

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT LOCATION

The Heavenly Mountain Resort (also referred to as Heavenly in this document) is a year-round resort located partially inside and partially outside of the Lake Tahoe Region on the south shore of Lake Tahoe. Heavenly is situated within El Dorado County, California and Douglas County, Nevada, primarily on United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service (Forest Service) lands. Access to the Heavenly Mountain Resort is by way of U.S. Highway 50 and State Highway 89 from California and U.S. Highway 50 and State Highway 207 from Nevada. The Lake Tahoe Airport is located approximately six miles from the California base area, and the Reno Cannon International Airport is approximately 55 miles to the northeast of the Nevada base areas.

PROCESS

Heavenly currently operates under a 40-year Ski Area Special Use Permit issued by the Forest Service on May 7, 2002. Heavenly's location in the Lake Tahoe Basin subjects its proposed resort improvements to extensive, multi-level review and approval by the Forest Service, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), El Dorado County California, Alpine County California as well as required compliance and conformity with all other applicable local, state and federal laws, rules, regulations, plans and policies.

A 20-year Heavenly Master Plan was adopted by the Forest Service, TRPA and El Dorado County in 1996 for the improvement, expansion, and management of summer and winter uses at Heavenly (MP 96). Section 1.4 of the MP 96 EIR/EIS/EIS (95 Draft and 96 Final EIR/EIS/EIS) stated that "because of changing needs or conditions and monitoring, this Master Plan may be amended." Following a change of Heavenly's ownership in 2002, a comprehensive review of all aspects of resort management, operations and future planning was completed. That review and subsequent analysis thereof, combined with direction from the Forest Service, resulted in Heavenly's decision to propose an amendment to the MP 96 through the Heavenly Mountain Resort Master Plan Amendment 2007 (MPA 07).

In early 2005, preparation of environmental documentation was initiated to analyze the potential effects of amending the MP 96 both on a programmatic level and for specific projects that were proposed for immediate implementation (identified as Phase 1 projects). After an initial agency review of an Environmental Assessment/Negative Declaration, the lead agencies and Heavenly agreed to prepare an EIR/EIS/EIS for the proposed MPA 07 that would include additional Action Alternatives and more detailed analysis for several of the environmental issues (e.g., biological resources, water quality and visual resources). The EIR/EIS/EIS was certified in 2007 along with the adoption of the Master Plan Amendment.

This EIR/EIS/EIS will be utilized by a number of regulatory agencies in order to consider approval of the projects proposed in the Epic Discovery Project. This document is an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for TRPA and is the environmental document on which

the Governing Board will consider its approval of the Heavenly Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan Amendment to add the Epic Discovery Project. In addition, the Epic Discovery Project EIR/EIS/EIS will also function as the environmental analysis and documentation for subsequent TRPA consideration of permits for the specific Epic Discovery projects. This document is also an EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, which the Forest Service will use to base its final decision in a forthcoming Record of Decision, and approve proposed projects. The EIR/EIS/EIS serves as the compliance document under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region is the CEQA Lead Agency.

SUMMARY OF THE ALTERNATIVES TO BE CONSIDERED

The No Action/No Project, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 and 2 are summarized below. Detailed descriptions of the Alternatives are provided in Sections 2.2 through 2.4 of this Draft EIR/EIS/EIS. Table Summary-1 documents the differences between the Alternatives selected for detailed study. The Alternatives were constructed to address potential impacts identified for certain Epic Discovery activities during initial project scoping. Alternatives that were considered by the lead agencies but eliminated from detailed study are described in Section 2.5.

No Action/No Project

As required by NEPA, TRPA, and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a No Action or No Project Alternative has been included in this analysis for review alongside the action alternatives. By definition, the No Action Alternative represents a continuation of existing management practices without changes, additions, or upgrades to existing conditions. The No Action Alternative (continued implementation of the 2007 Mater Plan Amendment) allows a comparison of the effects from continued implementation of the 2007 Ski Area Master Plan to the Action Alternatives. Existing summer uses would continue, including sightseeing via the Heavenly Gondola, hiking and mountain biking on existing roadways and pathways, and operation of activities such as the climbing wall, tubing hill, ziplines, and ropes courses.

Proposed Action

The Proposed Action is designed to expand and diversify year-round, non-skiing recreational opportunities at Heavenly, primarily for summer time users. Proposed projects would utilize existing infrastructure (e.g., ski lifts) and guest service facilities to provide a wide variety of new summer daytime activities for guests. Some of the proposed aerial activities (e.g., ziplines, coaster) would also operate during winter season. All activities would be accessed using the existing Gondola from the base station at Heavenly Village. The Proposed Action includes the following project activities, grouped by general location:

- Adventure Peak (Entirely within the Lake Tahoe Basin)
 - Mid-Station Zipline Canopy Tour
 - Sky Cycle Canopy Tour
 - Forest Flyer Alpine Coaster
 - Smaller Infill Activities
 - Interpretive Activities at Tamarack Lodge

- East Peak Basin (Almost entirely outside the Lake Tahoe Basin)
 - Mountain Bike Park
 - East Peak Zipline Canopy Tour
 - East Peak Reservoir Water Activities
 - Interpretive Activities at East Peak Lodge
 - East Peak Lodge Hiking Trail
- Sky Meadows Basin (Entirely within the Lake Tahoe Basin)
 - Sky Meadows Zipline Canopy Tour
 - Sky Meadows Challenge Course
 - Ridge Run Lookout Tower and Observation Deck
 - Interpretive Activities at Sky Deck
- Mountainwide
 - Educational Opportunities and Interpretive Information
 - Mountain Excursion Tour
 - Connecting Trails (e.g., Panorama Trail to connect East Peak Lake area to Tahoe Rim Trail and Van Sickle Park Connector Trail)
 - Emergency Gondola Snow Cat Evacuation Route (Winter Use Only)

Alternative 1

Alternative 1 includes each of the components of the Proposed Action except for the Forest Flyer Alpine Coaster. Although the Forest Flyer Alpine Coaster in Adventure Peak would be eliminated, Alternative 1 proposes the Sky Basin Coaster located in Sky Meadows Basin. This alternative is being studied as an alternative location due to the potential for sensitive species habitat in the Forest Flyer location in Adventure Peak. The Sky Basin Coaster would operate using a similar system and equipment as the Forest Flyer Alpine Coaster.

Alternative 2

Alternative 2 is the Proposed Action minus the Sky Basin Challenge (Ropes) Course. This alternative is being studied as a potential way to reduce physical impacts to the Sky Meadow SEZ area. This alternative would remove the Sky Meadows Challenge (Ropes) Course from the Proposed Action, but would retain the remaining Sky Basin components included under the Proposed Action (e.g., Sky Meadows Zipline Canopy Tour and Ridge Run Lookout Tower).

Table Summary-1

Differences Between Alternatives Selected for Detailed Study

| Epic Discovery Component | No Action | Proposed Action | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Forest Flyer Alpine Coaster | | X | | X |
| Sky Meadows Challenge (Ropes) Course | | X | X | |
| Sky Basin Coaster | | | X | |

SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS

Table Summary-2 summarizes the potential effects of the Proposed Action and Action Alternatives, and lists the mitigation measures and design features incorporated into the Proposed Action and Action Alternatives to eliminate or reduce the potential effects. Through inclusion of the mitigation measures and design features into the Proposed Action and Action Alternatives, no significant effects result from implementation of the proposed projects or alternatives. Effects and mitigation measures for the No Action Alternative (continued implementation of the Heavenly Master Plan) are addressed in the 96 Final EIR/EIS/EIS and 07 Final EIR/EIS/EIS prepared for the MP 96 and MPA 07, respectively. The detailed description of MPA 07 mitigation measures can be found in Chapter 5 and in Table 2-6: Measures/Design Features Added to the Proposed Action and Action Alternatives.

The following acronyms are used in Table Summary-2:

- S – Significant Impact
- PS – Potentially Significant Impact
- LS – Less than Significant Impact
- NI – No Impact
- AE – Adverse Effect
- PAE – Potential Adverse Effect
- NAE – No Adverse Effect

Table Summary-2

Summary of Potential Effects and Required Mitigation Measures/Design Features

| Potential Effects | Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures/Design Features | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|---|
| 3.1 Water Resources: Hydrology, and Cumulative Watershed Effects | | | |
| WATER-1: Would the Project increase peak and total runoff such that downstream conveyance or storage facilities (creeks, reservoirs, pipes, basins, etc.) no longer have adequate capacity, create new sources of chronic erosion or be located in areas of known chronic soil erosion in the Heavenly Valley Creek watershed (CA-1)? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | Implement Chapter 2 Design Features and existing MPA 07 measures including: <i>Sky Meadows Zipline Canopy Tour Design Features:</i> -The platform locations are designed to be located outside of Heavenly Valley Creek headwaters SEZ areas -Over-the-snow tree removal and yarding where feasible based on implementation timing and snowpack, over a minimum 12 inches compacted snow. -Trees which are removed over the snow will be skidded over a minimum of 12 inches of compacted snow behind a snow cat to a staging area in order to prevent soil disturbance. Removed trees will be limbed and chipped at the staging area for use for erosion control and soil amendments. -7.4-14 - Reduce and Control Fugitive Dust -7.5-23 - Minimize Loss/Degradation of Sensitive Plant Species <i>Trail Construction Design Features:</i> -Site-specific layout of walking paths and hiking trails with Forest Service specialists -7.4.1 – REVISED <u>Implement the Construction Erosion Reduction Program</u> -7.4.2 – Construct Infiltration Facilities -7.4.3 – Control Runoff for Existing Facilities -7.4.4 – Meet Water Quality Standards -7.4.5 – Implement Adaptive Ski Run Prescriptions | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |

Table Summary-2

Summary of Potential Effects and Required Mitigation Measures/Design Features

| Potential Effects | Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures/Design Features | Significance After Mitigation |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | <p>-7.4-6 – Control Runoff due to Future Construction and Long-term Operation of Facilities</p> <p>-7.5-24 – Noxious Weed Invasive Plant Management</p> <p>-7.5-2 – REVISED Collection/Monitoring Agreement (On-going Environmental Monitoring Program)</p> <p>-Drainage Spacing and Trail Tread Armoring</p> <p><i>Sky Meadows Challenge Course Design Features:</i></p> <p>7.4-7 – Avoid Disturbance to SEZ or Restore/Create SEZ</p> <p>7.4-9 – Avoid and/or Restore Future Disturbed SEZ to Meet MP-96 Mitigation Measure 7.4-7 Requirements.</p> <p>-7.5-21 Protect Tahoe Draba Populations within Heavenly Mountain Resort.</p> <p>-Heavenly shall define the staging and training area for the Sky Meadows Challenge Course with fencing/barriers outside of the Sky Meadows SEZ, which would avoid permanent land coverage in SEZ/LCD 1b.</p> <p>-Heavenly shall define the parking area for the Mountain Excursion Tour vehicles with fencing/barriers and separate it from nearby SEZ.</p> <p>-Heavenly shall locate all temporary and permanent disturbance required for the construction and operation of the Sky Meadows Challenge Course outside of the mapped SEZ, which would avoid permanent land coverage in SEZ/LCD 1b.</p> <p>-Heavenly shall use fencing/barriers to exclude pedestrian access to the mapped SEZ located under the Sky Meadows Challenge Course (e.g., stairway access from the Sky Deck to the SEZ will be closed during summer use).</p> <p>-Heavenly shall use fencing/barriers as needed to direct</p> | |

Table Summary-2

Summary of Potential Effects and Required Mitigation Measures/Design Features

| Potential Effects | Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures/Design Features | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|---|
| | | summer visitors to the existing Sky Meadows bathrooms using the existing summer maintenance roadway. <i>Mountain Excursion Tour Design Features:</i> -Pullouts/visitor stops would be designed at low risk and hydrologically stable locations. -Site-specific maintenance/road improvement needs would be identified and completed prior to public operations at the beginning of each summer season. -Ongoing dust control would be provided by a water truck on a regular daily or as needed in order to minimize dust and maintain a high-quality experience for the visitors. | |
| WATER-2: Would the Project increase peak and total runoff such that downstream conveyance or storage facilities (creeks, reservoirs, pipes, basins, etc.) no longer have adequate capacity, create new sources of chronic erosion or be located in areas of known chronic soil erosion in the Gondola watershed (CA-7)? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| WATER-3: Would the Project increase peak and total runoff such that downstream conveyance or storage facilities (creeks, reservoirs, pipes, basins, etc.) no longer have adequate capacity, create new sources of chronic erosion or be located in areas of known chronic soil erosion in the Mott Canyon watershed (NV-1)? | Action – NAE Alt. 1 – NAE Alt. 2 – NAE | None | Action – NAE Alt. 1 – NAE Alt. 2 – NAE |
| WATER-4: Would the Project increase peak and total runoff such that downstream conveyance or storage facilities (creeks, reservoirs, pipes, basins, etc.) no longer have adequate capacity, create new sources of chronic erosion or be located in areas of | Action – NAE Alt. 1 – NAE Alt. 2 – NAE | None | Action – NAE Alt. 1 – NAE Alt. 2 – NAE |

Table Summary-2

Summary of Potential Effects and Required Mitigation Measures/Design Features

| Potential Effects | Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures/Design Features | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|---|
| known chronic soil erosion in the Daggett Creek watershed (NV-2+5)? | | | |
| WATER-5: Would the Project increase peak and total runoff such that downstream conveyance or storage facilities (creeks, reservoirs, pipes, basins, etc.) no longer have adequate capacity, create new sources of chronic erosion or be located in areas of known chronic soil erosion in the Edgewood Creek watersheds (NV-3, EDGE-1, EDGE-2)? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| WATER-6: Would Construction and Operation of the Project Lead to Noncompliance with Surface Water Quality Standards and Thresholds in Heavenly Valley Creek? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| WATER-7: Would Construction and Operation of the Project Lead to Noncompliance with Surface Water Quality Standards and Thresholds in Edgewood Creek? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| WATER-8: Would Construction and Operation of the Project Lead to Noncompliance with Surface Water Quality Standards and Thresholds in Mott and Daggett Creeks? | Action – NAE Alt. 1 – NAE Alt. 2 – NAE | None | Action – NAE Alt. 1 – NAE Alt. 2 – NAE |
| WATER-C1: Would the Project have significant cumulative impacts to water resources in watershed CA-1? | Action – S/PAE Alt. 1 – S/PAE Alt. 2 – S/PAE | WATER-C1a: CA-1 ERA and Erosion Reduction Measures WATER-C1b: Amendment to MPA 07 Mitigation Measure 7.5-2, <u>On-Going</u> Environmental Monitoring Program | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| WATER-C2: Would the Project have significant cumulative impacts to water resources in watershed CA-7? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| WATER-C3: Would the Project have significant | Action – PAE | WATER-C3: NV-1 ERA and Erosion Reduction Measures | Action – NAE |

Table Summary-2

Summary of Potential Effects and Required Mitigation Measures/Design Features

| Potential Effects | Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures/Design Features | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|---|
| cumulative impacts to water resources in watershed NV-1? | Alt. 1 – PAE Alt. 2 – PAE | WATER-C1b: Amendment to Mitigation Measure 7.5-2, <u>On-Going</u> Environmental Monitoring Program | Alt. 1 – NAE Alt. 2 – NAE |
| WATER-C4: Would the Project have significant cumulative impacts to water resources in watershed NV-2+5? | Action – NAE Alt. 1 – NAE Alt. 2 – NAE | None | Action – NAE Alt. 1 – NAE Alt. 2 – NAE |
| WATER-C5: Would the Project have significant cumulative impacts to water resources in watershed NV-3? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | Existing MPA 07 mitigation measures and standard design features | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| 3.2 Stream Environment Zones and Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands | | | |
| See Chapter 3.1 and Chapter 3.8 | -- | Addressed in Chapter 3.1, Chapter 3.4 and Chapter 3.8 | -- |
| 3.3 Water Use, Water Rights and Groundwater | | | |
| None | -- | None | -- |
| 3.4 Geology and Soils | | | |
| GEO-1: Would the project result in covering of the soil beyond the limits allowed in the land capability or Individual Parcel Evaluation System? | Action – PSLS Alt. 1 – PSLS Alt. 2 – LS | GEO-1: Relocate Sky Challenge Course Outside the Mapped SEZ None | Action – LS Alt. 1 – LS Alt. 2 – LS |
| GEO-2: Would Project construction of new summer activities impact soil quality and function or create unstable soil conditions? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | Existing MPA 07 measure 7.4-1 Ongoing Implement the Construction Erosion Reduction Program | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| GEO C-1: Cumulative Geological Effects | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |

Table Summary-2

Summary of Potential Effects and Required Mitigation Measures/Design Features

| Potential Effects | Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures/Design Features | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| 3.5 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases/Climate Change | | | |
| AQ-1: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| AQ-2: Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| AQ-3: Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| AQ-4: Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollution concentrations? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| AQ-5: Will the Project Generate Objectionable Odors? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| GHG-1: Would the project generate more than 25,000 MT CO ₂ e GHG emissions? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| GHG-2: Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE |

Table Summary-2

Summary of Potential Effects and Required Mitigation Measures/Design Features

| Potential Effects | Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures/Design Features | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|---|
| | Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | | Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| 3.6 Noise | | | |
| NOISE-1: Adventure Peak Activities Noise Impacts | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| NOISE-2: East Peak Lake Basin Activities Noise Impacts | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| NOISE-3: Sky Meadows Basin Activities Noise Impacts | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| NOISE-4: Construction Noise Impacts | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| NOISE-5: Traffic Noise Impacts | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| NOISE C-1: Cumulative Noise Effects | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| 3.7 Transportation, Parking and Circulation | | | |
| TRANS-1: Will the Project result in the generation of 200 or more new Daily Vehicle Trip Ends? | Action – S/NAE Alt. 1 – S/NAE | TRANS-1: Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE |

Table Summary-2

Summary of Potential Effects and Required Mitigation Measures/Design Features

| Potential Effects | Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures/Design Features | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| | Alt. 2 – S/NAE | | Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| TRANS-2. Will the Project result in a substantial impact upon the existing transportation systems, including roadways and intersections? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| TRANS-3. Will the Project result in changes to existing parking facilities or create a demand for parking that cannot be served by existing parking facilities? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| TRANS-4. Will the Project result in a substantial impact upon the existing transportation systems, including bicycle or pedestrian facilities? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| TRANS-5. Will the Project result in a substantial impact upon the existing transportation systems, including transit facilities? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| TRANS-6. Will the Project result in alterations to the present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| TRANS-7. Will the Project result in substantial increased traffic congestion on mountain roadways and trails? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| TRANS-8. Will the Project result in a temporary impact upon existing transportation systems due to construction traffic? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| TRANS-9. Will the Project result in an increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or | Action – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE |

Table Summary-2

Summary of Potential Effects and Required Mitigation Measures/Design Features

| Potential Effects | Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures/Design Features | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|---|
| pedestrians? | Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | | Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| TRANS-C1: Will the project result in a substantial impact upon cumulative transportation systems, including roadways and intersections? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| 3.8 Vegetation | | | |
| VEG-1: Would the Project increase the risk of introduction or spread of invasive plants (aquatic or terrestrial)? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | Existing MPA 07 measure 7.5-24 Noxious Weed Invasive Plant Management | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| VEG-2: Would the Project result in an overall decrease in long term trends in Tahoe draba populations within the Project area? | Action – PS/PAE Alt. 1 – PS/PAE Alt. 2 – PS/PAE | Revised MPA 07 measure 7.5-21 VEG 1: Update MPA05 Mitigation Measure 7.5-21 10: Protect Tahoe Draba Populations within Heavenly Mountain Resort Existing MPA 07 measure 7.5-22 Tahoe Draba Long Term Conservation Strategy | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| VEG-3: Would the project result in an increase to the risk/threat factors for listing of whitebark pine? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| VEG-4: Would the project result in a loss of TESPC, CNPS, FSS, or Nevada at Risk Botanical Species? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | Existing MPA 07 measures including: 7.5-21 Protect Tahoe Draba Populations within Heavenly Mountain Resort (Revised) 7.5-22: Tahoe Draba Long Term Conservation Strategy 7.5-23: Minimize Loss/Degradation of Sensitive Plant Species 7.5-24 Noxious Weed Invasive Plant Management | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| VEG-5: Would the project adversely affect other botanical resources (e.g. LTBMU watch list, uncommon plant list communities, special aquatic | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |

Table Summary-2

Summary of Potential Effects and Required Mitigation Measures/Design Features

| Potential Effects | Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures/Design Features | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|---|
| features or Stream Environment Zones)? | | | |
| VEG-6: Will the Project result in the removal of any native live trees larger than 24-inch dbh, and late seral habitat as defined by TRPA or SNFPA? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| VEG-C1: Will the project have significant cumulative impacts to vegetation? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | Existing MPA 07 measures including: 7.4-15 Minimize Removal/Modification of Deciduous Trees, Wetlands, and Meadows 7.5-21 Protect Tahoe Draba Populations within Heavenly Mountain Resort (Revised) 7.5-22: Tahoe Draba Long Term Conservation Strategy 7.5-23: Minimize Loss/Degradation of Sensitive Plant Species 7.5-24 Noxious Weed Invasive Plant Management | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| 3.9 Wildlife and Fisheries | | | |
| BIO-1: Would the Project, directly or indirectly, cause a loss of individuals or occupied habitat of endangered or threatened fish or wildlife species? | Action – PS/PAE Alt. 1 – PS/PAE Alt. 2 – PS/PAE | BIO-1: Delay Sky Meadows Challenge Course, Sky Basin Coaster and East Peak Lake Water Activities Until Sierra Nevada Yellow-legged Frog Surveys and USFWS Consultation Are Complete | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| BIO-2: Would the Project cause a permanent loss of sensitive wildlife individuals, or habitat (e.g. Forest Service Sensitive, CA Species of Concern, NV At-Risk, TRPA Special Interest Species)? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| BIO-3: Would the Project have an adverse effect to migratory land bird species or their associated habitats? | Action – PS/AE Alt. 1 – PS/AE Alt. 2 – PS/AE | BIO-3: Migratory Bird Limited Operating Period and Habitat Utilization Survey | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| BIO-4: Would the Project cause a loss of wildlife nursery/den sites and associated habitat? | Action – PS/PAE Alt. 1 – PS/PAE Alt. 2 – PS/PAE | BIO-4: Wildlife Nursery Site Survey | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |

Table Summary-2

Summary of Potential Effects and Required Mitigation Measures/Design Features

| Potential Effects | Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures/Design Features | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|---|
| BIO-5: Would the Project substantially block or disrupt major fish or wildlife migration or travel corridors? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| BIO-6: Would the Project alter the existing bioregional trend in habitats and ecosystem components, or lead to a change in the distribution of Management Indicator Species (MIS) across the Sierra Nevada Bioregion? | Action – NI/NAE Alt. 1 – NI/NAE Alt. 2 – NI/NAE | None | Action – NI/NAE Alt. 1 – NI/NAE Alt. 2 – NI/NAE |
| BIO-7: Would the Project conflict with any federal, local, regional, or state policies or TRPA ordinances protecting wildlife resources, or with any applicable habitat conservation plans? | Action – NI/NAE Alt. 1 – NI/NAE Alt. 2 – NI/NAE | None | Action – NI/NAE Alt. 1 – NI/NAE Alt. 2 – NI/NAE |
| BIO-8: Would the Project result in increased human/wildlife interactions? | Action – S/AE Alt. 1 – S/AE Alt. 2 – S/AE | BIO-8: Wildlife Trash Management and Education Program | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| BIO-C1: Will the project have significant cumulative impacts to biological resources? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| 3.10 Visual Resources | | | |
| SCENIC-1: Emergency Gondola Snow Cat Evacuation Route Would Create New Forest Clearings and Would be Visible Offsite | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| SCENIC-2: Ridge Run Lookout Tower Would be Visible Off-site | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |

Table Summary-2

Summary of Potential Effects and Required Mitigation Measures/Design Features

| Potential Effects | Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures/Design Features | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|---|
| SCENIC-3: The Forest Flyer Alpine Coaster Top Terminal, Sky Meadows Zipline Canopy Tour and Sky Basin Coaster Would Create New Forest Clearings and Would be Visible Off-site | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| SCENIC-4: Proposed Project Components Would Create Changes to the Scenic Quality of Views within Heavenly Mountain | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| SCENIC-5: Proposed Project Components Would Be Visible from the Tahoe Rim Trail | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| SCENIC-C1: Cumulative Visual Resource | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| 3.11 Cultural Resources | | | |
| CULT-1: Would the Project comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and TRPA Ordinances included in Code Chapter 67? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | Existing MPA 07 measures including: 7.4-19 Evaluate and Monitor Known Archaeological Resources within the Comstock Logging Historic District 7.4-20 Identify and Protect Undiscovered Archaeological Resources | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| CULT-C1: Will the project have significant cumulative impacts to cultural resources? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| 3.12 Land Use | | | |
| LU-1: Will the Project be inconsistent with the TRPA Regional Plan, Code of Ordinances or Plan Area Statements 086 or 087? | Action – LS Alt. 1 – LS Alt. 2 – LS | None | Action – LS Alt. 1 – LS Alt. 2 – LS |

Table Summary-2

Summary of Potential Effects and Required Mitigation Measures/Design Features

| Potential Effects | Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures/Design Features | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|---|
| LU-2: Will the project be inconsistent with the LTBMU Forest Plan and Forest Service policy for Additional Year-Round Recreation Activities at Ski Areas? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| LU-3: Will the project be inconsistent with local General Plan designations? | Action – LS Alt. 1 – LS Alt. 2 – LS | None | Action – LS Alt. 1 – LS Alt. 2 – LS |
| 3.13 Recreation | | | |
| REC-1: Is the Project consistent with Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines and objectives for summer recreation at ski areas as authorized by SAROEAE? | Action –NAE Alt. 1 –NAE Alt. 2 –NAE | Existing MPA 07 measure 7.4-21 – Protect the Tahoe Rim Trail | Action –NAE Alt. 1 –NAE Alt. 2 –NAE |
| REC-2: Would the Project result in decreased availability or degradation of a high quality recreational experience? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| REC-3: Would the Project conflict with an established recreational use in the area? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| REC-4: Would the Project result in the need for new or expanded parks or recreational facilities? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |
| REC-C1: Will the project result in cumulative impacts to recreational uses or resources? | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE | None | Action – LS/NAE Alt. 1 – LS/NAE Alt. 2 – LS/NAE |

Table Summary-2

Summary of Potential Effects and Required Mitigation Measures/Design Features

| Potential Effects | Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures/Design Features | Significance After Mitigation |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 3.14 Socioeconomics | | | |
| None | -- | None | -- |