

Before the Board of Supervisors
County of Placer, State of California

**In the matter of: A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING
THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT,
AND ADOPTING CEQA FINDINGS AND A STATEMENT
OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS AND A
MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM REGARDING
THE HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA
MASTER PLAN PROJECT**

Reso. No. _____

The following resolution was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held November 15, 2011, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

Attest:

Board of Supervisors

Ann Holman
Clerk of said Board

Robert Weygandt, Chair

This Statement of Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations is made with respect to the "Project Approvals" (as defined below) for the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan Project (the "Project") and states the findings of the Board of Supervisors (the "Board") of the County of Placer (the "County") relating to the environmental impacts of the Project to be developed in accordance with the Project Approvals.

WHEREAS, the Homewood Village Resorts, LLC, ("Applicant") has requested the Board take the following requested actions related to the Project, which are referred to collectively as the "Project Approvals":

1. Adoption of amendments to the West Shore Area General Plan;
2. Approval of a Development Agreement;

3. Approval of a conditional use permit and planned residential use permit;
4. Approval of subdivision map; and

WHEREAS, the Project Approvals constitute the "Project" for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"--Public Resources Code sections 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA") and CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15378 and these determinations of the Board, and

WHEREAS, notices of preparation for the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan Project environmental impact report were prepared by the County and sent to the State Clearinghouse on September 2, 2008 (SCH No. 2008092008), and

WHEREAS, in due course, a draft environmental impact report ("DEIR") was prepared under the direction of the County and was made available for public review and comment in accordance with CEQA from January 21, 2011, through April 21, 2011, and the County received comments, in response to which the County prepared and released a Final EIR on October 3, 2011, (the "FEIR"), and

WHEREAS, the Board gave full and legal notice of a public hearing to consider and act upon the Project Approvals and the FEIR, which was held on November 15, 2011, and

WHEREAS, the Board duly considered the FEIR for the Project Approvals, the addendices thereto, the comments of the public, both oral and written, and all written materials in the record connected therewith, and is fully informed thereon,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF PLACER:

(1) The FEIR has been prepared in accordance with all requirements of CEQA and the Guidelines.

(2) The FEIR was presented to and reviewed by the Board. The FEIR was prepared under supervision by the County and reflects the independent judgment of the County. The Board has reviewed the FEIR, and bases its findings on such review and other substantial evidence in the record.

(3) The Board hereby certifies the FEIR as complete, adequate and in full compliance with CEQA as a basis for considering and acting upon the Project Approvals and, exercising its independent judgment, makes the specific findings with respect thereto as set forth in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

(4) All mitigation measures proposed in the FEIR shall be implemented, and the Mitigation and Monitoring Program ("MMP") in the FEIR is adopted, and will implement all mitigation measures adopted with respect to the Project pursuant to all of the Project Approvals. The MMP has been incorporated into the Specific Plan and has thus become part of and limitations upon the entitlements conferred by the Project Approvals.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That notwithstanding the imposition of the mitigation measures in the MMP as set forth above, significant impacts of the Project have not been reduced to a level of insignificance or eliminated by changes in the proposed Project. The Board of Supervisors finds that the project will bring substantial benefits to the County and that the Project's benefits outweigh the Project's significant unmitigated adverse impacts and pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15093 adopts and makes the Statement of Overriding Considerations as set forth in Section X of Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, to explain why the Project's benefits override its unavoidable impacts. Having carefully considered the Project, its impacts and the foregoing benefits, the Board of Supervisors finds, in light of the important social, economic and other benefits that the Project will bring, the adverse environmental impacts of the Project that are not fully mitigated are acceptable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Planning Department is directed to file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk within five (5) working days in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21152(a) and CEQA Guidelines section 15094.

EXHIBIT A

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

and

**STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
OF THE PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

for the

**HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

November 15, 2011

INTRODUCTION

On October 3, 2011, a joint document serving as the final environmental impact report (EIR) prepared on behalf of Placer County (County) and the final environmental impact statement (EIS) prepared on behalf of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) was released for public review. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, County, acting through its Board of Supervisors, adopts the following findings for the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan (the Project) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq.).

This document is organized as follows:

Section I provides an introduction to these findings.

Section II provides a description of the Project proposed for adoption, the environmental review process for the Project, the approval actions to be taken and the location of records;

Section III describes the environmental review process for the Project, including public scoping and review of the Project.

Section IV identifies the Record of Proceedings for this matter, including the administrative record upon which the County's approval of the Project is based.

Section V provides general guidance regarding the County's adoption of these findings.

Section VI provides the County's findings with respect to the Project's potentially significant impacts. Attachment "A" to these findings is a table setting forth each mitigation measure adopted by the County in connection with its approval of the Project. Attachment A includes the full text of each mitigation measure adopted by the County. The mitigation measures that are identified as adopted in Attachment A are hereby adopted by the County. Section VI also addresses mitigation measures and project modifications proposed by commenters, and the County's findings with respect to these proposals.

Section VII adopts and incorporates the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the mitigation measures that have been proposed for adoption. A copy of the MMRP is attached as Chapter 21 to the Final EIR/EIS. In adopting these findings, the County hereby adopts and commits to implement the MMRP. The measures set forth in the MMRP represent binding commitments with which the project applicant must comply.

Section VIII sets forth the County's findings with respect to recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS. These findings are adopted pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5.

Section IX sets forth the County's findings with respect to alternatives to the Proposed Project. These findings are adopted pursuant to Public Resources Code sections 21002 and 21081, subdivision (a)(3).

Section X sets forth the County's "statement of overriding considerations" concerning the Project. These findings are adopted pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (b).

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 EIR/EIS. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations by the Placer County Board of Supervisors (Board of Supervisors) 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 EIR/EIS and Final EIR/EIS in support of various conclusions reached below, the Board of Supervisors 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 County's approval of the mitigation measures recommended in the Final EIR/EIS, and the reasoning set forth in responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. The County 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 the County 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.

Like the EIR/EIS 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.

These Findings, along with the Statement of Overriding Considerations set forth in Section X, the table of findings set forth in Attachment A, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") set forth at chapter 21 to the Final EIR/EIS, are made with respect to the Project Approvals for the Project and state the findings of the Board of Supervisors relating to the potentially significant environmental effects of the Project in accordance with the Project Approvals. The following Findings, along with the Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program are hereby adopted by the Board of Supervisors as required by the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Sections 21002, 21081, 21081.5 and 21081.6, and CEQA Guidelines sections 15091 through 15093.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The HMR Ski Area Master Plan is a mixed-use project developed under the TRPA Community Enhancement Program (CEP) guidelines adopted in August 2007. Placer County as the lead agency under CEQA, jointly prepared an EIR/EIS for the project with TRPA. In its entirety, the documents consist of the January 2011 Draft EIR/EIS and the October 2011 Final EIR/EIS (State Clearinghouse No. 2008092008). The EIR/EIS prepared for the Project is both a program and project EIR. The EIR/EIS addresses the environmental impacts associated with adoption of the Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) Ski Area Master Plan (Project) covering approximately 1,253 acres within the County.

The Project proposes to develop and upgrade mixed-uses at the existing North Base project area, residential uses at the exiting South Base project area, a lodge at the Mid-Mountain Base area, and support facilities within HMR Ski Area Master Plan Area. These findings have been prepared to comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act and the CEQA Guidelines.

See Chapter 3, Proposed Project and Alternatives, of the Final EIR/EIS for a complete and detailed description of the Project. This includes figures, diagrams, and tables illustrating and describing the proposed Project. (Final EIR/EIS, pp. 3-1 - 3-54.) The following text describes briefly the Project.

A. Project Location

The approximately 1,253-acre HMR Ski Area Master Plan Area, the Project area, lies on the western shore of the Lake Tahoe Basin of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, approximately six miles south of Tahoe City in Placer County, California. The Project area is bound by State Route (SR) 89 and Lake Tahoe to

the east, Ellis Peak to the southwest, and Blackwood Ridge to the north. Access to the Project area is via SR 89 (West Lake Boulevard), from either Interstate 80 (I-80) from the north or U.S. Highway 50 (US 50) from the south. The Project area includes twenty (20) contiguous parcels of varying sizes. The Project area is characterized as a “mountain,” and the topography has a wide-range of values. The portions of the Project area proposed for development range from reasonably flat (1 to 10%) up to 30% slopes. Special features onsite include Watersheds (Homewood Mountain contains a portion of three watersheds and one intervening area), Lakes (Quail Lake and more than half of Lake Louis), and Mixed-Conifer forests. (Final EIR/EIS, pp. 3-1 - 3-8.)

B. Project Overview

The project as originally proposed was described in the HMR Ski Area Master Plan dated October 2010, as a conceptual plan to redevelop a mixed-use base area in the north Project area, a residential base area in the south, and a Mid-Mountain lodge and beginner ski area. The original proposed project was identified in the Draft EIR/EIS as “Alternative 1.” Following the circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS and community meetings on the project, HMR proposed modifications to Alternative 1 based on input from neighbors at the north and south base areas. The purpose of the project revisions was to address community concerns regarding the Project. The revised project is identified as “Alternative 1A” in the Final EIR/EIS. Section 3.5 of the Final EIR/EIS describes Alternative 1A. HMR has requested approval of Alternative 1A. Alternative 1A thus represents the project approved by the County pursuant to these findings. When these findings use the term “Project”, that term refers to Alternative 1A.

The Project area, existing zoning, existing facilities, and proposed redevelopment is shown on Figures 3-1 through 3-10 of the EIR/EIS. Alternative 1A proposed several changes to address community concerns regarding the project. In summary, at the north base area, the proposed parking structure (Building P) was moved from the existing gravel parking lot location in Alternative 1 to the SR 89 frontage just north of Fawn Street. The proposed commercial and residential building (Building C) proposed for the Alternative 1A parking structure location would be moved to the existing gravel parking lot and will only include residential condominiums and some associated surface parking spaces. The modifications do not change the number of proposed multi-family residential or tourist accommodation units, nor the amount of proposed commercial floor area, as compared to Alternative 1. The total parking provided onsite is increased by 9 spaces. (Final EIR/EIS, p. 3-16; Figure 3-8A of the EIR/EIS documents the proposed changes included in Alternative 1A.)

The south base modifications include the elimination of two of the three large multi-family residential condo buildings at the south base area (the most northerly and most southerly two buildings). These two buildings will be replaced with 24 smaller chalet buildings each containing two condo units and their associated parking in first floor garages. Total number of multi-family residential units would be reduced from 99 in Alternative 1 to 95 in Alternative 1A (48 in chalets and up to 47 in the remaining multi-family residential condo building). (Final EIR/EIS, p. 3-16; Figure 3-9A documents the proposed changes included in Alternative 1A.)

a. Removal of Existing Structures

The initial step of the Project development would be to remove existing structures and ski area facilities. At the North Base area, the Proposed Project will remove four existing ski lifts (including beginner lifts and the base of the Madden Ski Lift) and associated pads, footings and utilities; buildings and concrete foundations; storm drain structures; asphalt parking surfaces; overhead transmission lines; and a pumphouse. (Final EIR/EIS, p. 3-16; buildings and facilities at the North Base area to be removed are shown in Figure 3-5 of the EIR/EIS.)

At the South Base area, the Proposed Project will remove one existing ski lift (the beginner surface lift)

and associated pads, footings and utilities; buildings and concrete footings; asphalt parking surfaces; and overhead transmission lines. (Final EIR/EIS, p. 3-16; structures and facilities at the South Base area to be removed are shown in Figure 3-6 of the EIR/EIS.)

b. North Base Area

The approximately 17-acre North Base area will include six new mixed-use structures and eight new townhouse structures to provide up to:

- 56 residential condominiums (multi-family residential units with up to 20 potentially as fractional ownership) (TAUs with 10% or more units with kitchens);
- 16 townhouses (multi-family residential units);
- ;
- A resort lodge with:
- 75 traditional hotel rooms (TAUs with less than 10% of units with kitchens),
- 40 two-bedroom for sale condominium/hotel units (up to 20 of which could have one-room lock-offs, which means the units could be used as two rentals instead of one for a total of 60 TAUs with 10% or more units with kitchens), and
- 30 penthouse condominium units (TAUs with 10% or more units with kitchens located on the upper floors of the hotel);
- 25,000 square feet of commercial floor space (a portion of which may be provided at the Mid-Mountain lodge);
- 13 employee/workforce housing units (multi-family residential bonus units);
- A 272-space day skier parking structure on four levels (one level partially below grade, 3 above grade); and
- 30,000 square feet of skier services to provide food and beverage service, adult and children's ski school services, rental shop, locker facilities, restrooms, first aid, and mountain administration and operations offices.

Under the Proposed Project, day-skier access and ski resort amenities and services will be relocated to the North Base in Buildings A and B (Figures 3-7 and 3-8 of the EIR/EIS). The Proposed Project (Alternative 1A) provides 738 parking spaces, including 272 day use parking spaces in a four-level parking structure in Building P (located at SR 89 north of Fawn Street), 56 limited surface parking spaces in two locations adjacent to Buildings A and C, and 410 underground valet parking spaces. The commercial/retail areas are designed to be accessible from the adjacent residential neighborhood, employee/workforce housing, and the day-skier parking structure.

The up to 75-room boutique-style hotel (Building B, Figure 3-7 of the EIR/EIS) will feature resort amenities that are expected to include full service restaurant, spa and fitness facility. Hotel rooms will be combined with up to 40 two-bedroom, two-bath condominium/hotel units and up to 30 individually owned penthouse condominium units (top floor of Building B). The condominium/hotel units and penthouse condominium units will be individually owned and owners will be offered full hotel services.

The 56 residential condominiums, 20 of which may be fractional ownership units, will be spread between north base residential buildings (Buildings B, C, D and E, Figure 3-7 of the EIR/EIS). Alternative 1A locates Building C within the existing gravel parking area south of Fawn Street and across from existing single-family homes along Sacramento Avenue. The commercial floor area included in Building C under Alternative 1 will be included on the southwest and northwest side of the parking structure (Building P) under Alternative 1A, to remain adjacent to the proposed pedestrian plaza. Some of these units will be located in buildings with village retail space on the ground floor. Thirteen employee/workforce housing apartments the majority of which will have up to four bedrooms each, will be located adjacent to the above ground parking structure accessed from Fawn Street to the south of the hotel and condominium

units in Building P.

Vehicle access to 16 townhouses in eight buildings in the North Base area would be via an approximately 1,500 foot long extension of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way from the South Base area. Per Placer County requirements, a secondary access road is required to be constructed to serve these townhomes due to the length of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way extension, as dead end roads must not be more than 1,320 feet long for parcels 1-5 acres in size or 2,640 feet long for parcels 5-20 acres in size. The secondary access will for emergency use only and gated and will utilize the South Street easement located between Sacramento Avenue and the extension of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way. The North Base townhomes are a Phase 2 project component that will be analyzed at a project level for Placer County CEQA and TRPA purposes prior to its eventual permitting.

(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 3-18 to 3-19.)

c. South Base Area

Under the Proposed Project Alternative 1A, the South Base area will be converted to a neighborhood residential area, with day-skier access and skier amenities re-located to the North Base area. The approximately six-acre South Base area will include up to 24 Chalet buildings, each containing two multi-family residential units for a total of 48 units. Nine of the Chalets would be located to the south of the Homewood Creek and 15 of the Chalets would be located north of the creek (units B1 to B15). The northern most Chalets would be located farther up the hillside from Tahoe Ski Bowl Way providing for greater separation from existing single-family homes. Up to 47 additional multi-family residential condominiums would be provided in the three story central lodge, Building A, for a total of up to 95 residential units under Alternative 1A.

Under Alternative 1A, up to 49 spaces would be provided underground below Building A, along with two-car garages for each multi-family residential unit located in the Chalets, totaling 145 parking spaces. During peak seasons, the area will include a small snack bar and skier support in the central lodge residential building. The South Base area will include access to 16 new townhouses located slightly above the North Base area off of an extension of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way. At its crossing of Homewood Creek adjacent to the existing base lodge, Tahoe Ski Bowl Way will be realigned slightly to the east and the existing culvert will be removed and replaced with a bridge span. In order to relocate the roadway, HMR must comply with Placer County Procedures for Abandonment of County Easements and Public Resources Code section 4290. County requirements for the realigned segment of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way include a 40-foot minimum width and a turnaround (Plate U-22.1 or U-22.2) with public road easement dedication at the end of the Tahoe Ski Bowl Way public road easement (just north of the proposed South Base area buildings). The existing maintenance facility and surface parking areas will be removed from the South Base area. (Final EIR/EIS, pp. 3-19.)

d. Mid-Mountain Area

The Mid-Mountain area will include:

- A 15,000 square feet day-use lodge with a detached gondola terminal linked to the lodge by a covered passage;
- A learn-to-ski lift;
- A food & beverage facility with indoor & outdoor dining (part of day lodge);
- A small sundry outlet (part of day lodge);
- An outdoor swimming facility for use during the summer months by West Shore residents (adjacent to day lodge);
- A snow-based vehicle (e.g., grooming equipment) maintenance facility; and
- Two water storage tanks located up hill from the day-use lodge.

The Mid-Mountain lodge, as shown in Figure 3-10 of the Final EIR/EIS, will replace the white tent structure and the concrete foundation located at the Mid-Mountain near the top of the Madden ski lift. As part of the Proposed Project, the composting toilet/restroom will be removed and replaced with connection to the public sewer system. The learn-to-ski lift will be located north of the proposed lodge on gently sloping terrain. The snow-based vehicle shop/maintenance facility (i.e., no rubber-tired vehicles) will be relocated from the South Base area to the Mid-Mountain area in an 8,000 square feet facility directly behind the gondola terminal. Two 250,000-gallon water storage tanks will be constructed at Mid-Mountain area on the slope above the vehicle shop/maintenance facility to serve the entire Homewood Mountain Resort project area.

Mid-mountain lodge will include accessory uses: 1) Office of Emergency Services (OES) communication room, repeater antennas and emergency generator room; 2) An emergency cache room (fire fighting equipment) for North Tahoe Fire Protection District (NTFPD) and; 3) possibly Homewood ski patrol office. NTFPD will work with HMR to determine the size and equipment requirements for the cache room, including the maintenance of any equipment proposed to be located in the room.

(Final EIR/EIS, p. 3-29.)

e. Master Plan Phasing

HMR anticipates a ten (10) year time frame for the build out of the Ski Area Master Plan. The following outlines the anticipated development phasing.

Phase 1 – North Base area - Implementation in years 1 through 5:

1a. Mid Mountain Day Lodge and accessory structures (two 250,000-gallon water tanks and Gondola terminal), Mid Mountain Learn to Ski Lift, Mid Mountain Maintenance Facility, Gondola, North Base Amphitheater, North Base Hotel/Lodge (Building B), North Base Day Skier Services Building and Residential Units (Building A), North Base Commercial and Residential Units (Building C) and Landscape/Ice Pond Area, North Base Employee/Workforce Housing and Day Skier Parking Structure (Building P), TCPUD bike trail extension, and LEED Commissioning;

1b. North Base Residential Building Adjacent to Highway 89 (Building D); and

1c. North Base Residential Building Adjacent to Highway 89 (Building E).

A Phase 1 construction staging and parking plan will be prepared at the beginning of Master Plan implementation. HMR plans to shut down the entire North Base area for Phase 1 construction and utilize the existing parking areas according to a detailed construction logistics plan. The selected general contractor would be required to put such a logistics plan together as one of their first tasks. The focus of the first phase 1a would be the hotel, day skier facility, and parking/workforce housing structure, which would leave the existing paved parking area fronting SR 89 open and available for staging of materials and construction parking. During Phase 1a construction, winter ski operations would continue to operate out of the South Base area.

Phase 2 – South Base – Implementation in years 6 through 10:

2a. Culvert Removal, Tahoe Ski Bowl Way road realignment and SEZ Restoration; South Base Residential Buildings A and A1 (southern buildings) (under Alternative 1A, Building A1 is replaced with Chalets A1-1 to A1-9);

2b. South Base Residential Building B (northern building) (under Alternative 1A, Building B is

replaced with Chalets B1 to B15); and

2c. Tahoe Ski Bowl Way roadway extension and Townhouses (located above North Base area, but accessed from the South Base area). Additional project-level environmental review is required prior to acquiring project entitlements to complete this phase.

(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 3-53 to 3-54.)

C. Amendments to Placer County Plan Area Statements; Amendments to TRPA Ordinances, Goals and Policies, and Plan Areas Statements; Amendments to North Tahoe Fire Protection District Boundary (NTFPD)

The Project requires the following amendments to TRPA and County Ordinances, Goals and policies.

Amendments to Placer County Plan Area Statement Boundary Lines

Figure 3-13 of the EIR/EIS shows the location of the proposed PAS boundary amendments required for the Proposed Project (Alternative 1). The proposed boundary line amendments include:

PAS 158 – McKinney Tract Residential – Adjust Placer County PAS 158 boundary (shown in yellow) to include entirety of South Base area currently located in PAS 157 (yellow hatching area within black dashed line). Create a “Special Area” for the expanded portion of PAS 158.

PAS 159 – Homewood Commercial – Adjust Placer County PAS 159 boundary to include the entirety of the North Base area currently located in PAS 157.

Amendments to Placer County Plan Area Statement Allowable Uses

A copy of the proposed amendments to PAS 157, 158 and 159 (shown in revision mode) is included in Appendix E of the EIR/EIS and summarized as follows:

PAS 157 – Homewood Tahoe Ski Bowl Recreation - Add Personal Services (S) and Participant Sports Facility (S) as permissible uses.

PAS 157 – Homewood Tahoe Ski Bowl Recreation - Add TDR Receiving Area for Existing Development (commercial) to newly created Special Area 1 (that includes the Mid Mountain Lodge).

PAS 157 – Homewood Tahoe Ski Bowl Recreation – Modify Special Policy 6 to allow commercial at the mid mountain lodge.

PAS 157 – Homewood Tahoe Ski Bowl Recreation – Modify Special Policy 8 to allow commercial uses pursuant to a Ski Area Master Plan.

PAS 158 – McKinney Tract Residential - Add Multi-Family Dwellings (S) and Skiing Facilities (A) as permissible uses to the newly created “Special Area 1” shown on Figure 3-13 of the EIR/EIS (yellow hatching).

PAS 158 - McKinney Tract Residential - Add TDR Receiving Area for 1) Existing Development, and 2) Multi-Residential Units to the newly created “Special Area 1” shown on Figure 3-13 of the EIR/EIS (yellow hatching).

PAS 158 - McKinney Tract Residential - Add Multiple Family Dwellings (Special Area 1 only) to

Maximum Densities with a Maximum Density of 15 units per acre.

PAS 159 – Homewood Commercial - Add Multi-Family Dwellings (S) and Privately Owned Assembly and Entertainment (S) as permissible uses to the newly created “Special Area 1” shown on Figure 3-13 of the EIR/EIS (purple hatching).

PAS 159 – Homewood Commercial - Add TDR Receiving Area for Multi-Residential Units (to Special Area 1 only).

PAS 159 – Homewood Commercial - Increase Multiple Family Dwellings (Special Area 1 only) and Employee Housing Maximum Densities to 15 units per acre (from a current Maximum Density of 8 units per acre).

Amendments to TRPA Code of Ordinance/Plan Area Statement/Goals and Policies Amendments,

Required amendments to the TRPA Code of Ordinance, Plan Area Statement, Goals and Policies are described in the EIR/EIS. (See pp. 3-48 through 3-53.)

Amendments to North Tahoe Fire Protection District Boundary (NTFPD)

Amend NTFPD service boundary to include the Mid-Mountain lodge area. This would require an amendment of the NTFPD service boundary through the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). Placer County Fire currently has wild fire jurisdiction for the undeveloped Mid-Mountain lodge area.

D. Project Objectives

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

- Construct onsite residential and tourist accommodation units to support increased HMR skier visits during mid week operations;
- Optimize the quality of the existing winter ski experience and improve the year-round use of the site while responding to changes in technology, market trends and user preferences;
- Maintain consistency with the scale and character of Homewood, California;
- Enhance the lifestyle and property values of West Shore residents; and
- Generate sufficient revenues to support the proposed environmental and fire safety improvements and ensure the continued viability of the ski operations.

(EIR/EIS, pp. 3-8 to 3-9.)

E. Combined Program and Project-Level Analysis

The EIR provides a project-level analysis for:

- Amendments to TRPA Plan Area Statements, Code of Ordinance and Goals and Policies;
- Amendments to County Plan Area Statements;
- Mid-mountain Day Lodge and Accessory Structures (e.g., Gondola Terminal);
- Mid-Mountain Maintenance/Water Tanks; Gondola; North Base Hotel/Lodge (Building B);
- North Base Day Skier Services Building and Residential Units (Building A);
- Alternative Transportation Program (e.g., Summer Water Taxi, Shuttles, Dial-A-Ride);
- Extension of TCPUD Bike Trail through North Base Area; Amphitheater;
- North Base Commercial and Residential Units Building C (Commercial excluded under Alt 1A);

- North Base Employee/Workforce Housing and Day Skier Parking Structure (Building P) (Commercial included under Alt 1A);
- North Base Gathering/Ice Pond Area; North Base Residential Units (Building D);
- North Base Residential Units (Building E);
- Demolition of South Base Maintenance Facility; South Base Residential Units (Building A);
- South Base Residential Units (Chalets A1-1 to A1-9 and B1 to B15 under Alternative 1A); and
- South Base Culvert Removal/SEZ Restoration.

(See Table 3-4 of Final EIR/EIS, p. 3-17.)

The EIR also provides a program-level analysis of the construction of facilities that are part of the proposed Project, but for which specific plans and designs have not yet been prepared:

- Extension of Cross-Country Ski Trails at South Base Area;
- Mid-Mountain Learn to Ski Lift and Ellis Chair Lift Replacement;
- Snowmaking Expansion including Accessory Buildings (e.g., pump houses);
- On Mountain Road Abandonment and Restoration (e.g., restoration sites with potential use of project generated fill material);
- South Base Tahoe Ski Bowl Way Extension to North Base Townhouses; and
- North Base Townhouses

(See Table 3-4 of Final EIR/EIS, p. 3-17.) Specific plans and designs for these facilities will not be prepared until after the Proposed Ski Area Master Plan is approved and a final Alternative is selected.

CEQA Guidelines section 15161 defines a project EIR as “focusing primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from project development.” As stated in Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines, a project specific EIR is required to “examine all phases of the project including planning, construction, and operation.” A project-specific analysis has been prepared for plans and facilities where sufficient information is available to allow a project-level analysis of impacts.

While the Final EIR/EIS identifies the all the plans and facilities that would be included in the proposed project, it does not provide project-specific analysis of those that are analyzed at a programmatic level. Instead, a project area boundary is provided identifying the general location of these facilities. For example, Alternative 1A includes 16 townhomes located in the North Base area. These townhomes are part of phase 2 of the project. The location of these townhomes is shown (see Figure 3-8A). Impacts associated with these townhomes has been included in the analysis of project impacts (e.g., traffic, utilities, etc.). At the time the applicant proposes to construct these townhomes as part of phase 2, project-level analysis will be performed to ensure the impacts of the townhomes are consistent with the analysis in the EIR/EIS, and applicable mitigation measures are incorporated.

As defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, a program EIR is an EIR which may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either:

1. Geographically;
2. As logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions;
3. In connection with rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program; or
4. As individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in several different ways.

A Program EIR is a type of EIR that allows a public agency to consider broad policy alternatives and

program-wide mitigation measures at the early stages of planning. The final specific plans and designs will occur within the project footprint. Thus the combined program and project elements are appropriately analyzed at a program and project level of detail. Although specific site locations and designs for some facilities are not proposed at this time (e.g. the North Base townhomes, which are part of phase 2), the ultimate development of those facilities is identified and analyzed. (See FEIR, Volume 2, pp. 2-1- 2-3.)

When HMR provides specific plans and designs within the project area, the County shall review these plans and shall determine if the impacts associated with the project-level designs are consistent with the significance conclusions of the Final EIR/EIS, after implementation of mitigation. On this basis, the County shall determine whether the specific plans and designs are within the scope of the program EIR/EIS, pursuant to the provisions of section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines, or if additional environmental review is needed. In some cases, site-specific mitigation planning may be necessary when project designs are available. The EIR evaluates these potential consequences to the extent possible and provides program-level mitigation measures and performance criteria that will be applied when specific plans are submitted.

F. Discretionary Approvals

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

- Placer County West Shore Area General Plan Amendments (e.g., add multi-family dwelling, increase residential density, expand Plan Area Statement boundaries);
- Placer County Conditional Use Permit and Planned Development Permit (e.g., alpine ski facility, employee/workforce housing, hotel, motel and other transient dwelling units, outdoor concert events, single-family dwelling/condo, timeshare development and Planned Residential Development);
- Placer County Development Agreement between the County and applicant;
- Placer County Improvement Plans for Each Project Phase and Approval;
- Placer County Encroachment Permit(s);
- Placer County Highway Easement Abandonment (Tahoe Ski Bowl Way at South Base area);
- Tentative Subdivision Map Approval; and
- Final Map Approval.

TRPA is the lead agency under the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (PL 96-551 94 Statute 3233). The Project has been proposed to achieve the goals and objectives established by TRPA in the Community Enhancement Program (CEP). TRPA adopted a resolution (No. 2008-11) in February 2008 to list minimum requirements for HMR’s continued participation as a qualified CEP project. As required by the CEP, an analysis of the project’s compliance with Resolution 2008-11 will be prepared by TRPA staff and provided to the TRPA Governing Board during review of the project application. The analysis will document measures included in the action alternatives to comply with each item in the resolution, and if necessary, will identify additional measures necessary to meet the objectives of the CEP program. In addition to certifying the Final EIR/EIS, adopting Findings and a Mitigation Monitoring Plan (TRPA requirements), TRPA itself must take the following actions in approving the Ski Area Master Plan as a CEP Project:

- TRPA Regional Plan Amendment (Plan Areas, Code of Ordinances, and Goals and Policies);
- TRPA Ski Area Master Plan Adoption; and
- TRPA Construction Permit.

64

Additional permits and approvals required from other federal, state and local agencies for the project include:

- California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Lahontan Region, NPDES permit;
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA);
- California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal-OSHA);
- Federal Emergency Management Agency;
- Clean Water Act §401 Certification;
- Clean Water Act §404 Nationwide or Individual Permit- United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps);
- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) Lake or Stream Bed Alteration Agreement (LSAA);
- Water Service District Annexation;
- TCPUD Commercial Service Permit;
- California Department of Transportation Encroachment Permit; and
- LAFCO Amendment to NTFPD Service Boundary.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

In accordance with section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the County prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR/EIS, which was published on September 2, 2008. (Appendix A of the EIR/EIS.) The NOP was distributed for a 30-day comment period concluding on October 2, 2008. The NOP was distributed to public agencies and interested individuals of the community, including residents within 1,000 feet of the Project area. Comments received on the NOP are contained in Appendix B to the EIR/EIS.

The County held agency and public scoping meetings on the proposed project on September 10, 2008, at the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission and on September 23, 2008, at the Granlibakken Resort. 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 EIR/EIS. Comments on the NOP received during the scoping meeting were considered in the preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS.

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

- Land Use;
- Population, Employment, and Housing;
- Biological Resources;
- Cultural Resources;
- Visual Resources;
- Transportation and Circulation;
- Air Quality;
- Noise;
- Soils, Geology and Seismicity;
- Hydrology, Water Rights, Surface Water Quality, and Groundwater;
- Public Services and Utilities;
- Hazardous Materials and Public Safety;
- Recreation;
- Climate Change; and
- Cumulative Impacts.

(See Draft EIR/EIS, pp. 1-2.)

The County distributed the Draft EIR/EIS to various public agencies, citizen groups, and interested

individuals for an initial 60-day public review period, from January 19 through March 21, 2011. The comment period was subsequently extended to April 21, 2011, based on requests from the reviewing public. Comments were solicited during the public comment time frame and were incorporated into the final EIR/EIS. This period satisfied the requirement for a 45-day public review period as set forth in Section 15105 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Draft EIR/EIS was circulated to state agencies for review through the State Clearinghouse of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research. Copies of the Draft EIR/EIS were available for public review during normal business hours at the County. Copies of the Draft EIR/EIS were also available for review on the County's website.

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. Three public meetings were held to solicit comments on the Draft EIR/EIS: (1) TRPA Advisory Planning Commission on February 9, 2011; (2) Placer County Planning Commission on February 17, 2011; and (3) TRPA Governing Board on Wednesday, February 23, 2011. 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. (See Final EIR/EIS, Chapter 23.)

On October 3, 2011, the County released the Final EIR/EIS for the Project. The Final EIR/EIS includes comments on the Draft EIR/EIS, responses to those comments, revisions to the text of the Draft EIR/EIS, and other information required by CEQA. The County distributed copies of the Final EIR/EIS to public agencies submitting comments on the Draft EIR/EIS, as required by Public Resources Code section 21092.5.

On October 18, 2011, the Placer County Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final EIR/EIS and the Project. After receiving and considering public comment, the Planning Commission certified the Final EIR/EIS, recommended the Board of Supervisors approve the amendments to the West Shore Area General Plan and the Development Agreement, and approved the conditional use permit/planned development permit and tentative subdivision map upon approval by the Board of Supervisors of the Plan amendments. On October 26, 2011, the County received an appeal appealing to the Board of Supervisors the certification of the Final EIR/EIS and the approvals by the Planning Commission.

On November 15, 2011, the Board of Supervisors held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final EIR/EIS, the appeal and the Project. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered, as a whole, the evidence and analysis presented in the Draft EIR/EIS, the evidence and analysis presented in the comments on the Draft EIR/EIS, the evidence and analysis presented in the Final EIR/EIS, the information submitted on the Final EIR/EIS, and the reports prepared by the experts who prepared the EIR/EIS, the County's planning consultants, and by staff, and after receiving and considering public comment, makes the findings set forth herein.

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 and TRPA in conjunction with the Project;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the NOP;
- The Draft EIR/EIS for the Project (January 2011) and all appendices;

- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the Draft EIR/EIS;
- The Final EIR/EIS for the Project, including comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS, and responses to those comments and appendices (September 2011);
- Documents cited or referenced in the Draft EIR/EIS and Final EIR/EIS;
- The mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the Project;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors 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 TPRA as well as 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 public hearing on October 18, 2011;
- 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 County has relied on all of the documents listed above in reaching its decision on the Project, even if not every document was formally presented to the County. Without exception, any documents set forth above not so presented fall into one of two categories. Many of them reflect prior planning or legislative decisions with which the County was aware in approving the Project. Other documents influenced the expert advice provided to Planning Department staff or consultants, who then provided advice to the Board of Supervisors. For that reason, such documents form part of the underlying factual basis for the County's decisions relating to the adoption of the Project.

The record of proceedings does not include documents or other materials subject to the attorney/client

privilege, the common-interest doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, or other privileges recognized by statute or common law. Administrative draft documents that were prepared at the County's direction, but were not provided to the public or other agencies, and intra-County communications with respect to such administrative draft documents, are not part of the record of proceedings; rather, such documents reflect the County's deliberative process. In adopting these findings, the County does not waive its right to assert applicable privileges.

The public hearing transcript, a copy of all letters regarding the Draft EIR/EIS received during the public review period, the administrative record, and background documentation for the Final EIR, as well as additional materials concerning approval of the Project and adoption of these findings are contained in County files, and are available for review by responsible agencies and interested members of the public during normal business hours at the Placer County. The custodian of these documents is the Placer County Planning Director. The documents are located at the Placer County Community Development Resource Center, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603 and/or Placer County Tahoe Planning Office, 565 West Lake Blvd, Tahoe City, CA. . All files have been available to the County and the public for review in considering these findings and whether to approve the Project.

FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

The California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq. and the regulations implementing that statute, Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, §§ 15000 et seq. (the "CEQA Guidelines") (collectively, the act and the CEQA Guidelines are referred to as "CEQA") require public agencies to consider the potential effects of their discretionary activities on the environment and, when feasible, to adopt and implement mitigation measures that avoid or substantially lessen the effects of those activities on the environment. Specifically, 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." Section 21002 goes on to state 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. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a).) For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The three possible findings are:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
- (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
- (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment

opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd (a); see also CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a).)

Public Resources Code section 21061.1 defines “feasible” to mean “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors.” CEQA Guidelines section 15364 adds another factor: “legal” considerations. (See also *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (Goleta II)* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565.)

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. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417 (*City of Del Mar*).) “[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 (*Sequoyah Hills*); see also *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 [after weighing “economic, environmental, social, and technological factors’ ... ‘an agency may conclude that a mitigation measure or alternative is impracticable or undesirable from a policy standpoint and reject it as infeasible on that ground’”].)

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 why the agency found that the project’s “benefits” rendered “acceptable” its “unavoidable adverse environmental effects.” (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15093, 15043, subd. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).) The California Supreme Court has stated, “[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced.” (*Goleta II, supra*, 52 Cal.3d at p. 576.)

In making these Findings and the determination regarding the Project Approvals, the Board of Supervisors recognizes that the Project implicates a number of controversial environmental issues and that a range of technical and scientific opinion exists with respect to those issues. The Board of Supervisors has acquired an understanding of the range of this technical and scientific opinion by its review of the EIR/EIS, the comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS and the responses to those comments in the Final EIR/EIS, as well as testimony, letters and reports regarding the Final EIR and the merits of the Project. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered, as a whole, the evidence and analysis presented in the Draft EIR/EIS, the evidence and analysis presented in the comments on the Draft EIR/EIS, the evidence and analysis presented in the Final EIR/EIS, the information submitted on the Final EIR/EIS, and the reports prepared by the experts who prepared the EIR/EIS, the County’s planning consultants, and by staff, addressing these comments. In particular, the Board of Supervisors has considered the Alternatives presented in the EIR/EIS, as well as the proposed comments submitted by various commenters and the responses of the EIR/EIS preparers and staff to those comments. The Board of Supervisors has gained a comprehensive and well-rounded understanding of the environmental issues presented by the Project. In turn, the understanding has enabled the Board of Supervisors to make its decisions after weighing and considering the various viewpoints on these important issues. Accordingly, the Board of Supervisors certifies that its findings are based on a full appraisal of all of the evidence contained in the Final EIR/EIS, as well as the evidence and other information in the record addressing the Final EIR/EIS.

These findings constitute the Board of Supervisors' best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the Project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. These findings are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that come into effect with the County's approval of the Project. In particular, in adopting these findings, the County commits itself to ensure the implementation of the mitigation measures approved in these findings.

The Board of Supervisors is adopting these findings for the entirety of the actions described in these findings and in the Final EIR/EIS. Although the findings below identify specific pages within the Draft and Final EIR/EIS in support of various conclusions reached below, the Board of Supervisors 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 Board of Supervisors' approval of all mitigation measures, policies and implementation programs recommended in the Final EIR/EIS, and the reasoning set forth in responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS.

As noted, the Final EIR/EIS is incorporated into these Findings in its entirety. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of Mitigation Measures, the basis for determining the significance of impacts, the comparative analysis of alternatives, and the reasons for approving the Project in spite of the potential for associated significant and unavoidable adverse impacts. In the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR/EIS has inadvertently been omitted below, such a mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language describing a mitigation measure set forth in Section VI does not accurately reflect the mitigation measures in the Final EIR/EIS due to a clerical error, the language of the policies and implementation measures as set forth in the Final EIR/EIS shall control, unless the language of the policies and implementation measures has been specifically and expressly modified by these findings. Where the language of such measures differs between the Final EIR/EIS and these findings, the more stringent language shall control. The Board of Supervisors provides this direction in order to ensure that any such discrepancy shall be regarded as inadvertent, and shall not be regarded as an effort by the Board of Supervisors to undermine its commitment to adopt mitigation measures as necessary to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects of the Project.

More generally, to the extent there are any inconsistencies in the mitigation measures identified in these findings, in Attachment A, or in the MMRP, any such inconsistencies are inadvertent and unintentional. The County intends that, in the event of such inconsistencies, such inconsistency shall be reconciled in the manner that affords the greatest possible protection to the environment, in a manner consistent with the specific terms of the mitigation measures as adopted. In the event there are any future uncertainties or disputes regarding the nature, scope or feasibility of the adopted mitigation measures, the Board of Supervisors directs staff to return to the Board of Supervisors, at a properly noticed public hearing, to consider any such uncertainties or disputes. The Board of Supervisors intends that, in the event such a hearing is necessary, the public and other agencies will have an opportunity to review and comment on the manner in which such measures are implemented, and the Board of Supervisor's resolution of such issues occurs in a manner that allows the public to understand the basis for the Board of Supervisor's decision.

These findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of the Board of Supervisors regarding the environmental impacts of the Project and the mitigation measures included as part of the Final EIR/EIS and adopted by the Board of Supervisors as part of the Project. To avoid duplication and redundancy, and because the Board of Supervisors agrees with, and hereby adopts, the conclusions in the Final EIR/EIS, these findings will not always repeat the analysis and conclusions in the Final EIR/EIS, but instead incorporates them by reference herein and relied upon them as substantial evidence supporting these findings.

In making these findings, the Board of Supervisors has considered the opinions of other agencies and members of the public. The Board of Supervisors finds that the determination of significance thresholds is a judgment decision within the discretion of the Board of Supervisors; the significance thresholds used in the EIR/EIS are supported by substantial evidence in the record, including the expert opinion of the EIR/EIS preparers and County staff; and the significance thresholds used in the EIR/EIS provide reasonable and appropriate means of assessing the significance of the adverse environmental effects of the Project. Thus, although, as a legal matter, the Board of Supervisors is not bound by the significance determinations in the EIR/EIS (see Pub. Resources Code, § 21082.2, subd. (e)), the Board of Supervisors finds them persuasive and hereby adopts them as its own.

Section VI of these findings summarizes the environmental determinations of the Final EIR/EIS and Project's potentially significant impacts before and after mitigation. Section VI does not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR/EIS. Instead, Section VI provides a summary description of each impact, sets forth the mitigation measures identified to reduce or avoid the impact, and states the Board of Supervisors' findings on the significance of each impact after imposition of the adopted HMR Ski Area Master Plan Project's provisions and the recommended mitigation measures. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Final EIR/EIS and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR/EIS supporting the Final EIR/EIS's determination regarding the Project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the Board of Supervisors ratifies, adopts and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Final EIR/EIS relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

Because the EIR/EIS identified significant effects that may occur as a result of the project, and in accordance with the provisions of the Guidelines presented above, the County hereby adopts these findings as part of the approval of the HMR Ski Area Master Plan Project. These findings constitute the County's best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the Project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that come into effect with the County's approval of the Project.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The Draft EIR/EIS identified a number of significant and potentially significant environmental effects (or impacts) that the Project will cause or contribute to. These significant effects can be avoided or substantially lessened through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. The Board of Supervisors' findings with respect to the Project's significant effects and mitigation measures are set forth in the table appearing at Attachment A to these findings. The findings set forth in the table are adopted and incorporated by reference.

This table does not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR/EIS. Instead, the table provides a summary description of each impact, describes the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR/EIS or Final EIR/EIS and adopted by the Board of Supervisors, and states the Board of Supervisors' 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 the Draft EIR/EIS and Final EIR/EIS, or elsewhere in the record of proceedings, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in those documents supporting the Final EIR/EIS's determinations regarding the Project's impacts and mitigation measures

designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the Board of Supervisors ratifies, adopts, and incorporates into these findings the analysis and explanation in the Draft EIR/EIS, the Final EIR/EIS, or elsewhere in the record, and ratifies, adopts, and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS and Final EIR/EIS 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 Board of Supervisors 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 Board of Supervisors finds those agencies can and should implement those measures within their jurisdiction and control.

Some of the comments on the Draft EIR/EIS suggested additional mitigation measures and/or modifications to the measures recommended in the Draft EIR/EIS. 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 EIR/EIS 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 EIR/EIS, 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 EIR/EIS; (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/EIS.

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 EIR/EIS and the above-described table, the County modified several of the original proposed measures in response to such comments (see Final EIR/EIS, chapter 24). The Board of Supervisors 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.

For this project, the following impacts were identified as significant and unavoidable. That is, these impacts remain significant, despite the incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures to substantially lessen or avoid these impacts:

Impacts TRANS-3 and TRANS-C1

The Project will result in a substantial impact upon the existing transportation systems, including roadways and intersections (TRANS-3). The Project will also result in significant cumulative impacts to transportation or circulation (TRANS-C1). Specifically, the Project will contribute to summertime traffic at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections (Fanny Bridge). Because this area is already known to be congestion, the addition of any traffic is considered significant, for both the Project and for cumulative conditions. The Project will contribute traffic to this area during the summertime Friday PM peak hour. Other studies (e.g., SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study) have identified improvement alternatives to relieve congestion and reduce queuing on Fanny Bridge. Once these improvements are implemented the Project impact will be less than significant; however, funding for the improvement project (particularly state funding) has not been secured. The Project applicant is required to implement mitigation measure TRANS-3 (Implement Intersection Improvements). The Project applicant is also required to implement mitigation measure TRANS-C2 (Payment of Countywide Traffic Impact Fees). The applicant is therefore meeting its obligations to address these impacts. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.4, subd. (a)(4).) The impacts are significant and unavoidable due to uncertainties of other funding sources to address this impact, rather than due to the Project or project-related mitigation. Therefore, these impacts are significant and unavoidable. This impact is discussed in Final EIR/EIS chapter 11, and in chapter 23 (responses to comments) at Master Response 9.

The County received a number of comments concerning traffic impacts at Fanny Bridge and the “Y.” Generally, these comments noted the congestion at these locations. The comments also noted that plans have been developed to alleviate this congestion, and that funding sources are being identified. (See, e.g., Comment 250-2.) The County did not receive comments proposing new or revised mitigation measures to address these impacts. Rather, the comments recognized that this is an existing problem that is in the process of being addressed. The absence of such comment indicates that the measures identified in the EIS/EIR represent the only feasible mitigation measures available to address these impacts.

Impacts CC-C1 and CC-C2

The Project will generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may, on a cumulative basis, have a significant impact on the environment (Impact CC-C1). In addition, the Project may conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs (Impact CC-C2). The Project has made a variety of commitments to address these impacts. These commitments are part of the Project Description, and therefore are binding elements of the Project that the applicant must implement. These commitments are described in Final EIR/EIS section 19.5. The Project is required to implement the following mitigation measures: CC-C1 (Document and Verify Implementation of the Project GHG Reduction Commitments); and CC-C2 (Implement Project Design Features to Further Reduce Project Contribution to Climate Change). No additional feasible mitigation measures have been identified to address these impacts. These impacts are therefore considered significant and unavoidable.

The County received a number of comments concerning the Project’s impact on GHG emissions and climate change. (See, e.g., Comment Letters 11, 12.) These letters state generally the County should not approve the project due to its climate-related impacts. The County has already described in detail measures available to address the Project’s GHG and climate change impacts. No new or different proposals to address GHG emissions were provided. (Final EIS, EIR, chapter 19 (climate change), chapter 23 (Master Response 19). Some comments stated the project should be down-sized in order to reduce its GHG emissions. These comments are addressed below under “alternatives.”

Other comments proposing new mitigation measures, or modifications of existing mitigation measures,

addressed impacts already found to be less than significant, avoided, and/or substantially lessened. The Final EIR/EIS reflects the County's response to all such proposals. The County hereby adopts the responses set forth in the Final EIR/EIS. The County notes further that, because these impacts have already been determined to be less than significant, the County need not adopt new or additional mitigation measures with respect to such impacts. (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21002, 21081, subd. (a).)

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

The County has prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) for the Project. A copy of the MMRP appears at Chapter 21 to the Final EIR/EIS. The County, in adopting these findings, also approves the MMRP. 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 EIR/EIS 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.

RECIRCULATION OF DRAFT EIR/EIS

The Board of Supervisors adopts the following findings with respect to the need to recirculate the Draft EIR/EIS. Under section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, recirculation of an EIR/EIS is required when "significant new information" is added to the EIR/EIS after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS for public review but prior to certification of the Final EIR/EIS. 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 EIR/EIS is not "significant" unless the EIR/EIS 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 EIR/EIS 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 EIR/EIS 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

74

an exception, rather than the general rule.” (*Ibid.*)

The Board of Supervisors recognizes that the Final EIR/EIS incorporates information obtained by the County since the Draft EIR/EIS was completed, and contains additions, clarifications, modifications, and other changes. As noted above, several comments on the Draft EIR/EIS either expressly or impliedly sought changes to proposed mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR/EIS as well as additional mitigation measures. As explained in the Final EIR/EIS (Text Changes and Responses to Comments), some of the suggestions were found to be appropriate and feasible and were adopted in the Final EIR/EIS 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 EIR/EIS.

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 the Project and mitigation measures described in Final EIR/EIS chapters 3 and 24. The changes are designed to incorporate specific suggestions from commenters. These revisions do not require recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS. (See Final EIR/EIS, chapters 3, 24; see also responses to Comments 13a-33, 13a-64, 213-1.) 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 EIR/EIS is not required.

Other changes are designed to reflect “Alternative 1A” – a revised version of the Project proposed by the applicant in order to reduce impacts on adjacent neighbors. As the Final EIR/EIS explains, the impacts of Alternative 1A are either the same as, or less than, the impacts of Alternative 1. The same mitigation measures apply. For this reason, the Board of Supervisors finds that the identification of “Alternative 1A” does not require recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS. This alternative was developed by the applicant, the County and TRPA in order to respond to public comment on the original proposed project. Alternative 1A would reduce the impacts of Alternative 1. The applicant has not refused to proceed with Alternative 1A. Thus, the identification of Alternative 1A does not require recirculation. (See CEQA Guidelines, § 15088.5, subd. (a)(3); Final EIR/EIS, Chapter 23, Comments 13a-33.)

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 EIR/EIS 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 *Sequoiah 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.

All of the environmental impacts associated with Alternative 1A – the Proposed Project – may be substantially lessened or avoided with the adoption of the mitigation measures set forth in these findings, with the exception of the following impacts:

- TRANS-3 (contribution to congestion at Fanny Bridge and “Y” at summertime PM peak hour)
- TRANS-C1 (cumulative contribution to congestion at Fanny Bridge and “Y” at summertime PM peak hour)
- CC-C1 (direct or indirect GHG emissions)
- CC-C2 (conflict with applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions)

The Board of Supervisors’ goal in evaluating the project alternatives was to select an alternative that feasibly attains the project objectives, while further reducing the proposed project’s significant and unavoidable impacts. (Final EIR/EIS, p. 3-9.)

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

- Construct onsite residential and tourist accommodation units to support increased HMR skier visits during mid week operations;
- Optimize the quality of the existing winter ski experience and improve the year-round use of the site while responding to changes in technology, market trends and user preferences;
- Maintain consistency with the scale and character of Homewood, California;
- Enhance the lifestyle and property values of West Shore residents; and
- Generate sufficient revenues to support the proposed environmental and fire safety improvements and ensure the continued viability of the ski operations.

(Final EIR/EIS, chapter 3.2.)

The Draft EIR/EIS and Final EIR/EIS discussed several alternatives to the Project in order to present a reasonable range of options. To meet TRPA requirements for the consideration of alternatives, this environmental document evaluates the potential impacts of the Proposed Project (Alternative 1 – HMR Ski Area Master Plan), continuing operations in the Project area under existing conditions (Alternative 2 –

No Project), and four “Action Alternatives” that involve varying quantities and locations of Project elements. The Action Alternatives, described in detail below, are:

- Alternative 3 – No Code Amendment for Building Height;
- Alternative 4 – Close Ski Area, Develop Estate Lots;
- Alternative 5 – Compact Project area; and
- Alternative 6 –Reduced Project.

The Board of Supervisors finds that that a good faith effort was made to evaluate all feasible alternatives in the EIR/EIS 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 EIR/EIS is not unduly limited or narrow. The Board of Supervisors also finds that all reasonable alternatives were reviewed, analyzed and discussed in the review process of the EIR/EIS and the ultimate decision on the Project. (See, e.g., Draft EIR/EIS, pp. 3-9 to 3-83; Final EIR/EIS, pp. 3-8 to 3-90; Final EIR/EIS, chapter 23, Master Response 2.)

B. Alternatives Analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS and Final EIR/EIS

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 the Project. The EIR/EIS analyzed Alternatives 1, 1A, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. The EIR/EIS contains a detailed analysis of the impacts of each of these alternatives. The analysis appears throughout the Final EIR/EIS. The Board of Supervisors hereby incorporates by reference this analysis. Table 2-1 in the Final EIR/EIS summarizes the EIR/EIS’ conclusions concerning the impacts of, and mitigation measures applicable to, each alternative. This table includes Alternative 1A – the Project now proposed by the applicant.

Based on this analysis, the Board of Supervisors adopts the following findings with respect to each alternative.

Alternative 1 – Originally Proposed Project (HMR Ski Area Master Plan)

Alternative 1 is described in the HMR Ski Area Master Plan dated October 2010 and is a conceptual plan to redevelop mixed-uses at the North Base area, residential uses at the South Base area, a lodge at the Mid-Mountain Base area, and beginner ski area at the top of a new gondola that would originate from the North Base area. Alternative 1 is generally consistent with Alternative 1A, except that Alternative 1A includes certain refinements to the Master Plan in order to respond to concerns of neighbors. (See Final EIR/EIS, section 3.5.)

At the North Base area, Alternative 1 would remove four existing ski lifts and associated pads, footings and utilities; buildings and concrete foundations; stormwater treatment systems; asphalt parking surfaces; overhead transmission lines; and a pumphouse. At the South Base area, the Alternative 1 would remove one existing ski lift and associated pads, footings and utilities; buildings and concrete footings; concrete parking surfaces; and overhead transmission lines. The 17-acre North Base area will include six new mixed-use buildings and eight new townhouse buildings to provide 36 residential condominiums, 16 townhouses, 20 fractional ownership units, 75 traditional hotel rooms, 40 two-bedroom for sale condominium/hotel units, 30 penthouse condominium units, 25,000 square feet of commercial floor area (CFA), 13 affordable housing units (adjoined to a 4-story 272 space day skier parking structure), and a 30,000 square foot skier services lodge. The 6-acre South Base area will be converted to a 99-unit neighborhood condominium complex. Day-skier access and skier amenities will be relocated to the North Base area. The South Base area condominiums will be in three, three-story buildings.

The Mid-Mountain Base area will include a new 15,000 square foot day-use lodge with a detached

gondola terminal linked to the lodge by a covered passage, a new learn-to-ski lift, an outdoor swimming facility for use during the summer months by West Shore residents, a new snow-based vehicle (e.g., grooming equipment) maintenance facility, and two water storage tanks.

Alternative 1 would require TRPA Code of Ordinance amendments to Chapter 22 (Height) and 64 (Grading Standards), and TRPA Plan Area Statement (PAS) amendments for Plan Areas 157 (Homewood), 158 (McKinney Tract Residential) and 159 (Homewood/Commercial). Placer County Plan Areas would also require amendments to the same Plan Area Statements under the adopted West Shore Area General Plan (1998).

Alternative 1 would have the same potentially significant impacts as the Project. The same mitigation measures would apply. As the Final EIR/EIS notes, “[m]oving the parking structure near SR 89 and relocating the condominiums nearer existing residential units under Alternative 1A better reflects the existing neighborhood land use layout.” (Final EIR/EIS, p. 24-66; see also *id.* at p. 24-68.) In this respect, Alternative 1 would have greater land-use impacts than would the Project. Similarly, because Alternative 1 includes four more residential units than Alternative 1A (the Project), Alternative 1 would result in slightly greater traffic and air quality impacts; here again, the same mitigation measures would apply, and the resulting impacts would be virtually identical to those of the Project. (See Final EIR/EIS, p. 24-144, fn. 2; p. 24-295, fn. 4.) The Board of Supervisors therefore finds that, from an environmental perspective, Alternative 1 is environmentally comparable to the Project. The County finds that Alternative 1 is feasible and attains the objectives for the Project. By comparison, the Project (Alternative 1A) is more responsive to land-use compatibility concerns of neighbors, is feasible, and also attains the objectives for the Project. For this reason, the County rejects Alternative 1.

Alternative 1A – Revised Proposed Project

HMR has proposed modifications to Alternative 1 based on input from neighbors at the North and South base areas. The modifications and resultant environmental analysis are identified as Alternative 1A in Final EIR/EIS chapters 3 through 21, and are described throughout these findings as the “Project.”

Alternative 2 – No Project (Existing Conditions)

Under the No Project (Alternative 2), HMR will continue to be operated under existing conditions. Total land coverage will remain around 1,781,000 square feet, (approximately 271,000 square feet - North Base area, 117,000 square feet - South Base area, and 1,394,000 square feet - on-mountain hard and soft coverage). Facilities at the existing North Base area include food services/bar, restrooms, ski school, rentals and repairs, retail sales, ticket sales, ski patrol, employee lockers, storage, mechanical rooms, and administrative offices. Facilities at the existing South Base area include food services/bar, restrooms, retail sales, daycare/nursery, ticket sales, ski patrol, employee lockers, storage, mechanical rooms, and administrative offices. The white tent structure (warming shelter) and the existing concrete foundation located near the Mid-Mountain will remain. No TRPA Code of Ordinance or PAS amendments would be required for the No Project (Alternative 2).

Alternative 2 avoids the Project’s significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to traffic at Fanny Bridge and GHG emissions. In this respect, Alternative 2 is environmentally superior to the Project. Alternative 2 would also result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

- LU-1
- SCENIC-1
- SCENIC-2
- GEO-3
- HYDRO-1

- HYDRO-2
- HYDRO-4
- HYDRO-C1

These impacts relate to the fact that visual, geological and hydrological improvements proposed as part of the Project would not occur, such that existing problems would remain.

For example, the EIR/EIS includes a description of existing conditions with respect to hydrology. Under existing conditions, sediment yields exceed applicable thresholds of concern. This impact is considered significant and unavoidable because under this alternative no actions would be taken to address this existing condition. (Draft EIR/EIS, p. 15-49.) Similarly, existing visual conditions that do not comply with applicable thresholds will persist. (Draft EIR/EIS, p. 10-28.)

As the Draft EIR/EIS states, “[s]election of the No Project Alternative 2 would avoid the adverse impacts generated by construction activity and residential and tourist growth resulting from the CEP action alternatives; however, the water quality and soil restoration benefits would not occur and according to HMR, the long-term economic viability of the ski resort would be in doubt. Consequently, the No Project Alternative is not considered to be environmentally superior or environmentally preferred.” (Draft EIR/EIS, p. 20-21.) For this reason, the Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 2. The Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 2 for the further reason that this alternative would meet none of the objectives for the Project.

Alternative 3 – No Code Amendment for Building Height

Alternative 3 would include the same uses identified above for the Proposed Project (Alternative 1). However, under Alternative 3, additional buildings with larger building footprints would accommodate proposed uses with building heights that meet existing TRPA height standards. At the North Base area, Buildings A and B would include four additional structures located up slope of the building sites in the Proposed Project (Alternative 1). At the South Base area, Buildings A and B would include two additional structures located up slope of the building sites in the Proposed Project (Alternative 1). Alternative 3 would require each of the TRPA Code of Ordinance and PAS amendments outlined for the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) with the exception of the Chapter 22 amendment for additional height, which would not be required.

Impacts associated with Alternative 3 are generally comparable to those of the Project, and the same mitigation measures would apply. With respect to air quality, however, Alternative 3 would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

- AQ-1 (PM10 and PM2.5 emissions during construction)
- AQ-4 (conflict or obstruct with implementation of the applicable air quality plans)
- AQ-C1 (cumulative emissions during construction)

The Project, as mitigated, avoids these impacts. In that respect, the Project is environmentally superior to Alternative 3. Alternative 3 does not avoid the Project’s significant and unavoidable impacts (TRANS-3, TRANS-C1, CC-C1, CC-C2). Because Alternative 3 does not offer any environmental advantages over the Project, and results in significant and unavoidable impacts that would not occur under the Project, the Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 3.

Alternative 4 – Close Ski Resort – Estate Lots

Alternative 4 would close HMR and create 16 estate residential lots on the mountain and one commercial lot. A majority of the estate home lots would be located on the lower portion of the former ski area, and

the commercial lot would be located at the North Base area. For purposes of this analysis, the commercial lot would include up to 15,000 square feet of CFA in the area of the existing parking lots, which would have to be transferred to the Project area. One PAS amendment is proposed under Alternative 4. Alternative 4 proposes commercial uses within the North Base area parking lot currently located in TRPA Plan Area 157 and Placer County Plan Area 159. No TRPA Code of Ordinance amendments would be required for Alternative 4.

Alternative 4 would generate less traffic, and would therefore avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to traffic and climate change. (TRANS-3, TRANS-C1, CC-C1, CC-C2.) In this respect, Alternative 4 is environmentally superior to the Project. Nevertheless, the Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 4. First, Alternative 4 would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

- LU-1
- LU-C1
- REC-2
- REC-C1

In particular, Alternative 4 would eliminate existing ski runs at Homewood. As the Draft EIR/EIS states: "[I]mplementation of Alternative 4 would cause a significant and unavoidable impact based on the loss of the winter ski resort use and the currently assigned PAOTs for HMR. There are currently no closed ski areas in the Basin that could be re-opened to replace recreational uses at HMR, and the development of a new ski area is not considered feasible based on land ownership, environmental constraints, and land management regulations in the Basin. Consequently, no feasible mitigation measure is identified to reduce the significant impact of Alternative 4 on recreational access." (Draft EIR/EIS, pp. 18-14 - 18-15.) This impact is significant and unavoidable on a project-specific and cumulative basis. The loss of these recreational facilities would also result in significant and unavoidable land-use impacts on a project-specific and cumulative basis. As the Draft EIR/EIS states:

As addressed above and in Chapter 4 (Relationship to Existing Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations), Alternative 4 is not consistent with many TRPA or Placer County land use plans, goals, policies, and provisions adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. For example, closure of the ski resort is considered a significant land use impact as a major recreational provider would cease to exist/operate affecting recreation resources available in the Lake Tahoe Basin and supporting commercial services. As a result, numerous policies included in the County and TRPA Plan Areas would not be achieved. Ski Resort closure would also affect the adjacent tourist plan area 159 as the resort area would be substantially redefined and future commercial uses would be severely limited without the tourist draw of the ski resort. As discussed above, long-term environmental impacts may also result, such as water quality impacts from the on mountain roadway network. Therefore, this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable. (Draft EIR, p. 6-31.)

The Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 4 on this basis.

Moreover, Alternative 4 would meet none of the objectives for the Project. The existing ski facility would be closed, and the site would be redeveloped for estate residential uses. The project objectives focus on ensuring the continued viability of the ski resort.

Alternative 5 – Compact Project Area

Under Alternative 5, the PAS 159 boundary line adjustment proposed under Alternatives 1 and 3 would be reduced to include only the existing paved and gravel parking lots at the North Base area. North Base areas above these two parking areas and the entirety of the South Base area would remain in Plan Area

157 (Recreation). The proposed 225 multi-family residential units would be located in the existing North Base parking areas, substantially reducing the area proposed for addition to Plan Area 159 (Commercial). The 75-room hotel, 30,000 square feet of CFA, and 25,000 square feet of skier service uses would remain in Plan Area 157 up slope of the multi-family residential uses, where these uses are currently allowed. At the South Base area, 16 single-family residential lots would be reconfigured along with a small skier services building for locals using existing HMR parcels and a boundary line adjustment. Alternative 5 includes 12 onsite affordable housing units attached to a 156-space day skier parking structure. An amendment to TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 22 will be required for additional building height. TRPA will require PAS 159, 158 and 157 amendments for plan area boundaries, allowable uses, density, and special policies. Placer County Plan Areas would also require amendments to the same Plan Area Statements under the adopted West Shore Area General Plan (1998).

Alternative 5 would result in impacts to traffic and climate change that would be comparable to those of the Project (TRANS-3, TRANS-C1, CC-C1, CC-C2). Alternative 5 would also result in the following, additional significant and unavoidable impacts:

- LU-1
- LU-2
- LU-C1
- AQ-1
- AQ-4
- AQ-C1

Alternative 5 is also less consistent with TRPA policies related to building heights. (Final EIR/EIS, p. 10-54 et seq.) Thus, as compared to the Project, Alternative 5 avoids no significant impacts, and results in additional significant impacts that the Project does not. For this reason, the Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 5.

Alternative 6 – Reduced Project

Under Alternative 6, the PAS 159 boundary line adjustment proposed for the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternative 3 would be reduced to eliminate the proposed townhouses at the North Base area. A majority of the South Base area would remain in Plan Area 157 (Recreation) with the exception of the site of the existing skier services lodge, which would be redeveloped into a multi-family residential condominium building and added to Plan Area 158 (Residential). Alternative 6 proposes 75 tourist accommodation units (TAUs) located in the hotel/lodge building. To offset the large reduction in TAUs under Alternative 6, the number of proposed multi-family residential units (for sale units) would be increased to a total of 195 (from 181 included in Alternative 1), of which 145 units would be located at the North Base area and 50 units would be located at the South Base area. The remainder of the South Base area would include 14 single-family residential lots reconfigured along with a small skier services building using existing HMR parcels and a boundary line adjustment. Alternative 6 includes 12 onsite affordable housing units attached to a 156-space day skier parking structure. The proposed development at the Mid-Mountain area will be the same as the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3 and 5. Amendments to TRPA Code of Ordinances are proposed for Chapter 22 – additional building height, Chapter 33 – additional TAU distribution, Chapter 35 – tourist accommodation bonus units, and Chapter 64 – groundwater interception for below-grade parking. TRPA will require PAS 159, 158 and 157 amendments for plan area boundaries, allowable uses, density, and special policies. Placer County Plan Areas would also require amendments to the same Plan Area Statements under the adopted West Shore Area General Plan (1998).

Alternative 6 would result in the same significant impacts as the Project, and the same mitigation measures would apply. In particular, Alternative 6 would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to

traffic and climate change (TRANS-3, TRANS-C1, CC-C1, CC-C2). Alternative 6 includes a lower number of residential units, and therefore results in incrementally lower impacts with respect to traffic and climate change (although these impacts remain significant and unavoidable). (See Final EIR/EIS, Table 11-17). In this respect, Alternative 6 is environmentally superior to the Project. (See Draft EIR, pp. 20-21 – 20-22.)

Alternative 6 would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts during construction. (Final EIR/EIS, Table 12-14.) Although mitigation measures are available to address this impact, PM10 emissions remain significant and unavoidable under this alternative. (Final EIR/EIS, pp. 24-160 – 24-161.) The Project, as mitigated, avoids this impact. In this respect, Alternative 6 is not the environmentally superior alternative.

From an environmental perspective, Alternative 6 represents a trade-off as compared to the Project. Alternative 6 would result in incrementally fewer traffic and climate change impacts, although certain of these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. At the same time, Alternative 6 would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts during construction, whereas the Project would avoid these impacts. The Board of Supervisors finds that, from an environmental perspective, long-term impacts related to traffic and climate change are of greater weight than short-term impacts related to construction. For this reason, the Board of Supervisors agrees with the EIR that, taken as a whole, Alternative 6 is the environmentally superior alternative.

The EIR states that Alternative 6 would meet the project objectives. (Draft EIR/EIS, pp. 20-21 – 20-22.) The Board of Supervisors disagrees based on a determination that Alternative 6 is infeasible. Economic analyses have been provided to the County concluding that Alternative 6 will generate an insufficient rate of return to finance long-term operations and capital improvements necessary to ensure the viability of the ski resort. Based on reasonable estimates of occupancy rates and per-skier revenue, Alternative 6 does not provide enough residential units to support the resort. This information is summarized in Final EIR/EIS Master Response 3. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed this master response, and the information submitted in support of the master response, and concurs with its analysis. For this reason, the Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 6.

C. Other Alternatives

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

The public suggested several alternatives during the Project Scoping process through written and oral comments. While the specific components varied with each comment, three main types of alternatives were suggested: A Reduced Size Alternative, an Existing Land Coverage Alternative, and a Conservation Alternative. These alternatives were suggested to reduce or avoid potential project-related impacts to air and water quality, noise, traffic, biological resources, and compatibility with adjacent communities. The alternatives were considered during initial alternative development and in response to public scoping, but were rejected for further, detailed consideration as described in Section 3.4. Table 3-3 summarizes the comments received during scoping that requested further analysis of additional alternatives and identifies the Draft EIR/EIS' consideration of such alternatives.

During the public review period for the Draft EIR/EIS, comments were submitted stating that the EIR/EIS should analyze additional alternatives. Generally, these comments were not specific regarding the alternatives to be added to the analysis. These comments stated generally, however, that the EIR/EIS should analyze an alternative consisting of fewer residential units. The Final EIR/EIS responds to these comments. (See Final EIR/EIS, Master Response 2.) The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that this

82

response is appropriate.

In particular, the EIR/EIS analyzes in detail Alternative 6, which consists of a reduced number of residential units. As set forth above, the Board of Supervisors finds that Alternative 6 is infeasible. For the same reason, the Board of Supervisors finds that alternatives consisting of fewer units than Alternative 6 are similarly infeasible.

The Board of Supervisors also finds such alternatives would not avoid or substantially lessen the Project's significant and unavoidable effects. As noted above, two of the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts concern existing traffic congestion at Fanny Bridge. The traffic analysis prepared for the Project concludes, however, that Alternative 6 will also contribute to congestion at Fanny Bridge, even though Alternative 6 contains fewer residential units. (See Final EIR/EIS, chapter 11, discussion of Impact TRANS-3 – see Table 11-21.) An alternative containing fewer residential units than Alternative 6 will nevertheless contribute traffic to this intersection. The only way to avoid this impact would be to reduce peak-hour summertime traffic generated by the project so that the project generates less traffic at this intersection than it does under existing conditions. That cannot be accomplished while achieving the basic objectives of the project. Reductions in residential units would also reduce traffic impact fees paid by the project; a portion of these fees will be used to help finance construction of improvements at Fanny Bridge.

The Project will also result in significant and unavoidable climate change impacts. These impacts are analyzed in detail in Final EIR/EIS chapter 19. The EIR/EIS includes an estimate of the Project's GHG emissions. The EIR/EIS also estimates GHG emissions from Alternative 6. As the analysis shows, reducing the number of residential units under Alternative 6 does not result in a substantial decrease in GHG emissions. (Final EIR/EIS, chapter 19, Table 19-28.) The Board of Supervisors finds that further reducing the number of units would not avoid or substantially lessen these impacts. Any further reductions in units will also render the project financially infeasible, and therefore fail to achieve project objectives.

The alternatives analyzed in the EIS/EIR already consists of a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives. For this reason, the detailed analysis of another alternative is not required. In addition, an alternative consisting of further reductions in the size and scale of development is considered infeasible and would not attain most of the basic objectives of the Proposed Project. The project objectives include:

- Construct onsite residential and tourist accommodation units to support increased HMR skier visits during mid week operations;
- Generate sufficient revenues to support the proposed environmental and fire safety improvements and ensure the continued viability of the ski operations.

(Draft EIR/EIS, pp. 3-8 – 3-9.)

HMR has submitted information showing that Homewood's current winter operations are financially infeasible to sustain. Homewood had an operating loss of approximately \$5 million during the period 2006-2009. That loss did not take into account additional capital investments that need to be made on an ongoing basis in order to remain competitive within the ski industry. Based on its attendance figures, HMR has concluded that Homewood's mid-week, non-holiday attendance figures are too low to support ski operations. The key project objective, therefore, is to construct improvements at Homewood that will boost mid-week, non-holiday attendance figures. Boosting mid-week, non-holiday patronage would also attract visitors during the time of the week when traffic is relatively light, such that impacts on the surrounding area would be minimized. The traffic analysis confirms that, due to the shift from weekend/holiday to mid-week patronage, the Proposed Project would not have a significant impact on winter-time traffic levels of service.

An alternative that eliminates overnight lodging would be inconsistent with HMR's objective to transform Homewood into an overnight destination, rather than a resort patronized primarily by day-skiers. In addition, an alternative that reduces further the number of residential units would be financially infeasible. HMR has provided TRPA and the County with an analysis by Bay Area Economics. The analysis concludes that Alternative 6 (282 units) would generate an insufficient rate of return in order to be feasible. Alternatives consisting of fewer than the 282 units included in Alternative 6 would likewise be financially infeasible, in that such alternatives would further reduce the number of mid-week, non-holiday skiers. For further information regarding financial feasibility and Homewood's objectives for the Proposed Project. (See Findings Relating to Alternative 6 and EIR/EIS, Chapter 23, Master Response 3.)

A number of public comments on the Draft EIR/EIS request consideration of an Alternative that complies with all current TRPA Codes and Plan Areas. There is no legal requirement that an alternative be considered that complies with all Regional Plan documents (e.g., Code of Ordinances, Goals and Policies, Plan Areas) without amendment. As described above, the TRPA Code of Ordinances Subsection 5.8.A(2) only requires that an EIS include appropriate alternatives to the proposed action.

The "No Project Alternative" does not require amendments to the TRPA Codes or Plan Areas and is evaluated in the EIS/EIR as required under CEQA (See Draft EIR/EIS, p. 3-48). Alternative 4 is an Estate Lot Alternative developed by HMR to comply with existing Codes and Plan Area guidance. Alternative 4 would close the ski resort and convert the mountain into 16 residential estate lots and one commercial lot. Alternative 4 includes a proposal to convert the existing North Base ski area parking area into a commercial use. Plan Area 157 allows commercial uses, but does not allow for transfer of development rights (e.g., the transfer of commercial floor area into the Plan Area). To accommodate transfer of commercial floor area to PAS 157, one PAS amendment is required, adding transfer of development rights for existing development. No other Code of Ordinance or PAS amendments would be required for Alternative 4 (See Draft EIR/EIS, p. 3-53).

(See EIR/EIS, Chapter 23, Master Response 2.)

D. Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA requires the identification of an Environmentally Superior Alternative; an alternative to the project that has no significant effect or has the least significant effect on the environment while substantially accomplishing the objectives of the project. For reference, significance under CEQA is determined based on substantial or potentially substantial adverse changes of any of the physical environmental conditions due to the Project as compared to the existing conditions.

The Proposed Project (Alternative 1/1A) and other CEP Alternatives would redevelop the Base Areas of the existing HMR and improve the quality of the existing winter day use recreational facility. Alternatives 1/1A, 3, 5 and 6 are CEP Alternatives and include restoration of existing ground disturbance on the upper mountain, land coverage reduction, and stormwater treatment systems at the base areas designed for the 50 year, 1 hour storm, which would create benefits for long-term water quality, soil condition, and stream environment zones (SEZ). Alternative 4 would close the ski resort and therefore include the eventual restoration of much of the existing upper mountain disturbance, but would eliminate an existing winter day use recreational facility. Selection of the No Project Alternative 2 would avoid the adverse impacts generated by construction activity and residential and tourist growth resulting from the CEP action alternatives; however, the water quality and soil restoration benefits would not occur and according to HMR, the long-term economic viability of the ski resort would be in doubt. Consequently, the No Project Alternative is not considered to be environmentally superior or environmentally preferred.

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, subdivision (d)(2), requires that the

EA/EIR identify another alternative as environmentally superior. Of the CEP Action Alternatives, Alternative 6, Reduced Project, 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 existing land coverage (approximately 23 to 20 percent) the most among viable CEP Alternatives (Alternative 5 is not viable because of proposed density and adverse impacts to scenic quality ratings), which would reduce soils, hydrologic, and stream zone impacts;
- include the greatest decrease of winter vehicle trips and VMT of the CEP Alternatives (see Table 11-17);
- include the smallest increase of summer vehicle trips and VMT of the CEP Alternatives (see Table 11-17); and
- implement the proposed environmental benefits included in the HMR Master Plan and summarized in Table 2-2 of this EIR/EIS.

(Draft EIR/EIS, Chapter 20, pp. 20-21 to 20-22.)

As explained above, based on the analysis in the EIR/EIS, the Board of Supervisors finds that Alternative 6 (“Reduced Project”) is the environmentally superior alternative. The Board of Supervisors rejects this alternative, however, because this alternative is infeasible. The basis for this finding is summarized above.

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to CEQA section 21081 and CEQA Guideline 15093, the Board of Supervisors hereby finds, after consideration of the Final EIR and the evidence in the record, that each of the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the Project as set forth below independently and collectively outweighs these significant and unavoidable impacts and is an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project. Any one of the reasons for approval cited below is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the Board of Supervisors will stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this Section, and in the documents found in the Record of Proceedings.

On the basis of the above findings and the substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Board of Supervisors specially finds that there are significant benefits of the proposed Project to support approval of the Project in spite of the unavoidable significant impacts, and therefore makes this Statement of Overriding Considerations. Specifically, notwithstanding the significant and unavoidable impacts to Transportation (Impacts TRANS-3 (Summer Queuing) and TRANS-C1 (Cumulative Summer Queuing)), CC-C1 and Climate Changes (Impacts CC-C1 and CC-C2), the Project benefits as described below, including benefits such as water quality improvements, retirement of sensitive lands, an overall reduction in land coverage and sustainable development that relate directly to areas of impact, as well as all other benefits described below and elsewhere in this document, outweigh these impacts.

The Board of Supervisors further finds that, as part of the process of obtaining Project approval, all significant effects on the environment from implementation of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible. All mitigation measures proposed in the FEIR that are applicable to the Project are adopted as part of this approval action. Furthermore, the Agency has determined that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the

following specific overriding economic, technical, legal, social and other considerations. Any alternatives proposed by the public are rejected for the reasons set forth in the EIR/EIS and the reasons set forth herein.

The Project has the following benefits:

EIP Projects

- Project Number 632 - Homewood Ski Area Master Plan
- Project Number 86 - Scenic Roadway Unit 11- Homewood
- Project number 775 - Homewood Area Pedestrian Facilities
- Project Number 855 - Tahoe City “Y” Realignment (fair share participant)
- Project Number 725 – Design a stormwater treatment system to treat the 50 year/1 hour storm event within the north and south base areas
- Project Number 996 – SR 89 stormwater treatment

Water Quality

- Treatment of the 50 year/1 hour Storm Event for proposed redevelopment areas (EIP 725). Capture of water runoff planned through a series of vaults and infiltration galleries.
- Removal of culvert and fill from the SEZ at the South Base area and day lighting Ellis/Homewood Creek channel.
- Participation in local Homewood elements of environmental improvement project (EIP 996); a 9 mile segment of SR 89 in Placer County by helping to implement runoff treatment facilities, and erosion control features, including high level stormwater treatment vault and a series of additional vegetated basins to treat SR 89 runoff.
- Substantial land coverage reduction and restoration on the upper mountain areas (there is a commitment in the Master Plan for a total of 500,000 square feet of total land coverage restoration, – all of which must be verified by TRPA for potential relocation, banking or retirement).
- A majority of building footprints to be located on land capability classes 4 and higher.

Recreation

- By keeping the ski resort open, existing PAOTs assigned to Homewood would remain in operation and the 1987 TRPA Regional Plan assignment of 1,100 PAOTs to HOMEWOOD would remain available for potential use at the Resort (although the Master Plan does not propose to expand PAOT capacity).
- Provide five miles of hiking trails within PAS 157. Trails include directional markings, mapping, and interpretive signs. Trails will also be linked to pedestrian access pathways at the North and South Bases.
- Mid-mountain lodge located at the top of the proposed Gondola would be available for the public to use (pool, access to hiking, etc.) The lodge will include a space dedicated to members of the HMR HOA. Use of the pool will be open to residents of the west shore from Tahoma to Sunnyside (proximate to Homewood) to fulfill a void for area residents.
- New outdoor amphitheater at the North Base area for hosting outdoor concert events and use as the permanent home of the Lake Tahoe Music Festival.
- A cross country ski connection, which is an extension of the old Olympic course, is proposed for future consideration.

Air Quality/ Transportation

- Winter VMT reduction (based on reducing existing weekend day visitors with residents and guests of the proposed resort facilities).
- Provision of transit kiosk with signs, maps, etc.
- Integrate transportation linkages.
- A Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD) bike path into the North Base area. An eight-passenger gondola will bring guests up to the Mid-Mountain Base area. The existing Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART) stops will be furnished with shelters (two possibly three stops at resort), and proposed dial-a-ride, shuttle, and water taxi services will be provided to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMTs).
- Alternative transportation initiatives include 2-20+ passenger water taxis for use during summer months, summer and winter dial-a-ride service (7 days a week, at a minimum from 8 AM to 6 PM), and shuttle service. Shuttle service between bases will reduce parking demand at the North Base. Additional alternative transportation measures planned include a free-use bicycle fleet for resort guests, 5-hybrid electric rental vehicles for resort guest use, implementation of the missing bike trail segment. TART passes provided for employees, and shuttle service provided to/from employee housing areas not on a TART route. Summer scheduled shuttle service to/from Tahoe City, 7 days a week from 9 AM to 8 PM (scheduled to augment existing TART service).
- Pedestrian facilities will be built in the Homewood area to serve commercial businesses, improve access, improve drainage collection and treatment and provide scenic improvements (EIP 775).
- Pedestrian oriented plans with pedestrian access to neighborhood oriented retail and TCPUD bike trail connection to North Base area reduces VMT. On-site daycare to reduce vehicle trips.
- Fair-share participant in SR 28/SR 89 intersection improvement project (EIP 855)
- Limitation of total maximum ticket sales during the winter season & limiting day skier parking to 400 on-site parking spaces; electronic signage at the Tahoe City "Y" alerting travelers when ski parking is full, alternative means of transportation. Plan calls for a limitation on ticket sales to those arriving via transit only once parking lot at site is full.
- Potential to stockpile excavated materials on-site for use by other area projects such as the Blackwood Creek Restoration Project. This would reduce truck trips and VMT caused by material hauling during construction.

Scenic Resources

- Underground utility lines throughout the Project area.
- Existing landmark trees integrated into landscape design.
- Implement landscape frontage improvements, access controls, building upgrades, sign conformance & walkways throughout project site.
- Underground parking and replacement of surface parking lot at frontage with landscaping and pedestrian paths.
- Articulated design and incorporation of natural building materials.
- Public outdoor artwork at: hotel landscaped area, day skier drop-off landscape area and public ice pond. Public art also planned at indoor public spaces in hotel and day skier facility. Artwork by local/regionally based artists.

Forest Health

- Homewood Mountain Resort has treated over 400 acres of forested areas to reduce the threat of catastrophic fire. There is a plan to continue the forest thinning/fuels management for all forested areas within the 1,200 acre Homewood Mountain Resort and the adjacent 100-acre TCPUD open space parcel. The fuels management program uses a chipper that grinds up fuels waste and spreads the resulting chip material onto the forest floor which helps to reduce storm water runoff and maintain a healthier forest floor.

Housing

- Provision of 13 on-site affordable employee housing units under the proposed Master Plan.
- Employee transportation (buses & shuttles) to be provided for off-site employee housing locations (Tahoma/Sunnyside).

LEED Certification

- The north base proposal has been accepted into and will be designed under the LEED for Neighborhood Development Pilot Program. The south base, although not a part of the LEED for Neighborhood Pilot Program, will also be designed to stringent sustainable development standards using the LEED criteria as a template. Although the goal is to achieve LEED Silver certification, the US Green Building Council initial formal feedback suggests plan is on course for Gold Level.

Open Space

- All open space in master plan proposal is publically accessible. Primary open space areas at north base centered around the seasonal public ice pond area/ miniature golf & landscaped frontage adjacent to SR 89.
- Deed restriction from further non-recreational development to be placed on whole of mountain beyond the North and South Base areas & Mid-Mountain Base area.
- Linkage from the public/pedestrian oriented spaces at base areas to a hiking trail system on mountain aided through a new way finding/graphic system.

(Final EIR/EIS. pp. 6-21 through 6-23; Table 6-2.)

Having considered these benefits, the Board of Supervisors finds that the benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and that the adverse environmental effects are therefore acceptable. The Board of Supervisors further finds that each of the above considerations is sufficient to approve the project. For each of the reasons stated above, and all of them, the project should be implemented notwithstanding the significant unavoidable adverse impacts identified in the EIR/EIS.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AADT Annual Average Daily Traffic
AB 32 California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006
ACHP Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ADT Average Daily Traffic
AF Acre-Feet
AF/yr Acre-Feet per Year
ANSI American National Standards Institute
APCDs Air Pollution Control Districts
AQMDs Air Quality Management Districts
ARMR Archaeological Resources Management Reports
Basin Plan Water Quality Control Plan Report for the North Lahontan Basin
bgs Below Ground Surface
BLM United States Bureau of Land Management
BMP Best Management Practice
BOD Biological Oxygen Demand
BP Before Present
CAA Federal Clean Air Act of 1970
CAAA 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments
CalEPA California Environmental Protection Agency
Cal-OSHA California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Caltrans California Department of Transportation
CARB California Air Resources Board
CCAA California Clean Air Act
CCIC Central California Information Center
CDF California Department of Forestry
CDFG California Department of Fish and Game
CDMG California Department of Mines and Geology
CDMGB California State Mining and Geology Board
CEQA California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLA Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980
CESA California Endangered Species Act
CFA Commercial Floor Area
CFR Code of Federal Regulations
cfs Cubic Feet per Second
CIP Capital Improvement Plan
CNDDDB California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL Community Noise Equivalent Level
CNPS California Native Plant Society
CO Carbon Monoxide
CO₂ Carbon Dioxide
Cortese List California's Hazardous Waste and Substance Sites List
CSWGPP State of Nevada Comprehensive State Groundwater Protection Program
CWA Clean Water Act of 1972
CWC California Water Code
CWE Cumulative Watershed Effect
dB Decibel
dBA A-weighted decibel
dbh Diameter at Breast Height
DEIR Draft Environmental Impact Report
DEIS Draft Environmental Impact Statement

District Tahoe City Public Utility District
 Division Nevada Division of Fish and Wildlife
 DSOD California Department of Water Resources, Division of Safety of Dams
 EA Environmental Assessment
 EIR Environmental Impact Report
 EIS Environmental Impact Statement
 ERU Equivalent Residential Unit
 ETCCs Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities
 FEMA Flood Emergency Management Agency
 FESA Federal Endangered Species Act
 FTE Full Time Equivalent
 Forest Service United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service
 Fossils Paleontological Resources
 GBUAPCD Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District
 GHG Greenhouse Gases
 H₂S Hydrogen Sulfide
 HABS Historic American Buildings Survey
 HAER Historic American Engineering Record
 HAP Hazardous Air Pollutants
 HAZWOPER Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response
 in/yr Inches per Year
 Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board-Lahontan Region
 Ldn Day-night Average Sound Level
 Leq Energy Equivalent Sound Level
 LOS Level of Service
 MBTA Migratory Bird Treaty Act
 MCWC Madden Creek Water Company
 Mgal/yr. Million Gallons per Year
 mgd Million Gallons per Day
 mg/L Milligrams per Liter
 mg/L³ Microgram per Cubic Liter
 Mmax Maximum Moment Magnitude
 MMI Modified Mercalli Intensity
 µg/m³ Microgram per Cubic Meter
 MMP Mitigation and Monitoring Program
 MOA Memorandum of Agreement
 MPN Most Probable Number
 MRF Eastern Regional Materials Recovery Facility
 NAAQS National Ambient Air Quality Standards
 NAC Noise Abatement Criteria
 NAHC Native American Heritage Commission
 NEPA National Environmental Policy Act
 NNPS Nevada Native Plant Society
 NO₂ Nitrogen Dioxide
 NOAA National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
 NOP Notice of Preparation
 NPDES National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Program
 NRHP National Register of Historic Places
 NTFPD North Tahoe Fire Protection District
 NWP Nationwide Permit
 O₃ Ozone
 OES Office of Emergency Services

OPR California Governor's Office of Planning and Research
 OS Open Space
 OSHA Occupational Safety and Health Administration
 PA Programmatic Agreement
 Pb Lead
 PD Planned Development
 PGA Peak Ground Acceleration
 PM10 Particulate Matter Less than 10 Microns in Diameter
 PM2.5 Particulate Matter Less than 2.5 Microns in Diameter
 PPM Parts per Million
 PRC Public Resource Code
 Project Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan
 PSD Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program
 psi Pounds per square inch
 RCRA Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
 RIB Rapid Infiltration Basin
 RL Rural Low
 ROW Right-of-Way
 RR Rural Residential
 RWQCB Regional Water Quality Control Boards
 SHPO State Historic Preservation Office
 SIP State Implementation Plan
 SMARA Surface Mining Reclamation Act of 1975
 SO2 Sulfur Dioxide
 State Board California State Water Resources Control Board
 Superfund Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986
 SWPPP Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
 TAU Tourist Accommodation Unit
 TCPUD Tahoe City Public Utility District
 TKN Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen
 TMDL Total Maximum Daily Load
 TOC Threshold of Concern
 TP Total Phosphorus
 TROA Truckee River Operating Agreement
 TRPA Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
 TSS Total Suspended Solids
 TTSA Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency
 TTSD Tahoe-Truckee Sierra Disposal Company
 TTUSD Tahoe-Truckee Unified School District
 UAPCDs Unified Air Pollution Control Districts
 UBC Uniform Building Code 1997
 USACE United States Army Corps of Engineers
 USDA United States Department of Agriculture
 USEPA United States Environmental Protection Agency
 USFWS United States Fish and Wildlife Service
 USGS United States Geological Survey
 VMT Vehicle Miles Traveled
 WDR Waste Discharge Requirements
 WMA Wildlife Management Areas
 WWTP Wastewater Treatment Plant
 yds3 Cubic Yards

ATTACHMENTS

- A Table of impacts, mitigation measures and CEQA findings

ATTACHMENT A
 HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN PROJECT
 PLACER COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
 TABLE OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND CEQA FINDINGS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
LAND USE			
<p>Impact LU-1. Will the Project be consistent with the land use plan or zoning plan, or land use goals, policies, and provisions of the TRPA Regional Plan, including the Goals and Policies, Code of Ordinances, Plan Area Statement, or Ski Area Master Plan Guidelines, and the Placer County General Plan and West Shore Area General Plan?</p> <p>The consistency analysis in Chapter 4 of the EIR reveals inconsistencies between the Alternative 1A and the TRPA Regional Plan, TRPA Plan Area Statements, the West Shore Area General Plan, and the Placer County General Plan. Alternative 1A would require changes to the boundaries and content of County and TRPA Plan Areas 157, 158, and 159, because some proposed land uses, such as <i>interval ownership units</i> (residential timeshares), are not permitted in Plan Area 157, but are permitted in Plan Area 159. Amendments to the TRPA Goals and Policies and the Code of Ordinances are also proposed under Alternative 1A.</p> <p>Pursuant to County Code Section 17.60.090 (G) amendments to General Plans are processed through 1) a Planning Commission Hearing and Recommendations followed by 2) a Board of Supervisors Hearing and Decision per County Code Sections 17.60.090 (A through D). As discussed in the EIR/EIS for amendments to TRPA Plan Areas, it is feasible for County amendments to occur as these changes do not alter the intent of classification of their respective plan areas and they would be in keeping with proposed TRPA mapping.</p> <p>Implementation of proposed amendments results in consistencies with policies related to transfer of development rights, plan area boundaries, height and allowable uses that would otherwise result in an inconsistency. Implementation of proposed mitigation measures eliminates the other inconsistencies</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

93

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>with policies related to noise, habitat, SEZ function, operational air quality, groundwater, fertilizer use, transportation and circulation, erosion control, species protection, scenic improvements, development fees, and affordable housing.</p> <p>Alternative 1A would be consistent with the applicable land use and zoning plans, as well as the land use goals, policies, and provisions of the TRPA Regional Plan including the Goals and Policies, Code of Ordinances, Plan Area Statements, and Ski Area Master Plan Guidelines, and the Placer County General Plan and West Shore Area General Plan as amended. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 6-15 through 6-33; see also Chapter 4, Relationship to Existing Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations; and Chapter 23, Master Responses 1, 4, 17, and 18.)</p>			
<p>LU-2. Will the Project be consistent with adjacent land uses, expand/intensify existing non-conforming uses, or transfer development rights that exceed density limits?</p> <p>Alternative 1A is determined to be consistent with adjacent land uses because it proposes uses are either an appropriate expansion of facilities or are uses that will be amended to the Plan Area in support of Plan Area and community-wide goals. Alternative 1A does not expand/intensify existing non-conforming uses. Some TAU, ERU, and CFA have been allocated or purchased, however, the proposed mix of tourist, residential, and commercial uses will require the allocation of additional CFA, MFBU, and ERU before permits can be finalized. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 6-34 through 6-45; see also Chapter 23, Master Responses 4, 5, 6, and 7.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure LU-2a. Purchase and Transfer of Additional ERUs.</p> <p>Prior to permitting ERU development associated with the proposed Master Plan in excess of current entitlements, HMR shall obtain ERUs adequate for the proposed project application. At present, HMR is lacking ERUs for their proposed Phase 2 development at the South Base and the Townhouses at the North Base under Alternatives 1/1A and 3, and a portion of the proposed Phase 1 development under Alternative 6. These ERUs can be obtained by either converting excess TAUs that originated on low capability lands or by purchasing ERUs from other off-site locations. Prior to transfer, HMR shall demonstrate that the transfer of these additional units does not result in negative impacts to the Plan Area or Community Plan from which the purchased units came. Preferably, the units will be transferred from a nearby Plan Area or Community Plan area located in Placer County, and will be associated with the restoration of sensitive lands.</p> <p>If the TRPA Governing Board does not approve an increase in the number of MRBUs included in the TRPA February 2008 Governing Board resolution, then the proposed affordable housing units shall be reduced to 12 or an additional ERU may be transferred to the Project Area (Alternatives 1/1A and 3) area to accommodate the proposed 13 affordable housing units.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure LU-2a and Mitigation Measure LU-2b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring and setting forth criteria for the purchase and transfer of additional ERUs and CFA. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measures LU-2a and LU-2b will reconcile requested entitlements with those available to the Alternative 1A. The addition of additional entitlements or the reduction of the proposed project to match supply will reduce this impact to a less than significant level assuming the proposed Plan Area amendments are approved (as discussed in Impact LU-1). Mitigation Measure LU-2a also requires HMR demonstrate that the transfer of these additional units does not result in negative environmental impacts.</p> <p>Some commenters have express concern regarding the size, density, and massing of the project, as well as the mix of uses, will change the community character of Homewood. The Proposed Project will result in an increase in commercial, mixed-use, tourist and residential uses, clustered along SR 89 where other commercial and tourist features are currently found in the community. While the project would increase the number of uses on the site, this change does not alter the location of urbanization along SR 89 in the Homewood area. Visual elements of the new structures, including the "Old Tahoe" architectural design and</p>

fb
94

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Mitigation Measure LU-2b. CFA Reduction or Additional CFA Reservation.</p> <p>To comply with the CFA allocation reserved by TRPA under the 2008 Resolution, the project must reduce total CFA by 1,763 square feet or obtain an additional 1,763 square feet of CFA pursuant to TRPA Code Section 33.3. If additional CFA is pursued, the additional CFA must be obtained prior to the permitting of the development phase for which it will be applied.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 6-41..)</p>		<p>improved landscaping help maintain the "rustic" character of the area.</p> <p>Many portions of the community include residences spread throughout the landscape. The community does not have the development intensity of other Lake Tahoe areas such as South shore. However, this project does not propose to transform the community into an area that resembles South shore. In particular, the inclusion of new mixtures of uses does not disturb the community character if designed, located and placed correctly. Chapters 6.0 and 10.0 of the EIR/EIS both address the Project's compatibility with the surrounding community.</p> <p>The West shore is not as densely developed as other communities around the lake, such as the South shore referenced in many of the comments; however, the West shore includes urban features and is identified as an area appropriate for a community plan, which indicates that this is an urban area.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 6-34 through 6-45; see also Chapter 23, Master Responses 4, 5, 6, and 7.)</p>
<p>LU-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to land use?</p> <p>Alternative 1A would amend the list of permissible uses in the three affected Plan Areas and would increase tourist, commercial, and residential growth in these Plan Areas, particularly in the area fronting SR 89. The Proposed Project would also increase the size of urban land use boundaries. While some of these changes are promoted in the Plan Area Statement, the result is that the overall urbanization of the region increases, especially when cumulatively considered. However, by placing commercial and higher density development within the urban area, this helps to unify growth in the region instead of promoting development outside the existing tourist corridor.</p> <p>Alternative 1A includes a deed restriction on the majority of the property from future non-recreational development and also include other environmental benefits not required under existing codes and regulations. These benefits are magnified as there are other publicly-sponsored projects in the area that implement traffic improvements, water quality improvements, soil stabilization, coverage reduction or land restoration, and scenic quality improvements. The recreation benefits of the Proposed Project are considerable in that they serve both residents and tourists to the basin.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

95

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>With new tourist facilities planned in the north shore, bike trail expansions, and improved access, new facilities at HMR will result in an overall improvement to the tourist and recreation experience, thereby improving the vitality and long-term viability of the area in conjunction with long-term environmental and scenic improvements. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 6-45 through 6-47; see also Chapter 23, Master Responses 4, 5, 6, 7, 17 and 18.)</p>			
POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING			
<p>PEH-1. Will the Project increase the demand for housing, thereby causing direct or indirect environmental consequences?</p> <p>As documented in the Plan consistency analysis included in Table 7-8 of the EIR/EIS, Implementation of Alternative 1A would not provide sufficient employee/workforce housing to meet the requirements of Placer County Housing Element Policies B-15, C-2, and other applicable policies in the Housing Element and 1998 West Shore Area General Plan. Because the necessary off-site employee/workforce housing is not currently identified, the impact is considered to be significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 7-7 through 7-18.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure PEH-1: Develop Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall develop a detailed "Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan" based on the alternative selected for Placer County review and approval. Provision of sufficient housing opportunities to accommodate a minimum of half of new FTEs generated by Project operation will be assured through a combination of one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of new on-site employee/workforce housing; • Development/renovation of off-site employee/workforce housing; • Dedication of sufficient land for needed units, and/or; • Payment of an in-lieu fee. <p>The designs of applicant-provided on-site and off-site employee/workforce housing shall be reviewed and approved by the County. An approved Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan shall be required prior to the issuance of building permits or recordation of final maps, whichever occurs first. The Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan shall provide an accounting of the final number of net new FTEs expected to be created by the constructed alternative with identified phasing; the number, locations, and capacity of new employee/workforce housing units to be developed; location and capacity of dedicated land for new employee/workforce housing; in-lieu fees paid to the County, and implementation schedule to ensure that sufficient new housing is available for new employees as Project construction is completed and operations begin. In the event that HMR chooses to proceed with in-</p>	LS	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure PEH-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring development of Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan, which will ensure that sufficient housing is available for new employees as Project construction is completed and operations begin. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The Proposed Project require up to 33 additional units for 65 new employees. As a condition of receiving 13 MRBUs from TRPA as a CEP Project, the Applicant in its acceptance letter dated January 31, 2008, indicated that it would find employee/workforce housing solutions for the balance of new FTEs generated in excess of those served by the 13 on-site MRBUs. Following Master Plan adoption, HMR intends to identify and secure off-site employee/workforce housing for the balance of new full time equivalent employees generated by the selected alternative. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PEH-1 will ensure that sufficient employee/workforce housing is provided on-site and/or off-site for at least half of the expected new FTEs generated, consistent with Placer County General Plan Housing Element Policies B-15, C-2, and other applicable policies in the Housing Element and 1998 West Shore Area General Plan. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PEH-1 reduces this impact to less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 7-7 through 7-18.)</p>

96

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>lieu fees paid to the County, HMR must include a detailed accounting of the actual construction cost of each unit. This will ensure that enough fees are paid to actually build employee housing. If additional environmental impacts, other than those already identified, analyzed, and mitigated (if necessary) as part of this Draft EIR/EIS are created as a result of any of the proposed on-site or off-site employee/workforce housing, the Improvement Plans shall not be approved until subsequent environmental review has been completed.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 7-10.)</p>		
<p>PEH-2. Will the Project alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?</p> <p>Alternative 1A is not expected to result in substantial new population growth. The existing population in the North Lake Tahoe Basin was 26,913 residents in 2007, and the population of the Placer County portion of the Basin was 14,588 and Homewood was 906 persons. As presented in Chapter 3 of the EIR/EIS, the Proposed Project will include up to 181 multifamily residential units, including 165 whole or partial ownership market rate multifamily dwelling units and 16 Townhomes. The average household size in Placer County in 2007 was 2.6 persons. At this rate, the full time resident population may increase by up to 460 persons under Alternative 1A. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 7-18 through 7-19.)</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>
<p>PEH-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to population, employment, and housing?</p> <p>Implementation of Alternative 1A will result in population increases, including lower-income population demographic associated with the leisure, retail, and hospitality employment growth. There are multiple projects proposed for the North and West Shore Tahoe region that will expand recreation, commercial, and hospitality services. There are other projects proposed in Tahoe Vista and Kings Beach that are specifically targeted at increasing the amount of employee/ workforce housing in the Lake Tahoe Region. There are other employee/ workforce housing projects proposed in Kings Beach (84 units) and Tahoe Vista (162</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

97

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>units) that may provide an opportunity for housing new HMR employees. There is existing unmet demand, however, for employee/ workforce housing in the region.</p> <p>The Proposed Project are required to provide housing for only half of the new project-related employee/ workforce housing demand under Placer County General Plan Housing Element policy C-2. Consequently, the Proposed Project contributes to the existing cumulative impact of a lack of employee/workforce housing in the region.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will increase unmet demand for approximately 33 employee/workforce housing units for 65 new FTEs, Based on a supply of 11,481 housing units in the Placer County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin, the potential contributions of the Proposed Project to unmet demand for employee/workforce housing are not expected to be cumulatively considerable. In addition, based on existing employment and residential patterns in the area, a substantial portion of new employees at HMR are expected to be existing residents in the Placer County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Therefore, this potential cumulative impact related to population, employment and housing is considered less than significant.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will contribute to a cumulative employment benefit to the region by providing tourist recreational services and vacation homes that draw visitors to the area. In addition to the refurbished and improved winter sports facilities, the added services (hotel, restaurants, retail, hiking and biking trails) and the conversion of Tourist Accommodation Units (TAUs) to residential units will provide new tourist opportunities in conjunction with other tourist features offered at other redeveloped projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Therefore, this potential cumulative impact is considered less than significant. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, , pp. 7-20 to 7-21.)</p>			
<p>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</p> <p>BIO-1. Will the Project, directly or indirectly (including through spread of noxious weeds and habitat modification), cause a loss of individuals or occupied habitat of</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

86

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>endangered or threatened fish or wildlife species?</p> <p>Sierra Nevada red fox (<i>Vulpes vulpes necator</i>) and California wolverine (<i>Gulo gulo luteus</i>) are both Threatened in the State of California. Bald Eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>) is Endangered in the State of California. Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog is a candidate for federal endangered status. While the Project area contains potentially suitable habitats for these species, occurrences for Sierra Nevada red fox, California wolverine and Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog have not been recorded in or adjacent to the Project area. Bald eagles have been observed foraging at Quail Lake, however no changes to the Quail Lake area will occur with implementation of the project and associated alternatives.</p> <p>Implementation of Alternative 1A would remove forested habitat that would be suitable for foraging for both the California wolverine and Sierra Nevada red fox. However, due to existing human activities associated with existing recreational and operational uses onsite, the suitability of the habitat mountain-wide is severely diminished as both species prefer habitats undisturbed by human influences. No habitat for Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog would be impacted. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 8-54; see also Response to Comments 93-9 and 131-2.)</p>			
<p>BIO-2. Will the Project cause loss of raptor nests, migratory bird nests, or wildlife nursery sites?</p> <p>Alternative 1A includes tree removal associated with development at the North Base and South Base areas and the Mid-Mountain Lodge and gondola. Tree removal and construction activities associated with the new buildings may result in direct removal of active nests for migratory birds, raptors, or other wildlife and may result in disturbance or abandonment of nesting, roosting, or breeding sites in adjacent habitat. While no active nests or roosting sites were detected during previous surveys, the potential exists for nests or roosts to be present before construction commences in the future;</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2. Active Raptor, Migratory Bird Nest Site, Wildlife Nursery/Den Site, and Bat Roost Protection Program.</p> <p>Pre-construction surveys, conducted during the nesting/breeding season (spring) immediately prior to initial Project construction (e.g., where excavation and tree removal is required), shall be conducted to identify active raptor nest sites, migratory bird nests, mammal den sites, and bat roost sites in the proposed construction area. If no nests, den sites or roosts are found, then mitigation requirements are complete. If nests or roosts are located within the Project area during the pre-construction surveys, additional monitoring shall be required as follows. During initial construction activities (tree removal and</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the applicant conduct preconstruction surveys active raptor nest sites, migratory bird nests, mammal den sites, and bat roost sites and as well as provide monitoring and protective measures. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-2 will reduce project-related impacts to a less-than-significant level by requiring surveys to be performed in the season prior to construction activities and will ensure protection of any active nests, dens or roosts.</p>

bb

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>therefore, this impact is considered to be significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-54 through 8-57.)</p>	<p>excavation for the construction), a qualified biological monitor will be onsite to evaluate whether raptors are occupying trees, sensitive den sites are within the Project area or bats are occupying identified roosts. The biological monitor will have the authority to stop construction near occupied trees/den sites if he/she determines proposed activities could have a negative impact on nesting raptors, migratory birds or their young, or bats observed in the construction zone. If construction must be stopped, the monitor must consult with TRPA and CDFG staff within 24 hours to determine appropriate actions (minimum setbacks and avoidance measures appropriate to specific species present and individual situations) to restart construction while reducing impacts to identified raptors, migratory bird nests, den sites or bats. If a potential American marten den is located, an appropriate method will be used to confirm whether American marten occupy the den. This may involve placing a tracking medium at the den entrance to determine use of the den or using motion sensing camera stations. Monitoring for den occupancy shall be conducted for a minimum of two consecutive nights. Other devices such as fiber optic scope may be utilized to determine occupancy. If no marten occupy the potential den, the entrance shall be blocked to ensure no marten occupy the area during the construction period. If the den is found to be occupied by American marten, the California Department of Fish and Game shall be notified of the observation and shall be consulted regarding approach to addressing the den site. A potential option includes providing a no-disturbance buffer around the den during the breeding season (May 1 through July 31).</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 8-56.)</p>		<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-54 through 8-57; see also Response to Comment 14a-153.)</p>
<p>BIO-3. Will the Project substantially block or disrupt major fish or wildlife migration or travel corridors?</p> <p>Implementation of Alternative 1A includes the removal of the culvert and restoration of the SEZ associated with Homewood Creek in this area. Specific design of the restored SEZ has not been provided and therefore it cannot be determined that there would be no impact to the movement of fish species within the restored creek area. No impacts to deer migration corridors will result from implementation of the</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-3. Fish Passage Protection and Enhancement.</p> <p>Removal of the culvert within Homewood Creek located in the South Base area under Alternatives 1, 1A and 3 shall be performed in such a manner to protect fish passage during and after construction. Protection measures include installation of creek flow bypass measures to maintain flows below the Project area. The Stream Environment Zone restoration plan for Homewood Creek (Appendix C) shall be modified to include fish passage measures in the design so</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring protective measures for fish passage during construction and restoration plans. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Three perennial creeks occur in the Project area including Madden Creek, Homewood Creek and Quail Creek. Under Alternatives 1A, a</p>

100

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Alternative 1A, as no corridors exist in the Project area. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-57 to 8-58.)</p>	<p>as to not inhibit movement upstream or downstream of fish and other aquatic species. The restoration plan shall include design elements that will enhance fish habitat. Prior to finalization of the restoration plans, TRPA and Placer County staff shall review and approve the design to ensure adequate habitat improvements are included and fish passage is provided.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-57 through 8-58.)</p>		<p>new bridge would span the Homewood Creek SEZ and allow for establishment of riparian vegetation. Restoration will include design measures to allow for fish passage. Restoration would allow for enhanced functioning of the SEZ through increased diversity of riparian plant species, increased habitat for wildlife, and increased sinuosity of the stream channel thereby slowing flows. Increased suitability of habitat will allow for the riparian corridor to be better utilized for travel by wildlife species. The restored SEZ will allow for connectivity of habitats above the South Base area to habitats that exist below the existing parking area. Through widening of the SEZ and the addition of step pools, utilization of the habitats may increase and result in unhindered passage of fish and wildlife species.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-3 will reduce project-related impacts to a less-than-significant level by protecting fish access and movement in Homewood Creek during project construction. The remaining creeks in the Project area (Madden Creek and Quail Creek) would not be modified under the Proposed Project. Further, no other changes to the flow of the creeks or vegetation associated with them will occur.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-57 to 8-58; see also Response to Comment 19-40.)</p>
<p>BIO-4. Will the Project cause a permanent loss of sensitive wildlife individuals or habitat, as defined by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Placer County General Plan Section 6, or California Department of Fish and Game or cause a decline in population levels below a viable population level?</p> <p>Sensitive wildlife species in the Project area include California yellow warbler, waterfowl, osprey, Townsend's big-eared bat, Sierra Nevada mountain beaver, American marten, and mule deer. Sensitive species with suitable habitat in the Project area but not observed during wildlife surveys include Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog, bald eagle, northern goshawk, cooper's hawk, sharp-shinned hawk, California spotted owl, willow flycatcher, Myotis bat species, Sierra Nevada showshoe hare, Sierra Nevada red fox, California wolverine, and Pacific fisher.</p> <p>The Proposed Project would not negatively modify other riparian, lake, or meadow habitats at HMR, so impact to the California yellow warbler species and habitat are considered less than significant for this species.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2. Active Raptor, Migratory Bird Nest Site, Wildlife Nursery/Den Site, and Bat Roost Protection Program.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for BIO-2 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 8-56.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-4a. Bat Roost Relocation Program</p> <p>Prior to demolition of the Homewood Lodge located at the north base, the building shall be surveyed using acoustic survey methods as well as visual searches of the building to determine the presence or absence of bat species. The survey shall determine if the roost is a maternity roost (if survey is being performed in the spring), hibernacula or day roost. If a maternity roost is present, delay of the demolition may be necessary until after the roost is vacated. If bat species are detected/observed within the building, measures shall be taken to clear the bats prior to demolition activities. Measures to disturb resident bats within may include but are not limited to: disturbance to roosting individuals through introduction of light and/or noise to create an undesirable setting and to encourage the bats to</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-2, BIO-4a, and BIO-4b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the applicant conduct preconstruction surveys, monitoring and protective measures, as well as a Trash Management Program to prevent wildlife access to trash and refuse. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-2 will reduce Project related impacts to less than significant level by requiring surveys to be performed in the season prior to construction activities to ensure protection of active osprey and other species nests and dens should any be detected. Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-4a will reduce potential impacts to bat species to a less than significant level by requiring preconstruction surveys, a relocation program and protective measures to ensure this impact is less than significant. Limiting the exposure of refuse and food to wildlife species is vital to protect the wildlife and humans alike and decreases the potential negative interaction between the two. Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-4b will reduce potential impacts to Wildlife species (black bear, marten, Spermophilus sp, Tamias sp., and many avian species) that are often attracted to trash and refuse as a food source to a less than significant level by requiring a Trash Management Program.</p>

101

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Construction activities associated with installation of the mid-mountain lodge, water tanks and gondola will result in the disturbance of existing forest which is suitable foraging habitat for American marten. This minor loss of habitat will not likely have a negative impact on the local marten population but may have an impact on individuals, so this impact is considered potentially significant.</p> <p>With the introduction of a mid-mountain lodge within the Project area the opportunity arises for existing wildlife species to be impacted from increased human presence. Wildlife species (black bear, marten, Spermophilus sp, Tamias sp., and many avian species) are often attracted to trash and refuse as a food source. Potential impacts to sensitive individuals may occur due to prolonged exposure of wildlife species to refuse generated by the new development.</p> <p>The proposed stream restoration located at the South Base would impact existing riparian habitat, however this area is heavily disturbed and is not suitable for mountain beaver. As no proposed activities would impact existing riparian habitats that are suitable for mountain beavers, impacts to this species are considered less than significant.</p> <p>Suitable habitat for osprey nest sites are widespread throughout the Project area as Quail Lake and Lake Louise are suitable bodies of water containing fish for foraging. While no active or inactive nests have been located in the Project area, construction may result in the removal of suitable nesting trees for osprey. Due to the large number of trees in the Project area, and the high degree of human activity associated with the North and South Base areas proposed for a majority of the development, the loss of the large trees will not have a substantial impact on availability of nest trees for osprey. As no nests were located during surveys in the Project area, it is likely no individuals will be impacted or lost. While currently there are no active osprey nests in the Project area, the potential exists for the establishment of nests in the Project area prior to construction, therefore, this impact is considered to be potentially significant.</p>	<p>vacate the roost. Upon removal of the bats, access points to the building shall be sealed to prevent reentry of bat species. Once it has been concluded that no bat species are present, demolition may commence upon final approval of TRPA. To offset the loss of the occupied bat roost, Homewood Mountain Resort shall install bat boxes in the vicinity of the North Base to provide roosting opportunities and locations for the displaced bats. Homewood Mountain Resort shall work together with Placer County and TRPA biologists to agree upon the number of bat boxes and their respective installation locations prior to removal of the bat roost/demolition activities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-4b. Trash Management Program</p> <p>Prior to finalization of construction permits and prior to Improvement Plan Approva for the new mid-mountain lodge, HMR shall prepare a Trash Management Program for review and approval by the TRPA and Placer County. The Trash Management Program shall include measures to prevent wildlife access to trash and refuse generated by the new lodge and associated facilities. Measures to be included at a minimum are wildlife proof trash containers in all outside areas, scheduling for removal of refuse from the lodge area on a daily basis and educational signage outlining the dangers of feeding wildlife.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-60 to 8-61.)</p>		<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-58 through 8-61; see also Response to Comment 93-9 and 131-3.)</p>

103

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Increased nighttime lighting is not expected to have an impact on wildlife species in the area as all new lighting must comply with TRPA design review guidelines that require lighting to be for illumination only and shall not be directed above the horizontal. Compliance with these design guidelines will prevent the dispersal of light into adjacent residential areas and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Alternative 1A would result in the demolition of Homewood Lodge at the north base. As there are a number of sensitive species with suitable habitat (Townsend's big-eared bat, Spotted bat, small-footed myotis bat, long-eared myotis bat, fringed myotis bat, long-legged myotis, yuma myotis bat) the potential to disturb individuals during demolition is high. Due to this potential impact to individuals and the uncertainty of species to be impacted this impact is considered potentially significant. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-58 through 8-61.)</p>			
<p>BIO-5. Will the Project affect wetlands or waters of the U.S. and/or riparian and Stream Environment Zones (SEZ) through direct removal, filling, hydrologic interruption, encroachment, removal of streamside vegetation or other means?</p> <p>As described under Impact BIO-3 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the SEZ in the South Base area will be restored to a more natural state with the removal of the culvert and the day lighting of the stream channel. In its existing condition, Homewood creek is highly constrained with steep banks and a culverted section under the South Base parking area. The restoration of the Homewood Creek SEZ will likely result in improvements to the SEZ however the proposed Restoration Plan included in Appendix C of the Draft EIR/EIS does not provide sufficient detail to substantiate a conclusion that impacts will be beneficial and no negative impacts will occur to the SEZ below the Project area. Therefore this impact is considered potentially significant. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-61 through 8-65.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Final Homewood Creek SEZ Restoration Plan.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall modify the Homewood Creek SEZ Restoration Plan - April 3, 2010 to include supplemental information necessary for TRPA project approval and permitting. The Revised Homewood Creek SEZ Restoration Plan shall add the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of existing constraints of the Project area; • Channel location; • Channel substrate composition; • In-channel features such as logs or rocks to act as flow separators (if necessary) to encourage braiding of the channel and sediment deposition; • A profile of the restored stream channel in conjunction with existing cross sections; • A narrative of construction techniques that describe modifications to channel geometry; • A comprehensive planting plan identifying species and planting locations of riparian and wetland plants shall be incorporated into the restoration plan, including species that are known to occur in the existing 	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-5a, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR develop and implement a SEZ restoration 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The Project area contains SEZs associated with the streams that flow through or originate in the Project area. Streams include Madden Creek, Homewood Creek (Homewood Canyon Creek), Quail Creek, and an unnamed ephemeral drainage between the North Base and South Base areas. Implementation of Alternative 1A does not include new development in areas delineated as SEZ with the exception of the replacement of the existing roadway and culvert at the South Base area (see Impact BIO-3) and construction of an improved access roadway for the townhouse located to the west of the North Base area. The removal of the existing culvert and roadway at the South Base area will result in a reduction in total disturbance of the existing SEZ. The access roadway leading from the South Base to the townhomes located to adjacent to the North Base area will cross a narrow SEZ. The proposed paved roadway utilizes the same alignment as the existing dirt roadway that leads from the South Base area to the North Base area. BMPs for the roadway in the form of rolled curb and drainage basins will prevent stormwater from reaching the drainage. Construction will be restricted to the existing roadway, and no</p>

103

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>undisturbed SEZ above the proposed restoration site;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil stabilization and erosion control measures and other permanent BMPs; and • A long-term maintenance and monitoring plan to measure establishment of plants and to monitor the progress of restoration activities. <p>The desired condition shall mirror historic site conditions, adjacent plant community composition, and habitat value. Goals shall be identified to ensure parameters such as plant density, percent plant cover, and stage of maturity of planted plant species are achieved. The revised restoration plan shall be review and approved by appropriate permitting agencies prior to implementation to ensure restoration goals and success criteria are acceptable, sufficient and attainable for the site-specific conditions.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-63 to 64.)</p>		<p>riparian vegetation will be impacted due to paving.</p> <p>The SEZ restoration plan for Homewood Creek (see Appendix C of the Draft EIR/EIS) includes widening of the creek to allow for increased cross sectional area and will contain primary and secondary flood plains (IERS, April 2010). Widening of the stream cross-section results in a reduction of the kinetic energy and creates benefits to the SEZ. The restoration allows for better functioning of the SEZ habitat and will likely result in an increase of SEZ habitat in the Project area. Restoration of the Homewood Creek SEZ in the South Base area will not have negative impacts to downstream areas. The stream is currently contained by the culvert running through the parking lot. The proposed restoration will provide a connection to two day lighted areas that exist above and below the South Base development area. The restoration may have a positive impact on downstream floodplains as it will allow for increased area for groundwater recharge and also allow for the floodplain downstream to retain its character.</p> <p>Under the Proposed Project, the proposed North Base area parking garage has been designed to locate the footprint of the building completely outside of the SEZ delineated by TRPA during the HMR Land Capability Challenge (2008). While there are no plans provided by HMR for the restoration of the SEZ portions of the gravel parking lot, it is assumed that the gravel parking lot fill will be removed and restored during construction of the proposed parking garage and that the project will result in a benefit to the SEZ.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-5a will provide sufficient detail for approval of the restoration project and provide evidence on impacts to the SEZ below the Project area. This plan will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-61 through 8-65; see also Response to Comment 14a-34, 14a-53 and 14a-155.)</p>
<p>BIO-6. Will the Project, directly or indirectly (including through spread of noxious weeds), cause a loss of individuals or occupied habitat of endangered, threatened, or CNPS List 1b, 2, and 3, or TRPA listed plant species?</p> <p>Alternative 1A includes construction activities which may introduce additional noxious weed species or create conditions that increase the probability for the spread of existing weed populations. Catherine Schnurrenberger performed a botanical field reconnaissance for construction areas in early August 2007 (Botanical Field Reconnaissance Report, 2007). No special-status plant species were observed during the survey in the Project area. Noxious</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-6a. Noxious Weed Risk Assessment and Eradication.</p> <p>HMR shall develop and implement a Noxious Weed Eradication and Control Program to protect suitable sensitive plant habitat and to protect future populations of sensitive plants from invasive terrestrial and aquatic noxious weeds. The plan shall identify a noxious weed coordinator for HMR and include abatement measures to decrease and eradicate known populations of noxious weeds and prevention measures as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known populations of terrestrial and aquatic noxious weeds shall be identified and a plan shall be implemented to control and eradicate 	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-6a and BIO-6b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR develop and implement a Noxious Weed Eradication and Control Program and pre-construction rare plant 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measured BIO-6a and BIO-6b will reduce/eliminate known populations of noxious weeds and protect sensitive plant habitats and individuals from potential infestation and impacts associated with construction activities. These measures will reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant level.</p>

104

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>weeds were observed in the Project area, including Klamath weed (<i>Hypericum perforatum</i>), bull thistle (<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>), cheat grass (<i>Bromus tectorum</i>), woolly mullein (<i>Verbascum thapsus</i>), and witchgrass (<i>Panicum capillare</i>). Eurasian watermilfoil (<i>Myriophyllum spicatum</i>) was also noted to be present in Quail Lake. HMR does not have a noxious weed management plan in place to eradicate and control weeds onsite. While there were no special-status plant species detected during surveys, the potential exists for species to colonize suitable habitat present at HMR. Vegetation removal and ground disturbance associated with construction may introduce new weed species or result in the spread of existing noxious weeds that may exclude native plant species. Therefore, this impact is considered significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-65 through 8-67.)</p>	<p>weed populations and restore native plant cover.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipment used in the Project must be sanitized and free of non-native invasive species before moving into the Project area to ensure that the equipment is free of soil, seeds, vegetative material, or other debris that could contain or hold seeds of non-native invasive species. Vehicles, especially large, off-road and/or earthmoving vehicles shall be cleaned when they come into the Lake Tahoe Basin or come from a Basin area known to contain non-native invasive species. Equipment will be considered clean when visual inspection finds no soil, seeds, plant material, or other such debris. • Gravel, fill, or other materials shall be "weed-free." Use onsite sand, gravel, rock, or organic matter when possible. Otherwise, obtain "weed-free" materials from gravel pits and fill sources that have been surveyed and approved by the CDFG or Nevada Department of Agriculture or by the noxious weed coordinator. • Use "weed-free" mulches, and seed sources. Salvage topsoil from Project area for use in onsite revegetation, unless contaminated with non-native invasive species. Do not use soil or materials from areas contaminated by cheat grass. • After construction, the noxious weed coordinator shall be notified. The Project area shall be monitored for 3 years subsequent to Project implementation to ensure additional non-native invasive species do not become established in the areas affected by the Project, that native species are established on re-seeded or restored habitats, and that known non-native invasive species do not spread. <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-6b. Pre-Construction Rare Plant Surveys.</p> <p>HMR shall hire an approved botanist/biologist to perform rare plant surveys in Project areas</p>		<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-65 through 8-67.)</p>

105

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>proposed for development prior to construction. The survey shall identify species observed and include locations of rare plant species identified. TRPA and Placer County staff shall be notified of the location of rare plant species present within the proposed Project area. If rare plants are identified, measures shall be taken to avoid disturbance and impacts to the plants. Protection measures shall be developed in conjunction with TRPA, CDFG and Placer County staff as necessary and shall be specific to the species present and the potential disturbance that may result from construction activities (habitat modification, direct removal, blasting activities, noxious weed introduction, etc.). If avoidance of rare plant species is not possible, compensation measures shall be developed prior to disturbance/constructions activities. These compensation measures shall be tailored to the specific species to be disturbed and to the location in which the disturbance is to occur. If agency staff determines that compensation measures are not feasible, then the project shall be modified to avoid the disturbance.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-66 to 8-67.)</p>		
<p>BIO-7. Will the Project have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the US Fish and Wildlife Service?</p> <p>Sensitive natural communities in the Project area include SEZs as defined by TRPA. No uncommon plant communities identified by TRPA are present. As discussed under Impact BIO-5, mitigation measures BIO-5a ensures that onsite SEZs are properly restored with the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project will increase the amount and function of SEZ due to the restoration of Homewood Creek in the South Base area and restoration of a portion of the gravel parking lot located in SEZ at the North Base area. Due to construction in the SEZs at the South Base and North Base areas, the Proposed Project would have potentially significant impacts to sensitive natural communities, and mitigation is required. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 8-67.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Final Homewood Creek SEZ Restoration Plan.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for BIO-5 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-63 to 64.)</p>	LS	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-5a, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR develop and implement a SEZ restoration 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-5a will reduce Project related impacts to a less than significant level by ensuring that existing SEZ disturbance is successfully restored.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 8-67; see also Explanation/Facts in Support of Findings BIO-3 and BIO-5.)</p>
<p>BIO-8. Will the Project cause a change in diversity or distribution of species or result</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	LS	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are beneficial. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

106

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>in permanent loss of sensitive native plant communities (including Stream Environment Zones [SEZ] and communities defined as sensitive in the California Natural Diversity Data Base), including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, micro flora and aquatic plants through direct removal or indirect lowering of the groundwater table?</p> <p>The Project area does not contain sensitive native plant communities as defined by the CNDDDB. The Project area contains SEZs as defined by the TRPA. Implementation of Alternative 1A will improve SEZ function and habitat through the restoration of Homewood Creek in the South Base area and a portion of the gravel parking lot in the North Base area. Based on the increase of SEZ area and enhancement of riparian habitat on site (as compared to the existing conditions), this is considered a beneficial impact. The remainder of the development would occur in existing disturbed areas and/or on common upland habitat types, such as conifer forests. These common upland habitat types are not considered sensitive native plant communities. (B)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 6-68; see also Explanation/Facts in Support of Findings BIO-3 and BIO-5.)</p>			<p>Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>
<p>BIO-9. Will the Project introduce new vegetation that will require excessive fertilizer or water, or will provide a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?</p> <p>Landscape plans and fertilizer plans have not been developed for Alternative 1A. Under Alternative 1A, landscaping and fertilizer management would be the responsibility of HMR. Therefore, the level of impact that may result due to introduction of new vegetation or types of fertilizer cannot be determined with certainty. Therefore, this impact is considered to be potentially significant and mitigation is required. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-68 through 8-71.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-9. Final Landscape/Revegetation Plan and Fertilizer Management Plan.</p> <p>HMR shall prepare and implement a final landscape/revegetation plan and fertilizer management plan for the Project area in accordance with Sections 3.5.19 and 3.5.20 of the Final EIR/EIS. This plan shall comply with TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 31.7 Landscaping Standards and Section 81.7 Fertilizer Management. The landscape plan shall include replacement of trees in accordance with Placer County regulations. The plan shall be reviewed and approved by TRPA and Placer County Planning Department prior to issuance of the final Project approval.</p> <p>The revegetation/landscaping plan shall require the use of native or TRPA-approved nonnative shrubs and trees in the project area, as these plants are most adapted to the conditions of the</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-9, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR develop and implement a Final Landscape/Revegetation Plan and Fertilizer Management 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-9 will require the creation of a landscape plan and fertilizer management plan that complies with TRPA Code of Ordinances to retain native species where applicable and regulate the use of fertilizer. Implementation of this measure will reduce the impact to less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-68 through 8-71.)</p>

108

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Project area and require less irrigation for establishment and upkeep.</p> <p>Bioretention areas for stormwater treatment are proposed for use throughout the project area in-line with stormwater conveyance and retention systems. Runoff shall be directed into bioretention areas, where it can pond and infiltrate into the soil. The engineered soil mix and vegetation in the bioretention areas shall provide water quality treatment and infiltration similar to undeveloped areas.</p> <p>High traffic groomed turf areas are designed and located to allow for controlled irrigation and fertilization throughout the Project area. Irrigation shall be installed and managed to minimize the potential for runoff to the stormwater treatment systems.</p> <p>Fertilizer shall be managed carefully and used in dry, slow release form when applications are necessary. Special measures to avoid over spraying onto paved surfaces, which could result in wash off of nutrient rich water to the stormwater treatment systems, shall be taken. To ensure minimal escape of nutrients, fertilizer and irrigation shall be monitored closely. The Plan shall include, but shall not be limited to the following measures to minimize the potential for nutrients entering surface water or escaping the root zone and being delivered to groundwater:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of non-mowed or slow-growing turf grass species, locally native or adapted species with annual fertilizer requirements that do not exceed 1.5 pounds per 1,000 square feet; • Implementation of a Fertilizer Management Plan that meets the requirements of Section 81.7 of TRPA Code or Ordinances; • Determination of appropriate fertilizer rates by a soil/revegetation specialist and based on the results of soil nutrient testing; • Incorporation of fertilizer into soils prior to seed application to prevent burning and low germination rates; • Use of Biosol or other organic, slow-release fertilizers that do not contain nitrate or ammonium with careful application to avoid application on hardscape; 		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibit fertilizer use on bioretention areas for stormwater treatment after initial establishment; and • Installation of a highly controlled spray irrigation system to avoid over irrigation and overspray onto hardscape. <p>The Revegetation Plan shall apply to areas disturbed during construction activities, the steep slopes above the North and South Base areas and the bioretention areas for stormwater treatment. The objective of the soil and revegetation treatments is to control sediment at its source, to maximize hydrologic and biological function in the soil and to develop and support a robust vegetation community. Specific treatment outcomes shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize soil infiltration rates and minimize runoff; • Protect the soil surface with functional mulch cover; • Reestablish soil nutrient cycling; and • Reestablish an appropriate, self-sustaining native plant community. <p>Bioretention areas shall receive similar treatments as disturbed areas. Bioretention areas are not expected to be wet during much of the growing season and are therefore not under the influence of a mesic or wet hydrologic regime. Soil treatments shall be the same as for the disturbed areas. Since runoff will be routed into bioretention areas for stormwater treatment, bioretention areas shall be designed such that concentrated flow will be routed through energy dissipaters using rocks or other landscape elements to eliminate scouring flows. More specific seeding and planting strategies in bioretention areas shall be developed in conjunction with the landscape architect developing the final landscaping plan, as discussed below.</p> <p>Slow-release, organic fertilizer shall be used and irrigation shall be applied so that water penetrates to at least eight inches below ground surface (bgs) within 24 hours of irrigation. The irrigation system shall be designed to meet this specification without displacing mulch or causing erosion. The final Plan shall include site-specific fertilizer and irrigation rates and a monitoring plan and shall be submitted to TRPA for project approval and permitting.</p>		

109

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>BIO-10. Will the Project result in the removal of any native live, dead or dying trees 30 inches or greater in diameter at breast height (dbh) in TRPA's Conservation or Recreational land use classifications, remove native vegetation in excess of the area utilized for the actual development permitted by the land capability, or cause a change in the natural functioning of an old growth ecosystem?</p> <p>Implementation of Alternative 1A involves tree removal for construction of facilities at the North Base, South Base, townhome sites, gondola alignment and Mid-Mountain Lodge. Alternative 1A will result in the removal of 27 trees that are 30 inches dbh or larger. Because a limited forest plan has not been generated for the Project area, this impact is considered significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-71 through 8-74.)</p>	<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-70 to 8-71.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-10. Prepare Forest Plan and Tree Protection Plan For Homewood Mountain Resort.</p> <p>HMR shall prepare and implement a Forest Plan for the Project area that complies with TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 71 and incorporates the Fire Suppression and Management Plan compliance measure as described in Section 3.12.12 of this document. The Forest Plan shall be produced by a Registered Professional Forester and be submitted to TRPA for review and approval to confirm that the plan complies with Chapter 71. The Forest Plan and Fire Suppression Management Plan must both comply with the CA Forest Practices Act and will require a Timberland Conversion Permit to be approved by Cal Fire. The forest plan shall identify and detail trees for removal and other forested areas which may require treatment (thinning) in order to increase the overall health of the forest.</p> <p>In addition, a Tree Protection Plan shall be prepared for the Project. Included in the Tree Protection Plan shall be tree protection measures to prevent damage to trees that are proposed to remain. The Project applicant shall hire a Registered Professional Forester to develop specific measures to ensure adequate protection to trees slated for retention in the vicinity of proposed development. The tree protection measures shall include the establishment of tree protection zones, and protection measures to prevent damage to the trees (bole, roots and branches). Additionally the Tree Protection Plan shall identify areas where tree roots are to be protected and proper methods for pruning, irrigation and limb removal during construction activities. The Tree Protection Plan shall include monitoring of the trees slated for retention for a period of three years. Mortality of any of the retained trees shall require the replacement of trees lost utilizing the same species and relative location. The Tree Protection Plan shall be submitted to Placer County and the TRPA for review and approval prior to removal of any trees associated with the Project. Stump removal is not allowed without prior approval of the Development Review Committee and may require a Grading Permit for erosion control and water quality purposes.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-10, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR develop and implement a Forest Plan and Tree Protection 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Table 8-6 of the EIR/EIS details tree removal numbers associated with the base areas and Mid-Mountain Lodge, including the water tank. Detailed plans have not been provided for the utility corridor that would connect the North Base and the Mid-Mountain Lodge. Therefore, accurate tree removal estimates cannot be developed for utility alignments. However, it is anticipated that utilities would utilize existing roadway alignments or ski trails, which have been previously cleared of trees.</p> <p>Of the 27 trees larger than 30 inches dbh proposed for removal under the Proposed Project, a total of nine trees have been identified for potential preservation in the North Base area. However, at present, it cannot be determined with certainty that these trees can be retained based on potential modifications to construction activities or building locations. Therefore, they are included in the estimated total tree removal count. It is noted on the May 21, 2009 memo that "Trees proposed to be removed fall in the parameters of the proposed building footprint or hardscape.</p> <p>The trees to be removed are located in PAS 157 Homewood/Tahoe Ski Bowl, which is a recreational plan area. Building development location was analyzed and selected in order to minimize impacts on scenic, ground water, grading and land coverage criteria." However, no development area is considered an old growth forest. TRPA Code Section 71.2.A identifies the standards for tree removal on conservation and recreation plan areas.</p> <p>The one exception that applies to Homewood is TRPA Code Section 71.2.A(6) which states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In ski areas with existing TRPA-approved master plans, trees larger than 30 inches dbh in the westside forest types and 24 inches dbh in eastside forest types may be removed for facilities that are consistent with that master plan. For activities that are consistent with a TRPA-approved master plan, trees larger than 30 inches dbh in the westside forest types and 24 inches dbh in eastside forest types may be removed when it is demonstrated that the removal is necessary for the activity.

110

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-73 to 8-74.)		<p>While 71.2.A(6) may apply to the proposed project, because the Project is located on private land, TRPA Code Section 71.2.C can be applied. The removal of 27 trees larger than 30 inches dbh would be much less than 10 percent of the total large trees in the Project area and therefore Subsection 71.2.C(2) could be applied for the Project.</p> <p>A number of trees larger than 30 inches dbh are proposed to be saved and to remain onsite at the North Base area. The potential exists for these trees to be damaged during construction and result in increased loss of large mature trees onsite.</p> <p>The Project does not conflict with the Placer County Tree Preservation ordinance adopted in October of 1991. The tree preservations Ordinance applies to all projects where discretionary permit approvals are required by the County provided, however, no Landmark Tree may be removed without obtaining a tree permit pursuant to Section 12.16.060. However, there are no Landmark Trees proposed for removal within the HMR project area.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure BIO--10 will ensure Homewood Mountain Resort will comply with TRPA regulations regarding removal of trees larger than 30 inches dbh prior to construction. This impact will be less than significant after mitigation.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-71 through 8-74.)</p>
<p>BIO-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to biological resources?</p> <p>The combined effect of Alternative 1A and reasonably foreseeable future projects on biological resources (as listed in Table 20.1-1 of the EIR/EIS) would not result in a significant impact. Many of the future projects that are proposed in the project vicinity include development projects that will not result in significant impacts to sensitive plant or wildlife species. The proposed development projects are located within and surrounded by existing urban uses and do not contain high quality habitats for sensitive wildlife and plant species. Other known erosion control project and fuels reduction projects will result in modifications to habitats but will require compliance with regulatory measures to avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive species and their respective habitats.</p> <p>Forest fuels reduction projects, restoration project and erosion control projects listed in Table 20-1 of the EIR/EIS will result in ground</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are beneficial. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>disturbance that could result in impacts to undiscovered rare plant species and sensitive vegetation types. Standard compliance measures, mitigation measures and design features that will be required for implementation of the projects will offset potential cumulative impacts to biological resources. The proposed fuels reduction projects, restoration projects and erosion control projects will result in improvements to the biological environment. Therefore this impact is considered less than significant. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-74 through 8-76.)</p>			
CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL RESOURCES			
<p>CUL-1: Will the Project adversely change the significance of an eligible or potentially-eligible National Register property, or a resource that meets the criteria for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources, or a resource on TRPA maps, including archaeological, historical, architectural, and Native American/traditional heritage resources?</p> <p>No NRHP, CRHR, or TRPA mapped properties are located in the Project area (Lindström 2007, and Marvin and Brejla 2009). Architectural resources in the North Base area of the Project area were evaluated as not eligible for listing on the NRHP under any of the criteria, or to be important historical resources for the purposes of CEQA or TRPA, primarily due to their lack of integrity (Marvin and Brejla 2009). HMR intends to relocate the existing Ski School building to the proposed on-site fishing/ice skating pond located between buildings C and D at the North Base area (area shown on Figures 3-7 and 3-8 in Chapter 3). The relocation of the existing Ski School building will not result in impacts to any eligible or potentially eligible National Register properties. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-9 to 9-10.)</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are beneficial. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
<p>CUL-2: Will the Project cause a physical change which would adversely affect unique ethnic cultural values or restrict historic or pre-historic religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?</p> <p>No unique ethnic cultural values or historic or pre-historic religious or sacred uses are known to have occurred within the Project area</p>	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.)

112

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
(Lindström 2007, and Marvin and Brejla 2009). Therefore, there are no impacts associated with Alternative 1A. (LS) (Final EIR/EIS, p. 9-10.)			
<p>CUL-3: Will the Project disturb significant unknown archaeological resources?</p> <p>No unique archaeological features are known to exist in the Project area. Therefore, there are no known impacts associated with Alternative 1A. No immediate Native American concerns regarding the Project area were identified (Lindström 2007). The Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California was notified of survey findings and concurred with the report recommendations (Lindström 2007). As with any construction undertaking (including BMP retrofit disturbance), the potential for undiscovered subsurface archaeological features remains though it is unlikely, particularly within the existing footprint of the previously disturbed base areas. Therefore, this impact is potentially significant. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-10 through 9-11.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Identify and Protect Undiscovered Archaeological Resources.</p> <p>To assure that potential undiscovered resources are identified during site grading, a qualified archaeologist shall be on-site during initial ground disturbing construction excavation and grading operations.</p> <p>If previously undiscovered human remains, archaeological resources, exotic rock (non-native) or unusual amounts of shell or bone are discovered during construction or any subsequent activity, ground disturbing activity will cease in the vicinity of the discovery until the TRPA and Placer County Cultural Resources or Planning staff (or their qualified SOPA-certified consultants) assesses it for eligibility to the NRHP, compliance with TRPA Code Section 29, and/or (in the event of a prehistoric or ethnographic find) for Native American Heritage Commission (e.g., Washoe) values. This assessment will occur in consultation with the California SHPO, TRPA, Placer County and the Washoe Tribe, as appropriate. Cessation of applicable construction activity will continue until proper treatment can be determined and implemented by the responsible agencies.</p> <p>If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect shall be provided on the Improvement Plans for the project.</p> <p>Following a review of a new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-10 through 9-11.)</p>	LS	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure CUL-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to implement procedures for the protection and treatment plan for archaeological 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 will protect potentially eligible resources that may be unearthed during project construction. Therefore, with mitigation, this impact is reduced to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-10 through 9-11.)</p>

113

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>CUL-4: Will the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</p> <p>No unique paleontological resources or geologic features are located within the Project area. Therefore, there are no known impacts associated with any Alternative. As with any construction undertaking (including BMP retrofit disturbance), the potential for undiscovered subsurface paleontological features remains though it is unlikely, particularly within the existing footprint of the previously disturbed base areas. Therefore, this impact is potentially significant. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-11 through 9-12.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-4: Identify and Protect Undiscovered Paleontological Resources.</p> <p>Prior to submittal of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall provide written evidence to the Planning Department that a qualified paleontologist has been retained by the applicant to observe grading activities and salvage fossils as necessary. The paleontologist shall establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance and shall establish, in cooperation with the project developer, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit sampling, identification, and evaluation of fossils. If major paleontological resources are discovered, which require temporary halting or redirecting of grading, the paleontologist shall report such findings to the project developer, and to the Placer County Department of Museums and Planning Department.</p> <p>The paleontologist shall determine appropriate actions, in cooperation with the project developer, which ensure proper exploration and/or salvage. Excavated finds shall be offered to a State-designated repository such as Museum of Paleontology, U.C. Berkeley, the California Academy of Sciences, or any other State-designated repository. Otherwise, the finds shall be offered to the Placer County Department of Museums for purposes of public education and interpretive displays.</p> <p>These actions, as well as final mitigation and disposition of the resources shall be subject to approval by the Department of Museums. The paleontologist shall submit a follow-up report to the Department of Museums and Planning Department which shall include the period of inspection, an analysis of the fossils found, and identification of the repository in which the fossils are located.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 9-11.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure CUL-4, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to implement procedures for the monitoring, protection and treatment plan for undiscovered paleontological 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-4 will protect potentially eligible resources that may be unearthed during project construction. Therefore, with mitigation, this impact is reduced to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-11 through 9-12.)</p>
<p>CUL-5: Will the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries?</p> <p>No formal cemeteries were identified during the cultural resources study for the Project</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Identify and Protect Undiscovered Archaeological Resources.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for CUL-3 above.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure CUL-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to implement procedures to ensure proper treatment of human remain. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The Board of Supervisors,</p>

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

111

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>(Lindström 2007, and Marvin and Brejla 2009). No immediate Native American concerns regarding the Project area were identified (Lindström 2007). The Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California was notified of survey findings and concurred with the report recommendations (Lindström 2007). However, as with any ground-disturbing activity there is always the possibility of encountering buried resources that were not revealed during intensive surface investigations. Based on the history and movement of native peoples, the likelihood of encountering buried human remains is potentially significant. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 9-12.)</p>	<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-10 through 9-11.)</p>		<p>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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 will ensure proper treatment of human remains that may be unearthed during project construction. Therefore, with mitigation, this impact is reduced to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 9-12.)</p>
<p>CUL-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to cultural or historical resources?</p> <p>The list of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects considered in this cumulative impact analysis is provided in Table 20-1 (Chapter 20 of the EIR/EIS). The Project area contains no known historic, pre-historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to affect known cultural or historical resources. Consequently, construction and operation of Alternative 1A is not expected to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulative impact on cultural or historical resources. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 9-12.)</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>
SCENIC RESOURCES			
<p>SCENIC-1. Will the Project be inconsistent with a County General Plan or TRPA thresholds, regulations, standards, or guidelines applicable to the Project area?</p> <p>Alternative 1A building heights do not comply with TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 22 – Height Standards (TRPA 1987). Consequently, the Proposed Project is not consistent with existing TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies, Land Use Element, Community Design Subelement, Goal 2, Policy 1 (TRPA 1986). However, a height amendment to TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 22 is proposed that includes a new height calculation methodology for sloped areas. The buildings included in the</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-10. Prepare Forest Plan and Tree Protection Plan For Homewood Mountain Resort.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for BIO-10 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 8-73 through 8-74.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-10, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to develop and implement Forest Plan and Tree Protection Plan to ensure compliance with TRPA tree removal regulations. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The analysis in the EIR/EIS concludes that the Proposed Project would not result in adverse impacts on scenic quality, but would result in improvements to existing scenic quality ratings for SR 89 to help move the existing TRPA roadway travel route unit towards</p>

115

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Proposed Project would be in compliance with the amended height standards.</p> <p>In addition to lighting, signage and height standards, and visual resource goals and policies, tree removal policies are also be considered in relation to visual impacts and policy compliance. Tree removal, as discussed in Chapter 8 of the EIR/EIS, is considered to be a significant impact. As explained in Chapter 8, this impact is considered significant because a limited forest plan has not been generated for the Project area. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 10-33 through 10-43.)</p>			<p>threshold attainment.</p> <p>Although specific lighting and signage materials, dimensions, and locations are not currently identified, it is assumed that the Proposed Project will comply with TRPA and Placer County standards in order to obtain necessary approvals and permits prior to construction.</p> <p>As analyzed in Chapter 4 of the EIR/EIS, the Proposed Project would be consistent with policies related to Lighting and Signs. To address compliance with height standards, Alternative 1A proposes to amend the TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 22 – Height Standards by adding new §22.4.G and amending §22.7(6) to allow additional building heights for special projects located in a Ski Area Master Plan and designated through TRPA Governing Board Resolution 2008-11. A copy of the proposed Chapter 22 amendment is provided in Appendix F of the EIR/EIS. The height amendment, if approved, will allow building heights up to 77 feet as currently measured using TRPA Code Chapter 22 height measurement methods. The proposed amendment to chapter 22 would adopt the Placer County methodology of measuring height. Revising TRPA's height calculation methodology to use the average slope to roof pitch instead of the lowest grade to roof pitch, results in a similar overall visual effect, but would allow one large building rather than smaller buildings stepped up the hillside. Therefore, the amendment will not allow greater visual impact or overall height, rather it revises the calculation methods to better reflect the true height of large footprint/attached buildings on sloped areas.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is consistent with other applicable goals and policies related to visual resources, community design, and scenic corridors in the TRPA Regional Plan, Placer County General Plan, and West Shore Area General Plan. Tables 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 in Chapter 4 of the EIR/EIS- Relationship to Existing Land Use Plans, Goals and Policies, provide evaluations of Project consistency with applicable goals and policies. The Proposed Project is consistent with the following elements of the Placer County Design Standards and Guidelines for the Lake Tahoe Region Including the Community Plan Areas (Placer County 1994): 1) Site Plan, 2) Grading and Drainage, 3) Landscaping, 5) Architecture, 6) Design for Snow, 7) Energy Conservation, 8) Utility and Service Area, 9) Historic Buildings, 10) Scenic Highway Corridors, 11) Shorezone, 12) Parking, 13) Access, 14) Circulation, 15) Parking Lot Landscaping, 16) Parking for Disabled Persons, and 17) Loading (County of Placer 1994b).</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-10 will ensure Homewood Mountain Resort will comply with TRPA regulations regarding removal of trees larger than 30" dbh prior to construction ensuring this impact will be less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 10-33 through 10-43; see also Chapter 4,</p>

9/11

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			Relationship to Existing Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations; and Chapter 23, Master Responses 4, 7 and 8; Responses Comments 13a-15 and 13a-24, and 14a-46.)
<p>SCENIC-2. Will the Project be visible from or cause an adverse effect on foreground or middle ground views from a high volume travel way, recreation use area, or other public use area, including Lake Tahoe, TRPA designated bike trail, or State or federal highway?</p> <p>Alternative 1A includes new structures that are visible from scenic resources and include recommended actions identified by the TRPA to improve the scenic quality of the area. Development of Alternative 1A will improve the scenic quality ratings of Roadway Unit 11 (Homewood), and Recreation Areas 20 (Ski Homewood) and 21 (Tahoe Ski Bowl). The rating for Scenic Shoreline Travel Unit 12 (McKinney Bay) will not change, but the Proposed Project will increase the visibility of man-made structures at the North Base and Mid-Mountain areas as viewed from Lake Tahoe. Visibility of the Mid-Mountain lodge from distant Lake Tahoe viewpoints should be reduced to ensure it stays visually subordinate to the natural landscape. Because of the potential for the Mid-Mountain area lodge and gondola top station development to dominate the natural landscape, this impact is considered to be significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 10-67 through 10-74.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure SCENIC-2a. Slope Vegetation Management</p> <p>To reduce the prominence of man-made features as viewed from Lake Tahoe viewpoints, HMR shall implement management actions to improve the visual quality of the existing Face ski run (located just above the North Base area) as viewed from Lake Tahoe. These measures shall include vegetation management with the goal of matching vegetation patterns of the northern (dark green) portion of the ski run (as seen in Figures 10-5 through 10-7). The Face ski run has well established vegetation but is more visually prominent as viewed from Lake Tahoe when the vegetation is cut back on portions of the ski run and the vegetation color changes from dark green to light brown in color. During future permitting for vegetation management, HMR shall work with agency staff to develop procedures to ensure that the entirety of the Face ski run appears more uniform in color/texture when viewed from Lake Tahoe viewpoints.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure SCENIC-2b. Mid-Mountain Lodge Redesign</p> <p>The Mid-Mountain Lodge design shall be finalized with a goal of reducing the reflectivity of glass panes and roofing materials, and placement of landscaping to reduce its visibility from Lake Tahoe. Building materials shall be pre-approved by TRPA and Placer County planning staff consistent with existing design review guidelines. Natural materials and dark colors that conform to Chapter 30 – Design Standards (TRPA 1987) will be used on resort structures. Placement of new trees directly downslope of the structure, as feasible among existing ski trails, will reduce its visual dominance from identified lake views.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-73 to 9-74.)</p>	LS	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure SCENIC-2a and SCENIC-2b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to develop and implement Slope Vegetation Management and redesign of the Mid-Mountain Lodge Redesign. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Under Alternative 1A, the buildings located closest to SR 89 are of similar height and design and buildings farther away from SR 89 are at a similar roof top elevation, but laid out differently as depicted in Figure 10-14. As shown in Figures 10-5 through 10-8 and 10-10 through 10-13 of the EIR/EIS, the Project area is visible from Scenic Roadway Travel Unit 11 (Homewood) and Scenic Shoreline Travel Unit 12 (McKinney Bay). These units currently do not meet scenic quality thresholds for attainment (TRPA 2001, 2007). The Project area is located in TRPA Recreation Areas 20 (Ski Homewood) and 21 (Tahoe Ski Bowl). Dense conifer forest is expected to obscure views of the South Base area from Lake Tahoe and SR 89, but the North Base area is visually prominent along SR 89. From Lake Tahoe, the North Base area is mostly obscured by existing shoreline development and conifer forest, and is minimally visible. The Mid-Mountain Base area is not visible from SR 89, but is partially visible through the conifer forest from one of the four analyzed viewpoints from Lake Tahoe. The Mid Mountain lodge and gondola top station are not visible from the three closest Lake Tahoe viewpoints because of intervening topography.</p> <p>The TRPA recommends the following actions to improve scenic resources at HMR and to bring Scenic Roadway Travel Unit 11 (Homewood) and Scenic Shoreline Travel Unit 12 (McKinney Bay) into attainment (TRPA 1989a, 1993):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscaping in and around parking lots and buildings; • Reduce size and visual prominence of parking lots; • Architectural improvements and cohesiveness, including the use of materials and designs to current design standards to complement the natural landscape; • Removal of structures that do not meet design standards; • Paint ski lift towers to reduce visibility; • Relocation of maintenance facilities; • Undergrounding utilities; and • Signage improvements.

117

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>Table 10-9 of the EIR/EIS analyzes the consistency of the Proposed Project with these recommendations. Implementing TRPA recommendations will enhance scenic quality at HMR (TRPA 1989a, 1993). Design improvements and architectural unity along with landscaping and utility undergrounding will improve the quality along SR 89. Unified structures with cohesive architectural character will replace the barren parking lot and mismatched buildings. The integration of landscaping with the structures will create visual interest while reflecting the natural vegetation and beauty of the Project area.</p> <p>Variation in the location of the ski lifts, particularly the gondola, would not alter the visual character, particularly since many ski runs or portions of runs to remain in use would be rehabilitated and improved with vegetation. The bike path along SR 89 also would not result in a substantial visual change. The location of the path parallel to the roadway and the proposed structures would reflect the travel corridor and the urban development. The addition of landscaping along the path would improve views while expanding the public viewshed. No adverse impacts are anticipated as a result of ski lift development or removal or the development of the bike path.</p> <p>Development of Alternative 1A will improve the scenic quality ratings of Roadway Unit 11 (Homewood), and Recreation Areas 20 (Ski Homewood) and 21 (Tahoe Ski Bowl). The rating for Scenic Shoreline Travel Unit 12 (McKinney Bay) will not change, but the Proposed Project will increase the visibility of man-made structures at the North Base and Mid-Mountain areas as viewed from Lake Tahoe.</p> <p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures SCENIC-2a and SCENIC-2b will address visual quality issues identified for the shoreline unit relating to the visibility of the Mid-Mountain lodge from distant Lake Tahoe viewpoints and ensure it stays visually subordinate to the natural landscape. Therefore, these measures will reduce potential impacts to a level that is less than significant by maintaining the existing scenic quality ratings. Further, Alternative 1A would address several of the recommended actions in the SQIP to improve scenic quality, including landscaping, cohesive architecture, and undergrounding utilities. These improvements, along with avoidance or minimization of impacts from new development, will maintain or improve existing scenic quality ratings.</p> <p>Some commenters have express concern regarding the size, density, and massing of the project, as well as the mix of uses, will change the community character of Homewood. The Proposed Project will result in an increase in commercial, mixed-use, tourist and residential uses, clustered along SR 89 where other commercial and tourist features are currently found in the community. While the project would increase the number of uses</p>

111

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>on the site, this change does not alter the location of urbanization along SR 89 in the Homewood area. Visual elements of the new structures, including the "Old Tahoe" architectural design and improved landscaping help maintain the "rustic" character of the area.</p> <p>Many portions of the community include residences spread throughout the landscape. The community does not have the development intensity of other areas such as South shore. However, this project does not propose to transform the community into an area that resembles South shore. In particular, the inclusion of new mixtures of uses does not disturb the community character if designed, located and placed correctly.</p> <p>Chapters 6.0 and 10.0 of the EIR/EIS both address the Project's compatibility with the surrounding community.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 10-67 through 10-74; see also Master Responses 7 and 8; Responses Comments 13a-15, 13a-24, 13a-62, 14a-46, 14a-144 through 14a-150.)</p>
<p>SCENIC-3. Will the Project create an unacceptable new light source or cause glare or affect day or nighttime views in the area?</p> <p>Although a list of building materials is not defined, the Alternative 1A will pursue LEED certification and will utilize green materials for the North Base mixed development area. This will include high efficiency, low reflective windows to reduce glare on-site. In compliance with the TRPA Design Guidelines (TRPA 1989b) and Placer County West Shore Area General Plan (County of Placer 1998), non-reflective roofing materials will be used. Landscaping trees and architectural elements such as balconies, overhangs, and shutters will reduce the overall visual presence, reflectivity, and glare caused by windows.</p> <p>Windows can be reflective, and the Proposed Project could result in a higher intensity of reflection since there are very few existing windows in the Project area. To avoid or minimize this effect, the Proposed Project uses setbacks and variations in the upper floor plan of most buildings, and overhangs and other architectural details to reduce reflectivity. Non-reflective glass may also be required based on compliance with TRPA and Placer County design standards.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

b11

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Lighting fixtures will add glare and affect nighttime views in the Project area. Because the types of fixtures and materials used, as well as their placement, must comply with TRPA Code and design guidelines and Placer County standards, this impact is considered to be less than significant. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-80 through 9-81; see also Response Comments Comment 42-11.)</p>			
<p>SCENIC-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to scenic resources?</p> <p>Implementation of Alternative 1A will result in improvements to the west shore urban area along SR 89 and when combined with other projects in the Homewood area, has the potential to improve the overall urban character of the west shore. Existing development in the Project area detracts from the scenic quality with poorly designed and unattractive structures that reflect a lack of architectural unity and character, and that do not meet current TRPA design standards (TRPA 1989b, 1987). By redeveloping the Project area in the "Old Tahoe" style and implementing appropriate site design and landscaping, the Proposed Project will contribute to the trend toward traditional and characteristic architecture of Lake Tahoe and bring the site design into compliance with design standards and guidelines.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will include structures visible from Lake Tahoe. The Proposed Project will construct the Mid-Mountain Base area will result in new on-mountain estate residences visible from the lake. North Base area buildings will be partially screened by conifer trees and existing structures on the shoreline. However, the proposed structures will contribute to a general feeling of urbanization of the lake environment. While the visibility of one or two additional structures at one location may not result in a considerable change in the overall views from the Lake on the west shore, the increased visibility of structures around the lake creates a noticeable effect. Combined with other nearby planned, proposed, or recently completed projects that may also be visible from the lake, the urban view will intensify and the natural beauty of the area must compete with these structures. This is considered a</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure SCENIC-2a. Slope Vegetation Management</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for SCENIC-2 above.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure SCENIC-2b. Mid-Mountain Lodge Redesign</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for SCENIC-2 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 9-73 to 9-74.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measures SCENIC-2a and SCENIC-2b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to develop and implement Slope Vegetation Management and redesign of the Mid-Mountain Lodge Redesign. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of the Mitigation Measures SCENIC-2a and SCENIC-2b will reduce the visual presence of structures from the lake view. Through implementation of recommended actions designed to improve scenic quality in the Project area (TRPA 1989, 1993, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2007), elements of Alternatives 1A are expected to maintain and improve the scenic quality ratings in the Project area. Implementation of scenic resource mitigation measures will avoid or minimize potential adverse scenic quality impacts from new development, and therefore maintain scenic quality ratings. By making structures secondary to the natural environment and concealing their presence with appropriate design features and landscaping, Alternative 1A will not contribute to an adverse cumulative impact on scenic resources.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 10-81 to 10-82; see also Chapter 4, Relationship to Existing Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations; and Chapter 23, Master Responses 4, 7 and 8; Responses Comments 13a-15, 13a-24, 13a-62, 14a-46, 14a-144 through 14a-150.)</p>

120

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
cumulatively considerable impact. (PS) (Final EIR/EIS, pp. 10-81 through 10-82.)			
TRANSPORTATION, PARKING AND CIRCULATION:			
<p>TRANS-1. Will the Project result in generation of 200 or more new Daily Vehicle Trip Ends?</p> <p>Alternative 1A will result in a reduction of 337 net new daily trips during the winter months. Therefore, Alternative 1A will not generate more than 200 net new daily vehicle trip ends during the winter months.</p> <p>During the summer months, Alternatives 1A will generate 1,456 net new daily trips. The creation of more than 200 new daily trips during the summer months is a significant impact. The outdoor amphitheater was not included in the trip generation calculations for Alternatives 1A as it will only be used for special events, and not on a regular basis. HMR currently holds the same events that will be held in amphitheater; therefore, the addition of the amphitheater will not significantly change trip characteristics to and from the site. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-63 to 11-64.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure TRANS-1. Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program.</p> <p>HMR shall pay the appropriate air quality mitigation fee in accordance with Chapter 93 – Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Fees generated by the air quality mitigation fee are used to support programs/improvements that reduce VMT, improve air quality, and encourage alternative modes of transportation.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 11-64.)</p>	LS	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to pay fees that will be used to support programs/improvements that reduce VMT, improve air quality, and encourage alternative mode of transportation. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The TRPA Code of Ordinances – Chapter 93 implements TRPA's Air Quality Plan. The TRPA Code of Ordinances defines a Significant Increase for purposes of this Chapter as "an increase of more than 200 daily vehicle trips, determined by the Trip Table or other competent technical information." According to Chapter 93, if a project results in a significant increase in daily vehicle trips, all traffic and air quality impacts must be mitigated consistent with the environmental thresholds, the Goals and Policies, the Regional Transportation Plan and the 1992 Air Quality Plan.</p> <p>As discussed in the EIR/EIS, the Project effectively mitigates air quality emissions through VMT reductions achieved through the Mitigation Program By contributing to TRPA's Mitigation Program. Funds paid under the Air Quality Mitigation Program are used for activities that reduce VMT or otherwise reduce air pollutant emissions from automobiles. Section 93.5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances identifies permissible uses of these funds. It states:</p> <p>"Use And Distribution Of Mitigation Funds: TRPA shall deposit air quality mitigation funds in a trust account. Interest accruing to the trust account shall remain in the account until used on air quality mitigation projects. TRPA shall keep track of the amount of funds collected for each local jurisdiction, with interest, and shall disburse funds to the local jurisdiction, or to the Tahoe Transportation District, at their request, for expenditure within the jurisdiction of origin, provided TRPA finds that the expenditure is consistent with TRPA's Regional Transportation Plan or the 1992 Air Quality Plan."</p> <p>As discussed on pages 12-43 and 12-44 in the DEIR/EIS, specific regional and local VMT reduction strategies that may benefit from the mitigation include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of existing transit facilities; • Addition of bicycle lanes; • Transportation Systems Management measures such

121

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>as bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and use of alternative fuels in fleet vehicles; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of connectivity between multi-use paths for bicycles and pedestrians. <p>The purpose of TRPA's Mitigation Program is to generate revenue to fund projects that promote alternative modes of transportation and reduce VMT within the Lake Tahoe Air Basin (LTAB). While the payment of fees will not affect the number of Project-generated vehicle trips or associated emissions, it will contribute to cumulative regional reductions in VMT and air pollutants. Thus, by contributing to TRPA's Mitigation Program, the project effectively mitigates air quality emissions through VMT reductions achieved by alternative transportation projects supported by the Mitigation Program.</p> <p>Chapter 93 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances outlines requirements for the payment and distribution of mitigation fees from the Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program. The Project's fee will be determined in accordance with Section 93.3C of the Code of Ordinances. As determined by the TRPA, the mitigation fee will effectively offset increases in vehicle trips and emissions generated by the Project. Funds collected from the Project will be deposited into a trust account and distributed to local transportation projects, consistent with TRPA's Regional Transportation Plan or the 1992 Air Quality Plan.</p> <p>The air quality management agencies (PCAPCD and TRPA) within the Project area have acknowledged fund-based mitigation programs as acceptable methods for mitigating project-level emissions in CEQA documents. Continual contributions from projects throughout the air basin ensure adequate funds to support alternative transportation are available. Consultation with PCAPCD and TRPA confirms that payment into TRPA's Mitigation Program (Mitigation Measure AQ-2a) constitutes sufficient mitigation to reduce traffic-related emissions generated by the Project to a less than significant level.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-63 through 11-64; see also Chapter 23, Master Response 13 and Responses to Comments 13c-11 and 14a-112.)</p>
<p>TRANS-2. Will the Project result in changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?</p> <p>Alternative 1A will include 740 parking spaces at the North Base, 145 parking spaces at the South Base, and a two-car garage and two driveway spaces with each townhome (64 spaces), for a total of 949 parking spaces for the Project area, with a potential for up to 984</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure TRANS-2. Provide Adequate Parking to Meet Placer County Requirements.</p> <p>The project applicant shall implement a winter and summer Parking Management Plan, to address both during construction and post-construction, to be reviewed and approved by the Development Review Committee (DRC) prior to Improvement Plan approval for any and each subsequent</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to develop and implement a Parking Management Program to ensure that adequate parking is provided to meeting Placer County requirements. 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</p>

122

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>on-site parking spaces. According to Table 1 from Appendix K-3, 62 ski area employees will park off-site during peak ski weekends, resulting in an on-site parking demand of 993 parking spaces for Alternative 1A. Based on Table 11-19, Alternative 1A parking supply is less than the demand, therefore this impact is considered to be significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-64 through 11-67.)</p>	<p>project phase. The Parking Management Plan shall address the anticipated off-site peak winter ski day employee parking and any other on-site parking deficiencies. This plan shall be approved by the County and the TRPA with each project phase and will ensure that adequate parking and shuttle service operations are maintained in order to accommodate the required off-site peak ski day parking. As part of the Parking Management Plan, HMR may propose to provide Placer County Transit passes to employees to encourage their use of public transit from the Tahoe City Transit Center to the Homewood project. Off-site parking locations used by HMR shall comply with Placer County parking standards and shall be paved with required BMPs, available for winter weekend use by HMR, designed for adequate snow removal operations (e.g., include properly designed areas for snow storage) and located near SR 89 for convenient access by employees, resort guests and shuttle drivers. Types of existing parking that may be used by HMR for off-site parking needs include but are not limited to commercial establishments, churches, and private recreational facilities. Public parks, community centers or transit centers not fully utilized during winter months may be available if an agreement can be reached with the public agency responsible for the operation of the facility. Based on a review of these types of existing facilities along the SR 89 corridor near HMR and north to Tahoe City, there are hundreds of available parking spaces for potential use by HMR, subject to agreements with the property owners. The applicant shall provide shuttle service between the designated off-site parking location(s) and Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR).</p> <p>Additionally, the Parking Management Plan shall address the following: communication and management strategies for alerting people of when and where parking is available on-site and off-site (e.g. changeable message signs in Tahoe City); an employee parking plan with regulations and off-site parking locations; a boat trailer parking plan for times when boat trailers from adjacent business can be parked in the parking structure, including regulations and boat trailer parking locations; special event parking plan that addresses on and off site parking locations for guests of special events; and an enforcement plan to address neighborhood parking.</p>		<p>EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-2 will insure adequate on-site and off-site parking management to eliminate any potential parking impacts.</p> <p>The parking analysis presented in the EIR/EIS presents an accurate analysis of parking supply and demand. The assumptions presented in this analysis are founded on the best data available and/or engineering judgment based on logic and specialized expertise in the field. The parking analysis was performed using national state-of-the practice methods for conducting parking studies.</p> <p>Some comments on the Draft EIR/EIS suggest that the analysis and conclusions in the EIR/EIS regarding the Project's impacts on parking, including but not limited to on-street parking in the area, are inadequate or wrong. The County has considered the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters. The Board of Supervisors finds that the analysis set forth in the EIR/EIS is reasonable and appropriate, and has been prepared by qualified experts using appropriate assumptions and methodologies in accordance with TRPA and County guidance.</p> <p>Mitigation measure TRANS-2 requires HMR to provide adequate parking to meet Placer County requirements and will insure ensure adequate on-site and off-site parking management to eliminate any potential parking impacts. HMR is proposing to park employees and day use skier overflow at off-site parking sites to meet demand on peak winter days when on-site parking spaces are not adequate to meet estimated demand. To document that adequate parking supplies are available at off-site locations, Mitigation measure TRANS-2 has been revised as follows to document the minimum standards required for off-site parking locations (e.g., comply with Placer County land development manual regulations for paved parking, comply with TRPA BMP requirements, available for winter use, capable of being plowed, etc.) and provide a list of the type of spaces that could be utilized by HMR. By complying with the identified standards for the selection of off-site parking locations, impacts associated with the use of off-site parking locations (e.g., water quality, noise from snow removal, circulation related to access) will be less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 11-64 through 11-67; see also Chapter 23, Master Response 12 and Responses to Comments 4-2, 4-3, 13a-44, 14a-73, 14a-105, 19-20, 19-21, 33-50, 48-13, 107-33, 250-3, 328-9, 329-7 and 18-f.)</p>

123

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>If additional environmental impacts, other than those already identified, analyzed, and mitigated (if necessary) as part of this Draft EIR/EIS are created as a result of any of the proposed on-site or off-site parking areas or shuttle service operations, the Improvement Plans shall not be approved until subsequent environmental review has been completed.</p> <p>The project applicant has committed to eliminating the existing day skier parking along SR 89 and along County roadways. The Parking Management Plan, to be approved by the County and the TRPA and revised by the applicant as necessary for subsequent County/TRPA review and approval with each project phase, shall outline the measures proposed to fulfill this commitment, including signage, parking enforcement, surveys of on-street parking during peak ski days, and annual reporting to Placer County by May 1 of each year that surveys are required. Surveys shall be required until two years after completion of any new development phase of the project. All costs associated with the surveys and parking management report are the responsibility of Homewood Mountain Resort.</p> <p>Timing / Implementation: An agreement between the County, TRPA and the applicant to implement the Parking Management Program, along with the detailed plan, shall be signed before Improvement Plans for any and each subsequent project phase are approved.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-66 through 11-67.)</p>		
<p>TRANS-3. Will the Project result in a substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, including roadways and intersections?</p> <p>Summer LOS Analysis</p> <p>Table 11-20 of the EIR/EIS presents a summary of the LOS at the study intersections for existing summer plus project conditions for the Proposed Project and Alternatives. Figures 11-15 through 11-18 show the existing plus project traffic volumes at the study intersections. Alternative 1A will have a significant impact at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection. The overall intersection LOS is within the LOS standards (LOS C and D); however, the side-street approach (eastbound</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure TRANS-3. Implement Intersection Improvements</p> <p>The Project shall construct the following intersection improvement at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection: Add an acceleration lane or two-way left-turn lane (consistent with the Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project, 2006) to SR 89 at Granlibakken Road. The mitigation measure will result in the following summer LOS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delay after mitigation: 3.4 (44.2), LOS: A (E), Project (Alternatives 1/1A) and Alternative 3 • Delay after mitigation: 3.3 (41.9), LOS: A (E), Alternative 5 • Delay after mitigation: 3.2 (40.7), LOS: A (E), 	<p>SU for Summer Queuing Impacts; LS for Summer LOS, Winter LOS, and Winter Queuing Impacts</p>	<p>Finding for Summer LOS: Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to implement following intersection improvement at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding for Summer LOS: Alternative 1A has the same land uses as Alternative 1, but fewer units. The PM peak hour trip generation for Alternative 1A is 2 fewer vehicles than the trip generation for Alternative 1. Therefore, a separate LOS analysis is not needed for Alternative 1A. A difference of 2 vehicles would not affect delay and LOS at the study intersections. Implementation of mitigation measure</p>

124

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>left-turn) operates at LOS F. The number of eastbound, left-turning vehicles for Alternative 1A for existing plus Project conditions is 77. The remaining study intersections will operate at acceptable LOS with the addition of the Proposed Project. (S)</p> <p>Summer Queuing Analysis</p> <p>Table 11-21 of the EIR/EIS shows the Sim Traffic queuing analysis results for the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections during the summer for existing and existing plus project conditions. The Project alternatives were analyzed during the Friday PM peak hour; however, on peak weekends during summer months there is significant congestion at the Tahoe City "Wye", and the northbound queue can extend beyond the queue lengths shown in the analysis.</p> <p>Alternatives 1A will have a significant impact at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections. Although not directly represented in the queuing analysis results in Table 11-21 of the EIR/EIS, bicycle and pedestrian traffic that will contribute additional congestion to the area. Existing congestion at Fanny Bridge results in delays and vehicle queuing. The Fanny Bridge study (LSC, 2005) identifies the congestion issues, as well as improvements to alleviate the congestion. Alternatives 1A will contribute additional traffic volumes (Alternatives 1A adds 70 vehicles to the intersection, 10 travelling northbound) to this area of known congestion during the Friday PM peak hour. The queuing analysis results indicate that the project will increase the queue lengths at the SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersection by approximately 10 feet (1 vehicle) in the northbound direction, and 15 to 20 feet in the southbound direction (1 vehicle). The increase in traffic volumes and queue lengths (of one or more vehicles) is considered a significant impact. (SU)</p> <p>Winter LOS Analysis</p> <p>Table 11-22 of the EIR/EIS presents a summary of the LOS at the study intersections for existing winter conditions for the Project and Alternatives. Figures 11-19 through 11-22 of the EIR/EIS show the existing plus project</p>	<p>Alternative 6</p> <p>Note: A two-way left-turn lane has been environmentally cleared through a CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration, NEPA Finding of No Significant Impact, and TRPA Programmatic Environmental Assessment, and is scheduled for construction at this location as part of the Caltrans' Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project. Figures ESL 42 and ESL 43 from the Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project show the proposed roadway improvements, and are provided in Appendix L-2. If construction of the improvement is in place prior to being needed by HMR, HMR shall no longer be responsible for the improvement.</p> <p>Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the Project applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work proposed within the State Highway right-of-way. A copy of said Permit shall be provided to the County Engineering and Surveying Department prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans. Right-of-way dedications shall be provided to the State, as required, to accommodate existing and future highway improvements.</p> <p>Caltrans will not issue an Encroachment Permit for work within their right-of-way for improvements (other than signals, road widening, striping and signing) without first entering into a Landscape Maintenance Agreement with the County. This agreement allows for private installation and maintenance of concrete curb/gutters, sidewalks, trails, landscaping and irrigation within Caltrans' right-of-way. A similar agreement between the County and the applicant is required prior to the County entering into the agreement with Caltrans. If applicable, both of these maintenance agreements shall be executed prior to approval of the Improvement Plans.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp.11-74 and 11-75.)</p>		<p>TRANS-3 will improve the LOS at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection to better than existing conditions for Alternative 1A. The mitigation measure will result in the following summer LOS for Alternative 1A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay after mitigation: 3.4 (44.2), LOS: A (E), <p>This mitigation does not improve LOS to D or better at the side-street approach, but it The EIP project improves the LOS at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection to "E" under existing conditions. Alternative 1A will not degrade LOS to F or E for more than four hours. Therefore, this impact is less than significant as mitigated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-3.</p> <p>Comments suggest that the analysis and conclusion in the EIR/EIS regarding the TRANS-3 are inadequate or wrong. After considering the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters, TRPA and the County accept the assumptions, evidence, and conclusions for TRANS-3 included in the EIR/EIS based on expertise and experience of the transportation consultants who prepared Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking and Circulation of the EIR/EIS. The Board of Supervisors finds that the traffic analysis in the EIR/EIS has been prepared by qualified experts, and is based on data, assumptions and methods that meet the standards of industry practice, and are consistent with County guidance.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-68 through 11-75; see also Master Responses 9, 10, and 11, Responses to Comments 13a-40, Comment 14a-106, 14a-108, 14a-109, 14a-113, 14a-115, 14a-116, 19-22, 49-2, 268-15 through 268-18, 328-8, and 11-g.)</p> <p>Finding for Summer Queuing: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Alternative 1A that substantially lessen summer queuing impacts. As noted above, CEQA requires public agencies to adopt feasible mitigation measures which would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of projects. All Transportation, Parking and Circulation impacts are less than significant as mitigated with the exception of impacts on summer queuing at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections, which is considered significant and unavoidable. The County finds changes or alterations to these intersections are within the responsibility of another public agency, Caltrans, which can and should implement improvements to improve existing congestion at the Tahoe City "Y" and Fanny Bridge. This impact is considered significant and unavoidable because, although improvements are planned, all of the funding requirement to implement these improvements has not been identified. Thus, although the Project is required to pay its fair share towards the cost of this improvement, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.</p>

185

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>traffic volumes at the study intersections. Alternative 1A has the same land uses as Alternative 1, but fewer units. The PM peak hour trip generation for Alternative 1A is the same as the trip generation for Alternative 1. Therefore, separate LOS analysis is not needed for Alternative 1A. The LOS and delay at the study intersections is the same for Alternatives 1 and 1A.</p> <p>Alternative 1A will have a significant impact at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection. Although the overall trip generation for the Proposed Project is less than the existing HMR trip generation, the distribution of vehicle trips is expected to change, causing an increase in some turning movements at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection. It should be noted that the overall intersection LOS is A for each alternative. The remaining study intersections are expected to operate at acceptable LOS with the addition of the Proposed Project. (S)</p> <p>Winter Queuing Analysis</p> <p>Table 11-23 of the EIR/EIS shows the storage and queue lengths for the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections during the winter. The queue lengths at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections are not expected to exceed the existing storage lengths with the addition of project traffic from each alternative. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-68 through 11-86.)</p>			<p>Overriding Considerations: The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the project override the significant adverse impact of the project associated with the proposed project's impact to summer queuing, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of EIR's Summer Queuing Analysis:</p> <p>Queuing analysis was performed at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections. Queuing issues currently exist in the area, particularly near the Fanny Bridge. The SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study prepared by LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (2005) details the congestion issues on the bridge. The LSC study, as well as the LOS tables provided in this study, indicates that the congestion in the area is not caused by intersection operations, but rather by the "bottle neck" effect at the Fanny Bridge, and the high number of bicycles and pedestrians that use the bridge. As shown in Table 11-20 of the EIR/EIS, the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections operate at LOS D and LOS A, respectively, with and without the project. The SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study presents five realignment alternatives to relieve congestion on the Fanny Bridge. The queuing analysis includes the pedestrian signal on SR 89 south of the Fanny Bridge which was installed after the SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study was completed. The pedestrian signal in conjunction with a barrier chain between the Fanny Bridge sidewalk and the northbound travel lane has significantly reduced the impact of pedestrian and bicycle activity on traffic conditions. The queuing analysis accounts for the vehicle delay resulting from the pedestrian signal.</p> <p>As discussed in the EIR/EIS, other studies (e.g., SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study) have identified improvements to relieve congestion and reduce queuing on Fanny Bridge. Once these improvements are implemented the Project's impact on these intersections will be less than significant. However, funding for the improvement project (particularly state funding) has not been secured; therefore, the impacts are considered significant and unavoidable in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Fanny Bridge improvement project is identified in the Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan's Project Strategies (Short Term), and is partially funded by two sources: the Federal Transportation Improvement Program for the work being done by the Tahoe Transportation District and Placer County Capital Improvement Program traffic impact fees. More recently, following publication of the Draft EIR/EIS, the TMPO (Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization) and TRPA released the NOP for the Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Program EIR/EIS on</p>

126

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>August 24, 2011. The RTP includes a long list of projects from the Tahoe Transportation District's (TTD) Capital Improvement Program. Table 1 in the NOP lists the "First Phase High Priority" CIP Projects. The Fanny Bridge improvement project is identified as a First Phase High Priority project. TTD and Caltrans have determined the Fanny Bridge improvement project will require an EIR/EIS. TTD is the lead agency under CEQA and Caltrans (under delegation authority from FHWA) will be the lead agency under NEPA. The NOP/NOI for the Fanny Bridge improvement project is currently scheduled to be released later this year. Level of service impacts at Fanny Bridge are still considered significant and unavoidable despite HMR's obligation to pay its fair share fees for the cost of this improvement because the record does not indicate sufficient funding is in place to guarantee construction of the Fanny Bridge improvement project. Construction of these improvements is likely, and the Proposed Project will contribute its share. Because these improvements are not assured, however, the impact is significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) includes an Alternative Transportation Plan (ATP) to reduce vehicle trips in the Project area and vicinity. One of a series of transportation strategies, the ATP is expected to include the following year-round, winter, and summer program elements:</p> <p><u>Year-Round</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension of TCPUD West Shore Bike Trail to the North <p><u>Base area</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee Shuttle Bus • Employee Public Bus Transit Fares • Scheduled Shuttle Service • North Base-South Base Shuttle Service • Electric/Hybrid Car Rental Service • Free "Bicycle Share" Service <p><u>Winter Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter West Shore Dial-a-Ride Service • Skier Intercept Shuttle Service <p><u>Summer Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Taxi Service • Summer West Shore Dial-A-Ride Service <p><u>Additional transportation strategies will include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodate boat trailer parking during the summer at day skier parking facilities; • Day skier parking control (e.g., limit ticket sales so that parking does not exceed onsite supply); and • Transportation Information Exchange (e.g., provide information on Tahoe City electronic sign board to notify

127

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>day skiers when ski resort is at capacity).</p> <p>The proposed summer water taxi service is planned for operation from approximately mid-May to the end of September. The service is planned to be operated using a vessel with up to a 25-passenger capacity between Homewood and Tahoe City. There may be other periodic service between Homewood and South Shore as well dependent upon demand. This service is planned to be operated seven days a week between 9 AM and 8 PM on at least an hourly frequency. HMR residents and guests will be served at no fare, while other passengers will be served as space permits for a modest fare. This service is designed to provide an opportunity to get out on the Lake while also avoiding the existing traffic congestion in the SR 89/SR 28 Wye (e.g., Fanny Bridge) area. Should demand warrant in the future, one additional water taxi could be added with the same capacity. The plan would be to acquire a fuel efficient (possibly hybrid electric technology), low noise emitting water taxi vessel. With Homewood's recent acquisition of the lakeside West Shore Café, the water taxi would pick up passengers at the café pier, which is an existing pier structure designed to allow for passenger drop-off and pick-up. The potential use of the existing pier for use by a water taxi would be subject to any requisite regulatory approvals, but is not expected to require any additional facilities. Parking for use of the water taxi would not be required at the West Shore Café since it is intended to serve HMR guests and area residents who would walk to the pier from their accommodations. Fueling, storage and maintenance of the water taxi(s) could occur at one of the two adjacent Homewood marinas.</p> <p>Comments suggest that the analysis and conclusion in the EIR/EIS regarding the Proposed Project's impacts on Transportation, Parking and Circulation are inadequate or wrong. After considering the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters, TRPA and the County accept the assumptions, evidence, and conclusions included in the EIR/EIS based on expertise and experience of the transportation consultants who prepared Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking and Circulation of the EIR/EIS. The Board of Supervisors finds that the traffic analysis in the EIR/EIS has been prepared by qualified experts, and is based on data, assumptions and methods that meet the standards of industry practice, and are consistent with TRPA and County guidance.</p> <p>The project applicant is required to contribute a fair share contribution to the Fanny Bridge improvement alternative based on Placer County standards. As noted above even with HMR' fair share contribution and implementation of the ATP, which substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of the Proposed Projects, complete avoidance of direct and indirect effects of the project to summer queuing identified in TRANS-3 is</p>

138

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>not feasible. Therefore, this impact is significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-75 through 11-77; see also Master Responses 9, 10, and 11; Responses to Comments 13c-6, Comment 14a-64, 14a-117, and 76-13.)</p> <p>Finding for Winter LOS: Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to implement following intersection improvement at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding for Winter LOS: Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-3 will improve the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection to an acceptable LOS.</p> <p>Comments suggest that the analysis and conclusion in the EIR/EIS regarding the TRANS-3 are inadequate or wrong. After considering the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters, TRPA and the County accept the assumptions, evidence, and conclusions for TRANS-3 included in the EIR/EIS based on expertise and experience of the transportation consultants who prepared Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking and Circulation of the EIR/EIS. The Board of Supervisors finds that the traffic analysis in the EIR/EIS has been prepared by qualified experts, and is based on data, assumptions and methods that meet the standards of industry practice, and are consistent with County guidance.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-78 through 11-84; see also Master Responses 9, 10, and 11, Responses to Comments 13a-40, 14a-73, 14a-106, 14a-108, 14a-109, 14a-113, 14a-115, 14a-116, 14a-117, 19-22, 49-2, 268-15 through 268-18, 328-8, and 11-g.)</p>
<p>TRANS-4. Will the Project result in a substantial impact upon the existing transportation systems, including transit facilities?</p> <p>Alternative 1A includes implementation of Alternative Transportation elements, which will include year-round, winter and summer elements, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee Shuttle Bus; • Employee Public Bus Transit Fares; • Scheduled Shuttle Service; • North Base-South Base Shuttle 	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

129

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Service;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electric/Hybrid Car Rental Service; • Free "Bicycle Share" Service; • Summer and Winter West Shore Dial-a-Ride Service; • Skier Intercept Shuttle Service; and • Water Taxi Service. <p>Implementation of the Project's Alternative Transportation elements will result in increased access to and ridership on alternative modes of transportation. This is considered a less than significant impact.</p> <p>A northbound TART transit shelter exists on SR 89 across the street from the existing Homewood Ski Resort. HMR will install a southbound TART transit pullout on SR 89 adjacent to the North Base. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 11-86; see also Response to Comment 14a-121.)</p>			
<p>TRANS-5. Will the project result in a substantial impact upon the existing transportation systems, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities?</p> <p>Alternative 1A will include construction of the proposed Class I TCPUD bike trail through the North Base area, as shown on Civil Plan Sheet C10. The proposed bike trail will be designed to meet the standards of the authorizing jurisdictions. The Project and Alternatives will also include a free "Bicycle Share" program. The Project will also maintain five miles of existing hiking trails. This will improve access to and opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian uses. This is considered a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Peak hour bicycle and pedestrian trips were estimated based on the internally captured recreational trips discussed in Section 11.4.1, which include walking and bicycling recreational trips. The Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) provides signal warrant criteria for a pedestrian signal (Warrant 4, Pedestrian Volume). A pedestrian signal is not warranted based on pedestrian volumes generated by the project. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 11-87; see also Responses to Comments Comment 10-2 through 10-4, 10-24</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

130

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>through 10-28, 13a-41, and 93-1.)</p> <p>TRANS-6. Will the Project result in a temporary impact upon existing transportation systems due to construction traffic?</p> <p>Construction traffic will temporarily be present on the roadway network and study intersections. Construction traffic will access the Project area via SR 89. The heaviest construction period will occur during site grading. Because there is no existing plan for storing and future use of the cut material by restoration agencies at this time, the EIR/EIS assumed the material would be removed from the Basin, which equates to a worst case analysis for truck traffic. The total amount of excavation for Alternative 1A and is presented in Table 11-24. Table 11-24 also provides the estimated number of total trips associated with the removal of net cut material, which is the maximum amount of material that would need to be removed from site if it could not be stored and used for other projects, or reapplied to the ski resort as part of soils restoration projects.</p> <p>Trucks removing excavation material (i.e., arriving at the Project area empty and leaving with material) will generate up to approximately 146-192 trips per day. As a result, it is calculated that construction truck traffic will generate fewer trips than total vehicle trips calculated for Project operation. However, the character of the vehicles will be different. Heavy vehicles and trucks will dominate construction traffic. As required by the Traffic Control Plan (TCP), staging areas will be provided on-site and out of the public right-of-way to minimize heavy equipment trips on surrounding roadways.</p> <p>Grading activity will be limited to the TRPA grading season (May 1 – October 15), which is approximately 120 workdays, assuming a 5-day workweek.</p> <p>Based on information provided by the project applicant, the maximum number of employees on site during construction is not expected to exceed the number of full time equivalent employees when the Project is built out (approximately 182 employees). As a result, the number of construction related trips generated</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

131

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>by the site will not exceed the daily trip generation of the Project. Assuming 4 trips per day per construction employee (1 trip to the site, 1 trip from the site, and 2 lunch time trips – in/out) and 192 trips per day for grading activity, the Project can have up to 318 construction employees on site during grading activity without exceeding the daily trip generation of the Project at build out. Note that 4 trips per day per construction employee is a conservative estimate, as it is unlikely that each construction employee will drive to the site alone and many construction employees will not leave the project site for lunch. Based on TRPA standards (referenced in Section 11.2.7), level of service analysis is not required for construction activity if the estimated trip generation does not exceed the trip generation of the Project under normal operating conditions.</p> <p>As required by existing regulations, the project applicant will prepare a TCP for review and approval by TRPA, Placer County Department of Public Works, and Caltrans prior to construction. The TCP will address project construction traffic and parking. At a minimum, the plan will address truck haul routes, truck turning movements at the project driveway(s), traffic control signage, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, restriction of hauling activities to off-peak periods, on-site circulation and staging areas, and monitoring of the in-place traffic control to implement traffic control revisions, if necessary. The necessary encroachment and transportation permits will be obtained by the project applicant and/or a representative of the applicant prior to construction. Implementation of the TCP will result in a less than significant impact related to construction traffic for Alternative 1A. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-87 through 11-89; see also Response to Comment 14a-122.)</p>			
<p>TRANS-7. Will the Project result in alterations to the present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?</p> <p>Alternative 1A will provide access to the Project area via Silver Street, an exclusive Homewood Driveway, Fawn Street, and Tahoe Ski Bowl Way. Although the Project will add traffic to the</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

137

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>existing streets, it will not increase the delay to beyond acceptable levels, as shown in the LOS tables (Tables 11-20 and 11-22), and therefore will have a less than significant impact. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-89 to 11-90; see also Response to Comment 14a-123.)</p>			
<p>TRANS-8. Will the Project result in an increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?</p> <p>Alternative 1A will utilize the existing roadway network to provide access to the Project area. As shown in the LOS tables (Tables 11-20 and 11-22 of EIR/EIS), the increase in delay at the Project area access roads is less than 10 seconds during the summer, and less than 11 seconds during the winter, with the addition of the Proposed Project traffic. Alternative 1A will include an extension of the West Shore bicycle trail, providing better connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians. This will have a less than significant impact. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-90 to 11-91; see also Response to Comment 10-29, 13a-37 and 14a-124 and 16-g.)</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>
<p>TRANS-C1: Will the project result in a substantial impact upon cumulative transportation systems, including roadways and intersections?</p> <p>Summer LOS Analysis</p> <p>Table 11-26 of the EIR/EIS presents a summary of the LOS at the study intersections for cumulative summer plus project conditions for the Proposed Project. Alternatives 1A will have a significant impact at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection. Although the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection operates at an unacceptable LOS under cumulative conditions, the project is expected to increase delay at the side-street approaches, and therefore cause a significant impact. The remaining study intersections are expected to operate acceptably with the addition of Alternatives 1A traffic volumes. (S)</p> <p>Summer Queuing Analysis</p> <p>Table 11-27 of the EIR/EIS shows the Sim Traffic queuing analysis results for the SR</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure TRANS-C1: Implement Intersection Improvements</p> <p>SR 89/Granlibakken Road:</p> <p>The Project shall construct the following intersection improvement at SR 89/Granlibakken Road: Add an acceleration lane or two-way left-turn lane (consistent with the Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project, 2006) to SR 89 at Granlibakken Road. The mitigation measure will result in the following winter LOS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delay after mitigation: 2.8 (26.2), LOS: A (D), Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternative 3 • Delay after mitigation: 2.8 (25.7), LOS: A (D), Alternative 5 • Delay after mitigation: 2.9 (25.5), LOS: A (D), Alternative 6 <p>Note: A two-way left-turn lane has been environmentally cleared through a CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration, NEPA Finding of No Significant Impact, and TRPA Programmatic Environmental Assessment, and is scheduled for construction at this location as part of the</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Finding for Cumulative Summer LOS: Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-C1 and TRANS-C2, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to implement following intersection improvement at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection and the payment of traffic impact fees. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding for Summer LOS: Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-C1 will improve summer operations at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection to better than cumulative conditions. This mitigation does not improve LOS to D or better at the side-street approach, however it does improve intersection operations to better than 2030 cumulative conditions.</p> <p>Comments suggest that the analysis and conclusion in the EIR/EIS regarding the TRANS-3 are inadequate or wrong. After considering the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters, TRPA and the County accept the assumptions, evidence, and conclusions for</p>

133

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections during the summer for cumulative and cumulative plus project conditions. The Project alternatives were analyzed during the Friday PM peak hour; however, on peak weekends during summer months there is significant congestion at the Tahoe City "Wye", and the northbound queue can extend beyond the queue lengths shown in the analysis.</p> <p>Alternative 1A will have a significant impact at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections. Although not directly represented in the queuing analysis results in Table 11-27, it should be noted that the analysis does not include bicycle and pedestrian traffic that will contribute additional congestion to the area. The Project and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 will have a significant impact at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections. (SU)</p> <p>Winter LOS Analysis</p> <p>Table 11-28 of the EIR/EIS presents a summary of the LOS at the study intersections for cumulative winter plus project conditions for the Project. Figures 11-29 through 11-32 show the cumulative plus project traffic volumes at the study intersections. Alternative 1A has the same land uses as Alternative 1, but fewer units. The PM peak hour trip generation for Alternative 1A is the same as the trip generation for Alternative 1. Therefore, separate LOS analysis is not needed for Alternative 1A. The LOS and delay at the study intersections is the same for Alternatives 1 and 1A.</p> <p>Alternative 1A will have a significant impact at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road and SR 89/Fawn Street intersections. Although the overall trip generation for the Proposed Project is less than the existing HMR trip generation, the distribution of vehicle trips is expected to change, causing an increase in some turning movements at the intersections. The remaining study intersections are expected to operate at acceptable LOS with the addition of the Project and Alternatives. (S)</p> <p>Winter Queuing Analysis</p>	<p>Caltrans' Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project (2006). Figures ESL 42 and ESL 43 from the Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project show the proposed roadway improvements, and are provided in Appendix L-2. If construction of the improvement is in place prior to being needed by HMR, HMR shall no longer be responsible for the improvement.</p> <p>Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the Project applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work proposed within the State Highway right-of-way. A copy of said Permit shall be provided to the County Engineering and Surveying Department prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans. Right-of-way dedications shall be provided to the State, as required, to accommodate existing and future highway improvements.</p> <p>Caltrans will not issue an Encroachment Permit for work within their right-of-way for improvements (other than signals, road widening, striping and signing) without first entering into a Landscape Maintenance Agreement with the County. This agreement allows for private installation and maintenance of concrete curb/gutters, sidewalks, trails, landscaping and irrigation within Caltrans' right-of-way. A similar agreement between the County and the applicant is required prior to the County entering into the agreement with Caltrans. If applicable, both of these maintenance agreements shall be executed prior to approval of the Improvement Plans.</p> <p>SR 89/Fawn Street:</p> <p>The project shall construct the following intersection improvement at SR 89/Fawn Street:</p> <p>Add a left-turn pocket on Fawn Street. The pocket should have a minimum length of 140 feet (based on 95th percentile queue length presented in the Synchro analysis). This mitigation will require that Fawn Street be a <i>minimum</i> of 30 feet wide, and up to 36 feet wide to construct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delay after mitigation: 9.7 (41.6), LOS: A (E), Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternative 3 • Delay after mitigation: 8.2 (35.5), LOS: A (E), Alternative 5 • Delay after mitigation: 8.6 (35.8), LOS: A (E), Alternative 6 		<p>TRANS-3 included in the EIR/EIS based on expertise and experience of the transportation consultants who prepared Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking and Circulation of the EIR/EIS. The Board of Supervisors finds that the traffic analysis in the EIR/EIS has been prepared by qualified experts, and is based on data, assumptions and methods that meet the standards of industry practice, and are consistent with County guidance.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-96 through 11-104; see also Master Responses 9, 10, and 11; Responses to Comments 13a-40, Comment 14a-106, 14a-108, 14a-109, 14a-113, 14a-115, 14a-116, 19-22, 49-2, 268-15 through 268-18, 328-8, and 11-g.)</p> <p>Finding for Cumulative Summer Queuing: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, Alternative 1A that substantially lessen cumulative summer queuing impacts. As noted above, CEQA requires public agencies to adopt feasible mitigation measures which would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of projects. Even with the implementation of the Proposed Project's Alternative Transportation Plan, the County finds that complete avoidance of cumulative effects of the project to summer queuing identified in TRANS-3 is not feasible. This is because of the project objectives include constructing onsite residential and tourist accommodation units, providing year-round use of the Project site and generating sufficient revenues to support the proposed environmental and fire safety improvements while ensuring the continued viability of the ski operations. The County further notes that all Transportation, Parking and Circulation impacts are less than significant as mitigated with the exception of impacts on summer queuing at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections, which is considered significant and unavoidable. In addition, the County finds changes or alterations are within the responsibility of another public agency, Caltrans, which can and should implement improvements to improve cumulative congestion at significant congestion at the Tahoe City "Y" and Fanny Bridge.</p> <p>Overriding Considerations: The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the project override the significant adverse impact of the project associated with the proposed project's cumulative impact to summer queuing, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p> <p>Explanation/ Facts in Support of EIR's Cumulative Summer Queuing Analysis:</p> <p>Queuing analysis was performed at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections. Queuing issues currently exist in the area, particularly near the Fanny Bridge. The SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study prepared by LSC</p>

134

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Table 11-29 shows the storage and queue lengths for the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections during the winter. The queue lengths at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections are not expected to exceed the existing storage lengths with the addition of project traffic under Alternative 1A.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-91 through 11- 116.)</p>	<p>Note: The analysis period represents the absolute peak hour. The LOS E condition is not expected to exceed 4 hours of the day and therefore is not considered to be a significant impact after implementation of mitigation measures.</p> <p>Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the Project applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work proposed within the State Highway right-of-way. A copy of said Permit shall be provided to the County Engineering and Surveying Department prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans. Right-of-way dedications shall be provided to the State, as required, to accommodate existing and future highway improvements.</p> <p>Caltrans will not issue an Encroachment Permit for work within their right-of-way for improvements (other than signals, road widening, striping and signing) without first entering into a Landscape Maintenance Agreement with the County. This agreement allows for private installation and maintenance of concrete curb/gutters, sidewalks, trails, landscaping and irrigation within Caltrans' right-of-way. A similar agreement between the County and the applicant is required prior to the County entering into the agreement with Caltrans. If applicable, both of these maintenance agreements shall be executed prior to approval of the Improvement Plans.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure TRANS-C2: Payment of Countywide Traffic Impact Fees</p> <p>SR 89/Granlibakken Road:</p> <p>This project will be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Tahoe Resort District), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) will be required and shall be paid to Placer County Department of Public Works prior to issuance of any Building Permits for the project: A) County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code. The fees are calculated using the information supplied by the applicant. If either the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.</p>		<p>Transportation Consultants, Inc. (2005) details the congestion issues on the bridge. The LSC study, as well as the LOS tables provided in this study indicated that the congestion in the area is not caused by intersection operations, but rather by the "bottle neck" effect at the Fanny Bridge, and the high number of bicycles and pedestrians that use the bridge. As shown in Table 11-26, the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections operate at LOS D and LOS A, respectively, with and without the project.</p> <p>The SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study presents 5 realignment alternatives to relieve congestion on the Fanny Bridge. The cumulative queuing analysis accounts for the vehicle delay resulting from the pedestrian signal. Existing congestion at the Fanny Bridge results in delays and vehicle queuing. As discussed in the EIR/EIS, other studies (e.g., SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study) have identified improvements to relieve congestion and reduce queuing on Fanny Bridge. Once these improvements are implemented the Project's impact on these intersections will be less than significant. However, funding for the improvement project (particularly state funding) has not been secured; therefore, the impacts are considered significant and unavoidable in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Fanny Bridge improvement project is identified in the Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan's Project Strategies (Short Term), and is partially funded by two sources: the Federal Transportation Improvement Program for the work being done by the Tahoe Transportation District and Placer County Capital Improvement Program traffic impact fees. More recently, following publication of the Draft EIR/EIS, the TMPO (Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization) and TRPA released the NOP for the Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Program EIR/EIS on August 24, 2011. The RTP includes a long list of projects from the Tahoe Transportation District's (TTD) Capital Improvement Program. Table 1 in the NOP lists the "First Phase High Priority" CIP Projects. The Fanny Bridge improvement project is identified as a First Phase High Priority project. TTD and Caltrans have determined the Fanny Bridge improvement project will require an EIR/EIS. TTD is the lead agency under CEQA and Caltrans (under delegation authority from FHWA) will be the lead agency under NEPA. The NOP/NOI for the Fanny Bridge improvement project is currently scheduled to be released later this year. Level of service impacts at Fanny Bridge are still considered significant and unavoidable despite HMR's obligation to pay its fair share fees for the cost of this improvement because the record does not indicate sufficient funding is in place to guarantee construction of the Fanny Bridge improvement project. Construction of these improvements is likely, and the Proposed Project will contribute its share. Because these improvements are not assured,</p>

135

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-103 to 11-104; 11-113 through 11-115.)		<p>however, the impact is significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) includes an Alternative Transportation Plan (ATP) to reduce vehicle trips in the Project area and vicinity. One of a series of transportation strategies, the ATP is expected to include the following year-round, winter, and summer program elements:</p> <p><u>Year-Round</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension of TCPUD West Shore Bike Trail to the North <p><u>Base area</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee Shuttle Bus • Employee Public Bus Transit Fares • Scheduled Shuttle Service • North Base-South Base Shuttle Service • Electric/Hybrid Car Rental Service • Free "Bicycle Share" Service <p><u>Winter Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter West Shore Dial-a-Ride Service • Skier Intercept Shuttle Service <p><u>Summer Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Taxi Service • Summer West Shore Dial-A-Ride Service <p><u>Additional transportation strategies will include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodate boat trailer parking during the summer at day skier parking facilities; • Day skier parking control (e.g., limit ticket sales so that parking does not exceed onsite supply); and • Transportation Information Exchange (e.g., provide information on Tahoe City electronic sign board to notify day skiers when ski resort is at capacity). <p>The proposed summer water taxi service is planned for operation from approximately mid-May to the end of September. The service is planned to be operated using a vessel with up to a 25-passenger capacity between Homewood and Tahoe City. There may be other periodic service between Homewood and South Shore as well dependent upon demand. This service is planned to be operated seven days a week between 9 AM and 8 PM on at least an hourly frequency. HMR residents and guests will be served at no fare, while other passengers will be served as space permits for a modest fare. This service is designed to provide an opportunity to get out on the Lake while also avoiding the existing traffic congestion in the SR 89/SR 28 Wye (e.g., Fanny Bridge) area. Should demand warrant in the future, one additional water taxi could be added with the same capacity. The plan would be to acquire a fuel efficient (possibly hybrid electric technology), low</p>

136

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>noise emitting water taxi vessel. With Homewood's recent acquisition of the lakeside West Shore Café, the water taxi would pick up passengers at the café pier, which is an existing pier structure designed to allow for passenger drop-off and pick-up. The potential use of the existing pier for use by a water taxi would be subject to any requisite regulatory approvals, but is not expected to require any additional facilities. Parking for use of the water taxi would not be required at the West Shore Café since it is intended to serve HMR guests and area residents who would walk to the pier from their accommodations. Fueling, storage and maintenance of the water taxi(s) could occur at one of the two adjacent Homewood marinas.</p> <p>Comments suggest that the analysis and conclusion in the EIR/EIS regarding the Proposed Project's impacts on Transportation, Parking and Circulation are inadequate or wrong. After considering the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters, TRPA and the County accept the assumptions, evidence, and conclusions included in the EIR/EIS based on expertise and experience of the transportation consultants who prepared Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking and Circulation of the EIR/EIS. The Board of Supervisors finds that the traffic analysis in the EIR/EIS has been prepared by qualified experts, and is based on data, assumptions and methods that meet the standards of industry practice, and are consistent with TRPA and County guidance.</p> <p>The project applicant is required to contribute a fair share contribution to the Fanny Bridge improvement alternative based on Placer County standards. As noted above even with HMR' fair share contribution and implementation of the ATP, which substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of the Proposed Projects, complete avoidance of cumulative effects of the project to summer queuing identified in TRANS-C1 is not feasible. Therefore, this impact is significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-104 through 11-106; see also Responses to Comments 13c-6, Comment 14a-64, 14a-117, and 76-13.)</p> <p>Finding for Cumulative Winter LOS: Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-C1 and TRANS-C2, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to implement following intersection improvement at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding for Winter LOS: Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-C1 will improve</p>

137

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>winter operations at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road and SR 89/Fawn Street intersections to within LOS standards.</p> <p>[Comments suggest that the analysis and conclusion in the EIR/EIS regarding the TRANS-3 are inadequate or wrong. After considering the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters, TRPA and the County accept the assumptions, evidence, and conclusions for TRANS-3 included in the EIR/EIS based on expertise and experience of the transportation consultants who prepared Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking and Circulation of the EIR/EIS. The Board of Supervisors finds that the traffic analysis in the EIR/EIS has been prepared by qualified experts, and is based on data, assumptions and methods that meet the standards of industry practice, and are consistent with County guidance.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 11-107 through 11-115; see also Master Responses 9, 10, and 11, Responses to Comments 13a-40, 14a-73, 14a-106, 14a-108, 14a-109, 14a-113, 14a-115, 14a-116, 14a-117, 19-22, 49-2, 268-15 through 268-18, 328-8, and 11-g.)</p>
AIR QUALITY			
<p>AQ-1. Will the Project Generate Construction Emissions in Excess of Applicable Standards?</p> <p>PCAPCD Requirements</p> <p>The point of significance for construction emissions is the PCAPCD's thresholds of 82 pounds per day of ROG, NOX, SOX, and PM10 and 550 pounds per day of CO. Because these thresholds have been implemented to ensure that the CAAQS are met, they are also an appropriate proxy in determining if the proposed action is in compliance with TRPA standards. As shown in Tables 12-9 through 12-14, Alternative 1A would result in PM10 emissions in excess of PCAPCD's threshold of 82 pounds per day.</p> <p>TRPA Requirements</p> <p>The TRPA considers any increase in criteria pollutants above State, federal, and TRPA air quality standards to be significant.</p> <p>This is a significant impact. (S)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Implement PCAPCD Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutant emissions during construction.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall implement the following recommended mitigation measures, which were provided by the PCAPCD. These measures shall be implemented prior to and during the construction phase. In addition, construction of the Project is required to comply with PCAPCD rules and regulations (see section 12-2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dust Control Plan: The applicant shall submit a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan to the PCAPCD. This plan must address the minimum Administrative Requirements found in PCAPCD Rule 228, Fugitive Dust, Sections 300 and 400. The applicant shall not break ground prior to receiving PCAPCD approval of the Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan. Equipment Inventory: The Project Applicant shall submit a comprehensive inventory (i.e. make, model, year, emission rating) of heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or 	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring PCAPCD Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutant emissions during construction below applicable 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Construction emissions of ROG, NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5, were estimated using the URBEMIS2007 (version 9.2.4) model. To estimate construction emissions, URBEMIS2007 analyzes the type of construction equipment used and the duration of the construction period associated with construction of each of the land uses.</p> <p>Construction of the Alternative 1A will occur in four phases over a ten-year period (2011 through 2020). The number of residential dwellings and square feet of nonresidential facilities under construction varies by year. The Mid-Mountain Base area and the North Base area will be completed during Phase 1a and Phase 1b/c, while South Base area construction will occur during Phases 2a and 2b. Tables 12-9 through 12-14 of the EIR/EIS present construction emissions. Implementation of the Alternative 1A will generate a significant amount of PM10 during the first year of Phase 1a.</p>

138

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-25 through 12-42.)	<p>more hours for construction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enforcement Plan: An enforcement plan shall be established and submitted to the PCAPCD for review, to evaluate weekly project-related on-and-off-road heavy-duty vehicle engine emission opacities, using standards as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2180 - 2194. Compliance with Rule 202: Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed District Rule 202, Visible Emission limitations. Compliance with Rule 228: Grading operations shall be suspended if fugitive dust exceeds PCAPCD Rule 228 (Fugitive Dust) limitations. Water shall be applied to control dust, as required by the rule, to prevent dust impacts off-site. Operational water truck(s) shall be on-site, at all times, 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. Pre-Construction Meeting: If required by the Department of Engineering and Surveying and/or the Department of Public Works, the contractor shall have a pre-construction meeting for grading activities. The contractor shall invite the PCAPCD to the pre-construction meeting in order to discuss the construction emission/dust control plan with employees and/or contractors. Maintenance of Public Thoroughfares: The Project Applicant shall keep adjacent public thoroughfares clean of silt, dirt, mud, and debris, and shall "wet broom" the streets if silt, dirt, mud or debris is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares. Dry mechanical sweeping is prohibited. Traffic Limits: Traffic speeds on unpaved surfaces shall be limited to 15 miles per hour or less. Wind Restrictions: Grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds (including instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour and dust is impacting adjacent properties. 		<p>The TRPA considers any increase in criteria pollutants above State, federal, and TRPA air quality standards to be significant. These standards are concentration values at particular locations rather than mass emissions from Project construction (Table 12-9 through Table 12-14 of the EIR/EIS). Dispersion modeling to estimate pollutant concentrations is beyond the scope of this document; as such analysis would require specific details, such as specific construction schedule, location of operating construction equipment, and location of exposed sensitive receptors, that are currently unknown. However, the mass emissions presented in Table 12-9 through Table 12-14 of the EIR/EIS are an appropriate proxy for determining if the Project complies with TRPA thresholds. Based on Table 12-9 of the EIR/EIS, increases in ROG, NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5 are expected during all phases, with the greatest increases occurring during Phase 1a. Pollutant concentrations have the potential to exceed NAAQS, CAAQS, and TRPA standards on days requiring substantial construction equipment and activity. Because specific construction details are currently unknown, it is not possible to determine the number of days in which ambient air quality standards may be exceeded. Based on the mass emissions presented in Table 12-9 of the EIR/EIS, it can be inferred that Phase 1a would result in the most frequent and severe exceedences. However, these exceedences will be short-term as pollutant concentrations will dissipate once construction is completed.</p> <p>The point of significance for construction emissions is the PCAPCD's thresholds of 82 pounds per day of ROG, NOX, SOX, and PM10 and 550 pounds per day of CO. Because these thresholds have been implemented to ensure that the CAAQS are met, they are also an appropriate proxy in determining if a proposed action is in compliance with TRPA standards.</p> <p>PCAPCD staff indicates that compliance with Mitigation Measures AQ-1 can reduce construction PM10 and PM2.5 emissions by 50%. As shown in Tables 12-9 through 12-14, implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 will reduce PM10 emissions to 79.68 pounds per day and 79.73 pounds per day for Alternative 1A, respectively. Therefore, mitigated construction emissions for Alternative 1A are below the PCAPCD's significance threshold of 82 pounds per day. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-25 through 12-42; see also Master Responses 13, 14, 15 and 18; Responses to Comments 14a-74, 14a-130, 14a-131, 107-22, 199-3, and Comment 1-a.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Idling Restrictions: Idling time shall be limited to a maximum of five minutes for diesel-powered equipment. • Open Burning Restrictions: No open burning of removed vegetation shall be allowed during construction. Removed vegetative material shall be either chipped on-site or taken to an appropriate disposal site. • Ultra-Low Diesel Fuel: ARB ultra low diesel fuel shall be used for diesel-powered equipment and low sulfur fuel shall be utilized for stationary equipment. • Clean Power Sources: Existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators shall be used rather than temporary diesel power generators. • Compliance with PCAPCD Permit Regulations: On-site stationary equipment which is classified as 50 horsepower or greater shall either obtain a State issued portable equipment permit or a PCAPCD issued portable equipment permit. Pursuant to PCAPCD Rule 501, General Permit Requirements, the Project may need a permit from the PCAPCD prior to construction. In general, any engine greater than 50 brake horsepower or any boiler with heat greater than 1,000,000 Btu per hour requires a PCAPCD permit. • Compliance with NESHAPs: The demolition or remodeling of any structure may be subject to the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs) for Asbestos. This may require that a structure to be demolished be inspected for the presence of asbestos by a certified asbestos inspector, and that asbestos materials are removed prior to demolition. • Traffic Plans: If a Traffic Plan is required the PCAPCD shall be provided receive a copy for review. PCAPCD recommendations within the plan may include, but not be limited to: use of public transportation and satellite parking areas with a shuttle service. 		

141

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscaping Plan: The applicant shall provide a landscaping plan for review and approval by the Design/Site Review Committee. As required by the PCAPCD, landscaping shall include native drought-resistant species (plants, trees and bushes) and no more than 25% lawn area to reduce the demand for irrigation and gas powered landscape maintenance equipment. The Project Applicant shall include irrigation systems which efficiently utilize water (e.g., prohibit systems that apply water to non-vegetated surfaces and systems which create runoff), use applicant shall install water-efficient irrigation systems and devices, such as soil moisture-based irrigation controls, rain "shut off" valves, and other devices as reviewed and approved by the Design Site Review Committee. Limit Daily Construction Activities: Daily soil disturbance activities shall be limited to 15 acres per day. <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-40 through 12-42.)</p>		
<p>AQ-2. Will the Project Generate Operational Emissions or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in Excess of Applicable Standards?</p> <p>The point of significance for total operational emissions is PCAPCD's mass emissions thresholds. The TRPA's threshold of any increase in VMT and exceedences of the stationary source standards outlined in TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 91.3 are used to evaluate VMT and stationary sources, respectively.</p> <p>As shown in Tables 12-17 through 12-26 of the EIR/EIS, implementation of the Alternative 1A would not generate emissions in excess of PCAPCD's mass emissions thresholds. However, Alternative 1A would result in VMT increases compared to the No Project Alternative (Alternative 2) (Tables 12-18 and 12-23 or the EIR/EIS). Likewise, although stationary source emissions are not expected to exceed the standards outlined in the TRPA code, there is potential for future owners, operators, and residents to install wood-burning appliances that would generate substantial PM10 emissions. This is considered a</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-2a: Contribute to the TRPA Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall pay the appropriate air quality mitigation fee in accordance with Chapter 93—Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. The TRPA adopted this program as a means of generating the revenue necessary to address air quality impacts associated with VMT. By contributing to TRPA's Mitigation Program, the Project effectively mitigates air quality emissions through VMT reductions achieved through Mitigation Program, as VMT reductions typically result in reductions of air pollutant emissions. Specific regional and local VMT reduction strategies that may benefit from the mitigation include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expansion of existing transit facilities; Addition of bicycle lanes; Transportation Systems Management measures such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and use of alternative fuels in fleet vehicles; and Provision of connectivity between multi-use paths for bicycles and pedestrians. 	LS	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure AQ-2a and AQ-2b, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by necessary funding to offset the project's contribution to long-term criteria pollutant emissions resulting from increased traffic and prohibiting wood-burning appliances. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</p> <p>PCAPCD or TRPA thresholds. Area Source Emissions</p> <p>Tables 12-17 through Table 12-21 of the EIR/EIS summarize total operational emissions assuming the project would be fully operational in 2008. Tables 12-22 through 12-26 summarize operational emissions for the build-out year (2021). Based on Tables 12-17 through 12-26 of the EIR/EIS, Alternative 1A will result in an increase of most criteria pollutants under both existing (2008) and build-out (2021) years. However, the emissions increases will not exceed PCAPCD thresholds or result in a significant impact to air quality</p>

171

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>significant impact. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-43 through 12-61.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-2b: Prohibit Installation of Wood-Burning Appliances.</p> <p>There are no new wood-burning appliances included in the Alternative 1A. There is potential, however, for future owners, operators, and residents to install wood-burning appliances. However, no new wood burning appliances defined in District Rule 225 Wood-Burning Appliances shall be allowed in any residential or non-residential structures within the boundaries of the project. A standard note indicating this restriction shall be included on all building plans approved in association with this project.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 12-61.)</p>		<p>TRPA Vehicle Miles Traveled Requirement</p> <p>Project-related VMTs was provided by Fehr & Peers. Summer and winter traffic volumes are different due to seasonal land uses and tourist attractions. Existing VMT during the summer season is currently zero, while existing winter volumes are higher than those expected for the Proposed Project. Consequently, Project implementation would result in an increase of VMT during the summer season only.</p> <p>Table 12-27 of the EIR/EIS shows the VMT results compared to No Project (Alternative 2). Alternative 1A will generate 7,199, 5,176, and 4,624 new VMT compared to No Project.</p> <p>The TRPA considers any net increase in VMT to result in a significant impact to air quality. To reduce VMT related effects to less than significant, the Project Applicant will implement Mitigation Measure AQ-2a for 1A. This mitigation requires the payment of mitigation fees in accordance with Chapter 93—Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. By contributing to TRPA's Mitigation Program, the Project effectively mitigates air quality emissions through VMT reductions achieved through the Mitigation Program. Funds paid under the Air Quality Mitigation Program are used for activities that reduce VMT or otherwise reduce air pollutant emissions from automobiles. Section 93.5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances identifies permissible uses of these funds.</p> <p>The purpose of TRPA's Mitigation Program is to generate revenue to fund projects that promote alternative modes of transportation and reduce VMT within the Lake Tahoe Air Basin (LTAB). While the payment of fees will not affect the number of Project-generated vehicle trips or associated emissions, it will contribute to cumulative regional reductions in VMT and air pollutants. Thus, by contributing to TRPA's Mitigation Program, the project effectively mitigates air quality emissions through VMT reductions achieved by alternative transportation projects supported by the Mitigation Program. The purpose of TRPA's Mitigation Program is to generate revenue to fund projects that promote alternative modes of transportation and reduce VMT within the Lake Tahoe Air Basin (LTAB). While the payment of fees will not affect the number of Project-generated vehicle trips or associated emissions, it will contribute to cumulative regional reductions in VMT and air pollutants. Thus, by contributing to TRPA's Mitigation Program, the project effectively mitigates air quality emissions through VMT reductions achieved by alternative transportation projects supported by the Mitigation Program.</p> <p>As discussed on pages 12-43 and 12-44 in the EIR/EIS, specific regional and local VMT reduction strategies that may benefit from the mitigation include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of existing transit facilities;

142

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of bicycle lanes; • Transportation Systems Management measures such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and use of alternative fuels in fleet vehicles; and • Provision of connectivity between multi-use paths for bicycles and pedestrians. <p>Chapter 93 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances outlines requirements for the payment and distribution of mitigation fees from the Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program. The Project's fee will be determined in accordance with Section 93.3C of the Code of Ordinances. As determined by the TRPA, the mitigation fee will effectively offset increases in vehicle trips and emissions generated by the Project. Funds collected from the Project will be deposited into a trust account and distributed to local transportation projects, consistent with TRPA's Regional Transportation Plan or the 1992 Air Quality Plan.</p> <p>The air quality management agencies (PCAPCD and TRPA) within the Project area have acknowledged fund-based mitigation programs as acceptable methods for mitigating project-level emissions in CEQA documents. Continual contributions from projects throughout the air basin ensure adequate funds to support alternative transportation are available. Consultation with PCAPCD and TRPA confirms that payment into TRPA's Mitigation Program (Mitigation Measure AQ-2a) constitutes sufficient mitigation to reduce traffic-related emissions generated by the Project to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Comments suggest that the analysis and conclusion in the EIR/EIS regarding the Proposed Project's impacts on VMT are inadequate or wrong. After considering the issues raised by commenters, including traffic consultants and public agency commenters, TRPA and the County accept the assumptions, evidence, and conclusions included in the EIR/EIS based on expertise and experience of the transportation consultants who prepared Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking and Circulation of the EIR/EIS. The Board of Supervisors finds that the VMT analysis in the EIR/EIS has been prepared by qualified experts, and is based on data, assumptions and methods that meet the standards of industry practice, and are consistent with TRPA and County guidance.</p> <p>TRPA Stationary Source Requirement</p> <p>TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 91.3 establishes daily emission limits for stationary sources (see Table 12-6 of the EIR/IES). It is likely that improvements in technology and more stringent regulations will reduce future natural gas emissions below those shown in Table 12-28.</p> <p>As shown in Table 12-28 of the EIR/EIS, daily stationary source</p>

143

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>emissions of NOX under Alternative 1A would exceed TRPA thresholds. North Base area and South Base area facilities will be constructed using U.S. Green Building LEED standards. These standards will improve energy efficiency, reducing the need for natural gas combustion for space heating. According to the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), green buildings can reduce energy consumption by 24-50% (USGBC 2009). Using the USGBC's lower bound of potential energy reductions (24%), LEED-design features will reduce NOX emissions from stationary sources under the Alternative 1A to 19.7 pounds per day. Thus, Project emissions will not exceed the TRPA's stationary source standards.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure AQ-2a will reduce impacts associated with the Alternative 1A to a less than significant level by providing the necessary funding to offset the project's contribution to long-term criteria pollutant emissions resulting from increased traffic. Mitigation Measure AQ-2a 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 AQ-2a, measures may include, but are not limited to expansion of existing transit facilities; addition of bicycle lanes; Transportation Systems Management measures such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and use of alternative fuels in fleet vehicles; and provision of connectivity between multi-use paths for bicycles and pedestrians. 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.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure AQ-2b will reduce potential impacts associated with the future owners, operators, or residents installing wood-burning appliances under the Alternative 1A.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-43 through 12-61; see also Master Responses 13, 14, and 15; Responses to Comments 13a-7, 13a-43, 13c-11, 14a-72, 14a-76, 14a-97 through 14a-113, 14a-132 through 14a-138, 19-15 through 19-21, 19-27, 19-60, 269-23, and 18-m.)</p>
AQ-3. Will the Project Expose Sensitive	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts

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

147

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations?</p> <p>PCAPCD Requirement On-Road Carbon Monoxide</p> <p>Modeled CO concentrations plus background CO levels from the nearest monitoring station are presented in Table 12-29 of the EIR/EIS. CO concentrations would not exceed the federal or State 1- and 8-hour standards (PCAPCD) under both existing (2008) and future (2021) conditions.</p> <p>Construction Related Diesel Particulate Matter</p> <p>Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) is a carcinogenic toxic air contaminant that will be emitted by heavy-duty equipment during construction. A number of site-specific factors, which are beyond the scope of this master plan evaluation, are required to calculate DPM concentrations caused by construction activity. For example, the specific construction schedule, location of operating construction equipment, and location of exposed sensitive receptors, are necessary to model pollutant dispersion and calculate relative DPM concentrations at receptor locations. In addition, information on the location of specific receptors is required to perform an HRA. Because a detailed construction schedule is currently unavailable, a quantitative analysis of health risks from construction is not possible.</p> <p>The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) indicates that cancer health risks from DPM are typically associated with chronic exposure and recommends using a 70-year exposure period for the cancer risk analysis to represent a chronic exposure scenario. Construction is anticipated to take a maximum of ten years. This is well below the recommended 70-year analysis period. Moreover, construction-related DPM emissions will be spread between the north and south bases, rather than concentrated in one location. Tourists visiting the HMR during construction will also be transient and only exposed to elevated DPM during their visit. The first condos constructed at the resort will be completed in December of 2016. Assuming these dwellings will be occupied immediately</p>			<p>that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>

145

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>after construction, the potential exposure period of new residents to construction-related DPM would be no more than four years. It is therefore unlikely that construction activities will result in elevated health risks. In addition, Mitigation Measure AQ-1 will help to minimize concentrations of DPM at nearby sensitive receptors.</p> <p>TRPA Requirement As shown in Table 12-29 of the EIR/EIS, emissions of CO would not result in an increase in CO concentrations when compared to the existing conditions under future year conditions. Exposure of sensitive receptors to construction-related DPM is well below the 70 year recommended analysis period and is not anticipated to result in elevated health risks.</p> <p>Summary: The point of significance for the exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations is the TRPA threshold of any net increase in CO concentrations relative to existing conditions under future year (2021) conditions. Alternative 1A are not expected to result in increased CO concentrations. This impact is considered less than significant.</p> <p>The evaluation of DPM is based on a qualitative assessment of the construction period and type of sensitive receptors. Based on the discussion in the EIR/EIS, construction is well below OEHHA 70-year analysis period. Moreover, the actual exposure period to sensitive receptors will be even shorter given the seasonal travel patterns and construction schedule for the new residential dwellings.</p> <p>Several commenters expressed concern that implementation of the Project would generate ozone emissions, which are harmful to human health and the environment. Environmental affects of ozone are discussed on page 12-2 of the DEIR/EIS. The NAAQS and CAAQS, which have been adopted by the federal and state governments, respectively, establish primary and secondary emissions standards for ozone (see Table 12-1 in the DEIR/EIS). The primary standard is designed to protect human health, including the health of "sensitive" populations such as asthmatics, children, and the elderly, within an adequate margin of safety. The secondary standard is designed to protect</p>			

146

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>public welfare, including protection against decreased visibility and damage to animals, crops, vegetation, and buildings.</p> <p>As discussed in MR-14, the PCAPCD's and TRPA's emissions thresholds (Table 12-7 in the DEIR/EIS) will be adopted to ensure development projects do not hinder attainment the NAAQS and CAAQS. Projects that do not violate the appropriate air district thresholds are therefore not anticipated to exceed the NAAQS or CAAQS, which are established to protect human and environmental health.</p> <p>The Draft and FEIR/EIS evaluated mass emissions of ozone precursors (NOX and ROG) that will be generated by Project construction (Impact AQ-1) and operation (Impact AQ-2). As shown in Tables 12-9 through 12-14 in Chapter 24 of the FEIR/EIS, construction-related emissions of NOX and ROG are well below the PCAPCD's threshold of 82 pounds per day for Alternative 1A. Likewise, Tables 12-17 through 12-25 in Chapter 24 of the FEIR/EIS demonstrate that operational-related emissions of NOX and ROG will not exceed 82 pounds per day, when compared to the No Project Alternative. Because the Project-related emissions of ozone precursors (NOX and ROG) will not exceed the PCAPCD's thresholds during construction or operations, implementation of Alternative 1A will not result in a significant impact to human health or the environment from increases ozone levels. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-62 through 12-65; see also Chapter 23, Master Responses 13, 14 and 15; and Responses to Comments 14a-133, 14a-139 through 14a-141.)</p>			
<p>AQ-4. Will the Project Conflict with or Obstruction of Implementation of the Applicable Air Quality Plan?</p> <p>PCAPCD and TRPA Requirements</p> <p>The ARB adopted a revised SIP for CO for the north and south shores of Lake Tahoe. The SIP demonstrates how these areas will continue to maintain compliance with the federal 8-hour CO standard. The TRPA adopted a Regional Plan to outline how the region will achieve and maintain air quality thresholds.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Implement PCAPCD Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutant emissions during construction.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for AQ-1 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-40 through 12-42.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring PCAPCD Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutant emissions during construction to a level that would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable Air Quality Plans. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Mitigation Measure AQ-1 will minimize construction related emissions generated by</p>

147

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>A project is typically deemed inconsistent with air quality plans if it results in population and/or employment growth that exceeds growth estimates included in the applicable planning documents and therefore generates emissions not accounted for in the emissions budget. Alternative 1A would expand certain plan area uses beyond current TRPA and Placer County boundary lines and conflict with existing land use prescriptions. Boundary lines are established by the land use assumptions in the County General Plan and TRPA Code, so any boundary line violation could be inconsistent with the CO SIP and TRPA Regional Plan. An analysis of plan level-consistency was therefore conducted using the Project's potential to violate the CAAQS and NAAQS.</p> <p>Construction Emissions. Modeling presented in Impact AQ-1 indicates that Alternative 1A may result in construction emissions that exceed the CAAQS or NAAQS on days requiring sustainable construction equipment or activity. This is a significant impact.</p> <p>Operational Emissions. Alternative 1A will increase VMTs, but will not violate CO standards, the pollutant of greatest concern in the LTAB. The Project also incorporates traffic management strategies and LEED standards to reduce operation emissions. The Project Applicant will ensure HMR meets land use projections contained within TRPA and Placer County planning documents. Consequently, this impact is less than significant.</p> <p>(S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-66 to 12-67; see also Master Responses 13, 14, and 15.)</p>			<p>Alternative 1A) to less than significant. Consequently, implementation of the Alternative 1A will not conflict or obstruct with implementation of the applicable air quality plans, including the CO SIP and TRPA Regional Plan.</p> <p>Construction and operational emissions generated by the Project were compared to the PCAPCD and TRPA threshold of significance as addressed above in the Findings for Impacts AQ-1 through AQ-3. Based on the Findings for AQ1 through AQ-3, Alternative 1A will not generate emissions that exceed applicable air district thresholds after implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2a, and AQ-2b. Because these thresholds are adopted to ensure attainment of regional Air Quality Plans, the Project (Alternative 1/1A) will not conflict with the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan or result in significant impacts to air quality in the LTAB.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-66 to 12-67; see also Master Responses 13, 14, and 15; Responses to Comments 14a-129 and 14a-142.)</p>
<p>AQ-5. Will the Project Generate Objectionable Odors?</p> <p>PCAPCD and TRPA Requirements</p> <p>The generation and severity of odors is dependent on a number of factors, including the nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; wind direction; and the location of the receptor(s). Odors rarely cause physical harm, but can cause discomfort, leading to complaints to regulatory agencies. Typical facilities known</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

148

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>to produce odors include landfills, wastewater treatment plants, manufacturing plants, and certain agricultural activities.</p> <p>The existing HMR is not known to include any major facilities that produce odors. According to the PCAPCD and the TRPA, there have been no odor complaints against HMR. Consequently, continuing operation is not anticipated to generate any objectionable odors that affect a substantial number of people.</p> <p>Project implementation would not result in the addition of any major odor producing facilities. Since there have been no odor complaints against HMR, implementation of the Alternative 1A, which will not add new odor sources, is not anticipated to generate objectionable odors that affect a substantial number of people.</p> <p>Diesel emissions from construction equipment and volatile organic compounds from paving activities may create odors during construction. These odors would be temporary and localized, and they would cease once construction activities have been completed. Thus, it is not anticipated that the operation or the construction of the Proposed Project would result in odor complaints. This impact is considered less than significant. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-67 to 12-68; see also Response to Comment 138-5.)</p>			
<p>AQ-C1. Would the Project Result in a Cumulative Short-Term Impact on Air Quality?</p> <p>As discussed in Impact AQ-1, the Project would generate emissions of ROG, NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5 during construction. These emissions are primarily associated with fugitive dust during site grading and the use of heavy-duty equipment. Unmitigated construction activity under the Alternative 1A would exceed the PCAPCD significance standard for PM10 during Phase 1a. This is a significant cumulative impact. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 12-68.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Implement PCAPCD Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutant emissions during construction.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for AQ-1 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-40 through 12-42.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring PCAPCD Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutant emissions during construction below applicable 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation Mitigation Measure AQ-1 will reduce PM10 emissions generated by Alternative 1A to less than significant as addressed in the Findings for AQ-1. It is anticipated that similar projects in the LTAB, including those listed in Table 20-1 of the EIR/EIS would also be required to implement similar BMPs to reduce project-level construction-related emissions. Thus, the Proposed Project would not contribute to a cumulative impact.</p>

149

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			(Final EIR/EIS, p. 12-68; Master Responses 13, 14, and 15; Responses to Comments 14a-143.)
<p>AQ-C2. Would the Project Result in a Cumulative Long-Term Regional Impact on Air Quality?</p> <p>As shown in Impact AQ-2, implementation of Alternative 1A would increase VMT in the Project area and vicinity relative to the No Project (Alternative 2). This increase in VMT may result in long-term increase in criteria pollutant emissions from traffic operations. When combined with emissions from area and stationary sources, Alternative 1A generate ROG and NOX emissions in excess of 10 pounds per day, which exceeds the PCAPCD's cumulative significance threshold. This is considered a significant impact. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 12-69.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-2a: Contribute to the TRPA Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for AQ-2 above. .</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 12-61.)</p>	LS	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure AQ-2a, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by necessary funding to offset the project's contribution to long-term criteria pollutant emissions resulting from increased traffic. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The DEIR/EIS includes an evaluation of long-term regional impacts. This analysis compares project-level emissions to PCAPCD's 10 pounds per day cumulative threshold. Operational emissions are quantified in Table 12-17. As this table indicates, operational emissions of ROG and NOX will each exceed 10 pounds per day. The County and TRPA have consulted with PCAPCD regarding appropriate mitigation for this impact. PCAPCD staff has stated that the payment of funds under TRPA's Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program will also serve as mitigation for the Project's cumulative contribution to ROG and NOX emissions. As explained above, TRPA's program is designed to address a net increase in VMT associated with a project. Thus, in reducing VMT under TRPA's program, ROG and NOX emissions will also be reduced. To mitigate cumulative operational impacts, the PCAPCD requires the payment of fees for each pound of pollutant in excess of 10 pounds per day. Based on consultation with the PCAPCD, payment of the TRPA off-site fee (Mitigation Measure AQ-2a) will satisfy this PCAPCD fee requirement. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2a will therefore provide the necessary funding to offset the Project's contribution to long-term criteria pollutant emissions. TRPA adopted the Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program as a means of generating the revenue necessary to implement programs to reduce VMT, resulting in improvements to both traffic and traffic-related air quality. Alternative 1A will therefore not contribute to a cumulatively considerable air quality impact.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 12-69; see also Master Responses 13, 14, and 15; Responses to Comments 14a-143.)</p>
<p>AQ-C3. Would the Project Result in a Cumulative Long-Term Local Impact on Air</p>	No mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002;

150

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Quality?</p> <p>CO modeling for the Alternative 1A showed that existing and future concentrations from idling would not exceed existing State, federal, and TRPA thresholds. This modeling is based on traffic volumes that assumed cumulative growth throughout the Lake Tahoe area. Because Alternative 1A would not exceed State, federal, or TRPA thresholds, they would not contribute to a cumulative air quality violation. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 12-69 to 12-70; see also Master Responses 13, 14, and 15; Responses to Comments 14a-143.)</p>			<p>CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>
<p>NOISE</p> <p>NOI-1. Will construction (including blasting activities) of the Project expose the public to high noise levels or vibration?</p> <p>Construction noise in Placer County is exempt from 6:00 AM to 8:00 PM. Construction noise outside of these hours would be significant if it exceeds 55 dBA from 8:00 PM to 10:00 PM or 45 dBA from 10:00 PM to 6:00 AM. Noise from pile driving would reach maximum levels of 93 dBA at the nearest residences to the Project area. Placer County does not have thresholds for vibration. As stated in Table 13-14, an appropriate damage potential threshold at older residential structures should be 0.3 PPV (inches per second). As stated in Table 13-15, strongly perceptible PPV would be 0.10 inches per second.</p> <p>Construction noise from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM is exempt under the TRPA Codes of Ordinances Chapter 23 – Noise Limitations.</p> <p>The results in Tables 13-19 and 13-20 of the EIR/EIS indicate that blasting with a 30 pound charge would result in a maximum of 0.501 PPV (inches per second) and 127.8 dB would occur at the nearest residence. The predicted vibration level is below the TRPA thresholds of 1.0 PPV inches per second for vibration and the recommended threshold of 133 dB for blasting. However, depending on the location of blasting and the size of the charge, there is potential for blasting to result in vibration that exceeds the 0.5 inches per second damage threshold for older buildings and residential structures indicated in Table 13-14. Consequently,</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure NOI-1a: Employ Measures to Reduce Airblast and Vibration from Blasting.</p> <p>Contractors shall retain a qualified blasting specialist to develop a site-specific blasting program report to assess, control, and monitor airblast and ground vibration from blasting. The report shall be reviewed and approved by the County prior to issuance of a blasting permit. The report shall include, at minimum, the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The contractor shall use current state-of-the-art technology to keep blast-related vibration at offsite residential, other occupied structures and well sites as low as possible, consistent with blasting safety. In no instance shall blast vibration, measured on the ground adjacent to a residential, other occupied structure, or well site be allowed to exceed the frequency-dependent limits specified in the Alternative Blasting Level Criteria contained in USBM Report of Investigations 8507. The project contractor shall use current state-of-the-art technology to keep airblast at offsite residential and other occupied structures as low as possible. In no instance shall airblast, measured at a residence or other occupied structure, be allowed to exceed the 0.013-psi (133-dB) limit recommended in USBM Report of Investigations 8485. The project contractor shall monitor and record airblast and vibration for blasts within 1,000 feet of residences and 	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure NOI-1a. NOI-1ba. and NOI-1c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by development and implement measures that would ensure impacts from blasting and construction noise levels do not exceed applicable thresholds. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Noise impacts resulting from construction depend on the noise generated by construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise generating activities, and the distance and shielding between construction noise sources and noise sensitive areas. Table 13-17 of the EIR/EIS shows the calculated maximum (Lmax) and Leq sounds levels that would result from Project construction.</p> <p>The nearest residences to the North Base area are located along Sacramento Avenue south of the existing gravel parking lot, as close as 100 feet from the Project area. Residences along Silver Street are as close as 150 feet from the Project area, and residences east of SR 89 are approximately 200 feet from the Project area. As shown in Table 13-17 of the EIR/EIS, noise at these locations could reach 85 dBA, 80 dBA, and 77 dBA, respectively. The nearest residences to the South Base area are located along Tahoe Ski Bowl Way and Lagoon Road east of the existing parking lots and maintenance facility, as close as 100 feet to the Project area. As shown in table 13-17, maximum noise levels at adjacent residences could reach 85 dBA without acoustical shielding from structures or terrain. In addition, pile drivers could be used under the Proposed Project. As shown in Table 13-18, noise from pile drivers could be as loud as 93 dBA at 100 feet from the source.</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

151

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>vibration and airblast impacts from blasting are potentially significant.</p> <p>As shown in Table 13-17 of the EIR/EIS, construction noise could reach up to 85 dBA at the nearest residences, and if pile drivers are used noise could reach up to 93 dBA. Using the most stringent thresholds, noise from construction activity occurring within the hours of 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM is exempt. Therefore, if construction activity occurs outside of these hours, this impact would be considered significant and mitigation would be required. Detailed information on the construction schedule is not available. Because it is possible that construction activity could take place outside of the exempted hours, this impact is considered significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-22 through 13-26.)</p>	<p>other occupied structures to verify that measured levels are within the recommended limits at those locations. The contractor shall use blasting seismographs containing three channels that record in three mutually perpendicular axes and which have a fourth channel for recording airblast. The frequency response of the instrumentation shall be from 2 to 250 Hz, with a minimum sampling rate of 1,000 samples per second per channel. The recorded data must be such that the frequency of the vibrations can be determined readily. If blasting is found to exceed specified levels, blasting shall cease, and alternative blasting or excavation methods shall be employed that result in the specified levels not being exceeded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Airblast and vibration monitoring shall take place at the nearest offsite residential or other occupied structure. If vibration levels are expected to be lower than those required to trigger the seismograph at that location, or if permission cannot be obtained to record at that location, recording shall be accomplished at some closer site in line with the structure. Specific locations and distances where airblast and vibration are measured shall be documented in detail along with measured airblast and vibration amplitudes. <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-1b: Conduct Building Inspection prior to Blasting.</p> <p>HMR shall inspect any existing buildings located within a 500-foot radius of planned blasting activities. The inspection shall document preexisting conditions. The preinspection survey of the buildings shall be completed with the use of photographs, videotape, or visual inventory, and shall include inside and outside locations. All existing cracks in walls, floors, driveways, etc., shall be documented with sufficient detail for comparison during and upon completion of blasting activities to determine whether actual vibration damage has occurred. The results of both surveys shall be provided to the County for review and acceptance of conclusions. Should</p>		<p>Construction activities associated with the operation of heavy equipment may generate localized groundborne vibration. Vibration from non-impact construction activity is typically below the threshold of perception when the activity is more than 50 feet from the receptor. Additionally, vibration from these activities will be of limited duration and will end when construction is completed. Vibration from non-impact equipment would be less than 0.10 inches per second at 25 feet. Vibration from pile driving, assuming a typical pile driver (Table 13-2), would be less than 0.5 inches per second (the damage threshold for older buildings and residences in Table 13-14 of the EIR/EIS) within about 30 feet of pile driving.</p> <p>Vibration and airblast would also occur if blasting techniques are used. Tables 13-19 and 13-20 of the EIR/EIS depict calculated PPV and PSI at three distances from Project construction areas to represent potential impacts at the nearest sensitive receptors under a worst-case scenario.</p> <p>Construction would occur seasonally between May 2011 and December 2020 at various locations throughout the Project area and is anticipated to occur during normal working hours. Construction would occur at particular locations for only a fraction of the time between May 2011 and December 2020 (i.e. construction would not occur over the entire Project area for nine continuous years).</p> <p>Placer County's noise ordinance establishes a daytime (7:00 AM to 10:00 PM) construction noise limit of 55 dBA, Leq and nighttime (10:00 PM to 7:00 AM) construction noise limit of 45 dBA, Leq outside of the exempted hours of 6:00 AM to after 8:00 PM, Monday to Friday and 8:00 AM to after 8:00 PM, Saturday and Sunday. TRPA exempts construction activities during the hours of between 8:00 AM and 6:30 PM. Because of Placer County and TRPA's construction noise exemptions during daytime activities, construction noise impacts are considered less than significant during daytime activities. However, nighttime construction activities have potential to exceed Placer County's noise ordinance. Consequently, Mitigation Measure NOI-1c: Employ Noise-Reducing Construction Practices was identified to reduce construction noise to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures NOI-1a and NOI-1b reduce vibration impacts from blasting. Mitigation Measure NOI-1c reduces construction noise levels below the County thresholds of 55 dBA Leq between the hours of 8:00 PM to 10:00 PM and 45 dBA Leq between the hours of 10:00 PM to 6:00 AM on weekdays, and 55 dBA between the hours of 8:00 PM and 10:00 PM and 45 dBA between the hours of 10:00 PM and 8:00 AM on weekends.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-22 through 13-26; see also Master Response 16; Responses to Comments 13a-51 through 13a-53,</p>

152

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>damage occur, construction operations shall be halted until the problem activity can be identified. Once identified, the problem activity shall be modified to eliminate the problem and protect the adjacent buildings. Any damage to nearby buildings shall be repaired back to the pre-existing condition.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-1c: Employ noise-reducing construction practices.</p> <p>HMR shall design and implement measures to reduce noise from construction. HMR will prepare a noise control plan that will identify feasible measures that can be employed to reduce construction noise, including enclosing or shielding noise-generating equipment and locating equipment as far as practical from sensitive uses would also be effective. Implementation of such measures is anticipated to provide up to 10 dB of noise reduction. The noise control plan shall employ noise-reducing construction practices such that construction noise does not exceed: (1) 55 dBA Leq between the hours of 8:00 PM to 10:00 PM and 45 dBA between the hours of 10:00 PM to 6:00 AM on weekdays; or (2) 55 dBA between the hours of 8:00 PM and 10:00 PM and 45 dBA between the hours of 10:00 PM and 8:00 AM on weekends. The plan must be approved by the TRPA and Placer County prior to issuing a Grading Permit. The noise control plan may include, and is not limited to, the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gasoline or diesel engine construction equipment shall have sound-control devices that are at least as effective as those originally provided by the manufacturer and that equipment be operated and maintained to minimize noise generation. • Prohibit gasoline or diesel engines from having unmuffled exhaust. • Locate noise-generating equipment as far as practical from noise-sensitive uses. • Use noise-reducing enclosures around noise-generating equipment. • Schedule substantial noise-generating activity, and blasting in particular, during daytime or early evening hours. • Place temporary barriers between noise sources and noise-sensitive land uses or taking advantage of existing barrier 		268-7, 268-11, 268-15, and 6-e.)

153

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>features (terrain, structures, edge of trench) to block sound transmission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cover trenches where blasting will occur. Prohibit backup alarms and provide an alternate warning system, such as a flagman or radar-based alarm that is compliant with State regulations. <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-25 through 13-26.)</p>		
<p>NOI-2. Will operation and maintenance of the Project expose the public to high noise levels (e.g., above CNEL permitted in the applicable Plan Area Statements, Community Plan or Master Plan) from transportation sources?</p> <p>Residences are located throughout the surrounding roadway network. In addition, new residences will be built with the Proposed Project. Significant noise impacts are identified where existing noise sensitive receptors would be exposed to noise increases that exceed the noise significance thresholds.</p> <p>In Placer County, noise from mobile sources would be significant if exterior noise levels are greater than 50 dBA, Ldn/CNEL at the property line of the receiving land use. The TRPA Community Plan regulates noise for transportation corridors. For SR 89, noise is regulated to 55 dBA within 300 feet of the roadway. Noise from mobile sources would be significant if exterior noise levels are greater than 55 dBA within 300 feet of the roadway, or if the change in noise is greater than 3 dBA. In addition, for Plan Areas that are out of attainment, any increase in noise would be significant.</p> <p>Plan Areas 156, 157, and 160 have noise standards of 55, 55, and 60 dBA, respectively. As shown in Table 13-21, noise exceeds 55 dBA (the more stringent threshold) even without the Project. Based on a personal communication with TRPA staff, any increase in noise, relative to future no project conditions, would be significant because the standard is currently exceeded. Therefore, it is necessary to fully mitigate/offset the incremental increase in noise, relative to future no project conditions (Emmett, pers. comm.). Using an existing baseline indicates that traffic noise levels would</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Employ measures to ensure Project-related traffic noise does not increase relative to existing and future no project conditions.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall design and implement measures to reduce noise from traffic related to the Proposed Project (Alternative 1). HMR will prepare a noise control plan that will identify feasible measures that can be employed to reduce traffic noise by 0.4 dBA relative to existing conditions and 1.2 dBA relative to future conditions. The noise control plan shall employ noise-reducing measures such that Project-related noise does not increase relative to future no project conditions. This is in addition to the ongoing reduction in traffic volumes observed on SR 89 (see Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking, and Circulation). The plan must be approved by the TRPA and Placer County prior to issuing a Grading Permit. The noise control plan may include, and is not limited to, the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constructing/use of barriers, berms, and acoustical shielding (reductions of 3dB to 5dB). Utilizing noise-reducing pavement (reductions of 2-5dB). Lowering speed limits, if feasible and practical (reductions of 1-2dB). Programs to pay for noise mitigation such as low cost loans to owners of noise-impacted property or establishment of developer fees (no actual noise reduction from this, reduction depends on actual measure that is implemented.). Acoustical treatment of buildings (reductions of 3-5dB). <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 13-30.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measures NOI-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to develop and implement measures to ensure Project-related traffic noise does not increase relative to existing and future no project conditions. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Traffic-related noise will be generated by existing and anticipated traffic on SR 89. The Project will contribute to traffic on SR 89, and will therefore contribute to traffic-related noise. Traffic generated by the Project is a small proportion of the overall amount of traffic on SR 89 (see Chapter 11 – Transportation, Parking, and Circulation of the EIR/EIS). In addition, as shown in Table 11-4 of the EIR/EIS (Historic Traffic Volumes), historic traffic volumes in the HMR area are steadily decreasing. Therefore, because traffic-related noise is a function of all traffic on the roadway (existing and Project-related traffic), the focus is on noise levels that will occur if the Project is approved, in conjunction with existing and anticipated traffic.</p> <p>Traffic noise levels on SR 89 were calculated based on traffic noise modeling using the FHWA TNM. The calculated traffic noise levels at 100 feet from the centerline of SR 89 under future traffic conditions are summarized in Table 13-21.</p> <p>The Project will generate trips from employee and ski shuttles, dial-a-rides, and water taxis. The employee shuttle buses are planned to operate during both the summer and winter seasons. The employee shuttle will be a 20-25 passenger van and will serve the employee housing areas on the North Shore, which will reduce employee vehicle traffic. Shuttle and dial-a-ride vehicles will be smaller vans, such as a 195 horsepower Chevrolet Express. Scheduled shuttle service is planned to operate between Homewood and Tahoe City seven days a week from 7:00 AM to 11:00 PM every hour.</p> <p>Dial-a-ride service will operate during the summer and winter seasons from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM. Service will be provided in the</p>

154

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>increase by 0.4 dBA under Alternative 1A. Relative to future no project conditions Project-related traffic noise is predicted to increase by 1.2 dBA. Noise from the shuttles and dial-a-ride vehicles will be consistent with current noise on local roadways. Noise from the water taxi will be consistent with other boating activities in the Tahoe City and Homewood areas. Traffic noise would increase by 0.4 dBA relative to existing conditions and 1.2 dBA relative to future conditions for areas that are currently out of attainment with regards to TRPA Plan Areas. Therefore, this impact is considered to be significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-28 through 10-31.)</p>			<p>winter as far north as Tavern Shores and Granlibakken, and as far south as Rubicon Bay (excluding the Talmont and Upper Ward Canyon areas). Summer service will accommodate rides to/from the HMR in an area bounded by Granlibakken Road to the north and Sugar Pine Point to the south.</p> <p>The water taxi will likely be a 20-25 passenger hybrid vehicle and will operate in the summer months between Homewood and Tahoe City. This service is planned to operate seven days a week between 9:00 AM and 8:00 PM at least every hour. Vehicle trips from the shuttles and dial-a-ride will run on local roadways. Noise from the employee shuttle can reach 45 Leq on local roadways (Federal Transit Administration 2006). The shuttles, dial-a-rides, and water taxis will help to minimize single-passenger automobile trips.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-2 reduces traffic noise levels by establishing a noise reduction performance standard (1.2dB) that must be met, while also identifying potential mitigation strategies and the effectiveness of these strategies to meet this performance standard. As a result, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 identifies the specific amount of noise reduction that must be achieved, in addition to feasible measures that may be implemented to achieve the noise reduction. The EIR/EIS concluded that noise from the shuttles and dial-a-ride vehicles would be consistent with current noise on local roadways, while noise from the water taxi will be consistent with other boating activities in the Tahoe City and Homewood areas, resulting in a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would ensure that the Project-related traffic noise impacts would not result in any increase in noise levels (CNEL) relative to existing and future no project conditions, which would mitigate the Project's impact on traffic noise.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-28 through 13-31; Master Response 16; Responses to Comments 13a-17, 13a-57, 13a-82, 269-20 and 11-h.)</p>
<p>NOI-3. Will noise from Project concerts, snowmaking, or other resort operations effect existing or proposed noise-sensitive land uses?</p> <p>Noise from operational sources would be significant if exterior noise levels were greater than the Placer County standards of 50 dBA, Ldn/CNEL at the property line of the receiving land use. Noise is regulated under the TRPA Community Plan by land use category. Noise for high density residential uses are regulated to 55 dBA, noise from hotels and commercial uses are regulated to 60 dBA, and noise for outdoor recreational uses are regulated to 55</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure NOI-3a: Design new residences to reduce interior noise below 45 dBA, Ldn.</p> <p>HMR shall design and construct new residences such that interior noise from snowmaking and other sources of noise (including concerts, HVAC systems, cooling towers/evaporative condensers, loading docks, lift stations, emergency generators, and outdoor public address systems) in the area does not exceed 45 dBA, Ldn. HMR will retain a qualified acoustical consultant to design the necessary acoustical treatments. Measures that can be implemented include installing acoustically rated doors and windows, use of upgraded wall</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure NOI-3a. NOI-3b. and NOI-3c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by development and implement measures that would ensure noise levels from operations do not exceed applicable thresholds. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Operations and maintenance at HMR would generate noise under the Alternative 1A due to activities such as snow grooming, ski patrol activities, avalanche control, snowmaking, and concerts. Alternative 1A</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

155

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>dBA. For Plan Areas that are out of attainment, any increase in noise would be considered significant. Plan Areas 156, 157, and 160 have noise standards of 55, 55, and 60 dBA, respectively.</p> <p>The new amphitheatre is planned to be the permanent home of the annual Lake Tahoe Music Festival. Sound from the amphitheatre is anticipated to result in significant impacts at new HMR proposed residential townhomes located along the north end of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way. Depending on the type of music acts and the degree of amplification there is potential for significant noise impacts to occur at existing residences as well. Concerts, which are currently held periodically throughout the year, would require a special use permit from TRPA specifying hours of activities and specific sound level limits.</p> <p>As shown in Table 13-7 of the EIR/EIS, noise from snowmaking currently exceeds these standards at the residential uses near the South Base area and residential uses near the North Base area (e.g., the eastern Project boundary). Therefore, any increase in noise from snowmaking in these locations is considered significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-37 through 13-40.)</p>	<p>and roof materials to provide additional acoustical insulation, and sealing gaps in walls and ceilings with acoustical caulking. The acoustical consultant will prepare a report for the TRPA and Placer County demonstrating compliance with noise standards inside of residential units.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-3b: Implement design and operational measures at the amphitheater to ensure compliance with the adjacent Planning Area Statement (PAS) CNEL limit at existing residences.</p> <p>HMR shall demonstrate that the amphitheater has been designed such that operational noise at existing residences will be in compliance with the adjacent Planning Area Statement (PAS) CNEL limit. An acoustical engineer with experience in the prediction and mitigation of outdoor theater sound levels, HVAC systems, cooling towers/evaporative condensers, loading docks, lift stations, emergency generators, and outdoor public address systems shall be consulted prior to design and construction of the proposed amphitheater and other stationary Project elements with the potential to generate noise. The acoustical engineer shall identify feasible mitigation measures for reducing noise-related impacts to nearby residences. Mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to, orientation and location of the amphitheater, construction of noise barriers and shielding, limitations on speaker orientation, limitations on noise-generation levels, and hours of activity. The Project Applicant shall incorporate the mitigation measures into the design and operation of the amphitheater and other stationary Project elements with the potential to generate noise.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-3c: Implement measures to ensure noise levels at existing residences are reduced to meet the adjacent Plan Area Statement (PAS) CNEL limit.</p> <p>To reduce existing and proposed snowmaking noise levels to a less than significant level, HMR must reduce noise levels to meet adjacent PAS CNEL limits. The reduction of noise to PAS CNEL levels shall be reevaluated annually to ensure that HMR is implementing all possible snowmaking measures available to work towards the attainment of the PAS CNEL noise standards for Plan Areas 157, 158, and 159 (55dB, 55dB,</p>		<p>proposes no changes to existing grooming, or ski patrol activities at HMR, so no impact would occur. Other operational noise sources include HVAC systems, cooling towers/evaporative condensers, loading docks, lift stations, emergency generators, and outdoor public address systems. Similarly, these noise sources are a part of the existing noise environment with HMR operations and noise levels associated with other noise sources are not anticipated to increase under the Alternative 1A.</p> <p>Snowmaking typically occurs at nighttime throughout the ski season depending upon the amount of natural snowfall. To represent a worst-case scenario, it was assumed that snowmaking would occur every night of the ski season from midnight until 7:00 AM, and for 3 continual days per week for two weeks in the beginning of the season (Tirman pers. comm.). This is comparable to existing snowmaking operations. HMR currently uses 25 horsepower fan-gun technology for snowmaking. Fan guns include the Super Polecat, Super Wizzard, and the Viking Snowtower models. There are five guns operating at the north side and 5 guns operating at the south side of HMR. The Proposed Project would add guns on both the north and south sides, but it is currently unknown how many new guns will be used and the exact locations of the guns relative to existing and proposed noise sensitive land uses. Because the number and type of guns as well as the location of each gun is currently unknown, the noise levels from snowmaking cannot be quantified. For this reason, new snowmaking activities that result in an increase in snowmaking noise would result in a significant noise impact. Mitigation Measures NOI-3a: Design New Residences to Reduce Interior Noise Below 45 dBA, Ldn and NOI-3c: Implement Measures to Ensure Noise Levels at Existing Residences are Reduced to Meet the Adjacent Plan Area Statement (PAS) CNEL Limit were identified to reduce impacts related to snowmaking activities to less than significant. These mitigation measures identify specific noise performance standards that must be met. They also identify options available in order to ensure compliance with these noise standards. Acoustical studies are required at the time specific designs are submitted in order to confirm compliance with these standards. These studies will be reviewed by TRPA and the County in order to confirm compliance.</p> <p>The new amphitheatre is planned to be the permanent home of the annual Lake Tahoe Music Festival. Amplification of voice and music, combined with applause and other audience reactions could result in audible sound at nearby residential units. The amphitheatre will be located between the base of the gondola and the hotel outdoor deck area. The nearest existing residence is on Sacramento Avenue and is located approximately 400 feet from the new amphitheatre. New residential units along Tahoe Ski Bowl Way would be as close as 250 feet to the amphitheatre, and the hotel would be immediately adjacent to the amphitheatre. Although sound levels at a rock concerts can reach 110 dBA (see</p>

156

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>and 60dB, CNEL, respectively). HMR will prepare a noise control plan to design, construct/install, and operate new snowmaking equipment so that the increase in noise associated with snowmaking conditions, (see Table 13-7) is reduced to meet the appropriate PAS limit. The plan must be approved by the TRPA and Placer County prior to HMR using any new snowmaking equipment. The noise control plan may include, and is not limited to, the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Situate snowmaking equipment as far as practicable from existing noise sensitive land uses (reductions of 2-3dB). If setbacks are used to control snowmaking noise, snow could be moved from the location where it is made, and mechanically deposited in the desired location. This measure would involve the use of snow grooming equipment, which would also produce noise. In general, snow grooming equipment produces lower levels than snowmaking equipment, and the time required to move the snow would be less than the time required to make snow on a continuous basis. Typical snow grooming equipment is approximately the size of a bulldozer. Bulldozers between 100 and 250 HP can generate maximum noise levels of 81-85 dBA (Hoover & Keith, 2000). It is reasonable to assume that snowgrooming equipment would generate similar noise levels. Thus the overall noise impacts of this alternative in a given area would be lower than for continuous snowmaking using snowmaking nozzles. • Place temporary barriers between noise sources and noise-sensitive land uses or taking advantage of existing barrier features (terrain, structures, edge of trench) to block sound transmission. Barriers would be most effective where the nozzles are close to the noise sensitive land uses. The barriers should be solid and massive, and placed close to the nozzles to block line of sight to the receivers. Thick (1/2 inch) plywood or wood, and straw bales are examples of suitable materials for such an application. Where nozzles are placed in fixed, elevated positions, 		<p>Table 13-1), concerts at the amphitheatre are smaller-scale and are not anticipated to reach this level. Residential Building A is located between the amphitheatre and existing residences on Sacramento Avenue and will provide substantial acoustical shielding between the amphitheatre and existing residences. The building will also provide acoustical shielding between the amphitheatre and most of the new residential units along Tahoe Ski Bowl Way. New residential townhome units at the north end of Tahoe Ski Bowl way would not be shielded by the building. The amphitheatre will project amplified sound towards the mountain, and sound energy will primarily dissipate in that direction.</p> <p>As stated in the EIR/EIS, in Plan Areas out of attainment, any increase in noise would be significant. Mitigation Measures NOI-3a and NOI-3b would reduce impacts from the amphitheatre, and Mitigation Measures NOI-3a and NOI-3c would reduce impacts from snowmaking to meet PAS CNEL levels, and therefore would be less than significant</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-37 through 13-40; Master Response 16; Responses to Comments 13a-55, 13a-56, 13a-82, 269-20, and 11-h.)</p>

157

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>barriers could consist of tower structures with plywood sides blocking line of sight to the nozzles (reductions of 3-9dB). At the South and North Base areas, the construction of proposed HMR buildings may provide permanent barriers between snowmaking operations and adjacent land uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Select quieter snow making equipment (reductions of 2-3dB). HMR currently uses fan gun technology for its snowmaking system, which is quieter than compressed air/water nozzles used at other resorts. However, the latest snowmaking gun technology shall be consulted when purchasing new equipment. The new and quieter equipment shall be used in locations closest to noise sensitive land uses. • Prohibit/minimize the operation of snow making activities during nighttime hours (prohibition eliminates nighttime noise that is penalized in the calculation of CNEL averages). • Reduce the number of snow making equipment operating concurrently (reduction of 2-3 dB). • Reducing the number of nozzles close to noise sensitive land uses. (In general, a 50 percent reduction in the number of nozzles in a given area will result in a reduction of 3 dB, which is considered to be a perceptible reduction in noise levels). <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-38 through 13-40.)</p>		
<p>NOISE-C1: Will the Project result in a substantial impact upon the cumulative noise environment?</p> <p>The traffic volumes in the traffic analysis in Chapter 11 – Traffic, Parking, and Circulation were based on cumulative growth in the HMR area. Consequently, the noise analysis was also based on cumulative growth and represents cumulative effect conditions. Alternative 1A would result in minor increased in noise compared to the No Project (Alternative 2) (see Tables 3.6-21 through 3.6-23). Any increase in noise, relative to future no project conditions based on TRPA criteria, would be significant and thus it is necessary to fully mitigate/offset the incremental increase in</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Employ measures to ensure Project-related traffic noise does not increase relative to existing and future no project conditions.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for NOI-2 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 13-30.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-3a: Design new residences to reduce interior noise below 45 dBA, Ldn.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for NOI-3 above.</p>	LS	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure NOI-2, NOI-3a, NOI-3b, and NOI-3c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by development and implement measures that would ensure Project-related traffic noise does not increase relative to existing and future no project conditions and noise levels from operations do not exceed applicable thresholds. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative impacts would be considered less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-2, NOI-3a, NOI-3b and NOI-3c. Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would reduce traffic noise relative to</p>

158

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>noise, relative to future no project conditions</p> <p>Plan Areas 156, 157, and 160 are currently out of attainment due to traffic and snowmaking noise. Noise from traffic is anticipated to increase with Alternative 1A. Noise from snowmaking is also expected to increase. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-40 through 13-41.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure NOI-3b: Implement design and operational measures at the amphitheater to ensure compliance with the adjacent Planning Area Statement (PAS) CNEL limit at existing residences.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for NOI-3 above.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOI-3c: Implement measures to ensure noise levels at existing residences are reduced to meet the adjacent Plan Area Statement (PAS) CNEL limit.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for NOI-3 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-38 through 13-40.)</p>		<p>existing and future no-project conditions, and Mitigation Measures NOI-3a and NOI-3c would reduce snowmaking noise to PAS CNEL levels. In addition, Mitigation Measures NOI-3a and NOI-3b would reduce noise from the amphitheater at new and existing residences. Therefore, impacts from noise would be reduced to less than significant levels.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-40 through 13-41; Master Response 16; Responses to Comments 13a-17.)</p>
SOILS, GEOLOGY AND SEISMICITY			
<p>GEO-1. Will the Project expose people or structures to adverse geological hazards, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving fault rupture, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic related ground failure (e.g., liquefaction), or landslides?</p> <p>Fault Rupture. The geologic hazards and geotechnical evaluations (Kleinfelder 2007; Holdrege and Kull 2009, 2010a, 2010b) determined that two Quaternary-age faults are mapped across the Project area. Fault rupture has the potential to compromise the structural integrity of new facilities and expose a greater surface area (and more people) to fault rupture hazard. A potential hazard associated with earthquake faults across the Project area involves surface rupture.</p> <p>Ground Shaking. The potential hazard associated with earthquake faults also involves strong ground motion. The Project area is located in a region that is traditionally characterized by moderate to high seismic activity, as discussed in the Environmental Settings section of Chapter 14 of the EIR/EIS, and therefore, a large earthquake in the project vicinity could potentially cause moderate ground shaking in the Project area (Kleinfelder 2007).</p> <p>Liquefaction, Lateral Spreading and Slope</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure GEO-1. Submit Final Geotechnical Report.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall submit to the 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Road, pavement, and parking area design B. Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable) C. Grading practices D. Erosion/winterization E. Special problems discovered on-site, (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, soil creep, etc.) F. Slope stability G. Utility trench design, including seismic design for sewer and water utilities crossing fault lines <p>Once approved by the ESD, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the 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 that, if not corrected, could lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the requirements of the soils report shall be required for subdivisions, prior to approval of the Improvement Plans. It is</p>	LS	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure GEO-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by assuring compliance with Placer County codified regulations to prepare project-level geotechnical reports and incorporation of site-specific recommended geotechnical measures into Project designs to avoid, reduce and minimize effects from potential geologic hazards. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</p> <p>Fault Rupture. New structures and operational improvements will result in relocated land coverage with minimal changes to the existing landscape. The area that could potentially be affected by fault rupture does not increase in size because the Project area and development footprint will not significantly change. Furthermore, Alternative 1A does not increase the surface rupture hazard that current existing within the Project area. The data gathered indicates that the North Base and Mid-Mountain areas are not subject to significant risk of rupture from this fault (Holdrege and Kull 2010a, Holdrege and Kull 2010b). Compliance with the California Building Code standards is adequate to ensure that seismic risks are addressed and potential impacts are reduced to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>The recommendations from the geotechnical engineering reports for the Phase 1, primarily North Base area and the Mid-Mountain Area structures and infrastructure (Holdrege and Kull 2010a,</p>

159

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Instability. Soils most susceptible to liquefaction are saturated, loose, clean, uniformly-graded and fine-grained sand deposits. A potential for seismically-induced rock fall exists within the Project area (Kleinfelder 2007), but is considered low because these areas are not ideal for development and existing and structures and facilities are not proposed in these areas.</p> <p>The potential impact is considered significant until the completion of mitigation measure GEO-1. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-39 through 14-45.)</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-44 through 14-45.)</p>		<p>2010b), are incorporated as mitigation measures of the Project and will be included in the final design as required by Placer County Code Chapter 15 for project permitting. This mitigation measure is detailed as GEO-1.</p> <p>Ground Shaking. As addressed in the EIR/EIS, Unnamed Fault 2 is discontinuous and questionable as to presence and location. Therefore, the hazard from surface rupture on this fault is considered low. The professional opinion stated in Holdrege and Kull geotechnical engineering reports (2010a, 2010b) is that building set back distances from Unnamed Fault 2 are not warranted and no further study is necessary.</p> <p>The majority of the development is located in areas that will experience the least severity of ground shaking during an earthquake because these areas are typically underlain by shallow bedrock (Kleinfelder 2007). The area that could potentially be affected by ground shaking will not change because the Project area and the development footprint will not significantly change. Alternative 1A does not increase the ground shaking hazard that currently exists within the Project area.</p> <p>The effects of the Project related to potential structural damage and injury caused by ground shaking will be minimized through compliance with California Building Code seismic coefficients and the requirements for engineering grading plans in section 15.48.320 of Chapter 15 of the Placer County Code. Compliance with codified regulations and current building codes is mandatory for project permitting. The intentions of adopted codes and regulations are to avoid, reduce and minimize potential seismic hazards and provide for public safety. Implementation of the engineering and design recommendations of the final geotechnical report (Holdrege and Kull 2010a, 2010b) will minimize effects from ground shaking. Recommendations from the final geotechnical investigation required for project permitting will be incorporated into final project designs to address known seismic constraints, reducing the potential impact of ground shaking hazards to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Liquefaction, Lateral Spreading and Slope Instability. Soils most susceptible to liquefaction are saturated, loose, clean, uniformly-graded and fine-grained sand deposits. Lateral spreading is the lateral movement of fractured rock or soil resulting from liquefaction of adjacent materials. Seismically induced slope instability includes debris flows, rock fall and landslides.</p> <p>North Base Area. Because groundwater was encountered during October 2009 subsurface investigations, Holdrege and Kull utilized data obtained from exploratory borings, CPT probes and shear wave velocity measurements to evaluate the liquefaction potential of saturated sand and gravel in the eastern and southern portions of the North Base area. The soil profile is determined to</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

166

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>have a low potential for liquefaction. No surface manifestation (e.g. subsidence or lateral spreading) of underlying potentially liquefiable soils is expected based on the thickness and relative competency of near-surface soils. No recent landslides, debris flows or rock fall hazards were observed and because of the granular and rocky nature of the conditions within and surrounding the North Base area, the potential for slope instability is considered low. Seismically induced rock fall is a potential hazard, similar to most areas in mountainous terrain; however, no rock outcrops are located on the slope above the North Base and the potential is low to negligible.</p> <p><u>South Base Area.</u> Results reported in the preliminary geotechnical report for the Project area (Kleinfelder 2007) and the subsequent Second Revised Soils Hydrologic Scoping and Final Report (Kleinfelder 2010) indicate silty sand, gravelly sand, gravel, cobbles and boulders indicative of a colluvial environment. Shallow groundwater is measured at 1.72 and 3.72 feet bgs at the north end of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way and above the South Base area, respectively. Borings in the parking areas of the South Base did not encounter groundwater to depths of 18 feet bgs in 2007 and 2008. Locations where shallow groundwater and finer grained sandy soils are encountered could be susceptible to liquefactions.</p> <p>Placer County requires the submittal of a site-specific geotechnical engineering report for the South Base area prior to permitting of Phase 2 of the Project to comply with codified regulations to consider the impacts of a project resulting in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil as potentially significant unless mitigation measures are applied. This mitigation measure is detailed as GEO-1.</p> <p>If liquefiable soils or soils susceptible to other types of seismically-induced ground failure are determined to be present in portions of the Project area where project activities will occur, corrective actions will be taken by HMR and its contractors/engineers, including design methods, structural methods, and/or improving in situ foundation methods such as removal and replacement of soils, on-site densification, grouting, or other similar measures, depending on the extent and depth of susceptible soils. These measures reduce pore water pressure during ground shaking by densifying the soil or improving the drainage capacity.</p> <p>No recent landslides, debris flows or rock fall hazards are observed and because of the granular and rocky nature of the conditions within and surrounding the South Base area, the potential for slope instability is considered low. Seismically induced rock fall is a potential hazard, similar to most areas in mountainous terrain; however, no rock outcrops are located on the slope above the South Base and the potential is low to</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

191

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>negligible.</p> <p>Implementation of one or a series of these measures in accordance with the findings of the required final geotechnical report will reduce potential impacts of liquefaction and other types of seismic ground failure (subsidence and lateral spreading) to a level of less than significant.</p> <p><u>Mid-Mountain Area.</u> Based on the results of Holdrege and Kull's subsurface investigations, near-surface soil at the Mid-Mountain area consists of medium dense to very dense silty gravel to silty sand with gravel and cobbles, overlaying surface volcanic rock. This soil profile has a low potential for liquefaction. Because the potential for liquefaction is low, the potential for lateral spreading to occur is also low.</p> <p>No landslides, debris flows or rock fall hazards are observed at the Mid-Mountain area and because of the granular and competent nature of the subsurface conditions of this portion of the Project area, the potential for slope instability is low. The Mid-Mountain area is located on a topographically high ridge, and the rock fall hazard is therefore considered to be negligible.</p> <p><u>General Upper Mountain.</u> A Quaternary landslide is mapped in the volcanic rock to the north of the Project area. The same volcanic rock is mapped within the Project area and may be prone to landsliding (Kleinfelder 2007). The possibility of landslides and seismically induced slope instability in the general Project area is considered moderate because of the steep topography of the Project area and the observed evidence of soil creep. A number of areas of rock outcrops are observed in the Project area and additional rock outcrops could be present but not yet mapped. A potential for seismically induced rock fall exists within the Project area (Kleinfelder 2007), but is considered low because these areas are not ideal for development and new structures and facilities are not proposed in these areas.</p> <p>The Project, however, proposes a replacement of the existing Madden Triple Chair Lift with a Gondola. The Gondola alignment will follow the existing lift line but will require earthwork associated with modification of or replacement of the 14 existing lift towers and footings with Gondola towers and footings that are approximately 80 square feet each. Lift tower and locations may shift slightly to accommodate changes in vertical loads in and across the lift line but are not expected to increase the risk of seismic related ground failure because excavation necessary for replacement towers, approximately 27 cubic yards per tower footing, will be localized and within the previously disturbed lift alignment. Dopplemayr engineering specifications for vertical loads within and across lift lines indicate sufficient flexibility for lift tower spacing to span or otherwise avoid rock outcrops. Load calculations indicate tower spacing can range from approximately 23 feet to just over 450 feet. Engineering specifications indicate a</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

162

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>range of tower height from 18.6 feet to 47 feet, which will allow for adequate ground clearance with no additional grading along the lift alignment. Four trees have been identified for removal at the slope break in proximity to the existing Madden chair lift mid-station.</p> <p>The existing lift terminals will be replaced with a 6,000 square foot base terminal at the North Base and an 18,000 square foot top terminal adjacent to the proposed Mid-Mountain Lodge. No active faults are mapped in the areas of tower or terminal replacement.</p> <p>Placer County requires a final geotechnical report as outlined in Mitigation Measure GEO-1 to determine site-specific recommendations to avoid and minimize unstable soil conditions from seismic related ground failure. The intentions of adopted codes and regulations are to avoid, reduce and minimize potential seismic hazards and provide for public safety. Implementation of the engineering and design recommendations of the final geotechnical report will minimize effects from ground shaking. Recommendations from the final geotechnical investigation required for project permitting will be incorporated into final project designs to address known seismic constraints, reducing the potential impact of ground shaking hazards and slope instability to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Dopplemayr engineering specifications for vertical loads within and across lift lines indicate sufficient flexibility for lift tower spacing to span or otherwise avoid the previously unmapped spring and areas of soil creep and thus avoid areas of potential unstable soil conditions. Load calculations indicate tower spacing can range from approximately 23 feet to just over 450 feet.</p> <p>Mitigation measure GEO-1 minimizes potential impacts within the project area to a level of less than significant by assuring compliance with Placer County codified regulations to prepare project-level geotechnical reports and incorporation of site-specific recommended geotechnical measures into Project designs to avoid, reduce and minimize effects from potential geologic hazards.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-39 through 14-45 Responses to Comments 13a-58 through 13a-60, 19-25, 93-11, 268-13.)</p>
<p>GEO-2. Will Project facilities be located within an area of unstable soil conditions, including soils susceptible to collapse, subsidence, corrosion or expansion?</p> <p>Project-level geotechnical evaluations have been completed for the North Base and Mid-Mountain areas that will be developed during</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure GEO-1. Submit Final Geotechnical Report.</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for GEO-1 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-44 through 14-45.)</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure GEO-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by assuring compliance with Placer County codified regulations to prepare project-level geotechnical reports and incorporation of site-specific recommended geotechnical measures into Project designs ensure project facilities are not located on unstable soil conditions, including soils susceptible to collapse, subsidence,</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

163

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Phase 1 of the Project. Project-level geotechnical evaluations will be completed for the South Base area with Phase 2.</p> <p>No soil constraints are identified within the Project area that would preclude development and redevelopment proposed under Alternative 1A. Conformance to State and local building codes and implementation of the standard Placer County mitigation measures, along with those recommendations identified in site-specific final geotechnical reports reduce impacts of development on potentially unstable soils to a level of less than significant. Placer County considers the impacts of a Project resulting in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of soil as potentially significant unless mitigation measures are applied. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-45 through 14-48.)</p>			<p>corrosion or expansion. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Project-level geotechnical evaluations have been completed for the North Base and Mid-Mountain areas that will be developed during Phase 1 of the Project. Placer County requires the completion of a site-specific geotechnical evaluation for the Gondola lift alignment per Mitigation Measure GEO-1A to determine engineering specification for lift tower replacement in areas of potentially unstable soil conditions as discussed above under Impact GEO-1. Additionally, project-level geotechnical evaluations will be completed for the South Base area with Phase 2.</p> <p>North Base Area. Structures and facilities, including the Gondola base terminal, proposed at the North Base area under Alternative 1A will not be located within areas of unstable soils. Based on low soil risk potential reported in the Geotechnical Engineering Report for Homewood Mountain Resort North Base Lodge (Holdrege and Kull 2010a) the level of impact is less than significant.</p> <p>South Base Area. Structures and facilities proposed at the South Base area under Alternative 1A will not be located within areas of unstable soils. Based on past project investigations, records and operations, existing facilities that will be retained in the South Base area as part of the Alternative 1A are not located in areas of soils susceptible to expansion. Soil map units within the Project area are not considered expansive based on the low shrink-swell potential reported in Table 14-2. The Geologic Hazards and Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation (Kleinfelder 2007) reports a low soil risk potential for the South Base area.</p> <p>The South Base area will be developed during Phase 2 of Alternative 1A. Placer County will require the submittal of a site-specific geotechnical engineering report for the South Base area prior to permitting of Phase 2 of the Project. Should project facilities and structures be located in areas of corrosive soils based on future site-specific soil analysis, the use of corrosive resistant materials and engineering methods to protect buried pipes and infrastructure will reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Mid-Mountain Area. Structures and facilities, including the Gondola top terminal, proposed at the Mid-Mountain area under Alternative 1A will not be located within areas of unstable soils. Based on low soil risk potential reported in the Geotechnical Engineering Report for Homewood Mountain Resort Mid-Mountain Lodge (Holdrege and Kull 2010b) the level of impact is</p>

164

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>less than significant.</p> <p>General Upper Mountain. Based on past project investigations, records and operations, Alternative 1A does not propose new structures and facilities in areas of moderate to high soil risk potential and the level of impact is less than significant. Based on past project investigations, records and operations, existing facilities that will be retained and the Gondola alignment are not located in areas of soils susceptible to expansion. Soil map units within the Project area are not considered expansive based on the low shrink-swell potential reported in Table 14-2 of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Some soil map units within the Project area are considered moderate to highly corrosive to steel and concrete, as detailed in Table 14-2. A site-specific soil analysis was performed for the Quad chair lift replacement in 2007. Should project facilities and structures be located in areas of corrosive soils based on future site-specific soil analysis, the use of corrosive resistant materials and engineering methods to protect buried pipes and infrastructure will reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>In summary, no soil constraints are identified within the Project area that would preclude development and redevelopment proposed under Alternative 1A. Conformance to State and local building codes and implementation of the standard Placer County mitigation measures, along with those recommendations identified in site-specific final geotechnical reports reduce impacts of development on potentially unstable soils to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Mitigation measure GEO-1 minimizes potential impacts within the project area to a level of less than significant by assuring compliance with Placer County codified regulations to prepare project-level geotechnical reports and incorporation of site-specific recommended geotechnical measures into Project designs to avoid, reduce and minimize disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of soils.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-45 through 14-48; see also Responses to Comments 19-25.)</p>
<p>GEO-3. Will the Project result in compaction or covering of the soil beyond the limits allowed in the land capability system, including coverage within sensitive Class 1a and 1b lands?</p> <p>The Project reduces total land coverage within the Project area. Because land coverage in LCDs 1a and 2 exceed allowable base land coverage for those LCDs, Alternative 1A are subject to the excess coverage mitigation</p>	<p>GEO-3: Comply with Excess Land Coverage Mitigation Program.</p> <p>Based on allowable base land coverage determinations in LCDs 1a and 2, the Proposed Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 5 and 6 shall be subject to the excess coverage mitigation program described in Code Section 20.5. The excess land coverage within the Project area shall be mitigated to comply with Code Section 20.5 through: 1) reduction of</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure GEO-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to comply with TRPA's Excess Coverage Mitigation 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 potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: The Project area</p>

165

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>program described in TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 20.5, which is required to reduce significant land coverage impacts from excess existing land coverage to a level of less than significant. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-48 through 13-70.)</p>	<p>coverage onsite; 2) reduction of coverage offsite; 3) payment of excess coverage mitigation fee; 4) parcel consolidation or parcel line adjustment; or 5) combination of these options.</p> <p>Table 14-7 presents the excess land coverage mitigation fee and reductions in existing land coverage options for each of the alternatives, which are the mitigation options most applicable to the Project area. Land coverage must be permanently retired to supplement the payment of a mitigation fee. (See Table 14-7 of the EIR/EIS.)</p> <p>The impact from excess land coverage under the Proposed Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 5 and 6 can be reduced to a less than significant level through completion of the excess land coverage mitigation program as outlined in TRPA Code section 20.5. The mitigation options are listed according to alternative.</p> <p>Alternative 1A:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Payment of Excess Coverage Mitigation Fee = \$1,482,171; or 2) Permanent retirement of 174,373 square feet of onsite land coverage (offset of \$8.50/square foot assumed) in lieu of the Excess Coverage Mitigation Fee; or 3) Permanent retirement of 176,134 square feet of onsite land coverage (offset of \$8.50/square foot assumed) as required for TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 22 for building height findings and for CEP Governing Board Resolution requirements (Note that Chapter 22 requires a 10 percent reduction of verified existing land coverage, while the CEP Resolution requires a "substantial" reduction in existing land coverage but does not quantify square footage for permanent retirement. The 176,134 square feet stated above is based on 10 percent permanent retirement of verified existing land coverage.); or 4) Combination of Options 1 and 2 for permanent retirement of on or offsite land coverage (offset of \$8.50/square foot assumed) and payment of Excess Coverage Mitigation Fee that is appropriate for the amount of excess 		<p>was originally developed prior to the adoption of the TRPA Regional Plan. The Project area is approximately 1,253 acres with existing development concentrated in the North and South Base area. Table 14-4 in the Environmental Settings section above presents existing land coverage characteristics according to LCDs and the resultant totals. Appendix U contains the TRPA Land Coverage Verification letters on which the calculation of existing land coverage are based and the land capability map on which allowable base land coverage determinations are made.</p> <p>Under Alternative 1A, the Project Applicant commits to removing and restoring no less than 500,000 square feet of existing land coverage within the Project area and permanently retiring at least 10 percent of the total existing land coverage to meet the TRPA CEP resolution, which requires a significant reduction in land coverage within the Project area, and proposed height ordinance amendments, which require at least 10 percent reduction in total existing land coverage. However, resultant land coverage will still exceed TRPA allowable base land coverage limits.</p> <p>Excess land coverage is a significant impact that <i>must</i> be mitigated in accordance with TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 20.5. Mitigation measure GEO-3 presents the mitigation options outlined by TRPA Code of Ordinance Section 20.5 to reduce impacts from excess land coverage to a level of less than significant. Impacts from excess land coverage associated with the Proposed will be reduced to a less than significant level through completion of mitigation options outlined above in mitigation measure GEO-3.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-48 through 13-70; see also Master Responses 17; Responses to Comments 3-b through 3-d, 13a-27 through 13a-34, 13a-81, 14a-3 through 14a-13, 14a-66 and 19-33.)</p>

166

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>land coverage that remains (assuming an offset of \$8.50/square foot).</p> <p>According to TRPA Code Section 20.5.A, the payment of the Excess Coverage Mitigation Fee mitigates excess land coverage for the Project area to a level of less than significant. Identification and permanent retirement of onsite land coverage (174,373 square feet) in lieu of payment of the remaining Excess Coverage Mitigation Fee (\$1,482,171) is considered more beneficial option for reducing impacts from excess land coverage in the Project area watersheds. A combination of the two mitigation options, described above under option four, is considered more beneficial than the payment of the excess coverage mitigation fee only. Option 3, however, would be required for Alternative 1A because although options one, two and four would legally mitigate excess land coverage on the project area to a level of less than significant, these mitigation options would not meet the proposed TRPA Chapter 22.4.G amendment requirements for additional height nor the CEP Governing Board Resolution for substantial land coverage reductions, assumed to be at least a 10 percent reduction in existing land coverage. Identification and permanent retirement of 176,134 square feet of onsite or offsite land coverage in lieu of payment of the remaining Excess Coverage Mitigation Fee (\$1,482,171) is considered the most beneficial option (Option number 3 above) for reducing impacts from excess land coverage. HMR proposes to permanently retire land coverage as part of their Master Plan as needed for additional height findings and to mitigate past development.</p> <p>Notable benefits of Alternative 1A that are over and above standard TRPA mitigation requirements reflect those described for Alternative 1. Alternative 1A will utilize pervious pavers and pervious pavement to infiltrate approximately 850 cubic feet of runoff and will install bioretention areas for stormwater treatment (approximately 121,000 square feet) across the North Base, South Base and Mid-mountain areas. Cisterns will capture a portion of roof runoff from buildings, up to 7,800 cubic feet per runoff event. These LID measures are not considered in the TRPA calculations for land coverage reductions but will provide added benefits to the Project through reductions in runoff from impervious</p>		

167

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>surfaces. Table 15-8 in Chapter 15, Hydrology, Water Rights, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater, details the impact reductions specified above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-64 through 13-70.)</p>		
<p>GEO-4. Will construction of the Project result in changes to native geologic substructures or cause erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography from excavation, grading or filling?</p> <p>Construction Related Erosion, Loss of Topsoil and Unstable Soil Conditions. Construction of the Proposed Project Alternative 1A will involve grading, excavation and fill activities, trenching, removal of vegetative cover, and other earthwork activities. These activities could cause temporary increases in runoff, erosion and sedimentation from the Project area if precautions and measures are not taken to contain runoff and erosion on site and to stabilize disturbed soils.</p> <p>Changes in Topography and Geologic Substructures. The Project area has been previously altered by grading and fill activities in the North Base, South Base and Mid-Mountain areas and through the construction of roadways, utilities, ski trails and lifts on the upper mountain. No unique geologic or physical features are identified within the Project area that could be destroyed, covered or modified. Grading activities necessary for the construction of Alternative 1A will not result in significant changes in the topography of the Project area that will be inconsistent with the surrounding conditions.</p> <p>To construct the Project, changes in ground surface relief could occur. As identified on preliminary grading plans Sheets C10, 11, 12 and 13, Alternative 1A will create cut and fill slopes of up to approximately 20.5 feet maximum, as associated with the water tanks at the Mid-Mountain, and retaining walls 29 to 32 feet, as associated with the North Base underground parking structure, and 18 to 21 feet, as associated with the South Base underground parking structure. Aboveground retaining walls range from 15 feet to one foot in</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4a. Design Construction-related BMPs.</p> <p>According to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbooks and TRPA's Handbook of BMPs Construction-related Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD)).</p> <p>Construction (temporary) BMPs for the Project could include, but are not limited to: Fiber Rolls (SE-5), Hydroseeding (EC-4), Stabilized Construction Entrance (LDM Plate C-4), Storm Drain Inlet Protection (SE-10), Silt Fence (SE-1), revegetation techniques, dust control measures, and concrete washout areas.</p> <p>Storm drainage from on- and off-site impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, infiltration basins, water quality basins, filters, etc. for entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the ESD. BMPs shall be designed at a minimum in accordance with the Placer County Guidance Document for Volume and Flow-Based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality Protection. Post-development (permanent) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: above and below ground onsite infiltration basin(s), stormwater treatment vaults, and sand/oil interceptors.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure GEO-4a, GEO-4b, GEO-4c, GEO-4d, GEO-4e, GEO-4f, and GEO-4g, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by assure compliance with Placer County codified regulations pertaining to potential grading and construction-related impacts as well as assuring that construction impacts to groundwater will be reduced to a of less than significant level. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</p> <p>Construction Related Erosion, Loss of Topsoil and Unstable Soil Conditions. The Geologic Hazards and Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation (Kleinfelder 2007) found no severe soil constraints that would preclude grading and construction activities in the Project area. The final geotechnical engineering reports for the Mid-Mountain area (Holdrege and Kull 2010b) and the North Base area (Holdrege and Kull 2010a) were completed in conformance to section 15.48.390 of Chapter 15 of Placer County Code and TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 61. The reports detail the geotechnical engineering recommendations to be incorporated into final project designs to assure stable soil conditions during and following construction in these portions of the Project area. Although preliminary geotechnical investigations found no severe soil constraints that preclude grading and construction activities, a similar report will be completed for the South Base area during Phase 2 of the Project. The requirements of this report are detailed in the impact analysis for GEO-1.</p> <p>The Project will implement a number of compliance measures to contain runoff and erosion onsite, minimize wind erosion, stabilize disturbed areas, and reduce potential impacts from erosion, loss of topsoil, or unstable soil conditions to a level of less than significant. These compliance measures and associated plans are required by TRPA or Placer County for project-level approval and permitting and include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TRPA Erosion and Sediment Control and BMP Plan (including Winterization Plans per TRPA Code Chapters 25, 64 and 81) • Properly Locate and Protect Stockpile Areas (TRPA

168

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>height.</p> <p>Earthwork. The Project will result in disturbance of close to 40 acres of the 1253-acre Project area. Grading activities are associated with the installation of buildings, parking areas, retaining walls, roadway improvements and underground utilities, construction of which could significantly disrupt soils through creation of unstable soil conditions, soil disruptions, displacements and compaction.</p> <p>Placer County considers impacts from grading and earthwork potentially significant unless standard mitigation measures are applied to assure compliance with codified regulations to avoid and minimize construction-related impacts to soils.</p> <p>TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 64, Section 64.7.B. TRPA Code of Ordinances prohibits excavations in excess of five feet in depth or where there exists a reasonable possibility of interference or interception of a water table except under certain defined and permitted conditions. Alternative 1A will require excavations that exceed five feet and result in interception of groundwater movement during construction at the North and South Base area.</p> <p>Compliance with applicable sections of Article 15.48 of Chapter 15 and Article 12.32 of Chapter 12 of the Placer County Code (Placer County 2006), Placer County General Construction Specifications (Placer County 1994), goals and policies of the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin (Tahoe Regional Planning Agency 2004b), TRPA Code of Ordinances (Tahoe Regional Planning Agency 2004a), the Handbook of Best Management Practices and the Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region (TRPA 1988) and Lahontan's waste discharge requirements and construction permits serves to avoid, reduce and minimize potential impacts associated with runoff, erosion, sedimentation and unstable soils to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>The impact, however, remains significant because 1) the excavations exceeding five feet will intercept seasonal high groundwater during</p>	<p>The Project 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. Contractual evidence of a monthly parking lot sweeping and vacuuming, and catch basin cleaning program shall be provided to the ESD upon request. Failure to do so will be grounds for discretionary permit revocation. 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 County maintenance.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4b. Conform to Provisions of Placer County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance</p> <p>All proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the DRC. All cut/fill slopes shall be at a minimum of 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope but fill slopes shall not exceed 1.5:1 (horizontal:vertical) and the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) concurs with said recommendation.</p> <p>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 assure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas shall have proper erosion control measures</p>		<p>Code Chapter 64, Placer County standard mitigation measure)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscaping/Revegetation Plan (per TRPA Code Chapters 20 and 77); • Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP – required for NPDES General Construction Permit for projects with disturbance areas greater than one acre); • SEZ Protection and Restoration Plan; and • Conformance to TRPA Ordinances and Placer County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance. <p>Construction activities (e.g., ground disturbance) associated with Alternatives 1A will require installation of site-specific temporary BMPs and maintenance and monitoring to ensure that disturbed soils are protected during precipitation events and for over wintering. Mitigation measure GEO-4a outlines the requirements for Placer County BMPs to control erosion and contain sediment on-site.</p> <p>Placer County considers impacts from grading and earthwork potentially significant unless standard mitigation measures are applied to assure compliance with codified regulations to avoid and minimize construction-related impacts to soils. Improvement Plan submittal is required after project permitting, and at such time final grading plans are reviewed and approved as part of the Improvement Plans as detailed in mitigation measure GEO-4b.</p> <p>Placer County requires that stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas be identified on the Improvement Plans and located as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area. If blasting is required for the installation of site improvements, the developer must comply with applicable County Ordinances that relate to blasting and use only State licensed contractors to conduct these operations. Mitigation measures GEO-4c and GEO-4d detail stockpiling and blasting requirements for compliance with Placer codified regulations.</p> <p>Ground disturbance within the Project area will exceed one acre and is subject to the construction stormwater quality permit requirements of the NPDES program. The Project Applicant must obtain this permit from Lahontan and provide evidence of a state-issued WDID number or filing of a Notice of Intent (NOI) and fees prior to start of construction, as outlined in mitigation measure GEO-4e. A SWPPP is required under Board Order No. R6T-2011-0019 (General Permit No. CAG616002) for discharges of stormwater runoff associated with construction activity involving land disturbance in the Lake Tahoe hydrologic unit.</p> <p>The proposed landscaping plan and revegetation strategies are presented in the project description provided in Chapter 3 of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Changes in Topography and Geologic Substructures. The</p>

169

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>construction of proposed underground parking structures and requires mitigation to assure that intercepted groundwater does not leave the Project area as surface flow and 2) Placer County considers impacts from grading and earthwork potentially significant unless standard mitigation measures are applied, ensuring compliance with codified regulations to avoid and minimize construction-related impacts to soils. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-71 through 13-83.)</p>	<p>applied for the duration of the construction activity as specified in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the ESD.</p> <p>The applicant shall submit to the 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 prior to Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon 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.</p> <p>If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4c. Identify Stockpiling and/or Vehicle Staging Areas on Improvement Plans</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4d. Comply with Placer County Blasting Requirements</p> <p>If blasting is required for the installation of site improvements, the Project Applicant shall comply with applicable County Ordinances that relate to blasting and use only State licensed contractors to conduct these operations.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4e. Obtain NPDES Permit</p>		<p>Project area has been previously altered by grading and fill activities in the North Base, South Base and Mid-Mountain areas and through the construction of roadways, utilities, ski trails and lifts on the upper mountain. No unique geologic or physical features are identified within the Project area that could be destroyed, covered or modified.</p> <p>Grading activities necessary for the construction of Alternative 1A will not result in significant changes in the topography of the Project area that will be inconsistent with the surrounding conditions. These base areas are located at the termini of existing ski trails constructed on steep toeslopes. Under t Alternative 1A, the buildings at the North Base will be constructed into the toeslope and are designed to minimize and camouflage changes in topographic grades. Alternative 1A will construct a new lodge and two water tanks at the Mid-Mountain area. The lodge and water tanks will be constructed into the hillside and will create a change in topography as grades are altered to construct building pads. The change in topographic grade will be contained behind the lodge structure and water tanks and will not result in significant visible changes in topography that appear inconsistent with the surrounding conditions. Up to 14 Gondola lift towers and footings will be constructed from the Gondola base terminal at the North Base with spacing ranging from 23.5 feet to 450 feet in a westerly direction to the Gondola top terminal adjacent to the Mid-Mountain Lodge over a horizontal length of approximately 3,360 feet and a vertical rise of 1,040 feet. The Gondola will utilize the existing Madden Chair lift alignment, keep with the existing terrain and will result little impact to existing topography beyond excavations necessary for relocation of lift towers that may shift slightly to accommodate changes in vertical loads in and across the lift line.</p> <p>To construct the other Project components, changes in ground surface relief could occur. As identified on preliminary grading plans Sheets C10, 11, 12 and 13, Alternative 1A will create cut and fill slopes of up to approximately 20.5 feet maximum, as associated with the water tanks at the Mid-Mountain, and retaining walls 29 to 32 feet, as associated with the North Base underground parking structure, and 18 to 21 feet, as associated with the South Base underground parking structure. Aboveground retaining walls range from 15 feet to one foot in height. The Project's impacts will be reduced to a level of less than significant through compliance with Placer County codified regulations and mitigation measures GEO-4b and GEO-4f for mitigation of impacts associated with alteration of topography and relief features.</p> <p>Subsurface explorations (Kleinfelder 2007, Holdrege and Kull 2010a, Holdrege and Kull 2010b) identified no geologic substructures that would be destabilized by earthwork activities. Potential impacts from changes in topography and geologic substructures are less than significant.</p>

170

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>The Project's ground disturbance exceeds one-acre and is subject to the construction stormwater quality permit requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. The Project Applicant shall obtain such permit from Lahontan and shall provide to the Engineering and Surveying Department evidence of a state-issued WDID number or filing of a NOI and fees prior to start of construction.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4f. Satisfy the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual. (LDM)</p> <p>The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the ESD for review and approval. 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 within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees. (NOTE: Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction cost 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 process and/or DRC review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.</p> <p>Conceptual landscape plans submitted prior to project approval may require modification during the Improvement Plan process to resolve issues of drainage and traffic safety. Any building permits associated with this phased project shall not be</p>		<p>Earthwork. The estimates for grading, cut, and fill volumes for the North Base, South Base and Mid-Mountain Areas are totaled in Table 14-8 of the EIR/EIS for Alternative 1A. The portions of the Project area disturbed by trenching activities will be revegetated as outlined in Chapter 3.</p> <p>Under Alternative 1A, imported fill material will not be required because fill areas in the Project area will use material that is generated from cut areas. HMR has identified additional areas suitable for the receipt of excess cut materials, including the project locations and approximate fill volume needed to remove, redesign and realign on-mountain access roads, increase vegetation cover on ski trails and improve water quality and skiing conditions within the Project area. These areas are detailed in Chapter 3.</p> <p>Placer County requires compliance with standard mitigation measures for potential impacts from earthwork. Implementation of mitigation measures GEO-4b, GEO-4f and GEO-1 assure compliance with Placer County codified regulations to reduce potential impacts from unstable soil conditions, soil disruptions, displacements and compaction.</p> <p>TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 64, Section 64.7.B. Alternative 1A will require excavations that exceed five feet and result in interception of groundwater movement during construction at the North and South Base area. Excavations at the Mid-Mountain area are not expected to intercept groundwater movement (Holdrege and Kull 2010b). Based on building cross sections for the Proposed Project (Alternative 1/1A) prepared by Nichols for the North Base, South Base and Mid-Mountain areas (see sheets C19, C20 and C21 of the Civil Plan Set), excavations will be in excess of five feet in some areas to accommodate appropriate depths for underground parking structures. Soil Hydrologic exhibits in Appendix D show the existing grade, finished floor elevations and the groundwater cross-sectional profiles. The North and South Base areas have been designed to avoid groundwater interception from hotel and skier services structures and minimize groundwater interception in the underground parking structure areas. The EIR/EIS includes information regarding the findings for TRPA Code Section 64.7.</p> <p>TRPA Code of Ordinances prohibits excavations in excess of five feet in depth or where there exists a reasonable possibility of interference or interception of a water table except under certain defined and permitted conditions. Code Section 64.7.A(2)(a-j) outlines the exceptions to the prohibition of groundwater interception or interference. Under Code Section 64.7.A(2)(i) TRPA may make exceptions if excavations are "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 reductions, and</p>

171

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>issued until the Improvement Plans for that project phase are approved by the ESD.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4g. Final Construction Dewatering Plan</p> <p>The redevelopment in the Project area shall involve excavation in the North and South Base areas. The Second Revised Soils Hydrologic Scoping and Final Report (Kleinfelder 2010) suggests that groundwater will be intercepted during construction of underground parking facilities. Because groundwater will be intercepted, which is the process of diverting and/or capturing the groundwater flows, dewatering, which is the removal and disposition of the water itself, shall be implemented onsite.</p> <p>The final dewatering plan shall be further developed by the construction contractor based on the final site design of the selected alternative. The construction contractor shall demonstrate that they have a reliable plan for dewatering as well as contingency in case that plan does not function as expected. The contractor shall have demonstrable experience in dewatering operations and evidence of such experience shall be provided to TRPA and the County with the dewatering plan.</p> <p>There are a number of methods for dewatering intercepted groundwater, from drilling wells upslope to installing sheet piling to constructing temporary or permanent concrete walls with dewatering galleries installed. These decisions shall be made in collaboration with the earthwork contractor chosen to construct the Project and the earthwork contractor shall be responsible for addressing the issue effectively. Interception methods are fairly well understood. Interception strategies shall be explored and implemented in parallel with the actual dewatering strategies. Typical approaches to dewatering intercepted groundwater flows during construction shall include, but shall not be limited to the following: irrigation systems, holding tanks, low mountain feed, snowmaking line feed, distribution (sprinkler system), ground infiltration system, full treatment and surface water discharge (this option would require a temporary discharge permit from Lahontan and may require treatments for the removal of sediment, such as settling or baker tanks), groundwater recharge wells, and/or sewer</p>		<p>areawide drainage systems; and measures are included in the project to prevent groundwater from leaving the Project area as surface flow and that groundwater, if any is interfered with, is rerouted into groundwater flow to avoid adverse impacts to hydrologic conditions, SEZ vegetation, and mature trees".</p> <p>Because sub-section 22.4.D pertains to Project areas within both a TRPA adopted redevelopment plan and a TRPA adopted community plan, this exemption would not directly apply to the Project area (i.e., HMR Ski Area Master Plan Area). TRPA Code Section 64.7.A(2)(i) is proposed for amendment under the Alternative 1A to allow projects within Ski Area Master Plans to provide for below grade parking if adverse impacts to hydrologic conditions, SEZ vegetation and mature trees are avoided.</p> <p>Implementation of Placer County standard mitigation measures GEO-4a, GEO-4b, GEO-4c, GEO-4d, GEO-4e and GEO-4f assure compliance with Placer County codified regulations pertaining to potential grading and construction-related impacts within the Project area. Compliance with codified regulations and Placer County permitting conditions reduce potential impacts of construction-related erosion, loss of topsoil and unstable soil conditions to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Implementation of GEO-4g assures that construction impacts to groundwater will be reduced to a level of less than significant based on criteria for Impact GEO-4 pertaining to construction-related groundwater interception. Implementation of the groundwater protection measures approved for the Final Construction Dewatering Plan will assure that the Project complies with TRPA and State of California permit requirements to contain intercepted groundwater on-site and maintain groundwater quality throughout the construction period...</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-71 through 13-83; Master Response 18; Responses to Comments 7-3, 14a-13, 14a-74, and 93-10, 155-3 and 27-j.)</p>

172

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>inflows (this option is not typically viable for ongoing dewatering because the Truckee Tahoe Sanitary District typically denies permits for dewatering inflow into their sewer system due to the stress additional inflow puts on their treatment facilities, but shall be considered for an emergency situation). Dewatering discharges shall be treated to a level such that they do not contain pollutants, including but not limited to sediment, before discharging to surface waters, should discharge to surface water be necessary.</p> <p>A preliminary plan shall also be submitted to Lahontan, approved and in place prior to excavation and once excavation is underway, the primary plan shall be implemented with alternative plans in queue and implementable within a short window if necessary.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 13-80 through 13-83.)</p>		
<p>GEO-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to geologic resources?</p> <p>Geologic and Seismic Hazards. Geologic impacts related to the HMR Ski Area Master Plan Project and future projects in the region will involve hazards and potential impacts related to soils conditions, erosion and seismic activity. The entire region along the west shore of Lake Tahoe is susceptible to impacts from seismic activity; however, soils and geologic influences are typically site-specific and confined to discrete spatial locations. Construction and operation of the Project will not alter the potential for seismic activity or affect the level of intensity at which a seismic event on a nearby project site is experienced. Geologic impacts require project-level planning and site-specific design to avoid and minimize potential hazards and do not combine to create cumulative impact conditions beyond Project area boundaries. The exception to this general condition would occur in areas where a large geologic feature such as a fault zone or active landslide area might affect the geology of an off-site location up or down gradient. These circumstances are not present within the Project area. Project-specific geotechnical evaluations are required as part of the project design, approval and permitting process. As such, project facilities in the Lake Tahoe Basin and throughout the region are required to utilize standard engineering practices and to comply</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

173

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>with seismic design standards and adopted building codes to reduce the potential for cumulative geologic and seismic impacts during construction and operations to a less than significant level. The HMR Ski Area Master Plan Project is no exception and will not make a considerable contribution towards cumulatively significant effects to geologic hazards.</p> <p>TRPA Land Coverage. Excess land coverage within a particular LCD, parcel or Project area is a significant impact. The Project area is presently overcovered. The Project will reduce total existing land coverage within the Project area but will still result in excess land coverage in LCDs 1a and 2. Compliance with TRPA's excess coverage mitigation program defined in Code Section 20.5 will reduce the Project's contribution to excess land coverage to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Other reasonably foreseeable projects will have individually varied effects on land coverage, increasing, maintaining or reducing impervious surfaces. Projects that propose land coverage in excess of TRPA allowable base land coverage will be required to incorporate mitigation measures and comply with TRPA's excess coverage mitigation program to limit incremental contributions and conform to TRPA land coverage restrictions. With project-level mitigations, the Project when considered in context of other reasonably foreseeable projects will not make significant contributions towards cumulative effects from land coverage.</p> <p>Unstable Soil Conditions. Considerable cumulative impacts could result from unstable slopes and resultant erosion if multiple projects are constructed concurrently. The CWE analysis considered future development within the Project area watersheds combined with potential future development outside of the Project area and determined that the overall watersheds are below their Total Watershed TOCs, with the exception of Intervening Zone 7000 for reasons discussed above. The scenario of complete buildout within the watersheds as based on Bailey land coverage coefficients determined that even under this buildout scenario annualized total sediment would not exceed Total Watershed TOCs. The HMR CWE analysis concludes that annualized</p>			

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

1761

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>total sediment will be reduced through implementation of the Alternative 1A.</p> <p>Implementation of compliance and standard mitigation measures for erosion control during construction activities (i.e. Placer County and TRPA grading plans, TRPA Erosion Control Plan, geotechnical engineering recommendations, NPDES permit conditions and SWPPP) and during operations (i.e. Permanent BMP Plan, Landscaping and Revegetation Plan, Inspection, Operations and Maintenance Plan, Compliance Monitoring for Waste Discharge Requirements) will minimize the potential project-level effects to a level of less than significant. Permitting for other reasonable and foreseeable projects will require similar plans and BMP performance standards. The possibility for BMP failure exists on any Project area, especially when extreme runoff conditions exceed BMP design capacities. The likelihood of the effects of BMP failures in one Project area combining with those of other projects is low because BMP failures are typically localized. Therefore, the Project will not make significant contributions towards cumulative effects from erosion or unstable slopes. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 14-83 through 14-85.)</p>			
<p>HYDROLOGY, WATER RIGHTS, SURFACE WATER QUALITY AND GROUNDWATER</p>			
<p>HYDRO-1: Will the construction or long-term operations of the Project violate existing waste discharge permit provisions or result in discharges into surface waters (streams, SEZs or Lake Tahoe) so that beneficial uses and water quality standards are not maintained?</p> <p>Accelerated erosion potential and surface water quality impacts are present during construction phasing and occur when protective vegetative cover is removed and soils are disturbed. Site disturbance during construction could pose temporary impacts to surface water quality and beneficial uses of Project area receiving waters through increased pollutant concentrations in stormwater runoff. Runoff from disturbed and modified impervious surfaces, ski trails, roads and snow storage areas could occur as permanent long-term impacts from ski area operations. Indirect impacts from atmospheric</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a. Design Water Quality Protection BMPs According to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbooks and TRPA's Handbook of BMPs.</p> <p>Water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD)).</p> <p>Storm drainage from on- and off-site impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, infiltration basins, water quality basins, filters, etc. for entrapment of</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a, 1b and 1c and GEO-4a, 4b, 4c and 4e, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by assuring respectively, assure that permanent BMPs are designed to proven effectiveness levels. Compliance with Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1d, HYDRO-1e, and HYDRO-1f, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will ensure improvements to surface water quality and that stormwater treatment systems and permanent BMPs are maintained to the highest levels of effectiveness. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: A number of compliance measures, which are required by codified regulations or law, and standard engineering features and permanent BMPs are incorporated into the Project to avoid, reduce and minimize potential impacts to surface water quality and beneficial uses.</p>

175

176

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>deposition of particulates could occur. If not addressed by the Project, potentially significant impacts to surface water quality could occur under Alternative 1A construction runoff, post-construction runoff, eroding slopes, atmospheric deposition, snowmelt, accidental spills, or cumulative watershed effects within the Project area. This is a potentially significant impact. (PS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-48 through 15-74.)</p>	<p>sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the ESD. BMPs shall be designed at a minimum in accordance with the Placer County Guidance Document for Volume and Flow-Based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality Protection. Post-development (permanent) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: underground water quality treatment vaults, infiltration galleries, sediment basins, bioretention areas and revegetation of disturbed areas. No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.</p> <p>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 Project 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. Contractual evidence of a monthly parking lot sweeping and vacuuming, and catch basin cleaning program shall be provided to the ESD upon request. Failure to do so will be grounds for discretionary permit revocation. 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 County maintenance.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1b. Storm Drain Stenciling</p> <p>All storm drain inlets and catch basins within the Project area shall be permanently marked/embossed with prohibitive language such as "No Dumping! Flows to Creek" or other language as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department and/or graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping. Message details, placement, and locations shall be included on the</p>		<p>Construction Impacts on Water Quality. Construction activities associated with Alternative 1A will involve land disturbance and earthwork, including excavation and backfill, stockpiling of soils, trenching and removal of vegetative cover. These activities could cause temporary increases in runoff, erosion and sedimentation from the Project area if precautions and measures are not taken to contain runoff and erosion on site and to stabilize disturbed soils. The degree of disturbance is related to the amount of land coverage, which is detailed in Chapter 14, Geology, Soils and Seismicity, under Impact GEO-3 of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Alternative 1A will implement a number of compliance measures to control erosion, contain runoff and erosion on-site during construction activities and stabilize disturbed areas following construction activities to reduce potential impacts from erosion, loss of topsoil, or unstable soil conditions to a level of less than significant. Civil Sheets C15 through C18 detail the BMP Plans for the developed portions of the Project area.</p> <p>TRPA and Placer County codified regulations and Lahontan construction permit conditions require these compliance measures and plans for project-level permitting and approval and include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HMR Erosion and Sediment Control and BMP Plan (including Winterization Plans per TRPA Code Chapters 25, 64 and 81; Placer County Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance); • Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP – required for NPDES Construction Permit); • Properly Locate and Protect Stockpile Areas (TRPA Code Chapter 64 and Placer County standard mitigation measure); • Properly Locate and Manage Snow Storage Areas (TRPA Code Chapter 81, Lahontan WDRs); • Landscaping/Revegetation Plan (per TRPA Code Chapters 20 and 77 and Placer County standard mitigation measure); and • Conformance to TRPA and Placer County grading ordinances. <p>Alternative 1A will implement effective, reasonable and appropriate measures to protect water quality and beneficial uses of Project area receiving waters and will comply with TRPA, Lahontan and Placer County codified regulations and construction permit conditions. The EIR/EIS analyses in detail the effective, reasonable and appropriate measures of Alternative 1A for the protection water quality and beneficial uses of the Project area receiving waters.</p> <p>Based on the evaluation criteria for impact HYDRO-1, the potential short-term, temporary impacts to surface water quality and beneficial uses during construction activities are reduced to</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Improvement Plans. ESD-approved signs and prohibitive language and/or graphical icons, which prohibit illegal dumping, shall be posted at public access points along channels and creeks within the project area. The Homeowners' and/or Property Owner's association is responsible for maintaining the legibility of stamped messages and signs.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1c. Stormwater Routing for Refuse Management</p> <p>All stormwater runoff shall be diverted around trash storage areas to minimize contact with pollutants. Trash container areas shall be screened or walled to prevent off-site transport of trash by the forces of water or wind. Trash containers shall not be allowed to leak and must remain covered when not in use.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1d. Inspection, Operations, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan for Stormwater Treatment Systems and Permanent BMPs</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall prepare and implement an Inspection, Operations, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan for Stormwater Treatment Systems and Permanent BMPs. This plan shall comply with TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 25 and Chapter 81 and Lahontan's updated WDRs. TRPA, Lahontan, and Placer County shall review the plan prior to issuance of final Project approval. Post-project monitoring shall include post-project BMP effectiveness monitoring and stormwater monitoring as detailed below.</p> <p><u>Post-Project BMP Effectiveness Monitoring.</u> Revegetation/Landscaping and slope stabilizing measures shall be visually monitored annually for the first five years following construction to assess adequacy and effectiveness of BMPs. Additional BMPs shall be prescribed by the TRPA if existing treatments fail to protect the site from accelerated erosion. A qualified consultant or trained HMR staff (Note: completion of the TRPA contractor certification training is recommended) shall monitor restoration progress.</p> <p>Visual monitoring of the condition and effectiveness of BMPs shall occur before and after storm events, and if necessary, corrective</p>		<p>less than significant under TRPA codified regulations and less than significant after mitigation for Placer County CEQA analysis. Placer County standard mitigation measures, detailed as HYDRO-1a GEO-4a, GEO-4b, GEO-4c and GEO-4e herein, assure compliance with Placer County codified regulations. The mitigation measures serve to protect surface water quality and beneficial uses by requiring temporary BMPs be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbooks and Improvement Plan approval to conform to the Placer County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance.</p> <p><u>Long-Term Operational Impacts and Compliance with Board Order No. 6-95-86A2.</u> Runoff from impervious surfaces and disturbed slopes can carry a variety of pollutants, such as metals, oils and grease and sediment and chemical residues, from Project area roadways, parking lots, rooftops, and other surfaces and deposit them in adjacent waterways. Pollutant concentrations vary depending on storm intensity, land use, elapsed time between storms, and the volume of runoff generated in a given area that reaches a receiving water. Upon approval of a preferred project alternative, the Project Applicant will be required to submit a Form 200 for Application/Report of Waste Discharge for new facilities and changes in design and operations from the existing WDRs. Lahontan will then process the application for updated WDRs for the Project area. Ski area operations cannot violate WDR provisions or result in discharges into surface waters (streams, SEZs or Lake Tahoe) so that beneficial uses and WQOs are not maintained. Additionally, the Project will have to meet the anti-degradation findings under State Board Resolution 68-16.</p> <p>The Project implements stormwater treatment systems, LID strategies (pervious pavement and pavers, cisterns, heated walk ways, bioretention areas for stormwater treatment and slope revegetation to improve infiltration of runoff), improved snow storage and fuel storage, and revegetation and landscaping to protect beneficial uses and preserve and improve surface water quality.</p> <p>Winter Roadway and Snowmelt Management. Snowmelt from snow disposal areas can represent not only a significant source of nutrients but also harmful hydrocarbons, metals, and biological oxygen demand. The current TRPA Code of Ordinances references the Handbook of Best Management Practices, which is Volume II of the 208 Plan and provides snow storage guidelines, including: adequate sizing of the area according to estimated snow amounts, avoidance of SEZ areas, and placement of storage areas up-gradient of stormwater treatment and BMP facilities. The TRPA CEP has a goal of improved snow storage. Alternative 1A improves upon existing snow storage and management through the location of storage areas a greater distance from SEZ areas and in areas that will drain to</p>

177

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>actions shall be taken. The contractor shall be required to maintain the effectiveness of the BMPs until the disturbed areas are stabilized and erosion is no longer a substantial threat. Restoration of disturbed areas shall be in accordance with the Restoration/Landscaping Plan.</p> <p><u>Post-Project Stormwater Monitoring.</u> Post-project stormwater monitoring shall be performed annually for a minimum of five years following construction or for the period required in the Lahontan permit for comparison with pre-project monitoring results and for determination of compliance with State and TRPA discharge standards. Fine sediment shall be monitored as specified by TRPA and future Lake Tahoe TMDL research directives.</p> <p>Monitoring results shall address the following components:</p> <p>Compliance of project area runoff with State and TRPA discharge standards;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stormwater treatment system effectiveness; • Permanent BMP effectiveness; • Revegetation/Landscaping effectiveness; • Assessment of performance of strategies outlined in the Stormwater treatment calculations; and • BMP and Stormwater treatment system maintenance regimes. <p><u>Miscellaneous Monitoring.</u> Performance of LID strategies (pervious pavement and pavers, cisterns, heated walk ways, bioretention areas for stormwater treatment and revegetation of slopes to improve infiltration of runoff) shall be monitored in accordance with requirements and conditions outlined in the TRPA Project Permit.</p> <p><u>Inspection and Maintenance Program.</u> All stormwater treatment systems and permanent BMPs shall be visually inspected monthly and maintained as necessary to assure optimal performance of systems. A long-term maintenance program shall be developed as based on monitoring results.</p> <p><u>Reporting.</u> Monitoring results shall be submitted to TRPA in the Post-Project Bi-Annual Monitoring</p>		<p>bioretention areas and to stormwater treatment systems. Figure 15-4 of the EIR/EIS illustrates the proposed snow storage areas in the North Base and Figure 15-4A illustrates proposed snow storage areas in the South Base under Alternative 1A. Snow storage will not occur within Placer County ROWs or SEZ setbacks.</p> <p>Sanding activities on Placer County roadways will continue between the months of October through May as dependent on weather conditions. In 2008/2009 Placer County Department of Public Works applied approximately 8.5 tons of sand in the vicinity of the Project area. In 2009/2010 approximately 21.5 tons were applied (Placer County Road Application Logs for Zone 1, Area 22 – 2008, 2009, 2010). Placer County Department of Public Works will typically send out a sweeper within 72 hours after the sand is applied and weather conditions permit removal of loose sand. Placer County Department of Public Works uses Vactor equipment each summer to clean out road culverts and remaining sand that was applied the prior winter season. Typically the amount of sand removed each year exceeds the amount applied by the County because Placer County also removes some abrasives applied to SR 89 by Caltrans as well as some incidental naturally occurring sediment/soils.</p> <p>Fuel Storage. Under Alternatives 1A the maintenance facility currently located in the South Base area and in proximity to Homewood Creek will be relocated to the Mid-Mountain area. The existing 3,000-gallon fuel tank will remain in use at the South Base area and could be located in close proximity to the chalets to be constructed during Phase 2. The fuel tank will be upgraded to meet the requirements of the NTFPD and Lahontan, include secondary containment for accidental spills, and be located an adequate distance from Phase 2 structures to ensure safety of residents.</p> <p>New diesel fuel tanks constructed at the new Mid-Mountain area maintenance facility in Phase 1 development could also be used exclusively. If constructed, these Mid-Mountain tanks would be sized to sustain operations throughout the winter since they will be inaccessible by fuel trucks when roadways are snow covered. The estimates for winter operations total 40,000 gallons that would be stored in two 20,000-gallon above ground tanks located beneath the maintenance facility within the crawl space. The tanks will be serviced from the paved apron adjacent to the maintenance building. The use and operations are required to conform to the California Fire Code and receive approval from the North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District (NLTFPD), as discussed in Chapter 17, Public Safety and Hazards.</p> <p>Moving the maintenance facility from the South Base area, where accidental spills could reach Homewood Creek and SEZ areas, to the Mid-Mountain area, which contains no active stream channel, reduces the potential for surface water quality impacts from</p>

178

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Report. Recommended reporting dates are December 1st to accommodate for winterization of the project area and stormwater quality reporting according to water year (i.e., October 1, 2010 to September 30, 2011 is Water Year 2011) and June 1st during spring runoff. The report shall summarize site conditions, maintenance activities, physical observation on water quality and the degree of sedimentation, if apparent. The report will include 6 months worth of observations and corresponding field measurements and laboratory analytical results.</p> <p>Surface water that is infiltrated onto groundwater shall not exceed the TRPA and State discharge to land treatment limits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total Nitrogen as N: 5 mg/L; • Total Phosphorus as P: 1mg/L; • Iron as Fe: 4 mg/L; • Turbidity: 200 NTU; and • Oil and Grease: 40 mg/L. <p>Surface water runoff discharged to Homewood Creek shall not exceed the TRPA surface runoff concentrations stated in Chapter 81 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and the water quality objectives of the State for receiving waters outlined in the WDRs.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1e. Apply Project Security Fee Towards BMP and Stormwater System Improvements and/or Restoration Projects if Discharge Limits are Not Met</p> <p>If post-project monitoring determines that TRPA or State discharge standards are exceeded, the TRPA Security Deposit shall be used to implement additional water quality treatment needs in Madden Creek, Quail Lake Creek and Homewood Creek watersheds and portions of Intervening Zone 7000. The Project Applicant and its contractors shall make repairs or improvements to the proposed permanent BMPs, LID strategies (pervious pavement and pavers, cisterns, heated walk ways, bioretention areas for stormwater treatment, and revegetation of slopes to improve infiltration if runoff) and stormwater treatment systems to improve performance and effectiveness per TRPA and Lahontan requirements. If the repairs and/or improvements result in compliance with receiving water quality objectives and discharge to land treatment and surface water limits, then no additional mitigation</p>		<p>accidental spills. Retaining the existing fuel tank at the South Base area does not increase potential impacts to Homewood Creek, assuming the fuel tank is properly maintained and serviced.</p> <p>Stormwater Treatment Systems and Bioretention Areas. There are three perennial stream channels draining the Project area and potential hydraulic connections between ground and surface waters within the Project area. TRPA environmental thresholds WQ-4, which outlines tributary standards, WQ-5, which outlines runoff water quality parameters and standards, WQ-6, which addresses discharges to groundwater, and WQ-7, which requires attainment of existing water quality standards, apply to the Project area. TRPA discharge limits are listed in Table 15-4 of the EIR/EIS and Lahontan WQOs are listed in Table 15-5. As discussed in the EIR/EIS, no statistically significant degradation of surface water quality due to operations within the Project area has been measured.</p> <p>To address potential long-term effects to beneficial uses and surface water quality, Alternative 1A will revegetate disturbed areas (as discussed in Chapter 3 of the EIR/EIS and under potential construction impacts above) and install permanent BMPs, LID strategies and stormwater treatment systems as described in the EIR/EIS. The combined stormwater treatment approach will capture, treat and infiltrate runoff from the Project area for expected improvements in stormwater quality as compared to existing conditions.</p> <p>Placer County requires installation of standard mitigation measures to permanently mark/emboss with prohibitive language such as "No Dumping! Flows to Creek" or other language as approved by the ESD, and/or graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping. Diversion of stormwater runoff around trash storage areas to minimize contact with pollutants is also required. Mitigation measures to assure compliance with these Placer County codified regulations are detailed as mitigation measures HYDRO-1b and HYDRO-1c.</p> <p>CEP Resolution Compliance – Reduction in Land Coverage and Sediment Loading. The CEP Resolution for the Project requires reductions in land coverage and sediment loading for the Project area. Alternative 1A reduces total existing land coverage within the Project area by 13, 8, 23 and 20 percent, respectively, and relocate land coverage from lower capability LCDs 1a and 1b to higher capability LCDs 2, 4, 5 and 6. Land coverage is detailed in Chapter 14, Geology, Soils and Seismicity under impact GEO-3 of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Reductions in land coverage are expected to result in reductions in sediment loading. Sediment loading was modeled for the North Base, South Base and Mid-Mountain areas and for Tahoe Ski Bowl Way (redevelopment areas).</p>

179

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>is required.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1f. Restrict Development within Quail Lake Creek Watershed until Compliance with Project Area TOC</p> <p>The Project proposes no development or change in existing conditions within this watershed. Based on exceedance of the Quail Lake Creek Project Area TOC, no development within Project area portion of the Quail Lake Creek Watershed shall be permitted until annualized total sediment (T/yr) is reduced to below the Project Area TOC (147 T/yr). The Project Applicant shall identify sediment source control and land coverage removal projects within this watershed that will be completed prior to implementation of capital improvements or other actions that create soil disturbance. The Project Applicant shall monitor the effectiveness of these projects and update the HMR CWE analysis for the Quail Lake Creek watershed based on the results.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-9. Final Landscape/Revegetation Plan and Fertilizer Management Plan</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for BIO-9 above.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4a. Design Construction-related BMPs According to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbooks and TRPA's Handbook of BMPs</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for GEO-4 above.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4b. Conform to Provisions of Placer County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for GEO-4 above.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4c. Identify Stockpiling and/or Vehicle Staging Areas on Improvement Plans</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included</p>		<p>Table 15-8 of the EIR/EIS compares annual sediment loads between the 20-year BMP SWMP and the Project SWMP. Annual total sediment leaving the project area is connected to the amount of stormwater runoff leaving the Project area each year. The Project SWMP will capture more of the stormwater volume and thus more of the annual total sediment load as shown in Table 15-8. Appendix Z-2 presents graphs for comparisons of annual sediment loading for Alternative 1A for WYs 1994, 2003 and 2006. Under Alternative 1A and under a precipitation regime for a very wet WY, the Project SWMP for the North and South Base areas is expected to decrease annual total sediment by approximately 80 percent and 81 percent, respectively, as compared to the 20-year BMP SWMP (Table 15-8).</p> <p>Combined Level of Long-term Impact to Surface Water Quality and Beneficial Uses. Compared to existing conditions, long-term contributions from the Project area to stormwater runoff, snowmelt and atmospheric deposition will be reduced and minimized through installation of stormwater treatment systems, bioretention areas, reductions in land coverage, and continued revegetation of disturbed areas and ski trails. Conclusive results concerning effectiveness of compliance measures cannot be adequately stated without inspection, monitoring and maintenance of the proposed treatment systems and permanent BMPs, however. As a result, the level of impact is considered potentially significant until monitoring results prove compliance with TRPA discharge standards, as outlined in the TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 81, and State WQOs, as outlined in the Lahontan Basin Plan and forthcoming updated WDRs. Mitigation measure HYDRO-1d outlines the requirements of the Inspection, Operations, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan for Stormwater Treatment Systems and Permanent BMPs. Mitigation measure HYDRO-1e outlines follow up measures to be taken should monitoring results report compromised effectiveness of permanent BMPs or stormwater treatment systems.</p> <p>Compliance with CWE Project Area TOCs. The existing sediment yields for Intervening Zone 7000, Madden Creek, and Quail Lake Creek Project area watersheds currently exceed the Project Area TOCs, while the existing sediment yield for Homewood Creek watershed is below its Project area TOC. The HMR CWE analysis concludes that implementation of the Alternative 1A will reduce sediment yields originating within the Project area watersheds as compared to existing conditions. Three of the four sediment yields will be at or below their Project Area TOC through implementation of the Project.</p> <p>Combined Compliance with CWE Project Area TOCs. Project Area TOCs for Madden Creek and Homewood Creek watersheds and Intervening Zone 7000 will not be exceeded under Alternative 1A. Sediment yields from the Project area are expected to decrease through implementation of these alternatives, as</p>

180

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>under findings for GEO-4 above.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4e. Obtain NPDES Permit</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for GEO-4 above.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4f. Satisfy the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual. (LDM).</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for GEO-4 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-69 through 15-73.)</p>		<p>supported by the CWE analysis results and conclusions summarized above and detailed in Appendix W. Implementation of Alternative 1A will reduce sediment yield in Quail Lake Creek watershed but could still result in exceedance of the Project Area TOC.</p> <p>Explanation: Temporary construction-related impacts to surface water quality will be avoided and reduced through implementation of effective, reasonable and appropriate measures (compliance measures) to protect water quality as required by federal, regional, State and local regulations and TRPA and NPDES permit requirements. Revegetation and landscaping are required for all disturbed areas to protect and stabilize soils and thus minimize potential impacts to surface water quality and beneficial uses. Fertilizer management (i.e. mitigation measure BIO-9) will conform to TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 81.7 to minimize the potential for fertilizers to enter surface waters. Implementation of mitigation measures HYDRO-1a, 1b and 1c and GEO-4a, 4b, 4c and 4e, respectively, assure that permanent BMPs are designed to proven effectiveness levels identified in the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbooks, that storm drain inlets are marked to discourage illegal dumping, that stormwater runoff is diverted around trash storage areas, and that final grading plans conform to Placer County grading and erosion control ordinance.</p> <p>The degree of surface water quality improvement is based on engineering design objectives (e.g. Vortech treatment vault and Contech Stormfilter specifications), sediment models (e.g. project area LSCP base area loading and HMR CWE sediment yield exercises), BMP and stormwater treatment effectiveness ratings, and best available science (Referenced to IERS 2010; Grismer 2010; Ballesterio, T.P. et al. 2009; Clear Creek Solutions 2005; Kennedy Jenks Consultants 2007; NDOT 2006; Praul and Sokulsky 2008; Roseen et al 2009; Puget Sound Action Team 2005; USEPA 2000; Hood et al. 2007; Funkhouser 2007; Montalto et al. 2007). Post-project monitoring, to be outlined as a requirement of mitigation measure HYDRO-1d, will determine the degree of predicted improvements to surface water quality and ensure that stormwater treatment systems and permanent BMPs are maintained to the highest levels of effectiveness.</p> <p>If the appropriate plans are approved and post-project monitoring (HYDRO-1d) determines compliance, project design and recommended mitigation measures are effective in reducing ski area operational impacts to surface water quality, then long-term impacts are reduced to a level of less than significant. Should post-project monitoring determine that measures are ineffective, mitigation measure HYDRO-1e shall be implemented, which requires the application of the TRPA project security fee towards replacement, expansion and/or upgrade of BMPs and stormwater treatment systems to maintain surface water quality and</p>

181

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>beneficial uses. If monitoring shows WQOs are continually exceeded, the Project Applicant will be required to make repairs or improvements to BMPs and stormwater treatment systems to improve effectiveness per TRPA permit requirements and WDRs. If WQOs continue to be exceeded, the Project will be subject to Lahontan and TRPA directives towards the upgrade and/or expansion and/or replacement of the installed stormwater treatment systems. These additional measures, if necessary, will ensure continued efforts toward installation and maintenance of effective, reasonable and appropriate measures to protect surface water quality and beneficial uses.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 15-48 through 15-74; Chapter 23, Master Response 18; Responses to Comments 9-7, 13a-11, 13a-18, 14a-19 through 14a-26, 14a-28, 14a-30, 14a-31, 14a-33; Appendix W of the EIR/EIS.)</p>
<p>HYDRO-2: Will Project construction or operation alter the existing surface water drainage patterns or cause increased runoff resulting in flooding or stream bank erosion or contribute runoff in rates or volumes that will exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems so that a 20-year, 1-hour storm runoff (approximately one inch per hour) cannot be contained on the site?</p> <p>Alternative 1A will implement measures to improve stream bank conditions and related streambank erosion and will not cause increased runoff resulting in flooding. However, because the Preliminary Conceptual Revegetation and SEZ Restoration Plan described in Appendix C is insufficient to allow for TRPA permitting and subsequent construction, the potential impacts to existing surface water drainage patterns and stream bank erosion are considered significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-74 through 15-106.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2a. TRPA Soil Hydrologic Approval Conditions for BMPs.</p> <p>The TRPA soil hydrologic review does not give approval for the BMP design, but rather, evaluates the location and depths of BMPs as currently presented on the Civil Plans. As the Project is not at 100 percent design, it is understood that the design for BMPs may be modified and could potentially require an additional soil hydrologic review at the time of the project application. It is recognized that the project area has site-specific constraints related to the depth of excavations in relationship to groundwater, interception of groundwater by subterranean garages (i.e. underground parking structures) and significant amounts of stormwater and surface water that need to be treated and infiltrated as part of the proposed development. As such, the TRPA Stormwater Management Program staff has indicated that they require the bottom of all stormwater infiltrating features to be at least two (2) feet above the seasonal high water table, which will aid in achieving 'above and beyond' mitigation measures required for this Project as a participant in the CEP. These guidelines have been met under the current proposed design in all areas except "North-1". For this area, or any stormwater infiltrating areas that may have less than two (2) feet of separation to the seasonal high water table, the stormwater being infiltrated must meet TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 81 in regard to surface water discharge standards and/or be redesigned to provide the required two (2) feet separation. The</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2a, HYDRO-2b, HYDRO-2c, HYDRO-2d, GEO-4b, Geo-4f, and BIO-5a, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by (1) requiring compliance with TRPA Soil Hydrologic Approval conditions that a separation of 2 feet from the bottom of stormwater infiltration galleries and seasonal high water table is maintained and soil treatment remains effective; (2) requiring a drainage report for each phase of the Project that identifies water quality protection features and methods to be used during construction and post-construction to reduce erosion, water quality degradation and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable; (3) assures that stormwater treatment facilities are designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual; (4) assuring that post-development runoff is reduced to at or below pre-project conditions; (5) satisfying the requirements of the Placer County Grading Ordinance and LDM for the protection of existing drainages; and (6) improving the level of detail presented in the Preliminary Conceptual Revegetation and SEZ Restoration Plan to allow for TRPA permitting and subsequent construction. Compliance with codified regulations adequately reduces potential impacts to a level of less than significant. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Construction and operation of Alternative 1A will not cause increased runoff resulting in flooding or stream bank erosion or contribute runoff in rates or volumes that will exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems so that a 20-year, 1-hour storm runoff (approximately one inch per hour) cannot be</p>

182

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>final BMP plan to be submitted as part of the project application will be reviewed, and approved, by TRPA Stormwater Management Program staff.</p> <p>The soil hydrologic review gives conceptual approval for the depth (18 inches) and location of bioretention areas as presented on the site plans. This approval is based on the concept that bioretention areas are located over open and infiltrating matrices, but does not apply to bioretention over closed impermeable pretreatment vaults.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2b. Submit Final Drainage Report– Conformance with Section 5 of the Placer County Land Development Manual and Stormwater Management Manual</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall prepare and submit with the project Improvement Plans, a Final drainage report for each project phase in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the LDM and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the Engineering and Surveying Department 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 the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. "Best Management Practice" (BMP) measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2c. Drainage Facilities to Conform to Placer County Stormwater Management Manual</p> <p>Drainage facilities, for purposes of collecting runoff on individual lots, shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and shall be in</p>		<p>contained on the site. Stormwater treatment systems are proposed to capture, treat, and infiltrate a minimum of the 20-year, 1-hour storm volume on-site; thus removing this stormwater volume from entering existing municipal separate storm sewer systems downgradient from the North Base area and Homewood Creek in the South Base area. Stormwater treatment system capacities are maximized for measured site conditions.</p> <p>The current surface water drainage patterns of Homewood Creek will be altered through the removal of the existing culvert under Tahoe Ski Bowl Way in the South Base area. Alternative 1A will implement the Homewood Creek SEZ Restoration project in the South Base area for improvements to existing surface water drainage patterns and stream bank and channel conditions and to alleviate flood risk within the Project area and to private residences downstream. Figures 15-7, 15-8, and 15-9 of the EIR/EIS analyze the potential downstream impacts of removing the existing culvert crossing at Tahoe Ski Bowl Way and replace it with a bottomless arch bridge crossing. Figure 15-7 shows the calculated pre- and post-project 100-year flood plain for Homewood Creek. Removal of the culvert will improve the existing condition, which currently overtops the roadway during a 100-year event. The proposed bridge crossing will convey the 100-year peak flow without overtopping the roadway, and there will be no downstream impacts to existing structures or property, as the creek attenuates to the 100-year water surface elevation prior to leaving the Homewood property.</p> <p>Section VI (Drainage Systems, Item 2. Design Storms) of the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual (SWMM) (Placer County 1990) requires that new development be planned and designed so that no damages occur to structures or improvements during the 100-year/1-hour storm and no inundation on private property occurs during the 10-year/1-hour event. The 10-year, 1-hour storm is the minimum design storm for new developments in drainages and dedicated drainage facilities in Placer County. The Project's systems are sized in excess of this event to meet the minimum TRPA 20-year/ 1-hour storm volume capacities. The development plans must identify the effects of the 100-year/1-hour storm and provision be made in the plan to prevent loss of life and damages to property during a 100-year, 1-hour storm.</p> <p>TRPA 20-year/1-hour Storm Volumetric Analysis (TRPA Code 25.5.A). Stormwater treatment systems are proposed for the North Base, South Base and Mid-Mountain areas, Tahoe Ski Bowl Way extension, and off-site Caltrans/Placer County/HMR EIP project, as described below. The systems are considered part of the Project and are outlined as compliance measures for conformance with TRPA and Lahontan requirements for project approval and permitting. Under the Alternative 1A existing stormwater treatment systems will be replaced and expanded with systems that are located and sized to capture and treat</p>

183

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>compliance with applicable stormwater quality standards, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD). These facilities shall be constructed with subdivision improvements and easements provided as required by ESD. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the Homeowners' Association.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2d. Reduce Stormwater Runoff to Pre-Project Volumes</p> <p>The Improvement Plan submittal and Drainage Report shall provide details showing that storm water runoff shall be reduced to pre-project conditions through the installation of detention facilities. Detention facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD). No detention facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Homewood Creek Restoration Plan</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for BIO-5 above.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4b. Conform to Provisions of Placer County Grading Ordinance</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included in under findings for GEO-4 above.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4f. Satisfy the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual. (LDM).</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for GEO-4 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-105 through 15-106.)</p>		<p>runoff from proposed impervious coverage and contributing watershed areas in the North Base, South Base and Mid-Mountain areas and along the extended Tahoe Ski Bowl Way.</p> <p>The Project will utilize LID strategies such as porous pavers and pavement, cisterns, heated walkways, revegetation of slopes to improve infiltration of runoff, bioretention areas for stormwater treatment, and revegetation of slopes to improve source control. The bioretention areas will include soil amendments to balance infiltration rates with nutrient uptake, spreading of upland seed mixtures for revegetation, soil stabilization and vegetative uptake, as detailed in Chapter 3 and on preliminary Civil Plan Sheet C2.</p> <p>The stormwater infiltration galleries are designed to maximize separation between bottom of galleries and the seasonal high water table. TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 25.5.A requires that the bottom of infiltration facilities be a minimum of one foot (12 inches) above the seasonal high water table. The stormwater infiltration galleries are designed to maintain at least 18 to 24 inches of separation between the bottom of the galleries and the seasonal high water table as measured in 2006, 2007 and 2008 (see Appendix D of the EIR/EIS for groundwater data, modeling results and cross-sections of the North and South Base areas). Because of the complexity of the North Base area and its proximity to Lake Tahoe, TRPA Soil Hydrologic approval conditions require final stormwater systems designs to maintain a minimum two (2) foot separation between bottom of galleries and the seasonal high water table. Mitigation measure HYDRO-2a outlines the conditions for Soil Hydrologic Approval from TRPA.</p> <p>Figure 11A of the EIR/EIS illustrates Alternative 1A overall stormwater treatment design for the North Base Area and Figure 15-12A illustrates the overall stormwater treatment design for the South Base Area, noting that the South Base stormwater treatment systems have subsequently been relocated outside of the proposed Placer County ROW as updated on preliminary Civil Plan Sheet C12 (see Figure 3-9 of the EIR/EIS). North-4, North-5, South-3 and South-4 are groundwater reinjection galleries, as described in impact HYDRO-3, and are not stormwater infiltration galleries. Table 15-9A details the calculations in support of sizing for the stormwater treatment system capacities under Alternative 1A.</p> <p>Underground Gallery North-1. Under Alternative 1A, North-1 capacity remains 2681 cubic feet, bioretention is slightly reduced to 4,712 cubic feet, and percent above the TRPA required infiltration volume is 260 percent. The separation of the bottom of North-1 to the seasonal high water table is 1.5 feet. During stormwater infiltration, this separation decreases to 0.8 feet, which poses a potentially significant impact. Mitigation measure HYDRO-2a details the actions required to reduce this potential impact from planned stormwater treatment systems to a level of less than significant.</p>

781

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>Underground Gallery North-2. Bioretention areas are proposed around the hotel entrance road and roundabout, which will hydrologically disconnect or attenuate 4,327 cubic feet of runoff, increase the potential treatment capacity of North-2, reduce total runoff volumes entering North-2 and allow for treatment capacity that is 292 percent more than the TRPA required infiltration volume.</p> <p>Underground Gallery North-3. Under Alternative 1A, North-3 has the capacity to infiltrate up to 14,432 cubic feet of runoff, which exceeds the TRPA Code of Ordinances requirement to capture and treat the 20-year/1-hour storm volume (12,115 cubic feet) by just over 19 percent. LID strategies, including porous pavers and pavement (321 cubic feet reduction), the cisterns (2,400 cubic feet removed and stored), bioretention areas (11,511 cubic feet reduction) serve to hydrologically disconnect or attenuate runoff volumes to North-3. The reduction and attenuation in runoff volume increases the potential treatment capacity of North-3 to 137 percent above the TRPA required infiltration volume. The separation of the bottom of North-2 to the seasonal high water table is 2 feet. During stormwater infiltration, this separation decreases to 1.5 feet, which poses a potential impact. Mitigation measure HYDRO-2a details the actions required to reduce this potential impact from planned stormwater treatment systems to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Underground Gallery North-4. Under Alternative 1A, North-4 has the capacity to infiltrate up to 23,089 cubic feet of runoff, which exceeds the TRPA Code of Ordinances requirement to capture and treat the 20-year/1-hour storm volume (14,427 cubic feet) by 60 percent. LID strategies, including porous pavers and pavement (545 cubic feet reduction), four cisterns (2,400 cubic feet removed and stored) and bioretention areas (5,077 cubic feet reduction) described above, serve to hydrologically disconnect or attenuate runoff volumes to North-4. This reduction and attenuation of this runoff volume subsequently increases the potential treatment capacity of North-4 to 137 percent above the TRPA required infiltration volume. The separation of bottom of North-4 to the seasonal high water table is 2.0 feet. During stormwater infiltration, this separation decreases to 1.5 feet, which poses a potential impact. Mitigation measure HYDRO-2a details the actions required to reduce this potential impact from planned stormwater treatment systems to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Underground Gallery South-1. Under Alternative 1A, , South-1 has the capacity to infiltrate up to 9,650 cubic feet of runoff, which exceeds the TRPA Code of Ordinances requirement to capture and treat the 20-year/1-hour storm volume by 38 percent. LID strategies, including the cisterns (1,200 cubic feet removed and stored) and bioretention areas (7,850 cubic feet reduction), serve to hydrologically disconnect or attenuate runoff volumes to South-</p>

185

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>1. This reduction and attenuation of runoff volume subsequently increases the potential treatment capacity of South-1 to 168 percent above the TRPA required infiltration volume.</p> <p>Underground Gallery South-2. Under Alternative 1A, South-2 has the capacity to infiltrate up to 8,050 cubic feet of runoff, which exceeds the TRPA Code of Ordinances requirement to capture and treat the 20-year/1-hour storm volume (4,905 cubic feet) by 64 percent. LID strategies, including the cisterns (1,200 cubic feet removed and stored) and bioretention areas (6,614 cubic feet reduction), serve to hydrologically disconnect or attenuate runoff volumes to South-2. This reduction and attenuation of runoff volume subsequently increases the potential treatment capacity of South-2 to 223 percent above the TRPA required infiltration volume.</p> <p>Maintenance for Underground Infiltration Galleries North, 1, North-2, North-3, North-4, South-1 and South-2. An Inspection, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan will be completed based on the final design of the selected alternative and as required for project approval and permitting. Underground infiltration galleries will be regularly inspected and cleaned, seasonally and following significant precipitation events, to prevent an accumulation of build up that could inhibit filtration effectiveness or reduce treatment capacities. Cleaning will be completed at the discretion of maintenance personnel to maintain proper storage and flow, preferably during a relatively dry period. The Monitoring and Reporting Program of the WDRs require sampling of discharge from the systems to measure compliance with discharge to land water quality objectives.</p> <p>Tahoe Ski Bowl Way Extension. This project component is included as programmatic-level in the HMR Master Plan. Figure 15-13 of the EIR/EIS illustrates the stormwater treatment approach for the Tahoe Ski Bowl Way portion of the Project area, including treatment vault and bioretention area layout. Bioretention areas will infiltrate the roadway runoff after the stormwater is conveyed through pre-treatment facilities.</p> <p><i>Stormwater conveyance along the Tahoe Ski Bowl Way Extension is broken into two sections. The first section includes road runoff sheet flowing to a drop inlet at a low point on Tahoe Ski Bowl Way approximately half way in between the South Base Area and the proposed Townhomes. Under Alternative 1A, the bioretention areas along this portion of the roadway are expanded to infiltrate 1,935 cubic feet, which exceeds the TRPA Code of Ordinances requirement to capture and treat the 20-year/1-hour storm volume (1,649 cubic feet) by 17 percent.</i></p> <p>The second section includes approximately 600 linear feet of the roadway leading up to the Townhome turnaround. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the curb and gutter and flow north to the drop inlets south of the Townhomes. The bioretention areas are</p>

181
986

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>sized to treat 1,600 cubic feet of runoff, which exceeds the TRPA Code of Ordinances requirement to capture and treat the 20-year/1-hour storm volume (1,339 cubic feet) by 20 percent.</p> <p>Townhome roof runoff is directed to adjacent bioretention areas for infiltration and soil treatment. Bioretention areas are sized to treat 7,436 cubic feet of runoff, which exceeds the TRPA Code of Ordinances requirement to capture and treat the 20-year/1-hour storm volume (5,976 cubic feet) by 24 percent.</p> <p>The proposed systems are based on a design that assumes maximum allowable land coverage for each unit or a worst-case scenario for analysis to assume that at a minimum, peak runoff volumes from the TRPA design storm can be retained, treated and infiltrated on site. The proposed systems are based on a design that assumes maximum allowable land coverage for each unit or a worst-case scenario for analysis to assume that at a minimum, peak runoff volumes from the TRPA design storm can be retained, treated and infiltrated on site. Additional environmental review will occur prior to Phase 2D, Townhomes and Tahoe Ski Bowl Way Extension, project entitlement application. The secondary access road has not been analyzed for grading or water quality impacts in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Mid-Mountain Area. Figure 15-14 illustrates the stormwater treatment approach for the Mid-Mountain portion of the Project area. The bioretention areas proposed at the Mid-Mountain assume a maximum depth of five feet. The layout consists of several bioretention infiltration areas, each serving the proposed buildings. Mid-Mountain roof runoff is conveyed separately for each building via stormdrain pipe to bioretention areas downhill of the proposed development for infiltration and soil treatment. The Mid-Mountain system will treat 4,000 cubic feet of runoff, which is 4 percent greater than the required 20-year/1-hour storm volume.</p> <p>Off-Site CEP Required EIP Project. The HMR CEP resolution requires HMR to participate in an off-site EIP project in fulfillment of over and above CEP objectives. Placer County is planning to construct the Placer County-Homewood Mountain Resort Water Quality Improvement Project (WQIP) to the immediate north of the Project area in summer of 2012. The WQIP includes the collection and treatment of stormwater runoff from an existing residential and commercial area in Homewood that runs from Silver Street north to Fern Street and from SR 89 west to Sacramento Street. HMR's Tentative Map and Conditional Use Permit will be conditioned to construct frontage improvements on Silver Street to include water quality facilities for a portion of what is known as the "Silver Catchment"; an area to the immediate north of HMR and bound on the northern edge by Trout Street, as illustrated in Figure 15-15. Appendix BB-1 illustrates the total WQIP project area that is delineated as four PLRM catchments areas.</p>

187

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>Placer County currently plans on construction of the WQIP during the summer of 2012. HMR's improvements will be included in the project's Conditions of Approval for the Specific details regarding HMR's financial contribution (timing and amount) are to be included as part of the project development agreement currently being generated with Placer County. Ultimately the contribution by HMR to the WQIP will represent a significant sediment and nutrient load reduction in the Homewood area. Existing PLRM baseline sediment loads are estimated at 3,045 pounds/year of Total Suspended Solids (TSS) and 1,755 pounds/year of Fine Sediment Particle (FSP) from the four delineated catchments within the WQIP project area. The PLRM results indicate a 74 percent reduction in TSS and a 75 percent reduction in FSP, reducing annual sediment loads from the WQIP project area to 793 pounds/year of TSS and 439 pounds/year.</p> <p>The final monetary participation by HMR to the WQIP that addresses load reduction across the four PLRM catchments will be used to determine the percentage of the total catchment-wide TSS and FSP reductions to be credited to HMR.</p> <p>Placer County 10-year and 100-year Peak Flow Analysis. Placer County will require a final drainage report at the time of Improvement Plan review that addresses project design criteria. Typically, Placer County considers the impacts of a project "altering existing drainage of the site or area" or "increasing the rate or amount of surface runoff" as significant impact requiring mitigation. Under Placer County codified regulations, the 10-year event is the minimum design storm for sizing drainage facilities and new development must be planned and designed so that no damage occurs to structures or improvements and to prevent loss of life during the 100-year storm event.</p> <p>Appendix X-1 presents the Preliminary Drainage Report for Alternative 1A. Conclusions in the Preliminary Drainage Report state that the design for the Alternative 1A incorporates current requirements by Placer County for stormwater collection and conveyance as well as the requirements by the TRPA. The SWMM post-development calculations show a cumulative reduction in peak flow from existing to proposed conditions for the 10 and 100-year storm events. The proposed stormwater treatment systems for collection, conveyance and infiltration will comply with the Placer County SWMM dated September 1, 1990.</p> <p>Placer County staff review of the Preliminary Drainage Report indicates that the report adequately demonstrates that the proposed development has a less than significant impact on peak flow runoff leaving the Project area. Therefore, Placer County does not require onsite stormwater detention capacity in excess of the systems proposed as part of the Alternative 1A.</p> <p>Although the Project will improve upon project area drainage, reduce post-project runoff volumes and maintain peak flows</p>

188

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>compared to existing conditions, implementation of standard mitigation measures HYDRO-2b, HYDRO-2c and HYDRO-2d assure compliance with Placer County codified regulations to reduce impacts from drainage and stormwater runoff to a level of less than significant. Implementation of these measures minimize potential impacts to down-gradient properties and existing drainage facilities by assuring that the rate or amount of surface runoff does not exceed existing conditions and does not significantly impact downstream properties or existing drainage facilities.</p> <p>Existing Surface Water Drainage Patterns, Flooding, and Stream Bank Erosion. Alternative 1A will not alter the existing surface water drainage patterns of Quail Lake Creek, Madden Creek or the unnamed channels within the Project area. No existing flooding impacts have been identified along these drainages. Alternative 1A does not propose changes in the Project area that will increase flood risk or stream bank erosion resulting from increased flooding along these drainages.</p> <p>Alternative 1A will daylight Homewood Creek, which is currently collected and piped under the north-south extension of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way. Downstream impacts to Homewood Creek streambanks below the Project area were identified during channel evaluations completed in 2006 and 2007 (Kleinfelder 2007).</p> <p>The SEZ in the South Base area will be restored to a more natural state with the removal of the culvert and the daylighting of the stream channel under Alternative 1A. In its existing condition, Homewood Creek is highly constrained with steep banks and a culverted section under the South Base parking area. To alleviate the Project area's contribution to downstream channel impacts and flood risk, the existing culvert in the South Base parking lot will be removed, TRPA verified existing land coverage within the SEZ and floodplain will be removed to comply with TRPA and Placer County setbacks, and SEZ and floodplain functions will be restored as described in Chapter 3 of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The FEMA flood hazard area within the Project area is estimated at 1.47 acres or 64,124 square feet and is illustrated on Figure 8-1 in Chapter 8, Biological Resources of the EIR/EIS, along with the TRPA SEZ boundaries. Figures 15-7, 15-8, and 15-9 illustrate the pre and post-project conditions associated with the Homewood Creek unmitigated 100-year floodplain, as defined in the Placer County LDM. Removal of the culvert will improve the existing condition, which currently overtops the roadway during a 100-year event. The proposed bridge crossing will convey the 100-year peak flow without overtopping the roadway, and there will be no downstream impacts to existing structures or property, as the creek attenuates to the 100-year water surface elevation prior to leaving the Homewood property.</p>

189
689

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>A bridge will be used to cross the stream channel, which will be reconstructed to increase the overall cross-sectional area and flow length to maximize stream function and connection to the floodplain. The restoration area is within the FEMA flood hazard area. The bridge span will be constructed at a height and width that accommodates the 100-year floodway. Improving channel conditions in conjunction with reducing land coverage in the FEMA flood hazard areas will reduce the Project area's contribution to downstream impacts to stream channels.</p> <p>The SEZ restoration plan for Homewood Creek (see Appendix C) includes widening of the creek to allow for increased cross sectional area and will contain primary and secondary flood plains (IERS, April 2010). Widening of the stream cross-section results in a reduction of the kinetic energy and creates benefits to the SEZ. The proposed restoration will provide a connection to two day lighted areas that exist above and below the South Base development area. The restoration may have a positive impact on downstream floodplains as it will allow for increased area for groundwater recharge and also allow for the floodplain downstream to retain its character. The restoration of the Homewood Creek and SEZ will likely result in improvements to the SEZ; however, TRPA staff determines that the Preliminary Conceptual Revegetation and SEZ Restoration Plan described in Appendix C is insufficient to allow for permitting and subsequent construction and does not provide sufficient detail to substantiate a conclusion that impacts will be beneficial and no negative impacts will occur to the SEZ or check channel below the Project area. This impact is considered potentially significant and implementation of mitigation measure BIO-5a will be necessary to assure that potential impacts to existing surface water drainage patterns and stream bank erosion are reduced to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Explanation: Alternative 1A will install stormwater treatment systems capable of containing and treating the stormwater runoff in excess of the 20-year, 1-hour storm volume, effectively removing this volume of runoff from entering existing downstream drainage systems. Based on the evaluation criteria for HYDRO-2, the level of impact from stormwater runoff and flooding is less than significant.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure HYDRO-2a assures compliance with TRPA Soil Hydrologic Approval conditions that a separation of 2 feet from the bottom of stormwater infiltration galleries and seasonal high water table is maintained and soil treatment remains effective.</p> <p>Mitigation measures HYDRO-2b, HYDRO-2c, HYDRO-2d, GEO-4b and Geo-4f are standard mitigation measures required by Placer County to assure compliance with codified regulations. HYDRO-2b requires a drainage report for each phase of the</p>

Ob1

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>Project that identifies water quality protection features and methods to be used during construction and post-construction to reduce erosion, water quality degradation and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable. HYDRO-2c assures that stormwater treatment facilities are designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual. HYDRO-2d assures that post-development runoff is reduced to at or below pre-project conditions. Compliance with codified regulations adequately reduces potential impacts to a level of less than significant. GEO-4b and GEO-4f satisfy the requirements of the Placer County Grading Ordinance and LDM for the protection of existing drainages.</p> <p>Implementation of BIO-5a will improve the level of detail presented in the Preliminary Conceptual Revegetation and SEZ Restoration Plan to allow for TRPA permitting and subsequent construction. Through adequate site-specific restoration measures, the potential impacts to existing surface water drainage patterns and streambank erosion are reduced to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-74 through 15-106.; Master Response 18; Responses to Comments 13a-46 through 13a-50, 14a-31 through 14a-38, 14b-6, 152-4, through 152-7.)</p>
<p>HYDRO-3. Will Project construction activities or long-term operations result in a substantial degradation of groundwater or result in a substantial change in the quality, quantity, elevation, infiltration, or movement of groundwater?</p> <p>Construction of Alternatives 1A involves grading, excavation and fill activities. Excavation of earth below existing ground surfaces presents the potential to intercept or interfere with seasonal groundwater movement during construction activities and long-term operations of the Project area. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-110 through 15-119.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-3a. Implement Operation Dewatering Plan/ Implement Engineered Groundwater Mitigations.</p> <p>Groundwater intercepted as part of the drainage collection and conveyance systems for the underground parking structures shall include methods to infiltrate all collected groundwater for the purposes of groundwater recharge. The reinjection galleries for intercepted groundwater shall be separate entities from the stormwater treatment infiltration galleries and the distance between the groundwater and stormwater infiltration galleries shall be maximized to minimize potential for mixing. Collected groundwater shall be infiltrated locally in the general area where collected from. Systems shall be adequately sized to infiltrate no less than 100 percent of the collected volume. Tests and studies shall be conducted to confirm sufficient infiltration can be obtained for any and each given system with no adverse effects resulting from the infiltration/recharge activities. Prior to Improvement Plan approval for any and each project phase, a Geotechnical Evaluation Report</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure HYDRO-3a, 3b, and 3c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by assuring that Project area contribution to groundwater impacts will be reduced to a level of less than significant and is brought into compliance with TRPA groundwater protection measures. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Groundwater flows around and within the Project area have been previously modified by the construction of parking lots, mountain access roads, SR 89, and Placer County Roads, affecting historic surface and groundwater conditions.</p> <p>Groundwater Movement. To assure that no additional modifications to groundwater quantity and movement occur from proposed developments, TRPA requires that site-specific geotechnical investigations be completed for project permitting and approval. Potential impact to groundwater movement during construction of the Alternative 1A are analyzed in Chapter 14 of the EIR/EIS, Geology, Soils and Seismicity, and addressed in the</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

161

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>certified by a Registered Civil Engineer shall be submitted to the ESD for review and approval for each groundwater infiltration/recharge system. The report shall, at a minimum, confirm the adequacy of soils to sufficiently and successfully infiltrate collected groundwater, and shall provide design recommendations based on applicable investigation and testing criteria. The report shall likewise provide evidence that proposed infiltration/recharge systems will not detrimentally affect onsite or offsite structures or properties.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-3b. Inspection, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan Groundwater Infiltration Systems for Underground Parking Structures</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall prepare an Inspection, Operation, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan for the groundwater infiltration systems for the underground parking structures. TRPA, Lahontan, and Placer County shall review the plan prior to issuance of final Project approval.</p> <p>The Plan shall include, but is not limited to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction; planning and design, sampling objectives and water quality objectives; • Well construction details and/or system sampling access points; • Water level data for existing and new wells; • Groundwater sampling and analysis, sample collection methods, decontamination, sampling frequency, sampling handling, field analysis, laboratory analysis; • Maintenance scheduling; and • Quarterly reporting. <p>Sample results shall be provided to the TRPA on a quarterly basis. The report shall present site conditions, physical observations of groundwater quality and the degrees of sedimentation observed within the underground groundwater infiltration galleries, and include three months worth of observations and corresponding field measurements and laboratory analytical results.</p> <p>Single samples of groundwater shall not exceed the discharge to land treatment water quality objectives at the following concentrations: Total</p>		<p>findings for GEO-4 above. Because groundwater will be intercepted during long-term operations of the underground parking structures in the North and South Base areas, the level of impact is significant. Mitigation measure HYDRO-3a is necessary to assure that intercepted groundwater does not leave the Project area as surface flow and to assure that groundwater movement is not significantly altered.</p> <p>Groundwater Quality. The existing groundwater quality within the Project area is not well characterized, but groundwater quality in the Lake Tahoe Basin is generally of high quality and used to supply public drink supplies with minimal treatment for pollutants (California's Groundwater Bulletin 118 2004). The Project is not likely to violate potable water quality standards because it will utilize potable water from MCWC and/or the TCPUD. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Robinson Engineering 2005). Reported a low-level MTBE in one of the existing groundwater monitoring wells in the North Base area. The assessment concluded that natural attenuation has reduced the MTBE concentration to levels near the California water quality objective and that additional natural attenuation will result in the groundwater reaching the water quality objective. Because the levels are low and the well is under standard monitoring by the Lahontan, this is not considered to be a significant impact.</p> <p>Alternative 1A proposes underground infiltration galleries for stormwater treatment in areas of seasonal high groundwater. TRPA Code of Ordinances Subsection 25.5.A(1) requires that the bottom of infiltration facilities, which would include underground infiltration galleries, be a minimum of one foot (12 inches) above the seasonal high groundwater table. Underground infiltration galleries in the North and South Base areas are designed to maximize this separation. Galleries North-2, North-3, and North-4 will have separations of two feet (24 inches), Galleries North-1 and South-1 will have separations of 1.5 feet (18 inches) and Gallery South-2 will have a separation of 6.5 feet (78 inches). Although the galleries maintain the separations required by TRPA Code, fluctuations in the seasonal high water table are likely and the potential for degradation of groundwater quality exists if the separation between the bottom of the galleries and the seasonal high water table intersect to negate soil treatment necessary for stormwater treatment. Mitigation is necessary to reduce this potential impact to a level of less than significant. A post-project groundwater monitoring program will also be necessary.</p> <p>Due to the increase in landscaped area within the North and South Base areas, nitrogen and phosphorus inputs or loading in the Project area could increase if components of fertilizer leach past the root uptake zone towards seasonal high groundwater. To minimize potential impacts to groundwater quality the Project proposes the use of slow-growing turf grass in high pedestrian traffic areas and has replaced much of the higher water demand</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

192

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Nitrogen as N of 5 mg/L; Total Phosphorus as P of 1 mg/L; Total Iron as Fe at 4 mg/L; Turbidity at 200 ntu; and Oil and Grease at 40 mg/L.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-3c. Complete a Water Balance Analysis for the HMR-Operated Well and the TCPUD McKinney Well No. 1</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall prepare a hydrogeologic report for the HMR-operated wells and the TCPUD McKinney Well No 1 to determine recharge, recovery and storage capacities of the aquifers. The report shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Characterize the cone of depression that will result based on maximum proposed consumption, determine if this will result in a gross adjustment of the near static deep groundwater level for this aquifer, • Characterize the zone of influence and determine if the proposed extractions will negatively other source waters; • Identify or characterize the hydrogeologic conditions that impose constraints on Time and Drawdown; • Identify the well efficiency and the expected lifetime; • Determine and disclose what water rights could be potentially influenced; and • Determine the potential impacts towards the Truckee River Operating Agreement (TROA) allocations to the State of California. <p>Lahontan may require the characterization of the subsurface water chemistry to meet the general requirement for drinking water wells even though the water will be used for snowmaking. Should a decline in groundwater levels occur that exceeds seasonal fluctuations and that is attributable to the Project, pumping from the groundwater source shall cease and other supplies of water shall be utilized until groundwater levels return to historic levels.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-116 through 15-119.)</p>		<p>landscape areas with bioretention areas, which serve to both infiltrate stormwater and uptake pollutants and nutrients.</p> <p>The Project proposes the following measures to minimize the potential for nutrients to escape the root zone and be delivered to groundwater:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of non-mowed or slow-growing turf grass species, preferably local native or naturalized species with annual fertilizer requirements that do not exceed 1.5 pounds per 1,000 square feet; • Implementation of a Fertilizer Management Plan that meets the requirements of Section 81.7 of TRPA Code or Ordinances; • Determination of appropriate fertilizer rates by a soil-revegetation specialist and based on the results of soil nutrient testing with phosphorus fertilizer use only when supported by soil testing results; • Incorporation of fertilizer into soils prior to seed application to prevent burning and low germination rates; • Use of Biosol or other organic, slow-release fertilizers that do not contain nitrate or ammonium with careful application to avoid application on hardscape; • Prohibit fertilizer use on bioretention areas for stormwater treatment after initial establishment; and • Installation of a highly controlled spray irrigation system to avoid over irrigation and overspray onto hardscape. <p>Implementation of these project measures will reduce potential impacts to groundwater quality from landscaped areas. However, to assure long-term protection of groundwater quality, a post-project groundwater monitoring program will be necessary.</p> <p>Groundwater Quantity. The Project could potentially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted).</p> <p>The North Base well has an estimated 500 gallons per minute pumping rate and the McKinney Well No. 1 has a rate of around 1,000 gallons per minute (Kleinfelder 1994). HMR proposes to use these wells to supply 60.8 million gallons/year of snowmaking water needed for with the proposed snowmaking system expansion. Although pump rates are well documented, the recharge, recovery and storage capacities of the Project area wells and the proposed TCPUD McKinney Well No. 1 are unknown, the potential impact to groundwater quality is considered significant, requiring mitigation measure HYDRO-3a to reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant. The potential impacts to groundwater quantity as related to source</p>

193

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>water protection are analyzed in impact HYDRO-5 below.</p> <p>Explanation: Implementation of HYDRO-3a, 3b, and 3c will assure that Project area contribution to groundwater impacts will be reduced to a level of less than significant based on criteria for Impact HYDRO-3. Implementation of the mitigation measures will assure that the Project is brought into compliance with TRPA groundwater protection measures.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-110 through 15-119; Master Response 18; Responses to Comments 13a-46 through 13a-50, 14a-34 through 14a-38, 14a-53,33-36, 93-11, 141-16, 235-3, and 268-12.)</p>
<p>HYDRO-4. Will the Project alter the course or flow of the 100-year floodwaters or expose people or structures to water related hazards such as flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occurrence or seiches?</p> <p>The Geologic Hazards and Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation (Kleinfelder 2007) reports that the existing development in the North and South Base areas could be inundated by waves with maximum amplitudes of approximately six meters from a lake seiche resulting from magnitude 7.2 earthquake modeled on the West Tahoe-Dollar Point Fault. Due to the proximity of the Project area to active faults and to the shorezone of Lake Tahoe, the risk of inundation from a lake seiche is considered potentially significant.</p> <p>Alternative 1A will remove existing structures in the South Base area from the FEMA 100-year floodplain, conform to TRPA and Placer County setbacks and will replace the existing culvert crossing with a bridge span across Homewood Creek to reduce the potential for flood flows to be impeded or redirected. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-119 through 15-122.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-4a. Emergency Response and Evacuation Plan.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall prepare and submit an emergency response and evacuation plan to TRPA, Placer County ESD and the North Tahoe Fire Protection District (NTFPD) for review and approval before construction permits are issued. The plan shall include detailed descriptions of how emergency response and evacuation will occur in the case of a large earthquake and potential seiche, the 100-yr event, wildfire and avalanche. Emergency response and evacuation measures shall address the requirement of Placer County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan and at a minimum identifies steps that help avoid, reduce, alleviate, and mitigate disaster damages and potential loss of life. Additionally, Project area emergency access and evacuation designs shall be consistent with NTFPD's Emergency Preparedness and Evacuation Guide.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-4b: Comply with Placer County Stormwater Management Manual Section VI</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall show the limits of the future, unmitigated, fully developed, 100-year flood plain (after grading) for Homewood Creek on the Improvement Plans and designate same as a building setback line unless greater setbacks are required by other project conditions.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-4c: Comply with Placer County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance</p> <p>To comply with Placer County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Article 15.52, specifically</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measures HYDRO-4a, 4b, and 4c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring the preparation of an Emergency Response and Evacuation Plan as well as ensuring compliance with County regulations. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: An alteration of the course or flow of the 100-year floodwaters constitutes a significant impact. The FEMA FIRM indicates a Zone A area located along the lower reach of Homewood Creek, which flows through the South Base area. The lower reach of Madden Creek is also mapped Zone A, but is to the north and outside of the Project area. A FEMA Zone A corresponds to the 100-year floodplain with undetermined base flood elevations.</p> <p>The Placer County FCWCD requires the submittal of a detailed pre- and post-project hydraulic analysis of Homewood Creek for project permitting. The analysis identifies increases in runoff leaving the Project area as a result of the 10-year and 100-year storm events and a determination of the Project's effects on the 100-year water surface elevations. The Preliminary Drainage Report identifies no significant increase in runoff leaving the Project area or increase in the 100-year water surface elevations as a result of Alternative 1A. Under Alternative 1A No housing or habitable structures are placed within the 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on the FIRM and no structures are proposed in the 100-yr future, unmitigated, fully developed floodplain, as defined by Placer County's LDM.</p> <p>The bridge span included in Alternative 1A is designed to comply with Placer County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance. As a result, the 100-year floodwaters will not be impeded or redirected and people or structures will not be exposed to significant risk or</p>

761

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>15.52.170 C.1 Elevation and Floodproofing, the Project Applicant shall show finished structure pad elevations 2 feet above the 100-year flood plain line for South Base buildings under Alternatives 1, 1A, 3, 4, 5 and 6 on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet filed with the Final Map. Pad elevations shall be certified by a California registered civil engineer or licensed land surveyor and submitted to the Engineering and Surveying Department. This certification shall be completed prior to construction of the foundation or at the completion of final grading, whichever comes first. No construction is allowed until this certification has been received by the ESD and approved by the Flood Plain Manager. Benchmark elevation and location shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet to the satisfaction of DRC.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-121 to 15-122.)</p>		<p>loss, injury or death from flooding.</p> <p>The potential impact is further reduced through compliance with Placer County codified regulations. Standard Placer County mitigation measures HYDRO-4b and HYDRO-4c reduce the potential impact to 100-yr floodwaters to a level of less than significant through delineation of adequate setbacks from and establishment of building pad elevations above the 100-year floodwater elevations.</p> <p>The Kleinfelder evaluation (2007) states that debris flows are not mapped within the Project area but may exist in the Madden Creek, Homewood Creek, Quail Lake Creek and the unnamed creek drainages. Alternative 1A does not propose changes to the Project area that would increase the potential for debris flows. The risk of debris flows is considered to be less than significant based on the existing conditions of the Project area and the absence of mapped debris flow areas.</p> <p>Seiches are normally caused by an earthquake or high wind activity, and can affect harbors, bays, lakes, rivers and canals. See Chapter 14 of the EIR/EIS, Geology, Soils and Seismicity for details on geologic hazards associated with the Project area. The preparation of an emergency response and evacuation plan, as outlined in mitigation measures HYDRO-4a, is necessary to mitigate disaster damages and avoid potential loss of life from inundation by seiche. The Project area cannot be relocated out of the potential inundation area of a seiche from Lake Tahoe, but the risk of inundation can be minimized through the proper and timely execution of an Emergency Response and Evacuation Plan. Compliance with Placer County SWMM Section VI and the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance results in the avoidance of alteration of the course or flow of the 100-year floodwaters and minimizes exposure to significant risk or loss, injury or death from flooding. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure HYDRO-4a, 4b, and 4c.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-119 through 15-122; Responses to Comments 9-44, 11-19 through 11-23, 13a-61, 13c-8, 19-24, and 33-41.)</p>
<p>HYDRO-5. Will the Project change the amount of surface water in any water body, substantially reduce the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies, or be located within 600 feet of a drinking water source?</p> <p>Source Water Protection. Source water 09719101/11 and source water 08502048W11 are located in the vicinity of the Project area.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-5. Water Use/Water Rights Monitoring Program/Install meters at Points of Diversions and Application or Use</p> <p>To ensure that water from HMR's various supplies is used in appropriate quantities and locations, a Water Use/Water Rights monitoring program shall be implemented. The goal of the program shall be to measure or estimate the quantity of water</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure HYDRO-5, HYDRO-3c, and PSU-1a, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by (1) assuring compliance with the forthcoming TROA regulations for the State of California allocations; (2) requiring connection and service fees approved by TCPUD and/or MCWC to ensure sufficient water to meet peak demand in the Project area; and (3) requiring confirmation that water source(s) are adequate and meet State and Federal requirements for quality and quantity. The Board of Supervisors hereby directs that</p>

195

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>However, TRPA Source Water Assessment maps indicate that no source waters are located within the boundary or within 600 feet of the Project area. The potential impact from Alternative 1A to source waters is less than significant.</p> <p>Public Water Supply. The current rate of flow is not sufficient to meet peak demand for snowmaking under Alternative 1A. HMR and the TCPUD McKinney-Quail Water Service Area would require upgraded extraction, pumping, treatment, conveyance, and storage capacity to serve the new demand of the Project area. This is considered a significant impact on public water supply and mitigation is required.</p> <p>In-Stream Flows. Alternative 1A does not propose development of existing points of diversion located within the Project area. Alternative 1A will not significantly impact the instream flows in Quail Lake, Homewood, and Madden Creeks. New wells are not proposed as part of the Project, and the existing wells that supply the Project area are not located near perennial stream channels (North Base well) or are of sufficient distance from streams and are not directly connected to surface flows. The level of impact from the Alternative 1A to TRPA instream flow thresholds is less than significant.</p> <p>(S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-122 through 15-127.)</p>	<p>supplied by each source and document the location at which the water is used or applied. Meters shall be installed to monitor the monthly pumpage from individual wells. Additionally, the monitoring shall include monthly measurements of groundwater levels in the existing and proposed wells.</p> <p>With the existing and proposed water supply monitoring facilities, determination of the quantity of water supplied to Homewood from each water supply source and the points of application or use of this water shall occur. By knowing the use restrictions on water from each source, the maximum water use permitted in any area shall be known, and thus water uses shall be limited to the maximum permitted.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall prepare an annual report indicating the quantity of water used from each of its sources and the maximum entitlement from each of its sources. The report shall be provided to TRPA and Placer County for use in ensuring compliance with existing regulations.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-3c. Complete a Water Balance Analysis for the HMR-Operated Well and the TCPUD McKinney Well</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for HYDRO-3 above.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure PSU-1a. Water Supply Assessment and Infrastructure</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for PSU-1 below.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 15-127.)</p>		<p>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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measures HYDRO-5, HYDRO-3c, and PSU-1a will assure compliance with the forthcoming TROA regulations for the State of California allocations. The payment of connection and service fees approved by TCPUD and/or MCWC will ensure sufficient water to meet peak demand in the Project area. The preparation of X to identify the quantity and source of potable and non-potable water to serve the Project must demonstrate that water source(s) are adequate and meet State and Federal requirements for quality and quantity.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</p> <p>Public Water Supply. A revised HMR Water Supply Assessment (NCE 2011) was prepared for the Project area and is attached in Appendix AA-1. The demand of the Alternative 1A on TCPUD and MCWC public water supplies are referenced to Impact PSU-1 in Chapter 16, Public Services and Utilities of the EIR/EIS, which analyzes the potential effects of the Project on the ability of the water purveyors (i.e. TCPUD and MCWC) to meet the public water supply needs</p> <p>Table 16-3 of the EIR/EIS presents estimated domestic and snowmaking demand rounded to the nearest acre-foot/year. Estimated annual domestic water demand for residential, commercial, and irrigation uses for Alternative 1A is 64 acre-feet/year (see Table 16-3 for water demand presented in million gallons/year). Snowmaking is estimated to require up to 187 acre-feet/year under Alternative 1A.</p> <p>Snowmaking. Snowmaking is proposed as a programmatic-level project component and will require further environmental review prior to project conditioning and/or approvals. The EIR/EIS includes preliminary analysis, which presents a worst-case scenario for snowmaking water demand and presents quantities in units of acre-feet/year to comparison with allocations under TROA. Build out of the Project area under Alternative 1A will increase the use of surface water and groundwater for snowmaking from a current annual use of 43.6 acre-feet/year to cover 23.8 acres of ski trail to up to 187 acre-feet/year to cover 102.3 acres of ski trail (SnowMakers Inc. 2010).</p> <p>Based on the information provided in the HMR Water Supply Assessment (Nichols 2011) and the Snowmaking Planning document (Snowmakers 2010) and the HMR Ski Area Master Plan (JMA 2011) the impacts of expanding snowmaking operations on domestic water supplies of TCPUD and MCWC service districts are less than significant. Existing TCPUD and</p>

196

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>MCWC water supplies can adequately serve the existing Project area water demand and future projected water demand for the service areas through 2030. The Project will be responsible for water system connections, improvements to distribution systems, and on-site storage systems for the Project area. However, because there is a possibility that public water supply will be needed to supplement future snowmaking demand under a worst-case scenario and there is uncertainty associated with forthcoming TROA allocations and the reporting requirements for water supply diverted for snowmaking use, the impact is potentially significant based on the evaluation criteria for HYDRO-5. Mitigation Measure HYDRO-5 will reduce potential impacts to public water supply from waters diverted for use in snowmaking to a level of less than significant by assuring meters are installed to monitor the monthly pumping and usage from individual wells, allowing for accurate reporting of application or use that is anticipated.</p> <p>Irrigation. Landscaping proposed for the Project area has been designed to reduce total irrigation demand through the use of low-water use vegetation and incorporation of LID measures such as cisterns for storage of roof runoff and bioretention areas for stormwater treatment. For Alternative 1A the total maximum irrigation demand for the Project area is estimated at 10.8 acre-feet/year or X MGY based on calculations presented in Appendix CC. Once landscaping has been established this irrigation demand is expected to decrease substantially. Irrigation demand could decrease under Alternative 1A depending on the ratio of landscaping area to bioretention area associated with each chalet. Given that TCPUD's existing McKinney/Quail supply system is inadequate to meet current peak demands during the summer and must be supplemented by interim intake from Lake Tahoe, the use of potable water for irrigation during summer months poses a potentially significant impact to public water supplies.</p> <p>Explanation: Implementation of mitigation measures HYDRO-5, HYDRO-3c, and PSU-1a will assure compliance with the forthcoming TROA regulations for the State of California allocations. The payment of connection and service fees approved by TCPUD and/or MCWC will ensure sufficient water to meet peak demand in the Project area. The preparation of a Water System Engineering Report to identify the quantity and source of potable and non-potable water to serve the Project must demonstrate that water source(s) are adequate and meet State and Federal requirements for quality and quantity.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-122 through 15-127; Mater Responses 18 and 21; Responses to Comments 14a-28, 14a-34, 19-12, and 265-3.)</p>
HYDRO-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to water resources?	No additional mitigation is required.	LS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002;

197

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>The geographic context for this cumulative analysis is the Homewood, California watersheds, which are tributary to Lake Tahoe through Madden, Homewood and Quail Lake Creeks and stormwater flows through Caltrans and Placer County roadways and neighborhood drainage systems. The EIR/EIS analysis considers current and foreseeable development in the entirety of the Project area watersheds and evaluates whether the Project, together with the potential effects of cumulative development, will result in a significant impact that will remain and potentially increase over time, and if so, whether the contributions of the Project will be considerable. Both conditions must apply in order for the Project's cumulative impacts to rise to the level of significant.</p> <p>Construction of the Project, other projects in the Homewood, California watersheds and projects in the western and northwestern portions of Lake Tahoe could occur concurrently and has the potential to disturb soils and create unstable slopes, which could result in sedimentation and erosion or otherwise mobilize pollutants. Excavations associated with future projects could intercept the water table and introduce pollutants into groundwater sources. The operations of future projects could increase long-term pollutant loads in urban and upland runoff. Increased impervious areas or changes in land use associated with future projects could alter drainage patterns and increase the likelihood of flooding. Combined water demands associated with future development and permissible uses could impact public water supplies.</p> <p>No significant project-level impacts to hydrology or surface water or groundwater resources from construction or long-term operation of the Project are identified that would persist after implementation of compliance measures, Placer County standard mitigation measures and impact specific mitigation measures. At present, there are no other known projects in the Madden, Homewood, and Quail Lake Creek watersheds or Intervening Zone 7000 with direct or indirect impacts to water resources with the exception of roadway improvement projects in planning by Placer County and Caltrans.</p>			<p>CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)</p>

198

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Improvement upon existing channel conditions, surface water quality and stormwater quality will result from implementation of the Project, and as such, potential incremental effects will not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to hydrology and water resources. Cumulatively the Project is expected to provide direct beneficial effects to beneficial uses and surface water quality in the Homewood, California area through reductions in impervious surfaces and resultant runoff quantity and the active treatment of stormwater prior to infiltration to groundwater. Other benefits of the Project include: participation in the Placer County-Homewood Mountain Resort WQIP, reduced effects from surface parking and snowmelt from parking lots, landscaping with goals of water conservation and bioretention for stormwater treatment, along with indirect effects from improved site management that reduces airborne contaminants.</p> <p>Land use changes will occur both inside and outside of the Project area in each of the four watersheds. Four actions are assumed to occur outside of the Project area and these actions are incorporated into Alternative 1A. The land coverage changes within the Project area are detailed in Chapter 14, Geology, Soils and Seismicity. The four actions assumed for outside of the Project area include: new homes will be built, existing homes will have water quality BMP retrofits (BMP), existing commercial buildings will have water quality BMP retrofits, and environmental improvement projects will be completed by Placer County and Caltrans. Land coverage will be reduced under the Alternative 1A.</p> <p>The HMR CWE analysis modeled proposed reductions in existing land coverage to result in decreases in sediment yield from the Madden Creek, Homewood Creek and Quail Lake Creek watersheds and Intervening Zone 7000. Figure 15-17 of the EIR/EIS illustrates the sediment yields for whole watersheds as compared to the Total Watershed TOCs. As displayed in Figure 15-17, Alternative 1A will reduce Total Watershed sediment yields from the four watersheds as compared to existing conditions. As compared to the Total Watershed TOCs, sediment yields modeled for conditions of the</p>			

199

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Alternative 1A will not exceed Total Watershed TOCs for Madden Creek, Homewood Creek or Quail Lake Creek watersheds and Intervening Zone 7000, noting that the modeled sediment yield in Intervening Zone 7000 approaches the TOC and is within the expected range of error for the HMR CWE analysis. The development and redevelopment actions defined by the Alternative 1A could reduce combined sediment yields to Lake Tahoe by approximately 69 T/yr for cumulatively beneficial effects to surface water quality and beneficial uses.</p> <p>As further explained in Appendix W, the HMR CWE analysis also modeled the range of proposed conditions that would be reflected under build-out of maximum allowable base land coverage as permitted under a Bailey Classification System revised by the 2007 Soil Survey (NRCS 2007). Exceedance of the TOC for Intervening Zone 7000 is not measured under forthcoming TRPA allowable base land coverage limitations.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts to water resources are measured at a level of less than significant. Based on proposed phasing, future projects will be implemented over a number of years, minimizing the possibility for overlapping effects. Other projects in the Homewood, California watersheds and the Lake Tahoe Basin will be subject to similar programmatic requirements (TRPA and NPDES permit regulations, SWPPPs, regional and community stormwater treatment initiatives, pre- and post-project water quality and BMP effectiveness monitoring) and performance standards (revegetation success criteria, TMDL load reductions and stormwater treatment performance and BMP effectiveness) and thereby avoid, reduce and minimize the potential for cumulative adverse impacts. Mitigation measure HYDRO-1a requires post-project monitoring of BMP effectiveness, revegetation success and storm water treatment system performance. Should monitoring results measure impacts to surface or ground water resources from the Project, remedial actions have been identified to avoid, reduce or further mitigate incremental contributions to cumulative effects. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 15-128 through 15-132;</p>			

200

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Mater Responses 18 and 21; Responses to Comment 11-20.)</p>			
PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES			
<p>PSU-1. Will the Project increase demand or exacerbate peak period service demand of fire, law enforcement, schools, government services, water, sewage treatment and disposal, communication systems, solid waste, gas, or electric to such a degree that service standards and objectives cannot be maintained or new facilities are needed that could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p>Water Supply. Alternative 1A is expected to increase demand for domestic and raw water. The TCPUD water supply system infrastructure operates at capacity for its existing customers and does not have additional capacity available to serve the proposed South Base Area of Alternative 1A. TCPUD plans to construct a new WTP to replace the existing temporary WTP in this area.</p> <p>Calculations conducted for the MCWC indicate that MCWC facilities have water supply to serve the proposed HMR North Base area domestic water needs, but that some offsite improvements may be required to meet higher fire flows associated with the new development. The adequacy of fire flow and water storage tanks is not known, and would not be known, until the design review stage of the project. Therefore, impacts to fire flow are considered a significant impact.</p> <p>Current rate of flow is not sufficient to meet peak demand for snowmaking Alternative 1A. HMR and the TCPUD McKinney-Quail Water Service Area would require upgraded extraction, pumping, treatment, conveyance, and storage capacity to serve the total new snowmaking demand for the Project area. This is considered a significant impact on water supply and mitigation is required.</p> <p>Wastewater Treatment. Implementation of Alternative 1A includes the construction of new residences and affordable/employee housing units, and improved winter sports, recreational</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure PSU-1a: Water Supply Assessment and Infrastructure.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall obtain approval from the Placer County LAFCO for any service area adjustments required to provide water for the Project prior to the approval of Improvement Plans and the first Final Map recordation for any portion of the Project requiring water supply from the TCPUD, whichever occurs first. Because a water supplier has not been selected, details regarding water supply engineering will be determined at the time the supplier is identified. The Project Applicant shall provide a detailed Water System Engineering Report approved by the selected water supplier (TCPUD and/or MCWC) for any portion of the Project requiring water supply from the TCPUD and/or MCWC prior to approval of Improvement Plans for any portion of the HMR MP Phase 1 development. The Report shall be prepared by a California Registered Civil Engineer and describe the necessary infrastructure required by the selected water provider to meet the Proposed Project's domestic, fire protection, and snow making water demands. The report shall include specific on-site distribution system design calculations and demonstrate that peak, maximum, and average demands as well as flow rate, pressure, and duration requirements will meet Placer County, TPRA and other relevant standards. The Project Applicant shall obtain a "will-serve" letter from the selected water provider(s) prior to the approval of Improvement Plans and the first Final Map recordation for any portion of the Project.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall incorporate into their project designs fire flow requirements based on the California Fire Code and other applicable requirements based on TRPA and Placer County fire prevention standards.</p> <p>TCPUD off-site water system infrastructure improvements identified by the above Report shall be designed, permitted, and constructed prior to occupancy of any portion of the Project necessitating the improvement. The Project</p>	<p>S LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure PSU-1a, PSU-1b, and PSU-1c, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring HMR to demonstrate and pay fees to reduce impacts to water supply, solid waste disposal, and police services. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:</p> <p>Water Supply. Comments suggest that the draft Water Supply Assessment (WSA) (Nichols Consulting Engineers 2010) circulated with the DEIR/EIS does not comply with CEQA or TRPA requirements. Senate Bill (SB) 610 (Water Code, §§ 10910-10915) requires that when a proposed development is subject to CEQA, and is a "project" within the meaning of SB 610, a WSA is required. Although the proposed Project may not qualify as a "project" within the meaning SB 610 (Water Code § 10912), a final WSA for the Project that comports with the requirements of SB 610 was prepared in response to comments on the adequacy of the water supply information in the DEIR/EIS. As noted above, this Final WSA is included as Appendix AA to the FEIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Final WSA updates the analysis included in the draft WSA to include information from Tahoe City Public Utility District's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which TCPUD adopted after the release of the DEIR/EIS. The Final WSA also updates information regarding Madden Creek Water Company (MCWC) water supplies and Project water demands, based on consultation with TCPUD and MCWD. Lastly, the Final WSA adds a discussion of snowmaking supplies and demands and an appendix discussing fire flows. The County and TPRA will consider the WSA in determining whether to approve the proposed Project.</p> <p>In addition to the WSA, the DEIR/EIS analyzed the Project's impacts on water resources and the adequacy of the proposed water supply and infrastructure to serve the Project (Draft EIR/EIS, Chapter 15.0 "Hydrology, Water Rights, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater"; Chapter 16.0, "Public Services and Utilities"). The FEIR/EIS updates the DEIR/EIS's analysis based on the revisions to the Final WSA and in response to comments on the DEIR/EIS.</p>

102

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>and commercial facilities. Wastewater quantities generated by Alternative 1A are expected to be similar to the demand for domestic water (Beaudin Ganze Consulting Engineers, Inc. 2007). Alternative 1A require up to 70,431 gallons per day of domestic water, and are expected to generate up to that volume during peak use periods (Beaudin Ganze Consulting Engineers, Inc. 2007).</p> <p>TCPUD's and TTSA's existing wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities are considered adequate to accept wastewater from the Alternative 1A (Laloties 2009, Parker 2010). TTSA facilities are currently operating with about 20% available excess capacity. The TRI has a design capacity of 6.0 million gallons per day, and current excess capacity in the pipeline is 1.2 million gallons per day. The TTSA Water Reclamation Plant has a treatment capacity of 9.6 million gallons per day, and currently has an excess capacity of 1.92 million gallons per day. On peak demand days, Project wastewater may occupy up to 6% of available excess capacity in the TTSA conveyance and treatment systems. Excess capacities in the TRI and at the water reclamation plant are available on a first come/first serve basis.</p> <p>TCPUD requires a detailed domestic sewer study engineering report prepared by a registered civil engineer prior to Project approval. However, according to TCPUD, it is anticipated that the proposed development will connect directly to the District's West Shore Export (WSE) sewer facility. The WSE has greater than sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed project since the sewer collection and export systems were originally designed to serve a much larger population than presently exists. At this time, the District does not have any future projects planned for the WSE for which HMR would be responsible (Homolka, 12/15/10). TCPUD adopted water and sewer connection fees (Ordinance 259a) and user and service fees (Ordinance 295b) fees will apply to the Project. In addition to paying these fees, HMR will install the connections from the Project area to the TCPUD wastewater main in accordance with the District's standards, rules, and regulations.</p>	<p>Applicant shall be responsible to reimburse the TCPUD for all costs associated with the improvement.</p> <p>The identified WTP, or alternative water source solution shall be completed prior to occupancy of any portion of the Project requiring water supply from TCPUD. The Project Applicant shall be responsible to reimburse the TCPUD for their fair-share contribution to the water supply project as determined by the TCPUD.</p> <p>The Project may obtain water from a combination of TCPUD, MCWC, and on-site groundwater wells and surface water. With the water supply source identified, the Project Applicant shall determine the location and designs of infrastructure necessary to meet peak demand and overall quantity in the Project area for domestic use, fire flows, and snowmaking. If additional onsite or offsite facilities are required for snowmaking operations (e.g., facilities not included in the proposed HMR MP), then snowmaking operations will be managed to utilize available water resources until additional studies, if necessary, are completed and approved.</p> <p>The Project Applicant will be responsible for construction of infrastructure to connect to the established water system and to provide for the increased water demand of the Project. TCPUD assesses a single charge to buy into the system and fees are charged monthly for water usage based on consumption. Connection fees, however, do not accommodate additional development of the magnitude of the Proposed Project. The Project Applicant will be responsible to enter into a development agreement with TCPUD and pay costs related to onsite infrastructure and the fair share of off-site infrastructure. The Project Applicant will be required to pay the connection fee and for the construction of additional infrastructure to supply the Project with user fees charged upon connection for water usage.</p> <p>MCWC has similar requirements for connection and service fees, and the applicant will be required to construct the appropriate infrastructure to utilize MCWC water supply (Marr 2009). During the design phase of new water supply infrastructure, the lead and responsible agencies will determine if additional environmental review</p>		<p>Master Response, MR-21, provides an overview of the Project's water supply, updates the information presented in the DEIR/EIS where necessary, and provides additional background that was not available at the time the DEIR/EIS was prepared. Mitigation Measure PSU-1a has also been revised based on the Final WSA, Water Supply Overview. The Project's South Base area is within the service area of the TCPUD, specifically the TCPUD McKinney/Quail Sub-district; the North Base area is within the service area of the privately operated MCWC; the Mid-Mountain area and parcel APN 097-060-035 are currently outside of any water service area and inclusion of these areas into either the TCPUD or MCWC service area through TCPUD Board and/or MCWC approval would be required. Because no single water system serves the Project area, the information contained in the Final WSA was prepared in consultation with both TCPUD and MCWC.</p> <p>As reflected in the Final WSA, approximately 20.1 million gallons per year (MGY) of water will be required to meet the Project's residential, commercial and irrigation water demands at build-out, including fire flow. A total of 60.8 MGY will be required to meet Project snowmaking demands, for both existing and proposed terrain. Although the Project is proposed to be developed in phases, the Final WSA conservatively assumes 20.1 MGY for consumptive and irrigation demands and 60.8 MGY for snowmaking demands would be required to meet the Project's near-term (i.e., opening day) demands.</p> <p>To meet the Project's residential, commercial and irrigation water demands, the Final WSA presented two water supply alternatives. Snowmaking demands would be met identically under either water supply alternative. Under Water Supply Alternative 1 ("Alternative 1"), the Project's residential, commercial and irrigation water demands would be met exclusively with TCPUD supplies. Annexation into the TCPUD service area or TCPUD approval of a contract for water service outside its boundaries would be required for TCPUD to serve the North Base, Mid-Mountain area, and APN 097-060-035 under Alternative 1. Under Water Supply Alternative 2 ("Alternative 2"), MCWC would provide water to the North Base, as true under existing conditions. TCPUD would provide water to the South Base, APN 097-060-035 and the Mid-Mountain. Annexation or TCPUD approval of a contract for water service outside its boundaries would be required for TCPUD to serve APN 097-060-035 and the Mid-Mountain area under Alternative 2.</p> <p>Under either water supply alternative, existing and proposed snowmaking demands at Homewood would be met through the TCPUD McKinney Well No. 1 and the HMR-owned well in the North Base.</p> <p>The Final WSA concludes that with implementation of water</p>

207

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>TCPUD and the TTSA finance facility improvements and expansions through connection charges, service charges, and tax revenue. Developers are assessed connection charges, based on the number of new residential units and other uses, at the time development occurs. The TTSA Connection Fee Schedule (TTSA 2010) is based on the quantity of wastewater that would be generated by type of dwelling unit or commercial use.</p> <p>Due to existing available capacity in the wastewater conveyance and treatment system, and the fee schedules in place designed to recover agency costs to upgrade and maintain systems, the impact of Alternative 1A on the wastewater system is considered less than significant.</p> <p>Solid Waste Disposal. <u>Construction and Demolition Waste.</u> Due to the expected highly variable rates of generation of demolition and construction waste that would be dependent on the type and schedule of activities, demolition and construction may periodically overwhelm TTSD capacity to transport, sort, and handle solid waste. Consequently, the generation of demolition and construction waste is considered a significant impact, and mitigation is required.</p> <p><u>Operational Solid Waste.</u> Due to the seasonal nature of activities at HMR, solid waste generation during operation is presented for both peak days and an annual total. For planning and environmental analysis, Placer County assumes new dwelling units would be occupied by 2.6 persons, and each person generates seven pounds of trash per day. For peak daily demand, the calculations assume 2.6 persons occupy each tourist accommodation unit and dwelling unit (Placer County 2010). For annual waste generation, the calculations assume that 2.0 persons occupy each tourist accommodation unit and 2.6 persons occupy half of the residential dwelling unit. Table 16-5 presents estimates of solid waste generated by the Proposed Project and Alternatives.</p> <p>Alternative 1A will generate between 5,988 to 291 pounds per day if fully occupied. This represents a maximum of 0.37% of the TTSD's</p>	<p>will be required for the construction and operation of any facilities potentially required for HMR MP Phase 2 development (e.g., South Base area fire flows) or whether covered by the environmental analysis included in this EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure PSU-1b: Coordination of Construction Waste Disposal with ERSL</p> <p>To reduce impacts to the existing solid waste handling capacity, the Project Applicant shall coordinate with the Eastern Regional Sanitary Landfill, Inc. (ERSL) to ensure that sufficient capacity to handle demolition and construction waste is available. Coordinating waste volume with handling capacity during demolition and construction will reduce impacts to solid waste services to less than significant.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure PSU-1c: Payment of Development Impact Fee to Placer County Sheriff's Department.</p> <p>Based on the Alternative selected, the Project Applicant shall consult with the PCSD to develop an appropriate fair share development impact fee to offset the cost of 1.0 FTE PCSD sheriff deputy per 1,000 new residents. Payment of the impact fee is expected to go towards upgrading equipment or facilities, increasing staff, or otherwise improving response times in the Project vicinity.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 16-29 through 16-31.)</p>		<p>treatment and infrastructure to provide additional TCPUD surface water to the McKinney/Quail sub-district and to the Project area, in combination with groundwater supplies, there is a reasonable likelihood that sufficient water will be available to meet Project and existing and planned future water demands in normal, dry, and multiple dry years through 2030. This conclusion is based on the following facts:</p> <p><u>Alternative 1:</u> Based on the supply projections included in TCPUD's 2010 UWMP (UWMP Table 4.1), within the McKinney/Quail Sub-district, TCPUD projects a supply of 35 MGY of Lake Tahoe surface water in normal, dry and multiple dry years through 2030 and a supply of 26 MGY of groundwater in normal, dry and multiple dry years through 2030 (WSA, Table 19). The 35 MGY of Lake Tahoe surface water would be made available to TCPUD through TCPUD's planned new intake (replacing existing abandoned intakes) and a new water treatment plant (TCPUD, 2011 [TCPUD 2010 UWMP, § 4.1]). The new intake and water treatment plant are included in TCPUD's five-year Capital Improvement Program (Final WSA, Appendix D). As shown in Table 19 of the Final WSA, when added to existing and planned demand within the McKinney/Quail Sub-district, the Project would create a deficit of 18.8 MGY in 2015, 19.6 MGY in 2020, 20.4 MGY in 2025 and 21.2MGY in 2030.</p> <p>The water supply deficit shown in Final WSA Table 19 is not based on lack of sufficient TCPUD water to meet water demands, including the proposed Project's water demands; instead, the deficit is the result of insufficient planned capacity for the proposed TCPUD McKinney/Quail WTP (Nichols Consulting Engineers, 2011). As explained in the Final WSA and based on communications with TCPUD (see Homolka 2010), TCPUD intends to modify its plans for its proposed McKinney/Quail WTP in order to accommodate the proposed Project. TCPUD is currently investigating two alternatives for the WTP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use TCPUD's existing Chamber's Landing lake intake and build a new WTP facility at one of two potential locations. This alternative could also involve approximately 1,200 feet of raw water pipe from the existing Chamber's Landing intake to the new WTP facility, as well as connections to the existing distribution system. 2. Retrofit and use TCPUD's existing lake intake at the McKinney Shores Homeowners Beach and build a new WTP facility at Homewood Mountain Resort's (HMR) South Lodge area. This alternative could also involve approximately 2,400 feet of raw water pipe from the lake intake to the new WTP facility, as well as connections to the existing distribution system. <p>(Final WSA, p. 23, citing Homolka, 2010)</p> <p>The offsite water treatment plant and raw water supply infrastructure improvements that may be required for the Project will be addressed through a separate environmental documentation and review process administered by TCPUD. The new WTP would be sized for TCPUD's domestic water needs</p>

203

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>daily capacity to manage solid waste stream, and up to 1.4% of the current waste handled by the TTSD. On an annual basis, up to 788 tons of solid waste would be generated, representing a 1.25% increase over the current quantity. The annual quantity is considered a conservative estimate by assuming tourist accommodation units are fully-occupied. Existing waste handling systems and landfills have sufficient capacity to handle and dispose of new waste generated by Alternative 1A. The quantity of waste is not expected to shorten the lifespan of existing landfills or induce the need to construct new or expand existing waste disposal facilities. Consequently, this is considered a less than significant impact on solid waste services.</p> <p>On-site solid waste receptacles will be bear-resistant per Placer County Ordinance 8.16.266. TTSD fees for service are based on the number of waste bins used at the Project area.</p> <p>Construction waste would include materials that are not recycled during demolition of existing structures. Excavated materials are proposed for offsite disposal at facilities that will accept clean fill material. It is also possible that excavated material would be used onsite as part of on mountain restoration activities or within the west shore area by restoration agencies (e.g., California Tahoe Conservancy). Construction wastes would be generated in the initial phases of construction and would not occur over long-term operation of the Project or Alternatives.</p> <p>Energy (Gas and Electricity). HMR facilities will be required to comply with Title 24 of the CCR. Under Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines, the State of California sets forth goals for energy conservation, including decreasing per capita energy consumption and reliance on fossil fuels, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. Alternative 1A includes additional energy conservation measures as part of the LEED certification process at the North Base area, which requires a decrease in energy use by more than 50% per guest compared to standard construction and operation of similar facilities. The design will include solar energy us to augment</p>			<p>(constructed at TCPUD's expense) and the proposed Project's domestic needs (paid for by HMR). It is likely the facility would be sized to include some amount of regional expansion capacity to serve adjacent water companies, which would be constructed at TCPUD's expense. The new WTP is anticipated to be constructed in 2013, prior to project operations. With the new WTP in place, sufficient TCPUD water supply would be available to meet TCPUD's water demands within the McKinney/Quail Sub-district, including the proposed Project's water demands (WSA, p. 23).</p> <p><u>Alternative 2:</u> Under Alternative 2, MCWC has sufficient water supplies to meet existing and planned future water demands within its service area, including the proposed Project's water demands for the North Base area. With respect to the South Base (including APN 096-060-022 and the Mid-Mountain area), with inclusion of the proposed Project, TCPUD would experience a deficit of 5.0 MGY in 2015, 5.8 MGY in 2020, 6.6 MGY in 2025, and 7.4 MGY in 2030 (Final WSA, Table 21). This deficit is associated with insufficient planned water treatment facility capacity, rather than with inadequate water supplies. For the same reasons discussed under Alternative 1 above, this deficit would be addressed through TCPUD's new McKinney/Quail WTP. With the new WTP, TCPUD would have sufficient supplies to meet its existing and planned water demands in normal, dry and multiple dry years through 2030, including the proposed Project's demands (Final WSA, pp. 23-24).</p> <p><u>Snowmaking:</u> Existing and proposed snowmaking operations at the HMR site are anticipated to require 60.8 MGY. The TCPUD McKinney Well No. 1 and the HMR can supply a total of 140.76 MGY (60.6 MGY from HMR well and 78.2 MGY from McKinney Well No. 1), which is more than sufficient to meet the existing and proposed snowmaking demands of 60.8 MGY. A portion of the water used for snowmaking would be recharged into the aquifer along with natural snow (Final WSA, p. 22).</p> <p>Placer County recognizes that there is a degree of uncertainty with respect to TCPUD's water supply as a result of the Truckee River Operating Agreement (TROA). Section 204 of the Truckee-Carson-Pyramid Lake Water Rights Settlement Act (Title II of Public Law 101-618) ("Settlement Act") limits California water diversions in the Lake Tahoe Basin to 23,000 acre-feet per year. Section 205 of the Settlement Act requires the development of an operating agreement for the Truckee River reservoirs, including Lake Tahoe. This operating agreement is referred to as the "TROA." All signatory parties signed the TROA in September 2008; however, there are a number of additional actions that must take place in order for the TROA to enter into effect and be implemented. These actions include resolution of ongoing litigation brought by the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District in the United States District Court challenging the regulation adopting the TROA and the Final Environmental Impact Statement certified</p>

808

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>electrical demand and water heating. The buildings will include high efficiency insulation, windows, appliances, and building materials.</p> <p>Residential, commercial, and recreational electricity consumption was estimated using a variety of resources and methodologies. In 2007, Beaudin Ganze Inc. completed a natural gas and electric energy use estimates for Alternative 1A (Beaudin Ganze Inc. 2007). This data was therefore estimated from 2007 average consumptive data for residential and commercial customers in California (Dillard pers. comm; Energy Information Association 2009a, 2009b, and 2009c).</p> <p>The Project would receive electricity generated by NV Energy. Electricity consumption for Alternative 1A would be approximately 44,593,658 kilowatt-hours per year (Beaudin Ganze Inc. 2007), which is minor in relation to the total amount of energy supplied by NV Energy in its service area. NV Energy has a peak load of 7,152 MW. HMR currently consumes approximately 1,372,000 kilowatt-hours per year (Tirman pers. comm. [B]). Alternative 1A will increase electrical demand in the Project area by up to 16 MW and annual usage by 43,374,000 kilowatt-hours (Beaudin Ganze Consulting Engineers, Inc. 2007).</p> <p>The Tahoe City Substation on West Lake Boulevard supplies electricity to the Project area. The Tahoe City substation is nearing its maximum load capacity, and large additional loads will require an upgrade of the facility (Hutton 2009). Alternative 1A may hasten the need to upgrade the Tahoe City Substation. NV Energy establishes service connection and usage fees such that users pay their proportional fair share of anticipated capital improvements and expected maintenance.</p> <p>Aboveground electrical transmission lines serve the Project area. Alternative 1A includes a new underground distribution system with aboveground pad-mounted transformers, and eight miles of belowground lines to serve the snowmaking system. Off-site, new cables will be needed to provide electrical service to the site from existing transmission lines. The ultimate configuration would be approved by NV Energy in accordance with California Public</p>			<p>for the TROA; modifications to the Orr Ditch Decree; modifications to the Truckee River General Electric Decree; and petitions for changes of water rights.</p> <p>As noted in the EIR/EIS, the Settlement Act allocates 23,000 AFY diversions from the Lake Tahoe Basin to the State of California. This allocation is for use within the Lake Tahoe Basin from all natural sources, including both direct diversions from Lake Tahoe and groundwater. Other than the TCPUD, the major water purveyors on the California side of Lake Tahoe include the South Tahoe Public Utility District and the North Tahoe Public Utility District. TCPUD will be required to conform to the TROA when it is finalized. The portion to be allocated to TCPUD has not been finalized, so an exact quantification of available future supply is not possible at this time (TCPUD, 2010 UWMP, § 4.8; DEIR/EIS, pp. 16-7, 1-15). Based on its existing water rights, however, TCPUD anticipates sufficient water supply will be available to meet future demands within its service area through 2030, including those of the proposed Project (Final WSA, pp. 23-23).</p> <p>In addition to the uncertainty created by the TROA, the fact that TCPUD has not yet approved and constructed the WTP needed to serve the McKinney/Quail Sub-district, including the proposed Project, creates a degree of uncertainty. Because the WTP is part of the TCPUD's five-year Capital Improvement Program and TCPUD has indicated a willingness to construct the WTP in a manner to serve the proposed Project, in addition to its existing and other planned future users, Placer County concludes there is a reasonable certainty the WTP will be constructed and will have sufficient capacity to meet the proposed Project's demands under either water supply alternative.</p> <p>Thus, for the reasons described herein and in the Final WSA, Placer County find there is a reasonable likelihood that sufficient water will be available to meet proposed Project water demands in the short-term and long-term under varying water year conditions.</p> <p>Although Placer County and TPRA believe there is a reasonable certainty the proposed Project's water demands can be met under the water supply alternatives discussed above, an alternative water supply to meet the Project's build-out water demands could be made available through the MCWC supplies. Under this alternative supply, MCWC would meet all the proposed Project's non-snowmaking demands. Snowmaking demands would be met in the same manner discussed above. As shown in Table 20 of the Final WSA, MCWC would have a surplus of 84.1 MGY if it were to meet the proposed Project's North Base demand of 13.9 MGY (as proposed by Water Supply Alternative 2). Adding the South Base demand (including APN 097-060-035 and the Mid-Mountain area) of 6.3 MGY to that amount would still result in a surplus of 77.8 MGY of MCWC water supplies in normal, dry, and multiple dry years through 2030.</p>

205

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Utilities Commission (CPUC) Decision 95-08-038 for the installation or upgrading of electric facilities. Belowground transmission lines will not result in additional physical disturbances beyond that currently anticipated for the Project.</p> <p>Alternative 1A is expected to demand up to 154,000 Btus (British thermal units) per hour, with an annual demand of 1,064,000 therms (one therm equals 100,000 British thermal units) (Beaudin Ganze Consulting Engineers, Inc. 2007). Annual natural gas usage for existing conditions (No Project [Alternative 2]) was provided by JMA Ventures, LLC and estimated at 11,000 therms (Tirman pers. comm. [B]).</p> <p>Underground gas service will be extended to serve new structures. HMR will coordinate with Southwest Gas Corporation for the extension of on-site and off-site infrastructure with the ultimate configuration to be approved by Southwest Gas Corporation. New infrastructure will be installed in utility rights-of-way on-site. Extension of these facilities will not require upgrades to the Southwest Gas Corporation transmission system that are not currently planned for, nor will additional physical disturbances result beyond that currently anticipated. As part of the Project approval process, HMR will coordinate with and meet the requirements of Southwest Gas Corporation regarding the extension and locations of on-site infrastructure. HMR is required to pay for necessary natural gas infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Electrical and gas utility improvements and new easements on site will be identified in the final Project design and are required to comply with Placer County, NV Energy, of Southwest Gas Corporation, CPUC, and California Building Code requirements, and are expected to be sufficient to serve the Project area. New line extensions and facility construction to serve the site will occur concurrently with development phases. Off-site distribution systems and supply sources are considered adequate to serve the expected increased demand of the Project. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p> <p>Public Schools. Alternative 1A is anticipated</p>			<p>In order to effectuate this MCWC water supply alternative, the South Base would need to be taken out of the TCPUD service area and that area, along with APN 097-060-035 and the Mid-Mountain area, would need to be added to MCWC's service through an application to the Placer County LAFCO as well as an amendment to HMR's existing contract with MCWC. Additional water distribution facilities would be needed to transmit MCWC water to the South Base, APN 096-060-035 and the Mid-Mountain area. Upgrades to MCWC's existing well could also be required. Upgrades and distribution infrastructure, if needed, would be addressed through environmental documentation prepared by MCWC. Compliance with regulatory requirements would ensure that well upgrades, if needed, would not result in adverse environmental effects. Because the Lahontan Groundwater basin is not in overdraft, this alternative would not be expected to result in adverse impacts to groundwater supplies as addressed in the Final WSA. Mitigation measures for construction related impacts required for the proposed Project would be applied to the construction of the distribution lines needed to implement this alternative and impacts would be similar to those of the infrastructure currently proposed for the Project.</p> <p><u>Water Supply Infrastructure.</u> Under both water supply alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS, additional TCPUD water supply infrastructure (WTP) is necessary to meet TCPUD's existing and planned future water demands. This is true with or without the proposed Project; however, with the proposed Project the McKinney/Quail WTP would need to have greater capacity. TCPUD is the lead agency for the proposed intake and WTP. In order to serve TCPUD demand in 2030, including the Proposed Project, a new WTP, located on approximately 0.25 to 0.5 acre of TCPUD easement, would be constructed. According to TCPUD (Homolka, September 2011), the WTP structure would measure approximately 40 feet by 60 feet and would include a small number of parking spaces for employees. Approvals or consultation required for the intake and WTP could also include a United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Section 404/10 permit, Department of Health Services (DHS) Water Supply Permit, encroachment permits (e.g., from Caltrans, Reclamation Board, Placer County), Improvement/Grading Plans, a Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board National Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and consultation with TRPA, Placer County, and Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.</p> <p>In addition to the intake and WTP proposed by TCPUD, water infrastructure would be required as part of the proposed Project for delivering domestic water from the WTP and the TCPUD/MCWC wells to the Project area. This delivery infrastructure would most likely include underground pipes within existing public road easements. Mitigation measures and BMPs included in the EIR/EIS to address the Project's construction</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

206

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>to add new students to Tahoe Lake Elementary School, Tahoe Middle School, and North Lake Tahoe High School. TTUSD calculates potential students by utilizing the Student Yield Rates from its 2006 Developer Fee Justification Study (TTUSD 2006). To estimate the maximum potential number of students associated with the Project, it is assumed that residential and worker units are 100% occupied during the school year. In actuality, at least 50% of new residential units are expected to be second homes, yielding fewer students than estimated in this impact analysis. The potential maximum number of K-12 students and potential impacts on existing school capacity is as shown in Table 16-6 of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>There is currently sufficient excess capacity in the TTUSD system to accommodate new students generated by Alternative 1A. Long-term enrollment patterns are difficult to predict, but the TTUSD does not anticipate demographic shifts in the district that would bring substantial new students to area schools. No new facilities will be needed and the Project is not expected to adversely affect school resources.</p> <p>Projects are required to pay the State-mandated school impact fees to TTUSD for new residential and commercial construction in the district boundaries. The fees mitigate impacts of new development and can only be used for capital outlay expenses related to development (e.g., new construction, reconstruction, portable classrooms, etc.). Under SB 50, payment of the school impact fee is considered full and adequate mitigation under CEQA (Government Code §65996). Section 65996 does not provide for remediation of existing deficiencies in school services.</p> <p>Alternative 1A would be required to pay the school impact fee at the time of construction. The current rates for the 2009-2010 school year are \$2.63 per square foot of new residential construction, and \$0.42 per square foot for new commercial or industrial uses. With payment of the State-mandated school impact fees to mitigate potential adverse impacts on schools, this impact is considered less than significant.</p> <p>Fire Protection Services. Alternative 1A</p>			<p>impacts would be applied to the construction of the water delivery system to ensure impacts are reduced to less than significant levels. For the infrastructure required to meet the proposed Project's snowmaking demands, further environmental analysis will be performed at a future date since this project component has been addressed in the EIR/EIS at a programmatic level only.</p> <p>Annexation into TCPUD Service Area/TCPUD Approval of Contract for Water Service Outside TCPUD Boundaries. As noted, under either of the two Water Supply Alternatives presented in the WSA, a portion of the Project area as well as other HMR parcels between the Mid-Mountain and North and South Base would need to be annexed into TCPUD's Service Area or the TCPUD would need to approve of water service outside its boundaries (see TCPUD Water Ordinance No. 263, § 2.12 ["Water service outside District boundaries may be provided by contract only at the discretion of the District"]). The Project Applicant is currently in discussions with TCPUD regarding how best to proceed in order for TCPUD to supply water to the Project area other than the South Base currently within the TCPUD service area (i.e., the North Base, Mid-Mountain area and APN 097-060-035 under Water Supply Alternative 1, and the Mid-Mountain area and APN 097-060-035 under Water Supply Alternative 2). To implement Water Supply Alternative 1, MCWC concurrence would be required. TCPUD and Placer County LAFCO would rely on the FEIR/EIS in determining whether to approve the annexation/service contract. Because the FEIR/EIS assumes TCPUD would supply water to the proposed Project (as proposed under Water Supply Alternative 1 or Water Supply Alternative 2) no additional environmental impacts beyond those identified in the FEIR/EIS would result as a consequence of the TCPUD annexation/service contract.</p> <p>Fire Flows. Improvements at the South Base Area are necessary to increase fire flow capabilities to meet current residential fire flow requirements of 1,000 gallons per minute (gpm). The Project is expected to require 1,500 gpm and at least 429,000 gallons of storage (Nichols Consulting Engineers 2011). These improvements would be addressed through the new WTP as discussed in Mitigation Measure PSU-1a.</p> <p>Solid Waste Disposal. <u>Construction and Demolition Waste.</u> The EIR/EIS analysis of solid waste disposal is based on TTSD permitted capacity to handle waste on a daily basis, and the total lifespan capacity of disposal areas. The MRF has a permitted capacity of 800 tons of material per day and 832 vehicles per day. TTSD handled approximately 63,000 tons of solid waste in 2009 (average of approximately 210 tons per day of operation). The Lockwood Regional Landfill handles non-hazardous solid waste material and has a capacity of up to 250 years (Placer County 2008, 2010). The EIR/EIS waste generated during construction and demolition, and waste expected to be generated during project operation.</p>

201

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>would build new single- and multi-family residential units, hotel rooms, commercial floor space, skier service facilities, parking in surface, underground and parking structure facilities, and ancillary structures. New buildings will be equipped with sprinkler systems and fire hydrants will be installed at various locations in the Project area for fire protection. Specific hydrant locations and fire flow will be determined during the design phase through consultation with the NTFPD. SR 89 provides primary the emergency access route to the Project area.</p> <p>The NTFPD has provided a list of design conditions for the Project, some of which are encompassed in the requirements of local and State codes or ordinances, and some that are specific to NTFPD (NTFPD January 14, 2009). These conditions include emergency water supplies, adequate roadways and fire access roads, automatic fire sprinkler systems, automatic fire alarm systems, and main power disconnect systems. Approved non-freezing automatic sprinklers that meet or exceed NFPA (13, 13R, and 13D), CFC, and NTFPD standards will be required in many project structures. Approved automatic fire alarm systems that meet or exceed NFPA (72), CFC, and NTFPD standards will be required in many project structures. The systems must be connected to sprinkler system water flow, tamper, and other devices. Any building with an automatic sprinkler system shall have a Knox Box and 110-volt outside fire alarm properly installed. A remote main power disconnect switch may be required if the main switch is located inside or is inaccessible due to snow. The NTFPD will review the tentative Project site maps before construction begins or annexation of the Project area is completed to ensure these conditions are met. At the time of final NTFPD review and annexation, the NTFPD may place additional requirements on the Project, if needed, to meet public safety service standards.</p> <p>The potential for an increase in fires and accidents is inherent with an increase in resident population. The NTFPD expects that Alternative 1A will cause a marked increase in fire/EMS calls for service from NTFPD. NTFPD will require measures to maintain existing</p>			<p>According to a national survey, the national average construction waste generation is 4.38 pounds per square foot for residential buildings, 3.89 pounds per square foot for non-residential buildings, and 155 pounds per square foot for demolition of non-residential structures (Franklin Associates 1998). Statewide, construction and demolition account for 22% of the total waste stream by volume, and 11.6% by weight (California Integrated Waste Management Board 2002, 2005, CalRecycle 2009).</p> <p>An estimated 60% of green buildings certified by the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) program divert over 75% percent of construction and demolition waste through reuse, recycling, and other methods (California Integrated Waste Management Board 2005). Consequently, for this analysis, it is assumed that under LEED certification standards for Alternative 1A, construction would generate approximately 25% of the average amount of waste. This reduced rate of waste generation is considered feasible because construction and demolition materials recycling centers readily divert 60% - 90% of materials from the waste stream (California Integrated Waste Management Board 2002, 2005). To provide a more conservative analysis, the analysis assumes that mixed-use structures with multi-family and tourist accommodation units would generate waste at the residential construction rate, and demolition of existing structures and hardscape surfaces would occur at the non-residential rate. Therefore, Alternative 1A demolition of existing structures and facilities would generate 38.75 pounds per square foot, construction of residential and mixed-use structures (including hotels, timeshares/fractional ownership units, townhouses, condominiums, and single family homes) would generate 1.095 pounds per square foot, and construction of non-residential structures (e.g., parking structures, maintenance buildings, skier service facilities) would generate 0.9725 pound per square foot.</p> <p>The precise square footage of structures and facilities to be removed under demolition is not known. The estimated surface area and structures to be demolished under Alternative 1A are based on existing land coverage and structures described in Chapter 3, Section 3.1. Existing land coverage is approximately 271,000 square feet at the North Base area and 117,000 square feet at the South Base area. The existing North Base lodge is 13,943 square feet. The South Base lodge is 7,300 square feet and the vehicle shop/maintenance facility located adjacent to the South Base area is 3,884 square feet. Therefore, the total demolition area therefore is estimated to be 413,127 square feet for Alternative 1A. At the rate of 38.75 pounds per square foot, demolition would generate an estimated 16,008,671 pounds (8,004 tons) of waste and debris for Alternative 1A. Alternative 1A would generate up to 1,107,919 pounds during construction. Table 16-4 of the EIR/EIS below provides estimated construction waste.</p>

708

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>service levels and response times with the increased calls for service, such as increased staffing, specialized apparatus because of new building heights, and station accommodations for additional staff.</p> <p>Placer County and the NTFPD require projects to pay developer impact fees based on developed living space (including garages). It is expected that this fee will fund service capacity improvements that will offset the expected increase in calls for service to maintain existing service levels and response times in the service territory.</p> <p>NTFPD review and approval of Project design plans and development impact fees will ensure that Alternative 1A will include adequate fire protection facilities, including sprinkler systems in new buildings and fire hydrants on the Project area, to meet NTFPD service standards and local and State codes. This impact is considered less than significant.</p> <p>Sheriff and Police Services. Alternative 1A may add up to 855 new TAU and affordable/employee housing occupants to the Project area during periods of peak use. This would be in addition to the up to 321 permanent new residents generated by Alternative 1A. Police emergency response times to the Project and service area of the PCSD could increase due to increased calls for service. There is currently no developer impact fee designed to offset the costs of expanding PCSD service. This impact is considered a significant impact on police services.</p> <p>Telecommunications Service. The Project will expand telecommunication facilities to serve new buildings and residents. HMR will place these lines underground and will coordinate with AT&T on the location and capacity of new lines. Commercial buildings to be directly served by AT&T require a 4-inch duct from the point of feed, and single-family residences require a 2-inch duct. Existing service lines to Homewood are considered adequate to accommodate the increased demand for service within the Project area, so no off-site construction or infrastructure improvements are expected. Payment of appropriate new service connection fees is expected to cover costs to</p>			<p>LEED certification with Alternative 1A emphasizes reuse of building materials and limiting of waste disposal for previously developed sites. Accordingly, new buildings will utilize materials from existing structures dismantled on-site. Components from old chair lifts can be used when building new chair lifts on-site or at other local ski resorts. HMR is creating a "Green Guide" or sustainability plan that addresses the concerns associated with the building process. Architectural design will consider the "life-cycle" costs of the infrastructure and buildings used at HMR. Green building principles that to be implemented during redevelopment includes the reuse and recycling of materials from de-constructed buildings.</p> <p>Up to 100,000 cubic yards of excavated materials could be generated during construction of Alternative 1A. There are opportunities for the on-site reuse of approximately 102,000 cubic yards of excavated materials that is generated during project construction to be used as fill, as identified in Chapter 3, Figure 3-12, and Table 3-6 of the EIR/EIS. If materials cannot be used on-site for construction, restoration, and revegetation, the materials would be used at nearby California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) and Placer County project sites or exported to a TRPA designated disposal site out side of the Lake Tahoe Basin. HMR will coordinate with Placer County and the CTC on the storage and use of export material for restoration projects in the Project vicinity.</p> <p>While the existing landfills are expected to have sufficient capacity to handled demolition and construction waste and debris, existing sorting and transfer facilities may not have sufficient capacity to handle a large quantity of waste on given day. Demolition of existing structures and the construction of the project are expected to occur in phases over a 10-year period. Appendix N provides a detailed estimate of the 10-year construction schedule.</p> <p>Sheriff and Police Services. PCSD typically provides "will serve" letters to proponents of new residential projects, indicating that PCSD will serve the Project to the best of their ability. Placer County and the PCSD have a standard of providing one officer per 1,000 residents, but this ratio method is not well suited for application to the Lake Tahoe area with its large seasonal variation in the numbers of transient visitors and residents. Based on population growth analysis of new housing units in Chapter 7 – Population, Employment and Housing, Alternative 1A would require up to 0.32 new FTE of a PCSD sheriff deputy to offset the expected increased calls for service and to maintain existing service and response times.</p> <p>Explanation. Implementation of mitigation measures PSU-1a, PSU-1b, and PSU-1c will ensure impacts to water supply, solid</p>

809

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>upgrade and maintain communication systems as needed. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.</p> <p>Other Government Services. The Homewood Post Office is located near the Project area at 5375 West Lake Boulevard. Street delivery service is not available in Homewood or the Project area. Indirectly, the increase in residents may result in increased vehicle trips to the Post Office and potential safety concerns (especially in snow conditions). The increase in individual vehicle trips is considered in Chapter 11 – Transportation and Circulation. However, mail pickup from the post office will not affect postal operations. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.</p> <p>Library services are provided in the Homewood area by the Placer County Library Department at a branch library in Tahoe City at 740 North Lake Boulevard. Placer County does not have a developer impact fee specific to library services. The Placer County Library Department will continue to provide library services from its Tahoe City branch and no specific library service issues have been identified. The existing library facility is expected to accommodate the estimated increased demand for services, and this impact is considered less than significant.</p> <p>(S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 16-13 through 16-31; see also Chapter 23, Master Response 21.)</p>			<p>waste disposal, and police services are less than significant. Mitigation measure PSU-1a requires a detailed Water System Engineering Report approved by the selected water supplier as well as payment of connection and service fees approved by TCPUD and MCWC a to ensure sufficient water to meet peak demand in the Project area with less than significant impacts on water supply in the vicinity. Mitigation measure PSU-1b ensures coordination of demolition and construction waste disposal with the ERSL to handle and sort material will ensure sufficient capacity is available to handle solid waste. Mitigation measure PSU-1b requires the payment of a proportional fair development impact fee is expected to maintain existing police services levels and reduce the potential impact to less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 16-13 through 16-31; see also Chapter 23, Master Response 21 and Responses to Comments 7-9, 9-31 through 9-46, 10-14 through 10-23, 10-30 through 10-58, 11-5 through 11-10, 13a-16, 13a-50, 19-12, 19-13, 33-33 through 33-42, 2-c , and 2-d.)</p>
<p>PSU-2. Does the Project have the potential to damage existing utility infrastructure?</p> <p>Project development under Alternative 1A will replace existing on-site infrastructure as part of Project development. The existing utility infrastructure has potential to be damaged inadvertently during construction activity, or if the Project does not design for adequate capacity or connections. Designs for replacing, extending or upgrading existing utility infrastructure will be coordinated with and approved by the appropriate utility service provider. Each utility service provider will require that the Project meet equipment and installation standards for connection to existing service infrastructure to maintain existing service levels. Prior to performing excavation,</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

D12

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>HMR is required to call DigAlert at 811 to mark existing underground utilities and avoid inadvertent damage. Consequently, this impact is considered less than significant. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 16-32; see also Responses to Comment 10-59.)</p>			
<p>PSU-3: Will Project construction interfere with law enforcement and fire protection services?</p> <p>Alternative 1A will maintain adequate access to on-site and adjacent land uses during construction such that law enforcement and fire protection services will remain unimpeded. Designs for emergency vehicle access to the construction site and temporary construction-related detours, if necessary, will be coordinated with and approved by the PCSD and NTFPD. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, p. 16-32; see also Response to Comments 19-22, 33-40 and 128-3.)</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>
<p>PSU-C1. Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to public service and utility resources?</p> <p>The Project and other proposed, planned, or permitted projects in the Homewood area and along the West Shore of Lake Tahoe may temporarily interrupt provision of services and utilities during construction, and may reduce supplies or capacities to provide public services during operation.</p> <p>Construction and operation of Alternative 1A will result in increased demands for utilities and public services, including: water supply, treatment, and distribution; wastewater treatment and disposal; solid waste collection and disposal; electricity; natural gas; fire protection and emergency medical services, law enforcement, library, telecommunications; and postal service. Alternative 1A is not expected to result in significant impacts to these public services and utilities. The assessment of potential cumulative impacts must consider, in addition to the Project, other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects (e.g., other proposed, planned, or permitted projects). For the purpose of assessing potential cumulative impacts to public utilities and service</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

118

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>systems, a list of other past, present, and future projects that are expected to increase demand for public utilities and services, and may contribute to cumulative impacts to these resources is included in Table 20.1-1 in Chapter 20: Mandated Environmental Analysis of the EIR/EIR.</p> <p>Alternative 1A is not expected to contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact on public services and utilities. Public services and utilities either have sufficient excess capacity to provide service to the Project and cumulative projects, such as with wastewater and schools, or mitigation measures are provided to provide fees to expand or maintain service levels. Alternative 1A would have a significant impact on water supply and infrastructure. Mitigation Measure PSU-1a, which requires a Water System Engineering Report meeting the requirements of and approved by the TCPUD, would address cumulative impacts associated with increased water demand. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PSU-1a would ensure sufficient water supplies and service infrastructure is maintained for existing users, the Project, and would not constrain future planned uses listed in Table 20.1-1. Mitigation Measure PSU-1c ensures adequate funding is provided to maintain existing police service levels in the Project area and vicinity. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 16-33; see also Responses to Comments 33-40 and 76-18.)</p>			
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND PUBLIC SAFETY			
<p>PS-1. Will the Project expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving fire hazards, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?</p> <p>Construction and operation of new residential, commercial and recreational facilities in the Project area in a wildland-urban interface (WUI) setting would increase the exposure of people and structures to the risk of wildfires. Wildfires are a substantial threat to the HMR Project area and vicinity due to location of people and structures in a WUI setting with heavy fuel loads, steep terrain, summer dry conditions,</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure PS-1: NTFPD Design Approval and Annexation.</p> <p>Prior to issuing Building Permits for the Project, Placer County shall require the Project Applicant to pay appropriate fair share development impact fees for Project review and to maintain existing levels of wildland fire protection service and ensure compliance with existing state and local wildland fire protection standards in the NTFPD service area. The Project Applicant shall be required to post a bond to ensure that appropriate mitigation measures are completed and in place during construction and implemented for project operation. Development impact fees shall be paid at the time the application is submitted to provide for NTFPD, Placer County Fire, and</p>	LS	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure PS-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by increase the level of wildland fire protection capacity available to the Project area to a level equivalent the most current state and local standards for WUI areas and requiring design approvals to ensure that the Project incorporates measure to reduce the risk of exposure of people and structures to wildfires. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-1 will increase the level of wildland fire protection capacity available to the Project area to a level</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

212

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>and multiple ignition sources. Calfire classifies the Project area as a Very High Fire Hazard Area (Calfire 2009a).</p> <p>The Project area, including the NTFPD service area, is classified as SRA with Calfire having primary wildland fire suppression responsibility. Through a CFMA, the USFS conducts wildland fire suppression and fire protection activities. NTFPD serves the Project area as the agency having jurisdiction for all fire department emergencies except for wildland fires. (Alternative 1A includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • annexing the remaining HMR properties into the NTFPD; and • the adoption and implementation of a fuel reduction program; • and upgrading the existing snowmaking system to be compatible with wildland fire suppression needs in the Project area. <p>Specific fuel reduction measures, building designs and materials, and snowmaking water delivery systems have not been designed. Project compliance with applicable building codes (CBC Chapter 7), road access, and wildland fuel management codes (PRC §4290-§4291) are not known. Consequently, the increase in exposure of people and structures to wildfire hazards in a WUI setting in the Project area is considered a significant impact. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 17-13 to 17-14.)</p>	<p>Calfire review and approval of a Fire Suppression and Management Plan for the Project area, including building materials and designs, fire protection systems in buildings, landscaping, fire flows to hydrants and the snowmaking system, emergency vehicle access routes and turnarounds, and vegetation treatments in the Project area to ensure compliance with the most recent CBC Chapter 7, PRC §4290-§4291, and other applicable state and local codes.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 17-14.)</p>		<p>equivalent the most current state and local standards for WUI areas. Design approvals will ensure that the Project incorporates measure to reduce the risk of exposure of people and structures to wildfires to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 17-13 to 17-14; see Responses to Comments 9-8 through 9-14, 9-17 through 19-29, 9-37 through 9-46, and 11-19 through 11-23.)</p>
<p>PS-2. Will the Project result in an interference with emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans?</p> <p>Alternative 1A has the potential to impede emergency responses on a temporary basis during construction, and permanently if adequate emergency vehicle access is not providing to and throughout the Project area. Construction would occur in phases, depending on weather conditions, economic factors, and demand for new facilities: Site grading and utility work would occur in the earliest part of construction, followed by the residential and commercial structures. Alternative 1A would follow with construction of the new skier service and related recreational facilities at the North Base area. Construction activities would</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure PS-2: Ensure Emergency Access During Construction and Operation</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall prepare and submit an emergency access plan to TRPA, Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD), PCSD, Calfire, 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 during Project construction. Emergency access measures are expected to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; 	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure PS-2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by ensuring that emergency access to the Project area and surrounding areas will not be impeded by Project-related construction activities, and will be provided and maintained during Project operation. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-2 will ensure that emergency access to the Project area and surrounding areas will not be impeded by Project-related construction activities, and will be provided and maintained during Project operation. This will reduce the risk of interference with emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans to less than significant.</p>

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

213

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>probably be continuous, except during winter months when some activities would cease due to weather and snow cover.</p> <p>Much of the construction work would not affect emergency access to the surrounding area, because construction activities would be primarily focused within the Project area. However, construction vehicles and equipment may block and/or slow through traffic in the surrounding area, especially along SR 89. This could temporarily interfere with the ability of the PCSD or NTFPD to provide emergency services to the Project area and vicinity. A temporary, construction-related impediment to emergency access is considered a significant impact.</p> <p>Alternative 1A requires emergency vehicle access and evacuation routes to provide for adequate response times and safe evacuation. With major buildings and facilities concentrated next to SR 89, Alternative 1A is expected to have adequate road access and evacuation routes, but designs will require access and circulation for emergency response vehicles to multi-story, high-occupancy buildings in the Project area. The potential for inadequate internal circulation and access for emergency vehicles in Alternative 1A results in significant impacts to emergency response or evacuation plans. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 17-15 to 17-16.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheduling deliveries and truck trips during off-peak hours; Using or developing alternate access routes as needed; and Notifying the PCSD and the NTFPD of construction activities and providing these agencies with a copy of the emergency access plan. <p>Prior to issuing Building Permits for the Project, Placer County shall require the Project Applicant to pay appropriate fair share development impact fees for NTFPD review and approval of emergency vehicle access, circulation patterns, and evacuation routes. The Project shall incorporate designs, maintenance measures, and alternative emergency access routes as determined necessary by the NTFPD. The Project Applicant shall be required to post a bond to ensure that appropriate mitigation measures are completed and in place during construction and implemented for project operation.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 17-16.)</p>		<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 17-15 to 17-16; see Responses to Comments 9-42, 9-43, 11-19 through 11-23.)</p>
<p>PS-3. Will the Project involve the use of explosives for trenching?</p> <p>Blasting may be required to excavate large rock formations in the construction of underground parking facilities, utility trenching, and preparing building sites for foundations. Blasting includes a series of small charges, detonated in sequence, that are placed in holes drilled into the rock formations. While no specific sites that require blasting are known, extensive sub-surface rock and boulders are common in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and conditions necessitating the use of explosives for removal may be encountered during construction. With the continued operation of the HMR Ski Area under Alternative 1A, any existing use of explosives to control avalanches at HMR would continue unchanged.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure PS-3: Implement Blast Management Techniques to Reduce Adverse Effects</p> <p>Prior to any construction blasting, the Project Applicant shall prepare and submit a blasting plan to the Placer County ESD and the NTFPD for review and approval. The Project shall incorporate blast management techniques to minimize risks to life and property in the Project area and vicinity. These measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Blasting shall be allowed only on weekdays from 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM. Exceptions are allowed if it can be shown that construction beyond these times is necessary to meet other regulatory deadlines or to alleviate safety hazards. To the greatest extent feasible, blasting area 	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure PS-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by ensuring the use of explosives for blasting in the Project area will be conducted to minimize adverse impacts outside the controlled blasting area. Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1a and NOI-1b (see findings relating to Impact NOI-1) will also help to reduce potential adverse effects from blasting. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-3 will ensure the use of explosives for blasting in the Project area will be conducted to minimize adverse impacts outside the controlled blasting area, reducing the impact to less than significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measures</p>

214

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>The use of explosives for blasting during construction could result in vibration damage or risk of injury from explosion or flying debris to persons present at nearby locations, or at developed and occupied uses within or adjacent to the Project area. Therefore, the potential use of blasting during construction and ski area operation is considered a significant impact. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 17-16 through 17-18.)</p>	<p>shall occur prior to the occupancy of structures.</p> <p>3. In areas of controlled blasting, the contractor shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Ensure that blasting of rock shall be conducted under the guidance of a qualified blasting consultant. b) Give 30-day advance and 5-day advance written notices to residences, businesses and utility owners within 0.5 mile from the controlled blasting area; c) Inspect structures within 300 feet of the blast site no more than two weeks prior to commencement of controlled blasting to document existing conditions of the structures; d) Conduct post-blasting inspections of nearby structures and document any blasting-related impacts. If impacts occurred, develop remediation measures in consultation with ESD; e) Use best available technology, such as blast mats, emplacing overburden, modifying shot timing, or other techniques to minimize noise generated by blasting; and, f) Require personnel in the controlled blasting area to wear ear, eye, head, and other appropriate protection during blasting excavation activities. <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 17-17 to 17-18.)</p>		<p>NOI-1a and NOI-1b (see Impact NOI-1 in Chapter 13) will also help to reduce potential adverse effects from blasting.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 17-16 through 17-18; see also Response to Comment 9-46.)</p>
<p>PS-4. Does the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, release of hazardous materials into the environment, or emit hazardous emissions within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</p> <p>Construction would involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials typical of construction and operation of ski resort, residential, and commercial land uses projects. Commonly used hazardous materials expected to be used during construction and operation of Alternative 1A includes asphalt, gasoline, diesel, chlorine, lubricants, paints, and solvents. CHP and Caltrans regulate transportation of hazardous materials on area roadways, and the use of these materials is regulated by the DTSC as outlined in CCR 22.</p> <p>The Project Applicant, builders, contractors, business owners, and others would be required to use, store, and transport hazardous materials</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

915

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>in compliance with local, State, and federal regulations during construction and operation. There are no existing or proposed schools located within 0.25 mile of the Project area. Compliance with mandatory State and federal standards for the transport and use of hazardous materials will reduce potential hazardous materials impacts to less than significant.</p> <p>Under Alternative 1A, the Project Applicant will be required to prepare a Hazardous Materials Business Plan and inventory of hazardous materials under the State of California Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Law of 1985 (Business Plan Act, California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 1). The Hazardous Materials Business Plan includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inventory of hazardous materials handled; • Facility floor plans showing where hazardous materials are stored; • An emergency response plan, and; • Provisions for employee training in safety and emergency response procedures. <p>The SWRCB regulates the storage of hazardous materials in USTs under the California CCR. The installation and monitoring of new tanks, monitoring of existing tanks, and corrective actions for removed tanks are regulated by State standards. The preparation and implementation of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan and the design, installation, and use of storage tanks to State standards are expected to result in a less than significant impacts related to the storage or use of hazardous materials in the Project area. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 17-18 to 17-19; see also Response to Comment 9-7.)</p>			
<p>PS-5. Does the Project have the potential to encounter contaminated soils or expose workers or the public to health hazards, including those from a known hazardous waste site?</p> <p>The Phase I ESA identified that the removal of older buildings at HMR may expose people to lead based paint or ACMs. Although no inventory was conducted, lead and asbestos were commonly used materials in buildings prior to the 1980s. The Phase I ESA searched</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure PS-5: Construction and Design Review by the Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District.</p> <p>Prior to approval of Improvement Plans for any phase of the Project, Placer County shall require the Project Applicant to consult with the Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District to review and approve construction plans. If the District determines that the Project would create new temporary or permanent mosquito breeding habitats during construction or operation, the</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure PS-5, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by requiring appropriate design review and approval by the Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District to reduce potential mosquito breeding habitats, and ensuring appropriate access for technicians to inspect and treat as necessary habitats on-site. 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 EIR/EIS.</p>

918

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>regulatory databases and conducted a site investigation, and did not find other potential sources of hazardous materials or waste that would pose a health hazard for residents, visitors, or construction workers in the Project area (Robinson Engineering Company 2005). In the event that previously unknown lead based paint, asbestos, contaminated soils, or buried hazardous waste is encountered during construction, the contractor is required to notify appropriate regulatory agencies and implement appropriate actions to comply with regulatory agency standards to avoid hazardous waste releases and worker exposure and provide for cleanup measures. An accredited inspector in accordance with EPA and Cal-OSHA standards under Clean Air Act §112 must remove ACMs and lead. Agency notification and compliance with applicable construction and workplace safety standards is considered sufficient to maintain potential impacts to a less than significant level, and no additional mitigation is required.</p> <p>Construction of Alternative 1A may create opportunities for water ponding – such as stockpiles of soil and materials, compacted soil, graded swales, and other features – that may temporarily increase mosquito breeding habitat. Operation of Alternative 1A includes the restoration of an SEZ, which may increase breeding habitat. The potential for temporary and permanent increases in mosquito breeding habitat is considered a significant impact on public health and safety. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 17-19 through to 17-20.)</p>	<p>District shall recommend design modifications and BMPs, if needed. In addition, the Project Applicant shall provide access to District technicians to the Project area to inspect and treat breeding habitats as necessary to reduce risks to public health.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 17-20.)</p>		<p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-5 will ensure appropriate design review and approval by the Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District to reduce potential mosquito breeding habitats, and ensures appropriate access for technicians to inspect and treat as necessary habitats on-site, reducing the impact to public health and safety to less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 17-19 to 17-20; see Responses to Comments 268-12.)</p>
<p>PS-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to public safety?</p> <p>Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-1 ensures that the Project is built and operated to current state and local standards for construction and occupation of facilities in a WUI setting. As building codes (CBC Chapter 7) and standards for emergency vehicle access, evacuation routes, and vegetation management (PRC §4290-§4291) have become more stringent, building and operating the Project to current state and local standards for WUI settings is expected to reduce wildland fire risks compared to existing conditions. Consequently, the Project is not expected to contribute to a</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

217

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>cumulative impact to public safety related to wildland fire hazards.</p> <p>Other development projects in the Tahoe Basin where older structures would be demolished have a similar potential to result in health hazards related to exposure of persons to asbestos and lead-based paint. However, as with the Project, an accredited inspector in accordance with EPA and Cal-OSHA standards under Clean Air Act §112 must remove ACMs and lead, and therefore impacts would be expected to be less than significant and no cumulatively considerable contribution is expected. Other projects would have a similar less than significant impact from routine use and transport of hazardous materials commonly used during construction and operation of ski resorts, residential, and commercial uses because they are subject to the same government regulations. These hazardous materials include chlorine, gasoline, asphalt, and diesel. Transportation of hazardous materials on area roadways is regulated by the CHP and Caltrans, and the use of these materials is regulated by the DTSC, as outlined in CCR 22. The Project is not expected to directly or indirectly induce the use of hazardous materials in the Basin. Therefore, no cumulative impact to public safety is expected. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 17-20 to 17-21; see also Response to Comment 11-20.)</p>			
<p>RECREATION</p> <p>REC-1. Will the Project result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway, or public lands or decrease in the quality of a recreational experience?</p> <p>The Project area is located west of SR 89 and consists of an existing winter sports area and related recreational and support uses. Alternative 1A would not affect land uses or facilities on or with direct access to Lake Tahoe. Summer uses include informal hiking and mountain bike trail use. Alternative 1A would enhance recreation facilities and access to the Project area by designating 5 miles of publicly accessible hiking trails on the mountain, providing a community swimming pool at the Mid-Mountain Base area, an ice skating rink at the North Base area, an amphitheater for the</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure REC-1a. Beach Access Maintenance Funding</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall work with Placer County to develop a Zone of Benefit, which is a geographic area formed under Placer County Service Area law to provide extended services not already being provided, or a similar mechanism to fund maintenance as a result of the Project. Funding shall cover the cost of staff time maintaining the access points, maintenance materials, and, if a Zone of Benefit is established, administration fees. The fee shall be established through an engineer's report prepared by the applicant at the applicant's expense and approved by the County or as otherwise prescribed by law. The Zone of Benefit shall include cost of living adjustments.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure REC-1a, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by ensuring funding to maintain the quality of public beach access points. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure REC-1a will maintain the quality of public beach access points and therefore reduce the impact to less than significant.</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 18-12 through 18-14; see also Response to Comment 131-13.)</p>

218

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>Lake Tahoe Music Festival and other events, a link to the West Shore Bike Trail, and a miniature golf course. Hiking trails established at HMR would provide enhanced access to USFS LTBMU lands in the Project vicinity.</p> <p>There are no public or private access points to Lake Tahoe or any other lake or waterway that would be removed by Alternative 1A, including the existing trail access to the TCPUD Trail Creek Park and Quail Lake south of the resort. HMR recently acquired the West Shore Café and Inn located just west of the project area. The site includes a dedicated parking lot, restaurant and inn structure and outdoor seating area/pier located on the shoreline of Lake Tahoe. While this property is in the ownership of HMR, it will be available for Lake access by residents and guests of Alternative 1A. With the maintenance of access to public lands within the vicinity of the project area and the provision of dedicated Lake access for HMR residents and guest, impacts on the availability of public access to recreational resources would be less than significant.</p> <p>There are also public access points along the west shore of Lake Tahoe including points immediately across SR 89 from the proposed residential development areas of the Project. According to Placer County Department of Facility Services/Parks, these beach access points are currently lightly used and do not require substantial maintenance efforts due to low activity in the Homewood vicinity. Many public access points in the vicinity of the Project do not currently receive routine maintenance due to low use. With the addition of new full time residents and additional visitors to the Project area, the use of these beach access points would increase and current maintenance funding would not be adequate to address increased use. A new influx of Project generated use would create the need for a new maintenance operation that is currently not included in the funding structure of local public management agencies. Consequently, development under Alternative 1A would have a significant impact on the quality of the existing recreational experience at nearby beach access points along the west shore of Lake Tahoe. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 18-12 through 18-14.)</p>	<p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 18-13 through 14.)</p>		

618
619

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>REC-2. Will the Project create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed?</p> <p>Alternative 1A will renovate and enhance existing ski area facilities and biking and hiking trails, and provide new recreation facilities such as a West Shore Bike Trail linkage, ice skating rink, swimming pool, amphitheater, and miniature golf course. As required by Placer County and the Quimby Act, development under the Alternative 1A will include enhancements in park lands and/or in lieu payments to improve local recreational facilities, improving service to existing populations and providing adequate service to meet the increased resident and guest demands. Alternative 1A is expected to increase the range of recreation facilities and opportunities in the Project area, and add facilities that are compatible with existing recreation opportunities and land uses at HMR and in the Project vicinity. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 1A will have less than significant impacts related to conflicts between existing or proposed recreational uses. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, p. 18-15.)</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>
<p>REC-3. Will the Project result in the need to construct new recreational facilities or expansion of existing facilities?</p> <p>Development of Alternative 1A is expected to increase the population of the Project area and increase demand for recreation facilities. Alternative 1A will include new recreational facilities for visitors to the lodge and the public, such as a swimming pool, miniature golf course, West Shore Bike Trail linkage, amphitheater, and 5 miles of hiking/mountain biking trails.</p> <p>Under Placer County General Plan Policy 5.A.3 and Zoning Ordinance §17.54.100(D)(1), new residential developments are required to provide a minimum of 5 acres of improved parks and 5 acres of passive parklands or open space per 1,000 new residents to offset increased demand for recreation services and opportunities (Placer County 2008). Based on the number of whole or partial ownership residential units proposed by Alternative, the following are estimates of the number of new</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure REC-3. Provide On-site Recreational Facilities and Park Fees to Placer County; Operate Shuttle Service to State Parks.</p> <p>To mitigate for the increased demand on recreation facilities, the Project shall develop and dedicate to the TCPUD a public park consistent with the park needs of the community (e.g., 5 acres of improved park and 5 acres of open space per 1,000 new residents). Details of recreation facilities and timing of delivery shall be established through a development agreement with Placer County. For any public recreation facilities provided in conjunction with this project, including parks and trails, maintenance funding shall be provided through the creation of a Zone of benefit (or similar mechanism). The fee shall be established through an engineer's report prepared by the applicant at the applicant's expense and approved by the County or as otherwise prescribed by law. The Zone of Benefit shall include cost of living adjustments. The Project may provide for new or enhanced recreation facilities with an alternative method as</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Finding: Compliance with Mitigation Measure REC-3, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level, by providing or funding adequate new developed recreation facilities and open space, and by maintaining accessibility to heavily-used State Parks in the Project vicinity. 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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of mitigation measure REC-3 will reduce the potential impact to less than significant by providing or funding adequate new developed recreation facilities and open space, and by maintaining accessibility to heavily-used State Parks in the Project vicinity.</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 18-16 through 18-19.)</p>

02/24

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>residents that may be generated at Project buildout, and the required amount of new park land under the General Plan. The calculations assume 1.85 persons per whole or partial-ownership multi-family residential unit and 2.54 persons per single-family residential unit based on the analysis included in the Placer County Park and Recreation Facilities Impact Fee Study, Hausrath Economics Group, September 2003 (page 12).</p> <p>Alternative 1A includes 250 multi-family residential units equals 463 new residents, and 2.32 acres of improved parks and 2.32 acres of open space. If Alternative 1A does not provide adequate on-site recreation facilities, Placer County would require payment of park fees commensurate with the percentage of the shortfall. Payment of in lieu park fees to Placer County Department of Facility Services would be in addition to the standard Placer County park fees identified below, and would be established through a development agreement.</p> <p>Under Placer County Code §16.08.100 and Recreational Facilities Fee Ordinance (Chapter 15, Placer County Code), recreation facilities cannot be less than that needed to accommodate the new demand for such facilities created by the Project, as determined by the Board of Supervisors in consultation with the Placer County Department of Facilities Services, Parks and Grounds Division. In addition, in-tract recreational facilities must be provided in accordance with Placer County Code Section 17.54.100(D) or the payment of an in-lieu fee thereof.</p> <p>New residents and visitors in the Project area will increase visitation at other Basin recreational sites, increasing demand on the existing recreational facilities, especially during the peak summer months. New residents and visitors to the Project area are expected to increase usage of nearby Burton Creek, Ed Z'berg Sugar Pine Point, and D.L. Bliss/Emerald Bay State Parks. New residents and visitors will likely use local parks and recreational facilities in the vicinity such as Quail Creek Park, Chambers Landing Beach, and other access points to Lake Tahoe near the Project area. Without new facilities, the increased use will contribute to routine wear</p>	<p>provided under Placer County Code. Recreational alternatives may include, but are not limited to the following as approved by the County:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create commonly owned, on-site park and recreational improvements and/or as a credit toward a portion of the recreation fees, as deemed appropriate by the Board of Supervisors; • Pay a fee equivalent to the value of the park and recreation improved land and park improvements to provide public parks and recreation facilities in the vicinity of the planned development. If the County wishes to collect such fees, the fee agreement shall be established through a development agreement between HMR and Placer County. • Provision of public beach front property, access rights, and/or developed public beach access facilities conveyed to an appropriate public entity. • The forgoing may be provided in whole or combination in order to fully mitigate recreational impacts in accordance with Placer County Code Sections 15.34.010, 16.08.100, and 17.54.100(D). <p>To reduce impacts on parking facilities at nearby State Parks while enhancing public access to the State Park system, the Proposed Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 shall institute an on-call van service available to HMR residents, guests and the general public from Memorial Day Weekend through Labor Day to provide alternative transit service to Ed Z'berg Sugar Pine Point and D.L. Bliss/Emerald Bay State Parks. The HMR on-call van service will supplement existing public transit systems and reduce the reliance of private automobile usage for HMR residents, guests, and other nearby residents. HMR may charge a nominal fee to use the shuttle van service and may advertise the service to local residents and visitors of other developments. The use of the HMR on-call van service will reduce the number of private automobiles used to access the State Parks during peak summer months, thereby maintaining access to these parks for other visitors to the Lake Tahoe Basin.</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 18-18 through 18-19.)</p>		

221

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>and tear on existing turf areas, recreational equipment, trails, picnic tables, and parking capacity. It is difficult to determine the extent of the wear and tear that would be attributed directly to Alternative 1A, because most local parks and recreational facilities are used by a combination of local residents and visitors to the region.</p> <p>Placer County's per-unit assessment of park fees (including affordable housing units and tourist accommodation units or TAUs) funds improvements to existing park facilities and the construction of new park facilities (Placer County 2008). These park fees are assessed at the time of final map recordation and issuance of building permits, and are required for the development of residential units and TAU units to offset the impact of new development on community recreation. The Project fees would be earmarked for improvement of park facilities in the vicinity. Placer County, who collects and distributes these fees, would use these funds for projects at nearby recreational facilities.</p> <p>The Project is also subject to the Measure C parcel tax, which provides maintenance funds for the TCPUD. This is a parcel tax that adjusts annually and is applicable to parcels within the TCPUD district boundaries. The annual fee is determined based on the square footage of the residential units.</p> <p>Because Alternative 1A does not include the addition of new and/or improved park facilities, parks or open space to meet the increased demand for improved parks and open space, this is considered a significant impact. (S)</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 18-16 through 18-19.)</p>			
<p>REC-4. Will the Project create additional recreational capacity?</p> <p>Alternative 1A will increase recreation opportunities, but winter day-use PAOTs assigned to HMR will remain unchanged. Development under Alternative 1A will improve HMR ski area facilities and enhance other recreation opportunities in the Project area. Other new facilities include a West Shore Bike Trail connection, miniature golf, ice skating rink, swimming pool, amphitheater, and 5 miles of</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

2008

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>hiking/mountain bike trails.</p> <p>New winter sports facilities will replace existing facilities and enhance the ski experience with high speed, higher capacity lifts and other improvements, but the overall PAOT capacity of the ski area will not increase under Alternative 1A. Proposed improvements include the replacement of the Madden Ski triple-chair lift with an eight-passenger high-speed gondola, which would increase lift capacity from 1,800 to 2,400 persons per hour. A new learn-to-ski (beginner) lift would be constructed at the Mid-Mountain area for beginner use. The existing South Happy Platter, North Happy Platter, and Alpine Platter lifts would be removed. The Tailings T-Bar, South T-Bar, and Spring Chair lift have already been removed and would not be replaced. The verified capacity of these removed lifts is available for use on other lift replacements or upgrades. Table 18-2 summarizes the proposed changes to the HMR ski lift capacity.</p> <p>While improvements to the ski lifts are expected to increase the current operating capacity of the system from 8,646 persons per hour to 9,797 persons per hour, overall operations are expected to remain below the verified capacity of 10,653 persons per hour. Homewood's verified capacity is used to define the existing PAOT capacity assigned to HMR (1,704) by TRPA. At present, HMR does not expect to increase uphill lift capacity such that it would exceed its existing banked verified PAOT capacity of 1,704. Therefore, Alternative 1A is not expected to exceed the existing TRPA PAOT capacity for HMR or result in an adverse impact on additional recreational capacity. This is considered a less than significant impact. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 18-19 through 18-21.)</p>			
<p>REC-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to recreation?</p> <p>Development of enhanced winter sports recreation facilities and new tourist and residential and commercial development in the Project area, and associated increases in population associated with Alternative 1A will result in a cumulative increase in the demand for recreational facilities and would likely</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

213

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>increase the use of existing local parks and recreational facilities in the community. Placer County regulations require that new planned development projects contribute to Placer County park fees and incorporate on-site recreation facilities commensurate with the number of potential residents. Any shortage of the required on-site recreation facilities will require payment of park fees commensurate with 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). These requirements are implemented to offset and mitigate any imbalance that may result from new development on community recreational opportunities. Implementation of Mitigation Measures REC-1a and REC-3 and the mitigation action required for other projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin eliminates substantial contributions to cumulative impacts on recreational capacity. Therefore, the Project's contribution is not cumulatively considerable. (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 18-20 through 18-21.)</p>			
CLIMATE CHANGE			
<p>CC-1. Will the Project Result in a Significant Project-Level Impact on Climate Change?</p> <p>Table 19-26 of the EIR/EIS presents construction emissions. Because construction emissions are a one-time event, these emissions are considered short-term in comparison to ongoing GHG emissions associated with Project operations.</p> <p>Tables 19-27 and 19-28 of the EIR/EIS list annual GHG emissions by source under existing (2008) and future year (2021) conditions, respectively. Emission factors associated with transportation and energy usage are likely to decrease over time. Therefore, emissions calculations for Project operation under the future year (2021) likely overestimate annual emissions.</p> <p>Implementation of Alternative 1A would result in a net increase in local GHG emissions above compared to the No Project (Alternative 2).</p> <p>GHG emissions tend to accumulate in the</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>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.)</p>

727

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>atmosphere because of their relatively long lifespan. As a result, their impact on the atmosphere is mostly independent of the point of emission. Therefore, GHG emissions are more appropriately evaluated on a regional, State, or even national scale than on an individual project level. Further, it is unlikely that the GHGs emitted as part of the Project would have an individually discernible effect on global climate change. Therefore, this impact is less than significant (LS)</p> <p>(Final EIR/EIS, pp. 19-22 through 19-49.)</p>			
<p>CC-C1. Will the Project Generate GHG Emissions, Either Directly or Indirectly, that may Have a Significant Impact on the Environment?</p> <p>Unlike criteria pollutant impacts, which are local and regional in nature, climate change impacts occur at a global level. The relatively long lifespan and persistence of GHGs (Table 19-1 of the EIR/EIS) require that climate change be considered a cumulative and global impact. It is unlikely that any increase in global temperature or sea level could be attributed to the emissions resulting from a single project. Rather, it is more appropriate to conclude Project-related GHG emissions will combine with emissions across California, the U.S., and the globe to cumulatively contribute to global climate change.</p> <p>To put the Project in perspective, total estimated GHG emissions under both existing (2008) and future (2021) conditions were compared to the most recent global, national, and State GHG inventories. Construction emissions, which will be produced during Project development but not during Project operation, were amortized assuming a 40-year Project lifetime and included in the emissions totals. Based on the estimates presented in Table 19-29, Alternative 1A would have a miniscule impact on State, federal, and international emissions of GHGs.</p> <p>While GHG emissions from the Project may be negligible relative to total State, national, and global emissions, scientific consensus concludes that given the seriousness of climate change, small contributions of GHGs may be cumulatively considerable. When compared to</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure CC-1: Document and Verify Implementation of the Project GHG Reduction Commitments</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall document and verify the Project commitments outlined in Table 19-30 have been incorporated into the final Project design. Copies of the pre-certification plan (Stage 2 in the LEED-ND process) shall be provided to PCAPCD and TRPA. Once the Project is complete, the final LEED-ND certification that verifies the north base has achieved all of the prerequisites and credits required for Gold certification shall be submitted to the air districts.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure CC-2: Implement Project Design Features to Further Reduce Project Contribution to Climate Change</p> <p>A recent report by the California Attorney General's (AG) office, The California Environmental Quality Act: Addressing Global Warming at the Local Agency Level, identifies various example measures to reduce GHG emissions at the project level (State of California Department of Justice 2008). The following Project design features were compiled from the California AG's Office report and are intended to provide additional strategies that could be incorporated into HMR Master Plan, especially at the South Base, to further reduce GHG emissions. Note that majority of the AG's strategies have been removed from the list below as they overlapped with actions already committed to by the Project Applicant (Table 19-30), or are inapplicable to the Project because they address emissions from different types of projects.</p> <p>The final Project design shall incorporate the</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, Alternative 1A that substantially lessen Proposed Project's generation of GHG that may have a significant impact on the environment. As noted above, CEQA requires public agencies to adopt feasible mitigation measures which would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of projects. Even with the implementation of the Proposed Project's commitment to numerous GHG reduction strategies through participation in the LEED for Neighborhood Development Pilot Program, and Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2, the County finds that complete avoidance of potential cumulative effects of the project on climate change based on the criteria set forth in CC-C1 is not feasible. This is because of the project objectives include constructing onsite residential and tourist accommodation units, providing year-round use of the Project site and generating sufficient revenues to support the proposed environmental and fire safety improvements while ensuring the continued viability of the ski operations.</p> <p>Overriding Considerations: The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the project override the significant adverse impact of the project associated with the proposed project's generation of GHG that may have a significant impact on the environment, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p> <p>Finding of Fact for Cumulative Analysis of Project Generate GHG Emissions, Either Directly or Indirectly, that may Have a Significant Impact on the Environment: While implementation of the Alternative 1A's commitment to numerous GHG reduction strategies through participation in the LEED for Neighborhood Development Pilot Program, and Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2 will not eliminate Project GHG emissions, their inclusion will result in lower GHG emissions levels than had they not been incorporated. For example, green buildings have the potential to reduce CO2 emissions associated with building operations by 33%-39% (GSA Public Buildings Services 2008; Kats 2003). In addition future State actions taken pursuant to AB 32 including requirements for lower carbon-content in motor vehicle fuels, improved vehicle mileage standards (provided California is not</p>

225

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>existing emissions, Alternative 1A would result in net increases of GHGs. Based on consultation with the PCAPCD, Placer County, and the TRPA, the magnitude of these emissions would result in the Project having a significant cumulative impact on the environment (Clark, Chang, and Landry pers. comm.).</p> <p>Project Commitments The Project Applicant has committed to numerous GHG reduction strategies through participation in the LEED for Neighborhood Development Pilot Program (LEED-ND). Unlike traditional LEED programs, LEED-ND evaluates not just individual buildings, but the overall project design. The LEED-ND rating system is divided into three primary categories: Smart Location, Neighborhood Pattern, and Green Infrastructure. These categories have prerequisites that are required for all projects, as well as additional credits that reward performance. The final project score is reflected in the certification level, which include "certified" (40 points), "silver" (50 points), "gold" (60 points), and "platinum" (80 points).</p> <p>The North Base area will be designed under the Pilot Program and the South Base area will be constructed using the LEED criteria as a template. In addition, HMR has developed an Alternative Transportation Program (Transportation Program) to reduce reliance on the automobile. The North Base has been accepted into the program with a pre-certification estimate of 68 points ("gold level"). Table 19-30 of the EIR/EIS identifies the GHG reduction strategies committed to by the Project Applicant through LEED certification and the Transportation Program.</p> <p>There is limited research on the CO2 reduction potentials of individual LEED strategies. Instead, several documents have quantified the net energy, water, and waste savings resulting from LEED certification. According to the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), green buildings can reduce energy use by 24%-50%, water use by 40%, and solid waste by 70% (USGBC 2009). With regards to total CO2 emissions, recent case studies on certified green buildings revealed an average reduction of 33%-39% (GSA Public Buildings Services</p>	<p>following applicable AG measures. A standard note indicating these requirements will be included on building plans approved in association with this Project shall be included on building permits.</p> <p><u>Energy Efficiency</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use solar heating, automatic covers, and efficient pumps and motors for pools and spas. <p><u>Renewable Energy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Install solar or wind power systems and solar hot water heaters. Educate consumers about existing incentives. Install solar panels on carports and over parking areas. <p><u>Water Conservation and Efficiency</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Install water-efficient irrigation systems and devices, such as soil moisture-based irrigation controls. Restrict watering methods (e.g., prohibit systems that apply water to non-vegetated surfaces) and control runoff. Restrict the use of water for cleaning outdoor surfaces and vehicles. Provide education about water conservation and available programs and incentives. <p><u>Solid Waste Measures</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide education and publicity about reducing waste and available recycling services. <p><u>Transportation and Motor Vehicles</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit idling time for commercial vehicles, including delivery and construction vehicles. Use low or zero-emission vehicles, including construction vehicles. Increase the cost of driving and parking private vehicles by, e.g., imposing tolls and parking fees. Institute a low-carbon fuel vehicle incentive program. Provide information on options for individuals and businesses to reduce transportation-related emissions. Provide education and information about public transportation. 		<p>barred due to federal action), and an increased share of renewable energy in electricity generation will serve, in time, to further reduce GHG emissions.</p> <p>The majority of development in Alternative 1A will include transferred tourist accommodation units (TAUs) and residential accommodation units (RAUs). Consequently, GHG emissions generated by these structures are not new to the Lake Tahoe Basin and would be emitted regardless of the Project. The transfer of existing TAUs and RAUs to the Project site may even reduce basin-wide GHG emissions, as the existing units are older and less efficient than those being constructed. While some new TAUs and RAUs will be required as part of the Project, they will be obtained from TRPA bonus inventory, which is analyzed in the TRPA Regional Plan. Consequently, new HMR-generated GHG emissions have been accounted for in previous planning documents. Please see Chapter 7 of the EIR/EIS— Population, Employment, and Housing for more information on TAUs/RAUs. The mitigation measures and reduction strategies identified in the EIR/EIS will reduce Project-related GHG emissions, and the Project is being developed through existing and bonus TAUs and RAUs. However, it is unknown the extent to which climate change will be affected by GHG emissions from HMR. The possibility exists that Alternative 1A will contribute to global GHG emissions and global climate change.</p> <p>No other feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts associated with GHG emissions to a less-than-significant level because it is technically infeasible to allow development activities without some GHG emissions. The project's objectives include constructing onsite residential and tourist accommodation units, providing year-round use of the Project site and generating sufficient revenues to support the proposed environmental and fire safety improvements and ensure the continued viability of the ski operations. Therefore, mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the Proposed Project. Thus, because it is impossible to allow new development without GHG emissions, mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level would be facially infeasible and this impact is significant and unavoidable. As explained in the "Statement of Overriding Considerations," the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of Alternative 1A outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related to GHG emissions.</p> <p>One commenter suggested additional mitigation to reduced GHGs. The suggested measures were already included in the Proposed Project or the County has determined they are infeasible. Infeasible mitigation measures that were proposed by the commenter were using carbon credits and increased rail. The use of carbon credits and rail are not required by the County because they are determined to be infeasible for the Project. Carbon offsets are a complicated and somewhat controversial</p>

988

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>2008; Kats 2003).</p> <p>The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), and San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District have published various guidance documents with pre-quantified reduction potentials for mitigation measures used in the Bay Area, Sacramento Metropolitan Area, and San Joaquin Valley (EDAW 2009; SMAQMD 2008; SJVAPCD 2009). When appropriate, Table 19-30 of the EIR/EIS lists these reductions to provide an approximation of the potential CO2 reductions that may be achieved by the identified HMR LEED-ND strategies.</p> <p>Based on the pre-applicant checklist completed for HMR, the Project is expected to achieve gold certification. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CC-1 is required to document and verify Project certification. (SU)</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 19-51 through 19-60.)</p>	<p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 19-58 through 19-59.)</p>		<p>source of mitigation. Offsets must be consistent with an approved and valid protocol to assure the emissions offsets would only occur due to the financing provided by purchasing of the credits (i.e., the carbon offset project would not be able to commence without the funding provided by the Proposed Project). Credits must also be purchased annually until the Project is decommissioned to offset long-term, operational emissions. The costs of carbon offsets depends on program development and may increase with time. Currently, offsets from reputable programs range between \$10 to \$30 per metric ton of CO2e. Purchasing offsets in perpetuity may therefore require the project applicant to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars over the Project lifetime. Given the controversial issues surrounding carbon offsets, as well as the economic burden, carbon credits would be infeasible for the Proposed Project. The Project area and character does not support rail, and construction of a rail system may cause secondary impacts to noise, biology, and other sensitive resources. No additional mitigation measures for the Proposed Project have been identified by state or local agencies at this time.</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 19-51 through 19-60; see also Responses to Comments 11-11, 11-14 through 11-19.)</p>
<p>CC-C2. Will the Project Conflict with any Applicable Plan, Policy or Regulation of an Agency Adopted for the Purpose of Reducing the Emissions of GHGs?</p> <p>The State has adopted several policies and regulations for reducing GHG emissions (as discussed in Section 19.2). The most stringent of these is AB 32, which is designated to reduce Statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The TMPO has outlined a series of goals and polices geared towards reducing VMT and GHG emission from Transportation.</p> <p>As shown in Tables 19-27 and 19-28, Alternative 1A would result in substantial net increases of GHG and vehicle trips in comparison to the No Project (Alternative 2) under both existing (2008) and future year (2021) conditions. Thus, Project-generated GHG emissions may conflict with the State goals listed in AB 32 and polices outlines in the 2008 RTP. This impact is considered significant.</p> <p>(SU)</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 19-60 through 19-61.)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure CC-1: Document and Verify Implementation of the Project GHG Reduction Commitments</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for CC-1 above.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure CC-2: Implement Project Design Features to Further Reduce Project Contribution to Climate Change</p> <p>Complete text of Mitigation Measure is included under findings for CC-1 above.</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 18-18 through 18-19.)</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, Alternative 1A that substantially lessen Proposed Project's potential to conflict with applicable plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. As noted above, CEQA requires public agencies to adopt feasible mitigation measures which would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of projects. Even with the implementation of the Proposed Project's commitment to numerous GHG reduction strategies through participation in the LEED for Neighborhood Development Pilot Program, and Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2, the County finds that complete avoidance of potential cumulative effects of the project on climate change based on the criteria set forth in CC-C2 is not feasible. This is because of the project objectives include constructing onsite residential and tourist accommodation units, providing year-round use of the Project site and generating sufficient revenues to support the proposed environmental and fire safety improvements while ensuring the continued viability of the ski operations.</p> <p>Overriding Considerations: The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the project override the significant adverse impact of the project associated with the proposed project's potential to conflict with applicable plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p> <p>Finding of Fact for Project's Potential to Conflict with any</p>

997

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>Applicable Plan, Policy or Regulation of an Agency Adopted for the Purpose of Reducing the Emissions of GHGs: As described in the findings for Impact CC-C1, Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2 will result in lower GHG emissions levels than had it not been incorporated. However, Alternative 1A is unlikely to achieve reductions consistent with the requirements of AB 32. The possibility exists that the Project will contribute to global GHG emissions and therefore conflict with existing and future actions to reduce GHG emissions.</p> <p>No other feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts associated with GHG emissions to a less-than-significant level because it is technically infeasible to allow development activities without some GHG emissions. The project's objectives include constructing onsite residential and tourist accommodation units, providing year-round use of the Project site and generating sufficient revenues to support the proposed environmental and fire safety improvements and ensure the continued viability of the ski operations. Therefore, mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the Proposed Project. Thus, because it is impossible to allow new development without GHG emissions, mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level would be facially infeasible and this impact is significant and unavoidable. As explained in the "Statement of Overriding Considerations," the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the Project outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related to GHG emissions.</p> <p>One commenter suggested additional mitigation to reduced GHGs. The suggested measures were already included in the Proposed Project or the County has determined they are infeasible. Infeasible mitigation measures that were proposed by the commenter were using carbon credits and increased rail. The use of carbon credits and rail are not required by the County because they are determined to be infeasible for the Project. Carbon offsets are a complicated and somewhat controversial source of mitigation. Offsets must be consistent with an approved and valid protocol to assure the emissions offsets would only occur due to the financing provided by purchasing of the credits (i.e., the carbon offset project would not be able to commence without the funding provided by the Proposed Project). Credits must also be purchased annually until the Project is decommissioned to offset long-term, operational emissions. The costs of carbon offsets depends on program development and may increase with time. Currently, offsets from reputable programs range between \$10 to \$30 per metric ton of CO₂e. Purchasing offsets in perpetuity may therefore require the project applicant to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars over the Project lifetime. Given the controversial issues surrounding carbon offsets, as well as the economic burden, carbon credits would be infeasible for the Proposed Project. The Project area and character does not support rail, and construction of a rail system</p>

228

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE FINDING BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>may cause secondary impacts to noise, biology, and other sensitive resources. No additional mitigation measures for the Proposed Project have been identified by state or local agencies at this time.</p> <p>(Final EIR/ES, pp. 19-60 through 19-61; see also Master Response 19; and Responses to Comments 11-11, 11-13 through 11-19.)</p>

229

Less than Significant = LS

Beneficial = B

Significant = S

Cumulative Significant = CS

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Potentially Significant = PS