

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 TYPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EIR

The SNOW Sports Museum and Community Cultural Center Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 21000-21178, as amended and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 14, Sections 15000-15387 (CEQA Guidelines). Placer County is the lead agency for the environmental review of the SNOW Sports Museum and Community Cultural Center Project (proposed project) evaluated herein and has the principal responsibility for reviewing the impacts of and considering approval of the proposed project. As required by Section 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR will (a) inform public agency decision-makers, and the public generally, of the significant environmental effects of the project, (b) identify possible ways to minimize the significant adverse environmental effects, and (c) describe reasonable and feasible project alternatives which reduce environmental effects. The public agency shall consider the information in the EIR along with other information that may be presented to the agency.

As provided in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15021, public agencies are charged with the duty to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible. The public agency has an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social issues. CEQA requires the preparation of an EIR prior to approving any project that may have a significant effect on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, the term *project* refers to the whole of an action, which has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15378[a]). With respect to the proposed project, the County has determined that the proposed development is a *project* within the definition of CEQA, which has the potential for resulting in significant environmental effects.

The lead agency is required to consider the information in the EIR along with any other available information in deciding whether to approve the application. The basic requirements for an EIR include discussions of the environmental setting, environmental impacts, mitigation measures, alternatives, growth inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts.

The CEQA Guidelines identify several types of EIRs, each applicable to different project circumstances. This EIR has been prepared as a *project-level EIR* pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15161, which is an analysis that examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project. A *project-level EIR* focuses primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from the development of the project, and examines all phases of the project including planning, construction, and operation.

1.2 KNOWN RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

“Responsible agency” means a public agency that proposes to carry out or approve a project for which a lead agency is preparing or has prepared an EIR or Negative Declaration. For the purpose of CEQA, the term responsible agency includes all California public agencies other than the lead



agency that have discretionary approval power over the project or an aspect of the project. The Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) is identified as a responsible agency.

“Trustee agency” means a State agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project, which are held in trust for the people of the State of California. The known possible trustee agencies for the project are the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE).

Although not subject to California law, and, thus, outside the definitions of responsible agency or trustee agency, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) may also be called upon to grant approvals — under federal law — necessary for the development of the project site. The above agencies do not have duties under CEQA, but, rather, are governed by a variety of federal statutes, such as the Clean Water Act, which governs the dredging and filling of waters of the U.S. (e.g., wetlands), and the Endangered Species Act, which requires USACE to consult with the USFWS as part of the review process for any wetland or fill permits that may be required.

1.3 PROJECT SUMMARY

The project site consists of approximately one acre of the 26.8-acre Olympic Valley Park site, 101 Olympic Valley Road, southwest of the intersection of Olympic Valley Road and State Route (SR) 89, in the unincorporated community of Olympic Valley. Olympic Valley Park is a 26.8-acre park, consisting of five parcels, owned and operated by Placer County. The project site is identified by portions of Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs) 096-290-021-000 and 096-290-056-000, and would be located between the Olympic Valley Park driveway entrance to the parking lot from Olympic Valley Road and the existing pickleball courts. The project site is designated as Conservation Preserve (CP) in the 1983 Squaw Valley General Plan (SVGP) and Land Use Ordinance, and the current zoning designation for the site is Forest Recreation (FR). The project site is situated on undulating topography which runs north to south, and contains areas of vegetation, predominantly montane coniferous forest, which largely consist of white fir and pine trees native to the area. Patches of willow scrub occur in scattered locations within stormwater detention basins constructed for the Olympic Valley Park. The southeast portion of the project site is currently developed with an existing parking lot.

The project site is bounded by Olympic Valley Road to the north, SR 89 and the Truckee River Trail to the east, and Olympic Valley Park facilities to the south and west. The area north of the project site, across Olympic Valley Road, is sparsely developed and is largely occupied by forest and meadow vegetation. However, a commercial recreation store and convenience store (7-Eleven) are located on the west side of SR 89, north of the project site, across Olympic Valley Road. A soccer field and playground are located west of the project site within Olympic Valley Park. The Olympic Valley community is located further west, the nearest structures of which include condominiums and single-family residences in the vicinity of the project site to the northwest. The Lake Tahoe Preparatory School is also located northwest of the project site. Rural residences are located east of the project site, across SR 89, and the Truckee River. The Truckee River Trail and forest land are located south of the project site. Palisades Tahoe, which contains lodging, ski lifts, a golf course, and associated commercial uses is located further southwest.

The proposed project would include development of a museum and community cultural center building celebrating the 1960 Winter Olympics and history of winter sports in the Sierra Nevada. The proposed development would include the construction of a new, two-story, U-shaped



building, various site improvements, and a number of amenities such as event space. The two-story, U-shaped building would consist of up to 20,000 square feet (sf) of building space with a maximum height of approximately 30 feet. The second/upper floor would serve as the entrance to the building due to the museum having a stepped floor plan. Although not yet determined, the building could also include a mezzanine.

Outdoor gathering spaces and amenities would be provided, such as a plaza deck to be located south of the building and a V-shaped garden to be located east of the building. Various other improvements would be included in the development of the proposed project, including, but not limited to, landscaping and utility installation, as well as improvements to the existing facilities at Olympic Valley Park. In total, the construction of the building and associated improvements would comprise approximately one acre. However, the proposed project would only result in a total disturbance area of approximately 0.68-acre.

The existing Olympic Valley Park parking lot has a total of 116 spaces (61 in the upper/western area and 55 in the lower/eastern area). The existing parking lot would be resurfaced, and the parking area directly fronting the museum would be restriped to include two additional Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) parking spaces. A planting area in the eastern portion of the parking lot would be removed and replaced with eight vehicle parking spaces. Including existing and proposed parking, a total of 121 parking spaces (including seven ADA-compliant parking spaces) would be provided on-site.

The proposed project would require County approval of the following entitlements:

- Certification of the EIR;
- Adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;
- Amendment to the SVGP Land Use Ordinance to add Section 261 to establish the new Cultural Amenities Land Use District, and a subsequent Rezone of the approximately one-acre project site to the newly established district;
- Text Amendment to Section 12.24.040 of the Placer County Government Code;
- Conditional Use Permit to allow a museum and community cultural center within the new land use district;
- Design Review; and
- Potential Minor Land Division to create a new parcel for the proposed project.

In addition to the above County approvals, the proposed project could require the following approvals/permits from other responsible and trustee agencies:

- Less than three-acre Conversion Exemption – CAL FIRE;
- Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate a Sewer Lift Station – Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD);
- Section 404 Nationwide Permit (or Letter of Permission) – USACE;
- Section 401 Water Quality Certification – Lahontan RWQCB;
- Section 1602 Permit – CDFW; and
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit – Lahontan RWQCB.



1.4 EIR PROCESS

The EIR process begins with the decision by the lead agency to prepare an EIR, either during a preliminary review of a project or at the conclusion of an Initial Study. Once the decision is made to prepare an EIR, the lead agency sends a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to appropriate government agencies and, when required, to the State Clearinghouse (SCH) in the Office of Planning and Research (OPR), which will ensure that responsible and trustee State agencies reply within the required time. The SCH assigns an identification number to the project, which then becomes the identification number for all subsequent environmental documents on the project. Commenting agencies have 30 days to respond to the NOP and provide information regarding alternatives and mitigation measures they wish to have explored in the Draft EIR and to provide notification regarding whether the agency will be a responsible agency or a trustee agency for the project.

Upon completion of the Draft EIR and prior to circulation to State and local agencies and interested members of the public, a notice of completion is filed with the SCH and a public notice of availability is published to inform interested parties that a Draft EIR is available for agency and public review. In addition, the notice provides information regarding the location of copies of the Draft EIR available for public review and any public meetings or hearings that are scheduled. The Draft EIR is circulated for a minimum period of 45 days, during which time reviewers may submit comments on the document to the lead agency. The lead agency must respond to comments in writing. If significant new information, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, is added to an EIR after public notice of availability is given, but before certification of the EIR, the revised EIR or affected chapters must be recirculated for an additional public review period with related comments and responses.

A Final EIR will be prepared, containing public comments on the Draft EIR and written responses to those comments, as well as a list of changes to the Draft EIR text necessitated by public comments, as warranted. Before considering approval of a project, the lead agency shall certify that the EIR (consisting of the Draft EIR and Final EIR) has been completed in compliance with CEQA, and that the EIR has been presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency, which has reviewed and considered the EIR. The lead agency shall also certify that the EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis.

The findings prepared by the lead agency must be based on substantial evidence in the administrative record and must include an explanation that bridges the gap between evidence in the record and the conclusions required by CEQA. If the decision-making body elects to proceed with a project that would have unavoidable significant impacts, then a Statement of Overriding Considerations explaining the decision to balance the benefits of the project against unavoidable environmental impacts must be prepared.

1.5 PROJECT BASELINE

The CEQA Guidelines identify several types of EIRs, each applicable to different project circumstances. This EIR has been prepared as a project-level EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15161, which is an analysis that examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project. A project-level EIR focuses primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from the development of the project, and examines all phases of the project including planning, construction, and operation.



According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15125, an EIR must include a description of the existing physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project to provide the “baseline physical conditions” against which project-related changes could be compared. In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a) states that an EIR shall identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the proposed project. The CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.2(a), states in pertinent part:

An EIR shall identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the proposed project. In assessing the impact of a proposed project on the environment, the lead agency should normally limit its examination to changes in the existing physical conditions in the affected area as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or where no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced.

Normally, the baseline condition is the physical condition that exists when the NOP is published. The NOP for the proposed project was published on March 18, 2022. Therefore, conditions existing at that time are considered to be the baseline against which changes that would result from the proposed project are evaluated. Impacts could include both direct and indirect physical changes to the baseline condition. The baseline condition for the proposed project site is described in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR. The baseline conditions pertaining to each resource area are described in the “Existing Environmental Setting” section of the respective chapters of this EIR.

1.6 SCOPE OF THE EIR

The Initial Study prepared for the proposed project during the scoping period (see Appendix A) includes a detailed environmental checklist addressing a range of technical environmental issues. For each technical environmental issue, the Initial Study identifies the level of impact for the proposed project. The Initial Study identifies the environmental effects as either “no impact,” “less than significant,” “less than significant with mitigation incorporated,” or “potentially significant.” Impacts identified for the proposed project in the Initial Study as “no impact,” “less-than-significant,” or “less-than-significant with mitigation incorporated” are summarized below. All remaining issues identified in the Initial Study as “potentially significant” are discussed in the subsequent technical chapters of this EIR.

- *Aesthetics (Item I-2)*: According to the California Scenic Highway Mapping System, the project site is not located within the vicinity of an officially designated State Scenic Highway. While SR 89, located approximately 100 feet east of the project site, is an Eligible State Scenic Highway, the roadway has not been officially designated. Therefore, development of the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway, and a *less-than-significant* impact would occur.

- *Agricultural & Forest Resources (All Items)*: The project site has not been mapped by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. However, the site currently consists of undeveloped areas of vegetation, predominantly montane coniferous forest, which largely consist of white fir and pine trees native to the area, as well as an existing parking lot, and is, therefore, not considered Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. As such, development of the proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural



use. In addition, the project site is not under an existing Williamson Act contract, nor is the site zoned for agricultural use. The project site is currently zoned FR.

The project site is considered to be “timberland” pursuant to the Forest Practice Act. However, pursuant to Section 1104.1 of the CCR, a conversion exemption is applicable for a conversion of Timberland to a non-timber use for land less than three acres in one contiguous ownership, so long as the property owner seeking the exemption has not obtained such an exemption in the prior five years. Because the project site consists of an approximately one-acre portion of Olympic Valley Park, the proposed project would require preparation of a Notice of Conversion Exemption Timber Operations in accordance with CCR Section 1104.1(a). Although the project site currently contains trees that would require removal for development of the site, the area is not currently used or zoned for Timberland Production. Furthermore, the parcel on which the project site is located is currently in use as a recreational park. Therefore, timberland production at the project site would be incompatible with the site and the surrounding area. Based on the above, a *less-than-significant* impact would occur related to agricultural and forest resources.

- *Biological Resources (All Items)*: For the purposes of the analysis included in the Initial Study for the proposed project, a Biological Resources Assessment (BRA) was prepared for the project site by WRA, Inc. The BRA included a search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) for the Tahoe City, Truckee, Homewood, Martis Peak, Kings Beach, Meeks Bay, Norden, Granite Chief, and Wentworth Springs 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangle maps. The Placer County Conservation Program (PCCP) area, which is a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), does not include the project site or surrounding area. Therefore, the project site is not currently subject to any habitat conservation plans, and the project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. As such, *no impact* related to said Plans would occur.

In addition, according to the BRA prepared for the proposed project, due to the intensity of surrounding development throughout Olympic Valley, the fragmented habitat within the project site itself does not function as a movement corridor or serve as a critical linkage connecting patches of “high quality” habitat considered to be essential to the long-term survival of migratory wildlife species. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, and a *less-than-significant* impact would occur.

Based on the results of the CNDDDB search, several special-status plant and wildlife species are known to occur within the project region. WRA conducted site surveys on July 23rd and July 24th, 2020, which included a protocol-level rare plant survey for which the project site was traversed on foot to evaluate plant communities present within the project site. In addition, the site survey included evaluation of whether potential suitable habitat for special-status wildlife species is present on-site. Based upon a review of species databases and literature, 13 special-status plant species, six special status bat species, and migratory birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) were determined to have to potential to occur on the project site. Based on the negative results of the protocol level rare plant survey, it was determined that special status plant species are not present on the project site. However, the BRA determined that implementation of the



proposed project would have the potential to disturb habitat for special-status bats and migratory birds protected by the MBTA. Implementation of Mitigation Measures IV-1 and IV-2 would reduce adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on six special-status bat species, as well as migratory birds which could be considered species identified as special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or the USFWS, to a *less-than-significant* level.

According to the Tree Survey prepared for the proposed project, a total of 228 native trees exist within the project site. Of the 228 trees, 57 are recommended for removal due to health; however, during project construction, an estimated 109 trees would be removed for development of the site. The Placer County Woodland Conservation Ordinance (Chapter 19, Article 50, of the Placer County Code) regulates the encroachment of construction activities into protected zones of protected trees and the removal of any protected trees. Tree permits are required for any development activities within the protected zone of any tree, as defined in the Code, on public or private land. The proposed project would comply with all of the requirements included in the Placer County Woodland Conservation Ordinance. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance and a *less-than-significant* impact would occur.

An Aquatic Resources Delineation Report was prepared for the project site, which determined that the project site contains a 0.04-acre drainage swale that meets the USACE wetland criteria. Based on the current Clean Water Act (CWA) regulations, the assumption can be made that the drainage swale would be regulated as a federally protected wetland due to the swale's connectivity with the Truckee River. In addition to the drainage swale, the project site contains two patches of willow scrub totaling 0.05-acre. The BRA determined that the willow scrub does not meet the USACE wetland criteria; however, project construction activities could result in the direct removal and/or disturbance of willow scrub that occurs within depressional areas, which may be regulated by CDFW. Implementation of Mitigation Measures IV-3 and IV-4 would reduce impacts to sensitive riparian habitats and jurisdictional wetlands through removal of vegetation, excessive erosion, and/or non-native species incursion to a *less-than-significant* level.

- *Cultural Resources (All Items):* According to the Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation prepared for the proposed project, one historic built environment resource, the remnants of a gravel processing facility and possible quarry (SVOM-1), is located on the project site. However, the Cultural Resource Inventory and Evaluation concluded that SVOM-1 does not contain important information regarding an understanding of recreation and community development within the area, and does not meet the criteria of a historical resource. In addition, the Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation did not identify any known existing religious or sacred uses within the project site. Therefore, a *less-than-significant* impact would occur related to causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, and related to restricting existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area.

While the record search completed as part of the Cultural Resource Inventory and Evaluation identified five historical and archaeological resources within one-eighth mile of the project site, the record search did not identify any recorded archaeological resources within the project site boundaries. In addition, a search of the Native American Heritage



Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File did not identify any known sacred sites within the project area. Furthermore, given the extent of documented Native American occupations within the project region, unknown archaeological resources have the potential to be uncovered during ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project. Although human remains or evidence thereof was not identified during the site surveys, the potential for unknown human remains to be discovered during construction cannot be eliminated given the known prehistoric occupation of the vicinity by Native American tribes. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures V-1 and V-2 would reduce all such impacts to a *less-than-significant* level.

- *Energy (Item VI-1)*: Operation of the proposed project is required to comply with the California Building Standards Code (CBSC) and the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards (which is a portion of the CBSC). Compliance with the CBSC would ensure that the proposed project would not result in insufficient or wasteful use of energy during operations. All construction equipment and operation thereof would be regulated per the California Air Resources Board (CARB) In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation. Project construction would also be required to comply with all applicable PCAPCD rules and regulations related to energy efficiency, which would help to further reduce energy use associated with the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operations, and the impact would be considered *less than significant*.
- *Geology & Soils (All Items)*: Given that the proposed project would be served by the existing public sewer system, the project would result in *no impact* related to having soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

Buildout of the proposed project would require grading, excavation, and other construction-related activities that could cause topsoil to be exposed, potentially resulting in erosion or an accelerated rate of erosion. While Improvement Plans would conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Article 15.48 of the Placer County Code) and the Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Article 8.28 of the Placer County Code), short-term construction-related impacts associated with soil erosion and the loss of top soil could occur.

According to the Placer County General Plan, the eastern portion of the County, in which the project site is located, is generally characterized by high seismicity. However, the proposed project site is not underlain by any active faults and is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Study Zone. While strong ground shaking could occur, the design of project structures would be required to adhere to the provisions within the CBSC. The Geotechnical Exploration prepared for the proposed project determined that, based on site observations, topographic and lithologic data, subsurface data, and regional geology, the overall potential for landslides, lateral spreading, or liquefaction, at the site is low to negligible. Additionally, the Geotechnical Exploration did not identify expansive soils within the project site. However, due to the existing fill on-site, potential for subsidence to pose a risk to the proposed development is high. As such, implementation of the recommendations included in the original Geotechnical Engineering Report as well as the Geotechnical Engineering Report Update Letter would be required in order to ensure adequate support of the proposed project. The Geology and Soils section of the Initial



Study also considered paleontological resources, and determined that the potential exists for paleontological resources or unique geologic features to be unearthed and disturbed during construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measures VII-1 through VII-6, which include the County's standard geology and soils requirements for development projects, would reduce all aforementioned impacts to *less-than-significant* levels.

- *Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Items IX-1 through IX-5)*: The project area is not located within the vicinity of a public airport or a private airstrip, nor is the site located within an airport land use plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not create safety hazards for people living or working in the project area as a result of being in close proximity to an airport, and *no impact* would occur.

During construction of the proposed project, proper handling and usage of potentially hazardous materials in accordance with label instructions would ensure that adverse impacts to human health or the environment would not occur. Operations of the proposed project would not include the routine transport, use, disposal, or generation of substantial amounts of hazardous materials. The project is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Features such as septic systems, wells, above-ground storage tanks, underground storage tanks, or other features related to uses of environmental concern were not identified on the site. The project site is located approximately 0.2-mile from the Lake Tahoe Preparatory School. Therefore, the project site is located within one-quarter mile of a school. However, projects that emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste are typically industrial in nature. The proposed project would not be industrial in nature. Thus, operations of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials.

Overall, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* impact with respect to the following: creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; emitting hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; and being located on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 56962.5.

- *Hydrology & Water Quality (All Items)*: Although the proposed project would rely on groundwater as a potable water source, the cumulative water demand of all reasonably foreseeable development projects within Olympic Valley, including the development of the proposed museum, was anticipated by the Olympic Valley Public Service District (OVPSD); thus, the water demand from buildout of the project site is generally accounted for in the cumulative water demand projections. As such, OVPSD would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the proposed project as well as reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. Further, the proposed project would not substantially degrade groundwater quality given the limited infiltration potential of the on-site soils. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* impact related to substantially decreasing groundwater supplies or interfering



substantially with groundwater recharge, or conflicting with or obstructing implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

The proposed project would satisfy the treatment and flow control requirements set by the East Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual and would appropriately manage runoff from 100-year storm events. Thus, the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project area or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff. As established in Mitigation Measures X-1 and X-2, a final drainage report would be required with the project Improvement Plans to substantiate the preliminary drainage design. Without approval of a final drainage report, a potentially significant impact could occur. Compliance with the State NPDES Construction General Permit and Article 8.28 and 15.48 of the Placer County Code, as required by Mitigation Measures VII-1 through VII-4 within the Initial Study, would minimize the potential degradation of stormwater quality and downstream surface water associated with construction of the proposed project. In addition, Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be required to be designed in accordance with the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction and for New Development/Redevelopment (or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division). Implementation of Mitigation Measures X-1 through X-7 would reduce the aforementioned potential impacts to *less-than-significant* levels.

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's flood insurance rate map, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. Therefore, the proposed project would not place housing or improvements within a 100-year flood hazard area, and *no impact* would occur.

- *Land Use & Planning (Items XI-1, XI-3, and XI-4)*: The proposed project would be consistent with the intensity of planned uses in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community or disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. The zoning designation for the site is Forest Recreation (FR), and the General Plan land use designation is Conservation Preserve (CP). The proposed project would include a text amendment to add Section 12.24.040(B)(6) to the Placer County Code which would add the proposed SNOW Sports Museum as an exception to Section 12.24, and allow the proposed museum to remain open later than specified in the County Code in order to accommodate special events and museum operations. The proposed changes would allow for development of a museum, community cultural center, and ancillary uses within the FR zoning district with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

As noted in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR, the Olympic Valley Park site is bound by a deed restriction relating to the past purchase of the parcel from the USFS to Placer County, which occurred in 2000. The Quit Claim Deed conveying the park parcel to Placer County from the USFS includes the following restriction: “[T]he use of the property for a community park does not include the use of the property for private development of a commercial, residential, or industrial nature.” Placer County is currently coordinating with the USFS regarding the deed restriction, and will pursue the agreed upon course of action to allow for the proposed project to be developed within the Olympic Valley Park site.



Nonetheless, as noted in the Initial Study, the question of land use compatibility in the context of the analysis for the proposed project is focused on physical environmental effects that could result from placing one land use next to another, such as placing industrial uses next to residential uses, where the noise and hazards associated with industrial operations could adversely affect the residents. The question of whether the proposed project is consistent with the terms of the deed restriction is a legal consideration, not an environmental consideration subject to CEQA. Moreover, the potential compatibility issues associated with building a museum and cultural center at the existing Olympic Valley Park are evaluated throughout the Initial Study, as well as the technical chapters included within this EIR, which provide evidence that the proposed museum and cultural center would not present significant environmental incompatibilities with the adjacent park or nearest residential uses. As a result, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* impact related to physically dividing an established community, incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts, or economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration.

- *Mineral Resources (All Items)*: Pursuant to the California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG), the project site is classified as MRZ-3a^(sg-15) for aggregate as a result of glacial deposits. The MRZ-3a designation is used to describe areas underlain by geologic settings within which undiscovered mineral resources similar to known deposits in the same producing district or reason may be reasonably expected to exist. However, the project site is located within the existing Olympic Valley Park. Therefore, regardless of the proposed project being developed, the potential for mining activities to occur on-site would be very low. In addition, according to Table 8-6 in the Placer County Final EIR, the project area is not identified as an area containing existing or potential mineral extraction sites. As a result, *no impact* to mineral resources would occur as a result of development of the project.
- *Noise (Item XIII-3)*: The project site is not covered by an airport land use plan and is not located within two miles of a private airstrip, public airport, or public use airport. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *no impact* related to exposing people in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with air traffic.
- *Population & Housing (All Items)*: The proposed project would include development of a museum and community cultural center building, as well as various site improvements, and a number of amenities such as event space. As a result, the proposed project would not be considered to induce substantial unplanned population growth, and a *less-than-significant* impact would result. In addition, the project site does not contain any existing housing. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, and *no impact* would occur.
- *Public Services (All Items)*: Given that the Olympic Valley Fire Department (OVFD) is located approximately 0.25-mile from the project site, and the proposed project would include the incorporation of fire protection features in building design, the proposed project would not require new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection. The



proposed project would not substantially increase demand for Placer County Sheriff services such that construction or expanded facilities would be required. The proposed development would not result in an increase in demand for school services, and therefore would not necessitate the construction of new school facilities. The proposed project would include development of a museum and community cultural center building, as well as various site improvements, and a number of amenities such as event space within an undeveloped area of the Olympic Valley Park. Thus, the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered park facilities. Additionally, although project-generated traffic could result in an incremental increase in maintenance of County roads in the project area, such an increase would be negligible due to the limited number of visitors and employees, and associated vehicle trips. Museums are considered public facilities, and, thus, the proposed project would provide additional public facility space to residents and visitors of Olympic Valley. In addition, the proposed museum and community facility would not be expected to substantially increase the population within the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate any additional demand on existing public facilities, and would increase the availability of public facilities within Placer County. Based on the above, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or performance objectives for maintenance of public facilities, including roads, or for other government services. Thus, a *less-than-significant* impact would occur.

- *Recreation (All Items)*: The proposed project would provide additional community space to residents and visitors of Olympic Valley. In addition, the proposed museum and community facility would not be expected to substantially increase the population within the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate any additional demand on existing recreational facilities in the project vicinity or increase use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of such facilities would occur or be accelerated. Thus, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* impact related to recreation.

- *Tribal Cultural Resources (All Items)*: A search of the Sacred Lands File maintained by the NAHC returned negative results for the presence of known Native American sacred sites in the immediate project vicinity. Pursuant to Assembly Bill 52, invitations to consult were sent to tribes who requested notification of proposed projects within this geographic area on August 28, 2017. The United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria (UAIC) initiated consultation and requested copies of cultural searches/surveys. The County provided copies of all requested documentation prepared for the proposed project, and consultation with the UAIC was closed on October 19, 2017. The Shingle Springs Rancheria (SSR) requested copies of cultural searches/surveys, which were provided, and consultation with the SSR was closed on October 26, 2017. While none of the contacted tribes identified known Tribal Cultural Resources on the project site, the possibility exists that construction of the proposed project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource if previously unknown tribal cultural resources are uncovered during grading or other ground-disturbing activities. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure XVIII-1 would ensure that impacts associated with Tribal Cultural Resources would be reduced to a *less-than-significant* level.



- *Utilities & Service Systems (All Items):* Electricity, telecommunications, water, and sanitary sewer services would be provided by way of new connections to existing infrastructure in the project area. Given that the groundwater basin has adequate capacity, the proposed project would not significantly impact the OVPD's water supply. Furthermore, the project would include a connection to existing water infrastructure in the project vicinity. Off-site water system improvements would not be required. Therefore, the proposed project would not require major relocation or expansion of any water supply infrastructure. Sewer service would be provided to the site by the OVPD. Collected sewage is conveyed to the Tahoe Truckee Sanitation Agency (TTSA) Water Reclamation Plant, located adjacent to the Truckee River and Tahoe Truckee Airport. The TTSA previously upgraded and expanded wastewater facilities to increase handling capacity. The proposed project would construct a sanitary sewer force main along Olympic Valley Road. In addition, a wet well and sanitary sewer lift station would be constructed north of the project site, near the project driveway, within the Olympic Valley Road right-of-way. All sewer improvements would be consistent with Placer County's "All Districts" Sewer System Master Plan. The off-site sewer improvements would require disruption of existing pavement, but disturbance of natural habitats would not occur. As such, the proposed project would not require major relocation or expansion of any sewer service infrastructure, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Based on the conclusions of the Preliminary Drainage Report prepared for the proposed project, the proposed on-site stormwater system would be properly sized to handle stormwater under the 10- and 100-year events, and off-site expansion or relocation would not be required. With respect to operational solid waste generation, due to the nature and scale of the proposed project, the project would not be expected to generate substantial amounts of solid waste. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals and would comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Based on the above, impacts related to utilities and service systems would be *less than significant*.

Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, the scope of this EIR addresses specific issues and concerns identified as potentially significant in the Initial Study prepared for the proposed project. The sections of the CEQA Checklist identified for study in this EIR include:

- Aesthetics (Items I-1, I-3, and I-4);
- Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Energy (Items III-1 through III-4, VIII-1 and VIII-2, and VI-2);
- Land Use and Planning (Item XI-2 [the proposed project's consistency with applicable policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect related to aesthetics, air quality, greenhouse gas, noise, transportation, and wildfire is addressed in each technical chapter throughout this EIR]);
- Noise (Items XIII-1 and XIII-2);
- Transportation (All Items); and
- Wildfire (Items IX-6 and IX-7, and XX-1 through XX-4).

The evaluation of effects is presented on a resource-by-resource basis in Chapters 4 through 8 of the EIR. Each chapter is divided into the following four sections: Introduction, Existing Environmental Setting, Regulatory Context, and Impacts and Mitigation Measures. The Impacts and Mitigation Measures section addresses both project-specific and cumulative impacts. Impacts



that are determined to be significant in Chapters 4 through 8, and for which feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce those impacts to a less-than-significant level, are identified as *significant and unavoidable*. Chapter 9 of the EIR presents a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, summary of cumulative impacts, and significant irreversible environmental changes associated with the project. Alternatives to the proposed project are discussed in Chapter 10 of the EIR.

1.7 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The CEQA Guidelines define a significant effect on the environment as “a substantial, or potentially substantial adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic and aesthetic significance.” In addition, the Guidelines state, “An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15382).

As presented in Section 1.12 below, the level of significance of an impact prior to mitigation is included at the end of each impact discussion throughout the technical chapters of this EIR. The following levels of significance prior to mitigation are used in this EIR:

- 1) Less-than-Significant: Impacts that are insubstantial, do not exceed the specified thresholds of significance, and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts;
- 2) Significant: Impacts that exceed the defined standards of significance and require mitigation;
- 3) Less than Cumulatively Considerable: Where cumulative impacts have been identified, but the project’s incremental contribution towards the cumulative impacts would not be considered significant; and
- 4) Cumulatively Considerable: Where cumulative impacts have been identified and the project’s incremental contribution towards the cumulative impacts would be considered significant.

If an impact is determined to be significant or cumulatively considerable, mitigation is included, if available, in order to reduce the specific impact to the maximum extent feasible. A statement of the level of significance of an impact after mitigation is also included in each impact discussion throughout the technical chapters of this EIR. The following levels of significance after implementation of mitigation are used in the EIR:

- 1) Less-than-Significant: Impacts that exceed the defined standards of significance but can be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through the implementation of feasible mitigation measures;
- 2) Less than Cumulatively Considerable: Where the project’s incremental contribution towards cumulative impacts would be eliminated or reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level through the implementation of feasible mitigation measures; and
- 3) Significant and Unavoidable: An impact (project-level or cumulative) that cannot be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant or less than cumulatively considerable level through the implementation of feasible mitigations measures.

Each environmental area of analysis uses a distinct set of significance criteria. Where measurable and explicit quantification of significance is identified, such as violation of an ambient noise level



standard, this measurement is used to assess the level of significance of a particular impact in this EIR. If criteria for determining significance relative to a specific environmental resource impact are not identified in the CEQA Guidelines, criteria were developed for this EIR.

The significance criteria are identified at the beginning of the Impacts and Mitigation Measures section in each of the technical chapters of this EIR. Although significance criteria are necessarily different for each resource considered, the provided significance levels ensure consistent evaluation of impacts for all resource areas evaluated.

1.8 NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND SCOPING

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, an NOP (see Appendix A), as well as an attached Initial Study, was circulated to the public, local, State and federal agencies, and other known interested parties for a 30-day public and agency review period from March 18, 2022 to April 18, 2022. The purpose of the NOP was to provide notification that the County will be preparing an EIR for the proposed project and to solicit public input on the scope and content of the document.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, the County held an NOP scoping meeting for the EIR during the review period on March 28, 2022 for the purpose of receiving comments on the scope of the environmental analysis to be prepared for the proposed project. Agencies and members of the public were invited to attend in person or remotely and provide input on the scope of the EIR. All comments were taken into consideration during the preparation of this EIR. A summary of the NOP comments received, including the verbal comments received at the NOP scoping meeting, is provided in Section 1.9 below.

1.9 COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION

During the NOP public review period from March 18, 2022 to April 18, 2022, Placer County received eight comment letters. A copy of each letter is provided in Appendix B of this EIR. The comment letters were submitted by the following representatives of agencies, local groups, and individual members of the general public.

Agencies

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife – Barker, Kelley;
- California Department of Transportation (CalTrans) – Yount, Kevin;
- Native American Heritage Commission – Torres-Fuentes, Pricilla; and
- Tahoe National Forest Supervisor’s Office – Ilano, Eli.

Group

- Tavern Inn Condominiums Association – Basler, Janet.

Individuals

- Heneveld, Ed;
- Siewert, Marylyn; and
- Worrall, Rozlynn.

The following list, categorized by issue, summarizes the concerns brought forth in the comment letters and verbal comments at the NOP scoping meeting received on the scope of the EIR:



Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Energy <i>(Chapter 5)</i>	Concerns related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts related to the proximity of toxic air contaminants to sensitive receptors.
Noise <i>(Chapter 6)</i>	Concerns related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise pollution/increase in ambient noise levels.
Transportation <i>(Chapter 7)</i>	Concerns related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy of parking infrastructure on the project site. • Safety of the proposed entrance and exit roadways. • Increased traffic congestion in the project area. • Interference with emergency access and egress.
Initial Study <i>(see Appendix A)</i>	Concerns related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incompatibility of the proposed project with the surrounding land uses. • Impacts related to the proposed change in land use designation. • Impacts on protected species and habitats. • Impacts related to compliance with local habitat conservation plans. • Impacts on water quality. • Proper consultation with the appropriate Native American tribes.

All of these issues are addressed in this EIR in the relevant sections identified in the first column, as well as in the attached Initial Study.

1.10 DRAFT EIR AND PUBLIC REVIEW

This Draft EIR is being circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days. During this period, the general public, organizations, and agencies can submit comments to the Lead Agency on the Draft EIR's accuracy and completeness. Release of the Draft EIR marks the beginning of a 45-day public review period pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15105. The public can review the Draft EIR at the County's website at:

<http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/envcoordsvcs/eir>

or at the following address during normal business hours:

Placer County, Community Development Resource Agency – North Lake Tahoe
775 North Lake Boulevard
Tahoe City, CA 96145

Comments may be submitted both in written form and/or orally at the public hearing on the Draft EIR. Notice of the time and location of the hearing will be published in local newspapers, mailed to property owners and residents surrounding the project site, emailed to residents that have requested to be placed on the project's email notification list, posted on the County's website, and posted at and adjacent to the site prior to the hearing.

All comments or questions regarding the Draft EIR should be addressed to:

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



(530) 745-3132
cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

1.11 ORGANIZATION OF THE DRAFT EIR

The SNOW Sports Museum and Community Cultural Center Project EIR is organized into the following sections:

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Provides an introduction and overview describing the intended use of the EIR and the review and certification process, as well as summaries of the chapters included in the EIR and summaries of the issues and concerns received from the public and public agencies during the NOP review period.

Chapter 2 – Executive Summary

Summarizes the elements of the project and the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project, describes proposed mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of impacts after mitigation. In addition, the Executive Summary includes a summary of the project alternatives and areas of known controversy.

Chapter 3 – Project Description

Provides a detailed description of the proposed project, including the project's location, background information, major objectives, and technical characteristics.

Chapter 4 – Aesthetics

The Aesthetics chapter of the EIR summarizes existing regional and project area aesthetics and visual setting. To the extent applicable, the chapter describes project-specific aesthetics issues such as scenic vistas, trees, existing visual character or quality of the project area, as well as light and glare. Pursuant to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the focus of the analysis concerning the project's effects on visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings is on whether the proposed project will substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.

The Aesthetics chapter of the EIR is based in part on photo simulations showing pre- and post-project views of the project site from key public vantage points. The results of the analysis are incorporated into the Aesthetics chapter of the EIR to determine whether the proposed project would substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Chapter 5 – Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Energy

The Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions, and Energy chapter of the EIR describes the impacts of construction and operation of the proposed project related to air quality, global climate change, and energy consumption. The chapter was prepared using methodologies and assumptions recommended within the CEQA Air Quality Handbook of the PCAPCD, as well as the GHG reduction and energy efficiency measures included in the Placer County Sustainability Plan.

Chapter 6 – Noise

The Noise chapter of the EIR is based on a project-specific Noise Study. The chapter addresses potential noise impacts resulting from project construction and operation, including existing and future traffic noise levels on the local roadway network. Noise-sensitive land uses or activities in



the project vicinity are identified and ambient noise and vibration level measurements on, and in the vicinity of, the project site have been conducted to quantify existing background noise and vibration levels for comparison to the predicted project-generated levels. Noise exposure levels are then compared to applicable significance criteria in the Placer County General Plan Noise Element, the SVGP and Land Use Ordinance, and CEQA.

Chapter 7 – Transportation

The Transportation chapter of the EIR is based on a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis prepared for the proposed project. VMT will be used as the metric for assessing transportation impacts under CEQA. The proposed project's impacts to alternative modes such as pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities are assessed based on their significance criteria contained in the adopted Placer County guidelines. The EIR chapter also includes an analysis of the proposed project's potential impacts related to conflicting with applicable programs, policies, and ordinances addressing the circulation system, vehicle safety hazards, and emergency access.

Chapter 8 – Wildfire

The Wildfire chapter of the EIR is primarily based on an Emergency Preparedness and Evacuation Plan (EPEP) prepared for the proposed project in coordination with the local fire service providers. Recommendations from the EPEP are incorporated into the EIR to address potential impacts related to wildfire risk consistent with Section XX, Wildfire, of Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Specifically, the proposed project is evaluated to determine if the project would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. In addition, the chapter considers whether the proposed project would exacerbate fire risk, as well as whether the project would expose people or structures to significant post-fire risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides.

Chapter 9 – Statutorily Required Sections

The Statutorily Required Sections chapter of the EIR provides discussions required by CEQA regarding impacts that would result from the proposed project, including a summary of cumulative impacts, potential growth-inducing impacts, significant and unavoidable impacts, and significant irreversible changes to the environment.

Chapter 10 – Alternatives Analysis

The Alternatives Analysis chapter of the EIR describes and evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project. It should be noted that the alternatives are analyzed at a level of detail less than that of the proposed project; however, the analyses include sufficient detail to allow for a meaningful comparison of impacts.

Chapter 11 – EIR Authors and Persons Consulted

The EIR Authors and Persons Consulted chapter of the EIR lists EIR and technical report authors who provided technical assistance in the preparation and review of the EIR.

Chapter 12 – References

The References chapter of the EIR provides bibliographic information for all references and resources cited.

Appendices

The Appendices include the NOP and IS, comments received during the NOP comment period, and technical reports prepared for the proposed project.



1.12 TECHNICAL CHAPTER FORMAT

Each technical chapter addressing a specific environmental issue begins with an **introduction** describing the purpose of the section. The introduction is followed by a description of the project's **existing environmental setting** as the setting pertains to that particular CEQA issue. The setting description is followed by the **regulatory context** and the **impacts and mitigation measures** discussion, which contains the **standards of significance**, followed by the **method of analysis**. The **impact and mitigation measures** discussion includes impact statements prefaced by a number in bold-faced type (for both project-level and cumulative analyses). An explanation of each impact and an analysis of the impact's significance follow each impact statement. All mitigation measures pertinent to each individual impact follow directly after the impact statement (see below). The degree of relief provided by identified mitigation measures is also evaluated. An example of the format is shown below:

Project-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The following discussion of impacts is based on the implementation of the proposed project in comparison with the standards of significance.

X-1 Statement of Impact

Discussion of impact for the proposed project in paragraph format.

Statement of **level of significance** of impact prior to mitigation is included at the end of each impact discussion. The following levels of significance are used in the EIR: less than significant, significant, or significant and unavoidable. If an impact is determined to be significant, mitigation will be included in order to reduce the specific impact to the maximum extent feasible. Impacts that cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of all feasible mitigation would be considered to remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure(s)

Statement of *level of significance* after the mitigation is included immediately preceding mitigation measures.

X-1(a) *Required mitigation measure(s) presented in italics and numbered in consecutive order.*

X-1(b) *Required additional mitigation measure, if necessary.*

Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The following discussion of cumulative impacts is based on implementation of the proposed project in combination with cumulative development within the applicable area or region.

X-2 Statement of Cumulative Impact

Discussion of cumulative impacts for the proposed project in paragraph format.

As discussed in detail in Chapter 9, Statutorily Required Sections, of the EIR, the cumulative setting for the proposed project is generally considered to be development



anticipated to occur upon buildout of the SNOW Sports Museum and Community Cultural Center Project, as well as buildout of a number of approved or reasonably foreseeable projects within the project region.

Statement of ***level of significance*** of cumulative impact prior to mitigation is included at the end of each impact discussion. The following levels of significance are used in the EIR for cumulative impacts: less than significant, less than cumulatively considerable, cumulatively considerable, or significant and unavoidable. If an impact is determined to be cumulatively considerable, mitigation will be included in order to reduce the specific impact to the maximum extent feasible. Impacts that cannot be reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level with the implementation of all feasible mitigation would be considered to remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure(s)

Statement of *level of significance* after the mitigation is included immediately preceding mitigation measures.

X-2(a) *Required mitigation measure(s) presented in italics and listed in consecutive order.*

X-2(b) *Required additional mitigation measure, if necessary.*

1.13 FINAL EIR AND EIR CERTIFICATION

Upon completion of the Draft EIR public review period, a Final EIR will be prepared that will include written comments on the Draft EIR received during the public review period and responses to those comments. The Final EIR will also include the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) prepared in accordance with PRC Section 21081.6. The Final EIR will address any revisions to the Draft EIR made in response to public comments. The Draft EIR and Final EIR together will comprise the EIR for the proposed project. Before the County can consider approval of the project, it must first certify that the EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, that the County Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered the information in the EIR, and that the EIR reflects the independent judgment of the County. The County also will be required to adopt Findings of Fact and, for any impacts determined to be significant and unavoidable, adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

