

8 CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

8.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter analyzes and evaluates the potential impacts of the project on known and unknown cultural resources (also known as heritage resources) and historic resources. Cultural and historic resources include districts, sites, buildings, structures, or objects generally older than 50 years and considered to be important to a culture, subculture, or community for scientific, traditional, religious, or other reasons.

Archaeological resources are locations where human activity has measurably altered the earth or left deposits of prehistoric or historic-era physical remains (e.g., stone tools, bottles, former roads, house foundations). Historic architectural resources include standing buildings (e.g., houses, barns, outbuildings, cabins), intact structures (e.g., dams and bridges), districts (e.g., a collective unit of individual buildings or structures), sites (e.g., trails and cemeteries), or objects (e.g., sculptures). Paleontological resources include mineralized, partially mineralized, or unmineralized bones and teeth, soft tissues, shells, wood, leaf impressions, footprints, burrows, and microscopic remains that are more than 5,000 years old and occur mainly in Pleistocene or older sedimentary rock units.

The primary sources of information referenced for this chapter are the *Tahoe City Lodge EIR/EIS Cultural Resources Inventory Report* (Lindström 2015), the *Tahoe City Lodge Project Historic Resources Survey and Evaluation Report* (Placer County and TRPA 2016), the RPU EIS (TRPA 2012a), and the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS (TMPO and TRPA 2012).

Comment letters received on the Notice of Preparation that pertain to cultural resources include:

- ▲ Consult with Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California.
- ▲ Consider adding cultural resources policies to the Area Plan.
- ▲ Regarding cultural resources, the jail is not shown in the exhibit in the Area Plan.
- ▲ Follow NAHC-recommended procedures for adequately assessing and mitigating project-related impacts on archaeological resources.

As discussed in Chapter 4, “Approach to Environmental Analysis,” this analysis is provided to fully document the environmental effects of the four Area Plan and lodge alternatives. The broad geography and long timeframe to which the Area Plan applies and the policy-oriented nature of its guidance is such that the EIR/EIS is prepared at a programmatic level, i.e., a more general analysis of each resource area with a level of detail and degree of specificity commensurate with the overall planning level of the Area Plan. Similarly, because the Kings Beach Center design concept lacks sufficient detail for definitive impact analysis, that portion of the project is also evaluated in a programmatic fashion. The proposed Tahoe City Lodge represents a project that contains a greater level of detail and specificity such that a project-level analysis is included in this chapter.

8.2 REGULATORY SETTING

8.2.1 Federal

National Historic Preservation Act

Among those statutes enacted by Congress that affect historic properties, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) is the most significant law that addresses historic preservation. The NHPA established

the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the official list of properties worthy of protection. Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects meeting certain criteria are eligible for listing in the Register. Nominations are listed if they are significant in American or local history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. The NRHP is administered by the National Park Service. To be eligible, a resource must have significance under criterion A (history), B (persons), C (design/construction), or D (yield important information to history or prehistory); possess historic integrity; and ordinarily be 50 years of age or more.

Listing in the NRHP does not entail specific protection for a property but it does guarantee recognition in planning for federal or federally-assisted projects, eligibility for federal tax benefits, and qualification for federal historic preservation assistance. Additionally, project effects on properties listed in the NRHP must be evaluated under CEQA.

Federal agencies are required to assess potential impacts (or effects) of a project or an undertaking to historic and cultural resources listed on the NRHP or those that may be potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP. Federal regulatory impact thresholds are contained in Section 106 of the NHPA and accompanying regulations (36 CFR [Code of Federal Regulations] Part 800). The criteria of effect are found in 36 CFR 800.0(a) and state that:

An undertaking has an effect on a historic property when the undertaking may alter characteristics of the property that may qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register.

Such an effect on a historic property may be one that diminishes the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association, or the quality of data suitable for scientific analysis.

8.2.2 Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Article V(c)(3) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (Public Law 96-551) required the development of a conservation plan for the preservation, development, utilization, and management of scenic and other natural resources within the Tahoe Basin, including historic resources. TRPA accomplishes historic resource protection through implementation of its Goals and Policies and Code provisions as described below.

Lake Tahoe Regional Plan

TRPA regulates growth and development in the Tahoe Region through the Regional Plan, which includes the Goals and Policies, Code of Ordinances, and other components.

Goals and Policies

The Goals and Policies document establishes guiding policies for each resource element. The Conservation Element (Chapter 4) of the Goals and Policies document includes a Cultural Subelement, that includes a goal (Goal C-1) to identify and preserve sites of historic, cultural, and architectural significance within the Tahoe Region, and policies to identify and protect historic and culturally-significant landmarks (Policy C-1.1), and sites and structures designated as historically, culturally, or archaeological significance (Policy C-1.2) (TRPA 2012b: 4-28).

Code of Ordinances

The Code is a compilation of the rules, regulations, and standards to implement the Regional Plan Goals and Policies. Adopted standards in the Code must be met by projects. TRPA recognizes sites, objects, structures, districts or other resources, eligible for designation as resources of historical, cultural, archaeological paleontological, or architectural significance locally, regionally, state-wide or nationally. Those resources must meet at least one of the criteria summarized below. Chapter 67 of the Code also provides for consultation with state historic preservation offices as well as the Washoe Tribe. Additionally, Standard 33.3.7 in Chapter 33 (Grading and Construction, Section 33.3, Grading Standards) addresses discovery of historic resources.

- ▲ **Resources Associated with Historically Significant Events and Sites.** Such resources shall meet one or more of the following: a) association with an important community function in the past; b) association with a memorable happening in the past; or c) contain outstanding qualities reminiscent of an early state of development in the region.
- ▲ **Resources Associated with Significant Persons.** Such resources include: a) buildings or structures associated with a locally, regionally, or nationally known person; b) notable example or best surviving works or a pioneer architect, designer or master builder; or c) structures associated with the life or work of significant persons.
- ▲ **Resources Embodying Distinctive Characteristics.** Resources that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction that possess high artistic values or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity but whose components may lack individual distinction. Works of a master builder, designer, or architect also are eligible. Resources may be classified as significant if they are a prototype of, or a representative example of, a period style, architectural movement, or method of construction unique in the region, the states, or the nation.
- ▲ **State and Federal Guidelines.** Archeological or paleontological resources protected or eligible for protection under state or federal guidelines.
- ▲ **Prehistoric Sites.** Sites where prehistoric archaeological or paleontological resources that may contribute to the basic understanding of early cultural or biological development in the region.

Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

There are no TRPA Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities that pertain to cultural or historic resources.

Community Plans and Plan Area Statements

Existing community plans and PASs within the Placer County portion of the Tahoe Basin do not include policies or other provisions that pertain to cultural resources specifically.

8.2.3 State

California Register of Historical Resources

All properties listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP are eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The CRHR is a listing of State of California resources that are significant within the context of California's history. The CRHR is a statewide program of similar scope and with similar criteria for inclusion as those used for the NRHP. In addition, properties designated under municipal or county ordinances are also eligible for listing in the CRHR.

A historic resource must be significant at the local, state, or national level under one or more of the criteria defined in the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 15, Chapter 11.5, Section 4850. The CRHR criteria are similar to the NRHP criteria and are tied to CEQA because any resource that meets the criteria below is considered a historical resource under CEQA. As noted above, all resources listed in or formally determined eligible for the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR.

The CRHR uses four evaluation criteria:

1. Is associated with events or patterns of events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.

3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.
4. Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.

Similar to the NRHP, a resource must meet one of the above criteria and retain integrity. The CRHR uses the same seven aspects of integrity as the NRHP.

California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA requires public agencies to consider the effects of their actions on both “historical resources” and “unique archaeological resources.” Pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21084.1, a “project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.” Section 21083.2 requires agencies to determine whether proposed projects would have effects on unique archaeological resources.

Historic Resources

“Historical resource” is a term with a defined statutory meaning (PRC, Section 21084.1; determining significant impacts to historic and archaeological resources is described in the State CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15064.5[a] and [b]). Under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a), historical resources include the following:

- 1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the CRHR (PRC, Section 5024.1).
- 2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC, will be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- 3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be a historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource will be considered by the lead agency to be historically significant if the resource meets the criteria for listing in the CRHR (PRC, Section 5024.1), including the following:
 - a) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
 - b) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
 - c) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
 - d) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
- 4) The fact that a resource is not listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the PRC), or identified in a historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be a historical resource as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

Unique Archaeological Resources

CEQA also requires lead agencies to consider whether projects will impact unique archaeological resources. PRC Section 21083.2, subdivision (g), states that unique archaeological resource means an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

1. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
2. Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
3. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

California Native American Historical, Cultural, and Sacred Sites Act

The California Native American Historical, Cultural and Sacred Sites Act applies to both state and private lands. The act requires that upon discovery of human remains, construction or excavation activity cease and the county coroner be notified. If the remains are of a Native American, the coroner must notify the NAHC. The NAHC then notifies those persons most likely to be descended from the Native American's remains. The act stipulates the procedures the descendants may follow for treating or disposing of the remains and associated grave goods.

California Health and Safety Code

Section 7050.5 (b) of the California Health and Safety code specifies protocol when human remains are discovered. The code states:

In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined, in accordance with Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 27460) of Part 3 of Division 2 of Title 3 of the Government Code, that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27492 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of death, and the recommendations concerning treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

Assembly Bill 52

Assembly Bill (AB) 52, signed by the California Governor in September 2014, establishes a new class of resources under CEQA: "tribal cultural resources." It requires that lead agencies undertaking CEQA review must, upon written request of a California Native American tribe, begin consultation once the lead agency determines that the application for the project is complete, prior to the issuance of a NOP of an EIR or notice of intent to adopt a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration. AB 52 also requires revision to CEQA Appendix G, the environmental checklist. This revision would create a new category for "tribal cultural resources."

AB 52 currently applies to those projects for which a lead agency has issued a NOP of an EIR or notice of intent to adopt a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration on or after July 1, 2015. As the NOP for the proposed project was issued on June 3, 2015, the requirements of AB 52 do not apply.

8.2.4 Local

Placer County

The Recreational and Cultural Resources Section (Section 5) of the Placer County General Plan (Placer County 2013) includes a goal to “identify, protect, and enhance Placer County’s important historical, archaeological, paleontological, and cultural sites and their contributing environment.” This plan also includes policies to protect and enhance cultural resources through various means, including: incentive programs for private property owners, public education, avoidance and mitigation of cultural resource impacts in discretionary development projects, coordination with the local Native American community and NAHC, and assisting private citizens seeking historic landmark designations for their property.

8.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

8.3.1 Cultural Resources Setting for the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge

REGIONAL PREHISTORY

In broadest terms, the archaeological signature of the Tahoe Basin is marked by a trend from hunting-based societies in earlier times to populations that were increasingly reliant upon imported resources by the time of historic contact. The shift in lifeways may be attributed partially to factors involving paleoclimate, a shifting subsistence base, and demographic change.

Current understanding of northern Sierra Nevada and western Great Basin prehistory is framed within a hypothetical sequence spanning nearly 12,000 years of environmental change and human adaptation. The archaeological phenomena are organized into five time periods (known as the Western Great Basin Adaptive Sequence). Within this overarching framework, a regional chronology for the Eastern Sierra Front was developed through substantial programs of archaeological investigation throughout the northern Sierra and the Truckee Meadows. The Eastern Sierra Front Chronology, augmented by archaeological studies within the Tahoe Reach of the Truckee River, provides a relevant temporal framework for comparing and interpreting Tahoe archaeology. Pre-Archaic remains suggest occupation by about 9,000 years ago (Tahoe Reach Phase). Other Pre-Archaic to Early Archaic occupation dating from about 7,000 to 5,000 years ago (Spoooner Phase) was documented at Spoooner Lake. The most intensive period of occupation in the region may have occurred at varying intervals between 4,000 and 500 years ago (Martis Phases during the Early and Middle Archaic, and Early Kings Beach Phase during the Late Archaic). The protohistoric ancestors of the Washoe (Late Kings Beach Phase), also of Late Archaic times, may date roughly from 500 years ago to historic contact. This period has been associated with the Washoe Indians. It is estimated that the prehistoric Washoe had one of the highest population densities in the western Great Basin. Relatively high estimates are attributed to the bountiful environment in which they lived. Historic declines in Washoe population and traditional resource use were caused by disruptions imposed by incoming Euroamerican groups. The Washoe regard all “prehistoric” remains and sites within the Truckee Basin as being associated with their history.

ETHNOGRAPHY

The project area falls within the center of historic Washoe territory, with primary use by the northern Washoe. Lake Tahoe was both the spiritual and physical center of the Washoe world. The name “Tahoe,” adopted in popular jargon early on, is derived from the Washoe word *da’ow*, signifying “lake.” The lake was not officially designated as Lake Tahoe until an act by the legislature in 1945.

Several Washoe encampments have been recorded in the northwest quadrant of the Tahoe Basin, including locations near the outlets of the Truckee River, Burton Creek, and Dollar Creek. The outlet of the Truckee River was an important site where the Washoe paid respect and gave thanks to the Tahoe’s waters.

While the Washoe were an informal and flexible political collective, their ethnography hints at a level of technological specialization and social complexity that was uncharacteristic of their surrounding neighbors in the Great Basin. A semi-sedentary existence and higher population densities, concepts of private property, and communal labor and ownership are reported and may have developed in conjunction with their residential and subsistence resource stability. The ethnographic record suggests that during the mild season, small groups traveled through high mountain valleys of the Tahoe Sierra collecting edible and medicinal roots, seeds and marsh plants. In the higher elevations, men hunted large game and trapped smaller mammals. Lake Tahoe and its tributaries were important fisheries year round. Suitable toolstone was quarried at various locales. The Washoe have a tradition of making long treks across the Sierran passes for the purpose of hunting, trading and gathering acorns. While some Washoe trekked to distant places for desired resources, most groups circulated in the vicinity of their traditional habitation sites.

Their relatively rich environment afforded the Washoe a degree of isolation and independence from neighboring peoples and may account for their long tenure in their known area of historic occupation, as also evidenced by linguistic studies. The Washoe are part of an ancient Hokan-speaking population, which has been subsequently surrounded by incoming Numic speakers, such as the Northern Paiute. By the 1850s Euroamericans had permanently occupied the Washoe territory and changed traditional lifeways. Mining, lumbering, grazing, commercial fishing, tourism, and the growth of settlements disrupted traditional Indian relationships to the land. As hunting and gathering wild foods were no longer possible, the Washoe were forced into dependency upon the Euroamerican settlers. Beginning in 1917, however, the Washoe Tribe began acquiring back a small part of their traditional lands. The Washoe remain as a recognized tribe by the U.S. government and have maintained an established land base. Its approximate 1,200 tribal members are governed by a tribal council that consists of members of the Carson, Dresslerville, Woodfords, and Reno-Sparks Indian colonies, as well as members from non-reservation areas.

The Washoe have not been completely displaced from their traditional lands. The contemporary Washoe have developed a Comprehensive Land Use Plan that includes goals of reestablishing a presence within the Tahoe Sierra and re-vitalizing Washoe cultural and cultural knowledge, including the harvest and care of traditional plant resources and the protection of traditional properties within the cultural landscape.

REGIONAL HISTORY

In 1844, John C. Frémont and his companion Charles Preuss recorded the first sighting of Lake Tahoe by a Euro-American. Later that same year, members of the westward-bound Stevens-Murphy-Townsend party were likely the first Euro-Americans to venture onto the shore of the lake. The California Gold Rush, centered mainly in the Sierra Nevada foothills, and the subsequent Comstock Lode silver rush that occurred a decade later in Nevada, drew thousands of miners and entrepreneurs through the Tahoe Sierra on their way to the mining locales. During this period, the lake was known by various names, including Mountain Lake and Lake Bigler. It was officially designated Lake Tahoe by the California Legislature in 1945. The proximity of the Tahoe Basin to the Mother Lode in California and the Comstock Lode in Nevada promoted related development in lumbering, grazing, transportation, market hunting and fishing, tourism, and urban development in the region to provide materials to meet the demand of those areas.

Transportation

Lake Tahoe's strategic proximity to wood, water, mineral, rangeland, and recreational resources justified that a significant amount of capital and energy be invested into transportation to and through the Tahoe Basin. Beginning in 1852 Scott's Route (later known as the Placer County Emigrant Road) was traveled intermittently between Auburn and the Comstock mines by westbound emigrants and eastbound prospectors. It crossed the main sierran crest above Squaw Valley and entered the Tahoe Basin at Tahoe City. This historic route is now SR 28. This road appears on historic maps dating from 1865. The opening of the Central Pacific Railroad in 1869, with connections to Tahoe's north shore by stage in the 1860s and by rail in 1900, fostered tourism and encouraged the development of long-lived communities, even after the demise of timber harvesting and grazing activities. Owing to the difficulty of overland travel within the Tahoe Basin, steamships became critical modes of transportation as early as 1864. Automobile roads in the Tahoe

Basin generally date after the 1910s. During the 1930s the Forest Highway system was established, which resulted in a network of engineered and major routes through the Tahoe Basin. Not until 1927 did paved highways circle the lakeshore.

Logging

Although the history of lumbering in and around the Tahoe Basin took place within the larger history of the Comstock Lode, the onset of lumbering on the California side of Lake Tahoe's north shore was largely coincident with the building of the transcontinental railroad and the subsequent opening of new wood markets along its route. By the turn of the century, lands in the Tahoe Basin were largely stripped of pine, but fir and other species remained. With the introduction of paper mills, stands were revisited to harvest fir for use as pulpwood for paper mills. Between 1900 and 1930, local pulpwood was processed at the Floriston Pulp and Paper Mill, located down the Truckee River canyon on the main rail line near the California/Nevada state line. The company owned timber tracts surrounding Tahoe City. Cords of pulpwood were hauled down to Tahoe City to the narrow-gauge spur tracks of the Lake Tahoe Railway and Transportation Company. Maps dating from 1909, 1912, 1913, and 1916 show railroad spurs off the main line leading to wood yards in Tahoe City near the intersection of Fairway Drive and SR 89/28. From Tahoe City, wood was transported to the mainline at Truckee and then down the Truckee River Canyon to Floriston.

Growing communities in the vicinity of Tahoe City throughout the first half of the 20th century created a demand that was supported by small, localized sawmills and shingle mills, sawing pine and cedar, respectively. Stands surrounding Tahoe City were revisited during the 1950s and lumber harvest continued on a reduced scale through the 1970s. By the 1980s, the forests around Lake Tahoe were of more value as recreational rather than timber resources, and so the large-scale logging that occurred elsewhere in the northern Sierra Nevada was curtailed in the Tahoe Basin.

Community Development Context for the Tahoe City Lodge

In the summer of 1861, the first Euroamerican of record settled in a locale that would shortly become Tahoe City. The town site was first laid out sometime after 1863 by a party of men disenchanted by the unprofitable flash of mining excitement near Squaw Valley. The settlement was first known in April through November of 1864 as "Trucky River P.O." The townsite became official in 1868. In 1871 the post office was known as "Tahoe." The name "Tahoe" was not officially changed to "Tahoe City" until 1949.

A meadow, which is now part of the Tahoe City Golf Course, once extended from the lake outlet northeastward to what is now Rocky Ridge Properties. Beginning in 1862, wild timothy hay was harvested from this fertile cropland bordering the present site of Tahoe City. The production of feed for livestock was an essential link in the harvest of Tahoe lumber to support the silver mines of the Comstock.

Growing tourism supported the establishment of local inns and hotels. Beginning in 1900, Tahoe City served as a gateway port to Lake Tahoe and transit point between the trip by railroad from the transcontinental main line at Truckee to Lake Tahoe, and the trip by steamer to all points around the lake. With the decline of the Comstock mines and the demise of timbering in the Tahoe Basin, the Bliss family (of Carson and Tahoe Lumber and Fluming Company fame) formed a new corporation, the Lake Tahoe Railway and Transportation Company. The company operated a 16-mile narrow gauge line down the Truckee River canyon between Tahoe City and Truckee. Tracks and rail cars from the Bliss lumber mill complex at Glenbrook and Bijou were dismantled in 1898 and barged across the lake to Tahoe City. By 1899 simultaneous construction commenced on the tourist railroad and the internationally famous Tahoe Tavern Resort and railroad-steamer pier south of Tahoe's outlet. The railroad was opened in 1900, and in 1901 machine shops, maintenance equipment, and several dwellings were moved from Glenbrook and installed at Tahoe City on and adjacent to the current Tahoe City Marina. The famed, self-contained and opulent Tahoe Tavern opened for business in 1902, accessed easily by the railroad. The Tahoe Tavern maintained an undisputed reputation as "the place to go at Tahoe" until the railroad line was abandoned in 1943, coinciding with the movement of more automobile traffic over local roads and highways. While the resort continued to attract a wealthy clientele, by the early 1960s, environmental regulations and the inevitability and expense of connecting to the new sewer system on Tahoe's west shore spelled the resort's ultimate demise. It was demolished in 1964.

In April of 1925 the Linnard Hotel interests acquired the Tahoe Tavern property, along with its railroad and steamers. The narrow-gauge railroad was leased to the Southern Pacific Railroad and in exchange, the Southern Pacific widened (broad-gauged) the tracks. Southern Pacific operated Pullmans with over-night service between San Francisco and Tahoe City. An extensive publicity campaign was launched and Tahoe was promoted as an all-year resort.

At the onset of their railroad operations, the Linnard interests began developing other improvements to the Tahoe Tavern resort. One of the most significant was a golf links, which was located in the former hay meadow behind the town's commercial district and along the Bickford slough. The course was planned as a six-hole course, but it was expanded to nine holes and 2,700 yards when constructed in 1926. May Dunn (of the Scottish golfing family dynasty) oversaw the lay-out. Prior to 1926, the property now occupied by Save-Mart Super Market and areas adjoining to the east was the site of the Lake Tahoe Railway and Transportation Company's turnaround "Wye." Here, narrow gauge trains backed onto the Tahoe Commons spur and headed to the machine shops located at the current site of the Tahoe City Marina. By the late 1930s, areas to the east were being developed by the Bickford Lumber Company. In addition, a caddy shack was added to the new golf course. Over the years, ownership of the golf course changed hands. It became the property of Gordon and Pat Hyde in 1946, who sold to Carl Bechdolt, Jr. in 1948.

"Trail 's End" cemetery borders the Tahoe City Golf Course on the northwest. Tahoe City's original cemetery was first established along both sides of Bliss Creek (the creek that presently separates Boathouse Mall from Lighthouse Center). The cemetery was relocated when the Bliss buildings were relocated from Glenbrook mills in the late 1890s. The Bliss Company called for removal of the bodies and, in exchange, Bliss donated the land occupied by Tahoe City's current cemetery above the golf course. Fifteen coffins were removed. As the bodies were exhumed, many were found to be "petrified" by the seepage of water from Bliss Creek.

Tahoe City experienced a growth in commercial development following World War II. Local businessmen, Charles and Oliver Henrikson, were pioneers in this effort as explained by Charles.

For the first few years after returning from the service, our sand and gravel business was operated from our backyard, with our home as the office. In time, a commercial location was sensible and Tahoe City was the logical location, as there was no sand and gravel business in this area. Mr. Fred Kilner offered to sell us a small portion of his land adjacent to the Tahoe City Golf Course...35 feet of frontage with a depth of 100 feet...This was the former site of the caddy headquarters when the Kilner property was part of the Golf Course belonging [to] the Tahoe Tavern, and later to Pat and Gordon Hyde.

By 1951 the Henrikson's business was expanding and they acquired more land behind the office from Kilner and constructed a large warehouse (46 feet wide by 125 feet long) to house equipment. In March of 1954 the remaining frontage was purchased from Kilner. By around 1959 the Henriksons relocated their sand and gravel business to Squaw Valley and began converting the parcel from industrial to commercial buildings. Plans involved construction of central office space with stores fronting the highway and perimeter parking enclosing the buildings, landscaping, and pool. The last building in the commercial complex was constructed in about 1973.

8.3.2 Records Searches

Because of the programmatic nature of the Area Plan analysis, a historic records search was not conducted for the entire Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan area. Future projects implemented under the Area Plan or related to the Kings Beach Center design concept would be subject to subsequent project-level or parcel-specific environmental review.

NCIC RECORDS SEARCH

A confidential records search for the Tahoe City Lodge project site was conducted at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) on October 5, 2015 (File No.: PLA-15-93).

The search included a review of the following documents and sources:

- ▲ Office of Historic Preservation's Historic Property Directory (2012)
- ▲ Determination of Eligibility (2012)
- ▲ California Inventory of Historical Resources (1976)
- ▲ California State Historical Landmarks (1996 and updates)
- ▲ National Register of Historical Places/California Register of Historic Resources listings
- ▲ California Points of Historical Interest (1992 and updates)
- ▲ Caltrans State and Local Bridge Surveys (2009)

The records search disclosed that a single archaeological study was done within the project area submitted as part of the records search. It focused on the area along the highway corridor and included the Henrikson building complex. No cultural resources have been identified within or adjacent to the project site limits.

NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

The NAHC was contacted to request a search of its sacred lands file for the Tahoe City Lodge project site. In its response, dated December 21, 2011, the NAHC stated that its search of the sacred lands file had failed to identify any Native American cultural resources in the immediate limits of the project site. A second sacred files search request was made to the NAHC on October 31, 2015.

Prior ethnographic studies indicate that the Washoe Tribe is the applicable tribal authority for lands encompassing the project site. Accordingly, Darrel Cruz, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) for the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California was contacted in order to incorporate the opinions, knowledge and sentiments regarding traditional Native American lands within the project area. Mr. Darrel Cruz responded November 4, 2015, stating that he had no knowledge of cultural resources or sacred sites that may be affected by the proposed Tahoe City Lodge.

Because no areas that have religious or sacred significance or other cultural significance to the Washoe people have been identified on or near the Tahoe City Lodge project site during conversations with tribal representatives and the area has been highly disturbed by urbanization, there would be no impact and this topic is not discussed further in this EIR/EIS.

8.3.3 Pedestrian Surveys

Because of the programmatic nature of the Area Plan analysis, a pedestrian survey was not conducted for the entire Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan area. Future projects implemented under the Area Plan would be subject to subsequent project-level environmental review and surveys similar to that conducted for the Tahoe City Lodge project site.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The archaeological pedestrian survey of the Tahoe City Lodge project site was conducted on October 31, 2015 by Susan Lindström, Ph.D., Consulting Archaeologist. Ms. Lindström meets the Secretary of Interior Qualifications and Standards in archaeology, history and related disciplines (48 CFR 44738-44739) and has 42 years of professional experience in regional prehistory and history, holds a doctoral degree in anthropology/archaeology, and has maintained certification by the Register of Professional Archaeologists since 1982.

The entire project site has been subject to thorough disturbance. The Tahoe City Lodge project site encompassing the former Henrikson Property is covered by existing commercial development, underground utilities and pipelines, asphalt paving, and cinder and gravel overlays. The golf course portion of the Tahoe City Lodge project site includes the clubhouse and adjoining asphalt parking area and miscellaneous out buildings. Fairways and greens have been graded and re-contoured. Several small islands supporting wetlands vegetation dot the course.

Prior disturbance (e.g., grading, hard-surface coverage, and the built environment) dictated that a mixed of field strategies be employed using both intensive and cursory/non-coverage techniques. An intensive strategy entails systematically walking over the entire area in transects no greater than 30 feet apart, looking for all evidence of prior human activity. Cursory coverage is used when 100 percent of the ground is either covered by surface improvements or the ground has been subject to extreme subsurface disturbance and survey of the area is conducted by car. The pedestrian survey did not identify any previously unrecorded archaeological resources within the project site.

BUILT ENVIRONMENT SURVEY

All built-environment resources within the Tahoe City Lodge project site and immediately adjacent to it, were documented during the course of a pedestrian survey on October 5, 2015, with all resources that appeared to be 50 years of age or older were fully photo-documented and recorded in the field. This survey and the accompanying *Tahoe City Lodge Project Historic Resources Survey and Evaluation Report* (Placer County and TRPA 2016) were prepared by Alta Cunningham, M.A., Architectural Historian, who meets the requirements of Qualified Professionals as set forth by the Secretary of Interior for work in architectural history, and has five years of experience conducting cultural resources studies. The buildings were evaluated and recorded on California Department of Parks and Recreation Primary Record forms, which are the standard forms for recording potentially historic resources in the State of California. Based on this survey existing structures on the project site do not retain historic integrity.

8.3.4 Historic and Cultural Sites in Placer County

Federal, state and regional regulatory agencies maintain inventories of historic and archaeological resources in the Tahoe Basin. As described above, the NRHP and the CRHR are comprehensive inventories of cultural resources. Regionally, TRPA maintains historic resource maps, inventories, and parcel records that identify known archaeological, ethnographic, and historic resources.

In Placer County, there are 21 historic or archaeological sites designated by TRPA as having a high-level of historic integrity or regional significance. (TRPA 2012b:Section 3.15 p. 11) These sites are categorized by two physical types: linear features and non-linear features. Linear features account for three of the recognized sites and non-linear features account for 18 of the sites.

- ▲ Linear features include: roads, grades, passes, railroads, trestles, flumes, trails, etc.
- ▲ Non-linear features include: houses, lodges, chapels, ranger stations, ranches, toll houses, sawmills, bridges, dairies, historic districts, logging/lumber camps, railroad tunnels, cabins, taverns, mansions/estates, piers, hotels, resorts, beaches, points, creek/river mouths, marshes, Native American function sites, springs, bays, harbors, etc.

None of the features designated by TRPA as having a high-level of historic integrity of regional significance are located on the Tahoe City Lodge project site or within the limits of the Kings Beach Center design concept.

In addition to the features shown on historic resource maps and inventories, there are many small sites around the lake where a variety of artifacts have been discovered. As described above, under the headers

“Regional Prehistory,” “Ethnography,” and “Regional History,” evidence of human settlements appears throughout the county within the Tahoe Basin. Artifacts discovered at various sites include flaked basalt implements and milling stones, slabs for the grinding of seed foods, chert and obsidian toolstone, bedrock mortars, and smaller projectile points. Because historic and archaeological resources are context sensitive, these resources are inventoried on a case-by-case basis for individual projects within the region to evaluate potential impacts on historic and cultural resources or those potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Individual properties are required to complete a historic determination when a project would potentially cause an adverse effect to a building, site, object, district, or structure.

8.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

8.4.1 Methods and Assumptions

As described in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” this EIR/EIS evaluates the Tahoe City Lodge at a project level and the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan at a programmatic level.

The impact analysis for prehistoric- and historic-period archaeological resources is based on the findings and recommendations of the *Tahoe City Lodge EIR/EIS Cultural Resource Inventory* (Lindström 2015). The impact analysis for historic architectural resources is based on the *Tahoe City Lodge Historic Resources Survey and Evaluation Report* (Placer County and TRPA 2016), which has been included as Appendix F. The analysis is also informed by the provisions and requirements of federal, state, and local laws and regulations that apply to cultural resources. In determining the level of significance, the analysis assumes that the project would comply with relevant, federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and ordinances.

8.4.2 Significance Criteria

Significance criteria relevant to historic and cultural resources are summarized below.

TRPA CRITERIA

The “Archeological/Historical” criteria from the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist were used to evaluate the impacts relative to historic and cultural resources. Impacts would be significant if the project would:

- ▲ cause an adverse effect to a significant archaeological or historical site, structure, object, or building;
- ▲ cause an adverse effect to a property with any known cultural, historical, and/or archaeological resources, including resources on TRPA or other regulatory official maps or records; or
- ▲ cause an adverse effect to a property associated with any historically significant events and/or sites or persons.

CEQA CRITERIA

In accordance with Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines and the Placer County CEQA Checklist, impacts related to cultural resources would be significant if the project would:

- ▲ cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines;
- ▲ cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines;

- ▲ directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature (CEQA Guidelines); or
- ▲ disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

8.4.3 Environmental Effects of the Project Alternatives

Impact 8-1: Change in the significance of historic resources

Implementation of the Area Plan would incentivize environmentally beneficial redevelopment, which could occur on properties that contain known historical resources, be associated with historically-significant events or individuals, or result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a significant historical site, structure, object, or building. Because each of the alternatives (Alternatives 1 through 4) would result in some new construction over the planning period, each has the potential to disturb, disrupt, or destroy historic resources through implementation of specific projects. However, federal, state, and TRPA regulations address protection of historic resources and provide processes to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to these resources. Therefore, implementation of the Area Plan with Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, as well as the No Project Alternative (Alternative 4) would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

With respect to the Tahoe City Lodge project site, the record search revealed no historic resources and the pedestrian survey did not identify any historic resources within the project site; therefore, there would be **no impact** to historic resources with implementation of any of the Tahoe City Lodge alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, or 4).

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis

Alternative 1: Proposed Area Plan

Placer County is the location of a variety of historic resources, including federal, state, and locally-recognized resources. The majority of known resources are located along the lake shore or centered near Tahoe City. The demolition, alteration, or disturbance of existing features, buildings, and structures could result in changes to or destruction of historic resources.

Alternative 1 would implement the proposed Area Plan as described in Chapter 3, “Proposed Project and Alternatives.” The Kings Beach Center design concept could also be implemented with Alternative 1. This alternative includes the proposed Tahoe City Town Center boundary changes, the establishment of special planning areas, implementation of the Regional Plan policies coupled with proposed Area Plan policies, and implementation of all proposed Area Plan programs and substitute standards. None of these elements include project-specific construction activities that could affect the significance of historic resources.

However, the Area Plan includes redevelopment incentives and new development and design standards for mixed-use areas. These provisions are intended to implement Regional Plan policies promoting the redevelopment of existing town centers to improve aesthetic conditions, restore sensitive lands, and enhance recreation opportunities and multi-modal transportation options. The Kings Beach Center design concept site includes 16 parcels (totaling approximately 4 acres) owned by Placer County on the mountain side of North Lake Boulevard (SR 28). The collective parcels represent an opportunity for a mixed-use environmental redevelopment design concept in the Kings Beach Town Center. Policies and programs identified in the Area Plan promote redevelopment of the built environment, multi-modal transportation options, and enhanced economic conditions in town centers and other mixed-use areas, and other existing built areas. Once specific project activities are identified, increased maximum density allowances in the urban area could lead to the demolition of historic or potentially historic buildings and structures and/or damage to subsurface historic-period resources. Additionally, infrastructure or other public works improvements could result in damage to or demolition of other historic resources. However, as detailed in

the regulatory setting there are a number of federal, state, and TRPA regulations in place to protect or mitigate the impact to historic resources in the county.

The TRPA Code standards provide protection for these resources and/or the appropriate mitigation of project causing an adverse impact. In the Grading Standards Section (33.3), it is required that cessation of grading and consultation with government agencies occur whenever historical, pre-historical, or paleontological materials appearing to be 50 years or older are discovered during grading activity (TRPA Code Section 33.3.7). The Historic Resource Protection chapter (67) includes standards which require evaluation by a qualified archaeologist of any potential archaeological, cultural, or historic resources discovered during project construction (TRPA Code Section 67.3.1). TRPA also requires that projects in areas with known or newly discovered sites of cultural or historic significance include a site survey (performed by a qualified archaeologist or architectural historian) prior to TRPA approval (TRPA Code Section 67.3.2). This standard also requires consultation with the Washoe Tribe on all site surveys in order to determine if tribally significant sites are present. If an adverse impact can not be avoided or is approval per TRPA Code of Ordinances, then a resource protection plan is required. Such a plan shall be prepared by a qualified professional and may provide for surface or subsurface recovery of data and artifacts and recordation of structural and other data (TRPA Code Section 67.3.3). Additionally, grading, operation of equipment, or other soil disturbance is prohibited in areas where a designated historic resource is present, or could be damaged, except in accordance with a TRPA-approved resource protection plan (TRPA Code Section 67.3.4). Finally, upon discovery of a previously unknown site, object, district, structure or other resource, potentially meeting criteria as a historic resource (as outlined in TRPA Code Section 67.6) TRPA shall consult with the applicable state historic preservation officer (SHPO), and with the Washoe Tribe if it is a Washoe site.

At the federal level, Section 106 of the NHPA guides cultural resources investigations by federal agencies and requires considerations of effects on properties that are listed in, or may be eligible for listing in, the NRHP. The U.S. Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit adheres to the NHPA in managing the public land under its jurisdiction (approximately 75 percent of the land within the Tahoe Region). The LTBMU consults with the Washoe Tribe, TRPA, and the California Office of Historic Preservation. Additionally, the LTBMU Forest Plan provides guidelines for historic and archaeological resource protection.

At the state level, California has processes in place to protect and avoid impacts to historical resources. CEQA requires public agencies to consider the effects of their actions on both “historical resources” and “unique archaeological resources.” The CRHR identifies historic resources and indicates which properties are to be protected. On state-owned lands, historic and archaeological resources are subject to the requirements of PRC Section 5024.5, which requires notification of the California SHPO during the planning process. If the SHPO determines that a proposed action would have an adverse effect on a listed historical resource, State Parks and the California SHPO must adopt prudent and feasible measures that will eliminate or mitigate the adverse effects.

Impacts to known and unknown historic resources would be avoided and minimized through these federal and state regulations and TRPA Code provisions. Because projects associated with build-out of the Area Plan with Alternative 1 would be required to comply with these federal and state regulations and TRPA Code, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 2: Area Plan with No Substitute Standards

Alternative 2 includes the components described above under Alternative 1, except that it would not include a change to the Tahoe City Town Center boundary, new special planning areas, or the provision to allow conversion of commercial floor area (CFA) to tourist accommodation units (TAUs). Similar to Alternative 1, none of the elements associated with the Area Plan with Alternative 2 include project-specific ground-disturbing activities that could affect the significance of historical resources. However, construction of any new project implemented under the Area Plan with Alternative 2 could include demolition or alteration of historical resources. As described above for Alternative 1, impacts to known and unknown historic resources would be avoided or mitigated through federal and state regulations and TRPA Code standards. Because projects associated with build-out of the Area Plan with Alternative 2 would be required to comply with these federal and state regulations and TRPA Code, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 3: Reduced Intensity Area Plan

Alternative 3 includes the components described above under Alternative 1, except that the Area Plan would include lower height limits in town centers and the maximum number of stories in town centers would be lower. Similar to Alternative 1, because this portion of the proposed project is a program and policy-level document, none of these elements include project-specific ground-disturbing activities that could affect the significance of historical resources. However, construction of any new project implemented under the Area Plan with Alternative 3 could include demolition or alteration of historic resources. As described above for Alternative 1, impacts to known and unknown historical resources would be avoided and minimized through federal and state regulations and TRPA Code standards. Because projects associated with build-out of the Area Plan with Alternative 3 would be required to comply with these federal and state regulations and TRPA Code, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 4: No Project

Because the Area Plan would not be implemented and there would be no change in the existing regulatory framework (i.e., federal and state regulations and TRPA Code standards) that avoid and minimize impacts to known and unknown historic resources, there would be **no impact** to historical resources with Alternative 4.

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis**Alternative 1: Proposed Lodge**

Eight buildings on or in the vicinity of the Tahoe City Lodge project site were identified as being 50 years old or older and were therefore surveyed. Six of those buildings had been previously determined as not eligible for the NRHP or CRHR. The remaining two buildings were evaluated by a qualified architectural historian in the *Tahoe City Lodge Project Historic Resources Survey and Evaluation Report* (Appendix F of this document) and determined to be not eligible for designation under NRHP or CRHR criteria. These properties were also evaluated in accordance with Chapter 67 of the TRPA Code and determined not to retain historic significance as defined therein.

The record search revealed no historic resources within the Tahoe City Lodge project site and the pedestrian survey did not identify any historic resources. Therefore, project construction and operation of Alternative 1 would have **no impact** on historic architectural resources/structures.

Alternative 2: Reduced Scale Lodge

The lodge project site with Alternative 2 is within the limits of, but smaller than, Alternative 1. Alternative 2 does not include golf course SEZ restoration proposed as part of Alternative 1. Therefore, the record search and pedestrian survey conducted for Alternative 1 also applies to Alternative 2. The record search revealed no historical resources within the Tahoe City Lodge project site and the pedestrian survey did not identify any historical resources. Therefore, project construction and operation of Alternative 2 would have **no impact** on historical architectural resources/structures.

Alternative 3: Reduced Height Lodge

The lodge project site with Alternative 3 is the same as Alternative 1. Therefore, the record search and pedestrian survey conducted for Alternative 1 also applies to Alternative 3. The record search revealed no historical resources within the Tahoe City Lodge project site and the pedestrian survey did not identify any historical resources. Therefore, project construction and operation of Alternative 3 would have **no impact** on historical architectural resources/structures.

Alternative 4: No Project

Alternative 4 does not include redevelopment of the Tahoe City Lodge project site, but reflects a condition in which the project applicant could renovate the existing commercial center to increase occupancy relative to existing conditions. Because there are no historic resources within the Tahoe City Lodge project site, there would be **no impact** to historical resources.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Impact 8-2: Disturbance to archaeological resources

Implementation of the Area Plan would incentivize environmentally beneficial redevelopment, which could occur on properties that contain known or unknown archaeological resources or result in adverse physical effects to significant archaeological sites or features. Because each of the alternatives (Alternatives 1 through 4) would result in some new construction over the planning period, each has the potential to disturb, disrupt, or destroy archaeological resources through implementation of specific projects that involve ground-disturbing activities. However, federal and state regulations and TRPA Code address protection of and mitigation of adverse effects to archaeological resources and provide processes to avoid or minimize impacts to these resources. Therefore, implementation of the Area Plan with Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 as well as the No Project Alternative (Alternative 4) would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

Construction and excavation activities associated with the Tahoe City Lodge could result in sediment disturbance and removal, which can adversely affect previously undiscovered or unrecorded archaeological resources. Because the construction of the Tahoe City Lodge would require excavation and other ground-disturbing activities, this impact would be **potentially significant** for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Because Alternative 4 would not result in ground-disturbing activities that could damage or destroy archaeological resources, there would be **no impact** under Alternative 4.

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis

Alternative 1: Proposed Area Plan

Alternative 1 would implement the Area Plan and the Kings Beach Center design concept as described in Chapter 3, “Proposed Project and Alternatives.” This would include the proposed Tahoe City Town Center boundary changes, the establishment of special planning areas, implementation of the Regional Plan policies specific to new area plans, and implementation of all Area Plan programs and substitute standards. None of these elements include project-specific construction activities that could affect known archaeological resources.

Construction of any new project associated with Alternative 1 could result in disturbance, disruption, or destruction of previously undiscovered or unrecorded archaeological sites and materials, if resources are present within future project sites. If such resources were to represent “unique archaeological resources” as defined by CEQA in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and PRC Section 21083.2(g), any substantial change to or destruction of these resources would be a significant impact. However, as described in Impact 8-1 for Alternative 1, federal and state regulations and TRPA Code are in place to address protection of these resources. Impacts to known and unknown archaeological resources would be avoided and minimized through these federal and state regulations and TRPA Code. Because projects associated with build-out of the Area Plan with Alternative 1 would be required to comply with these federal and state regulations and TRPA Code, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 2: Area Plan with No Substitute Standards

Alternative 2 includes the components described above under Alternative 1, except that it would not include a change to the Tahoe City Town Center boundary, new special planning areas, or the provision to allow conversion of CFA to TAUs. As with Alternative 1, construction of any new project associated with Alternative 2 could result in disturbance, disruption, or destruction of previously undiscovered or unrecorded archaeological sites and materials, if resources are present within future project sites. However, as described above for Alternative 1, impacts to known and unknown archaeological resources would be avoided and minimized through federal and state regulations and TRPA Code standards. Because projects associated with build-out of the Area Plan with Alternative 2 would be required to comply with these federal and state regulations and TRPA Code, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 3: Reduced Intensity Area Plan

Alternative 3 includes the components described above under Alternative 1, except that the Area Plan would include lower height limits in town centers and the maximum number of stories in town centers would be lower. Alternative 3 also includes more stringent density standards and coverage limits relative to Alternative 1. As with Alternative 1, construction of any new project associated with Alternative 3 could result in disturbance, disruption, or destruction of previously undiscovered or unrecorded archaeological sites and materials, if resources are present within future project sites. However, as described above for Alternative 1, impacts to known and unknown archaeological resources would be avoided and minimized through federal and state regulations and TRPA Code standards. Because projects associated with build-out of the Area Plan with Alternative 3 would be required to comply with these federal and state regulations and TRPA Code, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 4: No Project

Because the Area Plan would not be implemented and there would be no change in the existing regulatory framework (i.e., federal and state regulations and TRPA Code standards) that avoids and minimizes impacts to known and unknown archaeological resources, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis**Alternative 1: Proposed Lodge**

Alternative 1 would redevelop the Tahoe City Lodge project site with 118 tourist units and accessory amenities, and would reconstruct the clubhouse building, provide shared-use parking, and implement SEZ restoration on the golf course site. The records search for the Tahoe City Lodge project site did not identify any archaeological resources within or adjacent to the site. In addition, the pedestrian survey did not identify any previously unrecorded archaeological resources. The cultural resources reports (archaeological inventory report and historic resources evaluation report) prepared to support this EIR/EIS determined that the sensitivity of the lodge site for buried prehistoric archaeological deposits is also low, given the extensive ground disturbance associated with urbanization that has taken place (Lindström 2015; Placer County and TRPA 2016). However, project construction or related ground disturbing activities could encounter previously undiscovered or unrecorded archaeological sites. These activities could damage or destroy these archaeological resources. Because all of the elements in Alternative 1 would involve some level of ground-disturbing activities, archaeological resources could be damaged or destroyed and this impact would be **potentially significant**.

Alternative 2: Reduced Scale Lodge

With Alternative 2, the Tahoe City Lodge would include 56 tourist units and accessory amenities and shared-use parking on the golf course, but it would not include reconstruction of the clubhouse building or SEZ restoration on the golf course that is part of Alternative 1. Construction activities associated with Alternative 2 would effect a smaller footprint than Alternative 1, but would include the same types and magnitude of physical activities and ground disturbance. Therefore, because all of the elements in Alternative 2 would involve some level of ground-disturbing activities, archaeological resources could be damaged or destroyed and this impact would be **potentially significant**.

Alternative 3: Reduced Height Lodge

Alternative 3 would include the same number of tourist units and other elements proposed as part of Alternative 1; however, the lodge would be limited to three stories and would have a larger footprint within the same project site limits. Construction activities would occur at the same locations as under Alternative 1; therefore, the same types and magnitude of physical activities and ground disturbance would occur with Alternative 3. This impact would be **potentially significant**.

Alternative 4: No Project

Alternative 4 does not include redevelopment of the Tahoe City Lodge project site, but reflects a condition in which the project applicant could renovate the existing commercial center to increase occupancy relative to existing conditions. Any renovations associated with Alternative 4 would be limited to interior and façade

improvements and would not involve ground-disturbing activities that could damage or destroy archaeological resources. Therefore, Alternative 4 would have **no impact** on archaeological resources.

Mitigation 8-2: Stop work in the event of an archaeological discovery

This mitigation measure would apply to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.

If potentially significant cultural resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, the project applicant will require the construction contractor to stop work in that area until a qualified archaeologist can access the significance of the find, and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with TRPA and other appropriate agencies and interested parties. A qualified archaeologist will follow accepted professional standards in recording any find including submittal of the standard Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Primary Record forms (Form DPR 523) and location information to the California Historical Resources Information Center office (North Central Information Center). The consulting archaeologist will also evaluate such resources for significance per California Register of Historical Resources eligibility criteria (PRC Section 5024.1; Title 14 CCR Section 4852).

If the archaeologist determines that the find does not meet the TRPA standards of significance for cultural resources, construction may proceed. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, the lead agency will be notified and a resource preservation and data recovery plan will be prepared to ensure the resource is avoided, moved, recorded, or otherwise treated as deemed appropriate by applicable federal, state, and/or local agency and in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. The plan will be prepared by a qualified archaeologist and include: (a) results of research relevant to the project; (b) research problems or questions to be addressed with an explanation of their relevance and importance; (c) the field and laboratory analysis methods to be used with a justification of their cost-effectiveness and how they apply to this particular property and these research needs; (d) the methods to be used in artifact, data, and other records management; (e) explicit provisions for disseminating the research findings to professional peers in a timely manner; (f) arrangements for presenting what has been found and learned to the public, focusing particularly on the community or communities that may have interests in the results; (g) the curation of recovered materials and records resulting from the data recovery; and (h) procedures for evaluating and treating discoveries of unexpected remains or newly identified historic properties during the course of the project, including necessary consultation with other parties (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation [ACHP] 1999).

Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-2 would reduce potentially significant impacts to archaeological resources related to the Tahoe City Lodge alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, and 3), because mitigation would be developed in coordination with the appropriate federal, state, and/or local agency(ies) to avoid, move, record, or otherwise treat the resource appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. By providing an opportunity to avoid disturbance, disruption, or destruction of archaeological resources, this impact would be reduced to a **less-than-significant** level for all the action alternatives.

Impact 8-3: Accidental discovery of human remains

Implementation of the Area Plan would incentivize environmentally beneficial redevelopment, which could occur on properties that contain human remains. Because each of the alternatives (Alternatives 1 through 4) would result in some new construction over the planning period, each has the potential to disturb, disrupt, or destroy human remains through implementation of specific projects. However, federal and state regulations and TRPA Code address protection of human remains and provide processes to avoid or minimize impacts to human remains. Therefore, implementation of the Area Plan with Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, as well as the No Project Alternative (Alternative 4) would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

Construction and excavation activities associated with construction of the Tahoe City Lodge could result in sediment disturbance and removal, which can unearth human remains if they are present. Because the construction of the Tahoe City Lodge would require excavation and other ground-disturbing activities, this

impact would be **potentially significant** for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Because Alternative 4 would not result in ground-disturbing activities that could damage or destroy human remains, there would be **no impact** under Alternative 4.

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis

Alternative 1: Proposed Area Plan

Alternative 1 would implement the Area Plan and the Kings Beach Center design concept as described in Chapter 3, “Proposed Project and Alternatives.” This would include the proposed Tahoe City Town Center boundary changes, the establishment of special planning areas, implementation of the Regional Plan policies specific to new area plans, and implementation of all Area Plan programs and substitute standards. None of these elements include project-specific construction activities that could affect known human remains. However, as described in Impact 8-1 for Alternative 1, federal and state regulations and TRPA Code are in place to address protection of these resources. Impacts to unknown human remains would be avoided and minimized through these federal and state regulations and TRPA Code. Because projects associated with build-out of the Area Plan with Alternative 1 would be required to comply with these federal and state regulations and TRPA Code, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 2: Area Plan with No Substitute Standards

Alternative 2 includes the components described above under Alternative 1, except that it would not include a change to the Tahoe City Town Center boundary, new special planning areas, or the provision to allow conversion of CFA to TAUs. As with Alternative 1, construction of any new project associated with Alternative 2 could result in disturbance, disruption, or destruction of human remains, if present within future project sites. However, as described above for Alternative 1, impacts to human remains would be avoided and minimized through federal and state regulations and TRPA Code standards. Because projects associated with build-out of the Area Plan with Alternative 2 would be required to comply with these federal and state regulations and TRPA Code, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 3: Reduced Intensity Area Plan

Alternative 3 includes the components described above under Alternative 1, except that the Area Plan would include lower height limits in town centers and the maximum number of stories in town centers would be lower. Alternative 3 also includes more stringent density standards and coverage limits relative to Alternative 1. As with Alternative 1, construction of any new project associated with Alternative 3 could result in disturbance, disruption, or destruction of human remains, if present within future project sites. However, as described above for Alternative 1, impacts to human remains would be avoided and minimized through federal and state regulations and TRPA Code standards. Because projects associated with build-out of the Area Plan with Alternative 3 would be required to comply with these federal and state regulations and TRPA Code, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 4: No Project

Because the Area Plan would not be implemented and there would be no change in the existing regulatory framework (i.e., federal and state regulations and TRPA Code standards) that avoids and minimize impacts to human remains, this impact would be **less than significant** with Alternative 4.

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis

Alternative 1: Proposed Lodge

Alternative 1 would redevelop the Tahoe City Lodge project site with 118 tourist units and accessory amenities, and would reconstruct the clubhouse building, provide shared-use parking, and implement SEZ restoration on the golf course site. These elements would involve excavation, construction, grading, and pavement. While there is no evidence to suggest that any prehistoric or historic-era marked or un-marked human interments are present on the project site, previously unknown Native American or other graves could be present within the project site, and could be uncovered by project-related construction activities.

Because project-related preconstruction and construction ground-disturbing activities have the potential to disturb previously undiscovered or unrecorded human remains, this impact would be **potentially significant**.

Alternative 2: Reduced Scale Lodge

With Alternative 2, the Tahoe City Lodge would include 56 tourist units and accessory amenities and shared-use parking on the golf course, but it would not include reconstruction of the clubhouse building or SEZ restoration on the golf course that is part of Alternative 1. Construction activities associated with Alternative 2 would affect a smaller footprint than Alternative 1, but would include the same types and magnitude of physical activities and ground disturbance. Therefore, because all of the elements in Alternative 2 would involve some level of ground-disturbing activities, previously undiscovered or unrecorded human remains could be damaged or destroyed and this impact would be **potentially significant**.

Alternative 3: Reduced Height Lodge

Alternative 3 would include the same number of tourist units and other elements proposed as part of Alternative 1; however, the lodge would be limited to three stories and would have a larger footprint within the same project site limits. Construction activities associated with Alternative 3 would affect a larger footprint than Alternative 1, but would include the same types and magnitude of physical activities and ground disturbance. Therefore, because all of the elements in Alternative 3 would involve some level of ground-disturbing activities, previously undiscovered or unrecorded human remains could be damaged or destroyed and this impact would be **potentially significant**.

Alternative 4: No Project

Alternative 4 does not include redevelopment of the Tahoe City Lodge project site, but reflects a condition in which the project applicant could renovate the existing commercial center to increase occupancy relative to existing conditions. Any renovations associated with Alternative 4 would be limited to interior and façade improvements and would not involve ground-disturbing activities that could damage or destroy human remains. Therefore, Alternative 4 would have **no impact** on human remains.

Mitigation 8-3: Stop work if human remains are discovered.

This mitigation measure would apply to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.

In accordance with existing regulations, if any human remains are discovered or recognized in any location on the Tahoe City Lodge project site, the project applicant will require the construction contractor to cease further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:

- a) The Placer County Coroner/Sheriff has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and
- b) If the remains are of Native American origin,
 1. The descendants of the deceased Native Americans have made a recommendation to the project applicant or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, or
 2. The Native American Heritage Commission was unable to identify a descendant or the descendant failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.
 3. The site shall be flagged and avoided during construction.

Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-3 would reduce potentially significant impacts to human remains because mitigation would be developed in coordination with the appropriate federal, state, and/or local agency

(ies) to avoid, move, record, or otherwise treat the resource appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. By providing an opportunity to avoid disturbance, disruption, or destruction of human remains, the impact would be reduced to a **less-than-significant** level for all Tahoe City Lodge alternatives.

Impact 8-4: Undiscovered paleontological resources

Although any ground-disturbing activities could affect subsurface resources, the Plan area has a low likelihood to contain paleontological resources. There is no evidence identifying any sensitivity for paleontological resources in the region. Surfaces in the Tahoe Basin were created by geologic uplift and have deep granitic bedrock and shallow surface soils. Because the region is not underlain with sedimentary rock formations (which are most likely to contain fossils), it is not likely to contain major paleontological resources. For these reasons, for both the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and the Tahoe City Lodge, this impact would be **less than significant** for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3; there would be **no impact** under Alternative 4.

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis

Alternative 1: Proposed Area Plan

There is no evidence identifying any sensitivity for paleontological resources in the region. Surfaces in the Tahoe Basin were created by geologic uplift and have deep granitic bedrock and shallow surface soils. Because the region is not underlain with sedimentary rock formations (which are most likely to contain fossils), it is not likely to contain major paleontological resources. Ground-disturbing activities, such as grading and excavation, are activities that can result in the disturbance of paleontological resources in areas where they may be present.

Alternative 1 would implement the Area Plan and the Kings Beach Center design concept as described in Chapter 3, "Proposed Project and Alternatives." This would include the proposed Tahoe City Town Center boundary changes, the establishment of special planning areas, implementation of the Regional Plan policies specific to new area plans, and implementation of all Area Plan programs and substitute standards. None of these elements include project-specific construction activities that could affect subsurface resources. Because of the low likelihood of any project site within the Plan area to contain paleontological resources, this impact would be **less than significant** for Alternative 1.

Alternative 2: Area Plan with No Substitute Standards

Alternative 2 includes the components described above under Alternative 1, except that it would not include a change to the Tahoe City Town Center boundary, new special planning areas, or the provision to allow conversion of CFA to TAUs. As with Alternative 1, because of the low likelihood of any project site within the Plan area to contain paleontological resources, this impact would be **less than significant** for Alternative 2.

Alternative 3: Reduced Intensity Area Plan

Alternative 3 includes the components described above under Alternative 1, except that the Area Plan would include lower height limits in town centers and the maximum number of stories in town centers would be lower. Alternative 3 also includes more stringent density standards and coverage limits relative to Alternative 1. As with Alternative 1, because of the low likelihood of any project site within the Plan area to contain paleontological resources, this impact would be **less than significant** for Alternative 3.

Alternative 4: No Project

Because the Area Plan would not be implemented and there would be no change in the existing regulatory framework (i.e., federal and state regulations and TRPA Code standards), and because the Plan area has a low likelihood to contain paleontological resources, there would be **no impact** with Alternative 4.

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis

Alternative 1: Proposed Lodge

Alternative 1 would redevelop the Tahoe City Lodge project site with 118 tourist units and accessory amenities, and would reconstruct the clubhouse building, provide shared-use parking, and implement SEZ restoration on the golf course site. Similar to Alternative 1, under the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan discussion, although ground-disturbing activities associated with this alternative could affect subsurface resources, because the area has a low likelihood to contain paleontological resources, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 2: Reduced Scale Lodge

With Alternative 2, the Tahoe City Lodge would include 56 tourist units and accessory amenities and shared-use parking on the golf course, but it would not include reconstruction of the clubhouse building or SEZ restoration on the golf course that is part of Alternative 1. Although ground-disturbing activities associated with Alternative 2 could affect subsurface resources, because the area has a low likelihood to contain paleontological resources, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 3: Reduced Height Lodge

Alternative 3 would include the same number of tourist units and other elements proposed as part of Alternative 1; however, the lodge would be limited to three stories and would have a larger footprint within the same project site limits. Although ground-disturbing activities associated with Alternative 3 could affect subsurface resources, because the area has a low likelihood to contain paleontological resources, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 4: No Project

Because there would be no improvements under the No Project alternative, there would be no construction-related ground disturbance and therefore **no impact** to subsurface resources, including paleontological resources.

Mitigation Measure

No mitigation is required.