

## 2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 2.1 AREA PLAN OVERVIEW

Placer County is initiating an update to its land use regulations that apply in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The proposed Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan (Area Plan) would update the existing community plans, general plans, plan area statements (PASs), maps, and regulations in the Placer County portion of the Tahoe Basin developed to implement the 1987 Lake Tahoe Regional Plan adopted by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA).

The proposed Area Plan is intended to implement and achieve the environmental improvement and redevelopment goals of the 2012 Regional Plan and the TRPA/Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The Area Plan would also serve as the General Plan for the Tahoe Basin portion of Placer County (California Government Code Section 65300).

A key objective of the Regional Plan is to focus redevelopment within town centers. To achieve this goal, the 2012 Regional Plan provides incentives to encourage such redevelopment within town centers, in exchange for providing environmental benefits such as improved stormwater controls, public transit facilities, stream environment zone (SEZ) restoration, and the like. These incentives include allowing increased density and height. The Regional Plan provides that these incentives will be implemented through the adoption of Area Plans by local jurisdictions and TRPA.

In accordance with Regional Plan objectives, the proposed Area Plan emphasizes redevelopment within the Kings Beach and Tahoe City Town Centers. These town centers include sites that provide particular opportunities for “environmental redevelopment” and revitalization. Environmental redevelopment is a term used to describe redevelopment that also aims to achieve environmental threshold gain. Two sites specifically, one each within the Kings Beach and Tahoe City Town Centers, were identified as “opportunity sites” in the Area Plan, and were the subjects of additional design and planning. The Tahoe City Lodge and the Kings Beach Center design concept provide specific examples of implementation of Area Plan provisions to achieve projects that reflect the region’s planning and environmental goals. By virtue of their more detailed development, albeit to varying degrees, they allow a more thorough environmental review that provides the public and decision-makers with examples of the likely effects of Area Plan development and design standards.

#### 2.1.1 Project Location

The Area Plan addresses that portion of Placer County that is also within the jurisdiction of TRPA, encompassing an area of 46,162 acres (72.1 square miles) that includes the communities of Kings Beach/Stateline, Tahoe City, Carnelian Bay, Dollar Point, Sunnyside, Homewood, Tahoe Vista, andTahoma. The area addressed by the Area Plan is bounded by El Dorado County to the south, the state of Nevada to the east, Martis and Squaw Valleys to the north, and the Sierra Nevada to the west. The Kings Beach Center design concept is located in the heart of the Kings Beach Town Center on properties owned by Placer County, and the Tahoe City Lodge project site is located east of the intersection of SR 28 and SR 89 near the western gateway to Tahoe City. The lodge site is located within the Tahoe City Town Center at 255 and 265 North Lake Boulevard (SR 28).

## 2.2 KINGS BEACH CENTER DESIGN CONCEPT OVERVIEW

The Kings Beach Center design concept site includes 16 parcels (totaling approximately 4 acres) owned by Placer County on the mountainside of North Lake Boulevard (SR 28) in the heart of Kings Beach, between Fox and Coon Streets. The Kings Beach Center design concept parcels are currently leased to residential and commercial tenants. The collective parcels represent an opportunity for a mixed-use environmental redevelopment design concept in the Kings Beach Town Center. Redevelopment of the 16 parcels could include a mix of tourist accommodation units (TAUs), professional offices, retail uses, and public service uses.

## 2.3 TAHOE CITY LODGE OVERVIEW

The proposed Tahoe City Lodge includes a proposal to redevelop an existing commercial complex into a 118-unit lodge resort with building heights ranging from two to four stories. The main lodge building fronting SR 28 would be three stories tall with rooftop amenities. In addition to tourist units, the lodge buildings would include a ground-floor restaurant and lobby area, and a rooftop terrace with a swimming pool and bar. The project also involves improvements on the Tahoe City Golf Course that include golf course enhancements, clubhouse expansion and relocation, shared-use parking, and stream environment zone (SEZ) restoration. The project site, excluding the SEZ restoration area, is about 3.9 acres. The restoration components include restoration of 1.7 acres of impaired SEZ lands.

## 2.4 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

Four alternatives are evaluated in this joint environmental impact report (EIR)/environmental impact statement (EIS), including a no project alternative (Alternative 4). Three action alternatives (Alternatives 1 through 3) would result in the implementation of the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and the redevelopment of the Tahoe City Lodge project site. The Kings Beach Center design concept could be implemented with any of the alternatives. The four alternatives are summarized briefly below; a full description of these alternatives is included in Chapter 3, “Proposed Project and Alternatives.”

### 2.4.1 Alternative 1: Proposed Area Plan/Proposed Lodge

Alternative 1 reflects the county’s proposed Area Plan and the proposed 118-unit lodge. The proposed Area Plan incorporates substantive standards from the existing Placer County planning documents, but proposes targeted changes primarily in the Kings Beach and Tahoe City Town Centers. The proposed Area Plan includes measures that would allow the county to manage and plan development in accordance with requirements of the 2012 Regional Plan. The types of measures include: redevelopment incentives for town centers; mixed-use development in town centers and other areas designated for commercial uses; and updated design and parking standards. The Area Plan would also result in changes to the TRPA Code of Ordinances and land use and zoning map changes.

### 2.4.2 Alternative 2: Area Plan with No Substitute Standards/Reduced Scale Lodge

Alternative 2 was developed in response to scoping comments concerned with the potential environmental effects of the substitute standards included in the proposed Area Plan. Rather than creating new development standards, Alternative 2 uses existing TRPA standards, which results in a reduced scale Tahoe City Lodge. The number of TRPA Code revisions would be fewer than Alternative 1. The lodge project would be limited to 56 units with this alternative. The golf course enhancements, clubhouse expansion and relocation, and SEZ restoration on the Tahoe City Golf Course would not occur with Alternative 2.

### 2.4.3 Alternative 3: Reduced Intensity Area Plan/Reduced Height Lodge

Alternative 3 includes all the elements of Alternative 1, the proposed project, but certain aspects have been modified to respond to scoping comments related to potential effects on scenic resources, water quality, air quality, and affordable housing. As with Alternative 1, Alternative 3 would allow redevelopment of the commercial complex at the Tahoe City Lodge site. However, because the Area Plan under Alternative 3 would limit building heights to three stories in the Tahoe City Town Center, the lodge complex buildings would also be limited to three stories, but would occupy a larger footprint so as to maintain up to 118 units. Alternative 3 would include reconstruction and expansion of the clubhouse, golf course enhancements, and golf course SEZ restoration, consistent with Alternative 1.

### 2.4.4 Alternative 4: No Project

Alternative 4 is the no project alternative. This alternative would include no Area Plan and no Tahoe City Lodge. The existing six community plans, 51 PASs, and Placer County zoning regulations would remain unchanged. Under this scenario, it is expected that the Tahoe City Lodge project applicant would renovate the existing commercial center to increase occupancy relative to existing conditions.

## 2.5 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Chapters 5 through 19 of this Draft EIR/EIS describe in detail the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of Alternatives 1 through 4. Impacts are classified as: (1) no impact (actions that result in no adverse effects); (2) beneficial (effects that show an improvement or favorable change in the environment); (3) less than significant (adverse effects that are not substantial); (4) significant or potentially significant (substantial or potentially substantial adverse changes in the environment, for which mitigation measures must be identified, if feasible); and (5) significant and unavoidable (substantial or potentially substantial adverse changes in the environment that cannot be feasibly reduced with mitigation measures to a less-than-significant level).

A discussion of the environmentally superior alternative is included in Chapter 20, "Other CEQA- and TRPA-Mandated Sections." A discussion of the most appropriate alternative for adoption will be provided with the findings, which will be prepared after circulation of the Final EIR/EIS.

Table 2-1 summarizes the potential environmental impacts that would result from implementation of Alternatives 1 through 4, and mitigation measures to avoid, eliminate, minimize, or reduce significant and potentially significant environmental impacts to less-than-significant levels, where feasible. This table presents a comparison of the potential environmental impacts of the four Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives after mitigation.

## 2.6 AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Based on concerns expressed through public meetings, responses to the Notice of Preparation (NOP), and other public inquiries, the following issues of controversy and issues to be resolved were identified:

- ▲ building heights, densities, and setbacks;
- ▲ adequacy of parking;
- ▲ effect on community character;

- ▲ effect of commodity conversion (commercial floor area [CFA] to tourist accommodation units [TAUs]);
- ▲ nearshore water quality;
- ▲ cumulative traffic impacts related to vehicle miles traveled (VMT), level of service (LOS), and related air quality and noise;
- ▲ availability of affordable housing; and
- ▲ the Tahoe City Town Center boundary modification.

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<b>5. Land Use</b>			
<p><b>Impact 5-1: Development pattern and land use, including consistency with existing plans, policies, and regulations.</b> Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would implement the TRPA Regional Plan policies related to mixed-use development, and redevelopment incentives allowing for higher intensity development within town centers, but would include additional height restrictions and development conditions for projects in mapped transition areas. These redevelopment incentives would be coupled with requirements for the transfer of land coverage and development rights from areas outside of town centers, and would result in environmental gains. Although Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3 would include substitute standards, they would not adversely affect the development pattern or land uses within the Plan area. In addition, the town center boundary modification proposed by Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3 would reduce the overall size of the Tahoe City Town Center, would reduce the acreage of LCD 1b lands within the town center, and would meet the town center boundary modification requirements of the TRPA Code. Finally, Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3 proposed reclassification of the Tahoe City Golf Course for recreation land use, which would preserve open space in Tahoe City and the designation of the Tahoe City Golf Course SPA would accelerate the pace of SEZ restoration within the Plan area. For these reasons, implementation of Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact relative to development patterns, land use, and existing policies and regulations. Area Plan Alternative 4 would have no impact. Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in redevelopment in accordance with the mixed-use development goals and policies of the Regional Plan, would comply with all TRPA Code provisions, and would result in environmental gains. Therefore, the potential impacts relative to development patterns, land use, and existing policies and regulations would be less than significant. Alternative 4 would result in a continuation of existing land uses within the Plan area and would have no impact.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p> <p>Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p> <p>Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>
<p><b>Impact 5-2: Land use classification change, including expansion/intensification of non-conforming uses.</b> Implementation of Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would permit new residential uses within mixed-use areas. Alternatives 1 and 3 would permit secondary dwelling units on parcels less than 1 acre where certain</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1 &amp; 3 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1 &amp; 3 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>conditions are met. These uses were proposed in the 2012 Regional Plan Update and evaluated in the RPU EIS. There are no site specific conditions that would invalidate the findings of the RPU EIS relative to these policies. A limited number of new non-residential uses, described in further detail below, would be permitted in some areas, however these are similar to existing uses in each location and would not create land-use compatibility issues. In addition, the existing requirements for site-specific environmental review, combined with TRPA and Placer County resource protection policies would require that all proposals are consistent with the Regional Plan and the potentially significant environmental impacts are identified, assessed, and mitigated. Therefore, although Area Plan Alternative 1 would result in modifications to land use classifications, zoning, and permissible uses, the new uses are consistent with the types of uses envisioned in the Regional Plan and analyzed in the RPU EIS and are consistent with typical uses in similar areas throughout the Tahoe region. For these reasons, the potential effects of Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would be less than significant. Area Plan Alternative 4 would be less than significant.</p> <p>Although the Area Plan would permit new uses on the Tahoe City Lodge project site, the construction of the Lodge project under Alternatives 1 and 3 would not create new or expanded non-conforming uses relative to existing or proposed zoning. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant. No new land use would be permitted at the Tahoe City Lodge site for Lodge Alternative 2, so there would be no impact. Alternative 4 would be a continuation of existing conditions for both the Area Plan and the Lodge and would therefore have no impact.</p>	<p>Alt. 2 &amp; 4 = NI</p>		<p>Alt. 2 &amp; 4 = NI</p>
<p><b>6. Population and Housing</b></p>			
<p><b>Impact 6-1: Location, distribution, density, or growth rate of population and housing in the region.</b> The Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would change the location and distribution of population and housing in accordance with the Regional Plan, which caps development through its system of marketable rights for residential, commercial, and tourist uses. Through that system, TRPA accommodates only modest growth in population, jobs associated with commercial floor area (CFA) and tourist accommodation units (TAUs), and housing along with the promotion of environmental improvements and increases in</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = B Alt. 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = B Alt. 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>walkability and transit and bicycle usage. Thus, the Area Plan under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would not induce substantial growth, and changes in the location, distribution, and density of population and housing in the Plan area would result in environmental gains. Because the location, distribution, density, and growth rate of the human population and housing under Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would be more concentrated in town centers and mixed-use areas than it is presently, and would be consistent with the Regional Plan, this impact would be beneficial. Area Plan Alternative 4 would allow for continued growth at levels contemplated by the Regional Plan, but without an adopted Area Plan, future development under Alternative 4 would not be able to utilize development incentives that would improve walkability, increase transit and bicycle usage, and result in overall environmental gains. This impact would be less than significant under Area Plan Alternative 4.</p> <p>Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would result in a net increase in employees, and Lodge Alternative 2 would result in a net reduction in employees, at the lodge site and jobs in the Plan area relative to existing conditions. The net change in employees at the site with any of the alternatives would not be considered a substantial change to the location and distribution of employment in the Plan area. While changes in levels of employment are important considerations for any project, under CEQA, an economic or social change by itself is not to be considered a significant effect on the environment. However, if a social or economic change is related to a physical change, then the social or economic change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant. There is no evidence to suggest that the change in number of jobs as a result of Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would result in any physical, adverse environmental effects. Therefore, the effects of Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 on location and distribution of population and housing in the Plan area would be less than significant.</p>			
<p><b>Impact 6-2: Induce substantial population growth and housing demand.</b> Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would result in population growth anticipated and approved in the Regional Plan. With implementation of new programs, such as the limited conversion of CFA to TAUs and the expanded secondary dwelling units program, and continuation of the Regional Plan growth management system, Area</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>Plan Alternatives 1 and 3 would maintain a balance of jobs and housing to meet demand. Area Plan Alternatives 2 and 4 would also continue to implement the Regional Plan growth management system, but would increase in the ratio of jobs-to-occupied housing that would increase the number of commuters into the Basin. This could result in an increase in demand for housing in areas outside the Basin, such as in Truckee. Future specific housing projects would be required to undergo project-level environmental review and would be required to mitigate any physical, adverse effects on the environment. The effects on VMT associated with the increase in commuters under Alternatives 2 and 4 were considered in the traffic model and transportation analysis prepared for this EIR/EIS, and thus, the related effects on air quality and noise. The effects on VMT, traffic congestions, and air quality from commuters traveling into the Basin under Area Plan Alternatives 2 and 4 would be incremental. For these reasons, none of the Area Plan Alternatives would induce substantial population growth, directly or indirectly, that would create additional demand for housing such that an adverse physical effect on the environment would occur. Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would have less-than-significant impacts.</p> <p>Construction of Lodge Alternatives 1 through 3 would be expected to generate a temporary demand for up to 100 to 120 construction workers. Since this demand would be met by local or nearby residents, the impact of temporary project construction activities on population growth and housing demand would be less-than-significant. Operation of the Lodge site under Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would be expected to generate between 58 and 66 FTEE, which is an increase in the existing employment level at the lodge site. Alternative 2 would generate 32 FTEE which would be a reduction when compared to existing conditions. The employee demand would be met by the existing, local workforce and would not induce substantial population growth. These alternatives would not include any other project components that would accommodate population growth that could generate additional demand for housing or result in any other adverse physical effects on the environment. Because Alternative 1 would increase the employment potential of the site (the current employment potential is represented by Alternative 4), Alternative 1 would be required to comply with Placer County General Plan employee housing requirements. All other alternatives would</p>			

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>generate fewer FTEE than the projected FTEE potential of the site and would not be required to provide employee housing. For these reasons, the operation of the Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would have a less-than-significant impact on population growth and housing demand.</p>			
<p><b>7. Biological Resources</b></p>			
<p><b>Impact 7-1: Disturbance or loss of sensitive habitats.</b> Sensitive habitats in the Plan area include a variety of wetland and riparian communities such as wet meadows, riparian zones along streams, marshes, seasonal wetlands, and drainages. Most of these communities are also designated by TRPA as SEZ and/or habitats of special significance. Other sensitive habitats include late seral/old growth forest. Depending on the specific locations of projects, development under all Area Plan alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4) could result in removal or disturbance of sensitive habitats, including SEZs and potential jurisdictional wetlands.</p> <p>Any new development or redevelopment project under any Area Plan alternative would be required to comply with existing TRPA, federal, and state regulations, permitting requirements, and environmental review procedures that protect SEZs, wetlands, and other sensitive habitats. These regulations and procedures address potential construction-related impacts to SEZs and other sensitive habitats through site-specific environmental review; require development and implementation of project-specific measures to minimize or avoid impacts through the design and permitting process; and require compensatory or other mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval and permitting. Specifically, existing regulations and permitting requirements would minimize the loss of sensitive habitats during construction and provide habitat compensation for the unavoidable loss of riparian, wetland, and other sensitive habitats through CWA Section 404, TRPA, and other permitting/review processes. These existing regulations require that compensation for unavoidable project-related losses or degradation of these sensitive habitats is achieved in a manner that results in no net loss. Therefore, construction of approved development under Alternatives 1, 2, 3, or 4 would have a less-than-significant impact to SEZs and other sensitive habitats in the Plan area.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = NI</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = NI</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>No sensitive biological communities are present on the Tahoe City Lodge project site. The lodge project site is urban and characterized primarily by a paved parking lot, buildings and other developed facilities, and a small patch of disturbed Jeffrey pine. Therefore, project construction under any lodge alternative (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, or 4) would result in no impact on existing sensitive habitats. Implementation of proposed restoration under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 is expected to result in a net benefit to SEZ lands.</p>			
<p><b>Impact 7-2: Disturbance or loss of special-status plants and animals.</b> Under all Area Plan alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4), construction of future projects could affect special-status plant or animal species, depending on the specific locations, presence of suitable habitat, and the type, timing, and specific nature of the project actions. During project-level planning and evaluation, impacts on species with potential to be affected would be determined based on the species' distribution and known occurrences, the presence of suitable habitat for the species in or near the project site, and preconstruction surveys. TRPA's existing policies and Code provisions address potential impacts to special-status species through site-specific environmental review, require development and implementation of project-specific measures to minimize or avoid impacts through the design process, and require compensatory or other mitigation for any significant effects on special-status species as a condition of project approval. For any TRPA special-interest wildlife species that could be affected, compliance with the TRPA Code requires that projects or land uses within TRPA non-degradation zones would not significantly affect the habitat or cause the displacement or extirpation of the population; and TRPA would not permit a project that would degrade habitat without compensatory mitigation to avoid a significant effect. For other special-status species, project-level planning and environmental analysis would identify potentially significant effects, minimize or avoid those impacts through the design process, and require mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval. Therefore, impacts to special-status species as a result of implementing Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Area Plan would be less than significant.</p> <p>The Tahoe City Lodge project site is urban and characterized primarily by a paved parking lot, buildings and other developed facilities, and a small patch of</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = NI</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = NI</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>disturbed Jeffrey pine, and does not provide suitable habitat for special-status species. Therefore, implementation of any lodge alternative (Alternative 1, 2, 3, or 4) would result in no impact on special-status plant and animal species.</p>			
<p><b>Impact 7-3: Tree removal.</b> Under all Area Plan alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4), although the details of individual development projects cannot be known at this time, construction of development and redevelopment projects would require the removal of native trees. For specific projects under all alternatives, project-level planning, environmental analysis, and compliance with existing TRPA and County regulations and policies would identify potentially significant tree removal; minimize or avoid those impacts through the design, siting, and permitting process; and provide mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval and permitting. TRPA's Goals and Policies, Code of Ordinances, and Rules of Procedure require protection of large trees, with limited exceptions; protection of late seral/old growth ecosystems; preparation and approval of tree removal plans; compensatory tree replacement or other project-level mitigation to avoid significant impacts if appropriate and needed; and other protection measures. Therefore, approved tree removal as a result of specific projects under all Area Plan alternatives would be a less-than-significant impact. For the Tahoe City Lodge project, none of the project alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4) would result in substantial tree removal as defined under Section 61.1.8 of the TRPA Code. Thus, tree removal related to the Tahoe City Lodge Project under all of the alternatives would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>
<p><b>8. Cultural and Historic Resources</b></p>			
<p><b>Impact 8-1: Change in the significance of historic resources.</b> 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</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = NI</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = NI</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>			
<p><b>Impact 8-2: Disturbance to archaeological resources.</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p> <p>Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = PS Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p><b>Mitigation 8-2: Stop work in the event of an archaeological discovery</b> <i>This mitigation measure would apply to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i></p> <p>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).</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p> <p>Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		<p>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).</p>	
<p><b>Impact 8-3: Accidental discovery of human remains.</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS  Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = PS Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p><b>Mitigation 8-3: Stop work if human remains are discovered</b> <i>This mitigation measure would apply to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i></p> <p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Placer County Coroner/Sheriff has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and</li> <li>b) If the remains are of Native American origin,             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> <li>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.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS  Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		3. The site shall be flagged and avoided during construction.	
<p><b>Impact 8-4: Undiscovered paleontological resources.</b> 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.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>
<p><b>9. Scenic Resources</b></p>			
<p><b>Impact 9-1: Effects on scenic or visual quality.</b> Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would include policies, development standards, and other provisions that could result in changes to the location, intensity, and form of the built environment within the Plan area. The provisions of Alternatives 1 – 3, including those related to town center boundaries, building height, density and coverage, secondary residential units, and limited conversions of CFA to TAUs would not have substantial effects on the mass and location of development allowed within the Plan area. In addition, any project proposed under Alternatives 1 – 3 would be required to comply with a series of existing requirements and proposed Area Plan standards that would minimize adverse effects on the existing visual character or quality of the Plan area, the TRPA scenic threshold ratings, scenic vistas, scenic resources, or views of Lake Tahoe. However, the provision in Alternatives 1 and 3 that would allow non-contiguous project areas could allow, in some areas, additional visual mass to be placed between major travel routes and Lake Tahoe, which could block or degrade views of Lake Tahoe or views toward the shore from Lake Tahoe. Therefore, Alternatives 1 and 3 would have a potentially significant impact on scenic and visual quality, and Alternative 2 would have a less-than-significant effect. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 9-1 would reduce potentially significant impacts of Alternatives 1 and 3 to a less-than-significant level because it would prevent a non-contiguous project area from resulting in an increase in</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1 &amp; 3 = LTS / PS Alt. 2 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 9-1: Limit visible mass near Lake Tahoe within non-contiguous project areas</b> <i>This mitigation measure applies to Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3.</i> Prior to approving a project that would use a non-contiguous project area, the county and TRPA shall revise the implementing ordinance to prevent a project from increasing visible mass between SR 28 or SR 89 and Lake Tahoe beyond what would be possible without the use of a non-contiguous project area. The revision to the implementing ordinance shall prohibit a project that uses a non-contiguous project area from locating land coverage or density on the lake side of SR 28 or SR 89 that would otherwise be allowed on the mountain side of SR 28 or SR 89. This mitigation measure could be implemented by revising Section 2.09.A.3 of the Area Plan implementing ordinances to include a version of the following text:  Projects using a non-contiguous project area shall not increase the density or land coverage in any portions of the project area that are between SR 28 or SR 89 and Lake Tahoe, beyond the limits that would apply to those portions of the project area without the use of a non-contiguous project area.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>visual mass that could block or degrade views of Lake Tahoe from scenic travel routes or views of the shore from Lake Tahoe. Alternative 4 would have no impact because it would include no changes to policies or standards that could result in changes scenic or visual quality.</p> <p>Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would physically change the project site in a way that would be visually evident, that would affect the visual quality of the site and its surroundings, and thus, TRPA Travel Route ratings. Under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, the project site would be redeveloped with a lodge that would include a mix of hotel rooms and 1- and 2-bedroom suites or hotel rooms and commercial uses. Effects on scenic or visual quality from implementation of any of the alternatives would result in less-than-significant impacts, because the existing site would be renovated and aesthetically improved in accordance with the policies and standards of the Area Plan, and because redevelopment of the site would be compatible with the surrounding area and be visually beneficial by improving the appearance of the project site to a level consistent with downtown Tahoe City.</p>			
<p><b>Impact 9-2: Effects on community character.</b> Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would consolidate and update existing building and site design standards throughout the Plan area to clarify existing requirements. They would add new standards for site design, building form, and street frontage improvements to create visual interest and promote pedestrian activity within mixed-use areas. Alternatives 1- 3 would also include new design standards that would be required in mixed-use areas, including areas that are currently out of attainment with scenic standards. Though appropriate to achieve environmental gains and other objectives of the Regional Plan, the increased height of up to 56 feet and four stories allowed in core areas of town centers, would be taller than many, but not all, of the existing buildings in town centers, but would be consistent with applicable standards. In combination with proposed policies and new standards for site design, building form, and street frontage improvements, the resultant visual effects in the Plan area would not substantially detract from community character. The policies and design standards in Alternatives 1 - 3 would be consistent with applicable TRPA height and design standards, design review guidelines, and the SQIP. Because Alternatives 1 - 3 would not be inconsistent with the SQIP, TRPA Design Review Guidelines, or applicable height and design standards, this would be a less-than-</p>	<p>Area Plan                      Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS                      Alt. 4 = NI                      Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan                      Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS                      Alt. 4 = NI                      Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>significant effect under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Alternative 4 would make no changes to existing design standards or guidelines. Because all existing design standards and guidelines would remain in effect, Alternative 4 would have no impact on community character.</p> <p>Under Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, the project site would be redeveloped with a lodge that would be designed to comply with the applicable design standards and guidelines and height standards. Alternatives 1 – 3 would replace the existing development on the site with new buildings that would be an aesthetic improvement, but taller and larger than nearly all other existing buildings along SR 28 in Tahoe City. Because Alternatives 1 – 3 would result in buildings that are an aesthetic improvement, but larger than surrounding buildings, and they would comply with applicable design standards and guidelines, the impact on community character would be less than significant. Under Alternative 4, a lodge building would not be developed on the project site. Instead, the existing buildings and grounds would be renovated resulting in a slight aesthetic improvement over existing conditions, which would result in a less-than-significant impact on community character.</p>			
<p><b>Impact 9-3: Effects from light and glare.</b> Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would maintain the substantive requirements of existing exterior lighting standards, convert portions of existing discretionary lighting guidelines into required standards, and add new standards that address prohibited lighting, fixture types, glare, and light trespass. These standards would reduce the potential for future projects to result in substantial light or glare, new sources of light or glare that are more substantial than other light or glare in the area, or exterior light that is cast off-site. This would be a beneficial effect on light and glare conditions. Alternative 4 would make no changes to exterior lighting design standards or guidelines. Because all existing lighting design standards and guidelines would remain in effect, Alternative 4 would have no impact on light and glare conditions.</p> <p>New sources of light can result from exterior lighting of new development while glare results from high-shine surfaces, such as building windows (glass) and high-gloss painted surfaces. Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would include new safety and convenience lighting. The introduction of new sources of light in this</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = B Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = B Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>urban setting during nighttime hours would not substantially alter the amount of illumination that currently exists, recognizing the existing night lighting of roadways, sidewalks, parking lots, and commercial areas. Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would have a less than significant impact from light and glare because impacts would be limited by lighting standards proposed as part of Area Plan Alternatives 1 – 3, or by existing lighting standards and guidelines for Alternative 4.</p>			
<p><b>10. Transportation and Circulation</b></p>			
<p><b>Impact 10-1: Roadway level of service.</b> Under all Area Plan alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4), future development and redevelopment would occur in the Plan area that would cause the level of service (LOS) on SR 28 between the Tahoe City Wye and Grove Street to continue to operate at an unacceptable level. This impact would be significant for all alternatives. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 10-1a, 10-1b, and 10-1c would reduce LOS effects of Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 by providing a pedestrian hybrid beacon crossing at the SR 28 and Grove Street intersection, which would reduce the influence of pedestrian crossings on LOS; by establishing a County Service Area Zone of Benefit to fund expansion of transit capacity, which would reduce traffic volumes; and by having development projects pay Tahoe area traffic mitigation fees to Placer County to fund identified regional Capital Improvement Projects. While Mitigation Measures 10-1a, 10-1b, and 10-1c would reduce LOS deterioration, the roadway LOS after implementation of the mitigation measures would remain unacceptable and no additional mitigation is feasible. In recognition of the LOS conditions in the Tahoe City Town Center, Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 3 would revise the LOS standards to allow LOS F during peak periods in town centers (Area Plan Policy T-P-6). The future LOS conditions would not exceed the proposed LOS standard for Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 3. However, because the alternatives would result in LOS that exceeds existing TRPA standards and no additional mitigation is feasible, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable for all alternatives.</p> <p>Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1 and 3 would not add traffic volumes in a direction or location that would exacerbate an existing LOS deficiency or degrade an existing acceptable LOS. Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1 and 3 would still be subject to payment of traffic mitigation fees prior to issuance of any building</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = S Lodge Alt. 1 &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 2 = B Alt. 4 = S</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 10-1a: Construct pedestrian crossing improvements at the Grove Street/SR 28 intersection</b> <i>This mitigation measure applies to Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i> As described above, pedestrian crossings, particularly near the SR 28/Grove Street intersection contribute to vehicular congestion and the existing unacceptable LOS conditions at the SR 28/Grove Street intersection. To reduce traffic delays on SR 28 through the Tahoe City Town Center during peak summer periods, Placer County shall construct a pedestrian activated hybrid beacon crossing at the Grove Street and SR 28 intersection in Tahoe City. The Tahoe City Mobility Plan and the Proposed Area Plan already identify this pedestrian crossing as a needed improvement. Article 15.28.010 of the Placer County Code establishes a road network Capital Improvement Program. The payment of traffic impact fees funds the Capital Improvement Program for area roadway improvements, such as the hybrid beacon pedestrian crossing. The implementation of the hybrid beacon pedestrian crossing would consolidate pedestrian crossings, which would reduce the impacts of pedestrian crossings on LOS at the Grove Street/SR 28 intersection.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 10-1b: Establish a County Service Area Zone of Benefit to fund expansion of transit capacity</b> <i>This mitigation measure applies to Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i> The key constraint to expanding transit capacity is the availability of ongoing transit operating subsidy funding, as discussed in the recently completed System Plan Update for the Tahoe Truckee Area Regional Transit in Eastern Placer County (LSC, 2016). While the proposed Area Plan includes Policy T-P-22</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = SU Lodge Alt. 1 &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 2 = B Alt. 4 = SU</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>permits, and this would reduce the project’s impact on roadway LOS to less-than-significant. Tahoe City Lodge Alternative 2 would create a reduction in traffic volumes, resulting in a beneficial impact to roadway LOS. Under Tahoe City Lodge Alternative 4, the additional traffic would exacerbate the existing LOS deficiency in the eastbound direction on SR 28 in Tahoe City and degrade the existing acceptable LOS in the westbound direction to an unacceptable level during the peak period. Because mitigation measures cannot be required for a no-project alternative, Tahoe City Lodge Alternative 4 would have a significant and unavoidable impact on roadway LOS.</p>		<p>(“Secure adequate funding for transit services so that transit is a viable transportation alternative”), this does not identify a specific mechanism to assure expansion of transit services to address increased peak demand. To provide an ongoing source of operating funding as well as transit bus seating capacity, Placer County shall establish one or more County Service Area Zones of Benefit encompassing the developable portions of the Plan area. Ongoing annual fees would be identified to fund expansion of transit capacity as necessary to expand seating capacity to accommodate typical peak-period passenger loads. At a minimum, this would consist of four additional vehicle-hours of transit service per day throughout the winter season on each of the following three routes: North Shore (North Stateline to Tahoe City), SR 89 (Tahoe City to Squaw Valley), and SR 267 (North Stateline to Northstar), as well as the expansion of transit fleet necessary to operate this additional service. Fees would be assessed on all future land uses that generate an increased demand for transit services, including residential, lodging, commercial, civic, and recreational land uses.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 10-1c: Payment of traffic mitigation fees to Placer County</b>  <i>This mitigation measure applies to Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 and Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1 and 3.</i></p> <p>Prior to issuance of any Placer County Building Permits, projects within the Area Plan shall be subject to the payment of established Placer County traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area, pursuant to applicable county Ordinances and Resolutions. Traffic mitigation fees shall be required and shall be paid to the Placer County Department of Public Works and Facilities subject to the County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code. The fees will be calculated using the information supplied. If the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.</p>	
<p><b>Impact 10-2: Impact on local residential streets.</b> Implementation of Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 4 would not generate an increase in traffic volumes to the extent that a substantial amount of traffic would divert to Fairway Drive causing the capacity of that roadway to be exceeded. Therefore, the Placer County</p>	<p>Area Plan                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS                      Lodge                      Alt. 1, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS                      Lodge                      Alt. 1, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS =Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>guideline regarding traffic volumes on residential streets would not be exceeded under any Area Plan alternative and this impact would be less than significant.</p> <p>The Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 3, and 4, would not alter travel patterns or increase volumes to the extent that a substantial amount of traffic would divert to local residential streets. This impact would be less than significant under Lodge Alternatives 1, 3, and 4. Alternative 2 would reduce traffic volumes in the area, which would reduce the potential for traffic to divert to Fairway Drive. This would be a beneficial impact under Lodge Alternative 2.</p>	<p>Alt. 2 = B</p>		<p>Alt. 2 = B</p>
<p><b>Impact 10-3: Intersection level of service.</b> Under all Area Plan alternatives, future development and redevelopment would occur in the Plan area that would affect the LOS of intersection operations. All study intersections would operate at an acceptable LOS under build-out conditions with any of the alternatives, with the exception of the SR 28/Grove Street intersection. Implementation of any alternative would result in increased vehicular delays at this intersection, thereby exacerbating the existing LOS F condition. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 10-3a, 10-3b would lessen the effect on intersection LOS by providing a pedestrian hybrid beacon crossing at the SR 28 and Grove Street intersection, with the approval of Caltrans for work proposed within the State highway, which would reduce the influence of pedestrian crossings on LOS; by establishing a County Service Area Zone of Benefit to fund expansion of transit service, which would reduce traffic volumes; and by having development projects pay Tahoe area traffic mitigation fees to Placer County to fund identified regional Capital Improvement Projects. While Mitigation Measures 10-3a and 10-3b would lessen the effect on intersection operations, implementation of any alternative would still result in increased vehicular delays at the Grove Street/SR 28 intersection and no additional mitigation is feasible. In recognition of the LOS conditions in the Tahoe City Town Center, Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 3 would revise the LOS standards to allow LOS F during peak periods in town centers (Area Plan Policy T-P-6), and the future LOS conditions would not exceed the proposed LOS standard with Alternatives 1 through 3. However, because the alternatives would result in LOS that exceeds existing standards and no additional mitigation is feasible, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable for all Area Plan alternatives.</p> <p>Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would slightly increase the traffic</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = S Lodge Alt. 1, 3, &amp; 4 = S Alt. 2 = B</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 10-3a: Construct and maintain a pedestrian activated hybrid beacon crossing at the Grove Street/SR 28 intersection pursuant to Mitigation Measure 10-1a, create a transit service expansion funding source pursuant to Mitigation Measure 10-1b, and require payment of traffic mitigation fees to Placer County pursuant to Mitigation Measure 10-1c</b></p> <p><i>This mitigation measure applies to Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3; and Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1 and 3.</i></p> <p>This impact would be minimized through the implementation of Mitigation Measures 10-1a, 10-1b, and 10-1c described under Impact 10-1, above. These same mitigation measures would be required to address this impact. In the case of Mitigation Measure 10-1b, the lodge project applicant shall be responsible for annual transit fees beginning with the first year of operation. If the county service area funding program is not implemented prior to the opening of the lodge, the lodge project shall pay all annual fees accrued retroactive to the opening date once the program comes into effect.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 10-3b: Obtain a Caltrans Encroachment Permit for Work within the State Highway</b></p> <p><i>This mitigation measure applies to Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3; and Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1 and 3.</i></p> <p>Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant for any development project proposing work within the State Highway right-of-way shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans. A copy of said Permit shall be provided to the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Division prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans. Right-of-way dedication to the State, as required, shall</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = SU Lodge Alt. 1, 3, &amp; 4 = SU Alt. 2 = B</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>volumes through the SR 28/Grove Street intersection during the peak hour. Although the increase would be minimal, the resulting increase in traffic delays would exacerbate the existing LOS F condition at this intersection. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 10-3a and 10-3b would require that the lodge project applicant be responsible for annual transit fees beginning with the first year of operation, which would provide new funding for increased transit operations partially offsetting this impact. After implementation of Mitigation Measures 10-3a and 10-3b some additional vehicle trips would still likely exacerbate the existing LOS F condition. Because no additional mitigation measures are feasible, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable for Lodge Alternatives 1, 3, and 4. Lodge Alternative 2 would reduce traffic volumes at the SR 28/Grove Street intersection by approximately 1.3 percent. This reduction in traffic volumes would create a beneficial impact to intersection LOS for Lodge Alternative 2.</p>		<p>be provided to accommodate the existing and future highway improvements. Caltrans will not issue an Encroachment Permit for work within their right-of-way for improvements (other than signals, road widening, striping and signing) without first entering into a Landscape Maintenance Agreement with the county. This agreement allows for private installation and maintenance of concrete curb/gutters, sidewalks, trails, landscaping and irrigation within Caltrans' right-of-way. A similar agreement between the county and the applicant is required prior to the county entering into the agreement with Caltrans. If applicable, both of these maintenance agreements shall be executed prior to approval of the Improvement Plans.</p>	
<p><b>Impact 10-4: Vehicle miles traveled.</b> Each Area Plan alternative would include variations in policies and standards that would affect the location and characteristics of future land uses, which would affect travel patterns and vehicle miles travelled (VMT). Alternatives 1 and 3 would maintain summer daily VMT levels below the adopted TRPA VMT threshold, and would reduce those VMT levels below existing levels. This would be a beneficial impact for Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3. Area Plan Alternatives 2 and 4 would result in an increase in VMT over existing levels, but would maintain VMT levels below the adopted TRPA threshold standard. This would be a less-than-significant impact for Area Plan Alternatives 2 and 4.</p> <p>Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1 and 3 would result in limited increases in VMT over VMT generated by existing uses at the site. Alternative 4 would result in greater increases in VMT than Alternatives 1 or 3, but under each of these alternatives, the lodge would not contribute to an exceedance of VMT standards and the impact would be less than significant for lodge Alternatives 1, 3, and 4. The Reduced Scale Lodge in Alternative 2 would result in a net reduction in VMT below existing conditions, which would be a beneficial impact.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1 &amp; 3= B Alt. 2 &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Alt. 2 = B</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1 &amp; 3 = B Alt. 2 &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Alt. 2 = B</p>
<p><b>Impact 10-5: Transit service and operations.</b> All Area Plan alternatives are expected to result in increased transit ridership during the peak-hour period. As some TART transit runs between Squaw Valley - Tahoe City, Tahoe City - North</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = PS Lodge</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 10-5: Create a transit service expansion funding source pursuant to Mitigation Measure 10-1b</b> <i>This mitigation measure applies to Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i></p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3= LTS Alt. 4 = SU</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>Stalene and Northstar – North Stalene in winter currently exceed the seating capacity, this increase in transit ridership would result in a potentially significant impact for all alternatives. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 10-5 would establish a funding mechanism that would facilitate increased transit service during peak periods. This increased transit service would accommodate typical peak-period transit loads that would occur with Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, which would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level for those alternatives. Because mitigation cannot be required for a no-project alternative, Area Plan Alternative 4 would remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>All Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would increase the key PM peak-hour transit ridership. Some of these trips could occur on a route and run already operating with passenger loads exceeding seating capacity during the winter. However, mitigation fees required by the TRPA Code would provide a funding source for transit improvements, which would offset the increase in ridership during peak periods. This impact would be less than significant for all lodge alternatives.</p>	<p>Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>This impact would be minimized through the implementation of Mitigation Measure 10-1b described under Impact 10-1, above. This same mitigation measure would be required to address this impact.</p>	<p>Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>
<p><b>Impact 10-6: Bicycle and pedestrian impacts.</b> Adequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities are expected to be provided under all Area Plan alternatives, as well as for the Tahoe City Lodge project alternatives. Under Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2 and 3, new policies would be adopted that promote improvements to bicycle/pedestrian conditions and specific improvements would be identified. This would result in a beneficial impact under Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Area Plan Alternative 4 is not expected to increase traffic hazards to bicyclists and pedestrians, or substantially impact existing bicycle/pedestrian facilities. Under Alternative 4, no new transportation policies would be adopted, and no additional specific bicycle and pedestrian improvements would be identified in the applicable community plans and plan area statements. Bicycle and pedestrian improvements would continue to occur as they currently do, and Alternative 4 would have no impact.</p> <p>None of the lodge alternatives would substantially increase traffic hazards to bicyclists and pedestrians, or substantially impact existing bicycle/pedestrian facilities. Bicycle and pedestrian amenities would be provided in the project area for all alternatives, which would be a less-than-significant impact for all lodge</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = B Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = B Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
alternatives.			
<b>Impact 10-7: Potential to increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.</b> None of the Area Plan or lodge alternatives would substantially increase traffic hazards to motorists, bicyclists, or pedestrians; or substantially impact existing bicycle/pedestrian facilities. As such, this would be a less-than-significant impact under all alternatives.	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS
<b>Impact 10-8: Parking conditions.</b> Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would include new parking provisions that would result in more efficient use of parking areas. These alternatives would result in lower total parking supply in town centers, while still providing adequate parking. Alternative 4 would make no changes to parking standards and future projects would continue to provide parking consistent with existing requirements. As a result, all Area Plan alternatives would result in a less-than-significant impact.  Under Lodge Alternatives 1, 3, and 4, the parking supply would meet or exceed the parking demand, and the parking impacts would be less-than-significant. Under Lodge Alternative 2, on-site parking would not be sufficient to meet peak parking demand, which would be a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 10-6 would expand on-site parking by three spaces to provide adequate capacity to meet peak parking demand. After implementation of Mitigation Measure 10-6, Lodge Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact.	Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 3, & 4 = LTS Alt. 2 = S	<b>Mitigation Measure 10-6: Expand on-site parking.</b> <i>This mitigation measure applies to Lodge Alternative 2.</i>  During the final design of the reduced-scale Lodge, revise the parking configuration and design to expand the onsite parking from 82 to 85 spaces.	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS
<b>11. Air Quality</b>			
<b>Impact 11-1: Consistency with Air Quality Plan and transportation conformity requirements.</b> None of the proposed project alternatives would conflict with or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality-related plans. All of the alternatives would meet federal air quality conformity requirements. Thus, the proposed project would not result in more severe impacts than already analyzed in the RPU EIS and this impact would be less than significant for all Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives.	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS
<b>Impact 11-2: Short-term construction emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.</b>	Area Plan	<b>Mitigation Measure 11-2a: Reduce short-term construction-generated</b>	Area Plan

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>Implementation of the proposed Area Plan and subsequent projects, including the Kings Beach Center design concept and Tahoe City Lodge, would involve construction that would result in the temporary generation of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions from site preparation (e.g., excavation, grading, and clearing); diesel-powered off-road equipment, trucks hauling materials to and from the site, worker commute exhaust emissions, the application of architectural coatings, and paving. The anticipated short-term construction emissions of individual development projects under Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 4 is not anticipated to result in more severe impacts than those identified in the RPU EIS. Emissions associated with the construction emissions of future individual development projects would have the potential to exceed PCAPCD-recommended significance criteria, thereby potentially violating or contributing substantially to the nonattainment status of the LTAB with respect to the CAAQS for ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>. Thus, the short-term construction emissions in the region would be a significant impact for Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 4.</p> <p>Like other individual projects, construction activity associated with Lodge Alternatives 1 through 4 would result in the temporary generation of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions. Construction activity for Lodge Alternatives 1 and 3 would generate emissions of ROG that exceed the PCAPCD-recommended significance criterion of 82 lb/day, thereby potentially violating or contributing substantially to the nonattainment status of the LTAB with respect to the CAAQS for ozone. Thus, the short-term construction emissions of ROG would be significant at the project level for Lodge Alternatives 1 and 3. Construction associated with Lodge Alternatives 2 and 4 would not generate ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions that exceed PCAPCD-recommended significance criteria and, therefore, would not violate or contribute to the nonattainment status of the LTAB with respect to the CAAQS for ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>. Thus, short-term construction emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> would be less than significant for Lodge Alternatives 2 and 4.</p>	<p>Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = S Lodge Alt. 1 &amp; 3 = S Alt. 2 &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p><b>emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub></b> <i>Mitigation Measure 11-2a is required for Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i></p> <p>Proponents of individual land use development projects in the Plan area subject to TRPA and/or CEQA environmental review shall be required to demonstrate that construction-related emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> for each project would be less than PCAPCD's significance standards of 82 lb/day. Every project applicant shall require its prime construction contractor to implement the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Submit to PCAPCD a comprehensive inventory (e.g., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that would be used for 40 or more hours, in aggregate, during a construction season. If any new equipment is added after submission of the inventory, the prime contractor shall contact PCAPCD before the new equipment is used. At least three business days before the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide PCAPCD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, name, and phone number of the property owner, project manager, and onsite foreman;</li> <li>▲ Before approval of Grading or Improvement Plans, whichever occurs first, the prime contractor shall submit for PCAPCD approval, a written calculation demonstrating that the heavy-duty (&gt; 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent reduction in NO<sub>x</sub> emissions as compared to ARB statewide fleet average emissions. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late-model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. The calculation shall be provided using PCAPCD's Construction Mitigation Calculator;</li> <li>▲ Use existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel (e.g., gasoline, biodiesel, natural gas) generators during construction rather than temporary diesel power generators to the extent feasible;</li> <li>▲ During construction, minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes</li> </ul>	<p>Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = SU Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		<p>for all diesel powered equipment; and/or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Post signs in the designated queuing areas of the construction site to remind off-road equipment operators that idling is limited to a maximum of 5 minutes.</li> </ul> <p>Every project applicant shall require additional measures, as necessary, to ensure that construction-related emissions would not exceed PCAPCD's significance standards for of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> of 82 lb/day. These additional measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Use of Tier 3 or better engines for construction equipment,</li> <li>▲ Use of no- or low-solids content (i.e., no- or low-VOC) architectural coatings that meet or exceed the VOC-requirements of PCAPCD Rule 218. Implementation of this measure would reduce ROG emissions from architectural coating by 90 percent, and/or</li> <li>▲ Participate in PCAPCD's offsite mitigation program, the Land Use Air Quality Mitigation Fund, by paying the equivalent amount of fees for the project's contribution of ROG or NO<sub>x</sub> that exceeds the 82 lb/day significance criteria, or the equivalent as approved by PCAPCD. The applicable fee rates of the program change over time. The actual amount to be paid shall be determined, and satisfied per current guidelines, at the time of approval of the Grading or Improvement Plans.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 11-2b: Reduce short-term construction-generated emissions of ROG</b></p> <p><i>Mitigation Measure 11-2b is required for Lodge Alternatives 1 and 3.</i></p> <p>The applicant for the Lodge project shall require its prime construction contractor to implement measures to ensure that construction-generated emissions of ROG would not exceed PCAPCD's significance standard of 82 lb/day. Measures to ensure maximum daily emissions of ROG would not exceed 82 lb/day include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Use of no- or low-solids content (i.e., no- or low-VOC) architectural coatings that meet or exceed the VOC-requirements of PCAPCD Rule 218. Implementation of this measure would reduce ROG emissions from architectural coating by 90 percent;</li> </ul>	

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS =Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Use existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel (e.g., biodiesel, natural gas) generators during construction rather than temporary diesel power generators to the extent feasible;</li> <li>▲ During construction, minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel powered equipment;</li> <li>▲ Post signs in the designated queuing areas of the construction site to remind off-road equipment operators that idling is limited to a maximum of 5 minutes;</li> <li>▲ Use of Tier 3 or better engines for construction equipment; and/or</li> <li>▲ Participate in PCAPCD's offsite mitigation program, the Land Use Air Quality Mitigation Fund, by paying the equivalent amount of fees for the project's contribution of ROG that exceeds the 82 lb/day significance criteria, or the equivalent as approved by PCAPCD. The applicable fee rates of the program change over time. The actual amount to be paid shall be determined, and satisfied per current guidelines, at the time of approval of the Grading or Improvement Plans.</li> </ul> <p>Prior to initiating construction, the applicant shall receive written approval by PCAPCD that its selected measures are sufficient for ensuring the construction-related ROG emissions would not exceed 82 lb/day.</p>	
<p><b>Impact 11-3: Long-term operational emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.</b> Implementation of the Area Plan alternatives would result in a substantial net decrease in operational emissions of in ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO between existing conditions and the planning horizon (2035). Implementation of the Area Plan alternatives would result in a net increase in emissions of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>; however, this increase would not exceed applicable PCAPCD significance criteria. These results are consistent with the evaluation of long-term operational emissions in the RPU EIS. Operational emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> associated with the Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would not exceed PCAPCD-recommended significance criteria of 82 lb/day. Therefore, operations under the Area Plan alternatives and the Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would not result in substantial air pollutant emissions, deteriorate existing ambient air quality, conflict with air quality planning efforts, or violate CAAQS or NAAQS. As a result, this</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>impact would be less than significant.</p>			
<p><b>Impact 11-4: Localized exposure to mobile-source carbon monoxide emissions.</b>                      According to the RPU EIS, all affected intersections are anticipated to operate at acceptable LOS of D or better and would result in a less-than-significant impact. However, under all of the proposed project alternatives, some affected intersections may worsen operation to unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS E or F). However, all affected intersections would operate with volumes that do not exceed 31,555 vehicles per hour, a SMAQMD screening criteria adjusted to Tahoe standards. Therefore, traffic volumes would not be heavy enough to result in a CO “hot spot.” For this reason, and based on the fact that CO emission factors would be reduced substantially over the planning period, long-term operation of proposed project Alternatives 1 through 4 would not result in congestion at intersections that would result in a violation of an air quality standard (i.e., 1-hour CAAQS of 20 ppm, 8-hour TRPA standard of 6 ppm for CO), contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Although the proposed project would result in worsening of intersection LOS, total volumes of affected intersections would be below screening criteria. Thus, this would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>
<p><b>Impact 11-5: Exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminant emissions.</b>                      Consistent with the Regional Plan, the proposed project would not site sensitive receptors near any major roadways or stationary sources of TACs, nor would the proposed project result in the siting of new stationary sources of TACs. However, implementation of projects under the Area Plan could potentially result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations during construction. This would be significant impact at the program-level with Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.                       With Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4, development and/or operation of the Lodge would not result in construction or operation emissions of TACs that would substantially affect nearby sensitive receptors. This would be a less-than-significant impact for Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.</p>	<p>Area Plan                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = S                      Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 11-5: Reduce short-term construction-generated TAC emissions</b>  <i>Mitigation Measure 11-5 is required for Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i>                      TRPA shall require proponents of every individual land use development project proposed in the Plan area to demonstrate that its construction activities would follow PCAPCD’s recommended BMPs. To ensure sensitive receptors are not exposed to substantial TAC concentrations, every project applicant shall require its prime construction contractor to implement the following measures prior to project approval:                      ▲ Work with PCAPCD staff to determine if project construction would result in release of diesel emissions in areas with potential for human exposure, even if overall emissions would be low. Factors considered by PCAPCD when determining significance of a project include the expected</p>	<p>Area Plan                      Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS                      Alt. 4 = SU                      Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		emissions from diesel equipment including operation time, location of the project, and distance to sensitive receptors. (PCAPCD 2012:2-6). ▲ Use PCAPCD's guidance to determine whether construction of an individual project would require detailed evaluation with a health risk assessment (HRA) (PCAPCD 2012: Appendix E). If an HRA is required, model emissions, determine exposures, and calculate risk associated with health impacts, per PCAPCD guidance. Coordinate with PCAPCD to determine the significance of the estimated health risks.	
<p><b>Impact 11-6: Exposure to excessive odorous emissions.</b> None of the Area Plan alternatives include goals, policies, or implementation measures that would change the nature, location, size, or operation of any odor-producing use or facility in the Plan area. No changes in land use designation or zoning are proposed that would result in placement of sensitive receptors nearer any such odor-generating facilities. Also, neither construction nor operation of projects that may be developed as a result of authorization of additional allocations for residential, commercial, or tourist uses, including any of the Lodge Alternatives, would be expected to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. This impact would be less than significant for all of the Area Plan alternatives and all of the Lodge alternatives.</p>	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS
<p><b>Impact 11-7: Atmospheric deposition of NO<sub>x</sub> and phosphorus.</b> Implementation of all of the Area Plan alternatives would not substantially affect the reduction in NO<sub>x</sub> emissions anticipated under the Regional Plan, which are mostly associated with NO<sub>x</sub> reductions from mobile-sources. The foreseeable reductions under the RPU in mobile-source NO<sub>x</sub> are attributable to increased vehicle emissions control requirements. Mobile-source emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> are also a major component of the deposition of atmospheric nitrogen into Lake Tahoe. Thus, all of the Area Plan alternatives would be consistent with performance standards for atmospheric nitrogen deposition and would promote attainment of thresholds for atmospheric deposition. This impact would be less than significant for all the Area Plan alternatives.</p>	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<b>12. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change</b>			
<p><b>Impact 12-1: Generation of GHG emissions.</b> Implementation of Alternatives 1 through 4 would result in a modest level of population growth from existing conditions in 2015, and development/redevelopment would result in construction- and operation-related GHG emissions. Construction-related emissions would primarily be associated with heavy-duty construction equipment and truck and vehicle exhaust associated with project development. Long-term operational sources of GHG emissions associated with the Area Plan and lodge would include area sources (e.g., landscaping equipment, snow removal equipment, wood-burning appliances), mobile sources (e.g., vehicle exhaust), energy consumption (e.g., electricity and natural gas), solid waste (e.g., emissions that would occur at a landfill associated with solid waste decomposition), and water consumption (e.g., electricity used to deliver and treat water to serve the region).</p> <p>Buildout of Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 4 would result in slightly more building square footage than considered in the RPU EIS, and Alternatives 2 and 3 would be the same (as shown in Table 12-5). Conversely (as explained in Section 12.4.1), vehicle activity in the Plan area would be lower under all Area Plan alternatives, as compared to that evaluated in the RPU EIS. By 2035, the combination of increased building area and decreased vehicle activity under the Area Plan would result in a net decrease in long-term operational GHG emissions from existing 2015 conditions and lower emissions than would have occurred under the RPU EIS analyses under all four alternatives. Generally, because a substantial portion of “new” development would actually be redevelopment, that is, new, more energy-efficient buildings would replace older, less efficient ones, GHG emissions per unit of development would be reduced. The level of construction-generated GHG emissions from all new development and redevelopment in accordance with the Area Plan cannot be known at the time of writing this EIR/EIS. Although construction activities in the Plan area would be subject to TRPA’s Best Construction Practices Policy that were compiled pursuant to RPU EIS mitigation measures, emissions from construction activities over the buildout period of the Area Plan could still be substantial. While an overall reduction in GHG emissions from existing conditions is anticipated, it would not, however, be sufficient to meet California’s GHG reduction goals. Thus, anticipated future GHG emissions in the</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = PS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 12-1: Implement all feasible energy, water, transportation, and vegetation measures recommended by PCAPCD</b></p> <p><i>The following mitigation measure is required for Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i></p> <p>Require, as feasible, new construction to implement energy, water, transportation, and vegetation measures recommended by PCAPCD available in Appendix F-1 of the District’s CEQA Handbook. This would apply to new construction occurring under the Area Plan, including the proposed lodge project. Also, initiate a funding program to apply these measures to existing facilities within the Plan area, as feasible (PCAPCD 2012).</p> <p>These recommended measures include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Installing Tank-less or Energy Efficiency water heaters (E5)</li> <li>▲ Installing solar water heaters (E3)</li> <li>▲ Installing energy efficient roofing (E4)</li> <li>▲ Require Energy Star-rated appliances in new construction (E9)</li> <li>▲ Pre-Plumb new construction for Solar Energy and design for load (E12)</li> <li>▲ Install low-flow water fixtures (W1)</li> <li>▲ Use reclaimed water for irrigation (W3)</li> <li>▲ Provide bus shelters and lanes and provide bike parking (T1, T2, and T3)</li> <li>▲ Plant drought tolerant plants (V2)</li> <li>▲ Prohibit gas-powered landscaping equipment (V3)</li> </ul>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = SU Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>Plan area would not result in more severe impacts than already analyzed in the RPU but the GHG impact in the region and would remain significant and unavoidable. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 12-1 would reduce GHG emissions further, but the extent of this additional reduction depends on market conditions, available technology, and general participation rates, and does not guarantee that Area Plan emissions would meet California GHG reduction goals. For the lodge, construction and operational emissions would be below PCAPCD thresholds for project-level GHG emissions. Thus, the lodge would result in a less-than-significant impact and would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change.</p>			
<p><b>Impact 12-2: Consistency with SB 375 targets.</b> Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 4 would meet and exceed TMO's ARB-issued SB 375 GHG reduction targets for 2020 and 2035. The Area Plan alternatives would also meet and exceed the percent reductions in GHG emissions per capita by 2020 and 2035, from 2005 levels, anticipated for the Tahoe Region in the Tahoe RTP/SCS. The allowed land uses under the Area Plan also include the Kings Beach Center design concept and the Tahoe City Lodge. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>
<p><b>Impact 12-3: Impacts of climate change on the project.</b> Climate change is projected to result in a variety of effects that would influence conditions in the Plan area including increased temperatures, leading to increased wildland fire risk; changes to timing and intensity of precipitation, resulting in increased stormwater runoff, flood risk, and water supply impacts; and potentially changes to snow pack conditions that could be more favorable to avalanche formation. However, there are numerous programs and policies in place to protect against and respond to wildland fire, as well as to protect new land uses and facilities from flooding and avalanche exposure. This impact would be less than significant for all of the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>
<p><b>13. Noise and Vibration</b></p>			
<p><b>Impact 13-1: Long-term traffic noise levels.</b> Traffic noise increases associated with land use development under Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would increase along some highway transportation corridors and decrease along others. For</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for Alternatives 1, 2, &amp; 3. Alternative 4: Because mitigation cannot be required of a no-action alternative, this impact would be significant and unavoidable for the purposes of TRPA and</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>those highway segments that would experience traffic noise increases, these increases would be nominal and not unlike the increases in traffic noise identified in the RPU EIS. Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would generate less noise-generating VMT than anticipated in the RPU EIS. Moreover, as stated in the RPU EIS, TRPA would only approve individual projects that can demonstrate compliance with TRPA's CNEL thresholds (TRPA 2012c:3.6-16). For these reasons, this impact would be less than significant for the purposes of TRPA and CEQA environmental review at the program level.</p> <p>Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in a decrease in traffic noise levels along all affected highway transportation corridors consistent with the corresponding reduction in daily traffic volumes. Thus, this impact would be less than significant for Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Lodge Alternative 4 would result in an increase in traffic noise levels along affected highway transportation corridors. Lodge Alternative 4 would also expose the outdoor activity areas of noise-sensitive land uses to traffic noise levels that exceed applicable Placer County standards. Because mitigation cannot be required of a no-action alternative, this impact would be significant and unavoidable for the purposes of TRPA and CEQA environmental review at the project level for Alternative 4.</p>	<p>Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = SU</p>	<p>CEQA environmental review.</p>	<p>Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = SU</p>
<p><b>Impact 13-2: Short-term project-related construction noise levels.</b> Projects proposed under the Area Plan may include development, redevelopment, commercial and tourist uses, transit and transportation, recreation, public/quasi-public facilities, and natural resources restoration. Construction activities to implement such projects would be subject to TRPA's Best Construction Practices Policy for the Minimization of Exposure to Construction-Generated Noise and Ground Vibration. As described in the RPU EIS, the implementation of these best construction practices would ensure that off-site noise-sensitive receptors are not exposed to excessive construction noise levels during noise-sensitive times of the day, thus this impact would be less than significant for all alternatives.</p> <p>Noise-generating activities performed for the construction of the Tahoe City Lodge under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would not occur outside of the hours exempted by TRPA or Placer County. All noise reduction measures required by TRPA's Best Construction Practices Policy for the Minimization of Exposure to Construction-</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>Generated Noise and Ground Vibration would also be implemented. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Alternative 4 (No Project Alternative) would not include any construction activities. Therefore, there would be no impact for Alternative 4 related to construction noise.</p>			
<p><b>Impact 13-3: Ground vibration.</b> Projects proposed under the Area Plan may include development, redevelopment, commercial and tourist uses, transit and transportation, recreation, public/quasi-public facilities, and natural resources restoration. Construction activities to implement such projects would be subject to TRPA’s Best Construction Practices Policy for the Minimization of Exposure to Construction-Generated Noise and Ground Vibration. As described in the RPU EIS, the implementation of these best construction practices would ensure that off-site ground vibration-sensitive receptors are not exposed to excessive levels of construction-generated ground vibration. For this reason, this impact would be less than significant for all the Area Plan alternatives.</p> <p>For lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, ground vibration generated by heavy equipment used during demolition and construction on the Tahoe City Lodge site could potentially expose nearby off-site those buildings to levels of ground vibration that exceed the Caltrans-recommended standard of 0.2 inch/second PPV for structural damage. In addition, ground vibration generated by heavy construction equipment could expose occupants of nearby buildings to levels of ground vibration that exceed FTA’s human response standard of 83 VdB for commercial buildings (i.e., where people do not sleep). This would be a significant impact for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 13-3 would ensure that construction-generated ground vibration would not result in damage to offsite buildings and or in a negative human response. Thus, ground vibration impacts associated with demolition and construction activities at the Tahoe City Lodge site for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. For Alternative 4 (No Project Alternative) no heavy off-road construction equipment operations would take place on the lodge site. Therefore, there would be no impact for Alternative 4 related to ground vibration.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = S Alt. 4 = LTS</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 13-3: Implement measures to avoid exposure of off-site buildings to levels of ground vibration that could result in structural damage and to minimize the level of human annoyance</b></p> <p><i>The following mitigation measure applies to Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i></p> <p>The Tahoe City Lodge project applicant shall ensure that off-site buildings will not be exposed to construction-generated ground vibration levels that exceed the Caltrans-recommended standard of 0.2 inch/second PPV for evaluating structural damage. The project applicant shall also ensure that off-site buildings will not be exposed to ground vibration levels that exceed FTA’s human response standard of 83 VdB for commercial buildings.</p> <p>The project applicant shall hire a California-registered geotechnical engineer to perform a site-specific study of the geotechnical conditions at and around the lodge site. The study shall determine the propagation rate of ground vibration in the area, taking into account local soil conditions, the age of the nearby buildings, and other factors. The study shall determine whether nearby structures and buildings could experience structural damage from the types of demolition and construction activities that would take place and the types of heavy equipment that will be used.</p> <p>The study shall identify detailed site-specific measures to lessen the potential for structural damage and to reduce the potential for negative human response from ground vibration generated by demolition and construction activities and the project applicant shall require construction contractor(s) to implement the measures identified in the study. Such measures shall include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ All heavy equipment used within a specified distance of offsite buildings shall have a reference vibration level no greater than a limit determined by the geotechnical investigation necessary to avoid structural damage and to minimize negative human responses;</li> </ul>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Equipment, debris piles, and building materials shall not be staged or stored within 34 feet of any off-site buildings;</li> <li>▲ All construction equipment on shall be operated as far away from vibration-sensitive sites as reasonably possible;</li> <li>▲ Earth moving, ground-disturbance, and truck loading activities shall be phased so as not to occur simultaneously in areas close to off-site buildings. The total vibration level produced could be substantially less when each vibration source operated close to off-site buildings is operated separately;</li> <li>▲ The project applicant shall designate a disturbance coordinator and post that person's telephone number conspicuously around the locations where pile driving would be performed. The disturbance coordinator shall receive all public complaints and be responsible for determining the cause of the complaint and implementing any feasible measures to alleviate the problem. The contact information of the disturbance coordinator shall also be provided to the owners of all properties for which a pre-inspection survey is performed; and</li> <li>▲ The project applicant shall also provide advanced notice to owners of all buildings and structures located within 43 feet of any portion of the Lodge site where demolition or construction activity would take place. This noticing shall inform property owners when and where construction equipment would be operated and the types of measures being implemented to lessen the impact at potentially affected receptors. This noticing shall also provide the contact information for the designated disturbance coordinator.</li> </ul> <p>If determined necessary by the geotechnical Engineer based on his/her assessment of the propagation rate of the local soils, this study shall also include a geotechnical inspection of all buildings and structures located within 50 feet of where demolition and construction activities would occur. The inspection shall document pre-existing conditions, including any pre-existing structural damage. The pre-inspection survey of the buildings shall be completed with the use of photographs, videotape, or visual inventory, and shall include inside and outside locations. All existing cracks in walls, floors, driveways shall be documented with sufficient detail for comparison during and</p>	

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		upon completion of Lodge construction to determine whether new actual vibration damage has occurred. The results of both surveys shall be provided to the project applicant for review and acceptance of conclusions. Should damage occur during construction, construction operations shall be halted until the problem activity can be identified. Once identified, the problem activity shall be modified to eliminate the problem and protect the adjacent buildings. Any damage to nearby buildings shall be repaired back to the pre-existing condition at the expense of the project applicant.	
<p><b>Impact 13-4: Noise and land use compatibility.</b> For Area Plan alternatives, TRPA would ensure that residential and tourist accommodation land uses with outdoor activity areas would not be developed in locations where they would be exposed to high exterior noise levels. For Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, noise generated by potential emergency-related aircraft activity at areas designated as Mixed-Use Recreation would be exempt from applicable noise standards. For Area Plan Alternative 4, none of the areas in the Plan Area would be designations for emergency aircraft use. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant for all the Area Plan alternatives at the program level.</p> <p>With lodge Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4, the outdoor activity area on the lodge site would not be exposed to highway noise levels that are not in attainment of TRPA's contour-based transportation corridor noise threshold for SR 28. Also, the outdoor activity area at the lodge would not be exposed to noise levels that exceed Placer County's 60 CNEL exterior transportation noise standard for outdoor activity areas of transient lodging and residential land uses and interior noise levels of the bedrooms would not exceed Placer County's 45 CNEL interior transportation noise standard for residential land uses and transient lodging. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant for all the lodge alternatives.</p>	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS
<p><b>Impact 13-5: Outdoor event noise related to the relocated golf course clubhouse.</b> For Area Plan alternatives, the change in land uses would not result in any new land uses that host outdoor events or an increase in the frequency of noise-generating outdoor events at existing land uses in the Plan area. Therefore, there would be no impact at the program level related to noise-generating outdoor events with Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.</p>	Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = NI Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1 & 3= S Alt. 2 & 4 = NI	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 13-5: Implement measures to ensure compliance with exceedance of Placer County Noise Ordinance Standards at nearby residential land uses</b></p> <p><i>The following mitigation measure applies to Lodge Alternatives 1 and 3.</i></p> <p>The Tahoe City Public Utility District shall prohibit outdoor events near the</p>	Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = NI Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1 & 3= LTS Alt. 2 & 4 = NI

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>At the project level, the frequency and effects of noise-generating outdoor events at the golf course clubhouse would change with Alternatives 1 and 3 such that nearby off-site residential receptors could be exposed to noise exterior levels that exceed the noise level standards for sensitive receptors established in the Placer County Noise Ordinance. This would be a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 13-5 would ensure that noise levels generated by outdoor events near the expanded, relocated golf course clubhouse would not exceed Placer County Noise Ordinance Standards at nearby residential land uses. Therefore, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. With Lodge Alternatives 2 and 4, the location of outdoor events at the golf course would not change and no change in event-related noise levels, resulting in no impact.</p>		<p>clubhouse or on the golf course between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. The Tahoe City Public Utility District shall ensure that Placer County Noise Ordinance standards of 50 dB <math>L_{eq}</math> and 65 dB <math>L_{max}</math> are not exceeded at the property line of nearby residences between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. Subwoofers shall not be used in amplified sound systems at outdoor events. Sound level measurements shall be conducted at the property line of the closest residential land use during the sound testing of the amplified sound system prior to each outdoor event. The sound level meter used for the sound level measurements should meet a minimum Type 2 compliance and be fitted with the manufacturer’s windscreen and calibrated before use.</p> <p>Noise reduction measures that can be implemented to ensure compliance with Placer County Noise Ordinance daytime noise standards of 50 dB <math>L_{eq}</math> and 65 dB <math>L_{max}</math> include but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Locate outdoor events as far as possible from nearby off-site residences along Fairway Drive. If feasible, orient outdoor events such that the new clubhouse serves as a sound barrier between the noise-generating outdoor activity and the nearest off-site residence.</li> <li>▲ Any outdoor generators used during outdoor events shall be located as far as possible from nearby off-site residences along Fairway Drive.</li> <li>▲ Adjust volume settings and orient speakers away from off-site residences.</li> <li>▲ If agreed to by nearby homeowners, install a permanent sound barrier (e.g., a wall, earthen berm, or berm-wall combination) near the property line of off-site residential land uses.</li> <li>▲ If agreed to by nearby homeowners, install a temporary sound barrier during outdoor events near the property line of the affected off-site residential land uses.</li> </ul>	

**14. Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Coverage**

<p><b>Impact 14-1: Create compaction or land coverage beyond TRPA limits.</b> Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could result in land coverage changes that are consistent with and implement the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Although there would be a small increase in coverage within Town Centers, this change would be</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge</p>	<p><b>Mitigation 14-1: Refine project site plan to reduce LCD 3 land coverage to comply with TRPA limits</b> <i>This mitigation measure applies to the Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1 and 3.</i></p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge</p>
---	---	---	---

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant      PS = Potentially significant      Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>accompanied by transfers of land coverage and retirement of coverage on sensitive lands and lands outside of Town Centers, which would result in an overall reduction in land coverage. Because Alternatives 1 through 3 would implement land coverage standards that are consistent with TRPA coverage limits, the Area Plan alternatives would have a less-than-significant impact related to the creation of compaction or land coverage as it is managed by TRPA. The Tahoe City Lodge components of Alternatives 1 through 3 would result in different amounts of overall coverage reduction and SEZ restoration, with net increases in coverage in some LCDs. Under Alternative 2, the lodge project would result in decreases in coverage in all LCDs and coverage changes would be consistent with TRPA limits, resulting in a less-than-significant impact. Lodge Alternatives 1 and 3 would result in a net increase in coverage within LCD 3, which would exceed TRPA limits. This would be a potentially significant impact. This impact would be reduced through compliance with Mitigation Measure 14-1, which would require that the lodge site plan be refined to reduce coverage in LCD 3 and comply with TRPA limits. This mitigation would reduce Alternatives 1 and 3 to a less-than-significant level. Alternative 4 is the no action alternative for the Area Plan and the lodge and would have no impact related to coverage.</p>	<p>Alt. 1 &amp; 3 = PS Alt. 2 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p>During the final design and before TRPA approval, the site plan shall be refined to reduce paved areas (such as roads, parking areas, or paved walkways) such that the total proposed land coverage within any LCD does not exceed the limits established by TRPA. This would require a net reduction of 1,122 sf and 1,179 sf of coverage in LCD 3 under Alternatives 1 and 3, respectively.</p>	<p>Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>
<p><b>Impact 14-2: Potential for substantial erosion or loss of topsoil.</b> Implementation of the Area Plan action alternatives would implement policies encouraging redevelopment within town centers. This redevelopment activity would involve ground disturbance, which could increase erosion. However, the Area Plan action alternatives would not change the existing protective TRPA and Lahontan RWQCB regulations regarding erosion control and natural resource protection. For this reason, implementation of Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would have a less-than-significant impact related to increased erosion. The Tahoe City Lodge action alternatives would result in ground disturbance which could lead to increased erosion, resulting in a potentially significant impact. This impact would be reduced through compliance with Mitigation Measure 14-2a through 14-2f, which would require that the alternatives prepare and comply with a series of construction standards that would reduce the impact of the Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 to a less-than-significant level. Alternative 4 is the no action alternative and would have no impact relative to seismic or geologic hazards.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = PS Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-2a: Prepare and implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan</b> <i>This mitigation measure applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i> Implement Mitigation Measure 15-1a. As a condition of the SWRCB Statewide Construction General Permit, the project applicant shall prepare and implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP will be prepared by a qualified SWPPP practitioner and/or a qualified SWPPP developer, will specify water quality controls consistent with Lahontan RWQCB requirements, and will ensure that runoff quality maintains beneficial uses of Lake Tahoe and the Truckee River. The site-specific SWPPP developed for each construction phase will describe the site controls, erosion and sediment controls, means of waste disposal, implementation of project specific plans required by local regulations, control of post-construction sediment and erosion control measures, and other impact reduction strategies unrelated to stormwater. The SWPPP shall be consistent with Chapter 4.5 of the TRPA BMP</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		<p>Handbook (“Temporary BMPs for Construction”).</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-2b: Prepare and submit required plan materials to Placer County</b></p> <p><i>This mitigation measure applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i></p> <p>The project applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications, and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) for review and approval. The plans shall show all physical improvements as required by the conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on and off site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. It is the project applicant’s responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or Development Review Committee (DRC) review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed before submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant’s expense and shall be submitted to the ESD in both hard copy and electronic versions in a format to be approved by the ESD before acceptance by the county of site improvements.</p> <p>Building Permits associated with this project shall not be issued until, at a minimum, the Improvement Plans are approved by ESD.</p> <p>Before the county’s final acceptance of the project’s improvements, submit to the ESD two copies of the Record Drawings in digital format (on compact disc or other acceptable media) in accordance with the latest version of the Placer County Digital Plan and Map Standards along with two blackline hardcopies (black print on bond paper) and two PDF copies. The digital format is to allow integration with Placer County’s Geographic Information System (GIS). The final approved blackline hardcopy Record Drawings will be the official document of record.</p>	

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS =Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		<p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-2c: Identify ground disturbance areas and develop revegetation plan</b></p> <p><i>This mitigation measure applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i></p> <p>The Improvement Plans shall show all proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal and all work shall conform to provisions of the Placer County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the Development Review Committee (DRC). All cut/fill slopes shall be at a maximum of 2:1 (horizontal: vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the ESD concurs with said recommendation.</p> <p>The project applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation, undertaken from April 1 to October 1, shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas shall have proper erosion control measures applied for the duration of the construction as specified in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the ESD.</p> <p>The project applicant shall submit to the ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110 percent of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work before Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. One year after the acceptance of improvements as complete, if there are no erosion or runoff issues to be corrected, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent.</p> <p>If, at any time during construction, a field review by county personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the</p>	

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		<p>plans shall be reviewed by the DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals before any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-2d: Use approved design standards for BMPs</b>  <i>This mitigation measure applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i>                      The Improvement Plans shall show that water quality treatment facilities/best management practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and for Industrial and Commercial (or other similar source as approved by the ESD, such as the Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for Developing Areas of the Sierra Foothills and Mountains prepared by the High Sierra RC&amp;D Council, October 1991).</p> <p>Construction (temporary) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: Hydroseeding (EC-4), Straw Mulch (EC-6), Velocity Dissipation Devices (EC-10), Silt Fencing (SE-1), Fiber Rolls (SE-5), Storm Drain Inlet Protection (SE-10), Wind Erosion Control (WE-1), and Stabilized Construction Entrances (TC-1). These BMPs shall comply with Chapter 4.5 of the TRPA BMP Handbook (“Temporary BMPs for Construction”).</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-2e: Comply with grading season prohibitions</b>  <i>This mitigation measure applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i>                      There shall be no grading or other disturbance of ground between October 15 of any year and May 1 of the following year, unless an extension has been granted by TRPA.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-2f: Staging areas</b>  <i>This mitigation measure applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i>                      The Improvement Plans shall identify the stock-piling and/or vehicle staging areas with locations as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.</p>	

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p><b>Impact 14-3: Exposure to seismic or geologic hazards.</b> The Area Plan is located within a seismically active area and it encompasses varied terrain which may become unstable or hazardous. Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would continue to permit development and redevelopment within the Plan area, however compliance with existing TRPA and Placer County permitting requirements, which limit development on steep slopes, require site specific environmental review, and, as appropriate, require geotechnical analysis to identify and mitigate potential geologic hazards would reduce these potential risks to a less-than-significant level. The Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would include redevelopment within an area where soils may be susceptible to seismically induced liquefaction and subsidence, and the project site could be located within the inundation area of a seismically induced seiche wave. This potentially significant impact would be reduced through compliance with Mitigation Measures 14-3a and 14-3b, which require the submission of a site specific geotechnical investigation which identifies and addresses potential geologic hazards, and the preparation of an emergency response and evacuation plan for the Tahoe City Lodge. Compliance with these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of the Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 related to seismic and geologic hazards to a less-than-significant level. Tahoe City Lodge Alternative 4 is the no action alternative and would have no impact relative to seismic or geologic hazards.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = PS Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 14-3a: Submit a geotechnical investigation for the Tahoe City Lodge Project site</b> <i>This mitigation measure applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i> As required by the Placer County Development Code, Improvement Plans submitted to Placer County for the Tahoe City Lodge shall include a final geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer for ESD review and approval. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following: A) Road, pavement, and parking area design; B) Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable); C) Grading practices; D) Erosion/winterization; E) Special problems discovered on-site, (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, etc.) F) Slope stability The report must also include the recommended and mandated measures to assure that the project complies with the California Building Code seismic design requirements. Once approved by the ESD, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the ESD and one copy to the Building Services Division for its use. It is the responsibility of the developer to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report. If the soils report indicates the presence of critically expansive or other soils problems that, if not corrected, could lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the requirements of the soils report will be required before issuance of Building Permits. <b>Mitigation Measure 14-3b: Prepare an emergency response and evacuation plan for the Tahoe City Lodge</b> <i>This mitigation measure applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i> Placer County and TRPA shall require that the project applicant prepare and</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		submit an emergency response and evacuation plan for the Tahoe City Lodge. This plan shall be submitted to Placer County, TRPA, and the appropriate municipality or fire protection district for approval. The plan shall include detailed descriptions of how emergency response and evacuation will occur in case of a large earthquake and seiche event. Emergency response and evacuation measures shall identify actions that help avoid, reduce, alleviate, and mitigate disaster damage and potential loss of life.	
<b>15. Hydrology and Water Quality</b>			
<p><b>Impact 15-1: Potential for adverse impacts to water quality resulting from construction activities.</b> None of the Area Plan Alternatives would alter existing laws and regulations that require erosion and sediment controls, implementation and maintenance of temporary construction BMPs, waste control measures, and management controls for stormwater runoff. Because regulatory protections are in place to minimize erosion and transport of sediment and other pollutants during construction, and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures would be defined to achieve Placer County and TRPA standards such that necessary permits and approvals can be secured, construction related impacts for all alternatives would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would create project specific construction-related disturbance, which would have the potential to degrade water quality. This would be a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measures 15-1a through 15-1d include Placer County standard permit conditions, which would substantially reduce the risk of construction-related stormwater quality impacts by minimizing the release of construction site contaminants (such as sediment-laden runoff and construction chemicals), and by proper management of hazardous materials onsite. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the potential for Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 to create substantial adverse effects on water quality from construction activities to a less-than-significant level. Alternative 4 is the no-action alternative and would have no impact related to construction effects on water quality.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = PS Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-1a: Prepare and Implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for each construction phase</b></p> <p><i>This mitigation measure applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i></p> <p>Each construction phase of the project shall be subject to the Lake Tahoe Construction General NPDES Permit from Lahontan RWQCB. After project approval and as a condition of the NPDES permit, the project applicant shall develop a project-specific SWPPP prepared by a qualified SWPPP practitioner and/or a qualified SWPPP developer, which specifies water quality controls consistent with Lahontan RWQCB requirements and ensures that runoff quality maintains beneficial uses of Lake Tahoe and the Truckee River. The site- and design-specific SWPPP developed for each construction phase shall describe the site controls, erosion and sediment controls, means of waste disposal, implementation of project specific plans required by local regulations, post-construction sediment and erosion control measures, and other impact reduction strategies unrelated to stormwater. BMPs identified in the SWPPPs shall be implemented during all development activities. Each SWPPP shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 4.5 of the TRPA BMP Handbook. Required elements of the SWPPPs include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Temporary BMPs to prevent the transport of earthen materials and other construction waste materials from disturbed land areas, stockpiles, and staging areas during periods of precipitation or runoff, including: filter fences, fiber rolls, erosion control blankets, mulch (such as pine needles and wood chips); and temporary drainage swales and settling basins.</li> </ul>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Designated contractor staging areas for materials and equipment storage outside of riparian areas. Designated staging and storage areas would be protected by construction fencing and/or silt barriers, as appropriate. Following project completion, all areas used for staging would be restored with native vegetation.</li> <li>▲ Temporary BMPs to prevent the tracking of earthen materials and other waste materials from the project site to offsite locations, including stabilized points of entry/exit for construction vehicles/equipment and designated vehicle/equipment rinse stations, and sweeping.</li> <li>▲ Temporary BMPs to prevent wind erosion of earthen materials and other waste materials from the project site, including routine application of water to disturbed land areas and covering of stockpiles with plastic or fabric sheeting.</li> <li>▲ A spill prevention and containment plan to minimize the potential for soil and groundwater contamination during construction. Project contractors would be responsible for proper storage of onsite materials and installation and maintenance of temporary BMPs capable of capturing and containing pollutants from fueling operations, fuel storage areas, and other areas used for the storage of hydrocarbon-based materials. This would include maintaining materials onsite for the cleanup of accidental spills (such as oil absorbent booms and sheets), maintaining drip pans beneath construction equipment, training site workers in spill response measures, immediate cleanup of spilled materials in accordance with directives from the Lahontan RWQCB, and proper disposal of waste materials at an approved offsite location that is licensed to receive such wastes.</li> <li>▲ Temporary BMPs to capture and contain pollutants generated by concrete construction including lined containment for rinsate to collect runoff from washing concrete delivery trucks and equipment.</li> <li>▲ Protective fencing to prevent damage to trees and other vegetation to remain after construction, including tree protection fencing and individual tree protection such as protective casings of wood slats around the bases of trees.</li> <li>▲ Temporary BMPs for the containment or removal of drilling spoils</li> </ul>	

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		<p>generated from construction of bridge foundations and abutments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Daily inspection and maintenance of temporary BMPs to ensure proper function. The prime contractor would be required to maintain a daily log of Temporary Construction BMP inspections and keep the log onsite during project construction, available for review by Lahontan RWQCB and Placer County.</li> <li>▲ Tree removal activities, including the dropping of trees, would be confined to the construction limit boundaries.</li> <li>▲ Construction boundary fencing to limit disturbance and prevent access to areas not under active construction.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measures 15-1b: Verification of SWPPP submittal</b>  <i>This mitigation measure applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i>                      Prior to construction commencing, provide evidence to the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) of a Water Discharger Identification number generated from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board's Stormwater Multiple Application &amp; Reports Tracking System (SMARTS). This serves as the Regional Water Quality Control Board approval or permit under the NPDES construction stormwater quality permit.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measures 15-1c: Design, install, and maintain water quality BMPs which meet industry and TRPA standards</b>  <i>This mitigation measure applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i>                      The Improvement Plans shall show that water quality treatment facilities/BMPs shall be designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development/Redevelopment, and for Industrial and Commercial (or other similar source as approved by the ESD) and with TRPA BMP Handbook Chapter 4.5.</p> <p>Storm drainage from on- and off-site impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, infiltration basins, water quality basins, filters, etc. for entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the ESD. No water quality facility construction shall be</p>	

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		<p>permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.</p> <p>All BMPs shall be maintained as required to ensure effectiveness. The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation. Vegetation species shall be selected that are appropriate to meet water restrictions in effect at the time of planting. Proof of on-going maintenance, such as contractual evidence, shall be provided to ESD upon request. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measures 15-1d: Demonstrate TRPA permit approval prior to approval of Placer County Improvement Plan</b></p> <p><i>This mitigation measure applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.</i></p> <p>Prior to Improvement Plan approval by the County, the Engineering and Surveying Division must be provided with permits and comments, if any, from TRPA indicating its approval of the Improvement Plan.</p>	
<p><b>Impact 15-2: Potential water quality impacts to surface and groundwater due to changes in land use or lodge operation.</b> Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would alter land uses and development within town centers and mixed-use areas, and each proposes new development concepts, programs, and standards. However, these alternatives would not alter the existing TRPA regulations related to discharge to surface and groundwater or water quality protection. The increased density and coverage limits within town centers were previously analyzed by the TRPA RPU EIS and were determined to have a less-than-significant effect on water quality. Finally, the PLRM modeling conducted for the proposed project indicates that Alternatives 1 and 2, which encourage the redevelopment of town centers, would result in a decrease in the pollutant load carried in stormwater runoff through TRPA BMP requirements. For these reasons, the land use changes and policies that would be implemented through Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 2 would have a beneficial impact on water quality. Alternatives 3 and 4 would also generate a slight reduction in pollutant loading and would have a less-than-significant impact on water quality. The Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in continued tourist or commercial use of the Lodge site. These</p>	<p>Area Plan                      Alt. 1 &amp; 2 = B                      Alt. 3 &amp; 4 = LTS                      Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = PS                      Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 15-2: Design, install, and maintain water quality BMPs pursuant to Mitigation Measure 15-1c</b></p> <p><i>This mitigation measure applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternative 1, 2, and 3.</i></p> <p>See Mitigation Measure 15-1c above. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	<p>Area Plan                      Alt. 1 &amp; 2 = B                      Alt. 3 &amp; 4 = LTS                      Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS                      Alt. 4 = NI</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>alternatives have the potential to generate pollutants which could be carried in stormwater runoff to surface waters, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 15-2 would require installation of approved permanent water quality BMPs, which would reduce the potential for Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 to create adverse effects on water quality from operational activities to a less-than-significant level. Lodge Alternative 4 represents a continuation of existing conditions and would have no impact.</p>			
<p><b>Impact 15-3: Potential for increase in stormwater runoff, impacts to existing drainage systems, or alteration of drainage patterns.</b> Implementation of Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 2 would result in increased impervious surfaces within town centers. However, the requirements for future projects to meet existing BMP standards and project level drainage analysis would remain in place under all alternatives. These requirements would cause a decrease in stormwater runoff volumes for all alternatives, resulting in a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would reduce the total volume of stormwater runoff generated by the project site, however the construction of the project could affect existing drainage systems and drainage patterns, creating a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure 15-3 would require the preparation of preparation of a final drainage report to meet Placer County Stormwater Management Manual requirements, which would reduce the potential for Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 to create substantial adverse effects on stormwater runoff volumes and existing drainage systems to a less-than-significant level. Tahoe City Lodge Alternative 4 is the no-action alternative and as such, would have no impact on runoff volumes or drainage patterns.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = PS Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p><b>Mitigation 15-3: Submittal of Final Drainage Report</b> <i>This mitigation measure applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternative 1, 2, and 3.</i></p> <p>As part of the improvement plan submittal process, the preliminary Drainage Report provided during environmental review shall be submitted in final format. The final Drainage Report may require more detail than that provided in the preliminary report, and will be reviewed in concert with the improvement plans to confirm conformity between the two. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the proposed improvements, all appropriate calculations, watershed maps, changes in flows and patterns, and proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used during construction, as well as long-term post-construction water quality measures. The final Drainage Report shall be prepared in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual and the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual that are in effect at the time of improvement plan submittal.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>
<p><b>Impact 15-4: Exposure to flood hazards.</b> Although the Plan area contains low-lying areas that are within the FEMA designated 100-year flood zone, project-level analysis of all future development projects within the Area Plan would ensure that any future development or redevelopment projects do not result in exposure of people or property to flood hazards. Analysis is also required for 100-year floodplain impacts of non-FEMA designated drainageways during future development project environmental review. The Placer County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance requirements would apply to projects on parcels within the</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = NI</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = NI</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>100-year flood zone or floodway. Therefore, implementation of Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would have a less-than-significant impact. Area Plan Alternative 4 is the no-action alternative. Because it would not alter the pace or location of development and would not affect flood regulation, Alternative 4 would have no impact relative to flood hazards. The Tahoe City Lodge project site is located above the 500-year and 100-year floodplain and therefore Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would have no impact relative to flood hazards.</p>			
<p><b>16. Public Services and Utilities</b></p>			
<p><b>Impact 16-1: Increased demand for water supply.</b> Water supply in the Plan area is provided by surface water from Lake Tahoe and groundwater. Implementation of any Area Plan alternatives would result in increased demand for water supply associated with buildout of the existing residential, tourist accommodation units (TAUs), and commercial floor area (CFA) commodities allocations established by the Regional Plan and assessed in the RPU EIS and RTP EIR/EIS (TRPA 2012a:3.13-11 – 3.13-14; TMPO and TRPA 2012:3.13-15 – 3.13-16). With the limited conversion of CFA to TAUs, implementation of Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3 would change the amount of types of uses that would use water, reducing the CFA water demand and increasing TAU water demand. The general amount of development that would occur under any of the Area Plan alternatives would not change from that allowed under the Regional Plan, and water supply was determined to be sufficient in the RPU EIS analysis. Future new development projects would be required to undergo project-level analysis to demonstrate sufficient supply, treatment capacity (as applicable), and conveyance capacity by the water purveyor serving a given project. Implementation of the Area Plan would result in a net increase in annual water demand over existing conditions that ranges between 554 af (180 mg) and 797 af (260 mg). Conservatively estimated water demand for each alternative at buildout is well within projections of the TCPUD and NTPUD UWMPS, and combined with existing demand, well below the volume of water supplies available to the districts. Water supply impacts would be less than significant for all Area Plan alternatives.</p> <p>Implementation of Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1 through 3 would result in a net increase in water demand over existing conditions that ranges between 6,962 gpd (2.5 mgy) and 14,700 gpd (5.4 mgy). TCPUD has sufficient water supply to</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>meet the demands of the lodge project and has indicated that it will serve the project (Gustafson, pers. comm., 2015). With implementation of Lodge Alternative 4, the improvements to the existing commercial buildings on the lodge site would result in a net increase in water demand over existing conditions by 5,016 gpd (1.8 mgy), which could be accommodated under existing conditions. This impact would be less than significant for Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1 through 3. There would be no impact under Alternative 4.</p>			
<p><b>Impact 16-2: Increased demand for wastewater collection and conveyance.</b>                      Wastewater collection in the Basin is provided by three service providers: NTPUD, TCPUD, and T-TSA. All wastewater is exported out of the Basin via the T-TSA TRI. Because of the limited conversion of CFA to TAUs, Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3 would result in a modest increase in the number of visitors in the Basin over that assessed in the RPU EIS and RTP EIR/EIS (TRPA 2012a:3.13-15 – 3.13-16; TMPO and TRPA 2012:3.13-18 – 3.13-19). NTPUD, TCPUD, and T-TSA currently has capacity in their wastewater collection systems. However, a bottleneck could lead to capacity issues in the TRI in the future. Potential development resulting from Alternatives 1 through 3 would be required to comply with TRPA Code and local policies to obtain certification from the service provider that either existing services are available or needed improvements will be made prior to occupancy. All future development projects under the Area Plan would be required to coordinate with utility providers, including NTPUD, TCPUD, and T-TSA, to undergo project-level analysis of each utility’s ability to serve the project. For these reasons, this impact would be less than significant for Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 3. Alternative 4 for the Area Plan would have no impact.</p> <p>Implementation of Alternatives 1 through 3 for the Lodge project would result in a net increase in wastewater flows over existing conditions that ranges between 6,608 gpd and 14,100 gpd. TCPUD and T-TSA have confirmed there is currently sufficient infrastructure to serve the project (Gustafson, pers. comm., 2015; Parker, pers. comm., 2016). With implementation of Alternative 4, the improvements to the existing commercial buildings on the Lodge project site would result in a net increase in wastewater flows over existing conditions by 5,016 gpd, which could occur under existing conditions. This impact would be less than significant for Alternatives 1 through 3. Alternative 4 would have no impact.</p>	<p>Area Plan                      Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS                      Alt. 4 = NI                      Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS                      Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan                      Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS                      Alt. 4 = NI                      Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS                      Alt. 4 = NI</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p><b>Impact 16-3: Increased demand for wastewater treatment.</b> Wastewater collection in the Tahoe Basin is provided by three service providers: NTPUD, TCPUD, and T-TSA. All wastewater is exported out of the basin via the T-TSA TRI. Because of the limited conversion of CFA to TAUs, Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3 would result in a modest increase in the number of visitors in the Tahoe Basin over that assessed in the RPU EIS and RTP EIR/EIS (TRPA 2012a:3.13-15 – 3.13-16; TMPO and TRPA 2012:3.13-18 – 3.13-19). NTPUD, TCPUD, and T-TSA currently has capacity in their wastewater collection systems. However, a bottleneck could lead to capacity issues in the TRI in the future. Potential development resulting from Alternatives 1 through 3 would be required to comply with TRPA Code and local policies to obtain certification from the service provider that either existing services are available or needed improvements will be made prior to occupancy. All future development projects under the Area Plan would be required to coordinate with utility providers, including NTPUD, TCPUD, and T-TSA, to undergo project-level analysis of each utility’s ability to serve the project. For these reasons, this impact would be less than significant for Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 3. Alternative 4 for the Area Plan would have no impact.</p> <p>Implementation of Alternatives 1 through 3 for the lodge project would result in a net increase in wastewater flows over existing conditions that ranges between 6,608 gpd and 14,100 gpd. TCPUD and T-TSA have confirmed there is currently sufficient infrastructure to serve the project (Gustafson, pers. comm., 2015; Parker, pers. comm., 2016). With implementation of Alternative 4, the improvements to the existing commercial buildings on the lodge project site would result in a net increase in wastewater flows over existing conditions by 5,016 gpd, which could occur under existing conditions. This impact would be less than significant for Alternatives 1 through 3. Alternative 4 would have no impact.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>
<p><b>Impact 16-4: Increased demand for solid waste.</b> Solid waste collection and disposal for the Plan area is provided by TTSD, Eastern Regional MRF, and Lockwood Regional Landfill. Because of the limited conversion of CFA to TAUs, Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3 would result in a modest increase in the number of visitors in the Tahoe Basin, and thus the amount of solid waste generated, over that assessed in the RPU EIS and RTP EIR/EIS (TRPA 2012a:3.13-18 – 3.13-19; TMPO and TRPA 2012:3.13-12, 3.13-16 - 17). Currently, the MRF and Lockwood Regional Landfill</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>have available capacity for receiving additional solid waste. Additionally, future individual projects under the Area Plan would be required to undergo project-level environmental review to identify and mitigate any potential impacts associated with an increase in demand for solid waste collection and disposal. For these reasons, this impact would be less than significant for Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 3. Alternative 4 for the Area Plan would have no impact.</p> <p>Implementation of Alternatives 1 through 3 for the lodge project would generate up to approximately 190 cubic yards (cu. yd.) of construction and demolition debris. These alternatives would also result in a net increase in solid waste generation between approximately 160 and 380 pounds per day and between approximately 200 and 480 cu. yd. per year. The Eastern Regional MRF and Lockwood Regional Landfill both have sufficient capacity to meet the additional construction and operation solid waste generated by the project. This impact would be less than significant. With implementation of Alternative 4, the improvements to the existing commercial buildings on the lodge project site would result in a net increase in solid waste generated over existing conditions by approximately 280 pounds per day and approximately 230 cu. yd. per year, which could occur under existing conditions. Alternative 4 would have no impact.</p>			
<p><b>Impact 16-5: Result in inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy.</b> In the Plan area, electricity is provided by Liberty Utilities and natural gas is provided by Southwest Gas. Because of the limited conversion of CFA to TAUs, Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3 would result in a modest increase in the number of visitors in the Tahoe Basin, and thus the demand for energy, over that assessed in the RPU EIS and RTP EIR/EIS (TRPA 2012a:3.13-18 – 3.13-19; TMPO and TRPA 2012:3.13-12, 3.13-16 - 17). Liberty Utilities and Southwest Gas have available capacity to meet energy demand. Future projects would be required to meet state standards for energy efficiency, and comply with the Conservation Element of the Area Plan. Projects could also take advantage of the mPOWER incentive program to reduce energy use and GHG emissions from buildings and other site improvements, and use the tools offered through the Lake Tahoe Sustainable Communities Program, specifically the Sustainability Action Plan, to further improve energy efficiency. With respect to energy use associated with transportation, the Area Plan would result in a reduction in vehicle miles traveled</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>(VMT) as compared to existing plans. Energy use related to transportation is directly related to VMT. Thus, transportation energy demand would be less than if no action were taken. Future individual projects under the Area Plan would be required to undergo project-level environmental review to identify and mitigate any potential impacts associated with an increase in energy demand and inefficient or wasteful energy consumption. For these reasons, implementation of the Area Plan would not result in inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy. This impact would be less than significant for Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 3. Alternative 4 for the Area Plan would have no impact.</p> <p>Implementation of Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in increased demand for electricity and natural gas. The lodge site is already served by electricity and natural gas infrastructure, and Liberty Utilities and Southwest Gas have indicated they would be able to serve the project. The project applicant is planning to build the project to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards, including those for energy efficiency (e.g., insulation, weatherization, high-efficiency appliances and lighting), so energy use would be similar to, or lower than that typical of hotel and commercial projects. The project would be constructed in accordance with various energy conservation code requirements, and energy conservation features and practices would be implemented in the Tahoe City Lodge buildings and operations, respectively. With respect to energy use associated with transportation, Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in a reduction in VMT as compared to existing plans. Thus, transportation energy demand would be less than if no action were taken. For these reasons, lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would not result in an inefficient or wasteful consumption of energy. The potential increase in occupancy of the commercial center proposed under Alternative 4 could occur under existing conditions. Renovation of the existing commercial buildings proposed for lodge Alternative 4 would be in accordance with local and state building code requirements that would result in energy efficiency improvements. Though VMT would be higher under Alternative 4 than the other lodge alternatives, there is no evidence to suggest that transportation energy demand would be wasteful or inefficient. The impact would be less than significant.</p>			

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p><b>Impact 16-6: Result in the need for new or expanded telecommunications facilities.</b> Implementation of the Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in an increased demand for telecommunications services. AT&amp;T has indicated that it would be able to serve the lodge project. Because Lodge Alternative 4 could result in additional demand for telecommunications services, which could occur under existing conditions. This impact is less than significant for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.</p>	<p>Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>
<p><b>Impact 16-7: Increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical services.</b> Because of the limited conversion of CFA to TAUs, Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3 would result in a modest increase the number of visitors in the Tahoe Basin, and thus an increase in demand for fire protection and emergency medical services over that assessed for the Regional Plan in the RPU EIS and RTP EIR/EIS (TRPA 2012a:3.13-21 – 3.13-22; TRPA 2012b:3.13-12). Future development resulting from Alternatives 1 through 3 would be required to comply with local and state regulations for fire protection, including mitigation fees and consultation with NTFPD for minimizing potential impacts from specific projects. Therefore, implementation of Alternatives 1 through 3 would reduce the impacts associated with the need for improved or expanded facilities for fire protection and emergency services provided by NTFPD and this impact would be less than significant. Alternative 4, the No Project Alternative, would be a continuation of existing conditions under the Regional Plan and existing plan area statements and community plans. Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in no new impacts that were not previously considered in the RPU EIS and RTP EIR/EIS (TRPA 2012a:3.13-21 – 3.13-22; TRPA 2012b:3.13-12). Alternative 4 for the Area Plan would have no impact.</p> <p>The lodge Alternatives 1 through 4 would result in a modest increase in the demand for fire protection and emergency response services. NTFPD has indicated they have adequate staffing and equipment to provide service to the lodge project. Lodge Alternative 4 would not result in an increase in demand for fire protection and emergency services over that which could occur under existing conditions. This impact would be less than significant for all alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p><b>Impact 16-8: Increased demand for law enforcement services.</b> Implementation of any of the Area Plan alternatives would result in some new development that could increase the demand for law enforcement services that, in turn, could require additional personnel and new or expanded facilities, the construction of which could result in adverse effects on the environment. However, as with other project development, environmental review of specific projects would be required to ensure that impacts are identified and mitigated. Based on consultation with the Placer County Sheriff’s Department, the lodge alternatives would not result in the need for additional or expanded law enforcement service facilities and would not result in decreased law enforcement service levels. This impact would be less than significant for all alternatives.</p> <p>The Placer County Sheriff Tahoe Substation is approximately two miles northeast of the Tahoe City Lodge project site. Because of the small scale of the project, none of the alternatives would have the potential to increase demand for law enforcement such that new facilities or additional personnel would be required. The impact would be less than significant for all Tahoe City Lodge alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>
<p><b>Impact 16-9: Increased demand for public schools.</b> Public schools that serve the Plan area include Kings Beach Elementary School, Tahoe Lake Elementary School, North Tahoe School, North Tahoe High School, and Cold Stream Alternative School. Because of the limited conversion of CFA to TAUs, Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3 would result in a modest increase in the number of visitors in the Tahoe Basin and an associated decrease in employment relative to Alternatives 2 and 4; therefore, Alternatives 1 and 3 would not result in an indirect increase in demand for schools, over that assessed in the RPU EIS and RTP EIR/EIS (TRPA 2012a:3.13-15 – 3.13-16; TMPO and TRPA 2012:3.13-18 – 3.13-19). Currently, the schools serving the Plan area have available capacity for additional students. For these reasons, this impact would be less than significant for Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 3. Alternative 4 for the Area Plan would have no impact.</p> <p>The Tahoe City Lodge alternatives have limited potential for generating new students since no new residences would be constructed and a small number of new employees would be created. Additionally, there is available capacity at nearby schools. The lodge alternatives would not result in any substantial adverse</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS =Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered school facilities the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Thus, this impact would be less than significant for all lodge alternatives.</p>			
<b>17. Recreation</b>			
<p><b>Impact 17-1: Demand for recreation facilities and physical deterioration of recreation facilities.</b> Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 4 would allow for increases in residential units within town centers and mixed-use areas identified in the RPU EIS and RTP/SCS EIR/EIS and are subject to existing allocations. More residential units and corresponding population increase would result in increased demand for recreation facilities and resources. Also, Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3 could add additional TAUs not included in the existing Regional Plan (with a formulaic decrease in CFA), which would increase visitor demand for recreation resources over that assessed in the RPU EIS and RTP/SCS EIR/EIS. However, recreation opportunities and resources are abundant in the region, and with continued implementation of existing recreation goals and policies and implementation of new recreation projects from existing programs (e.g., EIP) adequate capacity for recreation would continue to be provided, and implementation of any of the alternatives would not reduce capacity of existing recreation facilities or opportunities to such a degree that physical deterioration of those facilities would occur. Therefore, Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 4 would have a less-than-significant impact. Although Lodge Alternatives 1 through 3 would increase recreational demand, the lodge itself would include recreational amenities and the project would be subject to the Placer County parks development fee, which would be used towards creating and maintaining recreation facilities. Therefore, Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would have a less-than-significant impact. Lodge Alternative 4 would be a continuation of the site for commercial uses and would have no impact on recreation demand.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = NI</p>
<p><b>Impact 17-2: Create conflicts with existing or planned recreation resources.</b> Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 4 would allow for new development within areas designated for residential, commercial, and tourist accommodation uses. Through Area Plan recreation policies and the planned environmental improvement</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = NI</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = NI</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>program (EIP) projects identified in the Implementation Plan, the alternatives would facilitate enhancement of existing recreation resources. The alternatives would comply with existing Recreation Element Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan that provide for the appropriate type, location, and rate of development of recreational uses and facilities and that protect natural resources from overuse and rectify incompatibility between uses. Because these goals, policies, and land use designations were developed to address existing and planned recreational uses, conflict would be avoided. Therefore, Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would have a less-than-significant impact. The Tahoe City Lodge site is not located adjacent to existing or planned recreation sites (with the exception of the Tahoe City Golf Course) and therefore would not create conflicts. Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would have no impact.</p>			
<p><b>Impact 17-3: Decrease in public access to Lake Tahoe, public lands, and recreation areas.</b> Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 3 support projects that would increase public access to Lake Tahoe, public lands, and recreation areas. Improvements include proposed hiking trails, bike trails, beach access, improved parking, and alternative transportation programs and facilities that would improve access for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and drivers. Area Plan Alternative 4 includes many of the same bicycle, pedestrian, and transportation improvements as Alternatives 1 through 3, but would not include the redevelopment linked recreation improvements included in the Area Plan such as improved access to Lake Tahoe and the Truckee River and shared-use path connections. None of the Area Plan or lodge alternatives would obstruct or otherwise decrease public access to water or public land. Implementation of Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 4 would result in a beneficial impact with regard to recreation access. Implementation of Lodge Alternatives 1 through 4 would have no impact.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = B Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = NI</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = B Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = NI</p>
<p><b>18. Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Risk of Upset</b></p>			
<p><b>Impact 18-1: Expose the public or environment to hazards because of the routine use, storage, or transport of hazardous materials or from accidental release or upset.</b> Implementation of any of the four alternatives could involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials. New uses established within the Tahoe City Town Center and Kings Beach Town Center under Alternatives 1 through 3,</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>could release hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or wastes within 0.25-mile of an existing school. Future use and storage of hazardous materials would be typical of residential, commercial, recreation, and other development projects developed in accordance with the Area Plan, including for the four lodge alternatives, and would occur in compliance with all local, state, and federal regulations. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of the public or environment to hazards resulting from routine use, storage, or transport of hazardous materials or from accidental release or upset would be less than significant.</p>			
<p><b>Impact 18-2: Exposure to hazardous materials sites and recognized environmental conditions.</b> Future project construction under any of the Area Plan alternatives could be located on sites known to contain hazardous or potentially hazardous materials. However, future projects would be subject to project-level environmental review in which any potential exposure to hazardous materials sites would be identified, assessed, and if significant, required to be mitigated in accordance with existing laws and regulations adopted to protect public and environmental health. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of the public or the environment to hazardous materials would be less than significant. The Tahoe City Lodge project site contains potentially hazardous materials associated with ACM, lead based paint, contaminated soils, fertilizer use, an old septic system, fill material, and groundwater contamination from an adjacent dry cleaner. Construction and operation of the lodge project under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could encounter hazardous materials. This would be a potentially significant impact for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Under the Alternative 4 lodge proposal, there would be no changes to the Tahoe City Golf Course and clubhouse and no demolition of buildings that could contain hazardous materials. Therefore, Alternative 4 would have a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = PS Alt. 4 = LTS</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 18-2a: Conduct investigation and contamination removal</b> <i>The following mitigation applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1 through 3.</i></p> <p>Before building permit approval, the applicant or construction manager shall retain a qualified environmental contractor to sample and evaluate surface soils located within stained areas at the TCPUD maintenance yard, if the TCPUD maintenance yard will be used as a construction staging site. The soil investigation and removal shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Soil sample results shall be provided to PCEHD and Lahontan RWQCB.</li> <li>▲ Based on the soil sample results, the applicant or construction manager and qualified environmental contractor shall coordinate with PCEHD and Lahontan to determine the appropriate methods for soil removal and extent of soil removal required, if any.</li> <li>▲ A qualified environmental contractor shall be retained for removal of contaminated soils, if necessary. Contaminated soils in the stained areas shall be removed and disposed of at a permitted hazardous waste disposal facility. The qualified environmental contractor shall provide proof of disposal to PCEHD.</li> <li>▲ Soils shall be resampled and, if necessary as determined by PCEHD or Lahontan, additional contaminated soil shall be removed.</li> <li>▲ Building permits will be issued and construction may commence after soils in the maintenance yard are determined by PCEHD or Lahontan to no longer contain contamination.</li> </ul>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		<p><b>Mitigation Measure 18-2b: Remove or properly abandon existing septic system</b>  <b>The following mitigation applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1 and 3</b>                      Before building permit approval, the applicant or construction manager shall retain a qualified environmental contractor to remove or properly abandon the septic system located near the Tahoe City Golf Course clubhouse. The applicant or construction manager and qualified environmental contractor shall coordinate with the PCEHD to implement septic system abandonment procedures as set forth in the PCEHD On-Site Sewage Manual, which requires the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Applicant shall obtain a permit to abandon the system. The application for abandoning the system will include:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▼ A site plan showing where the septic tank and leachfield are located.</li> <li>▼ A description of how the system will be abandoned.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▲ The septic tank must be pumped by a licensed septic tank pumper (a list of licensed pumper’s is available from PCEHD) to remove the contents. The applicant must submit the receipt to PCEHD.</li> <li>▲ The septic tank must be abandoned as follows:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▼ If possible, the septic tank cover will be collapsed; or</li> <li>▼ If the septic tank cover cannot be collapsed, the tank will be filled so that there is not a cave-in or other structural hazard; or</li> <li>▼ The septic tank may be removed to an approved location; and</li> <li>▼ The septic tank or excavation hole must be filled with clean earth, sand, gravel, or other material approved by the PCEHD.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▲ The building wastewater plumbing system, if not connected to an approved septic or sewer system, must be permanently capped.</li> <li>▲ Future construction in the abandoned system area may require special construction considerations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 18-2c: Conduct surveys for asbestos-containing materials and lead based paint and coatings</b>                      The following mitigation applies to Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1 through 3.                      Demolition of buildings containing asbestos and lead-based materials will</p>	

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS =Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
		<p>require specialized procedures and equipment, and appropriately certified personnel, as detailed in the applicable regulations. Buildings intended for demolition that were constructed before 1980 will be surveyed for asbestos, while those constructed before 1971 will be surveyed for lead.</p> <p>A demolition plan shall be prepared for any location with positive results for asbestos or lead. The plan will specify how to appropriately contain, remove, and dispose of the asbestos and lead-containing material while meeting all requirements and BMPs to protect human health and the environment. A lead compliance plan shall be prepared by a Certified Industrial Hygienist.</p> <p>Before demolition, the project applicant shall submit the written plan to PCEHD describing the methods to be used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ identify locations that could contain hazardous residues;</li> <li>▲ remove plumbing fixtures known to contain, or potentially containing, hazardous materials;</li> <li>▲ determine the waste classification of the debris;</li> <li>▲ package contaminated items and wastes; and</li> <li>▲ identify disposal site(s) permitted to accept such wastes.</li> </ul> <p>Demolition shall not occur until the plan has been accepted by the PCEHD and all potentially hazardous components have been removed to the satisfaction of PCEHD staff. The project applicant shall also provide written documentation to the county that lead-based paint and asbestos testing and abatement, as appropriate, have been completed in accordance with applicable state and local laws and regulations. Lead abatement will include the removal of lead contaminated soil (considered soil with lead concentrations greater than 400 parts per million in areas where children are likely to be present).</p>	
<p><b>Impact 18-3: Interfere with implementation of an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.</b> Implementation of Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 4 would not alter or revise the existing Placer Operational Area East Side Emergency Evacuation Plan, Placer County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, or Lake Tahoe Geographic Response Plan. Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3 could result in an increase in overnight visitors in the Basin; however, because the lodge would</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS Lodge Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = PS Alt. 4 = LTS</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 18-3: Prepare and implement a traffic control plan in coordination with affected agencies.</b> <i>The following mitigation applies for Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1 through 3.</i> The Improvement Plans shall include a construction signing plan and include all on- and off-site traffic control devices. To minimize effects on emergency vehicle and existing public vehicular access, the project proponent will, in</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>accommodate approximately 236 people at maximum capacity (assuming a 118-unit lodge), the addition of these visitors would not substantially increase existing congestion that occurs in the Basin such that emergency evacuation would be impeded. Area Plan Alternatives 2 and 4 would not result in an increase in the amount of development or number of residents or visitors over that which could occur under existing conditions. Therefore, Alternatives 2 and 4 would not substantially increase existing congestion such that emergency evacuation would be impeded. Future projects constructed pursuant to each Area Plan alternative could result in construction activities that could affect emergency access and evacuation. However, each future project would be reviewed consistent with CEQA and TRPA environmental review requirements. The project-level review would evaluate the site-specific characteristic of a proposed project to determine if it would interfere with an emergency evacuation plan. If a future project would interfere with an emergency evacuation plan, then project-specific mitigation measures, such as a traffic control plan, or changes to project design or construction operations, would be required. For these reasons, operation of Area Plan Alternatives 1 through 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact on implementation of an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.</p> <p>Emergency access to lodge Alternatives 1 through 3 would be provided from North Lake Boulevard (SR 28). Operation of lodge Alternatives 1 through 3 would not interfere with emergency response or evacuation of the project site and would result in a less-than-significant impact. Construction of Lodge Alternatives 1 through 3 would require access by workers and heavy equipment, delivery and stockpiling of materials, demolition and removal of debris, and other operations that, depending on the exact timing and nature of construction activities, could restrict vehicular access to and around the project site. Construction activities could temporarily impair emergency routes, causing traffic delays and ultimately preventing access to calls for service or delays in evacuation. The potential delays in emergency response or evacuation caused by temporary construction activities would be a potentially significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 18-3 would reduce short-term impacts of the Tahoe City Lodge alternatives on emergency response services to a less-than-significant level because a Traffic Control Plan would be prepared that would require that</p>		<p>accordance with applicable regulations, prepare a traffic control plan (TCP) that will address locations that will involve construction in existing roadways and rights-of-ways. The TCP will be prepared in accordance with professional traffic engineering standards and in compliance with the requirements of the affected agency's encroachment permit requirements (i.e., Placer County, Caltrans) and will include measures that will provide notification to emergency service providers and adequate circulation around construction sites for emergency vehicle and existing public vehicular access. The TCP may include, but not be limited to, the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ The specific methods to maintain traffic flows on affected streets.</li> <li>▲ The maximum amount of travel lane capacity during non-construction periods.</li> <li>▲ Locations of flagger control for sensitive sites to manage traffic control and flows.</li> <li>▲ Construction work zones width limits that, at a minimum, maintain alternate one-way traffic flow past the construction zones.</li> <li>▲ Alternative routes to ensure that local residents, school buses, or emergency vehicles maintain access.</li> <li>▲ Coordinated construction activities (time of year and duration) to minimize traffic disturbances.</li> <li>▲ Coordinated construction activities (time of year and duration) to minimize traffic disturbances.</li> <li>▲ Appropriate warning signage and lighting for construction zones.</li> <li>▲ Appropriate and safe detour route identification if closure of a roadway is required, and signage that warns of road closures and detour routes.</li> <li>▲ The TCP will be submitted to Placer County and Caltrans for review and approval prior to Improvement Plan approval.</li> </ul>	

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>construction activities are coordinated with affected agencies to ensure service providers' service levels are not substantially deteriorated. Lodge Alternative 4 would not alter emergency access to the site and it would not include construction activities that could temporarily impair emergency access or evacuation. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>			
<p><b>Impact 18-4: Expose people or structures to wildland fire hazards.</b> The Plan area is characterized by moderate, high, and very high fire hazards. Because of the limited conversion of CFA to TAUs, Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3 would result in a modest increase the number of visitors in the Basin, and thus the number of people exposed to wildland fire hazards, over that assessed for the Regional Plan in the RPU EIS and RTP/SCS EIR/EIS (TRPA 2012a:3.14-12 – 3.14-13; TRPA 2012b:3.14-18). Future development resulting from Alternatives 1 through 3 would be required to comply with Regional Plan policies, existing local and state regulations for fire protection, and proposed Area Plan policies for fire fuels reduction and increases in defensible space. Therefore, implementation of Alternatives 1 through 3 would reduce potential risks from fire hazards and this impact would be less than significant. Alternative 4, the No Project Alternative would be a continuation of existing conditions under the Regional Plan and existing plan area statements and community plans. Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in no new impacts that were not previously considered in the RPU EIS and RTP/SCS EIR/EIS (TRPA 2012a:3.14-12 – 3.14-13; TRPA 2012b:3.14-18). Alternative 4 for the Area Plan would have no impact.</p> <p>Lodge Alternatives 1 through 4 would modestly increase the number of people exposed to fire hazards. However, development defined by these alternatives would be constructed and maintained in compliance with local and state regulations for fire protection, including use of fire resistant building materials, fire resistant landscaping, defensible space, and adequate water supply and emergency access. Alternatives 1 through 4 would result in less-than-significant impact with respect to exposure of people or structures to wildland fire hazards.</p>	<p>Area Plan                      Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS                      Alt. 4 = NI                      Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan                      Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS                      Alt. 4 = NI                      Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<b>19. Cumulative Impacts</b>			
<b>5. Land Use</b>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 5-1: Cumulative impacts to the regional development pattern.</b>                      New development and redevelopment proceeding from the Regional Plan and Area Plan alternatives would be limited to the TRPA established allocation limits and land use designations, as modified by the limited conversion of CFA to TAUs for Alternatives 1 and 3, the ratio of which was determined to be approximately equivalent with respect to certain environmental impacts (e.g., traffic generation). All Area Plan alternatives would maintain the established growth management system of the Regional Plan; continue the existing land use pattern (concentration of development in defined urban centers); and allow for or encourages transfer of existing and potential development to appropriate areas (higher capability lands within Centers). Any new development or redevelopment occurring under the Area Plan alternatives would be required to secure residential, commercial, and tourist accommodation allocations. The system of limited allocations and concentrated development in community centers is designed to continue and accelerate improvements to the environmental conditions in the Plan area through attainment and maintenance of environmental threshold standards. The limited conversion of CFA to TAUs for Alternative 1 (400 additional TAUs and 181,600 fewer square feet of CFA) and Alternative 3 (200 additional TAUs and 90,800 fewer square feet of CFA) would still occur under a system of finite allocations, and in accordance with a plan that emphasizes concentration of development in Town centers. In the context of a 72-square-mile Plan area that presently includes over 1.3 million square feet of CFA, 11,170 residential units, and 1,340 TAUs, this feature of Alternatives 1 and 3 would not have the potential to substantially change the regional development pattern.</p> <p>Cumulative programs, land management plans, and development projects, including known, and as-yet unknown residential, commercial, tourist, transit/transportation, and recreational development (including those projects described in Table 19-2), would individually and collectively contribute to the land use and development pattern that would evolve over the effective period of the Regional Plan. However, all cumulative development projects would be required to be consistent with TRPA land use designations, as applicable, and would be</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>limited by the available allocations—as modified in the Plan area by Alternatives 1 and 3—and land capability. Those projects that do not require allocations (such as EIP projects, infrastructure upgrades, and fuels management) would also be held to the established lands use designations, the maximum allowable coverage per the Bailey system, as well as TRPA requirements to support attainment and maintenance of the environmental threshold carrying capacities (i.e., avoidance and mitigation of environmental impacts). Furthermore, the U.S. Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, which manages more than 75 percent of the lands within the region, as well as California Department of Parks and Recreation and Nevada Division of State Parks maintain land management plans that guide the use of resources, as well as activities that occur, within their jurisdictions. These land management plans are prepared and updated in coordination with TRPA to be consistent with the Regional Plan and to support environmental improvements. Because the Area Plan alternatives, Tahoe City Lodge alternatives, and all future projects implemented in accordance with the Area Plan would be required to demonstrate consistency with the Regional Plan and support the attainment of the environmental thresholds, the proposed project and the cumulative projects would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact to the regional development pattern. The contribution of any of the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives to development pattern impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 5-2: Cumulative impacts resulting from land use classification changes, including expansion or intensification of non-conforming uses.</b> As described above, all new development permitted through the Regional Plan or the any of the Area Plan alternatives would be required to demonstrate consistency with the Regional Plan land use designations and the requirements of the TRPA Code. Cumulative development outside of the Tahoe Basin would not contribute to this potential effect. Future, cumulative programs, plans, or development projects could propose land classification changes and associated changes in permissible uses. However, these changes would be processed as amendments to the Regional Plan and would require independent environmental analysis. No future cumulative project would be approved or permitted unless it can be shown that any proposed land classification changes would not hinder progress toward</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>attainment of the environmental thresholds and would be consistent with TRPA's goals and policies. Therefore, the proposed project and the cumulative projects would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact on land classification changes or expansion or intensification of non-conforming uses. Therefore, any contribution by any of the proposed Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<b>6. Population And Housing</b>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 6-1: Cumulative location, distribution, density, or growth rate of population and housing.</b> Any Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge project alternative would be required to be consistent with the Regional Plan, which, by virtue of its growth management system, limits the number and general location of residential units, CFA, and TAUs that can be developed within the Tahoe Basin (TRPA 2012:4-32 - 4-33). In addition, the policies of the Regional Plan guide the location of development types, heights, densities, and other factors that affect the location and distribution of employment, population, and housing in the region. As described in the RPU EIS, growth in the Tahoe Basin, including the Plan area would be modest, the jobs-to-population ratio would remain relatively constant, and the cumulative projects in the Tahoe Basin would be limited by the established allocation limits and land use designations described in Chapter 5, "Land Use," and location of development, as identified in the Area Plan Land Use Map (see Exhibit 5-1).</p> <p>Construction jobs generated by foreseeable projects inside and outside the Tahoe Basin could be substantial, depending upon timing of construction of individual projects. But because of the temporary nature of such employment, and the local and regional population centers that can provide construction workers (e.g., Truckee, Reno, Sacramento), construction work is not expected to substantially alter long-term patterns of population, employment, and housing in the region. Reasonably foreseeable projects outside, but near the Tahoe Basin could have a moderate effect on patterns of population, employment, and housing. The Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan, Northstar Highlands Phase II, and Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan would result in construction of additional tourist units, second homes, and some permanent residences. Associated commercial and recreational development, particularly at the Village at Squaw Valley, would</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>generate additional seasonal and year-round employment that would likely draw workers from Truckee and communities within the Plan area. Other developments in the Martis Valley and Truckee (e.g., Martis Camp, Joerger Ranch Specific Plan) would also include housing (second-home and permanent) and employment. Because the residential component of these projects includes a substantial number of second homes, and employment opportunities would be limited in number and potentially seasonal, the cumulative projects would not have a substantial effect on the distribution of population, employment, and housing such that it could result in significant cumulative effects.</p> <p>As described in Impact 6-1, Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts on the location of population, housing, and employment in the region. Consistent with the Regional Plan, implementation of the Area Plan would result in modest growth in population, jobs, and housing along with the promotion of environmental improvements and increases in walkability, transit, and bicycle usage. Future development under Alternative 4, No Project, would be subject to Regional Plan policies and development limitations, but this alternative would not result in an increase in development density or adoption of additional policies to further incentivize development in Town centers that would encourage the level of environmental improvement or increases in walkability, transit, and bicycle usage that could occur under Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. For the reasons described above, the Area Plan alternatives, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact on the distribution and location of population, housing, and employment in the region. It follows, then, that the contribution of any of the Area Plan alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable.</p> <p>The Tahoe City Lodge would not directly result in any permanent housing, and would generate approximately 64 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees, an increase of approximately 5 FTE as compared to baseline conditions. The project would conform to the Area Plan, and thus to the Regional Plan. Because the Area Plan, in combination with other cumulative development would result in a less-than-significant cumulative effect on population, employment, and housing, it follows that the contribution of the Lodge project would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 6-2: Cumulative population growth and housing demand.</b>                      Cumulative development in the region, to the degree that it is not offset by redevelopment projects, would generate a small increase in employment both within the Tahoe Basin (e.g., VOLTAIX Commercial Project, Boulder Bay, 6731 Tahoe Timeshare, Brockway Campground, and Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan), and outside the Tahoe Basin (e.g., Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan [MVWPSP], Martis Camp, Northstar Mountain Master Plan, Northstar Highlands Phase II, Joerger Ranch Specific Plan, Tahoe Expedition Academy, Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan). A number of these projects would provide additional housing that could meet future demand associated with population and employment growth resulting from cumulative projects (e.g., MVWPSP, Northstar Highlands Phase II, Joerger Ranch Specific Plan). Housing development projects in Placer County are required to set aside at least 15 percent of the total housing units for affordable housing (Placer County Code Section 15.65.130), and new development projects are required to provide housing for 50 percent of FTE employees of the project, either through constructing new employee housing, dedication of land for needed units, or payment of an in-lieu fee to the County (Placer County General Plan Policy C.2). Development of affordable housing within the Tahoe Basin is incentivized through the MRIP, which distributes bonus units for improving environmental conditions or through development of affordable or moderate-income housing. Because cumulative development would occur in accordance with land use plans in effect for the various jurisdictions, cumulative growth includes both jobs-producing and residential developments, and that TRPA and Placer County require compliance with employee housing programs, future demand for housing associated with the modest population and employment growth from cumulative development could be met through such housing programs and existing housing stock in the region. Cumulative projects would not induce substantial population growth, directly or indirectly, that would create additional demand for housing such that an adverse physical effect on the environment would occur. This would be a less-than-significant cumulative impact. Future development implemented pursuant to the Area Plan would be limited by the Regional Plan allocations for new residential units, CFA, and TAUs, as modified by the limited conversion of CFA to TAUs for Alternatives 1 and 3. Implementation</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>of Area Plan Alternatives 1 and 3 would result in a balance of jobs and housing, where the number of jobs would roughly equal the number of available housing units in the Tahoe Basin. Because of the relatively higher proportion of CFA to TAUs at buildout, Area Plan Alternatives 2 and 4 would result in a jobs-to-occupied housing ratio in which approximately 870 employees may have to find housing outside the Tahoe Basin (see Chapter 6, "Population and Housing," Impact 6-2). As described above, future development under all of the Area Plan alternatives would be subject to Placer County requirements to provide affordable and/or workforce housing. Additionally, future Area Plan development could receive bonus units for affordable housing purposes. Although Alternatives 2 and 4 could increase the demand for housing relative to Alternatives 1 and 3, this demand could likely be met through workforce housing, bonus units for affordable housing, and to some degree by planned housing developments identified in the cumulative projects list (Table 19-2). In the event that additional housing would need to be constructed, those future housing projects would be subject to project-level environmental review and would be required to mitigate any potential adverse environmental effects. For these reasons, cumulative development, including the Area Plan alternatives, would not induce population growth to the degree that demand for, and construction of, new housing would cause adverse physical effects on the environment. The cumulative impact would be less than significant. Therefore, any contribution by development under any of the Area Plan alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable.</p> <p>The Tahoe City Lodge project would generate approximately 48 FTE employees, an increase of approximately 4 FTE as compared to baseline conditions. The Lodge project would be required to comply with Placer County workforce housing requirements. This degree of change would be negligible in the context of cumulative development in the region. Therefore, the contribution by any of the Tahoe City Lodge alternatives to cumulative housing demand would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<b>7. Biological Resources</b>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 7-1: Cumulative disturbance or loss of sensitive habitats.</b> Sensitive habitats in the Plan area and the region include a variety of wetland and riparian communities such as wet meadows, riparian zones along streams,</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>marshes, seasonal wetlands, and drainages. Most of these communities in the Tahoe Basin are also designated by TRPA as SEZ and/or habitats of special significance. Other sensitive habitats include late seral/old growth forest. Decades of growth and development, Comstock-era logging, hydrologic modification, livestock grazing, and fire suppression activities in the Tahoe Basin and beyond have resulted in an overall significant cumulative effect on these sensitive habitat types. It is estimated that 75 percent of marsh habitat and 50 percent of meadow habitats in the Tahoe Basin have experienced some level of functional degradation (TRPA 2012). Attainment status for meadow, wetland, and riparian hardwood habitats in the Tahoe Basin are “somewhat worse” than TRPA threshold targets. Outside of the Tahoe Basin, sensitive habitats have also declined in abundance and function.</p> <p>As described in Impact 7-1, depending on the specific locations of projects, development under all Area Plan alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4) could result in removal or disturbance of sensitive habitats, including SEZs and potential jurisdictional wetlands. Development projects outside the Tahoe Basin, including those in the Martis Valley, Olympic Valley, Truckee, and other areas could also result in removal or disturbance of sensitive habitats. Most of the SEZ/wetland/riparian habitats affected by cumulative development would likely be considered jurisdictional by USACE and LRWQCB under CWA Section 404 and the Porter-Cologne Act. Fill or reconfiguration of jurisdictional waters of the United States requires a permit from USACE under CWA Section 404. In addition, the deciduous riparian vegetation within most or all riparian areas and SEZs would likely be considered jurisdictional habitat by USACE and would require a permit and mitigation. CDFW has jurisdiction over activities affecting the bed and bank of drainages and would also require mitigation for any adverse impacts.</p> <p>Any new commercial, tourist, or residential development, redevelopment, or construction of restoration projects under all Area Plan alternatives would be required to comply with existing TRPA, federal, and state regulations and permitting requirements that protect SEZs, wetlands, and other sensitive habitats. TRPA’s existing policies and Code provisions address potential construction-related impacts to SEZs and other sensitive habitats Basin-wide through site-specific environmental review; they require development and implementation of</p>			

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>project-specific measures to minimize or avoid impacts through the design, siting, and permitting process; and they require compensatory or other mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval. Specifically, the TRPA Goals and Policies and the Code require protection of riparian habitats and SEZs through establishment of setbacks, BMPs, or other measures and protection of late seral/old growth forests and other sensitive habitats. The TRPA Rules of Procedure require mitigation for any significant impact on these resources as a condition of project approval. Additionally, the disturbance or loss of jurisdictional wetlands during construction would be minimized or avoided, and habitat compensation would be provided, through the CWA Section 404 permitting process. Impacts to riparian, wetland, and other sensitive habitats would also be minimized, avoided, or mitigated, as needed, through the permitting processes required by CWA Section 401, CDFW Code Section 1600 et seq., and CEQA. Depending on the type and magnitude of a potential impact to SEZ or other sensitive habitat, mitigation measures can include BMPs or setbacks specifically designed to protect those resources, compensatory enhancement or restoration on- or off-site, and requirements to provide funding for or otherwise contribute to restoration projects. Project-level planning, environmental analysis, and compliance with existing regulations would identify potentially significant effects, minimize or avoid those impacts through the design, siting and permitting process, and require mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval and permitting. Therefore, with all Area Plan alternatives, the contribution of approved projects to the cumulative impact on SEZs and other sensitive habitats would not be cumulatively considerable.</p> <p>No sensitive biological communities are present on the Tahoe City Lodge project site. Therefore, construction of the project would not contribute to a cumulative impact on sensitive habitats or communities.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 7-2: Cumulative disturbance or loss of special-status plants and animals.</b> The cumulative projects include residential and commercial development, recreation facilities, resort development, and forest vegetation and fuels treatment that could affect habitat for special-status plants in the Tahoe Basin and beyond. Habitat for several special-status plants and animals in the Tahoe Basin and other areas within the geographic scope for cumulative effects is</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>primarily within riparian and wetland settings, and some upland conifer forest and shrub/meadow communities. Development project areas that overlap with these habitats would be expected to have some level of adverse effects on these resources; however, forest vegetation and fuels treatment projects are expected to result in long-term habitat enhancement that may benefit those special-status plant species associated with forest habitats. Overall, the effects of past projects on special-status species are considered cumulatively significant.</p> <p>With all Area Plan alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4), construction of some projects could affect special-status plant or animal species, depending on the specific locations, presence of suitable habitat and the type, timing, and specific nature of the project actions. During project-level planning and evaluation, project-specific review and sources would be used to determine special-status plant and animal species with potential to occur on a specific project site, including reconnaissance or protocol-level surveys. Most ground disturbances resulting from development would occur within community centers, which are already largely developed and disturbed. However, projects in more remote areas could result in construction-related disturbances and loss of habitat for special-status plant or animal species. For example, cross-country bike trails, fuels management, habitat restoration, infrastructure development, and other projects in more remote areas could encroach into buffer zones around TRPA special interest species (e.g., northern goshawk, osprey) and adversely affect other special-status plant and animal species. At the project-review level, special-status plant and wildlife species with potential to be affected would be determined based on the species' distribution and known occurrences relative to the project site, the presence of suitable habitat for the species in or near the project site, and preconstruction surveys.</p> <p>As described in Impact 7-2, if special-status plants are present in affected areas, construction activities could result in vegetation removal or trampling, deposition of dust or debris, soil compaction, or disturbance to root systems that could affect their survival. Construction actions could temporarily disturb foraging, movement, and reproductive activities of special-status wildlife species that may occur on project sites, as a result of vegetation removal, noise, dust generation, or other project-related factors. Construction could also result in noise, dust, and other disturbances</p>			

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>to special-status animals in the vicinity of project sites, resulting in potential site abandonment and mortality to young. Also, long-term operation and use of some facilities (e.g., trails) could disturb or displace special-status wildlife species. With all Area Plan alternatives, each project that could affect biological resources would require some level of project-specific environmental review. TRPA's existing policies and Code provisions address potential impacts to special-status species through site-specific environmental review and requiring development and implementation of project-specific measures to minimize or avoid impacts through the design process, and providing compensatory or other mitigation for any significant effects on special-status species as a condition of project approval. For any TRPA special interest wildlife species that could be affected, compliance with the TRPA Code requires that projects or land uses within TRPA nondegradation zones would not, directly or indirectly, significantly affect the habitat or cause the displacement or extirpation of the population; and TRPA would not permit a project that would degrade habitat without compensatory mitigation to avoid a significant effect. For other special-status species, project-level planning and environmental analysis for CEQA and/or TRPA review would identify potentially significant effects, based on the type and location of the project; minimize or avoid those impacts through the design process (e.g., conducting surveys and modifying projects to avoid special-status species, if feasible); and provide mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval (e.g., implementing limited operating periods for construction and/or operations, compensatory habitat enhancement/restoration). Therefore, with all Area Plan alternatives, the contribution of approved projects to the cumulative impact on special-status species would not be cumulatively considerable.</p> <p>The Tahoe City Lodge project site is urban and characterized primarily by a paved parking lot, buildings and other developed facilities, and a small patch of disturbed Jeffrey pine, and does not provide suitable habitat for special-status species. Therefore, construction of any of the Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would not contribute to a cumulative impact on special-status species.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 7-3: Cumulative tree removal.</b> Logging, fire suppression activities, insect infestation, and drought have contributed to a relatively new stock of trees in the Tahoe Basin and beyond. As a result, many of the forestlands</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>are even-aged and densely stocked. Based on the most current data on the distribution on vegetation, the Tahoe Basin is not in attainment with management targets adopted for “other than mature,” small-diameter (&lt;10.9 inches in diameter at breast height [dbh]) for both red fir and yellow pine. The current percentage of small-diameter yellow pine cover within this vegetation type is 3.6 percent (or 24 percent of target), an estimated additional 11,570 acres of small-diameter yellow pine dominated stands is needed to achieve the lower limits of this management standard. The current percentage of small-diameter red fir cover with this vegetation type is 10.9 percent (or 72 percent of target) – an estimated additional 1,380 acres of small-diameter dominated stands is needed to achieve the lower limits of this management target. Overall, the effects of past logging, fire management activities, and other factors on the size-class distributions for forest types in the Tahoe Basin and beyond are considered cumulatively significant.</p> <p>As described in Impact 7-3, depending on their specific locations, construction of some individual projects with all Area Plan alternatives would require the removal of native trees. For most development, construction-related ground disturbance would be concentrated within urban areas, existing transportation corridors, and other already-disturbed areas, such as with the Kings Beach Center design concept parcels. Because ground disturbance would be focused mostly in these already-disturbed areas, the potential removal of native trees would have a relatively minor effect on the surrounding environment. Also, locations where most development projects would be constructed support common tree species such as Jeffrey pine, white fir, and lodgepole pine. Stands that consist of these species and their biological functions, particularly those that are disturbed and within developed landscapes, are not considered threatened or vulnerable to decline in the Tahoe Basin, Truckee, or other nearby regions. These trees or stands are not considered critical or limiting to the presence or viability of common or sensitive biological resources in the region.</p> <p>Regardless of the magnitude or biological effects of tree removal, native trees are protected in the Tahoe region. TRPA’s existing policies and Code provisions address tree removal through site-specific environmental review; require development and implementation of project-specific measures to minimize or</p>			

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>avoid impacts through the design, siting, and permitting process; and require compensatory or other mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval. Specifically, the TRPA Goals and Policies and Code of Ordinances include provisions limiting tree removal and protecting late seral/old growth forests, and TRPA's Rules of Procedure require mitigation for any significant impact as a condition of project approval. Additionally, TRPA cannot approve projects that would cause a significant adverse effect on the late seral/old growth ecosystem threshold standard without appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>Specific provisions for tree removal in the Tahoe region are provided in the TRPA Code (Chapter 61, and Chapters 36, 33, 62), and the removal of trees greater than 14 inches in diameter at breast height (dbh) requires review and approval by TRPA. A harvest or tree removal plan is required by TRPA where implementation of a project would cause "substantial" tree removal. "Substantial" tree removal is defined in Chapter 61 of the TRPA Code as: (1) removal of more than 100 live trees 10 inches dbh or larger on project sites of 20 acres or more; or (2) removal of more than 100 live trees 10 inches dbh or larger within land capability districts (LCDs) 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, or 3, regardless of the project site; or (3) tree removal that, as determined by TRPA after a joint inspection with appropriate state or federal forestry staff, does not meet the minimum acceptable stocking standards set forth in Chapter 61. For the purpose of late seral/old growth ecosystem protection, the Code specifies that no tree greater than or equal to 24 and 30 inches dbh in eastside and westside forest types, respectively, shall be cut. However, the Code provides an exception for private landowners by allowing for a limited forest plan to be prepared if 10 percent or less of the trees greater than or equal to 24 inches dbh in eastside forest types within a project site are proposed to be cut within the life of the plan. In addition, trees and vegetation not scheduled to be removed must be protected during construction in accordance with Code Chapter 33, Grading and Construction, Section 33.6, Vegetation Protection during Construction.</p> <p>TRPA's Goals and Policies, Code of Ordinances, and Rules of Procedure require protection of large trees, with limited exceptions; protection of late seral/old growth ecosystems; preparation and approval of tree removal plans; compensatory tree replacement or other project-level mitigation to avoid</p>			

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>significant impacts if appropriate and needed; and other protection measures. Because project-level planning, environmental analysis, and compliance with existing TRPA regulations and policies would identify potentially significant tree removal; minimize or avoid those impacts through the design, siting, and permitting process; and provide mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval and permitting, the contribution of approved tree removal under all Area Plan alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4) would not be cumulatively considerable.</p> <p>For the Tahoe City Lodge project, none of the project alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4) would result in substantial tree removal, such that it would adversely affect wildlife habitat or scenic quality. Additionally, the Tahoe City Lodge project site is urban and characterized primarily by a paved parking lot, buildings and other developed facilities, and a small patch of disturbed Jeffrey pine; and, project-related tree removal on the site would not result in any conversion of natural forest lands. Thus, tree removal required for the Tahoe City Lodge project under all of the alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<b>8. Cultural and Historic Resources</b>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 8-1: Cumulative change in the significance of historical resources.</b> The cumulative context for historical resources is the north shore of the Lake Tahoe Basin and areas north and east, where common patterns of historic era settlement have occurred over roughly the past century. As discussed under Impact 8-1, there are a number of federal, state, and local regulations in place to protect historical resources and to reduce the probability of demolition or alteration of historic buildings and structures. Without such protections, the proposed project, in combination with other development in the region, could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Impacts to known and unknown historical resources would be avoided and minimized through compliance with the TRPA Code of Ordinances for projects within the Tahoe Basin, and through other federal, state, and local regulations for projects outside the Tahoe Basin. These requirements protect cultural resources by capturing and preserving knowledge of such resources to provide opportunities for increasing our understanding historical resources and their cultural contexts. Therefore,</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>cumulative development in the region, including any of the Area Plan alternatives, would not result in a significant cumulative impact to historical resources, and any contribution by the Area Plan alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable. There are no historical resources on the Tahoe City Lodge site. Therefore, the project would not contribute to cumulative impacts on historical resources.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 8-2: Cumulative disturbance to unique archaeological resources.</b> The cumulative context for archaeological resources is the Truckee-Tahoe Basin portion of the Washoe territory. Based on previous cultural resource surveys and research, the Truckee-Tahoe Basin has been inhabited by prehistoric and historic people for thousands of years. Archaeological resources, including sacred and religious sites, are unique and non-renewable. For this reason, all detrimental effects to these resources erode a dwindling resource base. Destruction of any single cultural site or resource affects all others in the region because as a group they make up the context of the cultural setting. The cultural system is represented archaeologically by the total inventory of all sites and other cultural remains in the region. As a result, a meaningful approach to preserving and managing cultural resources must focus on the likely distribution of cultural resources, rather than on a single project or parcel boundary. Project construction that would occur as a result of cumulative development projects within, and outside the Tahoe Basin, and development under any of the Area Plan alternatives, including construction of the Tahoe City Lodge, could encounter previously undiscovered or unrecorded archaeological sites and materials during project-related preconstruction or construction-related ground disturbing activities. These activities could damage or destroy individual archaeological resources, which could in turn contribute to adverse cumulative effects relative to regional and cultural context. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-2 would reduce potentially significant impacts to archaeological resources in the Plan area 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. Projects outside the Plan area require similar mitigation to achieve compliance with CEQA, and federal, state, and local requirements to protect archaeological resources. By requiring projects to avoid</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>disturbance, disruption, or destruction of archaeological resources, cumulative impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant. Therefore, any contribution by any of the Area Plan or Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 8-3: Cumulative impacts on human remains.</b> Because of the likelihood that any undiscovered or unknown human remains would be Native American in origin, the cumulative context for human remains is the Truckee-Tahoe Basin portion of the Washoe territory. As discussed above under Cumulative Impact 8-2, the Truckee-Tahoe Basin has been inhabited by prehistoric and historic people for thousands of years. The loss of any one archaeological site or human remains could affect the scientific value of others in a region because these resources are best understood in the context of the entirety of the cultural system of which they are a part. The proposed project, in combination with other development in the Truckee-Tahoe Basin could contribute to the disturbance of human remains due to project-related construction activities. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-3, adverse effects on undiscovered or unknown human remains would be avoided. Similarly, projects outside the Plan area require similar mitigation to achieve compliance with CEQA, and federal, state, and local requirements to protect Native American remains. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant. With implementation of these measures, neither the Area Plan nor Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would contribute to a cumulative loss of undiscovered or unknown human remains, and the contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>
<p><b>9. Scenic Resources</b></p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 9-1: Cumulative effects on scenic or visual quality.</b> Consistent with the Regional Plan, the Area Plan alternatives would allow for changes in the built environment through the use of remaining allocations, use of newly authorized allocations, and through implementation of existing and revised policies that ultimately affect the form of new development and redevelopment. All future projects within the scenic resources cumulative effects analysis area would also be located within or directly adjacent to the Plan. As such, the analysis provided in Chapter 9, “Scenic Resources” takes into consideration potential</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>cumulative projects that would be located within the Plan area. As described in Chapter 9, future projects within the Plan area would be subject to the Area Plan scenic requirements and design standards, and all existing TRPA requirements. Additionally, projects outside of the Plan area but within the cumulative effects analysis area would be subject to the existing TRPA scenic standards. These provisions would minimize any potentially cumulative adverse effects on the existing visual character or quality of the Plan area, the TRPA scenic threshold ratings, scenic vistas, scenic resources, or views of Lake Tahoe. Therefore, the contribution by any of the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives to adverse effects on scenic or visual quality would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 9-2: Cumulative effects on community character.</b> As described for Cumulative Impact 9-1, All future projects within the scenic resources cumulative effects analysis area would also be located within or directly adjacent to the Plan area. For this reason, the analysis provided in Chapter 9, “Scenic Resources” considers the potential cumulative effects to community character from cumulative project within the Plan area. For the same reasons described in Chapter 9, projects that are outside of the Plan area but within the cumulative analysis area would be subject to the scenic requirements of the TRPA Regional Plan and Code. Because individual projects proposed pursuant to any of the Area Plan alternatives, Tahoe City Lodge alternatives, and cumulative projects in the vicinity would be required to demonstrate consistency with TRPA scenic protections, the cumulative impact would be less than significant. Therefore, the contribution by any of the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives to adverse effects on community character would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 9-3: Cumulative effects from light and glare.</b> Redevelopment stemming from implementation of the alternatives would include light sources and high-shine surfaces which could create adverse light and glare effect. However, all alternatives would maintain the substantive TRPA exterior lighting standards. In addition, the action alternatives (Alternatives 1 – 3) would convert portions of existing discretionary lighting guidelines into required standards; and add new standards that address prohibited lighting, fixture types, glare, and light trespass. These standards would reduce the potential for future projects within the Plan area to contribute to cumulative effects from light and glare. Additionally, any project located outside of the Plan area but within the cumulative analysis</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>area would be subject to the stringent lighting requirements of the TRPA Code. Although cumulative projects located outside of TRPAs jurisdiction (such as the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and the Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan) could potentially increase the amount of visible light and glare within the region, the proposed projects contribution toward this effect would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<b>10. Transportation and Circulation</b>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 10-1: Roadway LOS under 2035 cumulative scenarios.</b>                      Table 19-3 shows existing roadway directional volume and LOS and the cumulative peak-hour directional roadway traffic volumes and LOS for each alternative, which includes buildout of the Area Plan and the lodge components of each alternative. In future cumulative conditions with all Area Plan and lodge alternatives, LOS on the segment of SR 28 east of the SR 89 between the Wye intersection and Grove Street in Tahoe City would worsen from LOS E (for four hours per day or less) in the westbound direction to LOS F. The eastbound direction, which is currently at LOS F, would worsen. Because this roadway segment would operate at an unacceptable level, this would be a significant cumulative impact. As described in Impact 10-1, all Area Plan alternatives would have a significant impact related to LOS in this roadway segment, thus all Area Plan alternatives would make a considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant impact. As described under Impact 10-1, after implementation of all feasible mitigation, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. As this is a recognized problem, the Area Plan proposes to adopt a substitute standard as allowed by the Regional Plan, to modify the current LOS standards as described in Area Policy T-P-6. If this policy is adopted, the LOS impact at SR 28 in Tahoe City would be consistent with the adopted LOS standard. As described in Impact 10-1 in Chapter 10, Tahoe City Lodge Alternatives 1- 3 would not add traffic volumes in a direction or location that would exacerbate an existing LOS deficiency or degrade an existing acceptable LOS. However, Lodge Alternative 4 would result in additional traffic that would exacerbate the existing LOS deficiency. Therefore, the effects of Lodge Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would not be cumulatively considerable, but Lodge Alternative 4 would make a considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant impact.</p>	<p>Area Plan                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = S                      Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS                      Alt. 4 = S</p>	<p>As described in Impact 10-1, no additional mitigation is feasible.</p>	<p>Area Plan                      Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = SU                      Lodge                      Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS                      Alt. 4 = SU</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 10-2: Impact on local residential streets under 2035 cumulative scenarios.</b> In future cumulative peak summer traffic periods, the capacity of SR 28 in the Tahoe City Town Center will continue to be exceeded, resulting in long traffic queues, particularly in the westbound direction. Long traffic queues can result in the diversion of some traffic onto local residential streets. In this case, Fairway Drive could be affected by diverted traffic. Given the Placer County guideline regarding traffic volumes on residential streets (2,500 vehicles per day) and the existing traffic volume (600 vehicles per day), daily traffic volume on Fairway Drive would have to increase by 1,900 vehicles per day to exceed capacity. Table 19-4 shows the average daily trips (ADT) likely to occur on study roadway segments under future cumulative conditions with each alternative. Under cumulative conditions, ADT on SR 28 in Tahoe City between Grove Street and Jackpine Street is expected to increase by a total of 2,300, 1,900, 2,600, and 2,200 vehicles per day under Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. While there are factors that indicate actual diversion volumes will be substantially below the ADT figures discussed above, such as the proportion of traffic that is bound to Tahoe City or to SR 89 south and the proportion of daily traffic increase that will occur during periods of traffic congestion, this impact is still considered to be a potentially significant cumulative impact. As discussed in Impact 10-2 in Chapter 10, all Area Plan alternatives would contribute to the increase in ADT on this roadway segment. While the Area Plan alternatives, by themselves, would not result in significant impacts, they would make a considerable contribution to a potential cumulatively significant impact related to traffic diversion onto local streets. The Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would increase the westbound traffic volumes on SR 28 approaching Grove Street by between 11 and 24 vehicles per hour or less, depending on the alternative. This increase in traffic volumes represents a maximum of 3.3 percent of future cumulative traffic volumes. As such, the lodge alternatives would each results in a less-than-significant impact on additional vehicles diverting to Fairway Drive. As described above, the cumulative impact related to traffic diversion onto local streets is potentially significant cumulative, however, because the lodge alternatives would contribute very few additional trips the lodge alternatives the effects of the lodge alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = S Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p><b>Cumulative Mitigation Measure 10-2: Fairway Drive monitoring and traffic management program</b> <i>This mitigation measure applies to Area Plan Alternatives 1 – 3.</i> At least every 5 years, Placer County would conduct traffic counts on Fairway Drive between Bunker Drive and Grove Street for a two-week period in early August (peak summer traffic season). These counts will be summarized by day and by direction. If on any one day the daily two-way total traffic volume exceeds 1,700 vehicles, the County will implement traffic management measures to reduce diversion traffic on Fairway Drive and connecting local residential streets to maintain daily two-way total traffic volumes below 2,500 vehicles. Traffic management measures could include, but are not limited to: additional signage, increased traffic speed enforcement, speed cushions, and turn prohibitions.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = SU Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 10-3: Intersection LOS under future cumulative scenarios.</b> Table 19-4 shows existing LOS at study intersections within the Plan area and summarizes the intersection LOS conditions under future cumulative conditions with each alternative, including both the Area Plan and lodge components of each alternative. Under existing conditions all study intersections operate at acceptable levels except for the SR 28/Grove Street intersection, which operated at an unacceptable LOS F under summer peak PM conditions. As shown in Table 19-4, under future cumulative conditions with all alternatives, existing unacceptable LOS F conditions at the SR 28 and Grove Street intersection in Tahoe City would be exacerbated. Because already unacceptable intersection LOS would be degraded, this would be a significant cumulative impact. As described in Impact 10-3 in Chapter 10, all Area Plan and lodge alternatives would have a significant impact related to LOS at this intersection, thus all alternatives would make a considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant impact. As described under Impact 10-3, after implementation of all feasible mitigation, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. As this is a recognized problem, the Area Plan proposes to include a substitute standard that would modify the current LOS standards as described in Area Policy T-P-6. If this policy is adopted, the LOS impact at SR 28 and Grove Street intersection in Tahoe City would be consistent with the adopted LOS standard.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = S</p>	<p>As described in Cumulative Impact 10-3, no additional mitigation is feasible.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = SU</p>
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 10-4: Cumulative vehicle miles traveled.</b> The analysis of region-wide VMT resulting from build-out of the alternatives is presented in Chapter 10. That analysis also accounted for growth that could occur throughout the rest of the Lake Tahoe region consistent with the TRPA Regional Plan, to allow for comparison of regional VMT under the alternatives to TRPA's regional VMT threshold standard. The TRPA TransCAD model scenarios analyzed in Chapter 10 reflect some, but not all, of the cumulative growth that could occur outside of the Tahoe Basin. This cumulative analysis adds traffic growth that could occur as the result of growth outside of the Tahoe Basin, including Martis Valley, the Squaw/Alpine Meadows area, and Truckee. Table 19-5 shows summer daily VMT in the Tahoe Basin under baseline 2015 conditions and in cumulative 2035 conditions for each alternative, assuming full build-out of the Tahoe Basin and surrounding areas near the Plan area (including Martis Valley, Truckee, and</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>Squaw/Alpine). The VMT threshold is periodically updated whenever the TRPA updates its transportation model. The most recent VMT threshold was calculated at 2,030,938 for a peak summer day, based on the 2014 model update. Existing summer daily regional VMT is estimated to be 1,937,070, or 93,868 below the TRPA threshold standard based on the most recent modeling completed to support the Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan (TRPA 2016). Additional detail on the cumulative VMT methodology is provided in Appendix G. In future cumulative conditions with all alternatives, daily summer VMT in the Tahoe region would increase by various amounts. However, under cumulative conditions with all alternatives VMT would remain below the TRPA regional VMT threshold standard of 2,030,938. Because cumulative VMT would remain below the adopted standard under all alternatives, the cumulative impact would be less-than-significant. Thus, the Area Plan or Lodge alternatives would not make a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 10-5: Cumulative transit service and operations.</b> As described under Impact 10-5 in Chapter 10, all Area Plan alternatives are expected to result in increased transit ridership during the peak-hour period. As some TART transit runs between Squaw Valley - Tahoe City, Tahoe City - North Stateline, and Northstar - North Stateline in winter currently exceed the seating capacity, this increase in transit ridership would result in a potentially significant impact for all alternatives. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 10-5 would establish a funding mechanism that would facilitate increased transit service during peak periods. This increased transit service would accommodate typical peak-period transit loads that would occur with Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 under cumulative future conditions. All Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would increase the key PM peak-hour transit ridership. Some of these trips could occur on a route and run already operating with passenger loads exceeding seating capacity during the winter. However, mitigation fees required by the TRPA Code would provide a funding source for transit improvements, which would offset the increase in ridership during peak periods for all lodge alternatives. In addition, Lodge Alternatives 1 -3 would comply with Mitigation Measure 10-3, which would require that the lodge project applicant provide annual transit fees beginning with the first year of operation. If the county service area funding program is not implemented</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = S Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for Alternatives 1, 2, &amp; 3. Alternative 4: Because mitigation cannot be required of a no-action alternative, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>Area Plan Alt. 1, 2, &amp; 3 = LTS Alt. 4 = SU Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>prior to the opening of the lodge, the lodge project would pay all annual fees accrued retroactive to the opening date once the program comes into effect. Because Area Plan Alternatives 1 – 3 and all lodge alternatives would fund transit improvements that would accommodate typical cumulative peak-period transit loads, the effects of these alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable. Area Plan Alternative 4 would result in increased transit ridership during the peak-hour period in winter. Because this alternative would add transit ridership during periods when ridership currently exceeds the seating capacity, and mitigation cannot be required for a no-project alternative, Area Plan Alternative 4 would make a considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant impact.</p>			
<b>11. Air Quality</b>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 11-1: Consistency with air quality plan and transportation conformity requirements.</b> The Lake Tahoe Air Basin (LTAB) is in attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for carbon monoxide (CO), as shown in Table 11-1. Thus, existing concentrations of CO in the LTAB are not considered to be cumulatively significant. However, the LTAB is designated as a maintenance area with respect to the NAAQS for CO. For the Placer County portion of the LTAB, which includes the Plan area, the applicable federal air quality maintenance plan is the Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan (CO Maintenance Plan) originally adopted in 1996 and revised in 2004 (ARB 2004). Part of the maintenance strategy in the CO Maintenance Plan involves the allocation of transportation emissions budgets to the maintenance area. The Area Plan must conform to the transportation emissions budget, or Placer County would face penalties for impairing the region’s ability to maintain the NAAQS for CO. If the Area Plan conforms to the emissions budget allocated to the maintenance area, then the Area Plan would be consistent with the CO maintenance strategy for the CO NAAQS. Thus, the analysis presented under Impact 11-1 in Chapter 11, “Air Quality” is an inherently cumulative analysis of the combined level of CO emissions from existing vehicle travel and other sources, in combination with new or increased vehicle travel that may result from implementation of the Area Plan alternatives. As shown in Table 11-2, all of the Area Plan alternatives would result in a level of mobile-source CO emissions that is within the emissions budgets allocated for transportation conformity. The</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>transportation emissions budget is the basis for air quality planning efforts in the Lake Tahoe CO Maintenance Plan. Thus, because the transportation emissions budget would continue to be met with implementation of the Area Plan alternatives, the maintenance area would continue to be on track for maintaining the CO AAQS. The Area Plan alternatives would decrease daily VMT in the LTAB relative to estimates included in the Regional Plan Update (RPU) EIS estimates for 2035. The Area Plan alternatives, as well as the Tahoe City Lodge and Kings Beach Center design concept that would be consistent with those alternatives, would not conflict with or obstruct regional efforts to maintain the NAAQS for CO. This cumulative impact would be less than significant. Therefore, any contribution from any of the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 11-2: Cumulative short-term construction emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.</b> The Plan area is located in the Placer County portion of the LTAB, which is designated as nonattainment with respect to the CAAQS for ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>. This nonattainment designation is the result of emissions of ozone precursors, reactive organic gases (ROG), and oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), generated by cumulative development projects in the LTAB, as well as from transport of these same pollutants from outside the LTAB. This is also the case regarding the nonattainment status of the LTAB with respect to the CAAQS for PM<sub>10</sub>. When all sources of ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> in the LTAB are combined they result in a severe ozone problem. Similarly, when all sources of PM<sub>10</sub> in the LTAB are combined they result in a severe PM<sub>10</sub> problem. The analysis of construction-generated emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> presented under Impact 11-2 in Chapter 11, “Air Quality” is an inherently cumulative analysis of the combined levels of ozone precursor and particulate emissions from existing emission sources in the LTAB in combination with emissions-generating construction activity that would result from implementation of the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives. As discussed in Impact 11-2, emissions of pollutants generated during construction are temporary in nature. Emissions are primarily associated with heavy-duty construction equipment and fugitive emissions from ground disturbance and earth-moving activities. Unmitigated emissions associated with construction projects in the LTAB that would occur under the Area Plan</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>alternatives would contribute on a cumulative basis to nonattainment conditions for ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>. In addition, when taken together, construction-generated emissions would have the potential to result in violations of, or considerable contributions to violations of, ambient air quality standards.</p> <p>All Area Plan alternatives would implement Mitigation Measure 11-2, whereby projects proposed under the Area Plan, including any Tahoe City Lodge alternative, would be required to demonstrate that construction-related emissions would not exceed significance standards of the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) and, where projects still exceed thresholds, would be required to adopt additional project-specific emissions reduction measures. Possible additional measures include using emissions-efficient construction equipment with engines rated Tier 3 or better, using architectural coatings with no- or low-solids content, and participating in PCAPCD's offsite mitigation program. Projects would also be subject to TRPA's construction best practices included in TRPA's revised Standard Conditions of Approval for Construction Projects and Code of Ordinances (TRPA 2012). These policies would reduce construction-generated emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Additionally, implementation Mitigation Measure 11-2 would reduce ROG emissions associated with construction of the Tahoe City Lodge to below PCAPCD significance levels for Alternatives 1 through 3. These mitigation measures would minimize construction-generated emissions and an individual project's contribution of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>. Therefore, cumulative construction-related emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> would be less than significant, and the project contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 11-3: Cumulative long-term emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.</b> As discussed above, the nonattainment designations of the LTAB with respect to the CAAQS for ozone and PM<sub>10</sub> are the result of the emissions generated by cumulative development in the LTAB, as well as from transport of these same pollutants from outside the LTAB. When all sources of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> throughout the region are combined they can result in a severe ozone and PM<sub>10</sub> problem, as expressed by a nonattainment status with respect to the CAAQS for these pollutants. The analysis of long-term emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> presented under Impact 11-3 in Chapter 11, "Air Quality" is an inherently cumulative analysis of the combined level of ozone precursor and particulate</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>emissions from existing vehicle travel and area sources in combination with new or increased vehicle travel and area sources that would result from implementation of the Area Plan alternatives.</p> <p>As explained in Impact 11-3, development in the Area Plan area would result in a net reduction in daily emissions of ozone precursors and particulate matter at buildout in 2035. Emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> would decrease by approximately 530 pounds per day (lb./day), 4,103 lb./day, and 74 lb./day from 2015 conditions, respectively. This is shown in Tables 11-10 through 11-13. These reductions would include any new emissions generated by the Tahoe City Lodge project alternatives and the Kings Beach Center design concept because these projects are included with the development allowable under the Area Plan. Thus, long-term operational emissions of the proposed project and alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 11-4: Cumulative exposure to mobile-source carbon monoxide emissions.</b> As discussed above, the LTAB is in attainment of the CAAQS and NAAQS for CO. Thus, there is no cumulative impact with respect to localized concentrations of CO in the LTAB. As explained under Impact 11-4 in Chapter 11, “Air Quality,” a project would not result in a significant localized CO impact if an affected intersection would experience fewer than 35,111 vehicles per hour (vph). This screening criterion is based on one recommended by Sacramento Metropolitan Air Management District (SMAMQD) and adjusted for conditions in the LTAB. As shown in Table C of Appendix G-2 and presented in Impact 10-3, future cumulative intersection volumes would be less than 3,000 vph at full buildout in 2035 for Alternatives 1 through 4 and, therefore, would not exceed the screening criterion under future cumulative conditions. The cumulative conditions used in this screening-level analysis account for vehicle trips and related congestion associated with existing and future development in the LTAB, including future proposed land use development in and near the LTAB, such as the Village at Squaw Valley, Plumpjack Squaw Valley Inn, Palisades at Squaw, Alpine Sierra Subdivision, and the Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project. Thus, the analysis under Impact 11-4 is inherently cumulative because it examines whether project-related traffic could cause localized concentrations of CO to exceed the CAAQS and NAAQS for CO or contribute to an exceedance of the CAAQS and</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>NAAQS for CO in combination with ambient concentrations of CO. Because the affected intersections under the cumulative scenario for each Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternative would not experience traffic volumes that exceed the volume-based screening criterion, the project contribution to CO concentrations at affected intersections would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 11-5: Cumulative exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants.</b> Construction of development accommodated under Area Plan, Tahoe City Lodge (Alternatives 1 through 3), in combination with construction of reasonably foreseeable development projects (including those listed under Cumulative Impact 11-4) and currently unknown projects, could result in temporary emissions that contribute to cumulative exposure of sensitive receptors to TAC emissions and related health risks. However, all Area Plan alternatives would be required to implement TRPA's best construction practices included in the Standard Conditions of Approval and Code of Ordinances and Mitigation Measure 11-5. Mitigation Measure 11-5 would reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to short-term construction-generated TAC emissions by requiring project applicants to address project-level construction impacts, in coordination with PCAPCD. These practices would reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> dust emissions, diesel equipment exhaust emissions, and emissions of other TACs. These practices would be consistent with the requirements of Mitigation Measure 3.4-5 in the RPU EIS which applies to the entire Tahoe Region, ensuring that all construction activities over the life of the Regional Plan and applicable changes under the Area Plan would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels and would not contribute to cumulative TAC impacts. Thus, TACs associated with the development of land uses under the Area Plan, including development of the Tahoe City Lodge alternatives and Kings Beach Center design concept would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 11-6: Cumulative exposure to excessive odorous emissions.</b> There are no known odor problems or issues in the Plan area. None of the cumulative projects involve uses that result in substantial, long-term generation of odorous emissions (e.g., sewage treatment plant, landfill, industrial uses). Cumulative odor impacts are less than significant. The Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would have less-than-significant project-level odor impacts and,</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
for the same reasons identified in Impact 11-6, any project contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 11-7: Cumulative atmospheric deposition of NO<sub>x</sub> and phosphorus.</b> As discussed in Impact 11-7, the reductions in mobile-source emissions anticipated under the Regional Plan would not be inhibited by the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge project. The region-wide operational emissions reductions would continue under the Area Plan alternatives. Thus, mobile-source emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> would decrease substantially in the Tahoe Region as a whole between 2010 and 2035. The cumulative impact is less than significant. Because mobile-source NO<sub>x</sub> is an important contributor to atmospheric nitrogen loading, it is reasonable to conclude that atmospheric nitrogen deposition to the lake would be substantially reduced associated with implementation of any of the Area Plan alternatives. The Area Plan would support achievement and maintenance of the threshold standards for atmospheric nitrogen and the total maximum daily load requirements, and project contributions would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS
<b>12. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change</b>			
Greenhouse gas emissions are inherently cumulative in nature and are discussed in Impact 12-1 in Chapter 12, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change."	NA	NA	NA
<b>13. Noise and Vibration</b>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 13-1: Cumulative long-term traffic noise levels.</b> The noise analysis in Chapter 13, "Noise and Vibration," is based in large part on the analysis of traffic-generated CNEL levels along highway corridors, which considers cumulative development in the Plan area as well as the rest of the Tahoe Region. By definition, the CNEL is the combined, or cumulative, long-term noise level experienced at a particular location, and highway traffic is the predominant noise source in the Tahoe Region. Therefore, Impact 13-1, Long-Term Traffic Noise Levels, is an inherently cumulative analysis of the combined level of noise from existing traffic noise sources, new or increased traffic that may result from implementation of the Area Plan, traffic originating from outside the Plan area, and traffic from outside the Tahoe Region. This analysis determined that noise from additional traffic associated with development under all of the Area Plan alternatives, including reasonably foreseeable development projects and currently</p>	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>unknown projects, would be cumulatively significant because it would cause highway traffic noise levels to exceed TRPA-established contour-based CNEL standards for highway corridors, as well as CNEL standards designated for nearby land uses, and/or result in increases to traffic noise levels where these applicable CNEL standards are already exceeded. However, TRPA Code requires projects that alter or improve highways that are not in attainment of adopted corridor CNEL standards to develop and implement design features to achieve the standards (Code of Ordinances Section 68.8.3). In addition, in-Basin projects would be required to implement Mitigation Measure 13-1, project specific traffic noise impact analyses and features to minimize contribution to traffic noise. Therefore, although highway traffic noise levels exceed TRPA-established contour-based CNEL standards in some areas, projects developed pursuant to the Area Plan would be prohibited by TRPA Code from substantially contributing to such exceedance. Therefore, any contribution by the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 13-2: Cumulative short-term project-related construction noise levels.</b> Impacts related to short-term project-related construction noise levels (Impact 13-2) are localized in nature, based on audibility, and distance to sensitive receptors. These noises do not accumulate to cause broader environmental impacts, so by their nature, cumulative impacts would not occur. Therefore, the contribution by any Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 13-3: Cumulative ground vibration.</b> Impacts related to short-term project-related construction-generated levels of ground vibration (Impact 13-3) are localized in nature, based on audibility and sensitive receptors. Therefore, these vibration levels do not accumulate to cause broader environmental impacts, so by their nature, cumulative impacts would not occur. Therefore, the contribution by any Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 13-4: Cumulative land use compatibility.</b> Some land uses in the Plan area and other parts of the Tahoe Region are exposed to noise levels that exceed applicable TRPA threshold standards and/or applicable Placer County</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>noise standards. The land use compatibility analysis under Impact 13-4 in Section 13, "Noise and Vibration" is an inherently cumulative analysis because it examines whether newly located noise-sensitive receptors would be exposed to excessive noise levels generated by existing and future noise sources. The predominant noise source in the Plan area is traffic on local highways. As described in Impact 13-4, TRPA policies require that residential and tourist accommodation land uses with outdoor activity areas are not developed in locations where they would be exposed to noise levels that exceed applicable TRPA and Placer County noise standards. For this reason, the contribution by any Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives to potentially incompatible land uses would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<b>14. Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Coverage</b>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 14-1: Cumulative compaction and land coverage.</b> The Bailey land classification system (Bailey 1974) provides structure for land development within the Lake Tahoe Basin. This system emphasizes prevention of resource damage by directing development toward the most resilient soils and by protecting the natural functions of more sensitive soils. Development prior to TRPA's adoption of the land capability system resulted in excess land coverage in LCDs 1b and 2 (TRPA 2012a), creating a significant, adverse cumulative condition. According to the 2011 Threshold Evaluation for soils, LCDs 1a, 1c, and 2 through 7 are meeting the threshold standard based on hard impervious cover. LCD 1b is not meeting the standard as existing hard impervious cover is estimated to be exceeding the allowable land coverage by 657 acres or 681 percent. Coverage is an important environmental issue in the Tahoe Region and various programs and projects are in place to reduce coverage and the associated indirect impacts (e.g., water quality). Many cumulative projects addressed in the RPU EIS involve reductions in coverage on sensitive lands, including EIP projects, CTC and NDSL land acquisition/restoration projects, USFS restoration projects, the excess coverage mitigation program, coverage transfer requirements, as well as certain development projects (such as Beach Club on Lake Tahoe, Boulder Bay CEP, Kings Beach Housing Now, and Kings Beach Town Center). The proposed project and many of the cumulative projects would create additional land coverage within the cumulative analysis area. However, all projects within the</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>Tahoe Basin would be required to comply with TRPA land coverage regulations. In cases where excess coverage is permitted (such as within Town Centers or for linear public facilities, public health and safety facilities, or water quality control facilities) all coverage exceeding the base allowable would be purchased and transferred from within hydrologically connected areas or retired from sensitive lands. In addition, all land coverage within LCD 1b must be mitigated at a ratio of 1.5 acres of restoration for every 1 acre of disturbance (per TRPA Code Section 30.5.3). Although development prior to the implementation of the Bailey land classification system resulted in an adverse cumulative condition relative to land coverage, TRPAs existing regulatory framework is structured to protect soil resources and reduce land coverage in sensitive LCDs. Therefore, the contribution of the proposed project to cumulative land coverage impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 14-2: Cumulative grading, erosion, and alteration of topography.</b> The proposed project and the cumulative projects would result in grading and excavation, and soil disturbances that could cause erosion. However, all construction projects in the Tahoe Region must meet requirements and regulations of the TRPA, Lahontan RWQCB, NDEP, and federal, other state, and local agencies. The TRPA Code restricts grading, excavation, and alteration of natural topography (TRPA Code Chapter 33). In addition, all construction projects located in California with greater than one acre of disturbance are required, by Lahontan RWQCB, to submit an NPDES permit which includes the preparation of a SWPPP that includes site-specific construction site monitoring and reporting. In Nevada, projects are required to comply with NDEP’s Stormwater General Permit, which also includes a requirement for the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP. Project SWPPPs are required to describe the site, construction activities, proposed erosion and sediment controls, means of waste disposal, maintenance requirements for temporary BMPs, and management controls unrelated to stormwater. Temporary BMPs to prevent erosion and protect water quality would be required during all site development activities, must be consistent with TRPA requirements, and would be required to ensure that runoff quality meets or surpasses TRPA, state, and federal water quality objectives and discharge limits. The robust regulatory requirements of TRPA and other federal, state, and local agencies</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>ensure that the proposed project and the cumulative projects would implement erosion and sediment controls such that site preparation and construction of individual projects would not create grading or excavation that conflicts with TRPA policies or contribute to a significant increase in soil erosion. Cumulative impacts are less than significant. Therefore, the contribution by any of the Area Plan or Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<b>15. Hydrology and Water Quality</b>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 15-1: Cumulative adverse impacts to water quality.</b> The proposed Area Plan would incentivize development and redevelopment activities that could result in construction and ground disturbance. In addition, the proposed Lodge Project in combination with other projects in the Lake Tahoe and Truckee River Watersheds would result in construction activities that would create ground disturbance and increase the potential for soil erosion and sediment pollution of waterways. The equipment required for construction would use fuel, solvents, lubricants, and other potentially hazardous materials that could degrade surface and groundwater quality through accidental spills. Without mitigation, the construction activities of the Lodge project, future development projects, and the cumulative development identified herein would have the potential to create a significant cumulative impact to water quality. However, the potential water quality impacts of the Tahoe City Lodge project would be fully mitigated through implementation of Mitigation Measures 15-1a through 15-1d. These mitigation measures reflect standard Placer County development permit conditions which would be applicable to the Lodge project and to the other cumulative projects. The Lodge project and other foreseeable development would also be required to comply with Lahontan RWQCB NPDES permit conditions that include preparation of a SWPPP and a Hazardous Materials Spill Response Plan, and to comply with all Placer County stream setbacks. In addition, projects within the Lake Tahoe Basin would be required to meet TRPA's construction site BMP standards. Because the Tahoe City Lodge, any future project stemming from the Area Plan, and all other projects within the Lake Tahoe and Truckee River Watersheds would be required to comply with applicable protective regulations, the by any of the Area Plan or Tahoe City Lodge alternatives to adverse water quality conditions would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 15-2: Potential for increase in stormwater runoff or alteration of drainage patterns.</b> Development and redevelopment projects in the in the Tahoe Basin, including those that may be implemented in accordance with the Area Plan and the Tahoe City Lodge, are required to comply with TRPA regulations such that each individual project would be designed to infiltrate the 20-year, 1-hour design storm event. In special circumstances where this is not feasible, the project must provide documentation that its stormwater is fully infiltrated by an offsite facility (TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 60.4). Because the proposed project and the cumulative projects in the Tahoe Basin are required to fully infiltrate runoff on site or demonstrate that its runoff can be accommodated by shared stormwater infrastructure off site, the impacts of each individual project are minimized. Cumulative stormwater impacts are less than significant. Compliance with these protective regulations would result in a reduction in the volume of stormwater leaving project sites for which stormwater BMPs have not previously been implemented (as described for the proposed project under Impact 15-3). In addition, the proposed project would comply with Mitigation Measure 15-3, which requires that a final drainage plan be submitted to Placer County which demonstrates that the project would not adversely affect existing storm drain systems or flow volumes. This mitigation measure is a standard requirement of the Placer County Engineering Services Division and would be applicable to all future projects in Placer County. Because the proposed project and all future projects would be required to comply with TRPA, Placer County, and LRWQCB regulations and permit conditions, the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge in combination with the cumulative development would not result in significant cumulative stormwater impacts. Therefore, contributions by any of the Area Plan or Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 15-3: Cumulative risks from exposure to flood hazards.</b> Floodplains are well regulated by federal and Placer County codes which require all projects to minimize their potential affects to floodplains and 100-year flood elevations and no existing cumulatively adverse condition exists. The potential for future projects to expose people or properties to flood risks would be minimized through compliance with the Placer County Flood Damage Prevention Regulations (Section 15.52, Placer County Code). These regulations require that projects</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>located within a mapped 100-year flood zone must be evaluated by a registered civil engineer. An engineering study would be required including a hydraulic analysis which demonstrate that the project would not aggravate or cause flooding problems on an adjacent property, would not create risks to users of the project itself, and would not cause an increase in the 100-year flood elevation. Cumulative impacts relative to flood hazard risks are less than significant. Therefore, contribution by any of the Area Plan or Tahoe City Lodge alternatives to such flood impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<b>16. Public Services and Utilities</b>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 16-1: Cumulative water demand.</b> Cumulative development in the Plan area and beyond would result in some increased demand for water supply. The surface water allocation for the Tahoe Basin, pursuant to the Truckee River Operating Agreement (TROA) is 32,000 acre-feet per year (afy). At the time of preparation of the RPU EIS, water demand in the Basin was approximately 28,079 afy, and the estimated additional demand generated by development of remaining commodities allocations, Basin-wide, would be 1,725 afy (TRPA 2012a:3.13-12 - 3.13-13). Because development has been relatively limited since that time, existing water demand in the Basin is similar to that presented in the RPU EIS, and projected Basin-wide demand under the Regional Plan would be accommodated by the TROA allocation.</p> <p>The Area Plan proposes a pilot program of conversion of CFA to TAUs, which would affect water demand. Conversion of CFA to up to 400 TAUs under Alternative 1, and up to 200 TAUs under Alternative 3 would increase water demand at buildout by approximately 41.2 and 20.6 afy, respectively. These additional volumes could be accommodated with existing water supplies. As described in Chapter 16, NTPUD and TCPUD are able to meet existing water demand and anticipate being able to continue to meet water demand for anticipated population growth through 2030 (TCPUD 2011: 3-6 - 3-8, 4-1, 4-2).</p> <p>Water demand for projects outside the Basin is met through surface water allocations and groundwater that does not intersect with Plan area water supplies provided through NTPUD and TCPUD. For example, surface water from Lake Tahoe and the Truckee River for project areas downstream from the Tahoe Basin are subject to TROA allocations for those areas, separate from allocations for the Tahoe</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>Basin. The nearest, large projects to the Basin, the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and the Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan would be served by groundwater from Olympic Valley and Martis Valley, respectively, which are hydrologically disconnected from the Tahoe Basin (DWR 2003). Thus, water demand from projects outside the Basin would not combine with the proposed project to create cumulative water supply impacts. Water supply for the Brockway Campground is not yet proposed nor has demand been calculated. Given the project site location adjacent to the TRPA boundary and away from the urban areas of the Tahoe Basin, it is likely that water supplies would be drawn from groundwater, would be limited to summertime use, and would also be subject to TROA limitations. Because adequate water supply is available to accommodate buildout of the Regional Plan and any of the Area Plan alternatives, and because individual projects, including the Tahoe City Lodge, would be required to comply with applicable codes and regulations and to acquire will-serve letters from water purveyors, thereby verifying adequate water supplies, cumulative water demand would be less than significant and contribution by any of the Area Plan or Tahoe City Lodge alternatives to cumulative water demand would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 16-2: Cumulative wastewater conveyance demand.</b> Wastewater conveyance from the Plan area is via an existing collection system pipeline networks for TCPUD and NTPUD, which have pipeline diameters large enough to convey historic and future sewage flows based on potential growth. Alternative 2 would not increase the amount of allowable development that would require wastewater collection and conveyance in the Plan area beyond that assessed in the PRU EIS and RTP EIS/EIR, which concluded that sufficient wastewater conveyance capacity would be available to accommodate the anticipated population increase and land uses. The CFA to TAU conversion program under Alternatives 1 and 3 would result in an increase in wastewater flows of 36,800 gpd (approximately 0.04 mgd) and 18,400 gpd (approximately 0.02 mgd) respectively over those generated by Alternative 2. Wastewater from the Plan area is transported to the T-TSA Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) via the Truckee River Interceptor (TRI), which has sufficient capacity to serve existing demand. The TRI capacity varies throughout its length between the Basin (where NTPUD and TCPUD lines tie in) and the WRP. There is currently a bottleneck in segments of the TRI near</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>Olympic Valley and T-TSA is in the early planning stages of addressing anticipated future wastewater demand. Excess capacities in the TRI and at the WRP are available on a first come/first serve basis, and project proponents must submit an application to T-TSA to be allocated capacity. Potential development resulting from Alternatives 1 through 3 would be required to comply with TRPA Code and local policies to obtain certification from the service provider that either existing services are available or needed improvements will be made prior to occupancy. Cumulative projects that would have the potential to increase wastewater conveyance demand include the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan, the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan, the Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan, and the Brockway Campground project. The Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan EIR/EIS determined that the Master Plan would not contribute to a cumulative impact on wastewater conveyance. For the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan, the environmental analysis determined that the Specific Plan would not contribute to potential wastewater conveyance cumulative impact because, if needed, the project applicant would add wastewater detention capacity on the project site to ensure that during peak flow periods, wastewater delivered to the TRI can be retained on the project site until TRI flows are not at their peak and the TRI can accommodate additional flows. The Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan connects to the TRI at an area close to the WRP where the pipeline has capacity to meet anticipated buildout conditions, and therefore would not contribute to an adverse cumulative condition. Finally, although the Brockway Campground project would generate wastewater, it would connect to a septic system outside of the Basin and would not affect the TRI.</p> <p>As with water demand, the CFA to TAU conversion policy contemplated by Alternatives 1 and 3 could increase the demand for wastewater treatment conveyance beyond the level previously analyzed in the RPU EIS. Although the current wastewater conveyance system has the capacity to meet the projected demand for the region, a pinch point exists along the TRI near Olympic Valley, which could affect the potential for the system to accommodate increased wastewater flows. Additionally, some of the cumulative projects discussed above would contribute wastewater to the TRI. However, environmental review for some of the cumulative projects that would connect to the TRI has been completed and,</p>			

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>where necessary, include measures to manage flow during peak periods so as to avoid exceeding the capacity of the TRI. Any excess capacity in the TRI is allocated on a first-come, first-served basis and all future projects that would use this conveyance would be required to demonstrate that sufficient wastewater conveyance capacity is available. Therefore, the effects to the wastewater conveyance system from buildout of any of the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 16-3: Cumulative wastewater treatment demand.</b> The T-TSA WRP has a capacity of 9.6 mgd based on a seven-day dry weather average flow basis (Parker, pers. comm., 2015b). The remaining available capacity at the treatment plant is estimated to be 3.2 mgd. Currently, there is ample available capacity to serve projected future development, including the buildout conditions anticipated in the RPU EIS.</p> <p>As discussed above, Alternative 2 would not increase the amount of allowable development that would require wastewater collection and conveyance in the Plan area beyond that assessed in the PRU EIS and RTP/SCS EIS/EIR, which concluded that sufficient wastewater conveyance capacity would be available to accommodate the anticipated population increase and land uses. The CFA to TAU conversion program under Alternatives 1 and 3 would result in an increase in wastewater flows of 36,800 gpd (approximately 0.04 mgd) and 18,400 gpd (approximately 0.02 mgd) respectively over those generated by Alternative 2. However, the excess capacity at the WRP are available on a first-come, first-served basis, and project proponents must submit an application to T-TSA to be allocated capacity. Potential development resulting from Alternatives 1 through 3 would be required to comply with TRPA Code and local policies to obtain certification from the service provider that either existing services are available or needed improvements will be made prior to occupancy. Additionally, cumulative projects that would contribute wastewater to the WRP would include most future development projects within the Plan area (including the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan, Joerger Ranch, North Highlands II, Northstar Mountain Master Plan, Martis Camp, and projects in Squaw Valley, Alpine Meadows, Northstar, and the Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan). The T-TSA WRP is designed to address buildout of its service area which includes</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>cumulative projects located within the Town of Truckee and Placer County (Placer County 1994, Town of Truckee 2006). Also, the T-TSA emergency overflow ponds located between Riverview Park and the Truckee River are designed to hold additional volume that could be generated during peak flows until such flows could be processed by the treatment plant (T-TSA 2009). Therefore, because no project would be permitted without confirmation that available capacity exists at the WRP, and because the WRP has been designed to accommodate buildout of all projects within its service area, the Area Plans contribution to wastewater treatment demand would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<b>17. Recreation</b>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 17-1: Cumulative demand for recreation facilities and physical deterioration of recreation facilities.</b> Recreation demand within the Tahoe Basin as well as nearby Martis Valley and the area containing Squaw Valley is met with a wide variety and extensive amount of recreational facilities and opportunities. A number of projects identified in Table 19-2, including Northstar Mountain Master Plan, Truckee River Corridor Access Plan, Dollar Creek Shared-Use Trail, North Tahoe Bike Trail, and Brockway Campground would provide new recreation opportunities in the region. The Tahoe Basin, Squaw Valley, and Martis Valley areas contain thousands of acres of public lands and lands in permanent conservation that provide the public with opportunities for hiking, biking, cross country skiing, snowshoeing, snowmobiling, wildlife viewing, water sports, and relaxation. These resources include, but are not limited to, the Tahoe Rim Trail, Burton Creek State Recreation Area, Tahoe National Forest, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Fibreboard Freeway, Martis Creek Lake Recreation Area, Tahoe State Recreation Area, and Kings Beach State Recreation Area. The Homewood, Squaw Valley, Alpine Meadows, Northstar resorts also include trail systems and ski resorts that provide further recreation opportunities for visitors and residents. These recreation resources provide ample opportunities for recreating to meet the existing and future demand such that adverse physical effects would not result beyond that which occurs under current conditions. Currently, there is no existing adverse cumulative condition related to effects on existing recreation users or adverse physical effects on recreation resources. Several cumulative projects would generate recreationists that would utilize</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>recreation resources and could result in impacts to recreation facilities. These include projects that propose new residential or visitor lodging, such as Brockway Campground, Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan, Joerger Ranch Specific Plan, Palisades at Squaw, Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan, Alpine Sierra Subdivision, and Martis Camp among others. However, due to the dispersed nature and largely seasonal occupancy of these projects, and the ample variety and supply of recreation opportunities throughout the region, these projects together would not result in a cumulative impact on recreation user experience or adverse physical effects on these recreation resources. Furthermore, Table 19-2 also identifies cumulative projects that would result in new or enhanced existing recreation resources, including the Martis Valley Trail, Northstar Mountain Master Plan, Northstar at Tahoe Ski Trail Widening, Truckee River Corridor Access Plan, and the Dollar Creek Shared Use Trail among others. These projects together would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact on recreation resources. As described in Chapter 17, the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge would result in an increased demand for recreation resources. The proposed project, in combination with other cumulative projects, could affect recreation user experiences by new noise sources and new developed features that result in visual impacts. However, due to the dispersed nature of the projects and recreation resources, there is limited potential for project development to substantially affect recreation resources. In addition, the user experience at recreation resources that are within or surrounded by urban development in the Plan area (e.g., beaches, bike trails, parks) would likely be improved through redevelopment projects that replace older, lower-quality development with new projects that meet current scenic and design standards. As described in Impact 17-1, the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge project impact on recreation resources and recreation user experience would be reduced through implementation of a number of Area Plan policies that provide for the appropriate type, location and rate of development of recreational uses and facilities and that protect natural resources from overuse, reduce conflicts between uses, are consistent with environmental constraints and threshold standards (Area Plan Policies R-P-1, R-P-7, R-P-8, and R-P-10). Because the Plan area contains and is surrounded by ample recreation resources, with additional</p>			

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>planned recreation projects nearby, the effects on these recreation users would be minimized through implementation of Regional Plan and Area Plan policies, no substantial physical deterioration of existing recreation resources and facilities would occur. Therefore, the contribution by any of the Area Plan or Tahoe City Lodge alternatives to such effects would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 17-2: Cumulative conflicts with existing or planned recreation resources.</b> Cumulative projects listed in Table 19-2 that could combine with the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge project to create potential recreation conflicts include the Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan, directly adjacent to the Area Plan boundary, and the projects within the Area Plan boundaries. There are no known conflicts between any reasonably foreseeable projects and recreation resources. In fact, many of the cumulative projects are new or enhanced recreation facilities. For periodic recreation events (e.g., bike or hike events on the Tahoe Rim Trail and Fiberboard Freeway), event planners are required to coordinate with, and secure permits, as appropriate, from the U.S. Forest Service and/or other affected agencies. In this way, adequate notice is provided and potential conflicts are addressed and remedied.</p> <p>As described in Impact 17-2, the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge project would not result in substantial conflicts with existing or planned recreation resources as a result of Area Plan and Regional Plan policies related to avoidance of recreational land use conflicts that would be implemented and because maintenance of existing threshold attainment would be evaluated when considering approval of future projects. Additionally, future project planning would be completed in coordination with recreation providers and TRPA threshold standard requirements and potential conflicts with existing recreation resources would be addressed at the project-level. Thus, the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge project in combination with other cumulative projects would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact, and the contribution by any of the proposed Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge project alternatives would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 17-3: Cumulative decrease in public access to Lake Tahoe, public lands, and recreation areas.</b> As described in Impact 17-3, implementation of the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge project would not result in obstructions to existing public access to the Lake, public lands, or recreation areas. In fact, the</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>Area Plan would support implementation of projects that would improve public access to the Lake, public lands, and recreation areas. For these reasons, there would be no cumulative impact from implementation of the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge project.</p>			
<p><b>18. Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Risk of Upset</b></p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 18-1: Cumulative exposure of the public or environment to hazards because of the routine use, storage, or transport of hazardous materials or from accidental release or upset.</b> Although some hazardous materials releases can cover a large area and interact with other releases (e.g., atmospheric contamination, contamination of groundwater aquifers), incidents of hazardous materials contamination are more typically isolated to a small geographic area. These relatively isolated areas of contamination typically do not combine in a cumulative manner with other sites of hazardous materials contamination. In the Plan area, including at the Lodge project site, and in its vicinity, there are no identified incidents of widespread hazardous materials contamination with different sources of contamination interacting on a cumulative basis. Future projects that would include construction activities and add new residences, commercial uses, tourist accommodation units, recreation projects, and infrastructure, may use, store, and generate hazardous materials. However, these projects would be subject to existing federal, state, and local hazardous materials regulations, limiting the potential for releases and contamination and requiring clean-up when such events occurred. Given these conditions, there would not be a significant cumulative impact related to hazardous materials. Future projects implemented in accordance with the Area Plan would result in the transport, storage, and use of hazardous materials as part of their construction and operation. Individual future projects would be required to comply with existing federal, state, and local hazardous materials regulations would apply, limiting the potential for releases and contamination and requiring clean-up when releases/contamination do occur. In addition, the potential for the individual future projects to expose people or the environment to hazardous materials would be reduced through proper handling and compliance with applicable regulations as described in Impact 18-1. Therefore, any contribution by the proposed Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives to cumulative exposure to hazardous materials from</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
routine use, storage, or upset would not be cumulatively considerable.			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 18-2: Cumulative exposure to hazardous materials sites and recognized environmental conditions.</b> The geographic area for cumulative impacts related to exposure to hazardous materials sites or recognized environmental conditions (RECs) would be limited to the Lodge project site and the project sites and immediate adjacent areas for future individual projects subsequent to the Area Plan. While there are hazardous materials sites in the Plan area identified as undergoing ongoing remediation, monitoring, or characterization of potential contamination (see Table 18-2), there are no identified incidents of widespread hazardous materials contamination such that a cumulative impact would result. Impact 18-2 identifies a less-than-significant impact related to exposure to hazardous materials sites and RECs for the Area Plan, and the impact associated with encountering RECs or unknown contaminants would be specific to a given site under construction. There are no nearby similar conditions that would interact with conditions in these areas. Furthermore, future individual projects would be required to undergo some level of project-specific environmental review to assess hazardous materials conditions on the project site and would be required to mitigate any significant adverse impacts. Consequently, there would be no cumulative impact related to exposure to recognized environmental conditions. For these reasons, any contribution by the proposed Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives to cumulative exposure to hazardous materials sites and RECs would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 18-3: Cumulative interference with implementation of an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.</b> The geographic area for cumulative impacts related to implementation of emergency response and emergency evacuation plans would be the area extending along the West Shore and North Shore of Lake Tahoe and up to the southeastern portion of the Town of Truckee. Roadways identified in the Placer Operational Area East Side Emergency Evacuation Plan to be used as evacuation routes include State Route (SR) 28, SR 267, and Interstate 80 (I-80). Evacuation centers are identified in Kings Beach, Tahoe City, and Town of Truckee (see Table 18-1). In the event of an emergency that would require evacuation from these areas, evacuees could be directed to Kings Beach, Tahoe City, or Truckee.</p>	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, & 4 = LTS

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>By virtue of their location along major transportation routes in the Plan area, construction and operation of some cumulative projects (see Table 19-2) could interfere with implementation of emergency evacuation plans in the project vicinity, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Kings Beach State Recreation Area General Plan (KBSRA GP) Revision and Public Pier Rebuild Project,</li> <li>▲ Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project,</li> <li>▲ Tahoe Vista Partners, LLC Affordable Housing and Interval Ownership Development Project,</li> <li>▲ VOLTAIX Commercial Project,</li> <li>▲ Boulder Bay,</li> <li>▲ Brockway Campground,</li> <li>▲ Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan, and</li> <li>▲ Homewood Trail Project.</li> </ul> <p>Construction of some cumulative projects could result in temporary interference with implementation of emergency evacuation plans, but would result in mobility improvements that would enhance long-term emergency response services within the Area Plan and vicinity, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project,</li> <li>▲ Transportation Corridor Concept Report for SR 267,</li> <li>▲ Transportation Corridor Concept Report for SR 28,</li> <li>▲ SR 28 to SR 267 Intersection Improvements,</li> <li>▲ Lakeside Project,</li> <li>▲ Tahoe City Mobility Plan, and</li> <li>▲ Tahoe-Truckee Airport District Helipad.</li> </ul> <p>In the event of an emergency, evacuation from these areas would occur via local roads to SR 28, SR 89, and/or SR 267. From there, evacuees could be routed to evacuation centers located to in Tahoe City, Kings Beach, and Truckee. While conditions on local roadways and highways during an emergency evacuation could be congested, construction and operation of future projects implemented in accordance with the Area Plan plus cumulative development could prevent or</p>			

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>impede evacuation, or result in physical interference with an evacuation plan such that evacuation occurs more slowly. The cumulative projects listed above would be subject to project-level analysis for potential interference of an emergency response plan or evacuation plan and would be required to mitigate any adverse effects. Such mitigation could include off-street parking, staging, and materials storage during construction; signage; designated points of ingress and egress for construction vehicles and equipment; traffic control personnel; emergency preparedness and evacuation plans, and other measures. The cumulative impact with regard to emergency evacuation would be less than significant. Future individual projects subsequent to the Area Plan would be required to assess potential impacts on emergency response and evacuation plans. Any potential adverse effects would require individual projects to implement Mitigation Measure 18-3, which requires a project to prepare and implement a Traffic Control Plan, subject to approval by Placer County, to minimize the effects of project construction on emergency access and response. Because future individual projects subsequent to the Area Plan, including the Tahoe City Lodge, would be required to maintain sufficient access and traffic flow and operate in a manner that would not conflict with emergency response and evacuation plans, any contribution by the proposed Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives to interference with an emergency response or evacuation plan would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			
<p><b>Cumulative Impact 18-4: Cumulative exposure of people or structures to wildland fire hazards.</b> Lands within the boundaries of the Area Plan contain moderate, high, and very high fire hazards. Past fires in the region have resulted in loss of life, significant losses of property, and substantial damage to habitat and environmental resources. Historic fire suppression and other forest land management practices have allowed fuels to accumulate in many areas, contributing to the severity of wildfires when they do occur. Additionally, past development in the forested landscape has increased the risk to life and property when fires do occur, and increased the potential for ignition of wildland fires through increased human presence and activity. Cumulative development will continue this trend to varying degrees, including residential, commercial, and tourist-related projects (e.g., Martis Valley West Parcel</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Area Plan and Lodge Alt. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4 = LTS</p>

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>Specific Plan; VOLTAIX Commercial Project; Boulder Bay; and Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan) and recreation projects (e.g., Brockway Campground, KBSRA GP Revision and Public Pier Rebuild Project, North Tahoe Bike Trail, Tahoe Basin Connector Trail, Dollar Creek Shared-Use Trail, Truckee River Corridor Access Plan, and Homewood Trail Project). Past and future fuels management projects serve to reduce wildland fire risk, including the fuels management activities conducted by NTFPD, USFS, CAL FIRE, DPR, and Conservancy through projects that include the Carnelian, Incline, and West Shore Fuels Reduction and Healthy Forest Restoration Projects, DPR Fuels Reduction and Understory Burning project, and the Conservancy Forest Habitat Enhancement program. Although developments have placed additional structures and people within a fire hazard zone, the projects have also extended water service, roadways, and fire clearance measures that allow for improved wildland fire response in the region. In addition, there are CWPPs on neighboring lands, including Northstar and Alpine Meadows, which direct the implementation of wildfire protection measures such as defensible space. All habitable structures that can be used as residential space are also assessed a State Responsibility Area (SRA) Fire Prevention Fee by the State, which funds State efforts at fire prevention. The combination of these cumulative projects, including projects that would manage fuels and reduce wildland fire risk, would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact related to exposure of people and structures to wildland fires.</p> <p>The proposed project would result in additional development in a moderate to very high fire hazard area, which could increase the risk to life and property where fires do occur and increase the potential for ignition of wildland fires through increased human presence and activity. However, new development in accordance with the Area Plan will be concentrated in already-urbanized areas, and does not encourage development in the wildland-urban interface. In addition, as described in Impact 18-4, future individual projects subsequent to the Area Plan would be required to comply with fire protection regulations and practices, consult with the North Tahoe Fire Protection District or other fire protection districts, and pay the SRA Fire Prevention Fee, which provides funding for additional fire protection staffing to reduce the potential exposure to wildfire hazards. Therefore, with mitigation the cumulative condition related to wildland fire hazard because of the</p>			

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge

NI = No impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

**Table 2-1 Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)
<p>combination of effects from the proposed project with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects is less than significant. As identified in Impact 18-4, the Area Plan would result in a less-than-significant impact related to wildland fire hazards because the Area Plan supports continued implementation of fire fuels reduction projects and existing fire protection regulations that would ensure new development includes fire resistant building materials, defensible space, fire-safe landscaping, adequate water supply, and emergency access. Additionally, future individual projects subsequent to the Area Plan would be required to assess, and mitigate if necessary, their potential impacts on exposure of people or structures to wildland fire hazards. For these reasons, any contribution by the proposed Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge alternatives to cumulative wildland fire hazards would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>			

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Program-Level Analysis = Area Plan  
 NI = No impact      B = Beneficial      LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

Tahoe City Lodge Project-Level Analysis = Lodge  
 S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable