MARTIS VALLEY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

SECTION 6.0 – PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

SCH No.: 2001072050

PREPARED FOR

PLACER COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
11414 B AVENUE
AUBURN, CA 95603

PREPARED BY

PMC
PACIFIC MUNICIPAL CONSULTANTS

10461 OLD PLACERVILLE ROAD, SUITE 110
SACRAMENTO, CA 95827

MARCH 2003

REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE

MARTIS VALLEY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

SECTION 6.0 – PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

SCH No.: 2001072050

Prepared for:

PLACER COUNTY
Planning Department
11414 B Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Prepared by:

PACIFIC MUNICIPAL CONSULTANTS
10461 Old Placerville Road, Suite 110
Sacramento, CA 95827
916.361.8384
Fax: 916.361.1574

MARCH 2003

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Purpose 1.0-1
1.2 Intended Uses of the Revised Draft EIR 1.0-1
1.3 Organization and Scope 1.0-2
1.4 Environmental Review Process 1.0-2

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

6.1 Introduction 6.0-1
6.2 Alternatives Considered But Not Selected for Analysis 6.0-1
6.3 No Project Alternative 6.0-2
6.4 Clustered Land Use Alternative 6.0-17
6.5 Reduced Intensity Alternative 6.0-27
6.6 Lowest Intensity Alternative 6.0-38
6.7 Conclusions 6.0-48

TABLE NUMBER PAGE

6.0-1 Environmental Impact Comparison between the Proposed Land Use Diagram and Alternatives AA, AB, and AC 6.0-3
6.0-2 Reduced Intensity Alternative 6.0-28
6.0-3 Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Land Use Diagram 6.0-49

FIGURE NUMBER PAGE

6.0-1 Cluster Land Use Alternative 6.0-19
6.0-2 Reduced Intensity Alternative 6.0-29
6.0-3 Lowest Intensity Alternative 6.0-39

This Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR) was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and the Placer County Environmental Review Ordinance. Placer County is the lead agency for the environmental review of the Martis Valley Community Plan Update (proposed project) and has the principal responsibility for approving the project. This RDEIR specifically includes an expanded analysis of the alternatives to the Martis Valley Community Plan Update that were addressed in Section 6.0 (Project Alternatives) of the Martis Valley Community Plan Update Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2001072050) as well as the consideration of a new minimal development alternative that was suggested to the County through written comments on the Martis Valley Community Plan Update Draft EIR.

1.1 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

In 1998, the Placer County Board of Supervisors authorized and directed the Planning Department to initiate an update of the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan for the Placer County portion of Martis Valley in order to bring it into consistency with the 1994 Placer County General Plan as well as current setting conditions in the Plan Area. As part of the initiation of this planning process, the County identified that the intent of the process is to update the technical aspects of the Plan and the goals and policies, creation of a current environmental analysis as well as appropriate implementation programs. This process is not to include major changes to the land use designations, as it has been recognized for some time by the County that such changes are not appropriate, and that the previous land use plan, with minor changes, is still current for this area (Placer County, 1998). Also, the Board of Supervisors selected an advisory committee that represented various interests including citizens, property owners and service providers.

In June of 2002, Placer County released the Martis Valley Community Plan and its associated EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2001072050) for public review and comment. The comment period on the Martis Valley Community Plan Update Draft EIR (referred to as "original Draft EIR" in this document) was initiated on June 20, 2002 and ended on August 19, 2002. Several written comment letters were received regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR, with several commentors expressing concerns regarding the extent of development proposed under the Martis Valley Community Plan and expressing the desire for further reduced development alternatives to be considered. As a result of these comments, Placer County (County), acting as the lead agency, has prepared this Revised Draft EIR to provide the public, and responsible and trustee agencies with additional information regarding the potential environmental benefits and effects of alternatives to the proposed Martis Valley Community Plan Update. Specifically, this RDEIR includes an expanded analysis of the alternatives to the Martis Valley Community Plan Update that were addressed in Section 6.0 (Project Alternatives) of the Martis Valley Community Plan Update Draft EIR, as well as the consideration of a new lowest intensity alternative that was suggested to the County through written comments on the Martis Valley Community Plan Update Draft EIR. This additional analysis is for the purpose, among others, of evaluating whether or not this additional alternative would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the proposed project.

Provision of this additional analysis is considered "significant new information" as generally defined under CEQA Guidelines 15088.5(a) and requires recirculation of the alternatives analysis of the original Martis Valley Community Plan Update Draft EIR. Further details regarding recirculation of the alternatives analysis are provided below.

1.2 INTENDED USES OF THE REVISED DRAFT EIR

This RDEIR is intended to provide additional information regarding potential alternatives to the proposed Martis Valley Community Plan Update for consideration by the County as part of the review and approval process of the Community Plan Update. This RDEIR will be eventually incorporated with the original Draft EIR and the response to comments on the Draft EIR to comprise the Final EIR, which will be considered for certification.

1.3 ORGANIZATION AND SCOPE

Section 6.0 (Project Alternatives) of the original Draft EIR has been revised and expanded in this document and includes the following alternatives under consideration beyond the three land use map alternatives previously considered (Proposed Land Use Diagram [PP], Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map [AA], Alternative 1 Land Use Map [AB] and Alternative 2 Land Use Map [AC]):

- ***No Project Alternative:*** CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires that a "no project" alternative be evaluated in an EIR. Under this alternative, the project would not be approved and the current Martis Valley General Plan (1975) would remain.

- ***Clustered Land Use Alternative:*** This alternative would involve clustering land use densities as shown in **Figure 6.0-1** in order to provide compact development in the Plan Area and minimize the amount of land disturbance.

- ***Reduced Intensity Alternative:*** This alternative would consist of the modification of the Proposed Land Use Diagram that would minimize significant impacts identified in the analysis provided in Section 4.0.

- ***Lowest Intensity Alternative:*** This alternative would consist of limiting residential development to 5,383 units, which would reduce the density by approximately one-half of the difference between the number of potential dwelling units under the Proposed Land Use Diagram and the number of dwelling units or lots existing in the Plan Area (approximately 2,500).

1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The review process for the RDEIR will involve the following general procedural steps:

PUBLIC NOTICE/PUBLIC REVIEW

CEQA Guidelines 15088.5 describes procedures for recirculation of a portion of an EIR, which requires the provision of a public notice of availability of the RDEIR at the same time as the Notice of Completion is submitted to the State Clearinghouse. In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(f) acknowledges that comments on a recirculated EIR can result in the lead agency receiving more than one set of comments from reviewers and recommends ways in which the lead agency may identify the set of comments to which it will respond. For this RDEIR, the County will request that commentors limit comments to the recirculated alternatives analysis provided in this document. Comments received on the original Draft EIR during the previous comment period will be responded to in the Final EIR and need not be re-submitted on this RDEIR. Public comment on the Draft EIR will be accepted in written form. All comments or questions regarding the RDEIR should be addressed to:

Lori Lawrence
Placer County Planning Department
11414 B Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS/FINAL EIR

Following the public review period on the RDEIR, a Final EIR will be prepared. The Final EIR will respond to written comments received during the public review period on the original Draft EIR and the RDEIR.

CERTIFICATION OF THE EIR/PROJECT CONSIDERATION

The County will review and consider the Final EIR. If the County finds that the Final EIR is "adequate and complete", the County will certify the Final EIR. Upon review and consideration of the Final EIR, the Placer County Board of Supervisors may take action to approve, revise, or reject the project. A decision to approve the project would be accompanied by written findings in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and, if applicable, Section 15093. A Mitigation Monitoring Program, as described below, would also be adopted for mitigation measures that have been incorporated into or imposed upon the project to reduce or avoid significant effects on the environment. This Mitigation Monitoring Program will be designed to ensure that these measures are carried out during project implementation.

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires lead agencies to adopt a reporting and mitigation monitoring program to describe measures that have been adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.



PMC
PACIFIC MUNICIPAL CONSULTANTS

FIGURE 6.0-3
MINIMAL DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

6.1 INTRODUCTION

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) states that an environmental impact report shall describe and analyze a range of reasonable alternatives to a project. These alternatives should feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, while avoiding or substantially lessening one or more of the significant environmental impacts of the project. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project, nor is it required to consider alternatives that are infeasible. The discussion of alternatives shall focus on those which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if they impede the attainment of the project objectives to some degree or would be more costly (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[b]). In addition to provisions under CEQA, Section 18.20.030 of the Placer County Environmental Review Ordinance includes additional requirements associated with alternatives analysis, including consideration of alternative sites.

As described in Section 3.0 (Project Description) of the original Draft EIR, the EIR evaluates the environmental effects of the Proposed Land Use Diagram (PP) along with the environmental effects of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map (AA), Alternative 1 Land Use Map (AB) and Alternative 2 Land Use Map (AC) at an equal level of detail throughout the technical analysis in Section 4.0 (Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures) of the original Draft EIR. **Table 6.0-1** provides a comparison of the environmental benefits and detriments of the Proposed Land Use Diagram in comparison to the three alternative land use maps.

In addition to these land use alternatives and in accordance with the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, this Section considers the environmental benefits and effects of the following additional alternatives. These alternatives are compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram and its significant environmental impacts identified in Section 4.0 (Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures) of the original Draft EIR:

- No Project Alternative
- Clustered Land Use Alternative
- Reduced Intensity Alternative
- Lowest Intensity Alternative

6.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS

OFF-SITE ALTERNATIVE

Given the nature of the project (update of the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan) and the fact that the alternative would not meet the basic objectives of the project, an off-site alternative is considered infeasible pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15126.6(c).

TRANSFERRING OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS ALTERNATIVE

Another alternative that has been suggested consists of transferring development rights from the Plan Area to the Town of Truckee in order to protect habitat and open space areas. Currently, the Town of Truckee and Placer County do not have an established program for transferring development rights between the jurisdictions. Transferring of development rights from the Plan Area would be inconsistent with the direction given by the Placer County Board of Supervisors regarding the Martis Valley Community Plan Update. The direction given by the Placer County Board of Supervisors regarding the Martis Valley Community Plan Update process did not include major changes to the land use designations, as it has been recognized for some time by the County that such changes are not appropriate, and that the previous land use plan,

with minor changes, is still current for this area (Placer County, 1998). Such an alternative would also not be consistent with the basic objectives of the project (land use goals set forth in Section 2 [Land Use] of the proposed Martis Valley Community Plan associated with the general intent of the Plan). It should also be noted that as part of the findings for CEQA made when Placer County adopted the 1994 Placer County General Plan, the County identified that Alternative 1 (New Urban Growth to the Cities) was rejected as infeasible because it did not meet objectives of the General Plan (opportunities for a mix of housing [including affordable], business development in the unincorporated area) (Placer County, 1994).

Given the current legal infeasibility of this potential alternative and its inconsistency with the basic intent of the project and the basic land use goals of the proposed Community Plan, transferring of development rights to the Town of Truckee was not considered in the alternatives analysis.

ALTERNATIVE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

This alternative option was suggested as part of comments on the NOP; however, no specific details and information were provided as part of this alternative option. The environmental impact analysis provided in Section 4.0 already proposes several mitigation measures that would result in modification and/or refinement of proposed Community Plan policies and implementation programs for a range of land use map options (Proposed Land Use Diagram, Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map, Alternative 1 Land Use Map and Alternative 2 Land Use Map). Given that this analysis is already provided as part of the environmental impact assessment, a separate alternative was not considered in this section.

6.3 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

CHARACTERISTICS

Under this alternative, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would not be adopted and the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan policy document and land use map (see **Table 3.0-3** and **Figure 3.0-6** of the original Draft EIR) would remain in effect for the Plan Area. Based on County estimates, future development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would have 11,668 dwelling units (4,064 single-family and 7,604 multi-family dwelling units), 1,681,000 square feet of commercial/office land uses, and 130 acres of Recreation land use at buildout. This analysis of the No Project Alternative is consistent with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines 15126.6(e)(3)(A), which specifically identify that when the project under evaluation is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, that the "no project" alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan.

COMPARATIVE IMPACTS

As described under each environmental issue area, the No Project Alternative would result in the same impacts as the Alternative AA (Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map), with the exception that the proposed Community Plan policies and implementation programs that provide mitigation for some environmental effects would not be in place, which would result in more severe environmental effects than the Proposed Land Use Diagram in several areas as described below.

Land Use

As described in Section 4.1 (Land Use) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant land use impacts. A comparison of the No Project

Table 6.0-1
Environmental Impact Comparison between the Proposed Land Use Diagram and Alternatives AA, AB, and AC

Impacts	Proposed Land Use Diagram (PP)	Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map (AA)		Alternative 1 Land Use Map (AB)		Alternative 2 Land Use Map (AC)	
	Significance	Significance	Comparison to Project	Significance	Comparison to Project	Significance	Comparison to Project
Impact 4.1.1 Consistency with Relevant Land Use Planning Documents	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.1.2 Land Use Conflicts	**SU**	SU	=	SU	<	SU	<
Impact 4.1.3 Loss of Forest and Timber Lands	**SU**	SU	=	SU	<	SU	<
Impact 4.1.4 Consistency with Relevant Planning Documents	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.1.5 Cumulative Land Use Conflicts	**SU**	SU	=	SU	<	SU	<
Impact 4.1.6 Cumulative Loss of Timber/Forest Resources	**SU**	SU	=	SU	<	SU	<
Impact 4.2.1 Holding Capacity	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.2.2 Housing	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.2.3 Cumulative Housing Impacts	**CSUM**	CSUM	=	CSUM	=	CSUM	=
Impact 4.3.1 Abandoned Mines and Tailings	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.3.2 Hazardous Materials Contamination	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.3.3 Airport Operations	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.3.4 Radon Exposure	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.3.5 Cumulative Hazard Impacts	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.4.1 Potential to Exceed an Established LOS Standard	**SU**	SU	>	SU	>	SU	<
Impact 4.4.2 Traffic Impacts to Local Residential Roadways	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	>	SUM	<
Impact 4.4.3 Potential Hazards Because of Design	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.4.4 Inadequate Parking Capacity	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.4.5 Conflicts With Transit	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.4.6 Conflicts with Pedestrian and Bicycle Uses	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.4.7 Cumulative Impacts to Area Intersections & Roads	**CSU**	CSU	>	CSU	>	CSU	<
Impact 4.4.8 Cumulative Impacts to Regional Highway Facilities	**CSU**	CSU	>	CSU	>	CSU	<
Impact 4.4.9 Cumulative Roadway Hazards	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.4.10 Cumulative Conflicts with Transit, Ped and Bike	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.5.1 Construction Noise Impacts	**SU**	SU	=	SU	=	SU	=
Impact 4.5.2 Transportation Noise Impacts	**SU**	SU	>	SU	>	SU	<
Impact 4.5.3 Future Stationary Noise Impacts	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.5.4 Truckee-Tahoe Airport Noise Impacts	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.5.5 Cumulative Traffic Noise Impacts	**CSU**	CSU	>	CSU	>	CSU	<
Impact 4.6.1 Construction Air Quality Impacts	**SU**	SU	>	SU	<	SU	<
Impact 4.6.2 Local Carbon Monoxide Concentration Impacts	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	>
Impact 4.6.3 Regional Ozone Precursor Emissions	**SU**	SU	>	SU	>	SU	>
Impact 4.6.4 Regional PM10 Emissions	**SU**	SU	>	SU	>	SU	>
Impact 4.6.5 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts	**CSU**	CSU	>	CSU	>	CSU	>
Impact 4.7.1 Construction Water Quality Impacts	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.7.2 Operational Surface Water Quality Impacts	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.7.3 Groundwater Quality Impacts	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.7.4 Groundwater Recharge Areas Impacts	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	<	LTS	<
Impact 4.7.5 Increased Groundwater Usage Impacts	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	>	SUM	<
Impact 4.7.6 Flood Hazard Impacts	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	<	LTS	<
Impact 4.7.7 Cumulative Water Quality Impacts	**CSUM**	CSUM	>	CSUM	<	CSUM	<
Impact 4.7.8 Cumulative Groundwater Recharge Area Impacts	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	<	LTS	<
Impact 4.7.9 Cumulative Groundwater Usage Impacts	**CSUM**	CSUM	>	CSUM	>	CSUM	<
Impact 4.7.10 Cumulative Flood Hazards	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	<	LTS	<
Impact 4.8.1 Geologic Stability and Suitability	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.8.2 Seismic Hazards	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.8.3 Soil Erosion	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.8.4 Avalanche Hazards	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.8.5 Cumulative Geologic Impacts	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.9.1 Disturbance to Common Plant Communities	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	<	LTS	<
Impact 4.9.2 Disturbance to Common Wildlife	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.9.3 Potential Disturbance to Special-Status Plant	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.9.4 Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.9.5 Lahontan Cutthroat Trout	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.9.6 Nesting Raptors and Other Migratory Birds	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.9.7 Potential Disturbance to Special-Status Bats	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.9.8 Special-Status Mammals	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.9.9 Disturbance to Riparian Habitat	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.9.10 Loss of Wetland Areas	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.9.11 Disturbance to Wildlife Movement	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.9.12 Cumulative Biological Resource Impacts	**CSU**	CSU	>	CSU	<	CSU	<
Impact 4.10.1 Impacts to Prehistoric and Historic Resources	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.10.2 Paleontological Resource Impacts	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.10.3 Cumulative Prehistoric and Historic Resources	**CSUM**	CSUM	>	CSUM	<	CSUM	<
Impact 4.10.4 Cumulative Paleontological Resource Impacts	**CSUM**	CSUM	>	CSUM	<	CSUM	<
Impact 4.11.1.1 Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	>	SUM	<
Impact 4.11.1.2 Wildland Fire Hazards	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.1.3 Cumulative Fire Protection	**CSUM**	CSUM	>	CSUM	>	CSUM	<
Impact 4.11.1.4 Cumulative Wildland Fire Hazard	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.2.1 Law Enforcement Services	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.2.2 Cumulative Law Enforcement Services	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.3.1 Impacts on School Services	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.3.2 Cumulative Impacts on School Services	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.4.1 Water Facilities and Distribution Systems	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	>	SUM	<
Impact 4.11.4.2 Cumulative Water Facilities and Distribution	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.5.1 Wastewater Service	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.5.2 Cumulative Wastewater Service	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.6.1 Solid Waste Disposal	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.6.2 Cumulative Solid Waste Disposal	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.7.1 Availability of Electrical Energy	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.7.2 Increased Demand for Natural Gas	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.7.3 Extension of Utilities	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	>	SUM	<
Impact 4.11.7.4 Cumulative Availability of Electrical Energy	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.7.5 Cumulative Demand for Natural Gas	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.8.1 Park and Recreation	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	>	SUM	<
Impact 4.11.8.2 Cumulative Park and Recreation Impacts	**CSUM**	CSUM	>	CSUM	>	CSUM	<
Impact 4.11.9.1 Road Maintenance and Snow Removal	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.11.9.2 Cumulative Road Maintenance and Snow Removal	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.12.1 Alterations of Views from Highways	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.12.2 Alteration of Public and Private Views	**SU**	SU	>	SU	<	SU	<
Impact 4.12.3 Daytime Glare	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.12.4 Increased Nighttime Lighting	**SU**	SU	>	SU	>	SU	<
Impact 4.12.5 Cumulative Visual Impacts	**CSU**	CSU	>	CSU	<	CSU	<

LTS = Less than Significant
SUM = Significant Unless Mitigated
SU = Significant and Unavoidable
CSU = Cumulative Significant Unavoidable
CSUM = Cumulative Significant Unless Mitigated

< - Alternative's impact is better than the Proposed Land Use Diagram
> - Alternative's impact is worse than the Proposed Land Use Diagram
= - Alternative's impact is equivalent to the Proposed Land Use Diagram

Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Consistency with relevant plans of the Truckee-Tahoe Airport (Impact 4.1.1)

Subsequent development under the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan could result in conflicts with the Truckee-Tahoe Airport operations as well as with Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77 and the Tahoe Truckee Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan similar to the Proposed Land Use Diagram. However, the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan does not include any policies associated with considering land use restrictions associated with the airport, while the proposed Community Plan does include policies 5.E.1 and 5.E.2 regarding coordination with the airport and support for continued use of the airport. Thus, the No Project Alternative would have more severe consistency impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram given the lack of airport consistency policies in the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan.

Conflicts with forestry uses under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.1.2 and 4.1.5)

Both the No Project Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable conversion and conflict potential with forestry uses. The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan does include policies that encourage the protection of timber lands from urban development (Environmental Resource Policies 1 and 2 and Community Development and Transportation Policy 14). However, the proposed Community Plan includes several specific policies for the protection and preservation of forestry uses and activities (policies 1.F.3 through 1.F.6, 1.J.1, 9.E.3, 9.E.4, 9.E.6 through 9.E.9, 9.E.14 and 9.E.15) that are more detailed and comprehensive than the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan. Thus, the No Project Alternative would result in more severe forestry conflict issues than the Proposed Land Use Diagram given the lack of detailed timberland protection policies in the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan.

Loss of forest and timberlands and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.1.3 and 4.1.6)

Both the No Project Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable conversion of timberlands. The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan does include policies that encourage the protection of timber lands from urban development (Environmental Resource Policies 1 and 2 and Community Development and Transportation Policy 14). However, the proposed Community Plan includes several specific policies for the protection and preservation of forestry uses and activities (policies 1.F.3 through 1.F.6, 1.J.1, 9.E.3, 9.E.4, 9.E.6 through 9.E.9, 9.E.14 and 9.E.15) that are more detailed and comprehensive and provide better mitigation than the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan. Thus, the No Project Alternative would result in more severe timberland loss issues than the Proposed Land Use Diagram given the lack of detailed timberland protection policies in the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan.

Population, Housing and Employment

As described in Section 4.2 (Population, Housing and Employment) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Provision of insufficient affordable housing and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.2.2 and 4.2.3)

Implementation of the No Project Alternative would result in more development and housing than the Proposed Land Use Diagram, but would still be within the County's holding capacity estimates for the Plan Area. This alternative would also result in similar affordable and employee

housing impacts as the Proposed Land Use Diagram, though its jobs-housing ratio would be lower (2.25 versus 2.56). The direct environmental effects associated with this impact would consist of increases in traffic and associated air quality emissions and increases in traffic noise from employees having to travel outside of the Plan Area for housing, which were addressed in Sections 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation), 4.5 (Noise) and 4.6 (Air Quality) of the original Draft EIR. The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes two policies regarding the general provision of affordable housing (Community Development Policies 1 and 2), while the proposed Community Plan includes several detailed policies regarding the provision of affordable housing (policies 3.A.1 through 3.A.8 and implementation programs 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 11) that are more detailed and comprehensive and provide better mitigation than the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan. Thus, the No Project Alternative would result in more severe affordable housing impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram given the lack of detailed affordable housing provision policies in the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan.

Human Health/Risk of Upset

As described in Section 4.3 (Human Health/Risk of Upset) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Abandoned mines and tailings (Impact 4.3.1)

As shown in **Figure 3.0-6**, the No Project Alternative proposes a larger land area for disturbance than the Proposed Land Use Diagram, especially in the Northstar area where mining facilities have been identified. In addition, the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan does not include any policies addressing geologic hazards, while the proposed Community Plan includes Policy 9.A.1 and Implementation Program 2 in the Natural Resources section regarding consideration of geologic hazards. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have a more severe impact than the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Hazardous material contamination (Impact 4.3.2)

Both the No Project Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential exposure to hazardous material contamination given that their mix of land uses are similar. Neither the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan or the proposed Community Plan includes policies regarding hazardous materials.

Airport operations (Impact 4.3.3)

Both the No Project Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential safety hazards with land use proximity to the Truckee-Tahoe Airport given that their mix of land uses are similar near the airport. The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan does not include any policies associated with considering land use restrictions associated with the airport, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies 5.E.1 and 5.E.2 regarding coordination with the airport and support for continued use of the airport. Thus, the No Project Alternative would result in more severe airport safety impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram given the lack of airport consistency policies in the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan.

Transportation and Circulation

As described in Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of

the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Potential to exceed established level of service standards on area roadways under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.4.1 and 4.4.7)

The No Project Alternative would generate 25 percent more traffic during the peak hour and 23 percent more traffic over the average daily traffic volumes than the Proposed Land Use Diagram. As a result, this alternative would result in different LOS conditions on the following impacted roadways and intersections (see **Tables 4.4-16** and **4.4-17** in Section 4.4 [Transportation and Circulation] of the original Draft EIR for complete LOS analysis of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map):

- SR 89/SR 267 Bypass/I-80 Westbound intersection would operate at LOS F (winter weekend PM peak hour) under the proposed Plan Area roadway network and with the potential Schaffer Mill Road connection to Northstar, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram would operate at LOS E.
- SR 89 South/Donner Pass Road intersection would operate at LOS F (winter weekend PM peak hour) under the proposed Plan Area roadway network and with the potential Schaffer Mill Road connection, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram would operate at LOS E.
- Schaffer Mill Road west of SR 267 would operate at LOS F under the proposed Plan Area roadway network, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram would operate at LOS E.
- SR 267 Bypass (I-80 to Old Brockway Road) would operate at LOS F under the existing roadway network, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram would operate at LOS C and would not require widening to four lanes.
- Northstar Drive west of SR 267 would operate at LOS D under the existing roadway network and the proposed Plan Area roadway network, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram would operate at LOS E under both roadway network conditions.

With the exception of the intersections and roadway segments identified above, the No Project Alternative would result in the same LOS and/or LOS within standards of Placer County, Town of Truckee, Caltrans and/or Tahoe Regional Planning Agency for all other intersections and roadway segments.

As noted above, the No Project Alternative would generally have more severe traffic impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram, with the exception of impacts to Northstar Drive. The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes no transportation policies, while the proposed Community Plan includes several policies (5.A.3, 5.A.4, 5.A.7 through 5.A.15 and 5.C.1 through 5.C.4) and implementation programs in the Transportation and Circulation section (1 through 3, 5 and 6) associated with provision of adequate roadway facilities, LOS and alternative transportation and financing.

Traffic impacts to residential roadways in the Sierra Meadows/Ponderosa Palisades area (Impact 4.4.2)

The No Project Alternative would generate approximately 760 additional daily trips into the Sierra Meadows/Ponderosa residential area more than the Proposed Land Use Diagram if such connections were made to Schaffer Mill Road, which would result in a more severe residential

traffic impacts. The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes no transportation policies, while the proposed Community Plan includes Policy 5.A.5 that discourages the use of neighborhood roadways for through traffic.

Cumulative traffic impacts to regional highway facilities (Impact 4.4.8)

The No Project Alternative land uses are expected to increase traffic volumes along I-80 (east and west of SR 267) by 20 percent under year 2021 peak hour traffic conditions, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in a 15 percent increase along I-80. Thus, the No Project Alternative would result in a more severe traffic impact than the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Noise

As described in Section 4.5 (Noise) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Construction noise impacts (Impact 4.5.1)

Both the No Project Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram would have similar construction noise impacts, given the similarity in land use mix and pattern. Neither the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan or the proposed Community Plan includes policies regarding construction noise.

Transportation noise impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.5.2 and 4.5.5)

As shown in **Tables C-1** and **C-2** in **Appendix 4.5** of the original Draft EIR, the No Project Alternative (Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map) would result in traffic noise levels higher than what is anticipated under the Proposed Land Use Diagram along Brockway Road, SR 267, SR 28 and Schaffer Mill Road under year 2021 conditions. The noise level increase over anticipated noise levels under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would range from one to two dB. The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes no noise policies, while the proposed Community Plan includes several transportation noise policies (10.A.3, 10.A.5 through 10.A.8, 10.A.10) and two implementation programs (1 and 2) in the Noise section.

Truckee-Tahoe Airport noise impacts (Impact 4.5.4)

The No Project Alternative would result in similar potential airport noise impacts as the Proposed Land Use Diagram. While the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes no noise policies, the proposed Community Plan includes several noise policies (10.A.3, 10.A.5, 10.A.6, 10.A.9 and 10.A.10) and two implementation programs (1 and 2) in the Noise section that are applicable to airport noise. Thus, the No Project Alternative would result in more severe airport noise issues than the Proposed Land Use Diagram given the lack of airport consistency policies in the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan.

Air Quality

As described in Section 4.6 (Air Quality) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Construction air quality impacts (Impact 4.6.1)

The No Project Alternative is expected to result in worse construction air quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be disturbed from development (approximately an additional 600 acres above the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout). While the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan included only one policy regarding maintaining general air quality, the proposed Community Plan includes several air quality policies (9.H.1, 9.H.2 and 9.H.5 through 9.H.8) that include coordination with the Placer County Air Pollution Control District and development of appropriate air quality mitigation measures.

Regional ozone precursor emissions and cumulative air quality impacts (Impacts 4.6.3 and 4.6.5)

As identified in **Table 4.6-4** of the original Draft EIR, the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map (No Project Alternative) would result in increased air pollutant emissions ranging from 18 to 20 percent for criteria air pollutants under summer and winter conditions as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram. While the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan included only one policy regarding maintaining general air quality, the proposed Community Plan includes several air quality policies (9.H.1, 9.H.4, 9.H.5, 9.H.6, 9.H.8 through 9.H.14) that include coordination with the Placer County Air Pollution Control District and development of appropriate air quality mitigation measures for stationary and mobile sources.

Regional PM_{10} emissions (Impact 4.6.4)

As identified in **Table 4.6-4** of the original Draft EIR, the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map (No Project Alternative) would result in increased PM_{10} emissions by approximately 180 pounds per day during the summer and 1,522 pounds per day during the winter as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram. While the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan included only one policy regarding maintaining general air quality, the proposed Community Plan includes several air quality policies (9.H.1, 9.H.4, 9.H.5, 9.H.6, 9.H.8) that include coordination with the Placer County Air Pollution Control District and development of appropriate air quality mitigation measures.

Hydrology and Water Quality

As described in Section 4.7 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Construction water quality impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.7.1 and 4.7.7)

The No Project Alternative is expected to result in worse construction water quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be disturbed from extensive development (approximately an additional 600 acres above the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout). The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes several policies regarding the general protection of water quality (Environmental Resource Policies 1, 2, 3 and 5, and Community Development and Transportation Policies 1 and 2), while the proposed Community Plan includes several detailed policies regarding water quality (6.E.3, 6.E.11, 9.D.1 through 9.D.5, 9.D.7 through 9.D.10, 9.F.2 and 9.F.5 and implementation programs [Geology section] 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 and [Water Resources section] 10, 15 and 18) that are more detailed and comprehensive and provides better mitigation than the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan.

Operational surface water quality impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.7.2 and 4.7.7)

The No Project Alternative is expected to result in worse operational water quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be extensively developed (approximately an additional 600 acres above the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout). The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes several policies regarding the general protection of water quality (Environmental Resource Policies 1, 2, 3 and 5, and Community Development and Transportation Policies 1 and 2), while the proposed Community Plan includes several detailed policies regarding water quality (6.E.6, 6.E.8, 6.E.10, 6.E.11, 9.D.1, 9.D.4, 9.D.5, 9.D.9, 9.D.10, 9.F.1, 9.F.2 and 9.F.5 and implementation programs [Stormwater Drainage section] 1, 16, 17, and 18 and [Water Resources section] 15 and 18) that are more detailed and comprehensive and provides better mitigation than the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan.

Groundwater quality impacts (Impact 4.7.3)

The No Project Alternative is expected to result in similar groundwater quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram. The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes several policies regarding the general protection of water quality (Environmental Resource Policies 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 and Community Development and Transportation Policy 2), while the proposed Community Plan includes several detailed policies regarding water quality (6.C.6, 6.D.1, 6.D.5 through 6.D.7, 9.D.1, 9.D.4, 9.D.5, 9.D.9, 9.D.10, 9.F.1, 9.F.2 and 9.F.5 and implementation programs [Water Supply and Delivery section] 8, 12, 13, [Sewage Collection, Treatment and Disposal section] 14 and 15, [Stormwater Drainage section] 1, 16, 17, and 18 and [Water Resources section] 15 and 18) that are more detailed and comprehensive and provides better mitigation than the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan. Thus, the No Project Alternative would result in more severe groundwater quality impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram given the lack of water quality policies in the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan.

Increased groundwater usage impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.7.5 and 4.7.9)

The No Project Alternative would result in an increased water demand of 36 acre-feet annually as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram (see **Tables 4.7-4** and **4.7-5** in the original Draft EIR). However, adequate groundwater and surface water supplies exist to serve both options. This alternative would also have similar potential surface water impacts from increased groundwater usage as the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Geology and Soils

As described in Section 4.8 (Geology and Soils) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Seismic hazards (Impact 4.8.2)

Both the No Project Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential seismic hazards, given that their land use patterns are similar and include sensitive land uses in areas where faults are suspected. The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan does not include any policies associated with seismic hazards, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (9.A.1, 9.A.7 and 9.A.8) and implementation

programs ([Geology section] 2 and 5) that address potential seismic hazards. Thus, the No Project Alternative would result in more severe seismic hazards than the Proposed Land Use Diagram given the lack of seismic hazard policies in the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan.

Soil erosion (Impact 4.8.3)

The No Project Alternative is expected to result in worse soil erosion impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be extensively developed (approximately an additional 600 acres above the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout). The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan does not include any policies associated with geologic stability, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (6.E.3, 6.E.10, 9.D.1 through 9.D.5, 9.D.7 through 9.D.10, 9.F.2, 9.F.5, 9.H.7 and 9.H.8) and implementation programs ([Geology section] 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8) that include provisions regarding the continued implementation of County erosion control standards, buffers from waterways, use of Best Management Practices and protection of floodplains.

Avalanche hazards (Impact 4.8.4)

As shown in **Figure 3.0-6** of the original Draft EIR, the No Project Alternative proposes a larger land area for potential development in areas identified as having avalanche hazard potential (north facing slopes in areas with 30 percent and greater slopes) than the Proposed Land Use Diagram. Both the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan and the proposed Community Plan include policies that require the consideration of potential avalanche hazards for subsequent development.

Biological Resources

As described in Section 4.9 (Biological Resources) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Potential disturbance to special-status plant species (Impact 4.9.3)

As identified in **Figures 4.9-6** and **4.9-7** of the original Draft EIR, the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map (No Project Alternative) would result in more land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately an additional 308 acres of disturbance of existing vegetation at buildout that could support identified special-status plant species [Great Basin scrub, riparian scrub, mixed coniferous forest, ruderal and montane chaparral]) and would have greater potential to impact special-status plant species (Donner Pass buckwheat, plumas ivesia, Carson Range rock cress, long-petaled lewisia, Munroe's desert mallow and American manna grass). The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes general policies (Environmental Resource Policies 1, 2, 4 and 12) that provide for the protection of waterways, riparian and timberland areas, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (9.E.5, 9.E.10, 9.F.2, 9.F.4 and 9.G10) and implementation programs ([Natural Resources section] 1) that include provisions regarding the preservation of areas containing special-status plant species, subsequent development avoidance of ecologically-fragile areas and wetlands, no net loss of wetland and riparian habitats and detailed review of subsequent project impacts on biological resources.

Potential disturbance to mountain yellow-legged frog (Impact 4.9.4)

Both the No Project Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential impacts to the mountain yellow-legged frog, given that both land use options have similar potential effects to Martis Creek and its tributaries. The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes general policies (Environmental Resource Policies 1, 2, 4 and 12) that provide for the protection of waterways, riparian and timberland areas, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (9.E.10, 9.F.1 through 9.F.7, 9.G.1 through 9.G.4 and 9.G.8 through 9.G.10) and implementation programs ([Natural Resources section] 1) that include provisions regarding subsequent development avoidance of ecologically-fragile areas and wetlands, no net loss of wetland and riparian habitats, water quality protection measures for wetland areas, preservation of habitats that support special-status species, preservation of important wildlife corridors and detailed review of subsequent project impacts on biological resources. Thus, the No Project Alternative would result in more severe impacts to the mountain yellow-legged frog than the Proposed Land Use Diagram given the lack of natural resource policies in the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan.

Potential disturbance to the Lahontan cutthroat trout (Impact 4.9.5)

Both the No Project Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential impacts to the Lahontan cutthroat trout, given that both land use options have similar potential effects to Martis Creek and its tributaries. The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes general policies (Environmental Resource Policies 1, 2, 4 and 12) that provide for the protection of waterways, riparian and timberland areas, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (9.F.1 through 9.F.5, 9.F.7, 9.G.1 through 9.G.4, 9.G.6, and 9.G.8 through 9.G.10) and implementation programs ([Natural Resources section] 1) that include provisions regarding subsequent development avoidance of ecologically-fragile areas and wetlands, no net loss of wetland and riparian habitats, water quality protection measures for wetland areas, preservation of habitats that support special-status species and detailed review of subsequent project impacts on biological resources. Thus, the No Project Alternative would result in more severe impacts to the Lahontan cutthroat trout than the Proposed Land Use Diagram given the lack of natural resource policies in the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan.

Potential disturbance to nesting raptors and other migratory birds (Impact 4.9.6)

As identified in **Figures 4.9-6** and **4.9-7** of the original Draft EIR, the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map (No Project Alternative) would result in more land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately an additional 480 acres of disturbance of existing vegetation at buildout) and would have greater potential to impact nesting raptors and other migratory birds (e.g., northern goshawk, American peregrine falcon [federal and state listed species], California spotted owl, bald eagle [federal and state listed species], Cooper's hawk, red-tailed hawk, yellow warbler and little willow flycatcher). The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes general policies (Environmental Resource Policies 1, 2, 4 and 12) that provide for the protection of waterways, riparian and timberland areas, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (9.E.3 through 9.E.7, 9.E.9, 9.E.10, 9.E.12, 9.F.1, 9.F.2, 9.F.4 through 9.F.6, 9.G.1 through 9.G.5, and 9.G.8 through 9.G10) and implementation programs ([Natural Resources section] 1) that include provisions regarding the conservation of existing vegetation and trees, support of the Forest Practices Act to protect forest conditions, subsequent development avoidance of ecologically-fragile areas and wetlands, no net loss of wetland and riparian habitats and detailed review of subsequent project impacts on biological resources.

Potential disturbance to special-status bat species (Impact 4.9.7)

As identified in **Figures 4.9-6** and **4.9-7** of the original Draft EIR, the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map (No Project Alternative) would result in more land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately an additional 340 acres of disturbance of existing vegetation at buildout [riparian scrub, mixed coniferous forest, and red fir forest]) and would have greater potential to impact special-status bat species (spotted bat, long-eared myotis, fringed myotis, long-legged myotis, Yuma myotis and Pale Townsend's big-eared bat). The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes general policies (Environmental Resource Policies 1, 2, 4 and 12) that provide for the protection of waterways, riparian and timberland areas, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (9.E.3 through 9.E.7, 9.E.9, 9.E.10, 9.E.12, 9.F.1, 9.F.2, 9.F.4 through 9.F.6, 9.G.1 through 9.G.5, and 9.G.8 through 9.G10) and implementation programs ([Natural Resources section] 1) that include provisions regarding the conservation of existing vegetation and trees, support of the Forest Practices Act to protect forest conditions, subsequent development avoidance of ecologically-fragile areas and wetlands, no net loss of wetland and riparian habitats and detailed review of subsequent project impacts on biological resources.

Potential disturbance to Sierra Nevada red fox, California wolverine, Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, pacific fisher, Sierra Nevada mountain beaver and pine marten (Impact 4.9.8)

As identified in **Figures 4.9-6** and **4.9-7** of the original Draft EIR, the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map (No Project Alternative) would result in more land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately an additional 340 acres of disturbance of existing vegetation at buildout [riparian scrub, mixed coniferous forest, and red fir forest]) and would have greater potential to impact the Sierra Nevada red fox (state listed species), California wolverine (state listed species), Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, pacific fisher, Sierra Nevada mountain beaver and pine marten. The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes general policies (Environmental Resource Policies 1, 2, 4 and 12) that provide for the protection of waterways, riparian and timberland areas, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (9.E.3 through 9.E.6, 9.F.1, 9.F.2, 9.G.1 through 9.G10) and implementation programs ([Natural Resources section] 1) that include provisions regarding the conservation of existing vegetation and trees, support of the Forest Practices Act to protect forest conditions, subsequent development avoidance of ecologically-fragile areas, wetlands and water features, no net loss of wetland and riparian habitats, preservation of important wildlife corridors and detailed review of subsequent project impacts on biological resources.

Disturbance to wildlife movement (Impact 4.9.11)

Both the No Project Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential impacts to the wildlife movement and migration associated with the Verdi subunit of the Loyalton-Truckee deer herd, given that both land use options have similar land use patterns that could affect open space corridors. The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes general policies (Environmental Resource Policies 1, 2, 4 and 12) that provide for the protection of waterways, riparian, open space and timberland areas, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (9.D.1, 9.D.4, 9.D.9, 9.D.10, 9.E.3, 9.E.4, 9.E.6, 9.G.1 through 9.G.5, 9.G.8 through 9.G.10) and implementation programs ([Natural Resources section] 1) that include provisions regarding subsequent development avoidance of ecologically-fragile areas and wetlands, buffers along sensitive habitat areas, preservation of creek corridors, conservation of forest areas, preservation of habitats that support special-status species and preservation of important wildlife corridors and detailed review of subsequent project impacts on biological resources. Thus, the No Project Alternative would result in more

severe impacts to wildlife movement than the Proposed Land Use Diagram given the lack of natural resource policies in the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan.

Cumulative biological resource impacts (Impact 4.9.12)

As identified in **Figures 4.9-6** and **4.9-7** of the original Draft EIR, the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map (No Project Alternative) would result in more land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately an additional 480 acres of disturbance of existing vegetation at buildout) and would have a greater contribution to cumulative biological resource impacts in the region as described under impacts 4.9.3, 4.9.4, 4.9.5, 4.9.6, 4.9.7, 4.9.8 and 4.9.11 for the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

As described in Section 4.10 (Cultural and Paleontological Resources) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Impacts to prehistoric and historic resources under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.10.1 and 4.10.3)

The No Project Alternative is expected to result in a higher potential for cultural resource impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be extensively developed (approximately an additional 600 acres above the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout). The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes one policy regarding cultural resources (Environmental Resource Policy 13) that generally provides for the protection and enhancement of archaeological and historic sites, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (8.A.1 through 8.A.9) and implementation programs ([Cultural Resources section] 1 through 9) that include provisions for preserving cultural and paleontological resources, consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission and/or Native American Community and avoidance of impacts to significant cultural and paleontological resources.

Paleontological resource impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.10.2 and 4.10.4)

Both the No Project Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential paleontological resource impacts, given that both land use options have similar land use patterns in the valley portion of the Plan Area that contain the Pleistocene nonmarine sedimentary rocks (Prosser Creek Alluvium) and Quaternary alluvium geologic units, which are considered to have a high paleontological resource potential. The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes no policies regarding paleontological resources, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (8.A.2, 8.A.5 and 8.A.6) and implementation programs ([Cultural Resources section] 1, 3 and 5) that include provisions for preserving cultural and paleontological resources and avoidance of impacts to significant cultural and paleontological resources. Thus, the No Project Alternative would result in potentially more severe impacts to paleontological resources than the Proposed Land Use Diagram given the lack of resource protection policies in the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan.

Public Services

As described in Section 4.11 (Public Services) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the No Project

Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Fire protection and emergency medical services under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.11.1.1 and 4.11.1.3)

The No Project Alternative is expected to result in more severe fire protection and emergency services impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of designating more development outside of the existing service areas of the Truckee Fire Protection District and the Northstar Community Services District (see **Figures 3.0-5, 3.0-6** and **4.11-1** of the original Draft EIR). The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes one policy regarding fire protection services (Community Development and Transportation Policy 19), while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (6.H.3 through 6.H.5, 6.H.7, 6.H.14) and implementation programs ([Public Facilities and Services section] 1, 2 and 4) that include provisions for participate or fund fire protection services, coordination with applicable fire protection service agencies, review projects for compliance with fire safety standards.

Water facilities and distribution systems (Impact 4.11.4.1)

The No Project Alternative is expected to result in more severe water facility and distribution impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of increased development potential and associated increases in water demand and service (see **Tables 3.0-2** and **3.0-3** of the original Draft EIR). The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes three policies regarding the maintenance of groundwater resources and creation of a single entity for water supply provision (Community Environmental Resource Policies 5 and 7 and Community Development and Transportation Policy 7), while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (6.C.1 and 6.C.7) and implementation programs ([Water Supply and Delivery section] 9 and 10) that include provisions for demonstration of adequate water supplies are available for future development and preference for public agencies to provide water supply service.

Extension of electrical, natural gas and telephone infrastructure (Impact 4.11.7.3)

The No Project Alternative is expected to result in more severe utility extension impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of increased development potential and provision of utilities into undeveloped areas (see **Tables 3.0-2** and **3.0-3** and **Figures 3.0-5** and **3.0-6** in the original Draft EIR). The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes no policies regarding the extension of public utilities, while the proposed Community Plan includes Policy 2.B.5 and implementation programs ([Public Facilities and Services section] 1, 2, 5 and 31) that include provisions for proper siting and undergrounding of utilities as well as the proper timing of utilities with development.

Parks and recreation facilities impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.11.8.1 and 4.11.8.2)

The No Project Alternative is expected to result in more severe park recreation demand impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of increased development potential (see **Tables 3.0-2** and **3.0-3** in the original Draft EIR). The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes two policies regarding the enhancement of recreational opportunities and expansion of public park and recreation facilities for primary residents, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (7.A.1 through 7.A.5, 7.B.1 through 7.B.5, 7.C.1) and implementation programs ([Recreation section] 1, 2 and 3) that include provisions for coordination with the Truckee Donner Recreation and Park District for passive and active recreation facilities and services and continued enforcement of park dedication and/or fees for development.

Visual Resources/Light and Glare

As described in Section 4.12 (Visual Resources/Light and Glare) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Alteration of public and private views (Impact 4.12.2)

The No Project Alternative is expected to result in more severe visual impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of increased development potential and additional development in currently undeveloped areas (see **Figures 3.0-5** and **3.0-6** in the original Draft EIR). The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes one policy regarding the retention of high quality open space and visual resources, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (2.A.1 through 2.A.9, 2.B.1 through 2.B.9 and 2.C.1 through 2.C.7) and implementation programs ([Population and Housing section] 7 and [Community Design section] 1 and 2) that include provisions for compliance with the Placer County Design Guidelines and design and development standards set forth in the Community Plan and requiring development to be compatible with the natural environment.

Daytime glare (Impact 4.12.3)

Both the No Project Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential daytime glare impacts from development, given that both land use options have similar land use patterns and mix of land uses. The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes one policy regarding the retention of high quality open space and visual resources, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (2.A.1, 2.A.2, 2.A.8, 2.B.1 through 2.B.3, 2.B.5, 2.B.9, 2.C.2 and 2.C.3) and implementation programs ([Population and Housing section] 7 and [Community Design section] 1 and 2) that include provisions for compliance with the Placer County Design Guidelines and design and development standards set forth in the Community Plan and requiring development to be compatible with the natural environment. Thus, the No Project Alternative would have more severe daytime glare impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram given the lack of design policies in the 1975 Martis Valley General Plan.

Increased nighttime lighting (Impact 4.12.4)

The No Project Alternative is expected to result in more severe nighttime lighting impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of increased development potential and additional development in currently undeveloped areas (see **Figures 3.0-5** and **3.0-6** in the original Draft EIR). The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes one policy regarding the retention of high quality open space and visual resources, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (2.A.1 through 2.A.3, 2.A.9, 2.B.5 and 2.C.2) and implementation programs ([Population and Housing section] 7 and [Community Design section] 1 and 2) that include provisions for compliance with the Placer County Design Guidelines and design and development standards set forth in the Community Plan and requiring development to be compatible with the natural environment.

Cumulative visual resource impacts (Impact 4.12.5)

The No Project Alternative is expected to contribute to more severe visual impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of increased development potential and additional development in currently undeveloped areas (see **Figures 3.0-5** and **3.0-6** in the original Draft

EIR). The 1975 Martis Valley General Plan includes one policy regarding the retention of high quality open space and visual resources, while the proposed Community Plan includes policies (2.A.1 through 2.A.9, 2.B.1 through 2.B.9 and 2.C.1 through 2.C.7) and implementation programs ([Population and Housing section] 7 and [Community Design section] 1 and 2) that include provisions for compliance with the Placer County Design Guidelines and design and development standards set forth in the Community Plan and requiring development to be compatible with the natural environment.

6.4 CLUSTERED LAND USE ALTERNATIVE

CHARACTERISTICS

Under this alternative, a majority of future residential development would be clustered in the following manner and on the following sites in order to minimize land disturbance (see **Figure 6.0-1**):

Eaglewood site:	475 residential units on 175 acres
Hopkins Ranch site:	80 residential units on 16 acres
Northstar-at-Tahoe:	1,700 residential units on 170 acres
Siller Ranch site:	800 residential units on 80 acres
Waddle Ranch site:	1,200 residential units on 120 acres

This alternative would also include the following non-residential designated land uses distributed in the Plan Area generally similar to the Alternative 2 Land Use Map (see **Figure 3.0-8** of the original Draft EIR):

- 17,789 acres designated Forest (which would yield 205 residential units);
- 29 acres designated General Commercial;
- 29 acres designated Public/Quasi Public;
- 12 acres designated Professional Office;
- 100 acres designated Tourist Commercial;
- 509 acres designated Water; and,
- 4,947 acres designated Open Space.

The Clustered Land Use Alternative would have holding capacity of 6,870 residential units, which would be a 25 percent reduction in residential units as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram. This alternative would utilize the proposed Community Plan policies, implementation programs and design guidelines as they are currently proposed. It should be noted that designated Open Space areas would include timber production activities.

COMPARATIVE IMPACTS

Land Use

As described in Section 4.1 (Land Use) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant land use impacts. A comparison of the Clustered Land Use Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Consistency with relevant plans of the Truckee-Tahoe Airport (Impact 4.1.1)

Subsequent development under the Clustered Land Use Alternative could result in conflicts with the Truckee-Tahoe Airport operations as well as with Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77 and the Tahoe Truckee Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan similar to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Conflicts with forestry uses under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.1.2 and 4.1.5)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative would result in reduced impacts associated with conversion and conflict potential with forestry uses as a result of the reduced extent of extensive development in the Plan Area and the provision of more acreage designated Open Space (approximately an additional 1,287 acres) and Forest (approximately an additional 724 acres) than the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Loss of forest and timberlands and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.1.3 and 4.1.6)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative would result in reduced impacts associated conversion of timberlands as a result of the reduced extent of extensive development in the Plan Area and the provision of more acreage designated Open Space (approximately an additional 1,287 acres) and Forest (approximately an additional 724 acres) than the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Population, Housing and Employment

As described in Section 4.2 (Population, Housing and Employment) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Clustered Land Use Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Provision of insufficient affordable housing and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.2.2 and 4.2.3)

Implementation of the Clustered Land Use Alternative would result in less development and housing than the Proposed Land Use Diagram. This alternative would also result in similar affordable and employee housing impacts as the Proposed Land Use Diagram, though its jobs-housing ratio would be worse (4.13 versus 2.56) given the potential generation of approximately 5,674 fulltime equivalent employee jobs. The direct environmental effects associated with this impact would consist of increases in traffic and associated air quality emissions and increases in traffic noise from employees having to travel outside of the Plan Area for housing, which were addressed in Sections 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation), 4.5 (Noise) and 4.6 (Air Quality) of the original Draft EIR, would be more severe under this alternative.

Human Health/Risk of Upset

As described in Section 4.3 (Human Health/Risk of Upset) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the



PMC
PACIFIC MUNICIPAL CONSULTANTS

FIGURE 6.0-1
CLUSTER LAND USE ALTERNATIVE

Clustered Land Use Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Abandoned mines and tailings (Impact 4.3.1)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative proposes a smaller land area for disturbance and reduced development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram, especially in the Northstar area where mining facilities have been identified. Thus, this alternative would reduced hazard impacts associated with potential abandoned mine sites.

Hazardous material contamination (Impact 4.3.2)

Both the Clustered Land Use Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential exposure to hazardous material contamination given that their mix of land uses are similar.

Airport operations (Impact 4.3.3)

Both the Clustered Land Use Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential safety hazards with land use proximity to the Truckee-Tahoe Airport given that their mix of land uses are similar near the airport.

Transportation and Circulation

As described in Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the significant impacts discussed below. A comparison of the impacts associated with the Clustered Land Use Alternative to those associated with the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Potential to exceed established level of service standards on area roadways under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.4.1 and 4.4.7)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative would generate 15 percent less traffic during the peak hour and 13 percent less traffic over the average day than the Proposed Land Use Diagram. The PM peak-hour and daily trip generation of the Clustered Land Use Alternative is within 6 percent of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map trip generation. Therefore, the impacts associated with these two alternatives would be similar. This alternative would result in different LOS conditions on the following roadways and intersections:

- Intersection LOS thresholds would be exceeded at the same intersections under the Clustered Land Use Alternative as under the Proposed Land Use, although the extent of widening required at some intersections would be less.

- Schaffer Mill Road west of SR 267 would operate at LOS D under the Clustered Land Use Alternative, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram would operate at LOS E. Therefore, the need to widen Schaffer Mill Road to four lanes is avoided under this alternative.

- Northstar Drive west of SR 267 would operate at LOS D under the Clustered Land Use Alternative, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram would operate at LOS E under both roadway network conditions. Therefore, the need to widen Northstar Drive to four lanes is avoided under this alternative.

- Similar to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, SR 267 from Airport Road to Northstar Drive would operate at a LOS D. However, this section of roadway would not need to be widened to four lanes, as it would operate at a LOS E with one lane in each direction.

As noted above, the Clustered Land Use Alternative would have less severe traffic impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Traffic impacts to residential roadways in the Sierra Meadows/Ponderosa Palisades area (Impact 4.4.2)

By comparing the trip generation along Schaffer Mill Road under the Clustered Land Use Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Alternative, it is estimated that the Clustered Land Use Alternative would generate approximately 280 less daily trips into the Sierra Meadows/Ponderosa residential area than the Proposed Land Use Diagram if such connections were made to Schaffer Mill Road, which would result in a less severe residential traffic impacts.

Cumulative traffic impacts to regional highway facilities (Impact 4.4.8)

Assuming the reduction in trip generation of the Clustered Land Use Alternative compared to the Proposed Land Use Alternative is proportional to the reduction in traffic volumes at external nodes, the Clustered Land Use Alternative land uses are expected to increase traffic volumes along I-80 (east and west of SR 267) by 13 percent under year 2021 peak hour traffic conditions. The Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in a 15 percent increase along I-80. Thus, the Clustered Land Use Alternative would result in a less severe traffic impact than the Proposed Land Use Alternative.

Noise

As described in Section 4.5 (Noise) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Clustered Land Use Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Construction noise impacts (Impact 4.5.1)

Both the Clustered Land Use Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram would have similar construction noise impacts, given the similarity in land use mix and pattern and proximity to existing noise sensitive land uses (residential).

Transportation noise impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.5.2 and 4.5.5)

While the Clustered Land Use Alternative would result in a 13 percent reduction in average daily traffic volumes as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, this alternative would still result in similar traffic noise levels that are anticipated under the Proposed Land Use Diagram for year 2021 conditions.

Truckee-Tahoe Airport noise impacts (Impact 4.5.4)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative would result in similar potential airport noise impacts as the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the similarity in land use mix and pattern and proximity of noise sensitive land uses (residential) to the airport.

Air Quality

As described in Section 4.6 (Air Quality) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Clustered Land Use Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Construction air quality impacts (Impact 4.6.1)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative is expected to result in reduced construction air quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be disturbed from development (approximately 2,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout).

Regional ozone precursor emissions and cumulative air quality impacts (Impacts 4.6.3 and 4.6.5)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative would result in reduced air pollutant emissions ranging from approximately 14 to 24 percent for criteria air pollutants under summer and winter conditions as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Regional PM_{10} emissions (Impact 4.6.4)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative would result in reduced PM_{10} emissions by approximately 117 pounds per day during the summer and approximately 1,393 pounds per day during the winter as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Hydrology and Water Quality

As described in Section 4.7 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Clustered Land Use Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Construction water quality impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.7.1 and 4.7.7)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative is expected to result in reduced construction water quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be disturbed from extensive development (approximately 2,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout).

Operational surface water quality impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.7.2 and 4.7.7)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative is expected to result in reduced operational water quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be extensively developed (approximately 2,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout).

Groundwater quality impacts (Impact 4.7.3)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative is expected to result in similar groundwater quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the land use mix is similar to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Increased groundwater usage impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.7.5 and 4.7.9)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative would result in reduced water demand of approximately 1,154 acre-feet annually as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram (future potential golf courses at Hopkins Ranch, Siller Ranch, Eaglewood and Waddle Ranch, existing and future snow-making were assumed in the water demand for this alternative). However, adequate groundwater and surface water supplies exist to serve both options.

Geology and Soils

As described in Section 4.8 (Geology and Soils) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Clustered Land Use Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Seismic hazards (Impact 4.8.2)

Both the Proposed Land Use Diagram and the Clustered Land Use Alternative land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential seismic hazards, given that their land use patterns are similar and include sensitive land uses in areas where faults are suspected.

Soil erosion (Impact 4.8.3)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative is expected to result in reduced soil erosion impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be extensively developed (approximately 2,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout).

Avalanche hazards (Impact 4.8.4)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative would reduce the amount of land area for potential development in areas identified as having avalanche hazard potential (north facing slopes in areas with 30 percent and greater slopes) as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Biological Resources

As described in Section 4.9 (Biological Resources) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Clustered Land Use Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Potential disturbance to special-status plant species (Impact 4.9.3)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative would result in less land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 2,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout) that could support identified special-status plant species habitat (Great Basin scrub, mixed coniferous forest, montane meadow, and ruderal habitats), but would still have potential to impact special-status plant species (Donner Pass buckwheat, plumas ivesia, Carson Range rock cress, long-petaled lewisia, Munroe's desert mallow and American manna grass).

Potential disturbance to mountain yellow-legged frog (Impact 4.9.4)

Both the Clustered Land Use Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential impacts to the mountain yellow-legged frog, given that both land use options have similar potential effects to Martis Creek and its tributaries.

Potential disturbance to the Lahontan cutthroat trout (Impact 4.9.5)

Both the Clustered Land Use Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential impacts to the Lahontan cutthroat trout, given that both land use options have similar potential effects to Martis Creek and its tributaries.

Potential disturbance to nesting raptors and other migratory birds (Impact 4.9.6)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative would result in less land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 2,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout) and would have less potential to impact nesting raptors and other migratory birds (e.g., northern goshawk, American peregrine falcon [federal and state listed species], California spotted owl, bald eagle [federal and state listed species], Cooper's hawk, red-tailed hawk, yellow warbler and little willow flycatcher).

Potential disturbance to special-status bat species (Impact 4.9.7)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative would result in reduced land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 2,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout [including mixed coniferous forest, montane meadow and red fir forest habitats]) and would have less potential to impact special-status bat species (spotted bat, long-eared myotis, fringed myotis, long-legged myotis, Yuma myotis and Pale Townsend's big-eared bat).

Potential disturbance to Sierra Nevada red fox, California wolverine, Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, pacific fisher, Sierra Nevada mountain beaver and pine marten (Impact 4.9.8)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative would result in reduced land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 2,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout [including mixed coniferous forest, montane meadow and red fir forest habitats]) and would have less potential to impact the Sierra Nevada red fox (state listed species), California wolverine (state listed species), Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, pacific fisher, Sierra Nevada mountain beaver and pine marten.

Disturbance to wildlife movement (Impact 4.9.11)

Both the Clustered Land Use Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential impacts to the wildlife movement and migration associated with a portion of the Verdi subunit of the Loyalton-Truckee deer herd, given that both land use options have similar land use patterns that could affect open space corridors in the northern portion of the Plan Area.

Cumulative biological resource impacts (Impact 4.9.12)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative would result in reduced land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 2,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout) and would have a reduced contribution to cumulative

biological resource impacts in the region as described under impacts 4.9.3, 4.9.4, 4.9.5, 4.9.6, 4.9.7, 4.9.8 and 4.9.11 for the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

As described in Section 4.10 (Cultural and Paleontological Resources) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Clustered Land Use Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Impacts to prehistoric and historic resources under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.10.1 and 4.10.3)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative is expected to result in a reduced potential for cultural resource impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be extensively developed (approximately 2,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout).

Paleontological resource impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.10.2 and 4.10.4)

Both the Clustered Land Use Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential paleontological resource impacts, given that both land use options have similar land use patterns in the valley portion of the Plan Area that contain the Pleistocene nonmarine sedimentary rocks (Prosser Creek Alluvium) and Quaternary alluvium geologic units, which are considered to have a high paleontological resource potential. However, the Clustered Land Use Alternative would provide for more acreage designated Open Space (approximately an additional 1,287 acres) and Forest (approximately an additional 724 acres) than the Proposed Land Use Diagram, which would reduce its potential to impact undiscovered paleontological resources in the valley portion of the Plan Area.

Public Services

As described in Section 4.11 (Public Services) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Clustered Land Use Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Fire protection and emergency medical services under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.11.1.1 and 4.11.1.3)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative is expected to result in less severe fire protection and emergency services impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of designating less development outside of the existing service areas of the Truckee Fire Protection District and the Northstar Community Services District (see **Figure 4.11-1** of the original Draft EIR).

Water facilities and distribution systems (Impact 4.11.4.1)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative is expected to result in less severe water facility and distribution impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of decreased development potential and associated reductions in water demand and service.

Extension of electrical, natural gas and telephone infrastructure (Impact 4.11.7.3)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative is expected to result in less severe utility extension impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of decreased development potential and provision of utilities into undeveloped areas.

Parks and recreation facilities impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.11.8.1 and 4.11.8.2)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative is expected to result in less severe park recreation demand impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of decreased development potential.

Visual Resources/Light and Glare

As described in Section 4.12 (Visual Resources/Light and Glare) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Clustered Land Use Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Alteration of public and private views (Impact 4.12.2)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative is expected to result in more severe visual impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of increased density of development (4 to 10 units per acre) expected within the Hopkins Ranch, Eaglewood and Waddle Ranch sites from public views along SR 267 and Schaffer Mill Road.

Daytime glare (Impact 4.12.3)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative could result in more severe daytime glare impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given increased density of development along SR 267 and Schaffer Mill Road.

Increased nighttime lighting (Impact 4.12.4)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative could result in more severe nighttime lighting impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given increased density of development along SR 267 and Schaffer Mill Road that could result in focused sources of nighttime lighting.

Cumulative visual resource impacts (Impact 4.12.5)

The Clustered Land Use Alternative is expected to contribute to more severe cumulative visual impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of increased density of development (4 to 10 units per acre) expected within the Hopkins Ranch, Eaglewood and Waddle Ranch sites from public views along SR 267 and Schaffer Mill Road.

6.5 REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

CHARACTERISTICS

The Reduced Intensity Alternative generally consists of reductions in designated residential, office, and commercial uses associated with the Alternative 2 Land Use Map. Specifically, the holding capacity would be reduced to 7,160 units, land areas designated Medium Density Residential, Low Density Residential, Forest Residential. Tourist/Resort Residential and Professional Office within the Eaglewood and Siller Ranch sites would be reduced and/or eliminated and a

continuous open space corridor would be established along the identified western deer migration corridor shown in **Figure 4.9-5**. These alterations are shown in **Table 6.0-2** and **Figure 6.0-2**.

TABLE 6.0-2
REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

LAND USE DESIGNATION	Acres
General Commercial	29
Forest (1 du/40ac except 10,000 acres of TPZ at 160 ac/du)	17,789
High Density Residential (10 – 15 du/ac)	18
Medium Density Residential (5 – 10 du/ac)	405
Low Density Residential (1 – 5 du/ac)	1,806
Rural Residential (0.4 – 1 du/ac)	795
Forest Residential (2.5 – 10 ac/du)	182
Public/Quasi Public	29
Professional Office	1
Tourist/Resort Commercial (15 du/ac)[1]	70
Water	509
Open Space	3,845
Adjusted Holding Capacity (dwelling units)	7,160

du: *dwelling unit*
ac: *acres*
[1]: Except ski mountain commercial areas.



PMC
PACIFIC MUNICIPAL CONSULTANTS

FIGURE 6.0-2
REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

COMPARATIVE IMPACTS

Land Use

As described in Section 4.1 (Land Use) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant land use impacts. A comparison of the Reduced Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Consistency with relevant plans of the Truckee-Tahoe Airport (Impact 4.1.1)

Subsequent development under the Reduced Intensity Alternative could result in conflicts with the Truckee-Tahoe Airport operations as well as with Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77 and the Tahoe Truckee Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan similar to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Conflicts with forestry uses under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.1.2 and 4.1.5)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in reduced impacts associated with conversion and conflict potential with forestry uses as a result of the reduced extent of extensive development in the Plan Area than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 1,000 acres).

Loss of forest and timberlands and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.1.3 and 4.1.6)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in reduced impacts associated conversion of timberlands as a result of the reduced extent of extensive development in the Plan Area than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 1,000 acres).

Population, Housing and Employment

As described in Section 4.2 (Population, Housing and Employment) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Reduced Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Provision of insufficient affordable housing and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.2.2 and 4.2.3)

Implementation of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in less development and housing than the Proposed Land Use Diagram. This alternative would also result in similar affordable and employee housing impacts as the Proposed Land Use Diagram, though its jobs-housing ratio would be worse (3.59 versus 2.56) given the potential generation of approximately 5,153 fulltime equivalent employee jobs. The direct environmental effects associated with this impact would consist of increases in traffic and associated air quality emissions and increases in traffic noise from employees having to travel outside of the Plan Area for housing, which were addressed in Sections 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation), 4.5 (Noise) and 4.6 (Air Quality) of the original Draft EIR, would be more severe under this alternative.

Human Health/Risk of Upset

As described in Section 4.3 (Human Health/Risk of Upset) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Reduced Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Abandoned mines and tailings (Impact 4.3.1)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative proposes a smaller land area for disturbance and reduced development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram, especially in the Northstar area where mining facilities have been identified. Thus, this alternative would reduced hazard impacts associated with potential abandoned mine sites.

Hazardous material contamination (Impact 4.3.2)

Both the Reduced Intensity Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential exposure to hazardous material contamination given that their mix of land uses are similar.

Airport operations (Impact 4.3.3)

Both the Reduced Intensity Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential safety hazards with land use proximity to the Truckee-Tahoe Airport given that their mix of land uses are similar near the airport.

Transportation and Circulation

As described in Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the significant impacts discussed below. A comparison of the impacts associated with the Reduced Intensity Alternative to those associated with the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Potential to exceed established level of service standards on area roadways under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts4.4.1 and 4.4.7)

The Reduced Intensity Land Use Alternative would generate 27 percent less traffic during the peak hour and 28 percent less traffic over the average day than the Proposed Land Use Diagram. The PM peak-hour and daily trip generation of the Reduced Intensity Land Use Alternative is within 3 percent of the Lowest Intensity Land Use Alternative trip generation. Therefore, the impacts associated with these two alternatives would be similar. This alternative would result in different LOS conditions on the following roadways and intersections:

- Intersection LOS thresholds would be exceeded at the same intersections under the Reduced Intensity Land Use Alternative as under the Proposed Land Use Alternative, although the extent of widening required at some intersections would be less.
- Schaffer Mill Road west of SR 267 would operate at LOS D under the Reduced Intensity Land Use Alternative, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram would operate at LOS E. Therefore, the need to widen Schaffer Mill Road to four lanes is avoided under this alternative.
- Northstar Drive west of SR 267 would operate at LOS D under the Reduced Intensity Land Use Alternative, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram would operate at LOS E under both roadway network conditions. Therefore, the need to widen Northstar Drive to four lanes is avoided under this alternative.

- Similar to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, SR 267 from Airport Road to Northstar Drive would operate at a LOS D. However, this section of roadway would not need to be widened to four lanes, as it would operate at a LOS E with one lane in each direction.

As noted above, the Reduced Intensity Land Use Alternative would have less severe traffic impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Traffic impacts to residential roadways in the Sierra Meadows/Ponderosa Palisades area (Impact 4.4.2)

By comparing the trip generation along Schaffer Mil Road under the Reduced Intensity Land Use Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Alternative, it is estimated that the Reduced Intensity Land Use Alternative would generate approximately 260 less daily trips into the Sierra Meadows/Ponderosa residential area than the Proposed Land Use Diagram if such connections were made to Schaffer Mill Road, which would result in a less severe residential traffic impacts.

Cumulative traffic impacts to regional highway facilities (Impact 4.4.8)

The Reduced Development Alternative land uses are expected to increase traffic volumes along I-80 (east and west of SR 267) by 8 percent under year 2021 peak hour traffic conditions. The Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in a 15 percent increase along I-80. Thus, the Reduced Intensity Land Use Alternative would result in a less severe traffic impact than the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Noise

As described in Section 4.5 (Noise) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Reduced Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Construction noise impacts (Impact 4.5.1)

Both the Reduced Intensity Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram would have similar construction noise impacts, given the similarity in land use mix and pattern and proximity to existing noise sensitive land uses (residential).

Transportation noise impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.5.2 and 4.5.5)

While the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a 28 percent reduction in average daily traffic volumes as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, this alternative would still result in similar traffic noise levels that are anticipated under the Proposed Land Use Diagram for year 2021 conditions.

Truckee-Tahoe Airport noise impacts (Impact 4.5.4)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in similar potential airport noise impacts as the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the similarity in land use mix and pattern and proximity of noise sensitive land uses (residential) to the airport.

Air Quality

As described in Section 4.6 (Air Quality) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Reduced Intensity

Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Construction air quality impacts (Impact 4.6.1)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative is expected to result in reduced construction air quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be disturbed from development (approximately 1,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout).

Regional ozone precursor emissions and cumulative air quality impacts (Impacts 4.6.3 and 4.6.5)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in reduced air pollutant emissions ranging from 20 to 27 percent for criteria air pollutants under summer and winter conditions as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Regional PM_{10} emissions (Impact 4.6.4)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in reduced PM_{10} emissions by approximately 224 pounds per day during the summer and approximately 1,596 pounds per day during the winter as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Hydrology and Water Quality

As described in Section 4.7 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Reduced Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Construction water quality impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.7.1 and 4.7.7)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative is expected to result in reduced construction water quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be disturbed from extensive development (approximately 1,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout).

Operational surface water quality impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.7.2 and 4.7.7)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative is expected to result in reduced operational water quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be extensively developed (approximately 1,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout).

Groundwater quality impacts (Impact 4.7.3)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative is expected to result in similar groundwater quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the land use mix is similar to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Increased groundwater usage impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.7.5 and 4.7.9)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in reduced water demand of approximately 1,206 acre-feet annually as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram (future potential golf courses at Hopkins Ranch, Siller Ranch, Eaglewood and Waddle Ranch, existing and future snow-making were assumed in the water demand for this alternative). However, adequate groundwater and surface water supplies exist to serve both options.

Geology and Soils

As described in Section 4.8 (Geology and Soils) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Reduced Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Seismic hazards (Impact 4.8.2)

Both the Reduced Intensity Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential seismic hazards, given that their land use patterns are similar and include sensitive land uses in areas where faults are suspected.

Soil erosion (Impact 4.8.3)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative is expected to result in reduced soil erosion impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be extensively developed (approximately 1,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout).

Avalanche hazards (Impact 4.8.4)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce the amount of land area for potential development in areas identified as having avalanche hazard potential (north facing slopes in areas with 30 percent and greater slopes) as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Biological Resources

As described in Section 4.9 (Biological Resources) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Reduced Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Potential disturbance to special-status plant species (Impact 4.9.3)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in less land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 1,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout) that could support identified special-status plant species habitat (Great Basin scrub, mixed coniferous forest, montane meadow, and ruderal habitats), but would still have potential to impact special-status plant species (Donner Pass buckwheat, plumas ivesia, Carson Range rock cress, long-petaled lewisia, Munroe's desert mallow and American manna grass).

Potential disturbance to mountain yellow-legged frog (Impact 4.9.4)

Both the Reduced Intensity Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential impacts to the mountain yellow-legged frog, given that both land use options have similar potential effects to Martis Creek and its tributaries.

Potential disturbance to the Lahontan cutthroat trout (Impact 4.9.5)

Both the Reduced Intensity Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential impacts to the Lahontan cutthroat trout, given that both land use options have similar potential effects to Martis Creek and its tributaries.

Potential disturbance to nesting raptors and other migratory birds (Impact 4.9.6)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in less land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 1,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout) and would have less potential to impact nesting raptors and other migratory birds (e.g., northern goshawk, American peregrine falcon [federal and state listed species], California spotted owl, bald eagle [federal and state listed species], Cooper's hawk, red-tailed hawk, yellow warbler and little willow flycatcher).

Potential disturbance to special-status bat species (Impact 4.9.7)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in reduced land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 1,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout [including mixed coniferous forest, montane meadow, and red fir forest habitats]) and would have less potential to impact special-status bat species (spotted bat, long-eared myotis, fringed myotis, long-legged myotis, Yuma myotis and Pale Townsend's big-eared bat).

Potential disturbance to Sierra Nevada red fox, California wolverine, Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, pacific fisher, Sierra Nevada mountain beaver and pine marten (Impact 4.9.8)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in reduced land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 1,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout [including mixed coniferous forest, montane meadow, and red fir forest habitats]) and would have less potential to impact the Sierra Nevada red fox (state listed species), California wolverine (state listed species), Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, pacific fisher, Sierra Nevada mountain beaver and pine marten.

Disturbance to wildlife movement (Impact 4.9.11)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce potential impacts to the western migration corridor of deer associated with the Verdi subunit of the Loyalton-Truckee deer herd as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the open space corridor provided under this alternative.

Cumulative biological resource impacts (Impact 4.9.12)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in reduced land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 1,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout) and would have a reduced contribution to cumulative

biological resource impacts in the region as described under impacts 4.9.3, 4.9.4, 4.9.5, 4.9.6, 4.9.7, 4.9.8 and 4.9.11 for the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

As described in Section 4.10 (Cultural and Paleontological Resources) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Reduced Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Impacts to prehistoric and historic resources under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.10.1 and 4.10.3)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative is expected to result in a reduced potential for cultural resource impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be extensively developed (approximately 1,000 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout).

Paleontological resource impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.10.2 and 4.10.4)

Both the Reduced Intensity Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential paleontological resource impacts, given that both land use options have similar land use patterns in the valley portion of the Plan Area that contain the Pleistocene nonmarine sedimentary rocks (Prosser Creek Alluvium) and Quaternary alluvium geologic units, which are considered to have a high paleontological resource potential. However, the Clustered Land Use Alternative would provide for more acreage designated Open Space (an additional 227 acres) than the Proposed Land Use Diagram in the valley portion of the Plan Area, which would reduce its potential to impact undiscovered paleontological resources in the valley portion of the Plan Area.

Public Services

As described in Section 4.11 (Public Services) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Reduced Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Fire protection and emergency medical services under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.11.1.1 and 4.11.1.3)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative is expected to result in less severe fire protection and emergency services impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of designating less development outside of the existing service areas of the Truckee Fire Protection District and the Northstar Community Services District (see **Figure 4.11-1** of the original Draft EIR).

Water facilities and distribution systems (Impact 4.11.4.1)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative is expected to result in less severe water facility and distribution impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of decreased development potential and associated reductions in water demand and service.

Extension of electrical, natural gas and telephone infrastructure (Impact 4.11.7.3)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative is expected to result in less severe utility extension impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of decreased development potential and provision of utilities into undeveloped areas.

Parks and recreation facilities impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.11.8.1 and 4.11.8.2)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative is expected to result in less severe park recreation demand impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of decreased development potential.

Visual Resources/Light and Glare

As described in Section 4.12 (Visual Resources/Light and Glare) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Reduced Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Alteration of public and private views (Impact 4.12.2)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative is expected to result in reduced visual impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of reduced extent of development in the Plan Area.

Daytime glare (Impact 4.12.3)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative could result in similar daytime glare impacts as the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given that this alternative has a land use pattern similar to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Increased nighttime lighting (Impact 4.12.4)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in reduced nighttime lighting impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the decreased density of development within the Plan Area.

Cumulative visual resource impacts (Impact 4.12.5)

The Reduced Intensity Alternative is expected to contribute to reduced cumulative visual impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of decreased density of development within the Plan Area.

6.6 LOWEST INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

CHARACTERISTICS

The Lowest Intensity Alternative generally consists of reductions in designated residential, office, and commercial uses. Specifically, the holding capacity would be reduced to 5,383 units, which would allow for 2,646 new residential units. This would include the approved and proposed employee housing units associated with Eaglewood and Northstar, while total potential office and commercial square footage would be 1,097,000 square feet under this alternative. This alternative is illustrated in **Figure 6.0-3**.



PMC
PACIFIC MUNICIPAL CONSULTANTS

FIGURE 6.0-3
LOWEST INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

COMPARATIVE IMPACTS

Land Use

As described in Section 4.1 (Land Use) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant land use impacts. A comparison of the Lowest Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Consistency with relevant plans of the Truckee-Tahoe Airport (Impact 4.1.1)

Subsequent development under the Lowest Intensity Alternative could result in conflicts with the Truckee-Tahoe Airport operations as well as with Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77 and the Tahoe Truckee Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan similar to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Conflicts with forestry uses under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.1.2 and 4.1.5)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative would result in reduced impacts associated conversion and conflict potential with forestry uses as a result of the reduced extent of extensive development in the Plan Area than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 1,370 acres).

Loss of forest and timberlands and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.1.3 and 4.1.6)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative would result in reduced impacts associated conversion of timberlands as a result of the reduced extent of extensive development in the Plan Area than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 1,370 acres).

Population, Housing and Employment

As described in Section 4.2 (Population, Housing and Employment) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Lowest Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Provision of insufficient affordable housing and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.2.2 and 4.2.3)

Implementation of the Lowest Intensity Alternative would result in less development and housing than the Proposed Land Use Diagram. This alternative would also result in similar affordable and employee housing impacts as the Proposed Land Use Diagram, though its jobs-housing ratio would be worse (4.64 versus 2.56) given the potential generation of approximately 4,990 fulltime equivalent employee jobs. The direct environmental effects associated with this impact would consist of increases in traffic and associated air quality emissions and increases in traffic noise from employees having to travel outside of the Plan Area for housing, which were addressed in Sections 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation), 4.5 (Noise) and 4.6 (Air Quality) of the original Draft EIR, would be more severe under this alternative.

Human Health/Risk of Upset

As described in Section 4.3 (Human Health/Risk of Upset) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Lowest Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Abandoned mines and tailings (Impact 4.3.1)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative proposes a smaller land area for disturbance and reduced development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram, especially in the Northstar area where mining facilities have been identified. Thus, this alternative would reduced hazard impacts associated with potential abandoned mine sites.

Hazardous material contamination (Impact 4.3.2)

Both the Lowest Intensity Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential exposure to hazardous material contamination given that their mix of land uses are similar.

Airport operations (Impact 4.3.3)

Both the Lowest Intensity Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential safety hazards with land use proximity to the Truckee-Tahoe Airport given that their mix of land uses are similar near the airport.

Transportation and Circulation

As described in Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the significant impacts discussed below. A comparison of the impacts associated with the Lowest Intensity Alternative to those of the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Potential to exceed established level of service standards on area roadways under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.4.1 and 4.4.7)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative would generate 26 percent less traffic during the peak hour and 24 percent less traffic over the average day than the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses in the Plan Area. As a result, this alternative would result in different LOS conditions on the following roadways and intersections:

- Intersection LOS thresholds would be exceeded at the same intersections under the Lowest Intensity Alternative as under the Proposed Land Use Diagram.
- The Bridge Street / West River Street intersection would need to be signalized although no additional turn lanes would be required under the Lowest Intensity Alternative, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram would require signalization and a second southbound through lane.
- The SR 267 / Northstar Drive intersection would need to be signalized although no additional turn lanes would be required under the Lowest Intensity Alternative, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram would require signalization, an additional northbound through lane, and a second eastbound left-turn lane.
- The SR 89/SR 267 Bypass/I-80 Westbound intersection would operate at LOS D (winter weekend PM peak hour) under the Lowest Intensity Alternative, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram would operate at LOS E.
- Schaffer Mill Road west of SR 267 would operate at LOS C under the Lowest Intensity Alternative, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram would operate at LOS E. Therefore, the need to widen Schaffer Mill Road to four lanes is avoided under this alternative.

- Northstar Drive west of SR 267 would operate at LOS D under the Lowest Intensity Alternative, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram would operate at LOS E under both roadway network conditions. Therefore, the need to widen Northstar Drive to four lanes is avoided under this alternative.

- Similar to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, SR 267 from Airport Road to Northstar Drive would operate at a LOS D. However, this section of roadway would not need to be widened to four lanes, as it would operate at a LOS E with one lane in each direction.

As noted above, the Lowest Intensity Alternative would have less severe traffic impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Traffic impacts to residential roadways in the Sierra Meadows/Ponderosa Palisades area (Impact 4.4.2)

It is estimated that the Lowest Intensity Alternative would generate approximately 440 less daily trips into the Sierra Meadows/Ponderosa residential area than the Proposed Land Use Diagram if such connections were made to Schaffer Mill Road, which would result in a less severe residential traffic impacts.

Cumulative traffic impacts to regional highway facilities (Impact 4.4.8)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative land uses are expected to increase traffic volumes along I-80 (east and west of SR 267) by 8 percent under year 2021 peak hour traffic conditions, while the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in a 15 percent increase in traffic volumes along I-80. Thus, the Lowest Intensity Alternative would result in a less severe traffic impact than the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Noise

As described in Section 4.5 (Noise) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Lowest Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Construction noise impacts (Impact 4.5.1)

Both the Lowest Intensity Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram would have similar construction noise impacts, given the similarity in land use mix and pattern and proximity to existing noise sensitive land uses (residential).

Transportation noise impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.5.2 and 4.5.5)

While the Lowest Intensity Alternative would result in a 24 percent reduction in average daily traffic volumes as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, this alternative would still result in similar traffic noise levels that are anticipated under the Proposed Land Use Diagram for year 2021 conditions.

Truckee-Tahoe Airport noise impacts (Impact 4.5.4)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative would result in similar potential airport noise impacts as the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the similarity in land use mix and pattern and proximity of noise sensitive land uses (residential) to the airport.

Air Quality

As described in Section 4.6 (Air Quality) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Lowest Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Construction air quality impacts (Impact 4.6.1)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative is expected to result in reduced construction air quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be disturbed from development (approximately 1,600 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout).

Regional ozone precursor emissions and cumulative air quality impacts (Impacts 4.6.3 and 4.6.5)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative would result in reduced air pollutant emissions ranging from 24 to 38 percent for criteria air pollutants under summer and winter conditions as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Regional PM_{10} emissions (Impact 4.6.4)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative would result in reduced PM_{10} emissions by approximately 192 pounds per day during the summer and approximately 2,114 pounds per day during the winter as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Hydrology and Water Quality

As described in Section 4.7 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Lowest Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Construction water quality impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.7.1 and 4.7.7)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative is expected to result in reduced construction water quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be disturbed from extensive development (approximately 1,600 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout).

Operational surface water quality impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.7.2 and 4.7.7)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative is expected to result in reduced operational water quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be extensively developed (approximately 1,600 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout).

Groundwater quality impacts (Impact 4.7.3)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative is expected to result in similar groundwater quality impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the land use mix is similar to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Increased groundwater usage impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.7.5 and 4.7.9)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative would result in reduced water demand of approximately 2,374 acre-feet annually as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram (future potential golf courses at Hopkins Ranch, Siller Ranch, Eaglewood and Waddle Ranch, existing and future snow-making were assumed in the water demand for this alternative). However, adequate groundwater and surface water supplies exist to serve both options.

Geology and Soils

As described in Section 4.8 (Geology and Soils) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Lowest Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Seismic hazards (Impact 4.8.2)

Both the Lowest Intensity Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential seismic hazards, given that their land use patterns are similar and include sensitive land uses in areas where faults are suspected.

Soil erosion (Impact 4.8.3)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative is expected to result in reduced soil erosion impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be extensively developed (approximately 1,600 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout).

Avalanche hazards (Impact 4.8.4)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative would reduce the amount of land area for potential development in areas identified as having avalanche hazard potential (north facing slopes in areas with 30 percent and greater slopes) as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Biological Resources

As described in Section 4.9 (Biological Resources) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Lowest Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Potential disturbance to special-status plant species (Impact 4.9.3)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative would result in less land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 1,600 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout) that could support identified special-status plant species habitat (Great Basin scrub, mixed coniferous forest, montane meadow, and ruderal habitats), but would still have potential to impact special-status plant species (Donner Pass buckwheat, plumas ivesia, Carson Range rock cress, long-petaled lewisia, Munroe's desert mallow and American manna grass).

Potential disturbance to mountain yellow-legged frog (Impact 4.9.4)

Both the Lowest Intensity Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential impacts to the mountain yellow-legged frog, given that both land use options have similar potential effects to Martis Creek and its tributaries.

Potential disturbance to the Lahontan cutthroat trout (Impact 4.9.5)

Both the Lowest Intensity Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential impacts to the Lahontan cutthroat trout, given that both land use options have similar potential effects to Martis Creek and its tributaries.

Potential disturbance to nesting raptors and other migratory birds (Impact 4.9.6)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative would result in less land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 1,600 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout) and would have less potential to impact nesting raptors and other migratory birds (e.g., northern goshawk, American peregrine falcon [federal and state listed species], California spotted owl, bald eagle [federal and state listed species], Cooper's hawk, red-tailed hawk, yellow warbler and little willow flycatcher).

Potential disturbance to special-status bat species (Impact 4.9.7)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative would result in reduced land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 1,600 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout [including mixed coniferous forest, montane meadow, and red fir forest habitats]) and would have less potential to impact special-status bat species (spotted bat, long-eared myotis, fringed myotis, long-legged myotis, Yuma myotis and Pale Townsend's big-eared bat).

Potential disturbance to Sierra Nevada red fox, California wolverine, Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, pacific fisher, Sierra Nevada mountain beaver and pine marten (Impact 4.9.8)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative would result in reduced land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 1,600 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout [including mixed coniferous forest, montane meadow, and red fir forest habitats]) and would have less potential to impact the Sierra Nevada red fox (state listed species), California wolverine (state listed species), Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, pacific fisher, Sierra Nevada mountain beaver and pine marten.

Disturbance to wildlife movement (Impact 4.9.11)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative would reduce potential impacts to the western migration corridor of deer associated with the Verdi subunit of the Loyalton-Truckee deer herd as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the additional open space provided under this alternative.

Cumulative biological resource impacts (Impact 4.9.12)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative would result in reduced land disturbance from extensive development than the Proposed Land Use Diagram (approximately 1,600 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout) and would have a reduced contribution to cumulative

biological resource impacts in the region as described under impacts 4.9.3, 4.9.4, 4.9.5, 4.9.6, 4.9.7, 4.9.8 and 4.9.11 for the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

As described in Section 4.10 (Cultural and Paleontological Resources) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Lowest Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Impacts to prehistoric and historic resources under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.10.1 and 4.10.3)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative is expected to result in a reduced potential for cultural resource impacts as compared to the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the amount of land area anticipated to be extensively developed (approximately 1,600 acres less than the Proposed Land Use Diagram at buildout).

Paleontological resource impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.10.2 and 4.10.4)

Both the Lowest Intensity Alternative and the Proposed Land Use Diagram land uses would result in comparable impacts regarding potential paleontological resource impacts, given that both land use options have similar land use patterns in the valley portion of the Plan Area that contain the Pleistocene nonmarine sedimentary rocks (Prosser Creek Alluvium) and Quaternary alluvium geologic units, which are considered to have a high paleontological resource potential. However, the Lowest Intensity Alternative would provide for more acreage designated Open Space and Forest than the Proposed Land Use Diagram in the valley portion of the Plan Area (approximately 600 acres), which would reduce its potential to impact undiscovered paleontological resources in the valley portion of the Plan Area.

Public Services

As described in Section 4.11 (Public Services) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Lowest Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Fire protection and emergency medical services under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.11.1.1 and 4.11.1.3)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative is expected to result in less severe fire protection and emergency services impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of designating less development outside of the existing service areas of the Truckee Fire Protection District and the Northstar Community Services District (see **Figure 4.11-1** of the original Draft EIR).

Water facilities and distribution systems (Impact 4.11.4.1)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative is expected to result in less severe water facility and distribution impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of decreased development potential and associated reductions in water demand and service.

Extension of electrical, natural gas and telephone infrastructure (Impact 4.11.7.3)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative is expected to result in less severe utility extension impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of decreased development potential and provision of utilities into undeveloped areas.

Parks and recreation facilities impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.11.8.1 and 4.11.8.2)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative is expected to result in less severe park recreation demand impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of decreased development potential.

Visual Resources/Light and Glare

As described in Section 4.12 (Visual Resources/Light and Glare) of the original Draft EIR, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the following significant impacts. A comparison of the Lowest Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Land Use Diagram is provided under each significant impact identified.

Alteration of public and private views (Impact 4.12.2)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative is expected to result in reduced visual impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of reduced extent of development in the Plan Area.

Daytime glare (Impact 4.12.3)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative could result in similar daytime glare impacts as the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given that this alternative has a land use pattern similar to the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

Increased nighttime lighting (Impact 4.12.4)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative would result in reduced nighttime lighting impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram, given the decreased density of development within the Plan Area.

Cumulative visual resource impacts (Impact 4.12.5)

The Lowest Intensity Alternative is expected to contribute to reduced cumulative visual impacts than the Proposed Land Use Diagram as a result of decreased density of development within the Plan Area.

6.7 CONCLUSIONS

Table 6.0-3, on the following page, provides a summary of the potential impacts of the alternatives evaluated in this section, as compared with the potential impacts of the Proposed Land Use Diagram.

TABLE 6.0-3
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED LAND USE DIAGRAM

Impacts Identified for the Proposed Land Use Diagram	No Project	Clustered Land Use	Reduced Intensity	Lowest Intensity
Land Use				
Impact 4.1.1-Plan consistency	W	S	S	S
Impact 4.1.2 and 4.1.5-Conflicts with forest uses	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.1.3 and 4.1.6-Loss of forest and timber lands	W	B	B	B
Population/Housing/Employment				
Impact 4.2.2 and 4.2.3-Insufficient affordable housing	W	W	W	W
Human Health/Risk of Upset				
Impact 4.3.1-Abandoned mines and tailings	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.3.2-Hazardous material contamination	S	S	S	S
Impact 4.3.3-Airport operations	W	S	S	S
Transportation and Circulation				
Impact 4.4.1 and 4.4.1-Exceedance of LOS standards	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.4.2-Residential roadway impacts	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.4.8-Cumulative traffic impacts to highways	W	B	B	B
Noise				
Impact 4.5.1-Construction noise	S	S	S	S
Impact 4.5.2 and 4.5.5-Transportation noise	W	S	S	S
Impact 4.5.4-Truckee-Tahoe airport noise	W	S	S	S
Air Quality				
Impact 4.6.1-Construction air quality	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.6.3 and 4.6.5-Regional ozone emissions	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.6.4-Regional PM_{10} emissions	W	B	B	B
Hydrology and Water Quality				
Impact 4.7.1 and 4.7.7-Construction water quality	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.7.2 and 4.7.7-Operational water quality	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.7.3-Groundwater quality	W	S	S	S
Impact 4.7.5 and 4.7.9-Increased groundwater usage	W	B	B	B
Geology and Soils				
Impact 4.8.2-Seismic hazards	W	S	S	S
Impact 4.8.3-Soil Erosion	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.8.4-Avalanche hazards	W	B	B	B
Biological Resources				
Impact 4.9.3-Disturbance to special-status plant species	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.9.4-Disturbance to yellow-legged frog	W	S	S	S
Impact 4.9.5-Disturbance to Lahontan cutthroat trout	W	S	S	S
Impact 4.9.6-Disturbance to raptors and migratory birds	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.9.7-Disturbance to special-status bat species	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.9.8-Disturbance to special-status mammals	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.9.11-Disturbance to wildlife movement	W	S	B	B
Impact 4.9.12-Cumulative biological resource impacts	W	B	B	B
Cultural and Paleontological Resources				
Impact 4.10.1 and 4.10.3-Prehistoric and historic resources	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.10.2 and 4.10.4-Paleontological resources	W	B	B	B
Public Services				
Impact 4.11.1.1 and 4.11.1.3-Fire and emergency services	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.11.4.1-Water facilities and distribution systems	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.11.7.3-Utility extension	W	B	B	B
Impact 4.11.8.1 and 4.11.8.2-Park and recreation impacts	W	B	B	B
Visual Resources/Light and Glare				
Impact 4.12.2-Alteration of public and private views	W	W	B	B
Impact 4.12.3-Daytime glare	W	W	S	S
Impact 4.12.4-Increased nighttime lighting	W	W	B	B
Impact 4.12.5-Cumulative visual impacts	W	W	B	B

B - Impacts better than those under proposed project
S - Impacts the same as those under proposed project, or no better or worse
W - Impacts worse than those under proposed project

Based upon the evaluation described in this section, both the Reduced Intensity Alternative and the Lowest Intensity Alternative are considered to be the environmentally superior alternatives to the Proposed Land Use Diagram; however, it should be noted that the Clustered Land Use Alternative also provides environmental benefits over the Proposed Land Use Diagram. Of the two alternatives, the Lowest Intensity Alternative would have the least amount of impact. However, this alternative would result in a 41 percent reduction in residential development potential and may not be considered in conformance with the direction given by the Board of Supervisors that no major changes are made to the existing land use plan as part of the update of the Martis Valley General Plan (1975). In addition, this alternative may be considered to be less than adequate to meet Goal 1.B of the proposed Martis Valley Community Plan, which states:

> *To provide adequate land in a range of residential densities to accommodate the housing needs of all income groups expected to reside in Martis Valley.*

As identified in Section 3.0 (Project Description) of the original Draft EIR, this Goal consists of a key portion of the intent of the Martis Valley Community Plan.

REFERENCES

Placer County, 2002. *Martis Valley Community Plan Update Draft EIR.* Auburn, California. May, 2002.

Placer County, 1998. Yeager, Fred, Planning Director, Placer County Planning Department. *Martis Valley Community Plan Update-Citizen's Committee Memorandum.* March 13, 1998.

Table 6.0-1
Environmental Impact Comparison between the Proposed Land Use Diagram and Alternatives AA, AB, and AC

Impacts	Proposed Land Use Diagram (PP)	Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map (AA)		Alternative 1 Land Use Map (AB)		Alternative 2 Land Use Map (AC)	
	Significance	Significance	Comparison to Project	Significance	Comparison to Project	Significance	Comparison to Project
Impact 4.1.1 Consistency with Relevant Land Use Planning Documents	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.1.2 Land Use Conflicts	**SU**	SU	=	SU	<	SU	<
Impact 4.1.3 Loss of Forest and Timber Lands	**SU**	SU	=	SU	<	SU	<
Impact 4.1.4 Consistency with Relevant Planning Documents	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.1.5 Cumulative Land Use Conflicts	**SU**	SU	=	SU	<	SU	<
Impact 4.1.6 Cumulative Loss of Timber/Forest Resources	**SU**	SU	=	SU	<	SU	<
Impact 4.2.1 Holding Capacity	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.2.2 Housing	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.2.3 Cumulative Housing Impacts	**CSUM**	CSUM	=	CSUM	=	CSUM	=
Impact 4.3.1 Abandoned Mines and Tailings	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.3.2 Hazardous Materials Contamination	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.3.3 Airport Operations	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.3.4 Radon Exposure	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.3.5 Cumulative Hazard Impacts	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.4.1 Potential to Exceed an Established LOS Standard	**SU**	SU	>	SU	>	SU	<
Impact 4.4.2 Traffic Impacts to Local Residential Roadways	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	>	SUM	<
Impact 4.4.3 Potential Hazards Because of Design	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.4.4 Inadequate Parking Capacity	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.4.5 Conflicts With Transit	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.4.6 Conflicts with Pedestrian and Bicycle Uses	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.4.7 Cumulative Impacts to Area Intersections & Roads	**CSU**	CSU	>	CSU	>	CSU	<
Impact 4.4.8 Cumulative Impacts to Regional Highway Facilities	**CSU**	CSU	>	CSU	>	CSU	<
Impact 4.4.9 Cumulative Roadway Hazards	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.4.10 Cumulative Conflicts with Transit, Ped and Bike	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.5.1 Construction Noise Impacts	**SU**	SU	=	SU	=	SU	=
Impact 4.5.2 Transportation Noise Impacts	**SU**	SU	>	SU	>	SU	<
Impact 4.5.3 Future Stationary Noise Impacts	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.5.4 Truckee-Tahoe Airport Noise Impacts	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.5.5 Cumulative Traffic Noise Impacts	**CSU**	CSU	>	CSU	>	CSU	<
Impact 4.6.1 Construction Air Quality Impacts	**SU**	SU	>	SU	<	SU	<
Impact 4.6.2 Local Carbon Monoxide Concentration Impacts	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	>
Impact 4.6.3 Regional Ozone Precursor Emissions	**SU**	SU	>	SU	>	SU	>
Impact 4.6.4 Regional PM10 Emissions	**SU**	SU	>	SU	>	SU	>
Impact 4.6.5 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts	**CSU**	CSU	>	CSU	>	CSU	>
Impact 4.7.1 Construction Water Quality Impacts	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.7.2 Operational Surface Water Quality Impacts	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.7.3 Groundwater Quality Impacts	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.7.4 Groundwater Recharge Areas Impacts	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	<	LTS	<
Impact 4.7.5 Increased Groundwater Usage Impacts	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	>	SUM	<
Impact 4.7.6 Flood Hazard Impacts	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	<	LTS	<
Impact 4.7.7 Cumulative Water Quality Impacts	**CSUM**	CSUM	>	CSUM	<	CSUM	<
Impact 4.7.8 Cumulative Groundwater Recharge Area Impacts	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	<	LTS	<
Impact 4.7.9 Cumulative Groundwater Usage Impacts	**CSUM**	CSUM	>	CSUM	>	CSUM	<
Impact 4.7.10 Cumulative Flood Hazards	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	<	LTS	<
Impact 4.8.1 Geologic Stability and Suitability	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.8.2 Seismic Hazards	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.8.3 Soil Erosion	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.8.4 Avalanche Hazards	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.8.5 Cumulative Geologic Impacts	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.9.1 Disturbance to Common Plant Communities	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	<	LTS	<
Impact 4.9.2 Disturbance to Common Wildlife	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.9.3 Potential Disturbance to Special-Status Plant	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.9.4 Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.9.5 Lahontan Cutthroat Trout	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.9.6 Nesting Raptors and Other Migratory Birds	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.9.7 Potential Disturbance to Special-Status Bats	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.9.8 Special-Status Mammals	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.9.9 Disturbance to Riparian Habitat	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.9.10 Loss of Wetland Areas	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.9.11 Disturbance to Wildlife Movement	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.9.12 Cumulative Biological Resource Impacts	**CSU**	CSU	>	CSU	<	CSU	<
Impact 4.10.1 Impacts to Prehistoric and Historic Resources	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.10.2 Paleontological Resource Impacts	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	<	SUM	<
Impact 4.10.3 Cumulative Prehistoric and Historic Resources	**CSUM**	CSUM	>	CSUM	<	CSUM	<
Impact 4.10.4 Cumulative Paleontological Resource Impacts	**CSUM**	CSUM	>	CSUM	<	CSUM	<
Impact 4.11.1.1 Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	>	SUM	<
Impact 4.11.1.2 Wildland Fire Hazards	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.1.3 Cumulative Fire Protection	**CSUM**	CSUM	>	CSUM	>	CSUM	<
Impact 4.11.1.4 Cumulative Wildland Fire Hazard	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.2.1 Law Enforcement Services	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.2.2 Cumulative Law Enforcement Services	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.3.1 Impacts on School Services	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.3.2 Cumulative Impacts on School Services	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.4.1 Water Facilities and Distribution Systems	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	>	SUM	<
Impact 4.11.4.2 Cumulative Water Facilities and Distribution	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.5.1 Wastewater Service	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.5.2 Cumulative Wastewater Service	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.6.1 Solid Waste Disposal	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.6.2 Cumulative Solid Waste Disposal	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.7.1 Availability of Electrical Energy	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.7.2 Increased Demand for Natural Gas	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.7.3 Extension of Utilities	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	>	SUM	<
Impact 4.11.7.4 Cumulative Availability of Electrical Energy	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.7.5 Cumulative Demand for Natural Gas	**LTS**	LTS	>	LTS	>	LTS	<
Impact 4.11.8.1 Park and Recreation	**SUM**	SUM	>	SUM	>	SUM	<
Impact 4.11.8.2 Cumulative Park and Recreation Impacts	**CSUM**	CSUM	>	CSUM	>	CSUM	<
Impact 4.11.9.1 Road Maintenance and Snow Removal	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.11.9.2 Cumulative Road Maintenance and Snow Removal	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.12.1 Alterations of Views from Highways	**LTS**	LTS	=	LTS	=	LTS	=
Impact 4.12.2 Alteration of Public and Private Views	**SU**	SU	>	SU	<	SU	<
Impact 4.12.3 Daytime Glare	**SUM**	SUM	=	SUM	=	SUM	=
Impact 4.12.4 Increased Nighttime Lighting	**SU**	SU	>	SU	>	SU	<
Impact 4.12.5 Cumulative Visual Impacts	**CSU**	CSU	>	CSU	<	CSU	<

LTS = Less than Significant
SUM = Significant Unless Mitigated
SU = Significant and Unavoidable
CSU = Cumulative Significant Unavoidable
CSUM = Cumulative Significant Unless Mitigated

< - Alternative's impact is better than the Proposed Land Use Diagram
> - Alternative's impact is worse than the Proposed Land Use Diagram
= - Alternative's impact is equivalent to the Proposed Land Use Diagram