentally superior alternative.

## ES.6.2 Alternatives 3 and 4

With Alternative 2 eliminated from consideration as the environmentally superior alternative, it must be chosen from Alternatives 3 and 4.

While there are environmental issue areas where Alternatives 3 and 4 both clearly have lesser impacts than Alternative 2, differences between Alternatives 3 and 4 themselves are frequently more subtle. For example,

while the alignments for Alternatives 3 and 4 both cross the Five Lakes Trail between the trailhead near Alpine Meadows and the ultimate destination of the Five Lakes within GCW, Alternative 4 would be the closest alignment to the trailhead. This area currently supports limited development, including other ski lift infrastructure (i.e., “KT South” on the private Caldwell property). By encountering the new infrastructure in closer proximity to existing development and infrastructure, the new development under Alternative 4 would represent less of a contrast with the existing landscape than under Alternative 3. Alternative 4’s alignment is also generally the most distant from the Pacific Crest Trail (see Section 4.1, “Recreation”).

Alternatives 3 and 4 both avoid adverse effects related to close proximity to the GCW (see Section 4.3, “Wilderness”). While Alternative 3 would locate the Squaw Valley mid-station closer to the GCW than Alternative 4, the mid-station under Alternative 4 would be on a peak and would therefore be more visible to the surrounding area than the Alternative 3 mid-station location (see Section 4.2, “Visual Resources”). As such, Alternative 3 has slightly less effect on visual character compared with Alternative 4.

Alternatives 3 and 4 have similar risks related to avalanche effects and similar characteristics regarding undertaking an emergency evacuation of the gondola (see Section 4.6, “Public Safety”). Both Alternatives 3 and 4 have the potential to generate construction and operational noise that could affect nearby residences; however, Alternative 4 has the potential to affect fewer residences due to the distance of the alignment and the base terminal and mid-station from residences (see Section 4.9, “Noise”).

Among Alternatives 3 and 4, Alternative 3 has the least effect on aquatic habitats and associated wildlife and botanical species (see Sections 4.13, “Botany,” 4.14, “Wildlife and Aquatics,” and 4.15, “Wetlands”). However, this difference in habitat effects is small, ranging up to approximately 1.5 acres. Alternative 4 has a slightly greater effect on potential aquatic habitat for SNYLF compared to Alternative 3; however, Alternative 4 has less of an effect on potential upland habitat. Alternative 4 includes less of the alignment within the area designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) as critical habitat for SNYLF (see Section 4.14, “Wildlife and Aquatics”). As SNYLF and its habitat are of critical importance, Alternative 4 is the environmentally superior alternative because it affects less critical SNYLF habitat designated by USFWS.

Comparing overall ground disturbance, Alternative 3 disturbs approximately 18 acres whereas Alternative 4 disturbs approximately 15 acres, resulting in Alternative 4 having less potential for introduction and establishment of invasive plant species (see Section 4.13, “Botany”) and for erosion (see Section 4.17, “Hydrology and Water Quality”) compared with Alternative 3.

Alternative 3 is estimated to require the removal of 104 trees, with 133 additional trees at risk of removal. Alternative 4 is estimated to require the removal of 38 trees with an additional 176 trees at risk of removal. Thus, the estimated amount of tree removal and total amount of potential tree removal is less for Alternative 4 than for Alternative 3.

### ES.6.3 Conclusion

While Alternative 3 has less of an effect than Alternative 4 in some areas, such as disturbance of aquatic habitats, Alternative 4 results in less of an effect in multiple areas such as recreation, noise, total ground disturbance, tree removal, and SNYLF upland habitat. Therefore, overall, Alternative 4 is determined to have less of an adverse environmental effect compared to Alternative 3, and is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative.

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
<b>Adv = Adverse</b> <b>B = Beneficial</b> <b>LTS = Less than significant</b> <b>N/A = Not applicable</b> <b>NE = No effect</b> <b>PS = Potentially significant</b> <b>S = Significant</b> <b>SU = Significant and unavoidable</b>					
<b>4.1 Recreation</b>					
Impact 4.1-1: Recreation Experience, Access, and Visitation	Alt 1 = NE Alt 2 = B, Adv Alts 3, 4 = B, Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs MUL-7, and REC-1 through REC-4	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.1-2: Adverse Effects Associated with New or Expanded Recreation Facilities	N/A	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	No mitigation measures are required	N/A	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.1-3: Consistency with Land Use Plans	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	No mitigation measures are required	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
<b>4.2 Visual Resources</b>					
Impact 4.2-1: Consistency with Federal, State, and Local Regulations	Alt 1, 3, 4 = NE Alt 2 = Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alt 2 = LTS Alts 3, 4 = LTS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs SCE-1, SCE-2, SCE-4, SCE-7, SCE-8, REV-1, and REV-3	Alt 1, 3, 4 = NE Alts 2 = Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.2-2: Visual Character (General Impact on Visual Character)	Alt 1 = NE Alt 2 = Adv Alts 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = S	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs SCE-1 through SCE-4, SCE-6, and SCE-7	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = SU
Impact 4.2-3: Night Lighting and Glare	Alt 1, 3, 4 = NE Alt 2 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = S	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs SCE-5 and SCE-8	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
<b>4.3 Wilderness</b>					
Impact 4.3-1: Effects on Untrammeled Wilderness	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	N/A	No mitigation measures are required	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	N/A
Impact 4.3-2: Effects on Undeveloped Wilderness	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	N/A	No mitigation measures are required	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	N/A
Impact 4.3-3: Effects on Natural Wilderness	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	N/A	No mitigation measures are required	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	N/A
Impact 4.3-4: Effects on Opportunities for Solitude or Primitive and Unconfined Recreation	Alt 1 = NE Alt 2 = Adv Alts 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	N/A	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs SCE-1 and SCE-2	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	N/A

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
<b>Adv = Adverse</b> <b>B = Beneficial</b> <b>LTS = Less than significant</b> <b>N/A = Not applicable</b> <b>NE = No effect</b> <b>PS = Potentially significant</b> <b>S = Significant</b> <b>SU = Significant and unavoidable</b>					
Impact 4.3-5: Effects on Potential Wilderness Characteristics on Private Lands within the Congressionally Mapped Granite Chief Wilderness	Alts 1, 3, 4 = NE Alt 2 = Adv	N/A	No mitigation measures are required	Alts 1, 3, 4 = NE Alt 2 = Adv	N/A
<b>4.4 Land Use</b>					
Impact 4.4-1: Consistency with Relevant Federal and Local Rules and Regulations	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = NE (with General Plan amendment and rezone)	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS (with General Plan amendment and rezone)	No mitigation measures are required	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = NE (with General Plan amendment and rezone)	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS (with General Plan amendment and rezone)
<b>4.5 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice</b>					
Impact 4.5-1: Visitor Spending Impacts	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly B	N/A	No mitigation measures are required	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly B	N/A
Impact 4.5-2: Employment Impacts	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly B	N/A	No mitigation measures are required	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly B	N/A
Impact 4.5-3: Town/County Tax Revenue Impacts	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly B	N/A	No mitigation measures are required	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly B	N/A
<b>4.6 Public Safety</b>					
Impact 4.6-1: Health and Safety	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alt 2, 3, 4 = RPMs HAZ-2, HAZ-4, HAZ-6, HAZ-8 through HAZ-10, WQ-1, and NOI-4	Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	Alt 1 = NE Alt 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.6-2: Operations Efficiency	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	N/A	No mitigation measures are required	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	N/A
<b>4.7 Transportation and Circulation</b>					
Impact 4.7-1: Impacts on Placer County Roadways	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	No mitigation measures are required	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
<p>Adv = Adverse      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant      N/A = Not applicable</p> <p>NE = No effect      PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable</p>					
Impact 4.7-2: Impacts on Placer County Intersections	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = S	<p>Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 (Alt. 2)</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 (Alt. 2): Conduct Traffic Management at Squaw Valley Road/Chamonix Place Intersection</b></p> <p>Prior to October 15<sup>th</sup> annually, Squaw Valley Ski Holdings (SVSH) shall submit to Placer County Department of Public Works and Facilities a traffic management plan that shall include traffic management associated with Squaw Valley Road and intersecting roadways, including Chamonix Place and Squaw Creek Road. The traffic management plan shall include lessons learned from the previous season as well as modifications for the upcoming season and shall identify operational details and safety provisions to ensure both effective and safe management of traffic congestion. Upon approval of the traffic management plan, SVSH shall implement the traffic management plan with approval of an encroachment permit from Placer County Department of Public Works and Facilities.</p> <p>The traffic management plan may include, but not be limited to, employing traffic management personnel at intersections during the afternoon peak periods of peak weekend ski days. Traffic control personnel may manage traffic on Squaw Valley Road to assign right-of-way to vehicles on Chamonix Place and Squaw Creek Road. This type of traffic control is in effect at other intersections along Squaw Valley Road including at Wayne Road, which operates at an acceptable LOS.</p>	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.7-3: Impacts on Caltrans Intersections	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	No mitigation measures are required	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
<p>Adv = Adverse      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant      N/A = Not applicable</p> <p>NE = No effect      PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable</p>					
Impact 4.7-4: Impacts on Vehicular Queuing at Caltrans Intersections	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = S	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigation Measure 4.7-4 (Alt. 2)  <b>Mitigation Measure 4.7-4 (Alt. 2): Coordinate with Caltrans to Increase Maximum Amount of Green Time Provided for Northbound Left-Turn Movement at SR 89/Alpine Meadows Road Intersection</b> The project applicant shall coordinate with Caltrans to implement signal timing modifications that provide a greater amount of green time for this movement during peak winter AM periods. Caltrans staff (Brake, pers. comm., 2015) has indicated that they support the idea of modifying signal timing in response to changes in travel demand. Because there are so few competing movements at this intersection during the AM peak hour, it is possible to provide longer green times for this movement without adversely affecting queuing in the southbound right-turn and eastbound left- and right-turn movements.	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = SU
Impact 4.7-5: Impacts on Caltrans Highways	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	No mitigation measures are required	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.7-6: Impacts on Transit	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	No mitigation measures are required	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE
Impact 4.7-7: Impacts on Vehicle Safety Related to Roadway Design Features	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = S	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigation Measure 4.7-7 (Alt. 2)  <b>Mitigation Measure 4.7-7 (Alt. 2): Advise Motorists of "Parked Out" Conditions before They Enter Squaw Valley Road or Alpine Meadows Road Using Traffic Control Personnel, Changeable Message Signs on SR 89, Online Mobile App, or Other Means</b> Prior to October 15 <sup>th</sup> annually, SVSH shall submit to Placer County Department of Public Works and Facilities a traffic management plan that shall include an advanced messaging system to alert motorists of parking availability at the Squaw	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts		Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)		
		NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA	
Adv = Adverse	B = Beneficial	LTS = Less than significant	N/A = Not applicable	NE = No effect	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
				Valley and Alpine Meadows Ski Resorts. The traffic management plan shall include lessons learned from the previous season as well as modifications for the upcoming season. SVSH will be responsible to engage and coordinate affected agencies, including Caltrans, Placer County and the California Highway Patrol. Upon approval of the traffic management plan by all affected agencies, SVSH shall implement the traffic management plan with approval of any necessary encroachment permits from Caltrans and/or Placer County. Potential advanced messaging system(s) may include, but not be limited to, one or more of the following measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ California Highway Patrol or other traffic control personnel, accompanied by advisory signage or other means of disseminating information, present at the Squaw Valley Road and Alpine Meadows Road intersections on SR 89;</li> <li>▲ portable or permanent changeable message signs placed in both directions of SR 89 (i.e., in the southbound direction north of Squaw Valley Road and in the northbound direction south of Alpine Meadows Rad) during peak days (fed with “real-time” parking availability information); and</li> <li>▲ other methods, such as smartphone mobile apps that provide “real-time” information related to existing parking availability at each resort and travel times to each resort (both inbound and outbound).</li> </ul>			

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
<p>Adv = Adverse      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant      N/A = Not applicable</p> <p>NE = No effect      PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable</p>					
Impact 4.7-8: Construction Impacts on Transportation Facilities	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = S	<p>Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigation Measure 4.7-8 (Alt. 2)</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.7-8 (Alt. 2): Develop Construction Traffic Management Plan</b> Prior to the issuance of any grading or demolition permits, the project applicant shall prepare a Construction Traffic Management Plan to the satisfaction of the Forest Service, and Placer County Department of Public Works and the Engineering and Surveying Division. The plan shall include (but not be limited to) items such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ guidance on the number and size of trucks per day entering and leaving the project site;</li> <li>▲ identification of arrival/departure times that would minimize traffic impacts;</li> <li>▲ approved truck circulation patterns;</li> <li>▲ locations of staging areas;</li> <li>▲ locations of employee parking and methods to encourage carpooling and use of alternative transportation;</li> <li>▲ methods for partial/complete street closures (e.g., timing, signage, location and duration restrictions);</li> <li>▲ criteria for use of flaggers and other traffic controls;</li> <li>▲ preservation of safe and convenient passage for bicyclists and pedestrians through/around construction areas;</li> <li>▲ monitoring for roadbed damage and timing for completing repairs;</li> <li>▲ limitations on construction activity during peak/holiday weekends and special events;</li> <li>▲ preservation of emergency vehicle access;</li> </ul>	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts			Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures			Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
			NEPA	CEQA				NEPA	CEQA
Adv = Adverse	B = Beneficial	LTS = Less than significant	N/A = Not applicable		NE = No effect	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	
					<p>▲ coordination with any other ongoing construction activities elsewhere within Olympic Valley, at Alpine Meadows, or at other locations along SR 89 to minimize potential additive construction traffic disruptions, avoid duplicative efforts (e.g., multiple occurrences if similar signage), and maximize effectiveness of traffic mitigation measures (e.g., joint employee alternative transportation programs); and</p> <p>▲ provide a point of contact for Olympic Valley and Alpine Meadows residents and guests to obtain construction information, have questions answered, and convey complaints.</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan should be developed such that the following minimum set of performance standards is achieved throughout project construction. It is anticipated that additional performance standards would be developed once details of more project construction are better known.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Delivery trucks do not idle/stage on Squaw Valley Road, Alpine Meadows Road, or SR 89.</li> <li>2) Squaw Valley Road and Alpine Meadows Road do not feature any construction-related lane closures on peak activity days.</li> <li>3) All construction employees shall park in designated lots owned by Squaw Valley Ski Holdings.</li> <li>4) Roadways, sidewalks, crosswalks, and bicycle facilities shall be maintained clear of debris (e.g., rocks) that could otherwise impede travel and impact public safety.</li> </ol>				

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
<p>Adv = Adverse      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant      N/A = Not applicable      NE = No effect      PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable</p>					
Cumulative Impact 4.7-9: Impacts on Placer County Roadways	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = S	<p>Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigation Measure 4.7-9 (Alt. 2)</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.7-9 (Alt. 2): Conduct Traffic Management along Squaw Valley Road</b> Prior to October 15<sup>th</sup> annually, SVSH shall submit to Placer County Department of Public Works and Facilities a traffic management plan that shall include traffic management on ski days on which traffic on Squaw Valley Road is projected to exceed 13,500 ADT. The traffic management plan shall include operation of the three-lane coning program during both the AM and PM peak periods. The traffic management plan shall include lessons learned from the previous season as well as modifications for the upcoming season. Upon approval of the traffic management plan, SVSH shall implement the traffic management plan with approval of an encroachment permit from Placer County. Although it is noted that these types of traffic management techniques were implemented during the 2016–2017 season, they have not always been used during peak conditions. This mitigation measure is therefore intended to reestablish the need for this traffic management during such conditions.</p>	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.7-10: Impacts on Placer County Intersections	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = S	<p>Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigation Measure 4.7-10 (Alt. 2)</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.7-10 (Alt. 2): Conduct Traffic Management at Squaw Valley Road/Chamonix Place and Squaw Valley Road/Squaw Creek Road Intersections</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 (Alt. 2).</p>	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
<p>Adv = Adverse      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant      N/A = Not applicable</p> <p>NE = No effect      PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable</p>					
Cumulative Impact 4.7-11: Impacts on Caltrans Intersections	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = S	<p>Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigation Measure 4.7-11 (Alt. 2)</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.7-11 (Alt. 2): Pursue Strategies to Reduce Vehicle Trips Generated during the Sunday PM Peak Hour on Peak Ski Days</b></p> <p>Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant shall provide evidence to the Department of Public Works and Facilities of compliance with the Placer County Trip Reduction Ordinance, including a detailed accounting of Transportation Demand Management strategies currently provided for or planned by Squaw Valley. These strategies may include, but not be limited to, one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ operating a complementary and convenient shuttle between resorts and off-site park-and-ride lots (i.e., within Truckee or Tahoe City);</li> <li>▲ implementing programs to better disperse the departures of skiers during peak afternoons, through entertainment options and other incentives; and</li> <li>▲ joining/renewing membership in the Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association.</li> </ul>	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = SU
Cumulative Impact 4.7-12: Impacts on Vehicular Queuing at Caltrans Intersections	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = S	<p>Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigation Measure 4.7-12 (Alt. 2)</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.7-12 (Alt. 2): Pursue Strategies to Reduce Vehicle Trips Generated during the Sunday PM Peak Hour on Peak Ski Days</b></p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-11 (Alt. 2).</p>	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = SU
Cumulative Impact 4.7-13: Impacts on Caltrans Highways	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = S	<p>Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigation Measure 4.7-12 (Alt. 2)</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.7-13 (Alt. 2): Pursue Strategies to Reduce Vehicle Trips Generated during the Sunday PM Peak Hour on Peak Ski Days</b></p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-11 (Alt. 2).</p>	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = SU

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
<b>Adv = Adverse</b> <b>B = Beneficial</b> <b>LTS = Less than significant</b> <b>N/A = Not applicable</b> <b>NE = No effect</b> <b>PS = Potentially significant</b> <b>S = Significant</b> <b>SU = Significant and unavoidable</b>					
Cumulative Impact 4.7-14: Impacts on Transit	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	No mitigation measures are required	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE
Cumulative Impact 4.7-15: Impacts on Vehicle Safety Related to Roadway Design Features	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = S	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigation Measure 4.7-7 (Alt. 2) <b>Mitigation Measure 4.7-15 (Alt. 2): Advise Motorists of “Parked Out” Conditions before They Enter Squaw Valley Road or Alpine Meadows Road Using Traffic Control Personnel, Changeable Message Signs on SR 89, Online Mobile App, or Other Means</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-7 (Alt. 2).	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.7-16: Construction Impacts on Transportation Facilities	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	No mitigation measures are required	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE
<b>4.8 Utilities</b>					
Impact 4.8-1: Water Supply Impacts	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = NE	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	No mitigation measures are required	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = NE	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.8-2: Inefficient, Wasteful, and Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs AQ-9 and AQ-18	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.8-3: Increased Generation of Solid Waste	N/A	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	No mitigation measures are required	N/A	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
<b>4.9 Noise</b>					
Impact 4.9-1: Construction Noise Impacts	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alt 2, 3, 4 = S	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs MUL-7 and NOI-1 through NOI-6	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = SU
Impact 4.9-2: Construction Vibration Impacts	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alt 2, 3, 4 = LTS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs NOI-4 and NOI-6	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
<p>Adv = Adverse      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant      N/A = Not applicable      NE = No effect      PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable</p>					
Impact 4.9-3: Exposure of Existing Sensitive Receptors to Operational Noise from Proposed Gondola	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 4 = LTS Alt 3 = S	Alts 1, 2, 4 = No mitigation measures are required Alt 3 = Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 (Alt. 3) <b>Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 (Alt. 3): Reduce Noise Exposure to Existing Sensitive Receptors from Proposed Stationary Noise Sources</b> The location of the proposed gondola components (e.g., stations, towers) under Alternative 3 shall be located, at a minimum, 200 feet from any existing sensitive land use.	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.9-4: Exposure of Existing Sensitive Receptors to Operational Project-Generated Transportation Noise Sources	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	No mitigation measures are required	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
<b>4.10 Air Quality</b>					
Impact 4.10-1: Short-Term, Construction-Generated Emissions of ROG, NO <sub>x</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> , and PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs AQ-1 through AQ-27 (excluding RPMs AQ-9, AQ-22, AQ-23, and AQ-26, which relate to operational emissions)	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.10-2: Long-Term, Operation-Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alt 2, 3, 4 = RPMs AQ-9 and AQ-23	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.10-3: Mobile-Source CO Concentrations	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	No mitigation measures are required	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
<b>4.11 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change</b>					
Impact 4.11-1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs AQ-17 and AQ-18	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.11-2: Impacts of Climate Change on the Project	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	No mitigation measures are required	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Minorly Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
Adv = Adverse      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant      N/A = Not applicable      NE = No effect      PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable					
<b>4.12 Vegetation</b>					
Impact 4.12-1: Ground Disturbance and Overstory Vegetation Removal Effects	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs MUL-2, MUL-3, BIO-24, BIO-30 through BIO-32, BIO-34, BIO-38, TREE-1, and TREE-11	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.12-2: Adverse Effect on Any Riparian Habitat or Other Sensitive Natural Community	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = S	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs MUL-2, MUL-3, BIO-24, BIO-30 through BIO-32, BIO-34, BIO-38 through BIO-40, and TREE-11	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.12-3: Conflict with Any Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources	N/A	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = S	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs REV-3, TREE-10, and TREE-11	N/A	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
<b>4.13 Botany</b>					
Impact 4.13-1: Disturbance or Loss of Federally Listed, Forest Service Sensitive, and Other Special-Status Botanical Species	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-9 through BIO-11, BIO-25, and BIO-26	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.13-2: Result in the Introduction or Spread of Invasive Plant Species	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	N/A	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs BIO-2 through BIO-8, BIO-30, and BIO-31	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	N/A
<b>4.14 Wildlife and Aquatics</b>					
4.14-1: Direct and Indirect Effects on Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frog	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = PS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs MUL-1 through MUL-6, HAZ-1, HAZ-6 through HAZ-8, BIO-1, BIO-7, BIO-18, BIO-19, BIO-21 through BIO-36, BIO-39, SOILS-1, SOILS-3 through SOILS-5, SOILS-9, SOILS-11, SOILS-12, WQ-1, WQ-4 through WQ-6, WQ-8 through WQ-20, TREE-1, TREE-6, and TREE-7; RPMS related to noise, hazardous materials, and water quality provided in Sections 4.6, 4.9, 4.16, and 4.17; and Mitigation Measure 4.14-1 (Alt. 2)	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
Adv = Adverse      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant      N/A = Not applicable			NE = No effect      PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant		SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.14-1 (Alt. 2): Compensate for Impacts on Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frog and Its Habitat through Consultation with Permitting Agencies</b></p> <p>Direct and indirect effects to SNYLF and to its utilized (occupied) and unutilized potential (unoccupied) habitat shall be addressed through formal consultation with USFWS, and impacts on the critical habitat shall be compensated for through a combination of habitat compensation and habitat restoration at a minimum of a 3:1 mitigation ratio for utilized critical habitat and at a minimum of a 1:1 mitigation ratio for unutilized critical habitat, or as required by the permitting agencies. Habitat compensation shall be accomplished through USFWS- and CDFW-approved land preservation (if a mitigation bank exists by the time consultation is completed) or mitigation fee payment for the purpose of habitat compensation for lands supporting SNYLF (if a fee program is established). Land preservation or mitigation fee payment for habitat compensation must be completed prior to habitat disturbance or as approved by USFWS and CDFW. Habitat restoration may be appropriate as habitat compensation provided that the restoration effort is demonstrated to be feasible and implemented under a habitat restoration plan, which shall include success criteria and monitoring specifications and shall be approved by the permitting agencies prior to project construction. All habitat compensation and restoration used as mitigation for the selected alternative on public lands shall be conducted in areas designated for resource protection and management. All habitat compensation and restoration used as mitigation for the selected alternative on private lands shall include long-term management and legal protection assurances.</p>		

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
<p>Adv = Adverse      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant      N/A = Not applicable</p> <p>NE = No effect      PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable</p>					
4.14-2: Direct and Indirect Effects on Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frog Critical Habitat	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = PS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs MUL-1 through MUL-6, HAZ-1, HAZ-6 through HAZ-8, BIO-1, BIO-7, BIO-18, BIO-19, BIO-21 through BIO-36, BIO-39, SOILS-1, SOILS-3 through SOILS-5, SOILS-9, SOILS-11, SOILS-12, WQ-1, WQ-4 through WQ-6, WQ-8 through WQ-20, TREE-1, TREE-6, and TREE-7; RPMs related to noise, hazardous materials, and water quality provided in Sections 4.6, 4.9, 4.16, and 4.17; and Mitigation Measure 4.14-2 (Alt. 2)  <b>Mitigation Measure 4.14-2 (Alt. 2): Compensate for Impacts on Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frog Critical Habitat through Consultation with Permitting Agencies</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 4.14-1 (Alt. 2).	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
4.14-3: Direct and Indirect Effects on Southern Long-Toed Salamander	N/A	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = PS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs MUL-1 through MUL-6, HAZ-1, HAZ-6 through HAZ-8, BIO-1, BIO-7, BIO-18, BIO-19, BIO-21 through BIO-36, BIO-39, SOILS-1, SOILS-3 through SOILS-5, SOILS-9, SOILS-11, SOILS-12, WQ-1, WQ-4 through WQ-6, WQ-8 through WQ-20, TREE-1, TREE-6, and TREE-7; and RPMs related to noise, hazardous materials, and water quality provided in Sections 4.6, 4.9, 4.16, and 4.17	N/A	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
4.14-4: Direct and Indirect Effects on Management Indicator Species	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	N/A	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs MUL-1 through MUL-7, HAZ-1, HAZ-6 through HAZ-8, BIO-1, BIO-7, BIO-18, BIO-19, BIO-21 through BIO-36, BIO-39, SOILS-1, SOILS-3 through SOILS-5, SOILS-9, SOILS-11, SOILS-12, WQ-1, WQ-4 through WQ-6, WQ-8 through WQ-20, TREE-1, TREE-6, and TREE-7	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	N/A
4.14-5: Direct and Indirect Effects on Special-Status Terrestrial Wildlife	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = PS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs BIO-12 through BIO-17, BIO-22, MUL-1 through MUL-3, MUL-5, MUL-6, and BIO-34	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
<p><b>Adv = Adverse</b>      <b>B = Beneficial</b>      <b>LTS = Less than significant</b>      <b>N/A = Not applicable</b>      <b>NE = No effect</b>      <b>PS = Potentially significant</b>      <b>S = Significant</b>      <b>SU = Significant and unavoidable</b></p>					
4.1-6: Disturbance or Loss of Wildlife Movement, Wildlife Corridors, and Native Wildlife Nursery Sites	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = PS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs MUL-1 through MUL-7, BIO-1, BIO-12, BIO-13 through BIO-16, BIO-18, BIO-20, BIO-21, BIO-24 through BIO-26, and BIO-37 and Mitigation Measure 4.14-6 (Alt. 2) <b>Mitigation Measure 4.14-6 (Alt. 2): Compensate for Impacts on Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frog Nursery Sites through Consultation with Permitting Agencies</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 4.14-1 (Alt. 2).	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
<b>4.15 Wetlands</b>					
Impact 4.15-1: Loss and Degradation of Wetlands and Other Waters	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = S	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs BIO-1, BIO-23 through BIO-26, BIO-30, BIO-33 through BIO-36, BIO-39, BIO-40, SOILS-1 through SOILS-12, and WQ-1 through WQ-20	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
<b>4.16 Soils, Geology, and Seismicity</b>					
Impact 4.16-1: Exposure of People and Structures to Mass Wasting Events	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = PS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPM NOI-4 and Mitigation Measure 4.16-1 (Alt. 2) <b>Mitigation Measure 4.16-1 (Alt. 2): Develop and Implement a Rock Blasting Plan</b> To minimize the risk of mass wasting because of rock blasting during construction activities, a rock blasting plan shall be prepared by the contractor and submitted to the County at least 30 days prior to the blasting addressed in the plan. The blasting plan shall be site-specific, based on the locations of required blasting, and based on the results of a project-specific geotechnical investigation. The blasting plan shall include a description of the planned blasting methods, an inventory of receptors potentially affected by the planned blasting, calculations to determine the area affected by the planned blasting, and a description of measures that have been taken to minimize the risk of triggering mass wasting events by the blasting. The blasting plan shall meet criteria established in Chapter 3 (Control of Adverse Effects) in the Blasting Guidance Manual of the U.S. Department of Interior Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2,3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
<p>Adv = Adverse      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant      N/A = Not applicable</p>			<p>NE = No effect      PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant</p>		<p>SU = Significant and unavoidable</p>
Impact 4.16-2: Exposure of People and Structures to Avalanches	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = PS	<p>Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPM NOI-4 and Mitigation Measure 4.16-1 (Alt. 2)</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.16-2 (Alt. 2): Develop and Implement an Avalanche Hazard Mitigation Plan</b></p> <p>Prior to issuance of permits, the project applicant shall provide the Forest Service and Placer County with a complete Avalanche Hazard Mitigation Plan for the project. The plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Forest Service and County, and permit approval will be conditioned based on ongoing implementation of the plan. The plan shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Prior to opening of the gondola, the project applicant shall develop avalanche notification protocols in consultation with the Squaw Valley Fire Department (SVFD), North Tahoe Fire Protection District (contracted through Alpine Springs County Water District), Squaw Valley, and Alpine Meadows operations. The protocols shall specify conditions that warrant consultation with these agencies regarding potential avalanche risks.</li> <li>▲ If there is a substantial risk of avalanche, then the gondola and any public areas within the PAHA shall be closed to the public, and signs erected that explain that the closures are because of the avalanche risk. These areas shall be secured from entry until the risk of avalanche has abated.</li> <li>▲ On-site structures: The Building Services Division shall review building permit applications for structures within or near moderate PAHAs to confirm that they incorporate the structural specifications to address avalanche risk.</li> <li>▲ Up-slope conditions: Policy procedures and necessary agreements and permissions shall be included to ensure that operations on the ski terrain of Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows continue to implement avalanche</li> </ul>	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2,3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
Adv = Adverse      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant      N/A = Not applicable      NE = No effect      PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable					
			mitigation programs and that slope development and management avoids the creation of new long continuous openings that could increase the potential for avalanche release and movement that could affect the gondola. No new large openings shall be created on slopes steeper than 30 degrees that could influence avalanche runouts leading to the gondola.		
Impact 4.16-3: Risk Associated with Soil Limitations	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = NE, Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs SOILS-1, SOILS-7, SOILS-9, SOILS-11, and SOILS-12	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2,3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.16-4: Excessive Erosion during Construction	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs SOILS-1 through SOILS-12 and MUL-3	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2,3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
<b>4.17 Hydrology and Water Quality</b>					
Impact 4.17-1: Impacts from Erosion and Sedimentation Caused by Construction-Related Activities	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = PS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs REV-1 through REV-3, MUL-1, MUL-3 through MUL-7, BIO-1, BIO-19, BIO-23 through BIO-26, BIO-30, BIO-31, BIO-33 through BIO-36, BIO-38 through BIO-40, HAZ-1, HAZ-5, HAZ-7, SOILS-1 through SOILS-6, SOILS-9 through SOILS-12, WQ-1, WQ-3 through WQ-21, TREE-1 through TREE-7, and TREE-10	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2,3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.17-2: Impacts form Erosion and Sedimentation Caused by Long-Term Implementation of the Project	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs SOILS-9, BIO-30, and BIO-38	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.17-3: Water Quality Impacts from Acute or Diffuse Releases of Contaminants Used during Project Implementation	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs HAZ-1, HAZ-5, HAZ-7, and WQ-1	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS

**Table ES-3 Summary of Resource Topics with Impacts and RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Environmental Effects before Mitigation (by Alternative)		RPMs and/or Mitigation Measures	Environmental Effects after Mitigation (by Alternative)	
	NEPA	CEQA		NEPA	CEQA
<b>Adv = Adverse</b> <b>B = Beneficial</b> <b>LTS = Less than significant</b> <b>N/A = Not applicable</b> <b>NE = No effect</b> <b>PS = Potentially significant</b> <b>S = Significant</b> <b>SU = Significant and unavoidable</b>					
Impact 4.17-4: Impacts on Groundwater from Increased Visitation and Groundwater Demand	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	Alt 1 = NE Alt 2, 3, 4 = LTS	No mitigation measures are required	Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 = NE	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.17-5: Localized Flooding from Changes in Site Drainage Patterns	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = PS	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs WQ-9 and WQ-10	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS
Impact 4.17-6: Impacts on Riparian Conservation Objectives in Riparian Conservation Areas	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Adv	N/A	Alt 1 = No mitigation measures are required Alts 2, 3, 4 = RPMs in the RCO report	Alt 1 = NE Alts 2, 3, 4 = Mitigated	N/A