CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT
OF THE
PLACER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

for the

TAHOE VISTA PARTNERS, LLC AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND INTERVAL OWNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

July 7, 2008

212

EXHIBIT G

I.
CERTIFICATION OF FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

On June 26, 2008, a joint document serving as the final environmental assessment (EA) prepared on behalf of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and the final environmental impact report (EIR) prepared on behalf of Placer County was released for public review. The Final Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Report (Final EA/EIR) for the Tahoe Vista Partners, LLC Affordable Housing and Interval Ownership Development Project is hereby certified pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq.). The Planning Commission for Placer County (Planning Commission) hereby certifies that the Final EA/EIR has been completed in compliance with the requirements of the CEQA. The Planning Commission further certifies that the Final EA/EIR was presented to it and that the Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EA/EIR prior to approving the project. Finally, the Commission certifies that the Final EA/EIR reflects the Commission's independent judgment and analysis.

II.
EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The findings and determinations contained herein are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the project and the EA/EIR. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations by this Planning Commission in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

Although the findings below identify specific pages within the Draft EA/EIR and Final EA/EIR in support of various conclusions reached below, the Planning Commission has no quarrel with, and thus incorporates by reference and adopts as its own, the reasoning set forth in both environmental documents, and thus relies on that reasoning, even where not specifically mentioned or cited below, in reaching the conclusions set forth below, except where additional evidence is specifically mentioned. This is especially true with respect to the Planning Commission's approval of the mitigation measures recommended in the Final EA/EIR, and the reasoning set forth in responses to comments in the Final EA/EIR. The Planning Commission further intends that if these findings fail to cross-reference or incorporate by reference any other part of these findings, any finding required or permitted to be made by this Planning Commission with respect to any particular subject matter of the project must be deemed made if it appears in any portion of these findings or findings elsewhere in the record.

III.
INTRODUCTION

Placer County, California, (County) as lead agency, prepared an EA/EIR for the project. In its entirety, the documents consist of the January 2008 Draft EA/EIR and the June 2008 Final EA/EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2006022100). The EA/EIR prepared for the project addresses the environmental impacts associated with the development of approximately 6.25 acres in the unincorporated Tahoe Vista area within the County. These findings have been prepared to comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code § 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq.).

IV.
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Like the EA/EIR itself, these findings use a number of acronyms. To make the findings easier to follow, key acronyms are defined at the end of this document. Although the findings define most such acronyms the first time they are introduced, the listing of acronyms is also provided as a means of identifying such terms. Where terms are defined in the body of these findings in a manner that differs from the list of acronyms at the end of these findings, the definition in the body of these findings shall prevail.

V.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. LOCATION

The project site is located in unincorporated Placer County, California, in the Tahoe Vista area. Regional access to the site is provided by California State Route (SR) 28 and SR 267. The approximately 6.25-acre (272,303 square foot [sf]) project site is located at 6873 North Lake Tahoe Boulevard (SR 28), approximately 250 feet north of Lake Tahoe and about one mile west of the intersection of SR 28 and SR 267. The Placer County Assessors Parcel Number (APN) for the project site is 117-071-029. The TPRA verified existing land coverage is 174,324 sf, or 64% of the project site. (Draft EA/EIR, p. 3-1.)

The site is largely unpaved and contains Sandy Beach Campground (a 27-space campground and recreational vehicle [RV] park), an approximately 7,300-sf 2-story commercial building fronting SR 28, and several other smaller buildings. Surrounding land uses include residential uses to the west; vacant land to the north, which is also the location of the proposed Vista Village Workforce Housing Project (currently on indefinite hold); residential uses, a nursery, and other commercial uses to the east; and Sandy Beach Public Recreation Area, a small 200-foot beach currently maintained by the North Tahoe Public Utility District (NTPUD), just south of the site and across SR 28. (Draft EA/EIR, p. 3-1.)

B. OVERVIEW

The original proposed project was identified in the Draft EA/EIR as "Alternative A." Alternative A would include the construction of 45 TAUs (also referred to as fractional or interval ownership units), a clubhouse/administration building, 10 affordable/employee housing units, improvements to the existing main 2-story commercial building (including the likely replacement of the roof), and SR 28 frontage improvements. All buildings would be designed to comply with TRPA building height standards (TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 22). All buildings would be equipped with fire sprinklers. Access to the site would be via two driveway entrances on SR 28. All two-way onsite roads are proposed to be 25 feet wide and one-way onsite roads would be 15 feet wide. A new resort monument sign would be constructed along SR 28 near the western driveway and the existing restaurant sign would be setback from SR 28. Snow storage would occur in the landscaped areas throughout the project site. (Draft EA/EIR, p. 3-10.)

Following the circulation of the Draft EA/EIR and community meetings on the project, the applicant, the County and TRPA developed a revised project. The aim of the project revisions was to address community concerns regarding the Project.

The revised project is identified as "Alternative E" in the Final EA/EIR. The applicant has requested approval of Alternative E. Alternative E thus represents the project approved by the Planning Commission pursuant to these findings. When these findings use the term "project," that term refers to Alternative E.

Alternative E incorporates several modifications to the Alternative A site plan to reduce environmental impacts or address other environmental issues. Alternative E:

- reduces the number of TAUs from 45 to 39,
- increases TAU unit size from those proposed in Alternative A (reduces TAU unit size relative to Alternatives B and C),
- reduces the number of affordable/employee housing units from 10 to 6,
- provides additional space for snow storage on the site,
- preserves 30 additional on-site trees (removing 100 on-site trees, compared to 130 with Alternative A).

  (Note: Alternative E would also remove 32 off-site trees to accommodate construction of the secondary emergency access road described below. These trees would also have to be removed under Alternative A in order to provide secondary emergency access. Thus, the total number of trees removed under Alternative E is 132, versus 162 for Alternative A.)

- increases the main roadway width to 26 feet, and
- provides a secondary fire access road at the north end of the site via a 5,363 square-foot (sf) easement on the adjacent vacant parcel consistent with NTFPD direction.

(Final EA/EIR, p. 2-17.)

The maximum number of full-time occupants associated with the six affordable/employee housing units would be six persons per residence (two persons per bedroom per 3-bedroom housing unit) for a total of up to 36 residents. Assuming the maximum occupancy rates would be similar for the fractional units, the 39 TAUs would add 206 occupants to the site assuming all units were fully occupied. The combined total for the affordable/employee housing units and TAUs is estimated to be 242 occupants, compared to 302 occupants for Alternative A (see Chapter 3, "Revisions and Corrections to Draft EA/EIR"). (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-18.)

A secondary emergency access road has been identified at the north end of the project site to address needs of the NTFPD. The emergency access would pass through approximately 139 feet of the vacant parcel to the north (location of the proposed Vista Village Workforce Housing Project site) and would join Toyon Road at its western terminus. The emergency access road would be gated on both ends to ensure that it remains available primarily for use by emergency vehicles. Its location could also allow use as part of a future bike path, indicated in Alternative A as joining the Project roadway at the northeast corner of the site. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-18.)

The project parcel, APN 117-071-029, would be split into three separate parcels such that distinct site uses would be separated. The subdivision requires the approval of both Placer County and TRPA. The applications for this subdivision have been submitted; the County and TRPA are processing these applications concurrently with the proposed project. This subdivision is to allow the project applicant to obtain financing for the development of the project. The subdivision has undergone separate environmental review and a Negative Declaration has been prepared and circulated. (Draft EA/EIR, p. 3-13; Final EA/EIR, p. 3-5.)

The project applicant would retain control of the three parcels, but the proposed subdivision would allow the separate uses to operate under individualized covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs). Generally, Parcel 1 would include the development of affordable/employee housing units. Parcel 2 would include development of the proposed TAUs and clubhouse/administration building. On Parcel 3, alterations would be made to the existing main commercial building, and street frontage improvements (including a sidewalk, curbed roadway, and landscaping) along SR 28 would be implemented. The three parcels would be separated from each other by a six-foot tall wood fence, except in those areas where the access road(s) would require an opening. Shared access to SR 28 for ingress and egress to Parcel 1 through Parcel 3 would be ensured through an easement agreement. The project applicant would record a deed restriction for shared parking between the main commercial building and the proposed TAU units and affordable/employee housing units. (Draft EA/EIR, p. 3-13.)

An easement in the northern part of the site would be granted to the NTPUD (or jointly to several agencies including the NTPUD) for a future multiple use public trail (including bicycles). The easement would accommodate the future development of a multiple use public path consistent with the TVCP and NTPUD's plans for a trail alignment within the vicinity of the project property, and more specifically, with NTPUD's plans to construct a connection between the North Tahoe Regional Park and the intersection of SR 28 and National Avenue. The portion of the trail within this easement would be constructed as part of the project. (Draft EA/EIR, p. 3-10.)

With the exception of the "Manager's Cabin," the other ancillary buildings near the main commercial building along with the campground restroom facility and RV dump station would be demolished and removed from the site. The "Manager's Cabin" would be advertised for sale and relocation for a 2-week period to the public and agencies. If there is a lack of interest in its acquisition and removal, the "Manager's Cabin" would also be demolished. (Draft EA/EIR, p. 3-10.)

See Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of the Draft EA/EIR and Section 2.5.7 of Chapter 2, *Comments and Response to Comments on the Draft EA/EIR*, of the Final EA/EIR for a detailed description of the Project. This includes diagrams and tables illustrating and describing the proposed Project. (Draft EA/EIR, pp. 3-8 to 3-41; Final EA/EIR, pp. 2-17 to 2-25.)

C. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

As set forth in the Draft EA/EIR, the purpose and objectives for the Project are as follows:

- To create very high quality, low-density affordable homes that would be sold or leased to local families that are service providers and first time homebuyers.
- To restore the existing restaurant/office/apartment building to a quality, attractive building that resembles the historic character of Tahoe Vista.
- To install an attractive street frontage that improves the parking and vehicle safety for local residents.
- To enhance maintenance of the Sandy Beach Recreation Area across the street from the property.
- To create a multiple use public trail easement and rest stop for bicyclists.
- To develop the remainder of the site into tourist accommodation homes used under a shared ownership program.

(Draft EA/EIR, pp. 3-9 to 3-10.)

D. DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

Project approval requires the County, as lead agency, as well as certain "responsible agencies" to take discrete planning and regulatory actions to approve the overall Project. Described below are the discretionary actions necessary to fully carry out the Project. In addition to certifying the Final EA/EIR and adopting these Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (CEQA requirements), the County itself must take the following actions:

- Approve the Conditional Use Permit;
- Conduct Design Review;
- Approve the Grading Permit, Improvement Plans, and Building Permits;
- Approve the Landscaping Plan;
- Approve the Deed Restrictions for Affordable/Employee Housing Units;
- Approve the Tree Removal Permit;
- Approve the Tentative Map and Final Map for Minor Subdivision.

(DEIR, p. 3-41.)

Other Project approvals and associated entitlements to be granted by responsible agencies include or may include the following:

- **TRPA:** Approval of the Landscaping Plan, the Deed Restrictions for Affordable/Employee Housing Units, the Tree Removal Permit, and the Subdivision of Existing Structures.
- **North Tahoe Design / Site Review Committee:** Approval of a subsequent design/site review.
- **California Department of Transportation (Caltrans):** Approval of Encroachment Permits if required.
- **North Tahoe Public Utility District (NTPUD):** Approval of Encroachment Permits if required.
- **North Tahoe Fire Protection District:** Approval of Sewer and Water Connection Permits.

- **Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB):** Approval of Construction Storm Water Permit.
- **Cal-Fire:** Timber Harvest Plan/Exemption.

(Draft EA/EIR, p. 3-41.)

VI.
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

In accordance with section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the County prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EA/EIR, which was published on February 21, 2006. The NOP was distributed for a 30-day comment period that ended on March 22, 2006. A Scoping Summary Report was developed that summarizes the environmental issues raised during the scoping period, and can be found in Appendix A of the Draft EA/EIR. The County held an agency and public scoping meeting on the proposed project on February 28, 2006, in Truckee. The scoping meeting was an opportunity for agencies and the public to obtain information about the proposed project and to provide input regarding the issues they wanted addressed in the Draft EA/EIR. Comments on the NOP received during the scoping meeting were considered in the preparation of the Draft EA/EIR. (Draft EA/EIR, pp. 1-7 to 1-8.)

The EA/EIR includes an analysis of the following issue areas:

- Scenic Resources
- Air Quality
- Vegetation and Wildlife
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Land Capability and Coverage
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Noise
- Recreation
- Traffic, Parking, and Circulation
- Public Services and Utilities
- Cumulative Impacts

(See Draft EA/EIR, pp. 1-4 to 1-5.)

The County distributed the Draft EA/EIR to various public agencies, citizen groups, and interested individuals for a 60-day public review period, from January 9, 2008 through March 10, 2008. This period satisfied the requirement for a 45-day public review period as set forth in Section 15105 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Draft EA/EIR was circulated to state agencies for review through the State Clearinghouse of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research. Copies of the Draft EA/EIR were available for public review during normal business hours at the County. Copies of the Draft EA/EIR were also available for review on the County's website. (Final EA/EIR, p. 1-1.)

During the review period, consistent with Section 15202 of the CEQA Guidelines, the public was invited to public comment hearings held by the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC) and the County. The first hearing was held during the February 13, 2008 TRPA APC meeting at The Chateau in Incline Village, Nevada. The second hearing was held during the February 14, 2008 Placer County Planning Commission meeting at the North Tahoe Conference Center in Kings Beach, California. The public was asked to provide written comments at the meeting or before closure of the public review period. Written comments were received from members of the public and several agencies. (Final EA/EIR, p. 1-1.)

On June 26, 2008, the County released the Final EA/EIR for the Project. The Final EA/EIR includes comments on the Draft EA/EIR, responses to those comments, revisions to the text of the Draft EA/EIR, and other information required by CEQA. The County distributed copies of the Final EA/EIR to public agencies submitting comments on the Draft EA/EIR, as required by Public Resources Code section 21092.5.

For further information regarding community meetings, document circulation, public hearings, and other opportunities for input, please see Final EA/EIR section 2.5.6.

VII.
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

In accordance with Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e), the record of proceedings for the County's decision on the Project includes the following documents:

- The NOP and all other public notices issued by the County in conjunction with the Project;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the NOP;
- The Draft EA/EIR for the Project (January 2008) and all appendices;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the Draft EA/EIR;
- The Final EA/EIR for the Project, including comments received on the Draft EA/EIR, and responses to those comments and appendices (June 2008);
- Documents cited or referenced in the Draft EA/EIR and Final EA/EIR;
- The mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the Project;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the Planning Commission in connection with the Project and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the Project prepared by the County, consultants to the County, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the County's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the County's action on the Project;
- All documents submitted to the County by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the Project, up through the close of the Planning Commission public hearing on July 10, 2008;
- Any minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the County in connection with the Project;
- Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the County at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings;
- The Placer County General Plan and all environmental documents prepared in connection with the adoption of the General Plan;
- The Placer County Zoning Ordinance and all other County Code provisions cited in materials prepared by or submitted to the County;
- Any and all resolutions adopted by the County regarding the Project, and all staff reports, analyses, and summaries related to the adoption of those resolutions;
- Matters of common knowledge to the County, including, but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations;
- Any documents expressly cited in these findings, in addition to those cited above; and
- Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

The documents constituting the record of proceedings are available for review by responsible agencies and interested members of the public during normal business hours at the Placer County Community Development Resource Center,

3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. The custodian of these documents is Environmental Coordination Services.

VIII.
FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" The same statute provides that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of Projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects." Section 21002 goes on to provide that "in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof."

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. For each significant environmental effect identified in an EA/EIR for a Project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The first such finding is that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EA/EIR. The second permissible finding is that such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. The third potential conclusion is that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EA/EIR. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.) As explained elsewhere in these findings, "feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors. The concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.) Moreover, "'feasibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors." (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417 (*City of Del Mar*).)

For purposes of these findings (including the table described in section X below), the term "avoid" refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less than significant level. In contrast, the term "substantially lessen" refers to the effectiveness of such measure or measures to substantially reduce the severity of a significant effect, but not to reduce that effect to a less than significant level.

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt feasible mitigation measures or, in some instances, feasible alternatives to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur.

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons that the agency found the project's benefits to outweigh its unavoidable adverse environmental effects.

In this case, the Planning Commission finds that, through implementation of the mitigation measures included in the EIR, all significant and potentially significant impacts associated with the Project have been avoided and all remaining impacts are less than significant. The Commission, therefore, is not required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Project.

IX.
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

The County has prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) for the Project. The County is approving the MMRP by the same Resolution that adopts these findings. The County will use the MMRP to track compliance with Project mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period. The MMRP is attached to and incorporated into the Project and is approved in conjunction with certification of the EA/EIR and adoption of these Findings of Fact. In the event of any conflict between these findings and the MMRP with respect to the requirements of an adopted mitigation measure, the more stringent measure shall control, and shall be incorporated automatically into both the findings and the MMRP.

X.
SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The Draft EA/EIR identified a number of significant and potentially significant environmental effects (or impacts) that the Project will cause or contribute to. All of these significant effects can be avoided through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures.

The Planning Commission' findings with respect to the Project's significant effects and mitigation measures are set forth in the table attached to these findings. The findings set forth in the table are hereby incorporated by reference.

This table does not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EA/EIR. Instead, the table provides a summary description of each impact, describes the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Draft EA/EIR or Final EA/EIR and adopted by the Planning Commission, and states the Planning Commission's findings on the significance of each impact after imposition of the adopted mitigation measures. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Draft EA/EIR and Final EA/EIR, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in those documents supporting the Final EA/EIR's determinations regarding the Project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the Planning Commission ratifies, adopts, and incorporates into these findings the analysis and explanation in the Draft EA/EIR and Final EA/EIR, and ratifies, adopts, and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Draft EA/EIR and Final EA/EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

The Planning Commission has adopted all of the mitigation measures identified in the table. Some of the measures identified in the table are also within the jurisdiction and control of other agencies. To the extent any of the mitigation measures are within the jurisdiction of other agencies, the Planning Commission finds those agencies can and should implement those measures within their jurisdiction and control.

A. Findings Regarding Mitigation Measures Proposed by Commenters

Some of the comments on the Draft EA/EIR suggested additional mitigation measures and/or modifications to the measures recommended in the Draft EA/EIR. In considering specific recommendations from commenters, the County has been cognizant of its legal obligation under CEQA to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental effects to the extent feasible. The County recognizes, moreover, that comments frequently offer thoughtful suggestions regarding how a commenter believes that a particular mitigation measure can be modified, or perhaps changed significantly, in order to more effectively, in the commenter's view, reduce the severity of environmental effects. The County is also cognizant, however, that the mitigation measures recommended in the Draft EA/EIR represent the professional judgment and experience of the County's expert staff and environmental consultants. The County therefore believes that these recommendations should not be lightly altered. Thus, in considering commenters' suggested changes or additions to the mitigation measures as set forth in the Draft EA/EIR, the County, in determining whether to accept such suggestions, either in whole or in part, has considered the following factors, among others: (i) whether the suggestion relates to a significant and unavoidable environmental effect of the Project, or instead relates to an effect that can already be mitigated to less than significant levels by proposed mitigation measures in the Draft EA/EIR; (ii) whether the proposed language represents a clear improvement, from an environmental standpoint, over the draft language that a commenter seeks to replace; (iii) whether the proposed language is sufficiently clear as to be easily understood by those who will implement the mitigation as finally adopted; (iv) whether the language might be too inflexible to allow for pragmatic implementation; (v) whether the suggestions are feasible from an economic, technical, legal, or other standpoint; (vi) whether the proposed language is consistent with the project objectives; and (vii) whether the suggestions may result in other impacts that are more severe than the impacts that the suggestions are designed to address, such that on the whole the suggestions do not reflect an improvement over those measures identified in the EIR.

As is evident from the specific responses given to specific suggestions, County staff and consultants spent significant time carefully considering and weighing proposed mitigation language, and in many instances adopted much of what a commenter suggested. In some instances, the County developed alternative language addressing the same issue that was of concern to a commenter. In no instance, however, did the County fail to take seriously a suggestion made by a commenter or fail to appreciate the sincere effort that went into the formulation of suggestions.

Based on this review, as is evident from the Final EA/EIR and the above-described table, the County modified several of the original proposed measures in response to such comments (see, in particular, Final EA/EIR, pp. 3-9 to 3-11). The Planning Commission commends staff for its careful consideration of those comments, agrees with staff in those instances when staff did not accept proposed language, and hereby ratifies, adopts, and incorporates staff's reasoning on these issues.

With respect to mitigation measures proposed by commenters, the Planning Commission adopts the following findings:

(1) Jeff Dowling of the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection commented that the California Code of Regulations, per section 1103, and Public Resources Code 4581 require that a Timberland Conversion Permit and/or Timber Harvest Plan is filed with the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection if the project involves the removal of a crop of trees of commercial species. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-36.) Mitigation Measures 12.A-3, 12.B-3, and 12.C-3 of the Draft EA/EIR require the applicant to develop a Timber Harvest Plan (THP) with specific performance measures prior to tree removal and obtain an Exemption from Timberland Conversion Permit for Subdivision. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-37.) Therefore, no changes to the Draft EA/EIR or additional mitigation are required.

(2) William A. Davis of the Department of Transportation commented that any impact to Caltrans drainage facilities, bridges, or other State facilities arising from effects of development on surface water runoff discharge from the peak storm event should be minimized through project drainage mitigation measures. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-39.) As described on pages 3-31- through 3-36 of the Draft EA/EIR, as illustrated in Exhibit 3-15 of the Draft EA/EIR and as required by Mitigation Measure 8.A-1c, the project will include temporary and permanent drainage facilities and best management practices (BMPs). Furthermore, the Preliminary Drainage Report (K.B. Foster Civil Engineering 2006) included as Appendix B of the Draft EA/EIR, provides the calculations that support the conclusion that post-project peak runoff discharge for the 10- and 100-year storm events would be decreased from the pre-project (existing) condition. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-41.) Therefore, no changes to the Draft EA/EIR or additional mitigation are required.

(3) Katy Sanchez of the Placer County Planning Department commented that a mitigation plan was necessary for identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, artifacts, and Native American human remains. (Final EA/EIR, pp. 2-44 to 2-45.) Recommendations for the treatment of unintentionally discovered archaeological materials and human remains are outlined in the project's cultural resources assessment report was prepared by EDAW in July of 2006 and was submitted to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Placer County Planning Department, and the NCIC. Mitigation Measures 11.A-2 and 11.A-3 were incorporated into the Draft EA/EIR and are adequate to address these potential impacts. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-46.) Therefore, no changes to the Draft EA/EIR or additional mitigation are required.

(4) Jason Kuchniki of the State of Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources proposed the following mitigation measures:

a. Mr. Kuchniki commented that mitigation should include development and implementation of a TRPA-certified fertilizer management plan. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-48.) Mitigation Measure 8.A-3c has been revised per this suggestion. (See Final EA/EIR, p. 2-49.) This change does not change the significance of any conclusions presented in the Draft EA/EIR.

b. Mr. Kuchniki commented that short term admissions of pollution during construction could potentially impact Lake Tahoe water quality, but he recognized that implementation of Mitigation Measure 15.A-1 should ensure the impact is less than significant. In addition, he requested that the County consider including periodic street sweeping with PM 10-efficient vac trucks and paving or graveling dirt roads at access points. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-48.) Emissions of particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in

diameter (PM_{10}) are mitigated to the fullest extent recommended by TRPA and discussed under Impact 15.A-1, on page 15-23 of the Draft EA/EIR. Mitigation Measure 15.A-1 specifically addresses those measures identified by the commenter. TRPA and/or Placer County have the discretion to require the use of street sweepers with a vacuum-type system as part of its approval of the dust control measures. Additionally, soil binders are to be applied to all non-paved road surfaces. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-49.) Therefore, no changes to the Draft EA/EIR or additional mitigation are required.

c. Mr. Kuchniki commented mitigation should be included to require the developer pay into an air quality mitigation fee to address cumulative VMT impacts. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-48.) The proposed project would pay the required mitigation fees prior to project construction to reduce the cumulative VMT impact. The proposed project would implement Mitigation Measures 14.A-1a (Contribute to TRPA Air Quality Mitigation Fund to Reduce VMT) and 14.A-1b (Contribute to Placer County Road Network Traffic Limitation Zone and Traffic Fee Program) as identified in Chapter 14, "Traffic, Parking and Circulation." (Final EA/EIR, pp. 2-49 to 2-50.) Therefore, no changes to the Draft EA/EIR or additional mitigation are required.

(5) Thomas M. Goebel of the North Tahoe Public Utility District (NTPUD) proposed the following mitigation measures:

a. NTPUD commented that, while Mitigation Measure 7.A-2 provides funding for replacement of campsites on NTPUD-owned properties, the NTPUD Board of Directors has not yet voted to approve the construction of campsites on any NTPUD-owned properties. (See Final EA/EIR, p. 2-58.) Mitigation Measure 7.A-2 of the Draft EA/EIR has been revised to provide a mechanism to allow the funds to be used for other recreation facility needs if unused within a 5-year period. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-66; see also Final EA/EIR, p. 2-158.) This change does not change the significance of any conclusions presented in the Draft EA/EIR.

b. NTPUD requested that the NTPUD's National Avenue Water Treatment Plant and lake intake is shown on the watershed map required for the Project. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-59.) The first bullet of Mitigation Measure 8.A-3a has been revised per this suggestion. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-69.) This change does not change the significance of any conclusions presented in the Draft EA/EIR.

(6) Karen Van Epps of North Tahoe Development Watch proposed the following mitigation measures:

a. Ms. Van Epps commented mitigation measures or alternatives are required to address traffic impact on the surrounding community and flow through traffic. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-92.) The project would add new project trips to the transportation network year round as documented in Chapter 14, "Traffic, Parking, and Circulation," of the Draft EA/EIR. The project's transportation impacts and VMT impacts were analyzed and, where necessary, mitigation measures to reduce any impacts to less than significant were identified. The traffic analysis analyzed the worst case scenario, which included fully occupied units during summer months. The plus project summer traffic volumes at the study intersections within Tahoe Vista are approximately 12% higher than the winter volumes during morning hours and 20% higher than the winter volumes during afternoon hours. In addition, the VMT for the basin was modeled based on the TRPA TRANPLAN Model, which models volumes for the summer condition. Therefore, the analysis is consistent with the TRPA model. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-116.) No changes to the Draft EA/EIR or additional mitigation are required.

b. Ms. Van Epps commented that pre-grading prior to construction would leave the site vulnerable to sedimentation and erosion. She recommended the inclusion of mitigation measures restricting site grading to individual phases to address this concern. (Final EA/EIR, p. 98.) Proposed grading would be limited to that necessary to implement any phase of construction, as approved by Placer County during improvement plan review. Impact 8.A-1 of the Draft EA/EIR recognizes the potential for short-term accelerated erosion and sedimentation and/or release of pollutants to nearby water bodies during project construction. Mitigation Measures 8.A-1a through 8.A-1c would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. (Final EA/EIR, p. 118.) Therefore, no changes to the Draft EA/EIR or additional mitigation are required.

c. Ms. Van Epps commented that fees are inadequate to mitigate for water supply impacts because tanks to supply for increased demand are not in place. (Final EA/EIR, p. 104.) NTPUD conducted an analysis of existing water facilities to determine if there is sufficient water supplies and water systems, including water storage capacity, to meet project demands. As part of their analysis, the NTPUD compared existing water demand and wastewater flows to the project water demand and wastewater flows to determine if additional water or wastewater facilities are required. In a letter dated May 28, 2008, the NTPUD confirmed that no additional sewer or water facility improvements are needed outside of the project site to serve the project needs. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-121.) Therefore, no changes to the Draft EA/EIR or additional mitigation are required.

(7) Barbara K. Haas proposed that mitigation other than the payment of fees should be required to address the increase in vehicle trips in the Tahoe Vista community. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-146.) Chapter 14, "Traffic, Parking, and Circulation," of the Draft EA/EIR analyzes the level of service of the study area intersections and roadways based on traffic volumes that include all planned projects within and near Tahoe Vista including Tahoe Sands, Vista Village, North Tahoe Marina, Kings Beach CEP projects, and Crystal Bay CEP projects. The level of service analysis, which is used to measure congestion levels and vehicle delay, indicated that the study intersections can accommodate the proposed project plus the cumulative growth without changes to the intersections. If there had been a level of service impact, the project would need to construct a specific improvement to mitigate the impact. The fees paid to TRPA and Placer County are intended to be used to enhance programs that reduce dependency on the private automobile. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-149.) Therefore, no changes to the Draft EA/EIR or additional mitigation are required.

(8) Leah Kaufman of Kaufman Planning and Consulting proposed the following mitigation measures:

a. Ms. Kaufman commented that, while Mitigation Measure 7.A-2 provides funding for replacement of campsites on NTPUD-owned properties, the NTPUD Board of Directors has not yet voted to approve the construction of campsites on any NTPUD-owned properties. She, thus, recommended that the impact fee be made available for other specified recreational uses after five years. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-162.) Mitigation Measure 7.A-2 of the Draft EA/EIR has been revised to provide a mechanism to allow the funds to be used for other recreation facility needs if unused within a 5-year period. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-165.) This revision does not change the significance of any conclusions presented in the Draft EA/EIR.

b. Ms. Kaufman commented that the VMT mitigation fee should be made available for specified projects with a local nexus. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-163.) Mitigation options recommended by the commenter will be considered by the lead agencies. Placer County Road Network Traffic Limitation Zone and Traffic Fee Program funds have and will continue to be used locally in Tahoe Vista. The primary project that was recently constructed in Tahoe Vista with County traffic fee program funds was the signal at National Ave/SR28; this was a joint Caltrans and Placer County funded project. Other projects that have been partially or completely funded through traffic fees in the North Tahoe area include signal at West River/SR89, the widening/improvements to the bridge on Squaw Valley Road, the signalization of Squaw Valley Road/SR 89, the Tahoe City Project, and a contribution was made to the TCPUD Lakeside Trail Project. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-166.) Therefore, no changes to the Draft EA/EIR or additional mitigation are required.

(9) Maywan Krach of Environmental Coordination Services commented that, while Mitigation Measure 7.A-2 provides funding for replacement of campsites on NTPUD-owned properties, the NTPUD Board of Directors has not yet voted to approve the construction of campsites on any NTPUD-owned properties. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-212.) Mitigation Measure 7.A-2 of the Draft EA/EIR has been revised to provide a mechanism to allow the funds to be used for other recreation facility needs if unused within a 5-year period. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-218.) This change does not change the significance of any conclusions presented in the Draft EA/EIR.

(10) Several commenters questioned the adequacy of mitigation fees as mitigation. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-11.) The use of fees as a means of providing mitigation for significant impacts is provided for in the State CEQA Guidelines and in CEQA case law. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(3) states in part: "A project's contribution is less than cumulatively considerable if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact." Further, CEQA case law supports the use of fees for mitigation of impacts where the agency reasonably expects that such fees will be used for mitigation (*Save Our*

Peninsula Committee v. Monterey County Board of Supervisors (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 99, 140). CEQA requires "a reasonable plan for mitigation" and the EA/EIR should explain how the fee program will address the impact. There are mitigation measures in the Draft EA/EIR that require payment of mitigation fees. The Draft EA/EIR explains how the fees would be used to physically mitigate the project's impact. The use of these fees to mitigate the associated project impacts is appropriate and adequate pursuant to TRPA and CEQA. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-11.) Therefore, no changes to the Draft EA/EIR or additional mitigation are required.

B. Findings Regarding Recirculation of the Draft EA/EIR

The Planning Commission adopts the following findings with respect to the need to recirculate the Draft EA/EIR. Under section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, recirculation of an EA/EIR is required when "significant new information" is added to the EA/EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EA/EIR for public review but prior to certification of the Final EA/EIR. The term "information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting, as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EA/EIR is not "significant" unless the EA/EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement.

"Significant new information" requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

(1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

(2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.

(3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.

(4) The Draft EA/EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

(CEQA Guidelines, § 15088.5.)

Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EA/EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR. The above standard is "not intend[ed] to promote endless rounds of revision and recirculation of EIRs." (*Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of the University of California* (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1112, 1132.) "Recirculation was intended to be an exception, rather than the general rule." (*Ibid.*)

The Planning Commission recognizes that the Final EA/EIR incorporates information obtained by the County since the Draft EA/EIR was completed, and contains additions, clarifications, modifications, and other changes. As noted above, several comments on the Draft EA/EIR either expressly or impliedly sought changes to proposed mitigation measures identified in the Draft EA/EIR as well as additional mitigation measures. As explained in the Final EA/EIR (Text Changes and Responses to Comments), some of the suggestions were found to be appropriate and feasible and were adopted in the Final EA/EIR and included in the MMRP. As discussed in the previous section of these findings, where changes have been made to mitigation measures to respond to comments, these changes do not change the significance of any conclusions presented in the Draft EA/EIR.

Notably, CEQA case law emphasizes that "[t]he CEQA reporting process is not designed to freeze the ultimate proposal in the precise mold of the initial project; indeed, new and unforeseen insights may emerge during investigation, evoking revision of the original proposal." (*Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 736-737; see also *River Valley Preservation Project v. Metropolitan Transit Development Bd.* (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 154, 168, fn. 11.) "'CEQA compels an interactive process of assessment of environmental impacts and responsive project modification which must be genuine. It must be open to the public, premised upon a full and meaningful disclosure of the scope, purposes, and effect of a consistently described project, with flexibility to respond to unforeseen insights that emerge from the process.' [Citation.] In short, a project must be open for public discussion and subject to agency modification during the CEQA process." (*Concerned Citizens of Costa Mesa, Inc. v. 33rd Dist. Agricultural Assn.* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 929, 936.)

Here, the changes made to mitigation measures are exactly the kind of project improvements that the case law recognizes as legitimate and proper.

The changes to Mitigation Measures 7.A-2, 7.A-3, 7.B-3, 7.C-3, 8.A-3a, and 8.A-3c, described above and in the Text Changes to the Draft EA/EIR (Final EA/EIR, p. 3-6 to 3-13) supplement or clarify the existing language. None of these changes involves "significant new information" triggering recirculation because the changes to the mitigation measures do not result in any new significant environmental effects, any substantial increase in the severity of any previously identified significant effects, or otherwise trigger recirculation. Instead, the modifications were either environmentally benign or environmentally neutral, and thus represent the kinds of changes that commonly occur as the environmental review process works towards its conclusion. Under such circumstances, the County finds that recirculation of the EA/EIR is not required.

The Commission finds that the identification of "Alternative E" does not require recirculation of the Draft EA/EIR. This alternative was developed by the applicant, the County and TRPA in order to respond to public comment on the original proposed project. Alternative E would reduce the impacts of Alternative A. The applicant has not refused to proceed with Alternative A. Thus, the identification of Alternative A does not require recirculation. (See CEQA Guidelines, § 15088.5, subd. (a)(3); Final EA/EIR, § 2.5.7.)

XI.
PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

A. FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects."

Where a lead agency has determined that, even after the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures, a project as proposed will still cause one or more significant environmental effects that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided, the agency, prior to approving the project as mitigated, must first determine whether, with respect to such impacts, there remain any project alternatives that are both environmentally superior and feasible within the meaning of CEQA. Although an EA/EIR must evaluate this range of *potentially* feasible alternatives, an alternative may ultimately be deemed by the lead agency to be "infeasible" if it fails to fully promote the lead agency's underlying goals and objectives with respect to the project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417.) "'[F]easibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (*Ibid*; see also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal App.4th 704, 715.) Thus, even if a project alternative will avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the project, the decision-makers may reject the alternative if they determine that specific considerations make the alternative infeasible.

Because all of the environmental impacts associated with Alternative A - the original proposal - may be reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation, the Planning Commission goal in evaluating the project alternatives was to select an alternative that feasibly attains the project objectives, while further reducing the proposed project's impacts. (Final EA/EIR, p. 2-17.)

The Draft EA/EIR and Final EA/EIR discussed several alternatives to the Project in order to present a reasonable range of options. The alternatives evaluated included:

1. Alternative A – Original Proposal
2. Alternative B – Reduced Development
3. Alternative C – Reduced Development with Recreation Elements
4. Alternative D – No Project
5. Alternative E – Modified Reduced Development
6. Alternative Off-Site Location
7. Increased Density / Increased Affordable/Employee Housing Alternative

8. Mixed Use–On-Site Campsites / TAUs / Affordable/Employee Housing and Commercial Alternative
9. No Project Alternative–47 RV / Tent Sites

The Planning Commission finds that that a good faith effort was made to evaluate all feasible alternatives in the EA/EIR that are reasonable alternatives to the Project and could feasibly obtain the basic objectives of the Project, even when the alternatives might impede the attainment of the Project objectives and might be more costly. As a result, the scope of alternatives analyzed in the EA/EIR is not unduly limited or narrow. The Planning Commission also finds that all reasonable alternatives were reviewed, analyzed and discussed in the review process of the EA/EIR and the ultimate decision on the Project. (See, e.g., Draft EA/EIR, pp. 4-1 to 4-19; Final EA/EIR, pp. 2-16 to 2-28.)

1. Project Objectives

As set forth in the Draft EA/EIR, the purpose and objectives for the Project are as follows:

- To create very high quality, low-density affordable homes that would be sold or leased to local families that are service providers and first time homebuyers.
- To restore the existing restaurant/office/apartment building to a quality, attractive building that resembles the historic character of Tahoe Vista.
- To install an attractive street frontage that improves the parking and vehicle safety for local residents.
- To enhance maintenance of the Sandy Beach Recreation Area across the street from the property.
- To create a multiple use public trail easement and rest stop for bicyclists.
- To develop the remainder of the site into tourist accommodation homes used under a shared ownership program.

(Draft EA/EIR, pp. 3-9 to 3-10.)

B. ANALYSIS OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

1. Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration in the Draft EA/EIR

A number of alternatives were considered in the initial screening and were not considered or further analyzed in the EA/EIR. The Commission hereby incorporates by reference the discussion of these alternatives in the Draft EA/EIR. (Draft EA/EIR, pp. 4-17 to 4-19.)

2. Alternatives Analyzed in the Draft EA/EIR and Final EA/EIR

The goal for developing a set of possible alternatives was to identify other means to attain the project objectives while further reducing the less than significant environmental impacts caused by Alternative A – the original proposal. For the most part, comparisons are made qualitatively rather than quantitatively.

The following alternatives will be discussed below:

1. Alternative A – Original Proposal
2. Alternative B – Reduced Development
3. Alternative C – Reduced Development with Recreation Elements
4. Alternative D – No Project
5. Alternative E – Modified Reduced Development

Alternative A: Original Proposal

Alternative A was the originally proposed Tahoe Vista Partners, LLC Affordable Housing and Interval Ownership Development Project, discussed in detail in Chapter 3 of the Draft EA/EIR, which would result in the construction of 45

tourist accommodation units (TAUs), a clubhouse/administration building, 10 affordable/employee housing units, improvements to the existing 2-story commercial building containing Spindleshanks Restaurant, and SR 28 frontage improvements on approximately 6.25 acres (272,303 square feet [sf]) of partially developed land in Tahoe Vista. Alternative A is discussed in detail in Chapter 3 of the EA/EIR and illustrated in Exhibit 3-4. (Draft EA/EIR, pp. 4-1 to 4-3; Final EA/EIR, p. 3-6.)

Alternative B: Reduced Development

The Reduced Development Alternative is substantially similar to Alternative A, but has a different site plan and would reduce the number of TAU units to reduce direct and indirect impacts associated with Alternative A. Alternative B would be constructed on the same site, and would include 39 TAUs on Parcel 2, which is 6 TAUs (or about 13%) fewer than Alternative A. The 39 TAUs or fractional ownership units would include: 13 two-bedroom units (Unit Type "A" at 2,302 sf each), 16 three-bedroom units (Unit Type "B" at 2,902 sf each), 5 four-bedroom units (Unit Type "C" at 3,598 sf each), and 5 upper floor (above the clubhouse/administration building) two-bedroom units (Unit Type "D" at 1,230 sf each). The square footages of the TAUs for Unit Types "A," "B," and "C" would increase relative to their corresponding Alternative A units to maintain a floor area ratio between the TAUs and the10 affordable/employee housing units, because the TAUs are needed to offset the costs of providing the affordable units. Therefore, while there would be an overall reduction in the number of TAU units relative to Alternative A, the TAU building square footage would be reduced by just 604 sf (from 101,102 sf with Alternative A to 100,498 sf with Alternative B). Alternative B would also result in 10 fewer parking spaces than Alternative A (two fewer spaces in each of Buildings GB1, GB4, GB5, GB6, and GB7). The four decked spas proposed under Alternative A would be eliminated with Alternative B. As with Alternative A, buildings would be designed to comply with TRPA building height standards (TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 22). The density of TAUs on Parcel 2 would be reduced to 7.9 units per acre. The Reduced Development Alternative would result in approximately 3.75 acres (163,459 sf) of coverage (excluding the impervious surfaces in the linear public facility area – 1,133 sf of impervious surface area in the multiple use public trail easement), resulting in 60% total site coverage, approximately 2% less coverage than Alternative A. The estimated maximum occupancy at the site for the 10 affordable/housing units and 39 TAU units would be 268 occupants. For further information regarding Alternative B, please see Draft EA/EIR, pp. 4-3 to 4-4 and Final EA/EIR, pp. 3-6 to 3-7.

Alternative C: Reduced Development with Recreation Elements

Like Alternative B, the Reduced Development with Recreation Elements Alternative would be substantially similar to Alternative A. Alternative C would have a different site plan and would reduce the number of TAU units by 6 to reduce direct and indirect impacts. Alternative C would be constructed on the same site and would include 39 TAUs on Parcel 2. The TAU building size, design, height, density, occupancy, and reduction in parking spaces would be the same as that described for Alternative B. The Reduced Development with Recreation Elements Alternative would result in approximately 3.75 acres (163,459 sf) of coverage (excluding the impervious surfaces in the linear public facility areas: 1,261 sf and 2,511 sf of impervious surface area in the multiple use public trail area and the pedestrian walkway discussed below, respectively), resulting in 61% total site coverage, approximately 2% less coverage than Alternative A. The estimated maximum occupancy at the site for the 10 affordable/housing units and 39 TAU units would be 268 occupants.

The primary distinction between Alternatives B and C is the recreation elements that have been incorporated into Alternative C. These recreation elements include the addition of a Kayak/Bicycle Rental Concessionaire to the main commercial building, development of a public pedestrian path connection to the multiple use public trail easement, additional of bicycle racks, and shared day use parking for Sandy Beach Recreation Area in the commercial building parking lot. For further information regarding Alternative B, please see Draft EA/EIR, pp. EA/EIR, pp. 4-10 to 4-16 and Final EA/EIR, p. 3-7.

Alternative D: No Project

This alternative proposes no project and no action. With this alternative, the 45 TAUs, clubhouse/administration building, 10 affordable/employee housing units, and 2-story main commercial building and SR 28 frontage improvements would not be constructed. The project site would remain a partially developed campground and RV park, with a 2-story main commercial building and small ancillary buildings fronting SR 28, as it is today. This alternative assumes the continued operation and use of these existing facilities at the site. It is acknowledged that project objectives could possibly be met by

other means in the future. However, for the purposes of this EA/EIR, it is assumed that even into the future, no new development would occur at the project site. (Draft EA/EIR, p. 4-17.)

Alternative E: Modified Reduced Development

Alternative E proposes several modifications to the Alternative A site plan to reduce environmental impacts or address other environmental issues or community concerns. Alternative E:

- reduces the number of TAUs from 45 with Alternative A to 39,
- increases TAU unit size from those proposed in Alternative A (reduces TAU unit size relative to Alternatives B and C),
- reduces the number of affordable/employee housing units from 10 with Alternative A to 6,
- provides additional space for snow storage on the site,
- preserves 30 additional on-site trees (removing 100 on-site trees compared to 130 with Alternative A). (Note: Alternative E would also remove 32 off-site trees to accommodate construction of the secondary emergency access road described below. In sum, Alternative E would remove two more trees than Alternative A),
- increases the main roadway width to 26 feet, and
- provides a secondary fire access road at the north end of the site via a 5,363 square-foot (sf) easement on the adjacent vacant parcel consistent with NTFPD direction.

These site plan modifications address concerns relating to open space, number and density of units, and unit size. Table 1 below provides information about on-site land coverage with Alternative E compared to Alternative A. Table 2 provides information about off-site land coverage on the adjacent parcel to the north; Alternative A would not include this off-site coverage and is therefore not included in Table 2.

The maximum number of full-time occupants associated with the six affordable/employee housing units would be six persons per residence (two persons per bedroom per 3-bedroom housing unit) for a total of up to 36 residents. Assuming the maximum occupancy rates would be similar for the fractional units, the 39 TAUs would add 206 occupants to the site assuming all units were fully occupied. The combined total for the affordable/employee housing units and TAUs is estimated to be 242 occupants, compared to 302 occupants for Alternative A (see Chapter 3, "Revisions and Corrections to Draft EA/EIR").

A secondary emergency access road has been proposed at the north end of the project site to address needs of the NTFPD (see Comment F-1). The emergency access would pass through approximately 139 feet of the vacant parcel to the north (location of the proposed Vista Village Workforce Housing Project site) and would join Toyon Road at its western terminus. The emergency access road would be gated on both ends to ensure that it remains available primarily for use by emergency vehicles. Its location could also allow use as part of a future bike path, indicated in Alternative A as joining the proposed project roadway at the northeast corner of the site. (Draft EA/EIR, pp. 2-17 to 2-18.)

3. Summary of Alternatives Analyzed in the Draft EA/EIR and Final EA/EIR

The EA/EIR contains a detailed analysis of the impacts of the project, and of the identified alternatives to the project. The Commission hereby incorporates by reference this analysis. (Draft EI/EIR, Chapters 4 et seq.) The following table summarizes the impacts of the alternatives identified in detail in the Draft EA/EIR. The table also addresses "Alternative E," which was identified in the Final EA/EIR. The corresponding analyses of the alternatives in the Draft and Final EA/EIR are incorporated by reference into these findings.

Summary Comparison of the Project Alternatives

	Impacts	Alternative A Proposed Project	Alternative B Reduced Development	Alternative C Reduced Development with Recreation Elements	Alternative D No Project	Alternative E Modified Reduced Development
6	**Land Use**					
6-1	Consistency with Regional Plan Land Use Goals and Policies and TVCP Policies.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
6-2	Potential for Conversion of Land Use.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
6-3	Potential for Division of an Existing Community (or Land Use Compatibility and Density).	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
7	**Recreation**					
7-1	Granting of an Easement to the NTPUD for Proposed Future Multiple Use (including bicycles) Public Trail.	B	B	B	NI	B
7-2	Closure of Sandy Beach Campground/Loss of Recreation Capacity.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
7-3	Increase in Use of Parks and Other Recreation Facilities.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
8	**Hydrology and Water Quality**					
8-1	Potential Short-Term Accelerated Soil Erosion and Sedimentation and/or Release of Pollutants to Nearby Water Bodies During Construction.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
8-2	Interception of Groundwater Table During Construction.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
8-3	Impervious Surface Area and Runoff.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
8-4	Possible Increased Urban Contaminants in Surface Runoff.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
9	**Geology, Soils, and Land Capability and Coverage**					
9-1	Land Coverage.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
9-2	Seismic Hazards.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
9-3	Non-Seismic Geologic Hazards.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
10	**Scenic Resources**					
10-1	Scenic Quality of Roadway Travel Unit 20A.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
10-2	Scenic Quality of Shoreline Travel Unit 21.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
10-3	Scenic Quality Impact from Public Recreation and Bicycle Trail Areas.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
10-4	Consistency with Plans, Policies, and Guidelines.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
10-5	Increased Light and Glare.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
11	**Cultural Resources**					
11-1	Effects on Known Cultural Resources.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS

Summary Comparison of the Project Alternatives						
	Impacts	Alternative A Proposed Project	Alternative B Reduced Development	Alternative C Reduced Development with Recreation Elements	Alternative D No Project	Alternative E Modified Reduced Development
11-2	Previously Undiscovered Cultural Resources.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
11.3	Previously Undiscovered Burials.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
12	**Vegetation and Wildlife**					
12-1	Common and Sensitive Habitats.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
12-2	Vegetation Removal.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
12-3	Tree Removal.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
12-4	Wildlife Movement Corridors.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
12-5	Nesting Raptors and Migratory Birds.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
12-6	Special-Status Species and Common Wildlife.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
12-7	Bat Species.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
13	**Public Services and Utilities**					
13-1	Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, Distribution, and Storage.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
13-2	Increased Demand for Wastewater Service.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
13-3	Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
13-4	Increased Demand for Electricity and Required Extension of Electrical Infrastructure.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
13-5	Increased Demand for Natural Gas and Required Extension of Natural Gas Infrastructure.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
13-6	Increased Demand for Telecommunications Service.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
13-7	Emergency Access During Construction.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
13-8	Increased Demand for Fire Protection.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
13-9	Increased Demand for Police Services.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
13-10	Increased Student Enrollment in Tahoe Vista Schools.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
13-11	Increased Demand for Postal Service.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
14	**Traffic, Parking, and Circulation**					
14-1	Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT).	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
14-2	Existing Plus Alternative A Level of Service.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
14-3	Vehicular Access and Circulation.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
14-4	Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
14-5	Transit.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS

Summary Comparison of the Project Alternatives						
	Impacts	Alternative A Proposed Project	Alternative B Reduced Development	Alternative C Reduced Development with Recreation Elements	Alternative D No Project	Alternative E Modified Reduced Development
14-6	Parking Supply.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
14-7	Construction Traffic.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
15	**Air Quality**					
15-1	Short-Term Construction Emissions of ROG, NO_X, and PM_{10}.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
15-2	Long-Term Operational (Regional) Emissions.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
15-3	Long-Term Operational (Local) Mobile-Source Carbon Monoxide Emissions.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
15-4	Odor Emissions.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
15-5	Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
16	**Noise**					
16-1	On-site Construction Noise Levels.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
16-2	Off-site Construction Traffic Noise Levels.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
16-3	Stationary- and Area-Source Noise.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
16-4	Long-term Operational Increases in Daily Off-site Traffic Noise Levels.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
16-5	Land Use Compatibility with On-site Noise Levels.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
17	**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**					
17-1	Create a Safety Hazard to Construction Workers.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
17-2	Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS
17.3	Increased Exposure to Wildland Fire Hazard.	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS

Significance levels for Alternatives A through E reflect the levels of significance after mitigation
NI = No Impact
B = Beneficial
LTS = Less than Significant
S = Significant
PS = Potentially Significant
SU = Significant and Unavoidable

(Final EA/EIR, pp. 2-25 to 2-29.)

4. Alternative E

As noted above, in response to input from agencies and the public, the County and TRPA have identified "Alternative E" as the appropriate alternative to approve. Because the County is approving Alternative E, the County hereby adopts the following findings with respect to the relative impacts of Alternative A versus Alternative E.

Land Use: The site plan for Alternative E would be similar to that for Alternative A, including conversion of existing land uses. Alternative E would be consistent with Regional Plan Land Use Goals and Policies and TVCP Policies. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the land use impacts of Alternative E would be similar to or less than those identified for Alternative A because of a lower density of housing units.

Recreation: Uses at the project site would be the same with Alternative E as with Alternative A, although the density of development would be somewhat reduced. An easement would continue to be granted to the NTPUD for a proposed future multiple use public trail. Closure of the Sandy Beach Campground would result in a loss of recreational capacity, and mitigation would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Based on the occupancy of the project with Alternative E, this alternative would create demand for an additional 1.21 acres of recreational facilities. As with Alternative A, if the project site cannot support that additional amount of recreational facilities, the project applicant would pay additional park fees to account for the shortfall. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and, by virtue of fewer occupants, the recreational impacts of Alternative E would be slightly less than those identified for Alternative A.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Impacts relating to hydrology and water quality with Alternative E would be similar to those for Alternative A; stormwater best management practices (BMPs) would be required, and a dewatering plan and groundwater quality BMPs would be included in the stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). Development of Alternative E would result in approximately 3.8 acres (165,644 sf) of on-site impervious surfaces (approximately 61%), a slight reduction compared to Alternative A. Alternative E would also result in 2,672 sf of off-site coverage (<1%) on the undeveloped parcel north of the site for the secondary emergency access road. The combined on- and off-site coverage for Alternative E would be 168,316 sf, which would be slightly below the Alternative A coverage. Mitigation for this additional runoff and mitigation for increased urban contaminants in runoff would be required as was identified for Alternatives A, B, and C and these same measures would apply to the coverage on the vacant parcel to the north. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the hydrology and water quality impacts of Alternative E would be similar to those identified for Alternative A.

Geology, Soils, and Land Capability and Coverage: Development of Alternative E would result in approximately 3.8 acres (165,644 sf) of on-site impervious surfaces (approximately 61%), and 0.06 acre (2,672 sf) of off-site coverage, together resulting in a slight reduction in coverage compared to Alternative A. The secondary fire access connection to Toyon Road would result in an incremental increase in grading because of the necessary off-site grading that would occur with this alternative. However, all impacts relating to geology, soils, and land capability and coverage would be similar in magnitude to those described for Alternative A, with the exception of that reduction. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the geology, soils, and land capability and coverage impacts of Alternative E would be similar to or less than those identified for Alternative A.

Alternative E–On-Site Land Coverage Calculations Compared with Alternative A

	Alternative A	Alternative E
Net Lot Area:		
Including Coverage Within Future Linear Public Facility Area:	272,303 sf	272,303 sf
Excluding Coverage Within Future Linear Public Facility Area:	271,170 sf	271,503 sf
Land Capability District (TRPA Verified):	6 sf	6 sf
Allowable Coverage (Bailey–30%):		
Including Coverage Within Future Linear Public Facility Area:	81,691 sf	81,691 sf
Excluding Coverage Within Future Linear Public Facility Area:	81,351 sf	81,451 sf
Allowable Coverage (TVCP w/transfer–50%):		
Including Coverage Within Future Linear Public Facility Area:	136,152 sf	136,152 sf
Excluding Coverage Within Future Linear Public Facility Area:	135,585 sf	135,752 sf
Existing On Site:		
Site Land Coverage (TRPA Verified):	174,324 sf	174,324 sf
Existing Coverage:		

Alternative E–On-Site Land Coverage Calculations Compared with Alternative A		
	Alternative A	Alternative E
Asphalt:	16,489 sf	16,489 sf
Buildings:	6,778 sf	6,778 sf
Decks & Patio:	2,036 sf	2,036 sf
Gravel:	39,129 sf	39,129 sf
Compacted Dirt:	109,708 sf	109,708 sf
Concrete Pads:	184 sf	184 sf
Total:	174,324 sf (64%)	174,324 sf (64%)
Existing Off Site Land Coverage:	3,800 sf	3,800 sf
Proposed On Site Land Coverage (detail below):		
Including Coverage Within Future Linear Public Facility Area:	170,194 sf	165,925 sf
Excluding Coverage Within Future Linear Public Facility Area:	169,061 sf	165,644 sf
Future Linear Public Facility Area:		
Multiple Use (including bicycles) Public Path in Trail Easement:	1,133 sf	281 sf
Road & Parking Areas:	64,996 sf	65,196 sf
Sidewalk at SR 28 frontage:	1,450 sf	1,450 sf
Buildings:		
Affordable/Employee Housing Units:	6,365 sf	4,092 sf
Interval Ownership Buildings (TAUs):	48,318 sf	44,615 sf
Garage Buildings:	9,605 sf	8,246 sf
Clubhouse/Administration Building:	4,781 sf	4,781 sf
Restaurant/Office/Apartment Building:	3,774 sf	3,774 sf
Pool Equipment Building:		380 sf
Restaurant Deck:		800 sf
Total Buildings:	72,843 sf	66,688 sf
Raised Decks: (Coverage Shadow)	2,409 sf	--
Raised Deck Posts:	344 sf	--
Restaurant Deck:	1,000 sf	--
Landings & Walks:	13,318 sf	10,041 sf
Pool and Deck Area:	8,437 sf	8,057 sf
Spa Decks and Tubs:	2,216 sf	2,140 sf
Stone Monuments & Signs:	98 sf	98 sf
Trash Enclosures:	846 sf	720 sf
Play Area:	718 sf	3,082sf
Multiple Use Public Path Access:	386 sf	--
Total (Including Coverage Within Future Linear Public Facility Area):	170,194 sf (63%)	165,925 sf (61%)
Total (Excluding Coverage Within Future Linear Public Facility Area):	169,061 sf (62%)	165,644 sf (61%)
Proposed Off Site Land Coverage	427 sf	427 sf
Land Coverage to be Transferred:	0 sf	0 sf
Land Coverage to be Banked:		
Including Coverage Within Future Linear Public Facility Area:	4,130 sf	8,399 sf
Excluding Coverage Within Future Linear Public Facility Area:	5,263 sf	8,680 sf

Alternative E–On-Site Land Coverage Calculations Compared with Alternative A		
	Alternative A	Alternative E
Excess Land Coverage.		
Including Coverage Within Future Linear Public Facility Area:	88,503 sf	84,474 sf
Excluding Coverage Within Future Linear Public Facility Area:	87,710 sf	84,193 sf
Note: For the purposes of this EA/EIR, the land coverage in the multiple use (including bicycles) public path area (281 sf) at the rear of the site is included in this table. However, this easement would be dedicated to a public entity for use as a future linear public facility, which would allow its coverage to be excluded under TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 20.3.4. Sources: Lundahl & Associates 2008; K. B. Foster Civil Engineering, Inc. 2008		

(Final EA/EIR, pp. 2-22 to 2-23.)

Alternative E–Off-Site Land Coverage Calculations	
Net Lot Area (approximately 12.2-acre parcel; APN 112-050-001):	532,925 sf
Allowable Coverage By Land Capability District:	
Land Capability District 6 (TRPA Verified; Bailey - 30%):	156,347 sf
Land Capability District 4 (TRPA Verified; Bailey - 20%):	2,354 sf
Total Allowable Coverage:	158,701 sf
Proposed Emergency Access Road Coverage:	2,672 sf (< 1%)
Land Coverage to be Transferred:	0 sf
Land Coverage to be Banked.	0 sf
Excess Land Coverage:	0 sf
Sources: Auerbach Engineering Corporation 2008; EDAW 2007	

(Final EA/EIR, p. 2-24.)

Scenic Resources: Alternative E would have similar but reduced scenic impacts compared to Alternative A. Fewer trees (100 compared to 130) would be removed due to construction. The buildings would continue to require an increase in the maximum building height to the same extent as described for Alternative A, but fewer buildings would be constructed. The increase in light and glare would require mitigation to control lighting as with Alternative A, but fewer buildings and thus fewer lighting fixtures would be constructed. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the scenic resource impacts of Alternative E would be slightly less than those identified for Alternative A.

Cultural Resources: Impacts on cultural resources would be the same for Alternative E as for Alternative A. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the scenic resource impacts of Alternative E would be similar to those identified for Alternative A.

Vegetation and Wildlife: Impacts to vegetation and wildlife would be similar with Alternative E because the site would continue to be developed. Approximately 30 trees that would be removed from the project site with Alternative A would remain with Alternative E. An additional 32 trees would need to be removed from the easement to accommodate construction of the secondary emergency access road. In sum, Alternative E would remove two more trees than Alternative A. Impacts on special-status species, bats, and raptors would be the same. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the vegetation and wildlife impacts of Alternative E would be similar to those identified for Alternative A.

Public Services and Utilities: Impacts on public services and utilities would be reduced with Alternative E from Alternative A because the smaller development would accommodate approximately 242 occupants rather than 302 with Alternative A. These impacts were identified as being less than significant for Alternative A and would remain so for Alternative E. The impact on emergency access during construction, identified as significant before mitigation with

Alternative A, would remain significant but would be mitigated for Alternative E. However, Alternative E would have a reduced impact on emergency service over the long term because secondary emergency access would be provided at the north end of the project site. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the public services and utilities impacts of Alternative E would be similar to those identified for Alternative A.

Traffic, Parking, and Circulation: Alternative A is evaluated as generating approximately 299 net new daily trips during the peak summer months. Because fewer fractional ownership units and fewer affordable housing units would be constructed with Alternative E, the number of net new daily summertime trips would be reduced to 211; therefore, while the project applicant would still be required to contribute to the Air Quality Mitigation Fund and the County's Traffic Impact Fee, the total amount of these fees would be reduced compared to Alternative A. Because the emergency access road would be gated on both ends to ensure that it remains available primarily for use by emergency vehicles and restricted from use by through traffic, Alternative E would not create new traffic impacts on National Avenue not previously considered in the Draft EA/EIR. Its location could also allow use as part of a future bike path, indicated in Alternative A as joining the proposed project roadway at the northeast corner of the site. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the traffic, parking, and circulation impacts of Alternative E would be reduced from those identified for Alternative A.

Air Quality: As with vehicle miles traveled, the amount of air pollutant emissions resulting with Alternative E would be reduced relative to Alternative A because fewer occupants would be present. Construction emissions would be slightly reduced because fewer units would be constructed. The project applicant would be required to implement emissions control measures to mitigate for construction impacts, and to pay the Air Quality Mitigation Fee to mitigate for long-term vehicle trip-related impacts. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the air quality impacts of Alternative E would be reduced from those identified for Alternative A.

Noise: Construction noise would remain significant with Alternative E, and mitigation would be required to reduce that impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation would still be required for HVAC noise, and land use compatibility would remain a concern that requires mitigation. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the noise impacts of Alternative E would be the same as those identified for Alternative A.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Impacts relating to hazards and hazardous materials would remain unchanged by the changes to the project between Alternative A and Alternative E, and mitigation for construction impacts would continue to be required. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the hazards and hazardous materials impacts of Alternative E would be the same as those identified for Alternative A. (Draft EA/EIR, pp. 2-18 to 2-25.)

4. Environmentally Superior Alternative

As summarized above, and as discussed in the Draft EA/EIR and Final EA/EIR, Alternatives A, B, C, and E all result in less than significant environmental impacts after mitigation. Section 19.5 of the Draft EA/EIR, "Environmentally Superior Alternative/Environmentally Preferred Alternative," explains that the No Project Alternative would avoid the less than significant impacts generated by the project, and would therefore be considered the environmentally superior alternative with respect to CEQA. The No Project Alternative would not meet the project objectives stated in Chapter 3, "Project Description," of the Draft EA/EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(d)(2) requires that the EA/EIR identify another alternative as environmentally superior. Alternative C is identified in Section 19.5 of the Draft EA/EIR as the environmentally superior alternative among the other development alternatives because it would:

- reduce the amount of land coverage, which would reduce soils, hydrologic, and biological impacts;
- reduce the number of tourist accommodation units and occupants at the complex, which would reduce the associated traffic, air quality, noise, and utilities and public services impacts;
- include several recreational elements such as a kayak/bicycle concessionaire's facility, a public pedestrian footpath, bicycle racks, and a Sandy Beach Recreation Area shared day use parking area; and meet the project objectives listed in Section 3.3 of Chapter 3, "Project Description."

(Draft EA/EIR, p. 19-3; Final EA/EIR, p. 2-4.)

The Commission notes that Alternative E is similar to Alternative C, except that Alternative E does not incorporate the recreational elements incorporated into Alternative C. (See Final EA/EIR, § 2.5.7.)

C. CONCLUSION

As explained above, the Planning Commission has balanced the benefits of each alternative along with other environmental, economic, social, and technological considerations and has concluded that the Alternative E is the appropriate alternative to approve. Because all of the environmental impacts associated with Alternative A (the original proposal) may be reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation, the Planning Commission goal in evaluating the project alternatives was to select an alternative that feasibly attains the project objectives, while further reducing the proposed project's impacts. After balancing environmental factors against the benefits of each alternative, the Planning Commission has concluded that Alternative E feasibly attains the project objectives and further reduces the proposed project's impacts. Furthermore, the Commission finds that the proposed project's benefits to the Placer County community and economy outweigh the less than significant environmental impacts of the project.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

µin	1 micro inch
µg/m3	micrograms per cubic meter
AADT	annual average daily traffic
AB	Assembly Bill
AB 2588	Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act of 1987
ACM	asbestos-containing materials
ADT	daily traffic volumes
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
APC	Advisory Planning Commission
APCO	Air Pollution Control Officer
APN	Assessors Parcel Number
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
ATCM	Airborne Toxics Control Measure
BACT	best available control technology for toxics
Basin Plan	Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Basin
bgs	below ground surface
BMP	Best Management Practices
CAA	federal Clean Air Act
CAAA	federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990
CAAQS	California ambient air quality standards
California Division of Mines and Geology	California Geological Survey
California Geological Survey	California Division of Mines and Geology
Cal-OSHA	California Occupational Safety & Health Administration
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CASQA	California Stormwater Quality Association
CBC	California Building Standards Code
CC&R	covenants, conditions, and restrictions
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCAP	Center for Clean Air Policy
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDF	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CDMG	California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CEP	Lake Tahoe Community Enhancement Program
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	cubic feet per second
CHABA	Committee of Hearing, Bio Acoustics, and Bio Mechanics
CHP	California Highway Patrol
CIWMA	California Integrated Waste Management Act
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNELs	community noise levels
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	carbon monoxide
Community Noise Equivalent Level	CNEL
Conservancy	California Tahoe Conservancy
County General Plan	Placer County General Plan
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources

CTC	California Tahoe Conservancy
CWA	federal Clean Water Act
CY	cubic yards
Day-Night Noise Level	L_{dn}
dB	decibels
dBA	A-weighted decibels
dBA/DD	A-weighted decibels per doubling of distance
dbh	diameter at breast height
DFG	California Department of Fish and Game
diesel PM	PM from diesel-fueled engines
DOT	U.S Department of Transportation
DPR	Department of Parks and Recreation
DRC	Placer County Department of Resource Conservation
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
DU	Dwelling Unit
EA	environmental assessment
EIAQ	environmental impact assessment questionnaire
EIP	Environmental Improvement Program
EIR	environmental impact report
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ERC	Placer County Environmental Review Committee
ESA	federal Endangered Species Act
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
ETCC	environmental threshold carrying capacities
Fed-OSHA	Federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FIP	Federal Implementation Plan
FPR	Forest Practice Rules
FTA	Federal Transit Authority
gpm	gallons per minute
GVW	gross vehicle weight
HAP	hazardous air pollutants
HCD	California Department of Housing and Community Development
HCP	habitat conservation plans
HDPE	high density polyethylene
HEPA	High Efficiency Particulate Air
hp	horsepower
HPS	high pressure sodium
HUD	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
Hz	hertz
in/sec	inch per second
ISA	International Society of Arboriculture
ISO	Insurance Service Organization
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers
lbs/day	pounds per day

LCD	Land Capability District
LDM	Land Development Manual
L_{eq}	Equivalent Noise Level
LEV	Low Emission Vehicle
LID	low impact development
L_{max}	Maximum Noise Level
L_{min}	Minimum Noise Level
LOS	Level of service
LRWQCB	Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
LTAB	Lake Tahoe Air Basin
LTRTC	Lake Tahoe Railway and Transportation Company
m	meters
MACT	maximum available control technology for toxics
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MLD	Most Likely Descendant(s)
MMP	Mitigation and Monitoring Plan
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
mph	miles per hour
MRF	Material Recovery Facility
MRZ	Mineral Resource Zone
MSDS	Material Safety Data Sheets
msl	mean sea level
MW	Megawatts
Mwh	Megawatt hours
NAAQS	national ambient air quality standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCCP	natural community conservation plan
NCIC	North Central Information Center
NEHRP	National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program
NEHRPA	National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program Act
NESHAP	national emissions standards for HAPs
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
NMHC	non-methane hydrocarbon
NO_2	nitrogen dioxide
NOA	Naturally occurring asbestos
NOAA Fisheries Service	National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service
NOD	Notice of Determination
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
NSF	National Science Foundation
NTFPD	North Tahoe Fire Protection District
NTPUD	North Tahoe Public Utility District
NTRAC	North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council
NTU	Nephelometric Turbidity Units
OEHHA	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
OES	Office of Emergency Services
OHP	Office of Historic Preservation
OHV	Off-highway vehicle
ONRW	Outstanding National Resource Water
OPR	State of California, Governor's Office of Planning and Research
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration

PAOT	persons at one time
PAS	Plan Area Statement
Pathway	Lake Tahoe Regional Plan update process
PCAPCD	Placer County Air Pollution Control District
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyls
PCDEH	Placer County Department of Environmental Health
PCSD	Placer County Sheriff's Department
PM_{10}	aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less
$PM_{2.5}$	aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less
ppm	parts per million
PPV	peak particle velocity
PRC	Public Resources Code
Quimby Act	California Government Code Section 66477
REC	recognized environmental conditions
Regional Boards	Regional Water Quality Control Boards
Regional Plan	Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin
RMS	root mean square
ROG	reactive organic gases
RPF	Registered Professional Forester
RV	recreational vehicle
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SBC	SBC Communications
SCADA	Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition
sec	per second
SENL	Single-Event (Impulsive) Noise Level
SEZ	stream environment zones
sf	square feet
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMARA	Surface Mining and Reclamation Act
SO_2	sulfur dioxide
SO_x	sulfur dioxide
SPPC	Sierra Pacific Power Company
SQIP	Scenic Quality Improvement Program
SR	State Route
SRA	State Responsible Areas
State Water Board	State Water Resources Control Board
Statistical Descriptor	L_x
SWMM	Storm Water Management Manual
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
TAC	toxic air contaminants
TART	Tahoe Area Regional Transit
TAU	tourist accommodation units
T-BACT	best available control technology for TACs
TCP	Traffic Control Plan
TDM	transportation demand management
THP	Timber Harvesting Plan
TLCP	Timberland Conversion Permit
TMP	Tree Management Plan

TP	test pit
TPY	tons per year
TRPA	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
TRT	Tahoe Rim Trail
TSM	Transportation System Management
T-TSA	Tahoe Truckee Sanitation Agency
TTSD	Tahoe-Truckee Sierra Disposal Company, Inc.
TTUSD	Tahoe-Truckee Unified School District
TVCP	Tahoe Vista Community Plan
U.S. 50	U.S. Highway 50
UBC	Uniform Building Code
USC	United States Code
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UST	underground storage tank
UV	ultraviolet
VdB	vibration decibels
VFD	variable frequency drives
VMP	Vegetation Monitoring Plan
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VOC	volatile organic carbon
WQ	Water Quality

TAHOE VISTA PARTNERS, LLC AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND INTERVAL OWNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

PLACER COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

TABLE OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND CEQA FINDINGS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
LAND USE			
Impact 6.A-1: **Consistency with Regional Plan Land Use Goals and Policies and TVCP Policies.** Alternative A, the proposed project, would result in 45 TAUs, 10 affordable/employee housing units, and commercial space, which would be consistent with the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan and the applicable policies of the TVCP as described in Table 6-1 (LS) (DEIR, p 6-7.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
6.A-2 Potential for Conversion of Land Use. Alternative A would remove the existing private campground and RV park and would construct 45 TAUs, a clubhouse/administration building, 10 affordable/employee housing units, improvements to the existing main 2-story commercial building, and SR 28 frontage improvements. Although the site would change from a developed campground to TAUs and affordable/employee housing, the land use would remain consistent with the TVCP tourist area and commercial core designations. (LS) (DEIR, p. 6-8.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
6.A-3 Potential for Division of an Existing Community (or Land Use Compatibility and Density). Alternative A would not divide an established community because the project's proposed affordable/employee housing units, TAUs, and commercial land uses would be similar to those existing in the surrounding area and Alternative A would include features that would serve to connect the project site with the surrounding community. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 6-8 to 6-9.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
RECREATION			
7.A-1 Granting of an Easement to the NTPUD for Proposed Future Multiple Use (including bicycles) Public Trail. Implementation of Alternative A would result in the granting of an easement to the NTPUD for a future multiple use public trail connecting the North Tahoe Regional Park to National Avenue. The public trail would cross the project site's northeast corner. (B) (DEIR, p. 7-13.)	No mitigation is required	B	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are beneficial. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
7.A-2.Closure of Sandy Beach Campground/Loss of Recreation Capacity. Implementation of Alternative A would result in the conversion of the site from a campground/RV park to a TAU and affordable/employee housing development. Implementation of Alternative A would result in the elimination of overnight camping facilities and outdoor recreation concessions in Special Areas #1 and #2 of the TVCP. This land use conversion would reduce regional and basin-wide campground capacity. (S) (DEIR, p. 7-13 to 7-15.)	**7.A-2. Mitigate for Loss of 27 Camping/RV Sites.** Prior to the approval of any grading permits for the proposed project and subject to the approval of the Placer County Planning Commission and the TRPA Governing Board, the project applicant shall provide the means (in the form of a mitigation fee) by which replacement campsites can be constructed to mitigate for the loss of 27 existing camping/RV sites allowed under the Housing and Community Development (HCD) operating permit. Off-site and in-kind mitigation shall be achieved by providing equal funding for the following campground facilities: ▶ NTPUD-Owned Property in North Lake Tahoe. The project applicant has had discussions with NTPUD staff regarding the relocation of campsites at a 1:1 ratio to an NTPUD-owned facility. The District owns	LS	Finding. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 7.A-2, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by mitigating the closure of Sandy Beach Campground by providing a fee for the NTPUD and California State Parks to use to develop replacement campsites or, after five years, to fund other recreational facility developments subject to review and approval by Placer County and the TRPA Recreation Program Manager. The City Council hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation. Implementation of the Project would eliminate 27 existing camping/RV sites and an associated RV dump station at the project site. Prior to the approval of any grading permits for the

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	two undeveloped properties that are potential locations for future campground facilities the 16 5-acre Mogilefsky Property and the 103.7-acre Firestone Property An action item in the NTPUD's Draft Recreation and Parks Master Plan identifies the Mogilefsky Property (APN 111-010-007) north of the North Tahoe Regional Park as a suitable location for the development of campsites as part of a planned environmental camping retreat The Mogilefsky Property is located within Plan Area Statement 024—North Tahoe Recreation Area, outside of the TVCP Both developed and undeveloped campgrounds are identified as permissible uses in PAS 024 The maximum allowable density for developed campgrounds in PAS 024 is eight sites per acre PAS 024 also includes a target of 200 PAOTs for additional developed outdoor overnight recreation facility capacity Relocation of the campsites to the Mogilefsky Property (or other NTPUD-owned property) would require expansion of water/wastewater and electricity services to the site and access to and from the site The construction of campground sites at the Mogilefsky Property would also be subject to subsequent environmental review and approval of the NTPUD Board Under such an arrangement, the project applicant would pay fees towards the construction of the campground facilities and possibly fees to cover on-going maintenance costs, while NTPUD staff would be responsible for its continued operation • Burton Creek State Park near Tahoe City The Burton Creek State Park General Plan proposes, among other day use facilities, the possible future development of a campground on high capability lands that would include between one and 200 campsites (including one group area) The possible future campground development was among several primary reasons for preparation of the General Plan The General Plan EIR recognizes that the campground may contribute to significant and unavoidable traffic congestion on SR 28 (California State Parks 2005) The development of campground facilities at the 2,000-acre Burton Creek State Park is not envisioned for many years (perhaps 10 to 20 years) and would be subject to subsequent environmental review The feasibility of these off-site and in-kind campsite replacement projects has been discussed with senior NTPUD and State Parks staff Funding is not available at this time for the establishment of facilities at either the NTPUD Mogilefsky Property or at Burton Creek State Park Therefore, the mitigation fee for the loss of Sandy Beach Campground would provide needed funding to the NTPUD and State Parks to initiate design, environmental review and permitting, and construction of campground facilities that could expedite their development The mitigation fee shall be calculated at a cost of $17,488 per campsite (based on the average of two fee estimates: that of a private RV consultant which estimated the per campsite fee at $10,975, and that provided by State Parks staff, which estimated the per campsite fee at $24,000) Therefore, the mitigation fee for the loss of 27 campsites		proposed Project and subject to the approval of the Placer County Planning Commission and the TRPA Governing Board, the Project applicant shall provide the means (in the form of a mitigation fee) by which replacement campsites can be constructed to mitigate for the loss of the 27 existing camping/RV sites allowed under the Housing and Community Development (HCD) operating permit. The fees shall be paid at the time of permit acknowledgement Off-site and in-kind mitigation shall be achieved by providing equal funding for campground facilities at a North Tahoe Public Utility District (NTPUD) owned property in North Lake Tahoe and at Burton Creek State Park near Tahoe City The Project applicant has coordinated with both NTPUD and State Parks regarding the feasibility of relocating campsites to their properties. Funding is not available at this time for the establishment of facilities at either the NTPUD Mogilefsky Property or at Burton Creek State Park Therefore, the mitigation fee for the loss of Sandy Beach Campground would provide needed funding to the NTPUD and State Parks to initiate design, environmental review and permitting, and construction of campground facilities that could expedite their development The mitigation fee shall be calculated at a cost of $17,488 per campsite, based on estimates provided by a private RV consultant and by State Parks staff Therefore, the mitigation fee for the loss of 27 campsites would be $472,176—based on this estimate, a total of $236,089 would be directed to both the NTPUD and State Parks (i e , $236,088 to NTPUD and $236,088 to State Parks) and earmarked for campground facility development If after a period of 5 years following the banking of these fees, campground facility development has not progressed as envisioned above, the fees could be used by NTPUD and California State Parks for other recreational facility development subject to review and approval by Placer County and TRPA Examples of the types of facility development that NTPUD could use these fees for include construction of a restroom facility at the Sandy Beach Recreation Area, North Tahoe Regional Park improvements National Avenue Recreation Area improvements, or other improvements that would provide additional lake access. (DEIR, pp. 7-14 and 7-19 to 7-20, FEIR, p 2-12.) Uses at the project site would be the same with Alternative E as with Alternative A, although the density of development would be somewhat reduced. Closure of the Sandy Beach Campground would result in the same loss of recreational capacity (FEIR, p 2-18.) The mitigation fee required by Mitigation Measure 7 A-2 provides funding to replace onsite campsites eliminated by the Project with offsite campsites and/or provides funding to offset the reduction in recreation PAOT capacity caused by the elimination of the onsite camping/RV sites through the development of additional recreational facilities Therefore, implementation of this mitigation measures will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with elimination of the campsites and the remaining impact will be less than significant (DEIR pp 7-14 and 7-19 to 7-20, FEIR, p 2-12.)

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	would be $472,176—based on this estimate a total of $236,088 would be directed to both the NTPUD and State Parks and earmarked for campground facility development. If after a period of 5 years following the banking of these fees, campground facility development has not progressed as envisioned above, the fees could be used by NTPUD and California State Parks for other recreational facility development subject to review and approval by Placer County and the TRPA Recreation Program Manager. Examples of the types of facility development that NTPUD could use these fees for include construction of a restroom facility at the Sandy Beach Recreation Area, North Tahoe Regional Park improvements, National Avenue Recreation Area improvements, or other improvements that would provide additional lake access. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 7-19 to 7-20, FEIR, p. 3-9.)		
7.A-3 Increase in Use of Parks and Other Recreation Facilities. The addition of new residents and tourists in the Tahoe Vista area could result in an incremental increase in the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities. Implementation of Alternative A would increase the area's population by approximately 302 occupants, which would result in the demand for 1.51 acres of new on-site recreational facilities and increased use of local recreation areas. (PS) (DEIR, pp. 7-15 to 7-16, FEIR, p. 3-8.)	**7.A-3. Provide 1.51 acres of On-site Recreational Facilities and Provide Additional Park Fees to Placer County to Offset Any On-site Shortfall.** The project applicant shall ensure that Alternative A provides, to the satisfaction of the Placer County Department of Facility Services, 1.51 acres of on-site recreational facilities. If it is determined that the project cannot feasibly provide the complete 1.51 acres of on-site recreational amenities, then the applicant shall be responsible for the payment of additional park fees (beyond the standard park fees assessed by the County) commensurate with the percentage of the shortfall of the required on-site recreation facilities as determined by the Placer County Department of Facility Services. The additional park fees would be determined and assessed by the County at the time of final map approval and/or final building permits (Kimbrell, pers. comm., 2007). (LS) (DEIR, p. 7-20, FEIR, p. 3-10.)	LS	Finding. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 7.A-3, which has been required or incorporated into the Project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by providing 1.51 acres of on-site recreational facilities and providing additional park fees to Placer County to offset any on-site shortfall. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation. The Project is considered a "planned development" by Placer County; therefore, it would require the incorporation of on-site recreation facilities commensurate with the number of potential residents. The amount of required on-site recreation facilities is calculated at 5 acres per 1,000 residents. Implementation of Alternative A would result in the addition of an estimated 302 total occupants in the Tahoe Vista area, which equates to a requirement of 1.51 acres of on-site recreational facilities. Whereas implementation of Alternative E would result in the addition of an estimated 242 total occupants in the Tahoe Vista area, which equates to a requirement of 1.21 acres of on-site recreational facilities. Proposed on-site recreational amenities include an easement in the northern part of the project site, which would be granted to the NTPUD (or jointly to several agencies including the NTPUD) for a future multiple use (including bicycles) public trail. The easement would accommodate the future development of a multiple use public path consistent with the TVCP and NTPUD's plans for a trail alignment within the vicinity of the project property, and more specifically, with NTPUD's plans to construct a connection between the North Tahoe Regional Park and the intersection of SR 28 and National Avenue. The Project would also include a pool, a clubhouse, and decked spas associated with the TAUs. However, it is unclear if the proposed on-site recreational facilities would be sufficient to meet the 1.51 or 1.21-acre requirement for a planned development under Alternatives A or E respectively. Any shortage of the required on-site recreation facilities would require payment of park fees commensurate with the percentage of the shortfall of the required on-site recreation facilities as determined by the Placer County Department of Facility Services; these fees would be in addition to the standard Placer County park fees.

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			It is anticipated that the on site recreational facilities provided for the TAUs would be adequate, but that there may be a shortfall in the on-site recreational facilities for the proposed affordable/employee housing units (Kimbrell, pers. Comm., 2008). The fee for this shortfall would be calculated at two times the current park fees established on a per unit basis for multi-family housing ($2,805 for fiscal years 2008 and 2009). For example, with Alternative A the affordable/employee housing units are expected to generate a population of up to 60 residents, which by county standards (5 acres per 1,000 residents) results in a requirement to provide 0.30 acres of on-site recreational facilities for these project site residents. By ordinance (Code Section 16.08.100 and Recreational Facilities Fee Ordinance 15.34), the fees would be used by Placer County to provide public parks and recreation facilities in the vicinity of the planned development (Kimbrell, pers comm., 2008). Placer County is divided into 16 parks and recreation facility areas. Area #1 is the North Tahoe and Martis Valley area, which includes the project site. Placer County has spent over $600,000 in park fees in the North Tahoe area since 2002. Projects funded in the NTPUD-service area of the North Tahoe area include a trail staging area at the North Tahoe Regional Park, bear-proof/recycle containers at the North Tahoe beaches, and the North Lake Tahoe Activity Center in Kings Beach. It should be noted that very little of the $600,000 was generated from the NTPUD area because Placer County only collects park fees on projects with new residential units; nothing is collected on remodel or commercial projects. Because the North Tahoe area is mostly built-out, very few fees are generated there; rather, most Area #1 fees are generated in the Martis Valley. New residents would likely use local parks and recreational facilities in the community, particularly the North Tahoe Regional Park and the Sandy Beach Recreation Area, which are within walking distance of the project site. Construction of or expansion of existing parks and recreational facilities would not be necessary as a result of this incremental increase in park/recreational facility use. However, the Project-related increase in use would contribute to routine wear and tear on playing fields, recreational equipment, trails, and picnic tables. It would be difficult to determine the extent of the wear and tear that would be attributed directly to Alternative A or Alternative E, because most local parks and recreational facilities are widely used by local residents and visitors. Improvements to existing park facilities and the construction of new park facilities are funded, in part, through Placer County's assessment of park fees, which would be approximately $2,640 per unit (including affordable housing units and TAU units). The park fees would be assessed at the time of final map approval or final building permits, and are required for the development of residential units and TAU units to offset the impact of new development on community recreation. Although the park fees go to the County, the Project's fees would be earmarked for improvement of park facilities in the vicinity of the project site, such as the North Tahoe Regional Park or the Sandy Beach Recreation Area. The NTPUD, which is responsible for these parks, must apply to the County for funding from the park fee program. The NTPUD can then use the funds for projects at nearby NTPUD recreational facilities. In addition to the Placer County park fee, the Project would be subject to the locally approved Measure C parcel tax, which provides maintenance funds for the NTPUD. This is a parcel tax that adjusts

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			annually and is applicable to all parcels within the NTPUD district boundaries. The annual fee is determined based on the square footage of the residential units. (DEIR, p. 7-15, FEIR, pp. 2-12 and 2-18.) As discussed, uses at the project site would be the same with Alternative E as with Alternative A, although the density of development would be somewhat reduced. An easement would continue to be granted to the NTPUD for a proposed future multiple use public trail. Based on the occupancy of the project with Alternative E, this alternative would create demand for an additional 1.21 acres of recreational facilities. As with Alternative A, if the project site cannot support that additional amount of recreational facilities, the project applicant would pay additional park fees to account for the shortfall. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and, by virtue of fewer occupants, the recreational impacts of Alternative E would be slightly less than those identified for Alternative A. (FEIR, p. 2-18.) Therefore, implementation of this mitigation measures will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with the potential increase in use of parks and other recreational facilities and the remaining impact will be less than significant.
HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY			
8.A-1 Potential Short-Term Accelerated Soil Erosion and Sedimentation and/or Release of Pollutants to Nearby Water Bodies During Construction. Slope and soil disturbance associated with Alternative A construction could cause accelerated soil erosion and sedimentation or the release of other pollutants to nearby waterways. (PS) (DEIR, pp. 8-10 to 8-11.)	**8.A-1a. Prepare and Implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and Obtain a Storm Water Quality Permit.** In compliance with the requirements of the State General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit as well as the Basin Plan, the project applicant shall prepare a SWPPP, which describes the site, erosion and sediment controls, means of waste disposal, implementation of approved local plans, control of post-construction sediment and erosion control measures and maintenance responsibilities, and nonstormwater management controls. The SWPPP shall be submitted to the Lahontan Regional Board for review. The applicant shall require all construction contractors to retain a copy of the approved SWPPP on the construction site. BMPs identified in the SWPPP shall be implemented in all subsequent site development activities. Water quality controls shall be consistent with TRPA guidelines, the Placer County Grading Ordinance, and the Lahontan Regional Board's Regional Project Guidelines for Erosion Control and shall demonstrate that the water quality controls would ensure compliance with all current requirements of the County and the Lahontan Regional Board. Water quality controls shall ensure that runoff quality meets or surpasses TRPA and the Lahontan Region (Lahontan Regional Board 1995) water quality objectives, and complies with the Basin Plan's narrative water quality objectives, state antidegradation policy, and maintains beneficial uses of Lake Tahoe, as defined by the Basin Plan. Stormwater quality sampling and reporting associated with the SWPPP shall be the responsibility of the project applicant. Because the proposed project would result in ground disturbance on an area exceeding one acre, it is subject to construction stormwater quality permit requirements of the NPDES program. Therefore, the project applicant shall obtain a permit from the Lahontan Regional Board and shall provide to the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) evidence of a state-issued water discharge identification number or filing of Notice of Intent	LS	Finding. Compliance with Mitigation Measures 8.A-1a, 8.A-1b, and 8.A-1c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring that applicant prepare and implement a storm water pollution prevention plan, obtain a water quality permit from the Lahontan Regional Board, prohibit grading activity during winter months, and develop and implement a permanent and temporary BMP Plan and BMP Maintenance Plan. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation. Project construction would commence as soon as possible after Project approval and acquisition of permits. Site grading and utility work would occur across the entire site in the earliest part of construction between May and October of 2008. Development of the proposed buildings and commercial building improvements would occur in two phases. Phase 1 would include the construction of the proposed 10 affordable/employee housing units and the clubhouse/administration building with the five upper floor two-bedroom tourist accommodation units (TAUs) and associated pool/spa and deck area. Phase 2 would include the construction of the buildings that would house the additional TAU units, the associated garage buildings, and proposed modifications to the rear area of the existing main 2-story commercial building. Phase 2 construction would begin in September 2009 with complete occupancy of the buildings occurring as early as July 2010. Site grading and utility work (including excavations) would occur across the site in the earliest part of construction and permanent BMPs and all paving of access would be installed during this phase. Non-grading construction activities would be continuous, except during winter months when activities would be required to cease for a period of time. Construction is expected to require standard construction equipment to be operated from paved access and parking areas, including construction labor parking and access

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	and fees prior to the start of construction (DEIR, p 8-19.) **8.A-1b. Prohibit Grading Activities During Winter Months.** Grading activities shall be prohibited during the winter months, unless approved by TRPA, Placer County ESD and the Lahontan Regional Board. Exposed graded areas shall be protected during the winter months using approved methods. Site disturbance, such as clearing and grubbing, grading, and cut/fill, is limited to the period from May 1 to October 15 without special authorization from the appropriate agencies. (DEIR, p. 8-19.) **8.A-1c. Develop and Implement a Permanent and Temporary BMP Plan and BMP Maintenance Plan.** Before improvement plan approvals, the project applicant shall develop a permanent and temporary "BMP Plan" (including maintenance) and identify who would be responsible for ensuring its implementation and making the necessary updates/modifications. Water quality BMPs, shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development/Redevelopment, or for Industrial and Commercial (Lahontan Regional Board 1988 or other similar source as approved by TRPA, Placer County ESD, and Lahontan Regional Board). BMPs shall be designed and implemented to mitigate (e.g., minimize, infiltrate, filter, or treat) stormwater runoff to meet TRPA, ESD, and Lahontan Regional Board discharge requirements. Construction (temporary) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: 1. Temporary erosion control facilities shall be installed to prevent the transport of earthen materials and other waste off the property prior to commencement of grading (or other ground disturbance) activities. These facilities shall be reinforced and have a level of performance greater than typical requirements at the lower end of the site to prevent discharge to Lake Tahoe. 2. Temporary gravel earthen berms, sandbag dikes or filter fence shall be used as necessary to prevent discharge of earthen materials from the site during periods of precipitation or runoff. These facilities shall be inspected regularly to ensure that they continue to function properly. 3. Tree protection fencing shall be installed around trees that are to remain in place throughout construction of the project. 4. A minimum of 48-hours notice shall be provided to the appropriate agencies so that a pre-grading inspection could be conducted at the site to ensure proper installation of the temporary erosion control measures. 5. Ground compaction and disturbance activities shall be minimized in unpaved areas not subject to construction. The nonconstruction areas shall be protected with fencing or other barriers to limit access. 6. Before October 15 of each year, all disturbed or eroding areas shall be stabilized by installation of permanent, or temporary if the project is incomplete, vegetative or mechanical stabilization measures as outlined by the plans. 7. After October 15 of each year, construction vehicle		Most excavated soil would be used on-site as fill for finish grading and in other areas where necessary. However, excavation for subsurface structures and/or roadway improvements may result in excess material that may be exported from the project site to a previously approved disposal site. Materials that may be imported to the project site include aggregate base rock for roadway and parking area subgrade, sand bedding and backfill for utility lines, and crushed rock for buildings and foundations. (DEIR, p. 8-11.) Impacts relating to hydrology and water quality with Alternative E would be similar to those for Alternative A, stormwater best management practices (BMPs) would be required, and a dewatering plan and groundwater quality BMPs would be included in the stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the hydrology and water quality impacts of Alternative E would be similar to those identified for Alternative A (FEIR, pp. 2-18 to 2-19.) Therefore, implementation of these mitigation measures will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with potential short-term soil erosion and sedimentation and/or the release of other pollutants to nearby waterways and the remaining impact will be less than significant.

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	movement on-site must be only on paved roads and parking areas with permanent BMPs in place and protected 8 All slopes subject to erosion shall be stabilized 9 All loose piles of soil, silt, clay, sand, debris, or other earthen material shall be protected in a reasonable manner to prevent the discharge of these materials caused by runoff. All grading is to be completed in the first construction season; no such piles shall remain on-site after the grading season 10. If groundwater is encountered during construction and the excavated area requires dewatering to complete the work, a separate NPDES Permit may be required. Dewatering shall proceed according to the dewatering plan noted below and in a manner that treats the water and allows it to infiltrate back into the ground or reduce the levels of constituents of concern to a level acceptable for discharge into surface waters 11 Dust shall be controlled to prevent transport of such materials off the project site, into any surface water, or into any drainage course. Because Lake Tahoe is 250 feet from the lower end of the site, special diligence shall be required for the control of dust 12 The discharger shall immediately clean up and transport to a legal disposal site any spilled petroleum products or petroleum-contaminated soils, to the maximum extent possible. A spill prevention plan shall be developed and implemented as part of the SWPPP 13. At or before completion of the construction project or at the end of the grading season, all surplus or waste earthen materials shall be removed from the project site and disposed of only at a legal, authorized point of disposal or shall be stabilized on-site, in accordance with previously approved erosion control plans. 14. Drainage swales disturbed by construction activities shall be stabilized by appropriate soil stabilization measures to prevent erosion. 15 All areas compacted by construction activities and not intended to become permanent land coverage shall be ripped and revegetated with native vegetation to create a pervious surface Storm drainage from on- and off-site impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, infiltration basins, water quality basins, filters, etc. for the entrapment of sediment, debris, and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the ESD, TRPA, and the Lahontan Regional Board. BMPs shall be designed at a minimum, in accordance with the Placer County Guidance Document for Volume or Flow-Based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction BMPs for Storm Water Quality Protection and shall be installed as early in the project construction phasing as feasible. Post-development (permanent) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: 1 Infiltration trenches/pits shall be incorporated at the outlet of all new culverts draining proposed impervious road surfaces. These infiltration pits shall be sized based on TRPA and Lahontan Regional Board requirements. The infiltration pits shall provide settling time and filtering as the water is absorbed into the		

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	ground. Infiltration trenches and pits shall be inspected once yearly to ensure they are functioning properly and to ensure debris is removed from the flow path. 2 Rock energy dissipaters shall be placed at pipe outlets to reduce the velocity and energy of concentrated storm water flows. Outlet protection shall help to prevent scour and to minimize the potential for downstream erosion. Rock riprap shall be placed at the outlet of pipes, drains, culverts, conduits, or channels at the bottom of mild slopes. Rocks are typically angular, and hand placed to ensure locking and efficient filling of voids. Where appropriate, runoff from outlets shall be returned to sheet flow via level spreaders. 3 Modified drain inlets shall be required for the pretreatment of most roadway runoff. The modified inlets shall include sediment sumps with drains and oil-separation baffles at the outlets. These inlets may also be fitted with oil-absorbent pillows if necessary, or other appropriate inlet filters. Oil-absorbent pillows are equipped with retaining ring and cord, secured to or under the frame and cover for hand access. Drain inlets shall be inspected once per year to determine the need for replacement of oil-absorbent pillows and the need for sediment removal. 4 Sand oil separators shall be required for pretreatment of runoff from larger areas subject to vehicular traffic and parking. Larger sand-oil separation vaults shall generally be used where the placement of multiple smaller modified drain inlets is impractical, or where the flow rate from any one source of runoff from vehicular areas is too large for the smaller inlets to handle. 5. Vegetated/rock lined swales have been designed with a combination of rock and vegetation swales, where overland sheet flow must remain concentrated, to promote reduction in flow velocity and to increase infiltration opportunities. The vegetated/rock swale shall collect and detain storm water runoff to provide ample settling time before the water is absorbed into the ground water. Excess runoff shall be returned to sheet flow where appropriate. 6 Revegetation shall be implemented for all finished excavation and cut slopes and all areas disturbed by construction to establish a vegetative cover. Typical revegetation of roadway disturbance involves ripping to break compacted soil, transplanting, hand or hydroseed, fertilizer or appropriate compost incorporation, and mulch. Other disturbed areas may receive similar treatment depending on the slope, aspect, soil constituents and size of the disturbed area. Some portions of the developed area would also be landscaped with various types of shrubs, trees and grasses. The application rates, seed mixes, fertilizer content and other specifics of the revegetation process are developed on a case by case basis, and shall be submitted with the construction drawings along with landscape construction plans. 7. The project site shall be designed to eliminate or		

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	reduce runoff contaminants originating in snow storage areas. Filtering devices may be necessary in areas storing snow that may contain water quality contaminants such as de-icers and automobile exhaust components. Alternatives may include designing storage areas to utilize filtering devices for roadway runoff. Another alternative is the use of a hand system to clean out sand and oil from snowmelt. All methods would comply with TRPA and Lahontan Regional Board standards to prevent water quality impacts downstream and to meet local, state, and federal water quality standards. No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals. All BMPs shall be maintained as required to insure effectiveness. The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation. Proof of on-going maintenance, such as contractual evidence, shall be provided to ESD upon request. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees unless, and until, a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance. Prior to Improvement Plan or Final Map approval, easements shall be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of possible Placer County maintenance. (DEIR, pp. 8-19 to 8-22.)		
8.A-2 Interception of Groundwater Table During Construction. Excavation during construction of Alternative A could intercept the groundwater table, creating the potential for introduction of contaminants to groundwater. Excavation activities for the foundations of the proposed buildings and other facilities (e.g., the swimming pool and the clubhouse/administration building basement) may reach a maximum depth of approximately 12 feet below ground surface (bgs). Based on data generated during the soils/hydrologic subsurface investigation, proposed construction excavation on the site should not encounter groundwater and TRPA has issued an approved excavation exemption (TRPA Permit #20021821), which allows for excavation at depths of up to a maximum of 15 feet bgs; however, variable subsurface conditions may be present resulting in interception. (PS) (DEIR pp. 8-11 to 8-13.)	**8.A-2. Develop and Implement a Dewatering Plan and Groundwater Quality BMPs in the SWPPP as Part of Mitigation Measure 8.A-1a.** The SWPPP developed and implemented as part of Mitigation Measure 8.A-1a shall specifically include a dewatering plan and measures to prevent/minimize sediment and contaminant releases into groundwater during excavations and methods to clean up releases if they do occur. If necessary, dewatering shall be done in a manner that allows discharge to an infiltration basin approved by TRPA and Lahontan Regional Board. Measures to prevent/minimize sediment and contaminant releases into groundwater during excavations and methods to clean up releases may include using temporary berms or dikes to isolate construction activities, using vacuum trucks to capture contaminant releases, and maintaining absorbent pads, and other containment and cleanup materials on-site to allow an immediate response to contaminant releases if they occur. Additionally, permanent per-meter subsurface drainage systems shall also be constructed below the planned depth of all building excavations prior to any finish grading to pass groundwater flow around foundation structures if intercepted. (DEIR, p. 8-22.)	LS	Finding. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 8.A-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the applicant develop and implement a Dewatering Plan and Groundwater Quality BMPs in the SWPPP. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation. Excavation activities for the foundations of the proposed buildings, swimming pool and clubhouse/administration building basement may reach a maximum depth of approximately 12 feet; however, the final depths would be determined as part of the final improvement plan process. TRPA Ordinances prohibit excavation deeper than 5 feet because of the potential for groundwater interception or interference, except under certain defined and permitted conditions. Excavation is prohibited if it interferes with or intercepts the seasonal high water table by: (a) altering the direction of groundwater flow; (b) altering the rate of flow of groundwater; (c) intercepting groundwater; (d) adding or withdrawing groundwater; or (e) raising or lowering the water table (TRPA 2004). TRPA may approve exceptions to the prohibition of groundwater interception or interference if TRPA finds that: (a) excavation is required by the Uniform Building Code (UBC) or local building code for minimum depth below natural ground for above ground structures; (b) retaining walls are necessary to stabilize an existing unstable cut or fill slope; (c) drainage structures are necessary to protect the structural integrity of an existing structure; (d) it is necessary for the public safety and health; (e) it is a necessary measure for the protection or improvement of water quality; (f) it is for a water well; (g) there are no feasible alternatives for locating mechanical equipment; and measures

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			are included in the project to prevent groundwater from leaving the project area as surface flow and groundwater, if any is interfered with, is relocated in the groundwater flow to avoid adverse impacts to riparian vegetation, if any would be so affected; (h) it is necessary to provide two offstreet parking spaces, there is no less environmentally harmful alternative, and measures are taken to prevent groundwater from leaving the project area as surface flow, (i) it is necessary to provide below grade parking for projects qualifying for additional height under Subsection 22 4 D, to achieve environmental goals including scenic improvements, land coverage reduction, and areawide drainage systems, and measures are included in the project to prevent ground water from leaving the project area as surface flow and that groundwater, if any is interfered with, is relocated into the groundwater flow to avoid adverse impacts to hydrologic conditions, SEZ vegetation, and mature trees, or (j) it is necessary for a marina expansion approved pursuant to TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 16 and the environmental documentation demonstrates that there would be no adverse effect on water quality (TRPA 2004) Excavations in excess of 5 feet in depth or where there exists a reasonable possibility of interference or interception of a water table, shall be prohibited unless TRPA finds that (TRPA Code 64 7 B) (1) a soils/hydrologic report prepared by a qualified professional, whose proposed content and methodology has been reviewed and approved in advance by TRPA, demonstrates that no interference or interception of groundwater would occur as a result of the excavation, and (2) the excavation is designed such that no damage occurs to mature trees, except where tree removal is allowed pursuant to Subsection 65 2 E (TRPA Code), including root systems, and hydrologic conditions of the soil (To ensure the protection of vegetation necessary for screening, a special vegetation protection report shall be prepared by a qualified professional identifying measures necessary to ensure damage would not occur as a result of the excavation), and (3) excavated material is disposed of pursuant to Section 64 5 (TRPA Code) and the project area s natural topography is maintained pursuant to Subparagraph 30 5 A(1), or if groundwater interception or interference would occur as demonstrated by a soils/hydrologic report prepared by a qualified professional, the excavation could be made as an exception pursuant to Subparagraph 64 7 A(2) and measures are included in the project to maintain groundwater flows to avoid adverse impacts to SEZ vegetation, if any would be affected, and to prevent any groundwater or subsurface water flow from leaving the project area as surface flow (TRPA 2004). Data generated during the soils/hydrologic subsurface investigation showed that proposed maximum construction excavation of approximately 12 feet may not encounter seasonal groundwater (Kleinfelder, Inc 2001) and TRPA has issued an approved excavation exemption (TRPA Permit #20021821) dated August 7, 2003, which allows for excavation at depths of up to a maximum of 15 feet bgs (DEIR, p 8-12) Impacts relating to hydrology and water quality with Alternative E would be similar to those for Alternative A. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the hydrology and water quality impacts of Alternative E would be similar to those identified for Alternative A (FEIR, pp 2 18 to 2-19) Implementation of this mitigation measures will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated to potential to intercept the groundwater table during construction and the remaining potential impact will be less than significant

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
8.A-3 Impervious Surface Area and Runoff. Development of Alternative A would result in approximately 3.88 acres or 168,061 sf of impervious surfaces (a reduction in coverage from existing conditions) on a currently developed site, and would possibly increase and/or alter runoff from the project site to downgradient areas during storm events (PS) (DEIR, pp. 8-13 to 8-14.)	**8.A-3a. Submit, Obtain Approval, and Implement a Final Drainage Report in Conformance with Placer County Storm Water Management Manual.** Prepare and submit, with the project Improvement Plans, a drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual (LDM) and the Placer County SWMM that are in effect at the time of submittal, to Placer County ESD for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: ► A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of project improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map that identifies the NTPUD National Avenue Water Treatment Plant and lake water intake locations among other features, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and detention facilities, features to protect downstream uses and property, and drainage easements to accommodate downstream flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. BMP measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent the discharge of pollutants to storm water to the maximum extent practicable. ► Stormwater runoff shall be reduced to pre-project conditions for 10-year and 100-year storm events at the project's drainage outfall point through the installation of retention/detention facilities and where appropriate, returned to sheet flow. Retention/detention facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County SWMM that are in effect at the time of submittal and to the satisfaction of Placer County ESD. The ESD may, after review of the project drainage report, delete this requirement if it is determined that drainage conditions do not warrant installation of this type of facility. No retention/detention facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals. ► All related underground and surface drainage systems must be addressed to ensure full integration of areas that would generate runoff. These areas would include rooftops, sidewalks, cut/fill slopes, patio areas, streets, parking lots, up gradient off-site source areas, and impervious landscaping areas. Seepage from underground sources must also be addressed. ► Staging Areas. Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be identified on the Improvement Plans and located as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area. (DEIR, pp. 8-22 to 8-23, FEIR, pp. 3-10 to 3-11.) **8.A-3b. Design and Implement Drainage Facilities in Accordance with Requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual.** Drainage facilities, for purposes of collecting and treating runoff on individual lots, shall be designed and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the	LS	Finding. Compliance with Mitigation Measures 8.A-3a, 8.A-3b, and 8.A-3c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the applicant submit, obtain approval, and implement a final drainage report in conformance with Placer County Storm Water Management Manual, design and implement drainage facilities in accordance with requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual, and prepare and implement an Erosion Control/Water Quality Mitigation and Monitoring Plan in accordance with Placer County Condition MM5. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation. Impervious surfaces would be modified on the Project site as a result of the proposed road, parking, and buildings. The change in impervious surfaces would affect local drainage conditions. The existing site is currently developed with an existing TRPA-verified land coverage of 174,324 sf. The site has no evidence of any drainage ways transecting the site, and all drainage discharges from the site were determined to be from overland sheet flow to the southern and southeastern boundaries. With development of either Alternative A or Alternative E, on-site drainage would be collected in a new drainage system that would include runoff flow conveyance, runoff flow storage, and runoff water quality treatment facilities. According to the preliminary drainage study prepared by K. B. Foster Civil Engineering, Inc. (2006), the proposed change in impervious surfaces would result in a decrease in runoff flow rate for the 10-year event and the 100-year event. Development of Alternative A would create a total impervious surface area of 3.88 acres or 169,081 sf (without snow cover). These impervious surfaces would result in attenuated runoff flow rates of 2.13 cubic feet per second (cfs) (an approximate 16.8% decrease relative to existing conditions) for the 10-year event and 9.28 cfs (an approximate 1.1% decrease relative to existing conditions) for the 100-year event (K.B. Foster Civil Engineering, Inc. 2006). Development of Alternative E would result in approximately 3.8 acres (165,644 sf) of on-site impervious surfaces (approximately 61%), a slight reduction compared to Alternative A. Alternative E would also result in 2,672 sf of off-site coverage (<1%) on the undeveloped parcel north of the site for the secondary emergency access road. The combined on- and off-site coverage for Alternative E would be 168,316 sf, which would be slightly below the Alternative A coverage. Therefore, the preliminary drainage study identifies that Project-related change in runoff rate would be reduced to less than pre-project levels for the 10-year and 100-year events (per Placer County SWMM requirements) through implementation of the Project improvements, including the design and implementation of detention facilities. Calculations in the preliminary drainage study indicate that, based on Placer County criteria, Project improvements would result in a net decrease at the point of discharge from the project site and there would be no adverse effects from the proposed development on downstream facilities (K.B. Foster Civil Engineering, Inc. 2006). Runoff volume from the 20-year, 1-hour event (approximately 1-inch) would be stored and infiltrated for water quality treatment purposes per TRPA and Lahontan Regional Board requirements. The 20-year,

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	Placer County SWMM, TRPA, and Lahontan Regional Board that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of Placer County ESD. These facilities shall be constructed with subdivision improvements and easements provided as required by Placer County ESD. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project applicant or other entity approved by Placer County. (DEIR, p. 23.) **8.A-3c. Prepare and Implement an Erosion Control/Water Quality Mitigation and Monitoring Plan in Accordance with Placer County Condition MM5.** An Erosion Control/Water Quality Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (MMP), prepared by a civil engineer or other Development Review Committee (DRC) approved erosion control specialist, shall be submitted with the project's Improvements Plans. The potential for water quality degradation due to runoff or infiltration of fertilizers would be controlled through implementation of fertilizer management criteria incorporated into the Erosion Control / Water Quality Mitigation and Monitoring Plan that complies with Chapter 81, Section 81.7, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. An annual monitoring report for a minimum period of 1 to 5 years from the date of installation, prepared by the above-cited professional, shall be submitted to the DRC for review and approval. Any corrective action shall be the responsibility of the project applicant. Prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans, a Letter of Credit, Certificate of Deposit, or cash deposit in the amount of 100% of the accepted proposal shall be deposited with the Placer County Planning Department to assure on-going performance of the monitoring program (i.e., monitoring needs to demonstrate that stormwater BMPs are performing as designed and discharge standards are being met). Evidence of this deposit shall be provided to the satisfaction of the DRC prior to the approval of Improvement Plans. For the purposes of administrative and program review by Placer County, an additional 25% of the estimated cost of the Monitoring Program shall be paid to the County, in cash, at the time that the 100% deposit is made. With the exception of the 25% of the administrative fee, 100% of the estimated costs of implementing the monitoring program shall be returned to the applicant once the applicant has demonstrated that all years of monitoring have been completed to the satisfaction of the DRC. Refunds would only be available at the end of the entire review period. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure compliance with the MMP. Violation of any components of the approved MMP may result in enforcement activities per Placer County Environmental Review Ordinance, Article 18.28.080 (formerly Section 31.870). If a monitoring report is not submitted for any one year, or combination of years, as outlined in these conditions, the County has the option of utilizing these funds and hiring a consultant to implement the MMP. Failure to submit annual monitoring reports or take corrective action could also result in forfeiture of a portion of, or all of, the deposit. An agreement between the applicant and County shall be prepared which meets DRC approval that allows the County use of this deposit to assure performance of the		1-hour roof runoff from all buildings would be conveyed to standard dripline infiltration trenches or drywells that would be constructed adjacent to the buildings. The roadway runoff would also be treated before infiltration with treatment devices constructed to treat the 20-year, 1-hour storm volume as required by TRPA and Lahontan Regional Board for removal of sediment, nutrients (e.g., nitrogen and phosphorous) and oils. The capacity of drainage facilities would enable immediate detention and infiltration of snowmelt and rainwater resulting from impervious surfaces associated with the residential buildings, parking, and roads. This approach would keep runoff created at upstream developments from affecting downstream drainage facilities. Conveyance facilities would be designed for the 10- and 100-year storms per the Placer County SWMM. Flows from larger storm events would be allowed to bypass the treatment basins and flow into the onsite roadway drainage system. This system would incorporate onsite vegetated and paved swales and curb and gutter drainage that would be returned to sheet flow to the maximum extent possible. To ensure that the storage system is available to treat and store runoff from future storms, the infiltration systems would be designed to be drained over a 48- to 96-hour period. The SWMM requires that all storage facilities have a draw down within 96-hours. The time period also corresponds to the TRPA recommendations that a 34- to 96-hour draindown time shall be incorporated into the design of all detention facilities to provide for vector control. Placer County and TRPA recommend returning concentrated runoff to sheet flow (or predevelopment natural conditions) by using numerous small surface stormwater detention facilities in series. Due to the configuration of the property and site plan, it appears that there is ample room to store flows in excess of the 20-year, 1-hour storm event. Overflow spillways with level spreaders shall be incorporated into infiltration basins and galleries for flows and runoff over the 20-year, 1-hour event volumes. The high flows would be designed to sheet flow to the extent possible across the site from the detention areas and into the existing drainage system at State Route (SR) 28. The storm drain system pipe sizes shall be designed based on the 10-year peak flow and slopes shown on the conceptual drainage plan. The final drainage designs shall also incorporate the conveyance of the pre-project 100-year event through the site and the bypass of the culvert piping and roadway grades to prevent damage to property. In addition to managing storm runoff with the facilities outlined above, both Alternative A and Alternative E would incorporate "low impact development" (LID) concepts such as buffer zones or strips, which are grassed open spaces, to reduce the amount of impervious surfaces and associated runoff where feasible. Through implementation of this mitigation for additional runoff, potential impacts of both Alternatives A and E will be reduced to a less than significant level. (DEIR, pp. 8-13 to 8-14, FEIR, pp. 2-18 and 3-10.)

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	MMP in the event the project applicant fails to perform (DEIR, p. 23, FEIR, p. 3-11.)		
8.A-4 Possible Increased Urban Contaminants in Surface Runoff. Operation of Alternative A could result in an increase in urban contaminants in surface runoff (PS) (DEIR, pp. 8-14 to 8-15.)	**8.A-4. Implement Construction and Operational Water Quality Control Measures as Provided in Mitigation Measures 8.A-1a and c, and 8 A-3a, b, c and, to Remove Pollutants of Concern from Downstream Water Bodies or Groundwater.** Implementation of Mitigation Measures 8 A-1a and c, and 8 A-3a, b, and c would require construction and operational features of the project to provide sufficient water quality control measures (including specially designed water quality treatment facilities for removal of pollutants of concern, as approved by Placer County ESD, TRPA, and Lahontan Regional Board) to ensure no adverse impacts to downstream water bodies or groundwater as a performance standard and would reduce impact 8 A-4 to a less-than-significant level (DEIR, p. 24.)	LS	Finding. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 8.A-4, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by implementing construction and operational water quality control measures to reduce potential urban contaminants in surface runoff. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation. Implementation of Alternative A would create residential units and TAUs (and associated facilities) and increase impervious surfaces throughout the project site. Residential activities could contribute to water quality degradation through maintenance of yards associated with the use of fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides, motor vehicle operation and maintenance; and animal waste. In addition, an increase in impervious surfaces would have the potential to increase the amount of runoff coming from the project site. Runoff from developed uses would typically contain contaminants such as oils, grease, fuel, antifreeze, byproducts of combustion (such as lead, cadmium, nickel, and other metals), nutrients, sediment, and other pollutants. Therefore, the proposed change in current site conditions has the potential to result in impacts on the water quality in downstream water bodies and to groundwater. The Lahontan Regional Board requires that the first 1-inch of rainfall over improved, impervious surfaces be treated via standard permanent BMPs, which may include infiltration ponds, wet ponds, sediment ponds, biofiltration swales, buffer zones, and mechanical treatment facilities. As discussed above, Alternative A would incorporate LID concepts such as buffer zones or strips, which are grassed open spaces, to treat runoff before directing it to underground drainage systems. Sedimentation and infiltration ditches/trenches would be constructed, where possible, to capture sediment, trash, and metal and to treat grease and oil. The parking areas and driveways would be constructed with landscaped roadside ditches to help filter the runoff. Where LID concepts (e.g., buffer strips, biofiltration swales, and sedimentation/infiltration ditches) cannot be used, mechanical treatment methods, such as oil and sand separators and "rainstore" treatment facilities, would be used to treat the runoff. The Lahontan Regional Board permits bioswales (using grasses for filtration) and hard systems (filtration tanks) for filtering runoff. Additionally, the introduction of impervious surfaces to the project site would require snow removal services, including the use of deicers, such as sand and/or magnesium chlorides. Filtering devices would be necessary in areas storing snow that may contain water quality contaminants such as deicers and automobile exhaust components. The final design of the water quality treatment systems would be determined according to Lahontan Regional Board requirements. (DEIR, pp. 8-14 to 8-15.) Impacts relating to hydrology and water quality with Alternative E would be similar to those for Alternative A. Through implementation of this mitigation for increased urban contaminants in runoff, potential impacts of both Alternatives A and E will be reduced to a less than significant level. (FEIR, pp. 2-18 to 2-19.)
GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND LAND CAPABILITY AND COVERAGE			

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
9.A-1 Land Coverage. Alternative A would result in a total of approximately 3 88 acres or 168,061 sf of impervious surfaces on the project site, or 62% coverage, in LDC 6 This would result in a reduction of 5,263 sf (0 12 acre) in comparison to the TRPA-verified coverage for the site (174,324 sf) This land coverage reduction would be banked by TRPA (LS) (DEIR, p 9-10 to 9-11)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than s gnificant (Pub Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091)
9.A-2 Seismic Hazards. The project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone; however several faults are located in the North Lake Tahoe Area that could subject the project site to ground shaking Because the project would be designed and constructed in accordance with the current design requirements of UBC Seismic Zone 3, there would be no substantial increased risk of injury or property damage from strong ground shaking or earthquake-induced liquefaction or landslides caused by unstable soils (LS) (DEIR, p. 9-11 to 9-12)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126 4, subd (a)(3), 15091.)
9.A-3 Non-Seismic Geologic Hazards. The project would be constructed on a relatively level site, where no known non-seismic geologic hazards, such as landslides, mudslides, sinkholes, or lava flows, have occurred in the past The soils/hydrologic subsurface investigation found no severe soil constraints that would preclude construction and determined that the maximum depth of excavation of approximately 12 to 13 feet bgs should not encounter groundwater However, variable subsurface conditions may be present during construction resulting in the potential to encounter soil constraints or intercept groundwater Furthermore, site grad ng activities have the potential to result in soil erosion (PS) (DEIR, p 9-12 to 9-13)	**9.A-3a. Submit Final Geotechnical Engineering Report and Improvement Plans.** The project applicant shal. implement the following: ► Submit to Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) for review and approval, a geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer The report shall address and make recommendations on the following: (1) road pavement, and parking area design; (2) structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable), (3) grading practices, (4) erosion/winterization; (5) special problems discovered on-site (i.e , groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, evidence of previous mining activity), and (6) slope stability Once approved by Placer County ESD, two copies of the final report shall be provided to Placer County ESD and one copy to the Building Department for their use If the soils report indicates the presence of critically expansive or other soils problems which, if not corrected, could lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the requirements of the soils report may be required before issuance of building permits It is the responsibility of the developer to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report ► The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications, and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal) to Placer County ESD for review and approval of each project construction phase The plans shall show all conditions for the project, as well as pertinent topographical features both on- and off-site All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on-site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction shall be shown on the plans All landscaping and irrigation facilities in the public right-of-way or public	LS	Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measures 9 A-3a,9 A-3b, and 9 A-3c , which have been required or incorporated into the project will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the applicant submit final geotechnical engineering report and improvement plans including a Dewatering Plan in the Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Plan (SWPPP), obtain a grading permit from the Placer County ESD, secure a source for the transportation and deposition of excavated materials (if deemed necessary in the Final Grading Plan), and ensure that all earthwork is monitored by a geotechnical engineer The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR Explanation: Project implementation would require regrading much of the site, which would result in disturbance to approximately 95% of the site Development of Alternative E would result in approximately 3 8 acres (165,644 sf) of on-site impervious surfaces (approximately 61%), and 0 06 acre (2,672 sf) of off-site coverage, together resulting in a slight reduction in coverage compared to Alternative A The secondary fire access connection to Toyon Road would result in an incremental increase in grading as compared to Alternative A because of necessary off-site grading for the fire access connection Grading activities would include cut and fill, trenching excavation for roadways and building foundations, pipe installation, and revegetation The proposed Project would be constructed with slab on grade (or pad graded) foundations. This type of construction requires additional grading when placed on naturally sloped terrain because the grade around the perimeter of each building must be raised or lowered to create a flat pad Approximately 1 700 cubic yards (CY) of cut and approximately 3,130 CY of fill would be required for Alternative A This is a rough estimate based on the preliminary grading plan and does not take into consideration several factors, such as the potential use of the net cut as fill that would be needed for roadwork on site such as asphalt paving or aggregate base Assuming the material cut from the site was deemed appropriate by the soils engineer, it would be reused on-site as part of the required fill material. Given this uncertainty, it is possible that some amount of soil would need to be exported from the site

25

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	easement, or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees and before plan approval, all applicable recording and production costs shall be paid. The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review and/or Design Review Committee (DRC) review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed before submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to Placer County ESD in both hard copy and electronic version to be approved by Placer County ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements. ► All proposed grading, drainage, and utility improvements, and vegetation and tree removal shall be shown on the improvement plans, and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance that are in effect at the time of the submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall take place until the improvement plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the Design Review Committee. All cut/fill slopes shall be at 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and Placer County ESD concurs with said recommendation. The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation undertaken from April 1 to October 1 shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project improvement plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control winterization during project construction. Where soil stockpiling or borrow areas are to remain for more than one construction season, proper erosion control measures shall be applied as specified in the improvement plans/grading plans. Plans shall provide for erosion control to the satisfaction of the Placer County ESD where roadside drainage is off the pavement. The applicant shall also submit to Placer County ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110% of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work before improvement plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. On the County's acceptance of improvements and satisfactory completion of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent. If at any time during construction a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation		The maximum building excavation depths would be approximately six feet, however, the swimming pool and basement may require excavation of up to 12 or 13 feet bgs. As part of the Geotechnical Investigation Report (Kleinfelder 2001), six test pits were excavated throughout the project site at depths of 5 to 13 feet below ground surface (bgs), and no groundwater was encountered up to the maximum depth of 13 feet bgs (Kleinfelder 2001). TRPA Ordinances prohibit excavation deeper than five feet because of the potential for groundwater interception or interference, except under certain defined and permitted conditions. However, based on information provided in the Geotechnical Investigation Report, TRPA issued Permit #20021821, dated August 7, 2003, which allows for excavation at depths of up to 15 feet bgs. No known geologic hazards have been observed on the site, and the Geotechnical Investigation Report (Kleinfelder 2001) found no severe soil constraints that would preclude grading and construction activities. A final detailed geotechnical report and detailed improvement plans have not yet been prepared. The Final Geotechnical Investigation Report and Improvement Plans prepared for the Project would address very specific requirements that consider the full range of non-seismic geologic hazards related to soil properties. Requiring the report in the final design phase of the project does not constitute improper deferral of mitigation, because the engineering details required to prepare the report and improvement plans are not available at this time, the level of project design necessary to conduct environmental review differs from that required for final design. As discussed, impacts relating to geology, soils, and land capability and coverage for Alternative E would be similar in magnitude to those described for Alternative A. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the geology, soils, and land capability and coverage impacts of Alternative E would be similar to or less than those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with non-seismic geologic hazards and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, p. 9-13, FEIR, pp. 2-22 and 2-119.)

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Sign ficance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	from the proposed grading shown on the improvement plans, specifically with regard to slope he ghts, slope ratios, erosion control, winterizatron, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the Design Review Committee/Placer County ESD for a determination of substantral conformance to the project approvals before any further work proceeds. Failure of the Design Review Committee/Placer County ESD to make a determination of substantral conformance may serve as grounds for revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body ► The applicant shall provide Placer County ESD with a letter from the appropriate fire protection district descr-bing condit ons under which the service will be provided to the project. Said letter shall be provided before the approval of Improvement Plans, and a fire district representative's signature shall be provided on the plans. (DEIR, pp 9-18 to 9-19) **9.A-3b. Include a Dewatering Plan in the Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Plan (SWPPP) Developed and Implemented Pursuant to Mitigation Measure 8.A-1a.** The SWPPP developed and implemented as part of Mitigation Measure 8 A-1a (see Chapter 8, "Hydrology and Water Quality") must specifically include a dewatering plan that details procedures for safely and appropriately dealing with seasonal groundwater encountered during excavation (DEIR, p 9-20) **9.A-3c. Obtain Grading Permit from the Placer County ESD. Secure a Source for the Transportation and Deposition of Excavated Materials (if deemed necessary in the Final Grading Plan), and Ensure that All Earthwork is Monitored by a Geotechnical Engineer.** The project applicant shall ensure the following prior the commencement of any earthwork ► Obtain a Grading Permit from the Placer County ESD before export or import of any soil or other material to or from an off-site location ► The construction and excavation contractor secures a source of transportation and a location for deposition and/or storage of all excavated materials removed from the project site ► All earthwork shall be monitored by a geotechnical engineer tasked with the responsibility of providing oversight during all excavation activities, placement of fill, and disposal of materials removed from and deposited on the project site (DEIR, p 9-20.)		

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
SCENIC RESOURCES			
10.A-1 Scenic Quality of Roadway Travel Unit 20A. Portions of the project site are visible from SR 28, which is within Roadway Travel Unit 20A. The existing main 2-story commercial building and area along the front of the project site would continue to be visible from SR 28 under Alternative A. All other existing buildings and campground facilities on the project site would be removed. Approximately 130 trees, plus the remaining 25 trees previously marked by TRPA for removal, would be removed from the project site. Intermittent views of fences, parking facilities, and the upper portions of buildings constructed as part of the proposed project would be more visible from SR 28, but frontage improvements would be more visible as enhancements compared to current conditions. All utilities, except Sierra Pacific Power Company electrical lines, would be moved underground and street front improvements (e.g., curbed roadway, landscaping) would be made. Because views of the project facilities would be limited and many street front improvements would be made to the site, the proposed project would not degrade the scenic quality rating of the Roadway Travel Unit and would have a less-than-significant impact on the scenic quality of SR 28. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 10-15 to 10-16.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
10.A-2 Scenic Quality of Shoreline Travel Unit 21. Views of the project site, which is located north of SR 28 outside of the Shorezone, as seen from Shoreline Travel Unit 21 and the edge of Lake Tahoe are largely obscured by distance, topography, and intervening vegetation. The only perpendicular views of the project site that are currently available from Shoreline Travel Unit 21 are views of a portion of the second story and roof of the main 2-story commercial building, the area immediately to the east of the 2-story building, and the roof of the bicycle rental office building. Intervening trees, vegetation, and buildings obscure views of all other portions of the project site from this shoreline area as seen from the direction of the lake. Although there would be a reduction in tree cover on the project site, the scenic consequences of this change would be minor recognizing that the backdrop would be a combination of forest, the replaced main 2-story commercial building roof with a darker, TRPA-compliant color, and removed ancillary buildings. Under this alternative area views would have improved scenic quality, as viewed from Shoreline Travel Unit 21. The proposed project would, therefore, not degrade scenic quality, as seen from the Shoreline Travel Unit, and the scenic quality effect would be less than significant. (LS) (DEIR, 10-18 to 10-19.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
10.A-3 Scenic Quality Impact from Public Recreation and Bicycle Trail Areas. Sandy Beach Recreation Area is currently the only public recreation area that has views of the project site, however, this area is not a TRPA-designated scenic resource. There are currently no bicycle trail areas that have views of the project site. As described in Impact 10.A-2 above, Alternative A would have a less-than-significant impact on the Sandy Beach Recreation Area. Because Alternative A would	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
have a less-than-significant impact on public recreation areas and would have no impact on bicycle trail areas, this impact would be less than significant. (LS) (DEIR, p 10-19)			
10.A-4 Consistency with Plans, Policies, and Guidelines. Buildings constructed as part of Alternative A would be constructed in accordance with basic TRPA building height standards, except for four of the TAU buildings and the clubhouse/administration building. The additional building heights would be based on the ability of TRPA to make findings regarding the project per TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 22.4.A(1), which allows for increasing the maximum building height by 4 feet, but not to exceed a maximum of 38 feet, and Code of Ordinances Section 22.4.B, which allows for increasing the maximum building height for TAUs in Community Plan Areas up to a maximum of 48 feet. All new buildings would be constructed in variations of the Tahoe Style Theme, and landscaping would be done in accordance with TVCP standards. All other facilities included as part of the project would be constructed or altered consistent with all applicable policies and guidelines. Because Alternative A would include buildings that exceed the maximum allowed building height, Alternative A may be inconsistent with the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Alternative A would be consistent with all other local, state, and federal plans, policies, and guidelines related to visual resources that apply to development on the project site. (PS) (DEIR, pp. 10-20 to 10-21)	**10.A-4. Comply with TRPA Code of Ordinances Sections 22.4.A(1) and 22.4.B.** The project applicant shall prepare a letter report providing the necessary information consistent with TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 22.7 to support findings per Code of Ordinances 22.4.A(1), which allows for increasing the maximum building height by 4 feet, but not to exceed a maximum of 38 feet, and Code of Ordinances Section 22.4.B, which allows for increasing the maximum building height for TAUs in Community Plan Areas up to a maximum of 48 feet. TRPA shall make the necessary findings per Section 22.7, listed below. Findings (1), (2), and (3) must be made for TAUs; findings (1), (3), and (2) or (4) must be made for public service buildings, and findings (1), (2), (3), (4), and (7) must be made for the recreation uses (1) When viewed from major arterials, scenic turnouts, public recreation areas or the waters of Lake Tahoe, from a distance of 300 feet, the additional heights will not cause a building to extend above the forest canopy, when present, or a ridgeline. For height greater than that set forth in Table A for a 5:12 pitch, the additional height shall not increase the visual magnitude beyond that permitted for structures in the shoreland as set forth in Section 30.15.G, Additional Visual Magnitude, or Appendix H, Visual Assessment Tool, of the Design Review Guidelines (2) When outside a community plan, the additional height is consistent with the surrounding uses (3) With respect to that portion of the building which is permitted the additional height, the building has been designed to minimize interference with existing views within the area to the extent practicable (4) The function of the structure requires a greater maximum height than otherwise provided for in this chapter (5) That portion of the building which is permitted the additional height is adequately screened, as seen from major arterials, the waters of lakes, and other public areas from which the building is frequently viewed. In determining the adequacy of screening, consideration shall be given to the degree to which a combination of the following features causes the building to blend or merge with the background (a) The horizontal distance from which the building is viewed, (b) The extent of screening, and (c) Proposed exterior colors and building materials (6) The building is located within an approved community plan, which identifies the project area as being suitable for the additional height being proposed (7) The additional height is the minimum necessary to feasibly implement the project and there are no	LS	Finding. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 10.A-4, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by complying with TRPA Code of Ordinances Sections 22.4.A(1) and 22.4.B. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation: A number of local, state, and federal plans, policies, and guidelines apply to visual resources within the project area. The relevant plans, policies, and guidelines are described above in Section 10.2, "Regulatory Setting." The affordable/employee duplexes, all but four of the TAU buildings, and garage buildings would be designed to comply with the basic TRPA building height requirements. TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 22.2A defines maximum height as, "the difference between the point of lowest natural ground elevation along an exterior wall of the building, and the elevation of the coping of the highest flat roof, the deck line of the highest mansard roof or the ridge of the highest hip, gable, gambrel, shed or other pitched roof, whichever is highest. The maximum height of a structure other than a building is the difference between the point of lowest natural ground elevation along the exterior foundation of the structure and the elevation of the highest point of the structure." TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 22, Table A, establishes the maximum allowable heights of project buildings based on the slope of the project site and pitch of the proposed building roofs. Under Alternative A, four of the TAU buildings (BC1, BC2, BC3, and BC4) and the clubhouse/administration building, are proposed to be higher than the maximum building height allowed. Buildings proposed under Alternative E would continue to require an increase in the maximum building height to the same extent as described for Alternative A, but fewer buildings would be constructed. The additional height is proposed based on the ability of TRPA to make findings regarding the project per TRPA Code of Ordinances 22.4.A(1), which allows for increasing the maximum building height by 4 feet, but not to exceed a maximum of 38 feet, Code of Ordinances Sect on 22.4.B, which allows for increasing the maximum building height for TAUs in Community Plan Areas up to a maximum of 48 feet, and if TRPA makes the necessary findings per Section 22.7, listed below. Findings (1), (2), (3), and (6) must be made for TAUs, findings (1), (3), and (2) or (4) must be made for public service buildings, and findings (1), (2), (3), (4), and (7) must be made for recreation uses (1) When viewed from major arterials, scenic turnouts, public recreation areas or the waters of Lake Tahoe, from a distance of 300 feet, the additional height will not cause a building to extend above the forest canopy, when present, or a ridgeline. For height greater than that set forth in Table A for a 5:12 pitch, the additional height shall not increase the visual magnitude beyond that permitted for structures in the shoreland as set forth in Section 30.15.G Additional Visual Magnitude, or Appendix H, Visual Assessment Tool, of the Design Review Guidelines

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	feasible alternatives requiring less additional height. (8) The maximum height at any corner of two exterior walls of the building is not greater than 90 percent of the maximum building height. The maximum height at the corner of two exterior walls is the difference between the point of lowest natural ground elevation along an exterior wall of the building and point at which the corner of the same exterior wall meets the roof. This standard shall not apply to an architectural feature described as a prow. (9) When viewed from a TRPA scenic threshold travel route, the additional height granted a building or structure shall not result in the net loss of views to a scenic resource identified in the 1982 Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Inventory. TRPA shall specify the method used to evaluate potential view loss. (10) The building is no more than two stories in height. (DEIR, pp. 10-29 to 10-30.)		(2) When outside a community plan, the additional height is consistent with the surrounding uses. (3) With respect to that portion of the building which is permitted the additional height, the building has been designed to minimize interference with existing views within the area to the extent practicable. (4) The function of the structure requires a greater maximum height than otherwise provided for in this chapter. (5) That portion of the building which is permitted the additional height, is adequately screened, as seen from major arterials, the waters of lakes, and other public areas from which the building is frequently viewed. In determining the adequacy of screening, consideration shall be given to the degree to which a combination of the following features causes the building to blend or merge with the background: (a) The horizontal distance from which the building is viewed; (b) The extent of screening; and (c) Proposed exterior colors and building materials. (6) The building is located within an approved community plan, which identifies the project area as being suitable for the additional height being proposed. (7) The additional height is the minimum necessary to feasibly implement the project and there are no feasible alternatives requiring less additional height. (8) The maximum height at any corner of two exterior walls of the building is not greater than 90 percent of the maximum building height. The maximum height at the corner of two exterior walls is the difference between the point of lowest natural ground elevation along an exterior wall of the building, and point at which the corner of the same exterior wall meets the roof. This standard shall not apply to an architectural feature described as a prow. (9) When viewed from a TRPA scenic threshold travel route, the additional height granted a building or structure shall not result in the net loss of views to a scenic resource identified in the 1982 Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Inventory. TRPA shall specify the method used to evaluate potential view loss. (10) The building is no more than two stories in height. The facilities designed for both Alternative A and Alternative B would be constructed in variations of the Tahoe Style Theme. The colors, materials, and design of the replacement roof for the main 2-story commercial building would be consistent with TRPA and Placer County standards. Landscaping would be consistent with TVCP standards, and utilities on the project site would be placed underground per TRPA and Placer County requirements for new developments. All new outdoor lighting would be shielded and directed so that light is not directed off-site. Trees would be preserved to the extent possible, specifically trees

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			measuring 30 inches dbh or larger. Additional trees would be planted during project implementation. Existing parking would be setback from the front of the project site along SR 28 in accordance with TRPA regulations. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the scenic resource impacts of Alternative E would be slightly less than those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with Project consistency of applicable plans with regards to scenic resources and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, pp. 10-20 to 10-21, FEIR, p. 2-24.)
10.A-5 Increased Light and Glare. Alternative A would include new bollard pedestrian lighting along the street frontage and would introduce artificial nighttime light that could radiate upward and outward from the project site, disturbing views of the nighttime sky. (PS) (DEIR, p. 10-22.)	**10.A-5a. Comply with TRPA Design Review Guidelines and Placer County Guidelines Regarding Lighting.** The project applicant shall incorporate the following measures: ► Construction of the project shall adhere to TRPA Exterior Lighting Standards described in Chapter 7 of the TRPA Design Review Guidelines, Chapter 4 of the Standards and Guidelines, and TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 30.8. ► Construction shall adhere to Placer County design standards regarding exterior lighting, as described in the TVCP. ► All exterior lighting shall be shielded, focused downward, and focused away from residential areas. ► All exterior lighting shall be limited to non-sodium-vapor lighting. (DEIR, p. 10-30.) **10.A-5b. Submit a Detailed Lighting Plan to the Placer County Design Review Committee.** Concurrent with the submittal of Improvement Plans, a detailed lighting and photometric plan shall be submitted to the North Tahoe Design Review Committee (DRC) and TRPA for review and approval, to include the following: (a) The site lighting plan shall demonstrate compliance with the TVCP and the Standards and Guidelines. Night lighting shall be designed to minimize impacts to adjoining and nearby land uses. No lighting is permitted on top of structures. Lighting may not be directed against building walls, unless necessary for essential security purposes. (b) Site lighting fixtures in parking lots shall use high pressure sodium (HPS) or metal halide. Any light source over 10 feet in height shall incorporate a cut-off shield to prevent the light source from being directly visible from areas off-site. The metal pole color shall be such that the pole will blend into the landscape (i.e., black, bronze, or dark bronze) subject to final TRPA approval. All site lighting in parking lots shall be full cut-off design so that the light source is fully screened to minimize the impacts discussed above. (c) Building lighting shall be shielded and downward directed such that the bulb or ballast is not visible. Lighting fixture design shall complement the building colors and materials and shall be used to light entries, soffits, covered walkways and pedestrian areas such as plazas. Roof and wall pack lighting shall not be used. Lighting intensity	LS	Finding. Compliance with Mitigation Measures 10.A-5a and 10.A-5b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by complying with the TRPA Design Review Guidelines and Placer County Guidelines regarding lighting, and by requiring the applicant submit a detailed lighting plan to the Placer County Design Review Committee. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that these mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation: Alternative A would introduce a new source of nighttime lighting. Under Alternative E, the increase in light and glare would require mitigation to control lighting as with Alternative A, but fewer buildings and thus fewer lighting fixtures would be constructed. Exterior lighting would be limited to safety lighting placed on the buildings to light doorways and walkways, and lighting fixtures mounted on 20-foot poles in parking areas because Section 30.8.A(5) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances prohibits illumination for aesthetic or dramatic purposes of any building or surrounding landscape. Nonetheless, glare from project-related nighttime lighting could be an annoyance to nearby residences and could reduce the quality of nighttime views because of the increase in visible light. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the scenic resource impacts of Alternative E would be slightly less than those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with increased light and glare, and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, p. 10-22, FEIR, p. 2-24.)

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	shall be of a level that only highlights the adjacent building area and ground area and shall not impose glare on any pedestrian or vehicular traffic (DEIR, p. 10-30 to 10-31, FEIR, p. 3-11.)		
CULTURAL RESOURCES			
11.A-1 Effects on Known Cultural Resources. No cultural resources inventoried on the project site are significant according to TRPA, CEQA, or CRHR criteria. Therefore, Alternative A would have no effect on any known significant cultural site, feature, or artifact. (LS) (DEIR, p. 11-10.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3); 15091.)
11.A-2 Previously Undiscovered Cultural Resources. Although the Cultural Resources Assessment did not identify any significant historic resources or archaeological material on the project site, it is possible that buried or concealed cultural resources could be present and detected during ground-disturbing activities associated with Alternative A. If previously undiscovered, significant cultural resources are disturbed during construction, this could be a significant impact. (PS) (DEIR, p. 11-10.)	**11.A-2. Mitigate for Previously Undiscovered Cultural Resources.** In the event that previously unknown archaeological resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, the construction crew shall immediately halt work in the vicinity of the find. A qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to evaluate the resource in accordance with State and TRPA guidelines. If the discovered resource is determined to be significant, mitigation measures consistent with the State CEQA Guidelines and TRPA Code of Ordinances shall be devised and a mitigation plan submitted for approval by the Placer County Planning Department and TRPA. Any necessary archaeological excavation and monitoring activities shall be conducted in accordance with prevailing professional standards. Mitigation, in accordance with a plan approved by TRPA and the County, shall be implemented prior to resumption of work within the area of the resource find. (DEIR, p. 11-10.)	LS	Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure 11.A-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by mitigating for previously undiscovered cultural resources. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation: Although the Cultural Resources Assessment conducted on the project site identified no archaeological material, the project vicinity is known to have been rich in prehistoric and historic-era activity. Therefore, the potential exists that buried or concealed cultural resources could be present on the project site. Impacts on cultural resources would be the same for Alternative E as for Alternative A. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the scenic resource impacts of Alternative E would be similar to those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with previously undiscovered cultural resources and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, p. 11-10, FEIR, p. 2-24.)
11.A-3 Previously Undiscovered Burials. Although the cultural resources investigation did not produce evidence suggesting that any prehistoric or historic-era marked or un-marked human interments are present on the project site, it is possible that unmarked previously unknown graves could be present and detected during ground-disturbing activities associated with Alternative A. If previously undiscovered human remains are disturbed during construction, this could be a significant impact. (PS) (DEIR, pp. 11-10 to 11-11.)	**11.A-3. Mitigate for Previously Undiscovered Burials.** In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, the contractor and/or the project applicant shall immediately halt potentially damaging excavation in the area of the burial and notify the Placer County Coroner and a professional archaeologist to determine the nature of the remains. The coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or state lands (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5[b]). If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by phone within 24 hours of making that determination (Health and Safety Code Section 7050(c)). Following the coroner's findings, the property owner, contractor or project applicant, an archaeologist, and the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendent (MLD) shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments are not disturbed. The responsibilities for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in California Public Resources Code Section 5097.9. Implementation of Assembly Bill 2641 requires that if the	LS	Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure 11.A-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level by mitigating for previously undiscovered burials. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation: Based on the Cultural Resources Assessment conducted for the project site, no evidence suggests that any prehistoric or historic-era marked or un-marked human interments are present on the project site. However, there is a possibility that un-marked previously unknown graves could be present on the project site. Impacts on cultural resources would be the same for Alternative E as for Alternative A. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the scenic resource impacts of Alternative E would be similar to those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with previously undiscovered burials and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, 11-11, FEIR, p. 2-24.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	discovery of human remains is made after January 1, 2007 the following procecures will be implemented. Upon the discovery of Native American remains, the procedures above regarding involvement of the Placer County Coroner, notification of the NAHC, and identification of a MLD shall be followed. The landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity (accord ng to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards and practices) is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD has taken place. The MLD shall have 48 hours to complete a site inspection and make recommendations after being are granted access to the site. A range of possible treatments for the remains, including nondestructive removal and analysis, preservation in place, relinquishment of the remains and associated items to the descendents, or other culturally appropriate treatment may be discussed. AB 2641 suggests that the concerned parties may extend discussions beyond the initial 48 hours to allow for the discovery of additional remains. AB 2641(e) includes a list of site protection measures and states that the landowner shall comply with one or more of the following (1) Record the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center (2) Utilize an open-space or conservation zoning designation or easement (3) Record a document with the county in which the property is located. The landowner or their authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance if the NAHC is unable to identify a MLD or the MLD fails to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being granted access to the site. The landowner or their authorized representative may also re-inter the remains in a location not subject to further disturbance if they reject the recommendation of the MLD, and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner. Adherence to these procedures and other provisions of the California Health and Safety Code and AB 2641(e) will reduce potential impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level. (DEIR, pp. 11-13 to 11-14.)		
VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE			
12.A-1 Common and Sensitive Habitats. The project site does not support sensitive habitats. Implementation of Alternative A would result in the loss or disturbance of approximately 6.2 acres of Sierran mixed conifer forest, a common habitat in the project region. (LS) (DEIR, p. 12-18.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
12.A-2 Vegetation Removal. Buildout of Alternative A would result in the conversion of approximately 6.2 acres of Sierran mixed conifer forest to buildings, walkways, driveways, parking, and landscaping. Because vegetation removed would exceed 50% of the existing on-site vegetation, this would be a potentially significant impact. (PS) (DEIR, pp. 12-18 to 12-19.)	**12.A-2. Develop and Implement a Revegetation Plan.** Implementation of the following measures would reduce the conversion of vegetation at the project site to a less-than-significant level: ► A Revegetation Plan addressing all areas temporarily disturbed by project development shall be prepared by a qualified environmental professional (e.g., a licensed landscape architect, restoration specialist, Registered	LS	Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure 12.A-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by developing and implementing a Revegetation Plan. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	Professional Forester (RPF) or Certified Arborist with restoration qualifications, or similar qualified professional) and shall adhere to TRPA's landscaping and revegetation standards in the Code of Ordinances (Chapters 30 and 77) and Rules of Procedure. The Revegetation Plan shall be submitted to and approved by TRPA and the Placer County Department of Resource Conservation (DRC) prior to Final Map approval. The site plan and construction plans shall be designed to minimize removal and disturbance to existing vegetation. The Revegetation Plan shall demonstrate how site development and construction planning minimizes the removal and disturbance of vegetation, and specify the extent and location of areas to be revegetated. Construction and landscaping disturbance within all areas of vegetation to be retained shall be minimized. All areas of vegetation to be retained shall be fenced with sturdy, high-visibility protective fencing. This fencing shall be included on all site plans (e.g., Staging, Grading, Drainage, and Utility plans) and shall be depicted in the Revegetation Plan. Other minimization measures shall include clustering utilities in shared trenches, where feasible. The Revegetation Plan shall include a plant list, a planting plan, planting and maintenance techniques, and measures to control the introduction or spread of invasive plants. All landscaping shall consist of native, drought-tolerant plant species from the TRPA-approved plant list, except for accent plants which can be adapted plants. Transplanting shall follow International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) and American National Standards Institute (ANSI) standard digging and transplanting techniques to ensure proper handling and successful transplanting of trees and other plants. A water-conserving irrigation system shall be installed by the project applicant. ► All vegetation protection obligations required herein and in the Tree Management Plan (TMP, discussed below) shall be incorporated into construction contracts. Vegetation installation shall be inspected and approved by TRPA and/or DRC staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Vegetation shall be installed with sufficient time to establish prior to the winter season. All areas not revegetated prior to the winter season shall be winterized according to requirements in Mitigation Measure 8.A-1a. ► A Vegetation Monitoring Plan (VMP) prepared and implemented by a qualified environmental professional shall be submitted to and approved by the TRPA and the County prior to Final Map approval. The VMP shall include monitoring protocols, including the protocol for evaluating vegetation health and vigor. A monitoring report detailing vegetation success shall be submitted annually to the TRPA and the County for a minimum period of 5 years. Any revegetation falling below an 85% survival rate shall be replaced by the project applicant. Mitigation and monitoring of replacement revegetation shall continue until it satisfies the criteria for successful establishment. Criteria for successful		Explanation: The Sierran mixed conifer forest vegetation community on the project site is not a protected habitat type; therefore, as described in Impact 12.A-1 above, the loss of 6.2 acres of this common habitat would not be a significant biological impact by itself. However, Placer County CEQA thresholds provide that a potentially significant impact would occur if a project were to remove more than 50% of the existing vegetation. In addition, TRPA has standards for common vegetation structural diversity (TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 5, "Threshold Evaluation") and protective measures for vegetation (TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 71). Alternative A would result in the conversion of approximately 6.2 acres of vegetation to buildings, walkways, driveways, parking spaces, landscaping, and other pervious surfaces. The level of detail provided in the proposed development plans at this stage of the planning process is not sufficient to determine the total percentage of vegetation removed as part of Alternative A or Alternative E; however, based on known tree removal and the proposed site plans for Alternative A and Alternative E, the total vegetation removal would exceed 50%. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the vegetation impacts of Alternative E would be similar to those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with vegetation removal and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, pp. 12-18 to 12-19; FEIR, p. 24.)

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	establishment shall include survivorship for a period of at least 5 years ► If on-site avoidance and revegetation retains or restores a minimum of 50% of the project site to native conditions, no further mitigation is required. If on-site disturbance permanently removes over 50% of the area of existing vegetation at the site, off-site revegetation in accordance with TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 30 and 77 shall be required. The restored off-site area shall be equivalent in ecological value to that portion of the project site beyond 50% that would be disturbed, shall be within the north Tahoe Basin as close to the project site as possible, and shall be preserved in perpetuity by a conservation easement, deed restriction, or other similar mechanism. A Revegetation Plan and a Vegetation Monitoring Plan, prepared as described above, shall be created for this off-site revegetation as well, and shall be submitted to and approved by Placer County and TRPA prior to tree removal or the issuance of a Grading Permit. This off-site restoration may be combined with off-site tree revegetation required by Mitigation Measure 12.A-3, if the site chosen for off-site tree revegetation would be equivalent in ecological value (following revegetation) as that lost at the project site. (DEIR, pp. 12-27 to 12-28.)		
12.A-3 Tree Removal. Buildout of Alternative A would result in the loss of approximately 155 individual trees between 6 and 29 inches dbh. (PS) (DEIR, p. 12-19.)	**12.A-3. Minimize Tree Removal, Develop a Tree Management Plan, and a Tree Replacement Plan.** Implementation of the following measures would reduce the impacts of project-related tree removal to a less-than-significant level. The project shall minimize, to the maximum extent feasible, the removal of trees, especially any incense cedars, sugar pines, ponderosa pines, or any specimen trees or snags identified by a Certified Arborist or RPF. Any unavoidable impacts to trees shall be mitigated with the following measures: ► Before tree removal occurs, a Timber Harvest Plan (THP) shall be prepared by an RPF, and shall be submitted to CDF for review and approval. If the THP includes trees to be removed that were not indicated by a TRPA permit (TRPA permit # 2937), a copy of the THP shall also be submitted to TRPA for review. An Exemption From Timberland Conversion Permit for Subdivision shall also be obtained from CDF. ► A Tree Management Plan (TMP) shall be prepared by a qualified environmental professional (i.e., a restoration specialist, Registered Professional Forester (RPF) or Certified Arborist with restoration qualifications, or similar qualified professional), and shall be submitted to a TRPA RPF or other qualified TRPA professional and to Placer County for review and approval, prior to Tentative Map approval. Alternatively, if the THP prepared for CDF meets the requirements described in this mitigation measure, the THP may be submitted to TRPA and Placer County for review and approval in lieu of a separate TMP. The TMP shall adhere to the provisions in the TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 71, including the preservation of individual incense cedar trees (71.4.A-	LS	Finding. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 12.A-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by minimizing tree removal, developing a Tree Management Plan, and a Tree Replacement Plan. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation. The Sierran mixed conifer forest vegetation community on the project site is not a protected habitat type; therefore, as described in Impact 12.A-1 above, the loss of 6.2 acres of this common habitat would not be a significant biological impact by itself. However, both Placer County and TRPA have ordinances protecting trees from removal and, under the Forest Practice Act, CDF enforces laws that regulate logging on privately-owned lands in California. The project site supports approximately 292 trees greater than 6 inches dbh. Alternative A would result in the removal of approximately 155 trees between 6 and 29 inches dbh (Lundahl & Associates 2006, TRPA 2004, Ferrier 2004), totaling approximately 53% of the existing trees on the site. Of the 155 trees to be removed with Alternative A, 25 of those trees are already authorized for removal under TRPA Permit No. 2937 for forest health reasons, but remain in place to serve as barrier trees offering protection to other healthy trees. Alternative A would not result in the removal of any tree measuring 30 inches dbh or greater. Approximately 30 trees that would be removed from the project site with Alternative A would remain with Alternative E. Thus, Alternative E would result in the removal of approximately 125 trees between 6 and 29 inches dbh (Lundahl & Associates 2006, TRPA 2004, Ferrier 2004), totaling approximately 43% of the existing trees on the site. An

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	4), and other identified specimen trees where practicable. The plan shall include protection measures for snags and coarse woody debris as appropriate and feasible for an urban area. In accordance with the TRPA Threshold Standards for Common Vegetation, the plan shall maintain relative species richness, relative abundance, and relative age class as appropriate and feasible within an urban area, to contribute to the attainment of the region-wide Threshold Standard. Permanent disturbance (i.e., disturbance following project construction caused by the proposed land use changes) and temporary disturbance (i.e., disturbance from construction activities) of all trees to be preserved that are 6 inches in dbh (or 10 inches dbh aggregate for multi-trunk trees) shall be minimized. This shall include minimizing cuts, fills, grade changes, paving or other coverage, soil compaction, and landscaping impacts within the critical root zone of all trees, as determined by a qualified environmental professional. Creation of detailed site plans and construction documents shall be coordinated with a qualified environmental professional to minimize permanent and temporary disturbance. The TMP shall demonstrate how site development design will minimize the permanent disturbance of all trees to be preserved, and how construction planning will minimize temporary disturbance of all trees to be preserved. The TMP shall include the following requirements: To minimize permanent disturbance, utilities shall be clustered and shall be designed so as to avoid crossing in the root zone of trees to be protected, unless the utilities are installed by drilling under the root zones to avoid impacts associated with cutting roots. Feasibility of drilling under trees will be based on soil conditions. Pervious surfaces shall be used in the root zone whenever possible, and uses that encourage compaction (e.g., informal parking, trails) shall be avoided within the root zone. Snow storage areas shall be sited such that snow removal activities will not pose a risk of damage to preserved trees, and so that excessive snow-melt does not over-saturate the root zone of trees to be preserved. To minimize temporary disturbance, the TMP shall provide for vegetation protection during construction in accordance with TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 65 and 30. Protection measures shall include the following, at a minimum: 1. Sturdy high-visibility protective fencing shall be installed at the limits of construction (including all grading, road improvements, underground utilities, staging, storage, parking, or other development activity), and outside of the critical root zone of all trees to be preserved that have critical root zones in the limits of construction and that are 6 in inches dbh (or 10 inches dbh aggregate for multi-trunk trees). The critical root zone is defined here as the area within 10 feet of a tree's drip line. This fencing shall be included on all site plans (e.g., Staging, Grading, Drainage, and Utility plans) and		additional 32 trees would need to be removed from the off-site easement located on the adjacent parcel to the north to accommodate construction of the secondary emergency access road. In sum, Alternative E would remove two more trees, less than 1% more, Alternative A. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the tree removal impacts of Alternative E would be similar to those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with tree removal and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, p. 12-19, FEIR, p. 2-24.)

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	shall be depicted in the TMP. 2 If grading, trenching, or transplanting is necessary within the root zone of trees to be preserved, the work will be supervised by a certified arborist, an RPF, or other qualified biologist, and the following measures shall be implemented: soil shall be removed in lines radial to, rather than tangential to the tree to avoid excessive ripping and shattering of roots. If root cutting cannot be avoided, roots shall be cut cleanly at a 90-degree angle; a minimum of 6 inches of soil or sand shall be placed over exposed cuts and roots to reduce soil desiccation until the area is back-filled; and native soil shall be used to back-fill all cuts. 3 All necessary pruning shall be performed under the supervision of a Certified Arborist or RPF. • All tree protection obligations required herein and in the TMP shall be incorporated into construction contracts. Tree protection measures shall be installed, and shall be inspected by staff from the Placer County Department of Public Works and TRPA, prior to issuance of a grading permit. • A Tree Replacement Plan shall be prepared by a qualified environmental professional, in accordance with TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 30 and 77. This plan shall be submitted to and approved by Placer County and a TRPA RPF or other qualified TRPA professional prior to tree removal or the issuance of a Grading Permit. Replacement shall be required for all native trees removed that are 6 inches in dbh or larger, native multi-trunk trees with an aggregate diameter of 10 inches in dbh or greater, and such native trees with disturbance to their critical root zone. Compensation shall be provided on a three to one basis, or as specified by TRPA at the time of issuance of the tree permit. Trees shall be replaced with trees grown in 5-gallon containers, or the functional equivalent, using native species appropriate for the selected revegetation site to contribute to the attainment of the TRPA common vegetation Threshold Standard region wide. Trees that shall be removed for project development, that are also recommended for thinning in the TMP for fire safety, or the 25 trees recommended for removal for forest health reasons in TRPA Permit No. 2937 but that remain in place on site to serve as barrier trees offering protection to other healthy trees, shall not require replacement. Trees to be planted should be outside recommended defensible space distances. The Tree Replacement Plan shall include a plant list, a description of appropriate planting stock for new trees, a planting plan, planting and maintenance techniques, and measures to control the introduction or spread of invasive plants. Transplanting will follow International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) standard digging and transplanting techniques to ensure proper handling and successful transplanting of trees and vegetation. To compensate for the potential loss of trees that incur disturbance within their critical root zones, all such trees shall be monitored for a period of at least 7 years, in		

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	conjunction with the monitoring program described below. Any tree that does not survive shall be replaced on a three to one basis, and likewise monitored for a period of 7 years Tree replacement may occur on-site if remaining undeveloped project areas can support additional trees, as determined by a qualified environmental professional. If the remaining undeveloped project areas cannot support sufficient plantings, off-site replacement shall be required. Off-site replacement shall occur in areas in need of additional trees, shall be located as close to the project site as possible, and shall be preserved in perpetuity by a conservation easement, deed restriction, or other similar mechanism. ► A Certified Arborist, an RPF, or other qualified biologist shall inspect the results of construction activities to document which trees were removed by grading and construction, and to document disturbance to preserved trees. This documentation shall be provided to the County and TRPA, and the total number of trees to be replanted, as described in the Tree Replacement Plan, shall be modified as necessary to reflect the actual tree removal and disturbance that occurs during construction. ► Tree replacement installation shall be inspected and approved by TRPA and/or County staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. ► A VMP shall be prepared and implemented by a Certified Arborist, an RPF, or other qualified biologist, for areas to be revegetated as mitigation. The VMP shall be submitted to and approved by the County and a TRPA RPF or other qualified TRPA professional prior to Final Map approval. This plan shall include monitoring protocols, including the protocol for evaluating tree health and vigor. A monitoring report detailing vegetation success shall be submitted annually to the County and the TRPA through the monitoring period, for a minimum period of 5 years. The mitigation and monitoring of a replaced tree shall continue until it satisfies the criteria for a successfully established sapling, dies, or is otherwise no longer part of a mitigation effort. Criteria for successful establishment shall include survivorship for a period of at least 5 years, with at least 2 years without supplemental watering. (DEIR pp. 12-28 to 12-30.)		
12.A-4 Wildlife Movement Corridors. No wildlife movement corridors have been identified on the project site and no significant corridors are likely to exist. **(LS)** (DEIR, pp. 12-19 to 12-21.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

268

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
12.A-5 Nesting Raptors and Migratory Birds. Development of Alternative A could adversely affect nesting raptors and other migratory birds (PS) (DEIR, p. 12-21.)	**12.A-5. Avoid Vegetation Removal During Nesting Season and Conduct Preconstruction Surveys.** To the extent feasible, the project applicant shall avoid removing vegetation during the peak nesting season (approximately March 1 through August 15). If vegetation that could support nesting birds is to be removed during the nesting season, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct two focused preconstruction surveys for active nest sites of raptors on the project site. These surveys shall be conducted within 14 days of vegetation removal initiated during the nesting season. In addition, two focused preconstruction surveys shall be conducted within 14 days of grading initiated during the nesting season. If grading immediately follows tree removal, two focused preconstruction surveys within 14 days of initiating tree removal shall be sufficient. If an active raptor nest is located during the preconstruction surveys, the County, TRPA, DFG, and/or USFWS shall be notified, as appropriate to the species and its status. Vegetation removal and construction shall be delayed within 500 feet of the nest to avoid disturbance until the nest is no longer active. If nesting northern goshawk is found, vegetation removal and construction shall be delayed within 2,640 feet (0.5 mile) of the nest to avoid disturbance until the nest is no longer active. The buffer may be altered through consultation with the County, TRPA, and/or the appropriate agency (depending on the species found). If any active nests of other birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act are found during surveys for special-status birds and raptors, the County and TRPA shall be notified. Removal of an active nest site shall be delayed until the nest is no longer active. (DEIR, pp. 12-30 to 12-31.)	LS	Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure 12.A-5, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by avoiding vegetation removal during nesting season and by requiring the applicant conduct preconstruction surveys. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation: As described in Chapter 12, "Vegetation and Wildlife," of the Draft EA/EIR, the project site does not provide suitable breeding or significant foraging habitat for special-status animals (including rare, threatened, and endangered birds) due to unsuitable biophysical conditions, existing recreation use and high disturbance levels, and the urban/residential setting of this site. Although sensitive species could occasionally move through the site, it is not expected to regularly support or provide important resources for any special-status wildlife species. Therefore, implementation of the project would not substantially affect special-status species. The methods for identifying special-status animal species with potential to occur on the project site, and potential impacts on special-status wildlife species are detailed in Chapter 12, "Vegetation and Wildlife," of the Draft EA/EIR. After reviewing a list of sensitive animal species that could occur on the project site, a qualified biologist assessed the project site to determine whether suitable habitat for those species could be affected by the project. It was determined that the disturbed habitat present on the site does not provide suitable breeding habitat for any special-status animal species. The project study area includes potential nesting and foraging habitat for several common migratory bird species protected under the MBTA. Habitat is also available for common raptor species protected under Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code. Construction of Alternative A or Alternative E would result in the removal of trees and vegetation that could provide nesting habitat for bird species. Construction within occupied habitat of nesting bird species could cause direct impacts on breeding and nesting activities, including removal of active nests, nest abandonment, and mortality to eggs and chicks. Construction could also result in noise, dust, and other disturbances to nesting bird species in the vicinity, resulting in potential nest abandonment and mortality to eggs and chicks. Under Alternative E, impacts on special-status species and raptors would be the same as Alternative A. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the nesting raptor and migratory bird impacts of Alternative E would be similar to those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with nesting raptors and migratory birds and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, p. 12-21; FEIR, pp. 2-24 and 2-121.)
12.A-6 Special-Status Species and Common Wildlife. Development of Alternative A could adversely affect special-status species or common wildlife. However, special-status species are not expected to occupy the project site and Alternative A would not threaten the viability of common species populations. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 12-21 to 12-22.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
12.A-7 Bat Species. Development of Alternative A could adversely affect common bat species living in the project vicinity. Direct mortality and loss of roosting habitat would be a potentially significant impact. (PS)	**12.A-7. Conduct Bat Surveys and Prepare Bat Management Plan.** Prior to vegetation removal or demolition of existing structures, a visual and/or acoustical bat survey shall be	LS	Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure 12.A-7, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the applicant conduct bat surveys and prepare a Bat Management Plan. The Board of

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
(DEIR, p. 12-22.)	conducted by a qualified biologist. If any bat roosts are identified, a Bat Management Plan shall be developed. The Bat Management Plan shall include recommendations for passively relocating bats. Passive relocation from a site typically involves first constructing artificial roosting habitat features (e.g., "bat boxes") nearby to provide local populations with replacement habitat, then excluding bats from the occupied roosting site to be removed. Techniques for excluding bats involve sealing (e.g., with aluminum screening or other material) roost entrances after bats have exited the roost to forage. (DEIR, p. 12-31.)		Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation: As described in Chapter 12, "Vegetation and Wildlife," of the Draft EA/EIR, the project site does not provide suitable breeding or significant foraging habitat for special-status animals (including rare, threatened, and endangered bat species) due to unsuitable biophysical conditions, existing recreation use and high disturbance levels, and the urban/residential setting of this site. Although sensitive species could occasionally move through the site, it is not expected to regularly support or provide important resources for any special-status wildlife species. Therefore, implementation of the project would not substantially affect special-status bat species. Several bat species could inhabit the project vicinity, including long-eared myotis (*Myotis evotis*), fringed myotis (*Myotis thysanodes*), and Yuma myotis (*Myotis yumanensis*). Decadent Incense Cedar trees with large cracks and crevices, and old buildings on the project site could provide roosting habitat. Because many bat species are locally rare, loss of a significant roost could adversely affect local populations. Construction of Alternative A and Alternative E would result in the removal of potential bat roosting habitat including trees and old buildings. Under Alternative E, impacts on bats would be the same as Alternative A. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the bat species impacts of Alternative E would be similar to those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with bat species and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, p. 12-22, FEIR, pp. 2-24 and 2-121.)
PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES			
13.A-1 Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, Distribution, and Storage. Implementation of Alternative A would result in increased water demand. The Alternative A total peak day water demand would be approximately 85,000 gallons per day (gpd). NTPUD has indicated that improvements to the existing water supply, treatment, distribution, and/or storage systems are needed to serve increased water demands. In September 2007 NTPUD approved a new water connection fee to help pay for system-wide improvements to the water system, including improvements to accommodate projected increases in water service demands resulting from new development in the NTPUD service area. As established by NTPUD these fees have been determined to be sufficient to provide for the water system improvements necessary to accommodate additional development, including the development of the proposed project, in the NTPUD service area. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 13-12 to 13-13.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
13.A-2 Increased Demand for Wastewater Service. Implementation of Alternative A would result in an increased demand for wastewater service. Alternative A would generate a total peak day wastewater discharge of approximately 125,000 gpd. The T-TSA's treatment facility would adequately serve the proposed project.	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Q12

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
Capacity at the NTPUD wastewater pumping facility would also be adequate to serve the proposed project, however future improvements to the existing NTPUD wastewater conveyance facilities are necessary to maintain service. In September 2007 NTPUD approved modifications to the existing sewer connection fee in part to obtain funds for improvements to the existing wastewater facilities. The adjusted sewer connection fee would apply to the proposed project. As established by NTPUD these fees have been determined to be sufficient to provide for the wastewater system improvements necessary to accommodate additional development, including the development of the proposed project, in the NTPUD service area. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 13-13 to 13-14, FEIR, p. 3-12.)			
13.A-3 Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services. Alternative A would generate additional solid waste requiring collection and disposal by TTSD. TTSD has adequate capacity to serve development associated with Alternative A, which would not adversely affect TTSD's existing services or facilities. **(LS)** (DEIR, p. 13-13.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
13.A-4 Increased Demand for Electricity and Required Extension of Electrical Infrastructure. Implementation of Alternative A would increase the demand for electricity and electrical infrastructure at the site. Sierra Pacific Power Company would be able to provide electricity to the site and the increase in demand for electricity would not be substantial in relation to the existing electricity consumption in Sierra Pacific Power Company's service area. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 13-14 to 13-15.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
13.A-5 Increased Demand for Natural Gas and Required Extension of Natural Gas Infrastructure. Implementation of Alternative A would increase demand for natural gas. Southwest Gas Corporation would be able to provide natural gas services to the site, provided necessary improvements are installed. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 13-15 to 13-16.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
13.A-6 Increased Demand for Telecommunications Service. Implementation of Alternative A would result in an increased demand for telecommunications services. Although limited on- and off-site improvements would be necessary to establish service, SBC would be able to serve the level of development associated with Alternative A. (LS) (DEIR, p. 13-16.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
13.A-7 Emergency Access During Construction. Construction activities associated with Alternative A could temporarily interfere with the ability of the Placer County Sheriff's Department and the North Tahoe Fire Protection District to provide emergency services to the project area, particularly those parcels adjacent to the site (PSi (DEIR, pp 13-16 to 13-17.)	**13.A-7. Ensure Emergency Access During Construction.** The project applicant shall prepare and submit an emergency access plan to TRPA, Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD), Placer County Sheriff's Department, and the NTFPD for review and approval before construction permits are issued. The plan shall include detailed descriptions of how emergency access would be maintained throughout project construction. Emergency access measures are expected to include the following ► Phasing construction activities to provide continual access to emergency vehicles during construction. ► Backfilling trenches and/or placing metal plates over the trenches at the end of each workday. ► Using alternate access routes as needed, and ► Notifying the Placer County Sheriff's Department and the NTFPD of construction activities and providing these agencies with a copy of the emergency access plan. (DEIR, p 13-28)	LS	Finding. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 13 A-7, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by ensuring adequate emergency access during construction. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation. Surrounding land uses that require adequate emergency access include residential uses to the west, residential uses, a nursery, and other commercial uses to the east, and Sandy Beach Public Recreation Area just south of the site and across SR 28. The primary emergency access route to the project site is via SR 28, with a response time of approximately 5–8 minutes. Project construction (primarily building construction) would not occur all at once, but likely in two consecutive building phases. Site grading and utility work would occur across the entire site in the earliest part of construction and would take approximately 27 to 35 days to complete. Construction activities would be continuous, except during winter months when activities would cease for a period of time. Construction activities associated with each building phase would take roughly 10 months to complete. Much of the construction work would not affect emergency access to the surrounding area, because construction activities would be primarily focused on the project site. However, during construction, vehicles and equipment may block and/or slow through traffic in the surrounding area, especially along SR 28. Impacts on emergency access during construction under Alternative E would be similar with Alternative E because the site would continue to be developed. The impact on emergency access during construction, identified as significant before mitigation with Alternative A, would remain significant but would be mitigated for Alternative E. However, Alternative E would have a reduced impact on emergency service over the long term because secondary emergency access would be provided at the north end of the project site. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the public services and utilities impacts of Alternative E would be similar to those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with construction and emergency access in the project area and the remaining impact will be less than significant (DEIR, pp. 13-16 to 13-17; FEIR, p. 2-24.)
13.A-8 Increased Demand for Fire Protection. Implementation of Alternative A would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for fire protection (LS) (DEIR, pp. 13-17 to 13-18.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
13.A-9 Increased Demand for Police Services. Implementation of Alternative A would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for police services, which could result in a need for the addition of 1/3 PCSD deputy to effectively maintain the existing level of service. (LS) (DEIR, p. 13-18.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
13.A-10 Increased Student Enrollment in Tahoe Vista Schools. Implementation of Alternative A would increase student enrollment at TTUSD's schools. Payment of the development impact fees would provide the legally maximum required level of funding under State law, and would fully mitigate project-related school impacts. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 13-18 to 13-20.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ELR

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
13.A-11 Increased Demand for Postal Service. Implementation of Alternative A would result in an increased demand for postal services. Although street delivery is not available in Tahoe Vista, the TVCP contains an action element to provide home mail service throughout the area, with a specific requirement that appropriate facilities for mail delivery be provided. (PS) (DEIR, p. 13-20.)	**13.A-11. Install Appropriate Facilities for Mail Delivery.** Before occupancy of the proposed project, the project applicant shall install clustered postal boxes near the entrance of the project site, provide an area for the mail carrier to park, and provide a parking area for residents, to allow for postal delivery if this service is provided in the future. (DEIR, p. 13-28.)	LS	Finding. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 13.A-11, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by installing appropriate facilities for mail delivery. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation. Alternative A would generate approximately 302 new residents and Alternative E would generate approximately 242 new residents (TAU and affordable/employee housing unit occupants) in the Tahoe Vista area necessitating postal services. The Tahoe Vista Post Office is located near the project site at 7005 North Lake Boulevard. The Post Office is undersized to accommodate the current population that resides in Tahoe Vista (Martin, pers. comm., 2005) and the Project's additional new residents would exacerbate this situation. Street delivery service is not available in Tahoe Vista. Although it is acknowledged that picking up one's mail from the Tahoe Vista Post Office (or nearby post office) may be considered an inconvenience, no new postal facilities would be constructed in Tahoe Vista because of the proposed project. Indirectly, the increase in residents may result in increased vehicle trips to the Post Office and potential safety concerns (especially in snow conditions). However, mail pickup from the post office is the current practice in Tahoe Vista and would continue with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative E. In addition, the TVCP contains an action element to provide home mail service throughout the area, with a specific requirement that appropriate facilities for mail delivery be provided, such as an area for mail cluster boxes, an area for the mail carrier to park, and a parking area for residents. The appropriate mail facilities will be installed under this mitigation measure. Impacts on public services would be reduced with Alternative E from Alternative A because the smaller development would accommodate approximately 242 occupants rather than 302 with Alternative A. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the public services impacts of Alternative E would be similar to those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with the increased demand for postal service and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, p. 13-20, FEIR, 2-42.)
TRAFFIC, PARKING, AND CIRCULATION			
14.A-1 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT). Alternative A would generate approximately 299 net new daily trips during the peak summer months. Because the travel demand model forecasts future travel demand conditions for the peak Friday in August, the summer trip generation applies for VMT analysis. The Alternative A daily summer trip generation (299 trips) is considered significant based on criteria defined in TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 93. (S) (DEIR, pp. 14-11 to 14-12.)	**14.A-1a. Contribute to TRPA Air Quality Mitigation Fund to Reduce VMT.** Pursuant to Chapter 93.3.D of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, an air quality mitigation fee, assessed at a rate per daily vehicle trip, is required to offset the potential traffic and air quality impacts associated with a project. The total estimated fee based on the proposed land uses and summer daily increase in vehicle trips is $80,730. TRPA requires that the air quality impact mitigation fee be paid for any project that results in an increase of daily vehicle trips in the Tahoe Basin. Per TRPA Code of Ordinance Section 93.3.C, the Air Quality Mitigation Fund	LS	Finding. Compliance with Mitigation Measures 14.A-1a and 14.A-1b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the applicant to contribute to the TRPA Air Quality Mitigation Fund to Reduce VMT and to contribute to Placer County Road Network Traffic Limitation Zone and Traffic Fee Program. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation. Because the Sandy Beach Campground is only

CLR3

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	provides for regional and cumulative mitigation measures that may include, but are not limited to: ► Transit facility construction, ► Transportation Systems Management measures, including, but not limited to, bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and use of alternative fuels in fleet vehicles, or ► Transfer and retirement of off-site development rights Because Alternative A would result in an increase of 299 daily vehicle trips, the applicant shall contribute the required corresponding mitigation fee to the Air Quality Mitigation Fund prior to issuance of grading and construction permits for Alternative A. (DEIR, p. 14-30) **14.A-1b. Contribute to Placer County Road Network Traffic Limitation Zone and Traffic Fee Program.** The project would be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Tahoe Fee District), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The project applicant would be required to pay the following traffic mitigation fee(s) to the Placer County Department of Public Works (DPW) prior to issuance of any Building Permits for the project: ► County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.0140, Placer County Code The total combined estimated fee is $201,770. The fees were calculated based on the proposed land use types and square footages. If either the land use type or square footage were to change, then the fees would change accordingly. The fees to be paid shall be based on the fee program in effect at the time that the application is deemed complete. (DEIR, p. 14-30) The Traffic Fee Program pays for improved transportation facilities that Placer County DPW deems necessary, such as roadway improvements, traffic signals, sidewalks, etc. Because of the location of the project, in Tahoe Vista, the traffic impacts fees would be utilized by the County for transportation facility improvements within the Tahoe Region		operational between April and October, the proposed project would have a different effect on summer and winter traffic volumes given that it would be operational year round. During summer months, the addition of new project-related trips would be partially offset by the removal of the existing campground. During winter months, the proposed project would result in additional net new trips beyond those generated during the summer. Alternative A is evaluated as generating approximately 299 net new daily trips during the peak summer months. Because fewer fractional ownership units and fewer affordable housing units would be constructed with Alternative F, the number of net new daily summertime trips would be reduced to 211. TRPA's methodology for determining the significance of VMT impacts is based on daily trip generation. Traffic volumes on Tahoe area roadways are typically higher during summer months, which is the reason the TRPA TRANPLAN model forecasts traffic volumes for a Friday in August. While Project trip generation would be greater during winter/ski conditions, summer trip generation is used to determine the potential for VMT impacts. TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 93, Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program, defines a significant traffic increase as 200 or more daily trips, determined by TRPA's Table. It should be noted that the traffic analysis analyzed the worst case scenario, which included fully occupied units during summer months. The plus project summer traffic volumes at the study intersections within Tahoe Vista are approximately 12% higher than the winter volumes during morning hours and 20% higher than the winter volumes during afternoon hours. This indicates that even though the project generates more net new traffic during winter months, summer months are the more critical season as related to traffic congestion. Pursuant to Chapter 93.3 D of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, Mitigation Measure 14.A-1a of the Draft EA/EIR requires payment of an air quality mitigation fee assessed at a rate per daily vehicle trip to offset the potential traffic and air quality impacts associated with the project. TRPA collects the fees, which are then distributed for use within the jurisdiction from which they were paid, usually for Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) projects associated with traffic calming/mitigation. As described in Mitigation Measure 14.A-1a, measures may include, but are not limited to transit facility construction, transportation systems management measures, or transfer and retirement of off-site development rights. Because the air quality impacts related to increases in VMT are regional in nature, they may be properly mitigated by regional EIP projects. Cooperation and contributions from the federal, state, local and private sectors support the EIP program and fund project implementation. To be included in the EIP, individual projects, or categories of projects, must meet certain criteria, that is, the projects must be shown to assist in meeting specific TRPA Threshold goals. The EIP includes tracking requirements so that, after completion of a project, identified EIP measures of progress have been met. EIP projects funded in the Basin contribute to improved regional air quality. Mitigation Measure 14.A-1b of the Draft EA/EIR requires payment of traffic mitigation fees per the Placer County - County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone (Article 15.28.0140, Placer County Code) to mitigate for traffic-related impacts. These fees pay for improved transportation facilities within the Tahoe Basin portion of Placer County, which includes the northwest portion of the Basin from south of Tahoe Pines to Kings Beach. The required contribution for the project would

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			specifically be used by Placer County for prioritized roadway improvement projects in this area. The most recent project constructed in Tahoe Vista with traffic mitigation fees was the signal installed at SR 28 and National Avenue, which was a joint project between Caltrans and Placer County. Other recent projects in the North Tahoe area that have been partially or completely funded through traffic mitigation fees include the signal at SR 89 and West River, the widening and improvements to Squaw Valley Road, the signalization of SR 89 and Squaw Valley Road, the Tahoe City project, and a contribution to the TCPUD Lakeside Trail Project Traffic fee programs will be used for other capital improvement projects in Kings Beach and Tahoe Vista (Moorehead, pers. comm., 2008). In Kings Beach, traffic fee program funds will be used for: 1) the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project, 2) miscellaneous shoulder improvements on National Avenue; 3) bike lanes and shoulder work on SR 28, 4) SR 267/SR28 Intersection Improvements; 5) SR 28/Coon Street Intersection Improvements, and 6) SR 28/Bear Street Intersection Improvements. County traffic fees will also be used for two capital improvement projects in Tahoe Vista, these projects include traffic flow improvements and shoulder/pedestrian enhancements on the Tahoe Vista portion of SR 28. Program funds will also be used for transit route improvements in the Placer County portion of the Basin that include transit shelters and park and ride facilities While the project applicant would still be required to contribute to the Air Quality Mitigation Fund and the County's Traffic Impact Fee under Alternative E, the total amount of these fees would be reduced compared to Alternative A due to the reduction in daily trips. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the traffic, parking, and circulation impacts of Alternative E would be reduced from those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of these mitigation measures will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with vehicle miles traveled and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, pp. 14-11 to 14-12; FEIR, pp. 2-13, 2-24 to 2-25, 2-150.)
14.A-2 Existing Plus Alternative A Level of Service. Alternative A would add a significant number of new trips to adjacent roadways during summer months. However, all of the study intersections are anticipated to operate at acceptable levels of service under existing plus project conditions. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 14-12 to 14-15.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
14.A-3 Vehicular Access and Circulation. The vehicular access to/from the project site would be via two driveways on SR 28. Emergency access would be via these driveways, and the internal circulation includes a looped system as required by the North Tahoe Fire Protection District. (LS) (DEIR, p. 14-15.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
14.A-4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation. Alternative A would add bicycle and pedestrian trips to SR 28. The project does not include design features that would create hazards for pedestrians/bicycles or conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs related to pedestrian or bicycle circulation. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 14-17.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
14.A-5 Transit. Alternative A would be well served by existing transit services and convenient stops. The project would add some transit trips to TART, the Tahoe Trolley, and the Town of Truckee and other winter shuttle services; however, transit trips are encouraged	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

GLE

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
Based on conversations with TART (Peterson, pers. comm., 2006), the project would not increase transit trips above the capacity of the transit system under typical conditions. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 14-17 to 14-18.)			
14.A-6 Parking Supply. Alternative A would provide parking that meets Placer County Code requirements. Parking adjacent to the existing main commercial building would be removed and the spaces would be reconstructed on the project site. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 14-18 to 14-19.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3); 15091.)
14.A-7 Construction Traffic. Alternative A would temporarily add construction traffic on SR 28 during the construction period, however, all of the study intersections would be expected to operate at acceptable levels of service with the addition of project-related construction traffic. (LS) (DEIR, p. 14-19.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3); 15091.)
AIR QUALITY			
15.A-1 Short-Term Construction Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10}. Project-related construction emissions of criteria air pollutants would exceed the PCAPCD significance thresholds of 82 lbs/day for NO_x. In addition, construction emissions would potentially contribute to existing nonattainment conditions in the LTAB for PM_{10}. (S) (DEIR, p. 15-16.)	**15.A-1, Reduce Temporary Construction Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10}.** In accordance with the PCAPCD, the project applicant shall implement the following recommended mitigation measures (Backus, pers. comm., 2006) during construction of the proposed project. In addition to the mitigation measures identified below, construction of the project is required to comply with all applicable PCAPCD rules, including Rule 202 regarding visible emissions, Rule 228 regarding fugitive dust, Rule 218 regarding the application of architectural coating, and Rule 217 regarding cutback and emulsified asphalt paving materials. 1 The applicant shall submit to the PCAPCD and receive approval of a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan prior to any groundbreaking or tree removal activities. This plan must address the minimum Administrative Requirements defined in section 300 and 400 of District Rule 228, Fugitive Dust (www.placer.ca.gov/airpollution/airpolut.htm). 2 Fugitive dust shall not exceed 40% opacity and not go beyond the property boundary at any time during project construction. If lime or other drying agents are utilized to dry out wet grading areas they shall be controlled as to not to exceed Rule 228 limitations. 3 Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed Rule 202 limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment that exceed opacity limits shall be immediately notified and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours. 4 The prime contractor shall submit to the PCAPCD a comprehensive inventory (i.e., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. The project representative shall provide the PCAPCD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman. The project representative shall provide a plan for approval by the PCAPCD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles,	LS	Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure 15.A-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by reducing temporary construction emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} in accordance with the PCAPCD. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation: Construction emissions are described as "short-term" or temporary in duration and have the potential to represent a significant impact with respect to air quality. ROG and NO_x emissions are primarily associated with gas and diesel equipment exhaust and the application of architectural coatings. Fugitive PM_{10} dust emissions are primarily associated with site preparation and vary as a function of such parameters as soil silt content, soil moisture, wind speed, acreage of disturbance area, and VMT by construction vehicles on- and off-site. With respect to the proposed project, the initial site preparation and building phases of construction would result in the temporary generation of ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} emissions from site preparation (e.g., demolition, excavation, grading, and clearing), off-road equipment, material import/export, and worker commute exhaust emissions; paving; application of architectural coatings; other miscellaneous activities. Short-term construction emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} under Alternative A were modeled using the ARB-approved URBEMIS 2002 Version 8.7 computer program as recommended by the PCAPCD. URBEMIS is designed to model construction emissions for land use development projects and allows for the input of project-specific information. Input parameters were based on default model settings and information provided in the Project Description. Based on the modeling conducted, Alternative A construction would result in worst-case maximum unmitigated daily emissions of approximately 19.0 lbs/day of ROG, 98.6 lbs/day of NO_x, and 20.4 lbs/day of PM_{10}. The level of NO_x would exceed the PCAPCD's significance thresholds of 82 lbs/day. While the level of PM_{10} emissions is below the PCAPCD thresholds, fugitive dust emissions could violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20% NO_x reduction and 45% particulate reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available 5 No open burning of removed vegetation shall occur during infrastructure improvements 6 Minimize idling time to 5 minutes for all diesel-power equipment. 7 Use ARB diesel fuel for all diesel-powered equipment 8 Apply water to control dust as needed to prevent dust impacts offsite. Operational water truck(s), shall be onsite, as required, to control fugitive dust. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site 9 Apply approved chemical soil stabilizers, vegetative mats, or other appropriate best management practices to manufacturer's specifications, to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas which remain inactive for 96 hours) 10. Spread soil binders on unpaved roads and employee/equipment parking areas and wet broom or wash streets if silt is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares 11. Utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than temporary diesel power generators. If not available, low sulfur fuel is to be used for diesel-powered generators Implementation of Mitigation Measure 15.A-1 would reduce fugitive PM_{10} dust emissions a minimum of approximately 50% and prevent dispersion, thereof, beyond the property boundary. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 15.A-1 would also reduce diesel equipment exhaust emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} a minimum of 5%, 20%, and 45%, respectively. (DEIR, pp. 15-29 to 15-30.)		pollutant concentrations, especially considering the nonattainment status of the LTAB portion of Placer County with respect to the California and TRPA standards Under Alternative E, construction emissions would be slightly reduced because fewer units would be constructed. The project applicant would be required to implement emissions control measures to mitigate for construction impacts. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the air quality impacts of Alternative E would be reduced from those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with elimination of the campsites and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, p. 15-18, FEIR 2-25.)
15.A-2 Long-Term Operational (Regional) Emissions. The total of stationary, area, and mobile source emissions associated with the long-term operation of the project would not exceed the PCAPCD's significance threshold of 82 lbs/day for ROG, NO_x or PM_{10}. In addition, emissions from stationary sources associated with the project would not exceed the TRPA thresholds for stationary sources. However, PCAPCD maintains a 10 lbs/day cumulative threshold for ROG and NO_x and the project would exceed the NO_x threshold. (S) (DEIR, pp. 15-20 to 15-21.)	**15.A-2. Contribute to TRPA Air Quality Mitigation Fund to Reduce VMT Pursuant to Mitigation Measure 14.A-1a.** The air quality mitigation fee implemented as part of Mitigation Measure 14.A-1a (see Chapter 14, "Traffic, Parking, and Circulation") would provide necessary funding for projects that would offset the project's cumulative contribution to long-term NO_x emissions. Projects that would be implemented under the TRPA program would reduce NO_x emissions by greater than 1.6 lbs/day, the amount necessary to reduce the project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level. The total estimated fee for Alternative A is $80,730. Per TRPA Code of Ordinance Section 93.3.C, the Air Quality Mitigation Fund provides for regional and cumulative mitigation measures that may include, but are not limited to ► Transit facility construction, ► Transportation Systems Management measures, including, but not limited to, bicycle facilities,	LS	Finding. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 15.A-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by contributing to the TRPA Air Quality Mitigation Fund to reduce VMT. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation. Regional stationary-, area- and mobile-source emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM_{10}, CO, and SO_x associated with implementation of the proposed project were estimated using URBEMIS 2002 Version 8.7.0 computer program, which is designed to model emissions for land use development projects. URBEMIS allows land use selections that include project location specifics and trip generation rates. URBEMIS accounts for stationary- and area-source emissions from the usage of natural gas, wood stoves, fireplaces, landscape maintenance equipment, and consumer products; and mobile-source emissions associated with vehicle trips. Regional stationary-, area-, and mobile-source emissions were estimated based on proposed land

LTP 2

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	pedestrian facilities, and use of alternative fuels in fleet vehicles, or ► Transfer and retirement of off-site development rights *As required in Mitigation Measure* 14 A-1a the applicant shall contribute the required corresponding mitigation fee to the Air Quality Mitigation Fund prior to issuance of grading and construction permits for Alternative A (DEIR, pp 15-30 to 15-31)		use types and sizes identified in the Project Description and the net increase in trip generation from the traffic analysis prepared for this project in Chapter 14 of the Draft EA/EIR, "Traffic, Parking, and Circulation." Because wood stoves and fireplaces would not be installed in the proposed uses, they were not included in the analysis of stationary-source emissions Project-related stationary sources (e g., natural gas fired water heaters and central furnaces) would comply with Section 91 3 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Project implementation would not include the construction or operation of any major stationary sources of emissions Under Alternative A, the sum total emissions for ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} would not exceed the PCAPCD per-project thresholds Stationary source emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM_{10}, CO, or SO_x would be less than TRPA significance thresholds and because the project's operational emissions of NO_x would not exceed PCAPCD's NO_x threshold Alternative A would not affect TRPA's attainment designation for atmospheric deposition. However, the PCAPCD also has a 10 lbs/day threshold for ROG and NO_x, for a project's contribution to cumulative regional emissions Without mitigation, the project would exceed the threshold for NO_x. The amount of air pollutant emissions resulting with Alternative E would be reduced relative to Alternative A because fewer occupants would be present The project applicant would be required to pay the Air Quality Mitigation Fee to mitigate for long-term vehicle trip-related impacts No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the air quality impacts of Alternative E would be reduced from those identified for Alternative A Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with elimination of the campsites and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, p 15-20 to 15-21; FEIR, p 2-25)
15.A-3 Long-Term Operational (Local) Mobile-Source Carbon Monoxide Emissions. Long-term operational (local) mobile-source CO emissions under Alternative A would not violate an air quality standard (i e , 1-hour CAAQS of 20 ppm, 8-hour TRPA standard of 6 ppm), contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (LS) (DEIR, pp 15-21 to 15-22)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126 4, subd (a)(3), 15091)
15.A-4 Odor Emissions. Neither project construction nor operation of Alternative A would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people (LS) (DEIR, p 15-22)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub Resources Code, § 21002, CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126 4, subd (a)(3), 15091.)
15.A-5 Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions. Neither construction nor operation of Alternative A would result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial TAC emissions (LS) (DEIR, pp 15-23 to 15-24)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126 4, subd (a)(3), 15091)
NOISE			
16.A-1 On-site Construction Noise Levels. If construction were to occur during the more noise-sensitive evening and nighttime hours, short-term construction noise could result in increased sleep disruption and interference to adjacent and nearby residents (PS) (DEIR, p 16-17.)	**16.A-1. Reduce On-site Construction Noise Levels.** The project applicant shall implement the following mitigation measures during construction to reduce on-site short-term construction noise levels ► Construction activity that results in increased noise levels beyond the project site's property line, including all material haul trips, shall be limited to the hours between 8 00 AM and 6 30 PM and prohibited on Sundays and federal holidays ► All construction equipment shall be equipped with	LS	Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure 16 A-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by reducing on-site construction noise levels The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation: Alternative A would include the construction of 45 Tourist

Q12

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	properly operating mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications ► Equipment engine doors shall be kept closed during equipment operation ► Inactive construction equipment shall not be left idling for prolonged periods of time (i.e., more than 2 minutes). ► Stationary equipment (e.g., power generators) shall be located at the maximum distance feasible from nearby noise-sensitive receptors Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be identified by the project applicant on the construction plans and shall be located as far as is practical from existing dwellings in the area, including residences adjacent to the eastern and western boundaries of the site (DEIR, pp. 16-26 to 16-27.)		Accommodation Units (TAUs), a clubhouse/ administration building, 10 affordable/employee housing units, improvements to the existing main 2-story commercial building, and SR 28 frontage improvements. Alternative E would include the construction of 39 TAUs, a clubhouse/administration building, 6 affordable/employee housing units, improvements to the existing main 2-story commercial building, SR 28 frontage improvements, and development of a secondary fire access road Construction operations would include tree felling and vegetation clearing, the demolition of the ancillary buildings along with campground restroom building and RV pump station, site grading, and excavation associated with the site preparation phase, as well as paving and building construction. According to the EPA, the noise levels of primary concern are typically associated with the site preparation phase, because of the on-site equipment associated with clearing, grading, and excavation. Depending on the operations conducted, individual equipment noise levels could range from 78 to 91 dBA at distance of 50 feet. Without mitigation, residences adjacent to the site and in the surrounding areas could be adversely affected by construction noise. Construction operations that occur between the hours of 8:00 AM and 6:30 PM are exempt from the applicable noise standards. However, increases in ambient noise levels caused by construction activities may result in speech interference and increased sleep disruption to occupants of adjacent and nearby residences. Like Alternative A, construction noise would remain significant with Alternative E, and mitigation would be required to reduce that impact to a less than significant level. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the noise impacts of Alternative E would be the same as those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with construction noise and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, p. 16-17, FEIR, p. 2-25.)
16.A-2 Off-site Construction Traffic Noise Levels. Project-related construction would result in a short-term increase in traffic on the local area network. Heavy trucks accessing the project site during the more noise-sensitive nighttime and early morning hours may result in increased sleep disruption and interference to adjacent and nearby residents. (PS) (DEIR, pp. 16-18 to 16-19.)	**16.A-2. Reduce Off-site Construction Traffic Noise Levels.** The project applicant shall restrict construction-related heavy truck trips and material haul trips to the hours between 8:00 AM and 6:30 PM and prohibit such trips on Sundays and federal holidays. (DEIR, p. 16-27.)	LS	Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure 16.A-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by reducing off-site construction traffic noise levels. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation: Construction of the project would result in a short-term increase in traffic on the area roadway network. The additional construction-related trips would be most noticeable along SR 28 and SR 267. Residences along these roadways would be most affected by construction traffic noise because these roads provide immediate access to the project site. Daily off-site construction traffic would include approximately 20 trips associated with material delivery (i.e., trucks) and up to 150 employee commute trips (i.e., autos and light duty vehicles). Typically, traffic volumes have to double before the associated increase in noise levels is noticeable along roadways. Therefore, the addition of these daily trips on the roadway system to existing volumes, which includes 512 daily truck trips (Caltrans 2005), would be minor. Consequently, construction of the project would not result in

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			a noticeable change in the daily traffic noise contours of area roadways. In addition, construction-related vehicle trips that occur between the hours of 8:00 AM and 6:30 PM are exempt from the applicable standards, however, noise from truck passage that occurs during other times of day may have an adverse effect. Intermittent haul truck noise levels, including brake squeal and trailer impact noise, typically range from 85 to 95 dBA L_{max} at approximately 15 feet for brief periods of time (EDAW 2002). Like Alternative A, construction related traffic noise would remain significant with Alternative E, and mitigation would be required to reduce that impact to a less than significant level. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the noise impacts of Alternative E would be the same as those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with construction related traffic noise and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, pp. 16-18 to 16-18; FEIR, p. 2-25.)
16.A-3 Stationary- and Area-Source Noise. Operation of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment associated with buildings related to Alternative A, if not properly designed or located, could generate noise levels that exceed the TVCP and/or Placer County thresholds. Trash collection activities involving large refuse dumpsters, especially those that occur during the early morning or nighttime hours, could result in increased sleep disruption to adjacent and nearby sensitive receptors. (PS) (DEIR, pp. 16-19 to 16-20.)	**16.A-3. Reduce On-site Stationary and Area Source Noise Levels.** The project applicant shall implement the following mitigation measures in the design and operation of the proposed project to reduce exposure of nearby sensitive receptors to increased noise levels. ▶ Mechanical building equipment (e.g., heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment) shall be located at the farthest distance from and be shielded from nearby existing and proposed future noise-sensitive land uses. ▶ Garbage dumpsters shall be located as far as possible from sensitive receptors, including residences located adjacent to the eastern and western boundaries of the site. (DEIR, p. 16-27.)	LS	Finding. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 16.A-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by reducing on-site stationary and area source noise levels. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation. Under Alternative A, occupancy of the 45 TAUs, clubhouse/administration building, and the 10 affordable/employee housing units could expose residents adjacent to the western and eastern boundaries of the site to minor increases in ambient noise levels. Under Alternative E, occupancy of the 39 TAUs, clubhouse/administration building, and the 6 affordable/employee housing units could expose residents adjacent to the western and eastern boundaries of the site to minor increases in ambient noise levels. Noise typically associated with such development includes lawn and garden equipment, snow-removal equipment, voices, and amplified music. Activities associated with these land uses would result in minor increases in ambient noise levels primarily during the day and evening hours and less frequently at night as perceived at the closest off-site residential receptors. Outdoor activity areas would include spas and garage areas located in the central areas of the site, away from property lines, a swimming pool area adjacent to the clubhouse building, and decks or balconies around the perimeter of the buildings. Though use of these areas is not typically associated with noise impacts, all recreational amenities would be placed so that at least one of the proposed buildings or architectural features occurs between the amenity and the property line. Because of their size and scale proposed buildings would generally act as barriers between outdoor recreational uses of the site and adjoining properties. Noise resulting from outdoor activity areas such as balconies would occur as a result of project implementation. However, most balcony activities (e.g., dinner parties) are limited to a few hours and occur in the early evening. Noise levels resulting from human conversation range from 50 – 70 dBA at 3 feet. Assuming an average noise level of 60 dBA at 3 feet the noise level would not exceed the TVCP stationary source noise threshold of 55 dBA within 6 feet of the balconies or the evening standard of 45 dBA within 18 feet. No sensitive receptors are

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			within these distances from balconies or outdoor recreation areas proposed by the project Noise levels generated by stationary sources, primarily residential HVAC equipment, range from 55 to 90 dBA at 3 feet from the source (EPA 1971). HVAC equipment noise would mostly be generated by fans as opposed to large condensers for air conditioning, given that the project site does not experience extremely hot temperatures. Depending on whether the HVAC units are roof-mounted or at ground level and the distance between the HVAC units and nearby off-site residences, noise levels generated by HVAC equipment could exceed the TVCP and/or Placer County thresholds (e.g., exterior hourly L_{eq} standard of 55 dBA). Like most residential neighborhoods in the North Lake Tahoe area, trash collection would be collected from bear-resistant dumpsters by Tahoe-Truckee Sierra Disposal Company. While noise generated by trash collection would likely not increase hourly L_{eq} levels or CNEL levels near the site, single event noise levels generated by trash collection activities could adversely affect adjacent off-site residences. Noise levels generated by garbage collection reach as high as 89 dBA L_{max} at a distance of 50 feet with frequent occurrence of single event noise levels exceeding 80 dBA (EDAW 2004). These noise levels are sometimes generated high off the ground as a hydraulic lift shakes trash from the dumpster into the truck. Based on the location of the proposed garbage collection areas and depending on the times when garbage is collected, noise from garbage collection activities could result in increased sleep disruption and interference to nearby off-site sensitive receptors. Under Alternative E, as with Alternative A, mitigation would be required for HVAC and other operational noises. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the noise impacts of Alternative E would be the same as those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with stationary source and area source noise and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, pp. 16-19 to 16-20; FEIR, pp. 2-25 and 3-14 to 3-15.)
16.A-4 Long-term Operational Increases in Daily Off-site Traffic Noise Levels. Project-related traffic would not result in a perceptible increase in ambient noise levels on nearby local roadways or highways. (LS) (DEIR, p. 16-20.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
16.A-5 Land Use Compatibility with On-site Noise Levels. Alternative A would develop new noise-sensitive receptors (affordable/employee housing units) in a location where predicted noise levels would exceed the TVCP and/or Placer County's thresholds for land use compatibility. (PS) (DEIR, pp. 16-21 to 16-23.)	**16.A-5. Design and Construct Proposed Fence/Wall to Provide Adequate Noise Reduction to Ensure Compliance with TVCP and Placer County Land Use Compatibility Standards.** Consistent with implementation strategies outlined in the TVCP and in the Placer County General Plan Noise Element, the project applicant shall implement the following to ensure the proposed fence/wall would provide adequate noise attenuation to reduce the exposure of proposed affordable/employee housing units to traffic noise from SR 28 and to ensure compliance with TVCP and Placer County land use compatibility standards. ► The proposed fence or wall between the closest affordable/employee housing unit and SR 28 shall be designed and constructed to achieve a minimum exterior noise reduction of 3.3 dBA. The wall must be constructed of solid material (e.g., brick or	LS	Finding. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 16.A-5, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the applicant to design and construct proposed fence/wall to provide adequate noise reduction to ensure compliance with TVCP and Placer County Land Use Compatibility Standards. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation. Development of Alternative A and Alternative E would locate noise-sensitive receptors (TAU users and residents of the affordable/employee housing units) on a site developed with an existing campground/RV park. Noise levels on the project site are primarily influenced by traffic noise from nearby roadways (i.e., SR 28 west of National Avenue).

Less Than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	adobe), be of sufficient density and height to minimize exterior noise levels and have sufficient durability to withstand winter conditions. The barrier shall blend into the overall landscape and have an aesthetically pleasing appearance that agrees with the color and character of nearby residences, and not become the dominant visual element of the community. The barrier shall adhere to TRPA and Placer County Design Review Guidelines. Funding for the installation of this mitigation measure shall be provided by the project applicant and final design/specifications (e.g., height above line-of-sight break measured at the base elevation of the nearest affordable/employee housing unit, distance from nearest proposed receptor) shall be developed in consultation with a qualified professional. For maximum effectiveness, the fence/wall must be continuous and relatively airtight along its length and height. To ensure that sound transmission through the fence/wall is insignificant, barrier mass should be about 4 pounds per square foot, although a lesser mass may be acceptable if the fence/wall material provides sufficient transmission loss. ► Prior to the issuance of any building permits or as a condition of approval, the project applicant shall be required to provide verification of the effectiveness of the constructed fence/wall to comply with applicable noise standards. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce on-site noise levels by 3.3 dBA CNEL (e.g., from 58.3 to 55.0 dBA CNEL under cumulative plus project conditions) at 300 feet from the edge of the roadway. Thus, on-site noise levels would not exceed 55 dBA at 300 feet or beyond, or 60 dBA at the nearest noise sensitive receptor (affordable/employee housing unit). (DEIR, p. 16-27 to 16-28.)		To determine the compatibility of the proposed sensitive receptors with on-site noise levels, the thresholds established in the TVCP (i.e., 65 and 55 dBA CNEL for Special Areas #2 and #1, respectively, and 55 dBA CNEL for the SR 28 transportation corridor) and in the Placer County General Plan Noise Element (i.e., 60 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL at the outdoor activity areas of residential uses) would apply. It is important to note that with respect to the TVCP, the 55 dBA CNEL threshold for the SR 28 transportation corridor would override the land-use based CNEL thresholds (i.e., 65 and 55 dBA CNEL for Special Areas #2 and #1, respectively) within 300 feet of the edge of the roadway. Based on the noise modeling conducted for this EA/EIR, the CNEL at 300 feet from the roadway edge of the segment of SR 28 west of National Avenue would be 57.2 dBA and 58.3 dBA under existing and cumulative plus project conditions, respectively, which exceeds the TVCP 55 dBA CNEL threshold for the transportation corridor on the project site. More specifically, as shown in Table 16-11 and Exhibit 16-3, the 55 dBA CNEL contour would be located approximately 443.5 feet and 527.4 feet from the roadway edge under existing plus project and cumulative plus project conditions, respectively. For the area of the project site that is located beyond 300 feet, the 55 dBA CNEL threshold for Special Area #1 would apply as shown in Exhibit 16-3. This threshold would be exceeded on the project site between 300 feet and 443.5 feet under existing plus project conditions (527.4 feet under cumulative plus project conditions). With respect to the applicable Placer County threshold, modeled noise levels would exceed the 60 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL standard at proposed affordable/employee housing units within 193.6 feet and 232.5 feet from the edge of roadway under existing plus project and cumulative plus project conditions, respectively. The closest parcel line (e.g., outdoor activity area) for the proposed affordable/employee housing units would be approximately 145 feet from the edge of roadway. The proposed six-foot wood fence/wall adjacent to the southern property line of the proposed affordable/employee housing units would result in a reduction in on-site noise levels, but without specific details on its design it is unclear whether it would be sufficient to reduce noise levels to below the applicable TVCP and Placer County thresholds. The amount of on-site noise sources with Alternative E would be reduced relative to Alternative A because fewer units and occupants would be present. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the noise impacts of Alternative E would be the same as those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with stationary source and area source noise and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, pp. 16-21 to 16-23. FEIR, p. 2-25.)
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
17.A-1 Create a Safety Hazard to Construction Workers. Demolition, excavation, and construction activities at the project site associated with Alternative A could result in the exposure of construction workers to hazardous materials, including asbestos, lead-based paint, and materials contained in underground storage tanks. (PS) (DEIR, pp. 17-6 to 17-7.)	**17.A-1. Prepare Site Health and Safety Plan, Conduct Investigation for Asbestos and Lead-Based Paint, and Prepare Final Determination on USTs.** ► To avoid health risks to construction workers, the contractor shall prepare and implement a site Health and Safety Plan. This plan will outline measures that shall be employed to protect construction workers and the public from exposure to hazardous materials during demolition and construction activities through education, physical separation, and compliance with applicable laws and regulations. These measures	LS	Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure 17.A-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the applicant prepare a Site Health and Safety Plan, conduct investigation for asbestos and lead-based paint, and prepare a final determination on USTs. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	could include, but would not be limited to posting notices of the presence and use of hazardous materials, limiting access to the site, air monitoring, watering for dust containment, and installation of wind fences. Development contractors shall be required to comply with state health and safety standards for all demolition work. If applicable, this shall include compliance with OSHA and Cal-OSHA requirements regarding exposure to asbestos and lead-based paint. ▸ Before demolition of any onsite buildings, the project applicant shall hire a qualified consultant to investigate whether any of these buildings contain asbestos-containing materials that could become friable or mobile during demolition activities, or materials containing lead. If found, the asbestos-containing materials and lead shall be removed by an accredited inspector in accordance with EPA and Cal-OSHA standards. In addition, all activities (construction or demolition) in the vicinity of these materials shall comply with Cal-OSHA asbestos and lead worker construction standards. The asbestos-containing materials and lead shall be disposed of properly at an appropriate off-site disposal facility. ▸ The PCDEH shall be notified if evidence of previously undiscovered soil or groundwater contamination (e.g., stained soil, odorous groundwater) is encountered during excavation. Any contaminated areas shall be remediated in accordance with recommendations made by PCDEH, LRWQCB, DTSC, or other appropriate federal, state, or local regulatory agencies. ▸ Before the start of project-related excavation or grading activities in the southeastern portion of the project site, the project applicant shall hire a licensed soils or geotechnical engineer to make a final determination as to whether the USTs would be affected by project-related activities. If the qualified professional determines that the USTs should be removed, the PCDEH shall be notified and the tanks shall be removed and the site remediated in accordance with recommendations made by PCDEH, DTSC, or other appropriate federal, state, or local regulatory agencies. (DEIR, p. 17-11.)		Explanation. The Phase I ESA did not identify any areas of the project site where past operations could have resulted in elevated concentrations of hazardous constituents (i.e., lead, asbestos, petroleum hydrocarbons, pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers) in surface soils or groundwater. The Phase I ESA did identify the location of two, 500-gallon underground storage tanks (USTs) at the site of a former gas station just east of the existing main commercial building. However, an investigation in 1989 and subsequent closure letter in 1998 from the Department of Environmental Health Services indicated that no health hazards were present and no cleanup activities were required. The applicant has indicated that the only project construction activity that would take place in the area of the USTs would be asphalt paving. Because the paving process would only require excavation to a depth of 10 to 12 inches, the USTs would probably not be affected, however, this determination must be made by a licensed soils or geotechnical engineer. The Phase I report did identify that asbestos could be present in on-site buildings because of their age. Lead-based paint could be present as well. Development of the project would involve site grading, excavation for utilities, backfilling, demolition of existing facilities, and construction of new residences and renovation of existing commercial facilities. During construction activities, construction workers could come in contact with and be exposed to hazardous material present in on-site buildings (i.e., asbestos or lead-based paint) or materials contained in USTs, which could create a significant environmental or health hazard. Impacts relating to hazards and hazardous materials would remain unchanged by the changes to the project between Alternative A and Alternative E, and mitigation for construction impacts would continue to be required. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result with Alternative E, and the hazards and hazardous materials impacts of Alternative E would be the same as those identified for Alternative A. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce or eliminate the impacts associated with construction worker safety hazards and the remaining impact will be less than significant. (DEIR, p. 17-7, FEIR, p. 2-25.)
17.A-2 Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment. Alternative A would involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials at the project site during construction activities. However, use of hazardous materials at the site would be in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. There are no nearby sources of hazardous materials or wastes that would pose a significant health risk for people at the project site. Project development would not result in increased risk of health hazards from vector-borne diseases or mosquito abatement techniques. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 17-7 to 17-8.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
17.A-3 Increased Exposure to Wildland Fire Hazard. The project site is located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone; however, adequate fire protection services are available to serve the proposed project.	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
Furthermore, the project site is already developed and has been in use as a campground for more than 60 years. Therefore, Alternative A would not result in increased exposure of people or structures to significant risk of loss or injury involving wildland fires. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 17-8, FEIR, p. 3-15.)			
CUMULATIVE			
18-1 Cumulative—Consistency with Regional Plan Land Use Goals and Policies and TVCP Policies. The proposed project and project alternatives would result in less-than-significant impacts related to land use. The proposed project and project alternatives would be consistent with the Goals and Policies of the TRPA Regional Plan and the applicable policies of the TVCP shown in Table 6-1, the project would not convert existing land uses and would not divide an established community. Therefore, the project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 18-10 to 18-11.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002, CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-2 Cumulative—Loss of Recreation Capacity. The proposed project would result in the closure of the Sandy Beach Campground thereby reducing regional and basin-wide campground capacity. However, the proposed project and other related projects would be required to implement mitigation measures that would mitigate the loss of recreation capacity to less-than-significant levels. The proposed project would implement Mitigation Measure 7.A-2 (Mitigate for Loss of 27 Camping/RV Sites), which would mitigate its associated loss in recreation capacity. Therefore, the project's contribution to a significant cumulative recreation impact would not be cumulatively considerable. (LS) (DEIR, p. 18-11.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002, CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-3 Cumulative—Increase in Use of Parks and Other Recreational Facilities. The cumulative addition of new TAUs and affordable/employee housing units in the Tahoe Vista area would result in an incremental increase in the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed project and related projects would be required to construct on-site recreation facilities (and provide additional park fees to Placer County to offset any on-site shortfall), pay Placer County Park fees ($2,640 per unit (including affordable housing units and TAUs)), and pay annual Measure C parcel taxes. Through implementation of these measures, the project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 18-11 to 18-12.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002, CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-4 Cumulative—Potential Change in Surface Water Runoff, Groundwater and Water Quality in the Tahoe Basin. Slope and soil disturbance associated with construction of the proposed project and related projects could cause soil erosion and sedimentation or the release of other pollutants to adjacent waterways and wetlands. Excavation during construction of related projects could intercept the groundwater table, creating the potential for introduction of contaminants to groundwater. Operation of the proposed project and related projects could result in an increase of urban contaminants in surface runoff. However, the proposed project and all related projects would be required to	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002, CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
implement water quality protection measures and BMPs (as discussed in Chapter 8, "Hydrology and Water Quality") that reduce project-related effects on water quality to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, there would be no cumulative impact on water quality. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 18-12 to 18-13.)			
18-5 **Cumulative—Increased Risks of Geologic Hazards.** Because of the physical separation between the proposed project and related projects, the minor topographic alteration, and the low likelihood of geologic instability, the project would neither be affected by, nor would it affect, other planned or proposed development in the project vicinity. Consequently, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (LS) (DEIR, p. 18-13.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-6 **Cumulative—Increased Light and Glare.** The proposed project and related projects would introduce new sources of lighting to the immediate neighborhood and region, contributing to the skyglow produced by development around the north shore of Lake Tahoe. Given that the proposed project and related projects would adhere to the TRPA Design Review Guidelines and Placer County Design Review Guidelines (see Mitigation Measures 10.A-5a and 10.A-5b) that address light and glare, the project's contribution to increased light and glare would not be cumulatively considerable. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 18-13 to 18-14.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-7 **Cumulative—Impacts on Undiscovered Cultural Resources.** Implementation of the proposed project and related projects could potentially uncover previously unknown prehistoric or historic resources. Depending upon how such resources are classified according to California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), TRPA, or CEQA criteria, identification of cultural resources during construction could be considered a significant cumulative impact. However, mitigation measures described in Chapter 11, "Cultural Resources," would mitigate the project's potential impacts on cultural resources to a less-than-significant level. Consequently, the project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable, and there would be no cumulative impact on undiscovered cultural resources. (LS) (DEIR, p. 18-14.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-8 **Cumulative—Impacts on Undiscovered Burials.** Implementation of the proposed project and related projects could potentially uncover unmarked previously unknown graves during ground-disturbing activities. If previously undiscovered human remains are disturbed during construction, this could be considered a significant cumulative impact. However, mitigation measures described in Chapter 11, "Cultural Resources," would mitigate the project's potential impacts on previously undiscovered human remains to a less-than-significant level and would ensure that the project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 18-14 to 18-15.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-9 **Cumulative—Loss of Common Habitat (Vegetation and Tree Removal).** Cumulative loss of Sierran mixed conifer forest resulting from significant vegetation and tree removal is a potentially significant impact of the proposed project and related projects.	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

C82

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
based on TRPA, Placer County and California Department of Fire Protection and Forestry (CDF) criteria. However, implementation of the mitigation measures described in Chapter 12, "Vegetation and Wildlife," would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on habitat loss to a less-than-significant level through tree and vegetation replacement and management. (LS) (DEIR, p. 18-15.)			
18-10 Cumulative—Impacts to Nesting Birds and Bats. Cumulative loss of potential nesting and roosting sites is a potential cumulative impact from the proposed project and related projects. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Chapter 12, "Vegetation and Wildlife," would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on wildlife to a less-than-significant level. (LS) (DEIR, p. 18-16.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-11 Cumulative—Emergency Access During Construction. Construction activities could temporarily interfere with the ability of the Placer County Sheriff's Department and the North Tahoe Fire Protection District to provide emergency access to the immediate surrounding area. If construction of related projects were to coincide with the proposed project construction, they could combine to result in temporary cumulative impacts related to emergency response. However, preparation and approval of emergency access plans (Mitigation Measure 13 A-7) would reduce the project's contribution, resulting in no cumulatively considerable impacts. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 18-16 to 18-17.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-12 Cumulative—Provision of Public Services and Utilities. Neither the proposed project nor related projects are expected to interrupt provision of non-emergency services and utilities during construction or during operations. All utility and public service providers, including those providing emergency services, would be expected to meet the additional demand for utilities and public services for these projects; therefore, the proposed project and related projects would not result in a cumulative impact to public services and utilities. As such, the project would not have a cumulatively considerable effect. (LS) (DEIR, p. 18-17.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-13 Cumulative—Increased Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT). The proposed project would generate approximately 299 and 522 net new daily trips in the North Lake Tahoe area during the peak summer months and winter months, respectively. This increase, as well as increases in VMT associated with related projects, is considered a potential cumulative impact. However, the proposed project would implement Mitigation Measures 14 A-1a (Contribute to TRPA Air Quality Mitigation Fund to Reduce VMT) and 14 A-1b (Contribute to Placer County Road Network Traffic Limitation Zone and Traffic Fee Program), and related projects would be required to implement similar mitigation to reduce cumulative VMT impacts. Therefore, the proposed project and related projects would not result in a cumulative VMT impact, and the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on VMT. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 18-17 to 18-18.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-14 Cumulative—Level of Service. The proposed project would add a significant number of new trips to	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
adjacent roadways during summer months. However, all of the study intersections are anticipated to operate at acceptable levels of service overall under cumulative no project and cumulative plus project conditions. Therefore, the project would not have a cumulatively considerable impact on level of service. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 18-18 to 18-23.)			Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-15 Cumulative—Parking Supply. The proposed project would provide on-site parking that exceeds Placer County Code requirements. Therefore, the project would not have a cumulatively considerable impact on parking supply. (LS) (DEIR, p. 18-24.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-16 Cumulative—Construction Traffic. The proposed project would temporarily add construction traffic on SR 28 during the construction period; however, all of the study intersections would be expected to operate at acceptable levels of service with the addition of project-related construction traffic. Because the proposed project and related projects are required to manage construction impacts (including staging, construction vehicle ingress/egress, and emergency access) through preparation and implementation of a construction traffic management plan, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable impact on traffic during construction, and no cumulative impact on traffic during construction would occur. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 18-24 to 18-25.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-17 Cumulative—Short-Term Construction Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10}. Unmitigated, reactive organic gases (ROG) and NO_x emissions (the combined emissions of nitric oxide and nitrogen dioxide) from construction of the proposed project and related projects would exceed the PCAPCD significance threshold of 82 lbs/day; therefore, construction-generated criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions could violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, especially considering the nonattainment status of the Lake Tahoe Air Basin (LTAB) with respect to the TRPA standards. However, the proposed project would implement Mitigation Measure 15.A-1 to reduce construction-generated emissions of ROG, NO_x, and respirable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less (PM_{10}). It is, therefore, anticipated that the proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative air impacts. (LS) (DEIR, p. 18-25.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-18 Cumulative—Increases in Regional Emissions of ROG, NO_x, or PM_{10}. The total of stationary, area, and mobile vehicle source emissions associated with the long-term operation of the proposed project would not exceed the PCAPCD's project-level significance threshold of 82 lbs/day. In addition, emissions from stationary sources associated with the project would not exceed the TRPA thresholds for stationary sources. However, PCAPCD maintains a 10 lbs/day cumulative threshold for ROG and NO_x, and the project would exceed the NO_x threshold. The proposed project would implement Mitigation Measure 15.A-2, which includes a	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

L88

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
contribution to TRPA's Air Quality Mitigation Fund When taken in conjunction with other related projects throughout the region, the proposed project's emissions would not be substantial, and would not affect TRPA's attainment designations. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable impact on regional air emissions, and no cumulative impacts would result. (LS) (DEIR, p. 18-26.)			
18-19 Cumulative—Local Mobile Source Carbon Monoxide Emissions. The proposed project and related projects are not anticipated to result in or contribute to CO concentrations that exceed the California 1-hour CO ambient air quality standard of 20 ppm or the TRPA 8-hour CO ambient air quality standard of 6 ppm. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable impact on CO concentrations and no cumulative impacts are expected as a result of the proposed project and related projects. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 18-26 to 18-27.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-20 Cumulative—Generation of Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions. Because the project would not be a source of toxic air contaminants (TACs), and there are no sources of TACs near the proposed project site, implementation of the proposed project and related projects would not combine to expose sensitive receptors to concentrations of TACs that exceed recommended thresholds. (LS) (DEIR, p. 18-27.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-21 Cumulative—Short-Term Construction-Generated Noise Levels. Construction of the proposed project and project alternatives could result in noise levels in excess of local standards. Construction of related cumulative projects could also result in the exceedance of local noise standards. However, construction noise occurring during daytime hours is exempt from applicable standards, provided that construction equipment is properly fitted with feasible noise control devices. Because the project would adhere to the requirements of the exemption for construction noise, the project would not contribute to a substantial increase in noise levels and would not have a cumulatively considerable impact. In addition, noise is a localized occurrence and attenuates with distance. Therefore, only cumulative development projects in the direct vicinity of the project site would have the potential to add anticipated project-generated noise. Because the proposed project and other nearby projects would be required to implement measures to reduce construction noise and because construction schedules may or may not overlap and this would be a less-than-significant cumulative impact. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 18-27 to 18-28.)	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-22 Cumulative—Off-site Construction Traffic Noise Levels. Project construction and related project construction would result in a short-term increase in traffic noise levels at sensitive receptors along the local area network. However, heavy trucks accessing the proposed project would be restricted to daytime hours as mitigation. Construction schedules of related projects may or may not overlap with those of the proposed project, but it is anticipated that construction traffic for related projects would also be restricted to daytime hours. Thus, noise generated by construction-related	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Environmental Impact (Significance Before Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Findings of Fact
trips for the proposed project is not cumulatively considerable and noise generated by construction-related trips for the proposed project and related projects is considered to be a less-than-significant cumulative impact. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 18-28 to 18-29.)			
18-23 Cumulative—Increases in Stationary- and Area-Source Noise. The proposed project would include two new stationary on-site noise sources: HVAC equipment and trash collection activities. Nearby land uses do not include stationary and area sources that would generate a substantial amount of operational noise. However, the Lake Tahoe region is currently in nonattainment for community noise equivalent levels. The proposed project shall implement Mitigation Measure 18 A-3, which would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative area-source noise to a less-than-significant level. (LS) (DEIR, p. 18-29.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-24 Cumulative—Off-site Operational Traffic Noise Levels. Traffic generated by the proposed project, in combination with other planned projects and projected growth, would not result in a perceptible increase in ambient noise levels on nearby local roadways or highways. (LS) (DEIR, pp. 18-29 to 18-30.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-25 Cumulative—Hazardous Materials. The activities of demolition, construction, and transportation of hazardous materials associated with the proposed project and related residential, tourist accommodation, and commercial projects are subject to the applicable governmental safety regulations thereby reducing the cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials to a less-than-significant impact. (LS) (DEIR, p. 18-31.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
18-26 Cumulative—Increased Mosquito-borne Illness and Wildland Fire Hazards Risks. Project development would not result in increased risk of health hazards from vector-borne diseases or mosquito abatement techniques nor would it result in increased exposure of people or structures to significant risk of loss or injury involving wildland fires. For these reasons, the proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to increased risks in these areas. (LS) (DEIR, p. 18-32.)	No mitigation is required	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

(00044200.DOC, 1)

Less than Significant = LS Beneficial = B Significant = S Cumulative Significant = CS Significant and Unavoidable = SU Potentially Significant = PS