

Appendix L

Corrected Appendix G-2



TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C
Post Office Box 5875
Tahoe City, California 96145
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966
info@lsctahoe.com
www.lsctrans.com

MEMORANDUM

To: Nanette Hansel, Ascent Environmental
From: Gordon Shaw, PE, AICP, LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.
Date: ~~October 4~~ May 27, 2016
RE: Traffic Volumes and VMT for Placer Area Plan EIR/EIS

This memo presents the traffic volumes and VMT forecast for the forecasting to be used in the traffic analysis elements of the EIR/EIS for the Placer Area Plan.

Existing Traffic Volumes

Intersection PM peak-hour traffic volumes for busy summer conditions were drawn from the following sources, and represent the most recent available counts.

- State Route (SR) 89 / SR 28 (Tahoe City Wye) – SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA
- SR 28 / Mackinaw Road – LSC traffic count conducted 7/21/15
- SR 28 / Grove Street – SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA
- SR 28 / SR 267 – LSC traffic count conducted 8/1/2014
- SR 28 / Bear Street – LSC traffic count conducted 7/29/2011
- SR 28 / Coon Street – Fehr and Peers count conducted 9/4/2015

2035 Project Scenario Traffic Volumes

Existing Plus Project Alternative Scenarios

These scenarios include TRPA regional growth through 2035 as well as the impacts of the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives, but do not include additional external growth in traffic. These project scenario traffic volumes were developed as follows:

1. As discussed elsewhere, 2035 land use forecasts under each of the Area Plan alternatives were developed by Ascent Environmental staff, and approved by Placer County and TRPA staffs. These forecasts were prepared for each of the 60 Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs) in the TRPA TransCAD region-wide transportation model.
2. TRPA staff then converted the land use forecasts into the variables used in the TransCAD model, and ran the model for each of the four Placer Area Plan alternatives, as well as the existing “base case”. Not that the alternative model runs assumed development in the remainder of the Tahoe Region, as well as within the Placer County portion of the Region, and did not reflect the traffic reassignment associated with the Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project.
3. LSC then used the traffic volume forecasts at the key study intersection for each of the model runs as provided by TRPA, and developed a growth factor for each movement and for each alternative. While the TRPA TransCAD model was developed to accurately model the major intersections (such as SR 28/SR 89 and SR 28/SR 267), it was not designed to model every individual public street intersection. Specifically, many of the TAZs encompass areas with multiple local public streets. As an example, all of the commercial area of Kings Beach north of SR 28, east of SR 267 and west of Chipmunk Street is a single TAZ. As a result, the model assigns traffic through only a few “TAZ centroid connectors”, rather than specifically on the individual public streets. In both Kings Beach (at Bear Street and Coon Street) and Tahoe City (at Grove Street), the overall growth of traffic volumes on local roadways was used to identify growth factors, and assigned to all movements with a capacity to accommodate traffic growth. While this is sufficient to reflect the overall impacts of the Area Plan alternatives, the resulting peak-hour turning movements into and out of the side streets reflect general overall growth in each community, rather than site-specific land use plans.
4. The summer PM peak-hour impact of Tahoe City Lodge was next calculated. As the TRPA model includes land use on the Lodge property which differed from the final alternative land uses due to changes in the alternatives, the trip generation associated with the land use quantities assumed by TRPA staff under each alternative was calculated and distributed to the roadway network using the distribution pattern also used by LSC. Next, the Lodge land uses specifically identified under each alternative were used to identify trip generation and distributed to result in turning movements. The alternative land use peak-hour volumes were added, and the peak-hour volumes associated with the TRPA model assumption land use were subtracted.
5. At the SR 89/SR 28 intersection, the approved Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project will change traffic volumes, through the provision of a new roadway connecting SR 89 south of this intersection with SR 89 west of this intersection. The Draft EIR traffic analysis for this project was reviewed to identify the proportion of traffic change on each movement between the future no-project condition and the future plus-project condition. The resulting factor was applied to the results of steps 1 through 4.

The resulting 2035 busy summer peak-hour volumes are shown in Table A.

Future Cumulative Analysis

A review of the TRPA TransCAD forecasts at the two external access points in the Placer County area (SR 89 just south of Alpine Meadows Road, and SR 267 at Brockway Summit)

indicated that the model reflects some but not all of the potential growth in external traffic volumes at these two points. The additional external traffic growth was defined as follows.

On the **SR 267** external corridor, the Town of Truckee maintains a separate TransCAD model. Because of the strong interaction of trips between the Town and the Martis Valley portion of Placer County, the area encompassed by this model includes the Town of Truckee, the Martis Valley area, and also several parcels of unincorporated Nevada County (including the Tahoe Truckee Airport). This model was recently updated. Important to this discussion, the model area extends south on SR 267 to Brockway Summit (making it directly adjacent to the TRPA Model area), and extends south on SR 89 to just south of West River Street (leaving an intervening area between the two models, encompassing Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows).

The land use growth in the most recent Truckee/Martis model reflect the buildout of the Town of Truckee General Plan (assumed to occur in 2035), as well as the buildout of the current maximum land use growth under the Martis Valley Community Plan (MVCP). Since adoption of the MVCP in 2004, several major developments have been approved with maximum buildout levels below those identified in the MVCP, while other properties have been purchased for public open space. As a result, the current maximum buildout trip generation of the MVCP area is 35 percent lower than that identified in the MVCP EIR.

The current Truckee/Martis Model identifies existing summer PM peak-hour traffic volumes (total of both direction) over Brockway Summit of 1,055 vehicle-trips, and a buildout (assumed 2035) summer PM peak-hour volume forecast of 1,347 vehicle-trips. This reflects a 28 percent increase in traffic volumes.

As an aside, the Truckee/Martis Model assumes development of 760 single-family dwelling units on Southern Pacific Industries (SPI) lands, along with 17,000 square feet of commercial development. The currently proposed Martis Valley West project on these SPI lands would consist of 560 single family dwelling units (including 60 cabins), 200 multi-family dwelling units, and 34,500 square feet of commercial development. As multifamily units have a lower trip generation rate than single family units, the current land use proposal would generate 3 percent less external PM peak-hour vehicle-trips than the land uses assumed in the Truckee/Martis Model. This indicates that there is no need to add trips to reflect this specific development. To be conservative, however, and as the Martis Valley West project has not been approved, no reduction in the Truckee/Martis Model volume has been taken.

The Truckee/Martis Model forecasted growth is higher than the TRPA Model forecasted growth by 63 southbound vehicle-trips and 126 northbound vehicle-trips in the summer PM peak-hour. It is therefore appropriate and conservative (resulting in relatively high traffic forecasts) to add the incremental volume (Truckee/Martis Model volume minus TRPA Model volume) to the external volume growth at Brockway Summit. This adjustment to external traffic was then tracked through the Tahoe roadway system, based upon LSC's trip distribution.

For the **SR 89** external corridor, there is no existing transportation model encompassing the Squaw Valley / Alpine Meadows area¹. Based upon the current status of land use proposals, the traffic forecasts associated with the following projects were summed:

¹ The Truckee/Martis model area only extends as far south on SR 89 as West River Street. As a result of the intervening 9-mile gap between the two model areas and the significant traffic generators within this gap, the Truckee/Martis model does not produce forecasts useful to this analysis, necessitating the need for the alternative methodology.

- Village at Squaw Valley (as reflected in the *Village At Squaw Valley Specific Plan DEIR* (Ascent Environmental, May 2015)).
- Plumpjack Squaw Valley Inn (as reflected in working draft documents). The DEIR is currently being prepared.
- Palisades at Squaw (as reflected in working draft documents). The DEIR is currently being prepared.
- Alpine Sierra Subdivision (as reflected in working draft documents). The DEIR is currently being prepared.

There are also several smaller potential developments currently under consideration in the Squaw Valley/Alpine Meadows area. In addition, these developments do not constitute the full potential development under the community plans. However, given the substantial level of overall development, it is reasonable to assume that in total they represent the market-driven development that could actually occur by 2035.

The resulting sum of volumes were found to exceed the TRPA Model growth volumes associated with development in Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows at the SR 89 external point² by a total of 121 southbound vehicle-trips and 128 northbound vehicle-trips over the summer PM peak hour. These volumes were assigned to SR 89 at the external point, and then distributed through the remainder of the Tahoe roadway system based on LSC's trip distribution.

For the SR 89/SR28 intersection, these additional external volumes were adjusted to reflect the Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project redistribution of traffic. The resulting busy summer 2035 PM peak-hour volumes are presented in Table B. These volumes are then added to those shown in Table A to result in the future cumulative busy summer 2035 PM peak-hour volumes shown in Table C.

VMT Analysis

The analysis of Vehicle-Miles of Travel (VMT) generated in the Tahoe Basin over a busy summer day in 2035 is summarized in Table D. The basis of the analysis are the basin-wide VMT figures output by the TRPA TransCAD model for the four alternatives. These figures were then adjusted as follows:

- As discussed above, the land use assumptions for the Tahoe City Lodge site incorporated into the TransCAD model differ slightly from the current alternative land use assumptions for two of the four alternatives. As shown in Table E, the summer daily VMT generated by the land uses assumed in the model were calculated, based upon the trip generation and distribution factors used in the remainder of the analysis as well as the roadway miles between the Lodge site and the various trip origins/destinations. These figures were subtracted from the model results. The same methodology was

² A portion of the TRPA model growth forecasts at the external point are associated with growth in Squaw Valley/Alpine Meadows (while the remainder are associated with growth in travel between the Tahoe Basin and Truckee or points beyond Truckee). Based on turning movements along SR 89, it is estimated that 33 percent of the total future model growth is associated with Squaw Valley / Alpine Meadows growth. The additional TRPA Model growth figures were therefore reduced by 33 percent, thereby increasing the volumes added at the external point.

used to estimate the summer daily VMT generated by the proposed land uses under each alternative at buildout, as also shown in Table E, and added to the model volumes, resulting in a slight net change for Alternatives 1 and 3.

- Consistent with the methodology used in the analysis of VMT for the TRPA Regional Plan and Regional Transportation Plan, a reduction from the model VMT was applied to reflect factors (such as improvements in transit, bicycle, pedestrian and Transportation Demand Management programs) that are not reflected in the model analysis³. Per Table 9 of Appendix C: Modeling Methodology of the *Draft Regional Transportation Plan EIR/EIS*, the model outputs for each alternative were reduced by 2.0 percent to reflect the reductions on trips generated within the Tahoe Region. Consideration was also given to whether additional VMT reductions would result from the adoption of the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan (over and above the Regional Plan reductions). The Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan includes a number of policy elements that would, if implemented, reduce auto use. In particular, Transportation Policies T-P-11 through T-P-23 present general policies to encourage pedestrian, bicyclist and transit travel by encouraging improved facilities, safer travel corridors, expanded bicycle parking, etc. However, the proposed policies are not significantly more aggressive in enhancing non-auto travel modes than the existing Community Plans, nor does the proposed Area Plan include specific implementation steps (such as new funding sources) to ensure implementation of the policies. As such, and to provide a conservative estimate of future traffic conditions, no further reductions in traffic volumes or VMT are applied to reflect changes in transportation policies.
- As discussed above, the TRPA model partially but not wholly reflects the potential impacts of development external to the Tahoe Region, specifically in the Squaw Valley/Alpine Meadows and the Truckee/Martis Valley areas. An analysis of the additional VMT within the Tahoe Region associated with this development not captured in the TRPA VMT figures is presented in Table F:
 - For the **SR 267** external point, the daily traffic identified in the recently-updated Truckee/Martis Valley model was distributed from the external point at Brockway Summit to specific areas within the Tahoe Region using LSC's distribution to estimate the growth in daily vehicle-trips to each internal area. The same procedure was applied to the TRPA model external daily traffic growth. Subtracting the lower TRPA model volume from the higher Truckee/Martis model volume yielded the additional daily vehicle-trips. This volume was multiplied by the highway travel distance for each trip pair and summed over all trips, to yield the additional VMT figure of 12,616 over a busy summer day through this external point.
 - For the **SR 89** external point, the total daily traffic growth identified by the TRPA model was divided into traffic volume growth associated with increased travel between the Tahoe Region and Squaw Valley/Alpine Meadows versus traffic volume growth associated with increased travel between the Tahoe Region and Truckee or points beyond Truckee (such as I-80 over Donner Summit). Based on current trip patterns, one third of the traffic growth was assigned to the Squaw Valley / Alpine Meadows area and two thirds to Truckee and beyond. This

³ To quantify this reduction, TRPA developed the Trip Reduction Impact Analysis (TRIA) tool, as described in Appendix C of the 2012 TRPA Regional Transportation Plan.

indicates that the TRPA model projects a growth of 328 daily vehicle-trips between the Tahoe Region and Squaw Valley/Alpine Meadows. The daily traffic volumes at the SR 89 external point resulting from four current developments in the Squaw Valley / Alpine Meadows area (Village at Squaw Valley, Plumpjack expansion, Alpine Sierra, and Palisades at Squaw) were summed, indicating daily traffic volume growth of 3,132 vehicle-trips. The external volume for the sum of the four developments was distributed to the various destination/origin areas with the Tahoe Region based on LSC distribution. The same methodology was applied to the TRPA external trip daily growth volume, and then subtracted to yield the additional growth between the SR 89 external point and each origin/destination. The resulting additional volumes were then multiplied by the highway trip length between the external point and each internal area, and summed. As shown in Table F, the additional VMT through this external point is estimated to be 29,861. Between the two external points, cumulative summer daily VMT is estimated to be increased by 42,477.

- This additional external VMT would also be reduced by the non-auto policies in the Regional Plan, though at a lower degree. Per Table 9 of Appendix C: Modeling Methodology of the *Draft Regional Transportation Plan EIR/EIS*, this adjustment for non-auto transportation strategies for internal-external trips is 0.78 percent resulting in a small reduction.

The resulting VMT estimates are shown in Table D. All alternatives would increase daily summer Tahoe Basin VMT over the existing condition (1,939,159,7,070), ranging between 1,973,780 (Alternative 1) and 1,983,452 (Alternative 4). This represents between a 1.89 percent and a 2.34 percent increase in basin-wide VMT, respectively. Significantly, all of these figures are below the TRPA Air Quality Threshold value of 2,030,938 by at least 47,486. They are also below the VMT estimate for 2035 of 2,131,000 identified in the 2012 *Regional Transportation Plan EIS*.

TABLE A: Scenario Intersection Turning Movement Volumes -- Existing Scenarios

	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound			Total Vehicles
	Left	Through	Right	Left	Through	Right	Left	Through	Right	Left	Through	Right	
Existing No Project													
1 SR89	318	74	304	30	89	13	48	344	417	362	323	21	2,343
2 SR89		0	17	3	0	7	6	699	2	7	611	14	1,368
3 SR28	7	0	19	37	0	35	27	752	12	17	598	21	1,525
4 SR28	1	1	0	363	2	334	257	662	1	0	539	337	2,497
5 SR28	28	1	23	25	0	79	43	605	23	16	634	18	1,495
6 SR28	14	5	6	76	11	103	46	755	16	16	639	36	1,723
Existing + Alt 1													
1 SR89	96	34	165	39	42	51	76	521	79	211	491	26	1,831
2 SR89		0	18	0	0	0	0	722	3	9	650	0	1,404
3 SR28	7	0	19	51	0	48	37	719	12	17	603	29	1,542
4 SR28	1	1	0	367	2	386	279	666	1	0	562	323	2,589
5 SR28	29	1	23	41	0	130	74	601	23	27	636	18	1,602
6 SR28	14	5	6	125	11	169	79	729	36	27	620	36	1,857
Existing + Alt 2													
1 SR89	97	34	155	39	42	51	76	483	80	212	486	26	1,782
2 SR89		0	18	0	0	0	0	712	3	11	622	0	1,368
3 SR28	7	0	19	57	0	54	44	716	12	17	570	34	1,531
4 SR28	1	1	0	359	2	414	295	664	1	0	553	315	2,604
5 SR28	29	1	23	42	0	131	74	597	23	28	623	18	1,589
6 SR28	15	5	6	126	11	171	80	731	35	28	623	36	1,867
Existing + Alt 3													
1 SR89	93	34	174	39	42	51	76	535	76	220	503	26	1,869
2 SR89		0	18	0	0	0	0	744	3	10	668	0	1,445
3 SR28	7	0	19	60	0	57	42	733	12	17	603	33	1,583
4 SR28	1	1	0	368	2	403	295	670	1	0	561	327	2,629
5 SR28	29	1	23	37	0	117	67	602	23	25	636	18	1,578
6 SR28	14	5	6	112	11	152	72	709	29	25	597	36	1,767
Existing + Alt 4													
1 SR89	89	34	172	39	42	51	76	511	70	223	508	26	1,842
2 SR89		0	18	17	0	19	16	759	3	10	653	38	1,535
3 SR28	7	0	19	50	0	47	36	735	12	17	583	28	1,535
4 SR28	1	1	0	367	2	406	287	671	1	0	556	320	2,613
5 SR28	28	1	23	42	0	133	74	601	23	27	626	18	1,596
6 SR28	14	5	6	128	11	173	79	736	36	27	621	36	1,872

TABLE B: Intersection Turning Movement -- External Projects Not Fully Reflected in TRPA Model

	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound			Total Vehicles
	Left	Through	Right	Left	Through	Right	Left	Through	Right	Left	Through	Right	
Additional External Volumes: Squaw Valley/Alpine Meadows Projects - Village at Squaw Valley, Palisades, Plumpjack, Alpine Sierra													
1 SR89	57	0	0	0	0	0	7	59	54	0	63	0	240
2 SR89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	0	0	63	0	122
3 SR28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	0	0	63	0	122
4 SR28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	27	0	52
5 SR28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	17	0	33
6 SR28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	13	0	25
Additional External Volumes: Martis Valley/Truckee													
1 SR89	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	35
2 SR89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	12	0	35
3 SR28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	0	0	16	0	49
4 SR28	0	0	0	32	0	29	64	0	0	0	0	58	183
5 SR28	5	0	0	0	0	5	2	21	2	0	42	0	78
6 SR28	4	0	0	0	0	4	2	17	2	0	35	0	64

TABLE C: Scenario Intersection Turning Movement Volumes -- Future Cumulative Scenarios

	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound			Total Vehicles
	Left	Through	Right	Left	Through	Right	Left	Through	Right	Left	Through	Right	
Future Cumulative + Alt 1													
1 SR89 SR28 (TC Wye)	113	34	177	39	42	51	87	603	89	218	583	26	2,062
2 SR89 Mackinaw	2	0	18	0	0	0	0	804	3	9	724	0	1,561
3 SR28 Grove St	7	0	19	51	0	48	37	811	12	17	682	29	1,712
4 SR28 SR267	1	1	0	399	2	415	343	691	1	0	589	382	2,824
5 SR28 Bear St	34	1	23	41	0	134	76	638	25	27	695	18	1,713
6 SR28 Coon St	18	5	6	125	11	173	81	759	38	27	668	36	1,946
Future Cumulative + Alt 2													
1 SR89 SR28 (TC Wye)	114	34	167	39	42	51	87	565	90	219	578	26	2,013
2 SR89 Mackinaw	2	0	18	0	0	0	0	794	3	11	696	0	1,525
3 SR28 Grove St	7	0	19	57	0	54	44	808	12	17	649	34	1,701
4 SR28 SR267	1	1	0	390	2	443	359	689	1	0	579	373	2,839
5 SR28 Bear St	34	1	23	42	0	136	77	634	25	28	683	18	1,700
6 SR28 Coon St	19	5	6	126	11	175	81	760	37	28	671	36	1,956
Future Cumulative + Alt 3													
1 SR89 SR28 (TC Wye)	110	34	186	39	42	51	87	616	86	227	595	26	2,100
2 SR89 Mackinaw	2	0	18	0	0	0	0	827	3	10	742	0	1,602
3 SR28 Grove St	7	0	19	60	0	57	42	825	12	17	682	33	1,753
4 SR28 SR267	1	1	0	399	2	432	360	695	1	0	588	385	2,864
5 SR28 Bear St	34	1	23	37	0	122	69	639	25	25	696	18	1,689
6 SR28 Coon St	18	5	6	112	11	156	74	738	31	25	645	36	1,856
Future Cumulative + Alt 4													
1 SR89 SR28 (TC Wye)	106	34	184	39	42	51	87	593	80	230	600	26	2,073
2 SR89 Mackinaw	2	0	18	31	0	31	26	842	3	10	727	62	1,752
3 SR28 Grove St	7	0	19	50	0	47	36	827	12	17	662	28	1,705
4 SR28 SR267	1	1	0	399	2	435	351	696	1	0	583	378	2,848
5 SR28 Bear St	33	1	23	42	0	137	76	638	25	27	685	18	1,706
6 SR28 Coon St	18	5	6	128	11	177	81	766	38	27	669	36	1,962

TABLE D: Regionwide VMT Analysis for Placer Tahoe Basin Area Plan

	Placer Area Plan Alternative			
	Alt One	Alt Two	Alt Three	Alt Four
Existing 2015 Regionwide VMT	1,939,159	1,937,070		
TRPA TransCAD Model -- Unadjusted	1,968,788	1,977,429	1,973,828	1,980,925
Minus TRPA TransCAD VMT on Tahoe City Lodge Site	-6,302	-2,943	-6,302	-13,910
Plus VMT Generated by Tahoe City Lodge Site	8,570	2,943	8,570	13,910
Minus TRIA Adjustment for RTP Mode Shift Policies	-39,421	-39,549	-39,522	-39,619
Plus External VMT Not Fully Reflected in TRPA Model	42,477	42,477	42,477	42,477
Minus TRIA Adjustment for Additional External VMT	-331	-331	-331	-331
Regionwide VMT	1,973,780	1,980,026	1,978,719	1,983,452
Increase Over Existing: #	34,621	40,867	39,560	44,293
Increase Over Existing: %	1.8% 1.9%	2.1% 2.2%	2.0% 2.2%	2.3% 2.4%
TRPA Compact Threshold	2,030,938	2,030,938	2,030,938	2,030,938
Threshold Minus Alternative Regionwide VMT	57,158	50,912	52,219	47,486
Alternative Attains Compact Threshold?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

TABLE E: Analysis of Tahoe City Lodge VMT

Origins/Destination within the Lake Tahoe Basin	Existing Non Pass-by	Lodge Alternative Land Use			
		1	2	3	4
Daily 1-Way Vehicle Trips					
South Lake Tahoe	19	34	12	34	44
Emerald Bay	9	45	16	45	22
Homewood/Tahoma	93	113	39	113	219
Sunnyside	84	91	31	91	197
Eastern Tahoe City	84	57	19	57	197
Dollar Hill/Lake Forest	84	0	0	0	197
Carnelian Bay	84	45	16	45	197
Tahoe Vista	84	102	35	102	197
Kings Beach/ Crystal Bay	112	181	62	181	263
Incline Village/East Shore	47	68	23	68	110
SR 89 North	233	397	136	397	548
Total	932	1,133	389	1,133	2,191
Daily Vehicle-Miles of Travel					
South Lake Tahoe	582	1,060	364	1,060	1,367
Emerald Bay	175	852	293	852	412
Homewood/Tahoma	802	974	335	974	1,884
Sunnyside	201	218	75	218	473
Eastern Tahoe City	34	23	8	23	79
Dollar Hill/Lake Forest	201	0	0	0	473
Carnelian Bay	478	258	89	258	1,124
Tahoe Vista	688	836	287	836	1,617
Kings Beach/ Crystal Bay	1,119	1,813	622	1,813	2,629
Incline Village/East Shore	760	1,108	380	1,108	1,786
SR 89 North	839	1,428	490	1,428	1,972
Total	5,879	8,570	2,943	8,570	13,816

Origins/Destination within the Lake Tahoe Basin	Distribution	
	Lodge	Retail Non-Passby
South Lake Tahoe	3%	2%
Emerald Bay	4%	1%
Homewood/Tahoma	10%	10%
Sunnyside	8%	9%
Eastern Tahoe City	5%	9%
Dollar Hill/Lake Forest	0%	9%
Carnelian Bay	4%	9%
Tahoe Vista	9%	9%
Kings Beach/ Crystal Bay	16%	12%
Incline Village/East Shore	6%	5%
SR 89 North	35%	25%
Total	100%	100%

Origins/Destination within the Lake Tahoe Basin	Trip Length (Miles)
South Lake Tahoe	31.2
Emerald Bay	18.8
Homewood/Tahoma	8.6
Sunnyside	2.4
Eastern Tahoe City	0.4
Dollar Hill/Lake Forest	2.4
Carnelian Bay	5.7
Tahoe Vista	8.2
Kings Beach/ Crystal Bay	10.0
Incline Village/East Shore	16.3
SR 89 North	3.6

