17.0 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND PUBLIC SAFETY

17.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

17.1.1 Regional Setting

This chapter evaluates the potential hazardous material and public health and safety impacts from implementation of the Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) Ski Area Master Plan (Project). The analysis presented in this chapter is based partly on review of the *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment* (*Phase I ESA*) prepared for the HMR property (Robison Engineering 2005).

The Project area consists of 20 contiguous parcels on 1,200 acres in Placer County near the west shore of Lake Tahoe in the Sierra Nevada Mountains. The property is forestland developed as a ski resort since the 1960s. Elevation of the property ranges from 6,360 to 7,880 feet above sea level. Generally, the property slopes steeply to the east toward Lake Tahoe. The community of Homewood, which consists of residences, a post office and several small businesses, is situated east of the Project area, between HMR and the west shore of Lake Tahoe. The west, north, and south sides of HMR are bordered by undeveloped forestland administered by the USDA Forest Service (USFS), Lake Tahoe Management Unit (LTBMU).

17.1.2 Existing Site Conditions

The closest schools to the project site are Tahoe Lake Elementary School, Coldstream Alternative School, North Tahoe Middle School, and North Tahoe High School, located 5 miles north in Tahoe City. The closest airports are located in South Lake Tahoe (14 miles south), Truckee (17 miles north), and Reno, Nevada (33 miles east). The Project area is not located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school, an airport land use plan, or within 2 miles of a public or private airport. Consequently, issues associated with hazardous materials in proximity to these uses are not evaluated further in this EIR/EIS. The project's potential effect on emergency access routes and plans is also discussed in Chapter 11 - Transportation and Circulation.

HMR was used for logging from the 1860s to the 1890s. It was developed as a ski resort in the 1960s. Developed areas are the South Base area and North Base area accessed from SR 89. HMR includes eight ski lifts and the Mid-Mountain Pavilion in a temporary structure. At the South Base area, the South Lodge is a wooden, three-story building that contains a restaurant, offices, restrooms, and a food storage area. Immediately south of the South Lodge are two smaller two-story wood buildings used for offices, lift ticket sales, and a children's ski school. The main HMR maintenance building is located southeast of the South Lodge. Gasoline and diesel fuel are stored nearby in an above ground storage tank (AST). New and used motor oil and antifreeze, gear lubricants, and maintenance supplies are stored in the maintenance building. The building also contains a parts washing basin. A licensed hazardous waste recycler removes used fluids and lead acid batteries on a routine basis.

The North Base area contains the main ski lodge, which is a three-story wood frame building. The lodge building houses a restaurant/snack bar, ski rental area, office, restrooms and storage areas. A single story wood frame building used for equipment rentals and sales is located immediately west of the North Lodge. A small maintenance building is located northwest of the lodge. Diesel fuel is stored in a nearby

AST. Small quantities of motor oil and other maintenance supplies are stored in the maintenance building. The building also has a parts washing basin. A one-room wood frame building located west of the North Lodge houses the pumps and equipment used for making artificial snow. Another small wood frame building located southwest of the Madden lift base is used for parts storage.

The regularly occupied buildings on the HMR property are served with electricity, natural gas for heating, municipal water, and municipal sewer connections. The temporary Mid-Mountain Pavilion does not have a municipal sewer connection. A commercial disposal company removes trash from the property.

Other areas of the property that are developed with structures are at the bases and termini of the ski lifts, a temporary tent that serves as a lunch area, and an area near the terminus of the Madden ski lift that contains a communications repeater station. Ski lifts have an auxiliary diesel generator power unit. Diesel fuel is contained in small (generally 25-gallon) tanks.

A *Phase 1 ESA* was prepared to document recognized environmental conditions at HMR related to current and historical uses of the Project area and to evaluate the potential for release of hazardous materials from on-site or off-site sources that could significantly affect environmental conditions (Robison Engineering Company 2005). As part of the *Phase 1 ESA*, a search was performed of several regulatory agency databases, including those of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), and Office of Emergency Services (OES) to identify potential pollution sources within one mile of the HMR property. The *Phase 1 ESA* also reviewed historic aerial photographs to identify past activity at or adjacent to the Project area and conducted four site reconnaissance visits (Robison Engineering Company 2005).

The record search identified underground storage tanks (USTs) that were formerly located at the South Base area and North Base area. Two USTs used for fuel have been removed and groundwater monitoring wells were installed. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board issued letters of closure for both tanks, indicating that the sources of contamination were removed. The record search identified 11 other sites with USTs or other potential sources of contamination in the Project vicinity located along or near the shore of Lake Tahoe and down-gradient from HMR (Robison Engineering Company 2005, DTSC 2010).

The site reconnaissance and records search conducted for the *Phase I ESA* found that there is a low concentration of MTBE in the groundwater near monitoring well 4 in the North Base area parking lot. MTBE was a commonly used gasoline additive. The source of the MTBE is likely from releases of gasoline from cars in the parking lot area, rather than from a chronic source such as a leaking UST. Natural attenuation has reduced MTBE concentrations to levels that are near the California water quality objective, and continued attenuation over time is expected to result in groundwater reaching the water quality objective. The *Phase I ESA* has no recommendations for additional environmental assessment of HMR beyond another round of sampling of monitoring wells 2 and 4 (Robison Engineering Company 2005). MTBE was banned from use as a gasoline additive in California on January 1, 2004, so new sources of MTBE contamination are not expected in the Project area.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

The EPA enforces the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), which address hazardous waste generation, transportation, storage, treatment, and disposal. The law requires hazardous waste manifests to track the movement and transfer of hazardous waste from its original location to its final destination for disposal. Any business, institution, or other entity that generates hazardous waste is required to identify and track its hazardous waste from the point of generation until it is recycled, reused, or disposed.

CalEPA and DTSC are responsible for implementing RCRA and the State Hazardous Waste Control Law. The DTSC regulates hazardous waste generation, transport, treatment, storage, and disposal more stringently than the EPA under 22 CCR, Division 4.5. The California Hazardous Waste Control Law and its associated regulations are similar to RCRA but regulate a larger number of chemicals because they define hazardous waste more broadly. The DTSC maintains the Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List ("Cortese List") of designated as hazardous waste properties per CCR §65962.5. There are no reported hazardous waste facilities or contaminated sites listed in the Project area or vicinity, or along major transportation routes that may be used during construction or operation of the Project (DTSC 2010).

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, commonly called the Superfund Act, created a national policy and procedures to identify and clean up sites contaminated by releases of hazardous substances. The law was amended and strengthened in 1986 by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act. One important provision of the amendments was to expand public participation in the clean up process. Funding is available to advisory groups composed of persons affected by releases from a site. There are no ongoing environmental investigations or cleanups, nor any unresolved known contamination issues, on or near the Project area.

17.1.3 Asbestos

Asbestos was formerly used in insulation and other building materials, and has potential to occur in the existing buildings at HMR that were built prior to 1980. Asbestos is designated as a hazardous substance when the fibers have potential to come in contact with air because the fibers are small enough to lodge in human lung tissue and cause health problems. Asbestos is not required as part of the *Phase I ESA*, and there is no inventory of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) in existing buildings at HMR. ACMs pose an inhalation threat if they occur in a friable state. If the ACMs are not friable, there is no inhalation hazard because asbestos fibers remain bound in the material matrix.

17.1.4 Lead Paint

Human exposure to lead has been determined by EPA and the U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) to be an adverse health risk, particularly to young children. Demolition of structures containing lead-based paint requires specific remediation activities regulated by federal, State, and local laws. The use of lead as an additive to paint was discontinued in 1978. However, many structures at HMR were built before the 1980s and may contain lead-based paints. A lead-based paint survey has not been performed on these structures by a certified Cal-EPA Inspector/Assessor (California Department of Health Services, Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Branch).

17.1.5 Polychlorinated Biphenyls

Prior to 1975, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) were commonly used in transformers, capacitors, and fluorescent light ballasts. In 1975, when it was demonstrated that PCBs were highly toxic to the environment, the manufacture of PCBs was discontinued in the U.S. The *Phase I ESA* found no older pole-mounted electrical transformers that may contain PCBs are known to occur at or adjacent to the Project area.

17.1.6 Mosquito/Vector Control

Mosquitoes species expected to occur in the Project area have potential to transmit human diseases, such as West Nile Virus and encephalitis, and diseases affecting pets and wildlife. Mosquito larvae generally require stagnant, standing water over a period of three or more days to successfully hatch. Developed areas typically include numerous microenvironments suitable for mosquito reproduction, such as poorly drained impervious surfaces on structures, in debris, or landscaping. The climate, topography, and plant communities of the Tahoe Basin provide an abundance and variety of natural larval mosquito habitats. The restoration of stream environment zones (SEZs) has created additional habitat sources. The mosquito population in the Tahoe Basin is most active in the spring and early summer.

The Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District (District) has jurisdiction over mosquito abatement activities in the Project area and vicinity. The District employs technicians certified by the State of California Health Services in pesticide usage, and mosquito and vector identification. The District routinely conducts surveillance to locate mosquito breeding sources and to solve mosquito problems using physical, biological and chemical means, along with conducting public education outreach efforts. The District is authorized to treat problem areas on public and private property to reduce the health risks to the public.

The District uses biological larvicides, *Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis* and *B. sphaericus,* which are naturally occurring bacteria. Only mosquitoes, black flies, and certain midges are susceptible to these bacteria – other aquatic invertebrates and non-target insects are unaffected. Larvicidal oils and monomolecular films are used to drown the mosquito larvae in their later aquatic stages, when they are not feeding, by forming a thin coating on the surface of the water. The District uses pyrethrins and pyrethroids for its adult mosquito fogging program in and around populated areas. These are generally applied by truck mounted or hand held foggers in accordance with safe handling and application standards (Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District 2009).

17.1.7 Wildland Fire Hazards

Dry summers, topography, and forests with high fuel loads create an annual wildfire hazard in the Project area. The Project area is situated in a developed and wildland-urban interface (WUI), where developed areas are adjacent to areas of natural vegetation capable of carrying a wildfire. The wildfire suppression strategy in the Project area calls for suppression of all fires due to the WUI setting, heavy fuel loads, steep terrain, and proximity to homes and other structures. Land management agencies in the Lake Tahoe Basin are cooperating to reduce hazardous fuel levels in the Project vicinity through forest stand thinning, understory burning, and other strategies (USFS LTBMU 2006a, 2006b, 2006c). Paved and unpaved roadways and ski trails in the Project area provide emergency vehicle access and fuel breaks during wildfire events.

Ignition sources of wildfire include natural sources, such as lightning, and human activities. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Calfire) has established a fire hazard severity classification system, which assesses the wildland fire potential based on fuel load, climate, and topography. The classification system provides three classes of fire hazards: Moderate, High, and Very High. Calfire considers homes in High and Very High fire hazard areas to be without adequate protection from wildland or structural fires. HMR is located in a Very High fire hazard area due to steep topography and heavy fuel loads (Calfire 2008, 2007a). The Homewood community is considered to be at risk of wildfire from potential ignitions on USFS LTBMU lands (Calfire 2001).

The California Public Resources Code (PRC) requires the designation of State Responsible Areas (SRAs) where the financial responsibility of preventing and suppressing fires falls primarily on Calfire. Fire

protection outside the SRAs is the responsibility of local (LRAs) or federal (FRAs) jurisdictions. Most of the Project area is in a LRA served by the North Tahoe Fire Protection District (NTFPD). The Mid-Mountain Base area is in a SRA (Calfire 2007b, NTPFD 2009). The USFS LTBMU provides wildland fire protection on USFS lands adjacent to HMR and in SRA at HMR via a cooperative agreement with Calfire. NTFPD has the primary responsibility for structure fire protection and related emergency services at the North Base and South Base areas. An NTFPD fire station is adjacent to the Project area in Homewood.

The Placer County Fire Safe Alliance works towards improving public outreach on fire prevention and facilitating coordination among State and federal agencies for fuel load reduction, healthy forest ecosystems, and fire safe communities (Placer County Fire Safe Alliance 2009).

17.2 REGULATORY SETTING

17.2.1 Hazardous Materials Management

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

Under RCRA, any business, institution, or other entity that generates hazardous waste is required to identify and track its hazardous waste from the point of generation until it is recycled, reused, or disposed. RCRA was amended in 1984 by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984, which specifically prohibits the use of certain techniques for the disposal of various hazardous substances. The federal Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act of 1986 impose hazardous materials planning requirements to help protect local communities in the event of accidental release.

Federal agencies that regulate hazardous materials include the EPA, OSHA, the Department of Transportation (DOT), and the National Institute of Health (NIH). The following federal laws and guidelines govern hazardous materials:

- CERCLA
- Federal Water Pollution Control
- Clean Air Act (§112 regulates asbestos fiber emissions)
- Toxic Substances Control Act
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
- Safe Drinking Water Act
- Occupational Safety and Health Act
- Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
- Guidelines for Carcinogens and Biohazards
- Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act Title III.

Worker Safety Requirements

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 assigns the responsibility for assuring worker safety in the handling and use of chemicals to the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal-OSHA) and OSHA. OSHA has adopted numerous worker safety regulations for hazardous materials handling in Code of Federal Regulations Title 29 (29 CFR). Those regulations set standards relating to hazardous materials handling. Cal-OSHA has the primary responsibility for developing and enforcing State workplace regulations. Because California has a federally approved OSHA program, the State is required to adopt regulations that are at least as stringent as those found in 29 CFR. Cal-OSHA standards are generally more stringent than federal regulations.

CCR Title 8 contains the Cal-OSHA requirements for safety training, availability of safety equipment, accident and illness prevention programs, hazardous substance exposure warnings, and emergency action and fire prevention plan preparation.

Cal-OSHA enforces a State-wide hazard communication program. That program regulations specify training and information requirements, including procedures for identifying and labeling hazardous substances, communicating hazard information related to hazardous substances and their handling, and preparation of health and safety plans to protect workers and employees at hazardous waste sites. The Cal-OSHA hazard communication program requires that Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) be available to employees and that employee information and training programs be documented.

State Plans, Policies, Regulations, and Laws

Within Cal-EPA, DTSC has primary regulatory responsibility for the management of hazardous materials and the generation, transport, and disposal of hazardous waste. The DTSC regulates hazardous materials management. DTSC delegates authority to local jurisdictions that enter into agreements with the State. The Placer County Department of Environmental Health (PCDEH) and the NTFPD are such local administrators of hazardous materials management laws and regulations.

The DTSC implements RCRA and California's hazardous waste laws, which are known collectively as the Hazardous Waste Control Law. The California Hazardous Waste Control Law and its associated regulations are similar to RCRA but regulate a larger number of chemicals because they define hazardous waste more broadly. Applicable State hazardous waste laws include:

- Hazardous Waste Control Law
- Hazardous Substances Information and Training Act
- Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Law of 1985 (Business Plan Act)
- Air Toxics Hot Spots and Emissions Inventory Law
- Underground Storage of Hazardous Substances Act
- Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act
- Public Safety/Fire Regulations/Building Codes (regulated at local level).

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) requires preparation of Hazardous Materials Business Plans and disclosure of hazardous materials inventories. A business plan includes:

a) An inventory of hazardous materials handled;

b) Facility floor plans showing where hazardous materials are stored;

c) An emergency response plan, and;

d) Provisions for employee training in safety and emergency response procedures.

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) regulates the storage of hazardous materials in USTs under the California Code of Regulations (CCR). The installation and monitoring of new tanks, monitoring of existing tanks, and corrective actions for removed tanks are regulated by State standards.

Among its other responsibilities, the DTSC oversees the Voluntary Cleanup Program that provides an opportunity for owners of property with low-priority hazardous waste sites to fund and undertake site cleanup with DTSC oversight.

State Hazardous Materials Handling and Transport

The Business Plan Act requires preparation of Hazardous Materials Business Plans and disclosure of hazardous-materials inventories. A Business Plan includes 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 (California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 1). Statewide, DTSC has primary regulatory responsibility for management of hazardous materials, with delegation of authority to local jurisdictions that enter into agreements with the State. Placer County administers these laws and regulations.

The DOT regulates transportation of hazardous materials between States. State agencies with primary responsibility for enforcing federal and State regulations and responding to hazardous materials transportation emergencies are the CHP and Caltrans. Together, these agencies determine container types used and license hazardous-waste haulers for transportation of hazardous waste on public roads.

Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents

California has developed an Emergency Response Plan to coordinate emergency services provided by federal, State, and local governments and private agencies. Response to hazardous-materials incidents is one part of this plan. The plan is managed by the Governor's Office of Emergency Services (OES), which coordinates the responses of other agencies including the California Environmental Protection Agency, California Highway Patrol (CHP), California Department of Fish and Game, Lahontan RWQCB, Placer County Department of Environmental Health Services, Placer County Sheriff's Department, and NTFPD.

17.2.2 Placer County General Plan

The *1994 Placer County General Plan* (Placer County 1994) includes policies regarding the safe use, manufacture, production, transportation, storage, treatment, disposal, and clean-up of hazardous materials

and wastes, as well as wildfire protection. The following *1994 Placer County General Plan* Goals and Policies related to hazardous materials, wildfire, and public health and safety apply to the Project:

GENERAL LAND USE

Goal 1.A: To promote the wise, efficient, and environmentally-sensitive use of Placer County lands to meet the present and future needs of Placer County residents and businesses.

1.A.2. The County shall permit only low-intensity forms of development in areas with sensitive environmental resources or where natural or human-caused hazards are likely to pose a significant threat to health, safety, or property.

VISUAL AND SCENIC RESOURCES

Goal 1.K: To protect the visual and scenic resources of Placer County as important quality-of-life amenities for County residents and a principal asset in the promotion of recreation and tourism.

1.K.6. The County shall require that new development on hillsides employ design, construction, and maintenance techniques that:

a. Ensure that development near or on portions of hillsides do not cause or worsen natural hazards such as erosion, sedimentation, fire, or water quality concerns;

b. Include erosion and sediment control measures including temporary vegetation sufficient to stabilize disturbed areas;

c. Minimize risk to life and property from slope failure, landslides, and flooding; and

d. Maintain the character and visual quality of the hillside.

PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Goal 4.I: To protect residents of and visitors to Placer County from injury and loss of life and to protect property and watershed resources from fires.

4.I.1. The County shall encourage local fire protection agencies in Placer County to maintain the following minimum fire protection standards (expressed as Insurance Service Organization (ISO) ratings):

a. ISO 4 in urban areas,

b. ISO 6 in suburban areas,

c. ISO 8 in rural areas.

4.I.2. The County shall encourage local fire protection agencies in the County to maintain the following standards (expressed as average response times to emergency calls):

a. 4 minutes in urban areas,

b. 6 minutes in suburban areas,

c. 10 minutes in rural areas.

4.I.3. The County shall require new development to develop or fund fire protection facilities, personnel, and operations and maintenance that, at a minimum, maintains the above service level standards.

4.I.4. The County shall work with local fire protection agencies to identify key fire loss problems and design appropriate fire safety education programs to reduce fire incidents and losses.

4.I.5. The County shall work with local fire protection agencies and implement ordinances to control fire losses and fire protection costs through continued use of automatic fire detection, control, and suppression systems.

4.I.6. The County shall continue to promote standardization of operations among fire protection agencies and improvement of fire service levels.

4.I.7. The County shall maintain and strengthen automatic aid agreements to maximize efficient use of available resources.

4.I.8. The County shall work with local fire protection agencies to maintain a prefire planning program with selected high-risk occupancies reviewed at least annually.

4.I.9. The County shall ensure that all proposed developments are reviewed for compliance with fire safety standards by responsible local fire agencies per the Uniform Fire Code and other County and local ordinances.

4.I.10. The County shall work with local fire protection agencies to inventory and eliminate structurally unsafe and fire-hazardous housing units that are beyond repair or rehabilitation.

4.I.11. The County shall encourage local fire protection agencies to provide and maintain advanced levels of emergency medical services (EMS) to the public. [See also the policies/programs under Goal 8.C, Fire Hazards.]

VEGETATION

Goal 6.D: To preserve and protect the valuable vegetation resources of Placer County.

6.D.11. The County shall support the continued use of prescribed burning to mimic the effects of natural fires to reduce fuel volumes and associated fire hazard to human residents and to enhance the health of biotic communities.

AIR QUALITY--GENERAL

Goal 6.F: To protect and improve air quality in Placer County.

6.F.5. The County shall encourage project proponents to consult early in the planning process with the County regarding the applicability of Countywide indirect and area-wide source programs and transportation control measures (TCM) programs. Project review shall also address energy-efficient building and site designs and proper storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials.

FIRE HAZARDS

Goal 8.C: To minimize the risk of loss of life, injury, and damage to property and watershed resources resulting from unwanted fires.

8.C.1. The County shall ensure that development in high-fire-hazard areas is designed and constructed in a manner that minimizes the risk from fire hazards and meets all applicable State and County fire standards.

8.C.2. The County shall require that discretionary permits for new development in fire hazard areas be conditioned to include requirements for fire-resistant vegetation, cleared fire-breaks, or a long-term comprehensive fuel management program. Fire hazard reduction measures shall be incorporated into the design of development projects in fire hazard areas.

8.C.3. The County shall require that new development meets State, County, and local fire district standards for fire protection.

8.C.4. The County shall refer development proposals in the unincorporated County to the appropriate local fire agencies for review for compliance with fire safety standards. If dual responsibility exists, then both agencies shall review and comment relative to their area of responsibility. If standards are different or conflicting, the more stringent standards shall be applied.

8.C.5. The County shall ensure that existing and new buildings of public assembly incorporate adequate fire protection measures to reduce the potential loss of life and property in accordance with State and local codes and ordinances.

8.C.10. The County shall continue to implement State fire safety standards through enforcement of the applicable standards contained in the Placer County Land Development Manual.

8.C.12. The County shall support annexations and consolidations of fire districts and services to improve service delivery to the public. [See also policies/programs under Goal 4.1, Fire Protection Services.]

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Goal 8.G: To minimize the risk of loss of life, injury, serious illness, damage to property, and economic and social dislocations resulting from the use, transport, treatment, and disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous materials wastes.

8.G.1. The County shall ensure that the use and disposal of hazardous materials in the County complies with local, State, and federal safety standards.

8.G.2. The County shall discourage the development of residences or schools near known hazardous waste disposal or handling facilities.

8.G.3. The County shall review all proposed development projects that manufacture, use, or transport hazardous materials for compliance with the County's Hazardous Waste Management Plan (CHWMP).

8.G.5. The County shall strictly regulate the storage of hazardous materials and wastes.

8.G.6. The County shall require secondary containment and periodic examination for all storage of toxic materials.

8.G.9. The County shall require that applications for discretionary development projects that will generate hazardous wastes or utilize hazardous materials include detailed information on hazardous waste reduction, recycling, and storage.

17.2.3 West Shore Area General Plan

The *Placer County 1998 West Shore Area General Plan* (Placer County 1998) includes a Safety Element that includes the following goal and policies related to hazards applicable to the HMR Project:

VI. Safety Element

Goal 1. To protect the lives and property of the citizens of the West Shore Area General Plan from unacceptable risks associated with seismic, flooding, or wildfire hazards.

6. Ensure that all proposed developments are reviewed for fire safety standards by all local fire agencies responsible for its protection, including providing adequate water supplies and ingress and egress.

7. Maintain strict enforcement of the Uniform Building Code and the Uniform Fire Code.

8. Inform residents and visitors of the wildfire hazard associated with occupancy in the basin. Encourage use of fire resistant materials and fire preventative techniques when constructing structures, especially in the highest fire hazard areas. Manage forest fuels to be consistent with State laws and other goals and policies of this Plan.

17.2.4 Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)

The TRPA is a bi-State planning agency with the authority to regulate growth and development in the Lake Tahoe Basin. TRPA implements that authority through the *Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin* (*Regional Plan*). The *Regional Plan i*s composed of numerous documents, of which the following are applicable to this environmental analysis: *Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities* (1982); *Goals and Policies* (September 1986); *Code of Ordinances* (2004); *Plan Area Statements* (August 1987 and updated); *Regional Transportation Plan and Air Quality Plan* (1992); *Water Quality Management Plan* (1988); and the *Scenic Quality Improvement Program* (1989).

Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin

The *TRPA Goals and Policies* Chapter 2, Land Use Element, Natural Hazards, Policy 3 (TRPA 1986) provides the following goals and policies related to hazards, hazardous materials, and wildfire applicable to the Project:

Natural Hazards

Goal 1 – Risk from natural hazards will be minimized.

Policy 1. Development shall be regulated in identified avalanche or mass instability hazard areas.

Policy 2. Prohibit construction, grading, and filling of lands within the 100-year flood plain.

Policy 3. Inform residents and visitors of the wildfire hazard associated with occupancy in the Basin. Encourage use of fire resistant materials and fire preventative techniques when constructing structures. Manage forest fuels to be consistent with State laws and other goals and policies of this plan.

TRPA Code of Ordinances

The *TRPA Code of Ordinances* (2004), Section IX, Chapter 75, §75.3 provides the following related to wildfire hazards applicable to the Project:

> Vegetation Management to Prevent the Spread of Wildfire: Within areas of significant fire hazard, as determined by local, State, or federal fire agencies, flammable or other combustible vegetation may be removed, thinned, or manipulated up to 30 feet from any structure to prevent the spread of wildfire. Sufficient quantities of residual vegetation should remain in this 30 foot zone to stabilize the soil and prevent erosion. Whenever possible, vegetation in this zone should be thinned, tapered, cut back, or otherwise selectively manipulated, rather than removed entirely. Re-vegetation with approved species may be required where vegetative ground cover has been eliminated or where erosion problems may occur."

17.2.5 State of California – Building Codes in Wildland-Urban Interface

The California Building Standards Commission adopted the Office of the State Fire Marshal's emergency regulations amending the CCR, Title 24, Part 2, known as the 2007 California Building Code (CBC), §701A.3.2 New Buildings Located in Any Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Calfire and the Office of the State Fire Marshal (OSFM) mapped fire hazard areas and established building standards to lessen the vulnerability of buildings to wildfire and resist the intrusion of flames and burning embers projected during a wildfire. The WUI Fire Area Building Standards establish minimum standards for materials and material assemblies and provide a reasonable level of exterior wildfire exposure protection for buildings. The new building standards went into effect in 2008.

Under PRC §4291, Calfire establishes standards for fuel and vegetation conditions in the vicinity of structures. The intent is to reduce fuel loadings in the vicinity of structures to alter the behavior of a wildfire, such as slowing the rate of spread and reducing the intensity, to allow suppression activities and structure protection activities to occur (State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection and California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 2006).

17.3 EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH POINTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Table 17-1 presents the evaluation criteria for Hazardous Materials and Public Safety. These criteria are drawn primarily from local plans, adapted where necessary to reflect CEQA, TRPA and NEPA requirements. For the purpose of this analysis, the stated applicable points of significance determine whether implementing the Project will result in a significant impact. These points of significance are based upon Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines and the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist. A

Hazardous Materials and Public Safety impact is significant if implementation of the Project exceeds the point of significance shown in Table 17-1.

The EIR/EIS does not address certain CEQA and TRPA evaluation criteria for Hazardous Materials and Public Safety because the Project Team determined that the criteria are not applicable to the Project. Rejected evaluation criteria for Hazardous Materials and Public Safety include soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water, and impacts related to projects in the vicinity of an airport or private airstrip.

Table 17-1

Evaluation Criteria with Point of Significance - Hazardous Materials and Public Safety

Evaluation Criteria	Significance Threshold	Justification
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?	Failure to implement best management practices (BMPs) for wildfire prevention	CEQA Appendix G Checklist VIII (h); California Government Code §51175-51189; PRC §4291; CBC §701A.3.2
PS-2. Will the Project result in an interference with emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans?	a) Impediments to emergency response or evacuation routes b) Emergency response times below agency standards	CEQA Appendix G Checklist VIII (g); TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist II (10b); *TRPA Code of Ordinances* and *Regional Plan Goals and Policies*; *Placer County General Plan* Public Facilities and Services Element
PS-3. Will the Project involve the use of explosives for trenching?	Failure to implement adequate protection measures.	CEQA Appendix G Checklist VIII (a); TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist II (10a)
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?	a) Non-compliance with State and federal standards for the transport and use of hazardous materials during construction and operation b) Location of the Project within on-quarter mile of a school.	CEQA Appendix G Checklist VIII (a, b, c); TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist II(10a); federal Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (29 CFR 172, 173, 177, and 397); California Health and Safety Code Division 20; 8 CCR and 19 CCR
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?	a) Non-compliance with State and federal handling and disposal regulations and procedures b) Location of project within 500 feet of a known hazardous waste site c) Creation of project operation	CEQA Appendix G Checklist VIII (d); TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist II (10a and 17 a, b); PRC §21150-21154; Government Code Section 65962.5; RCRA; CERCLA; Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District

Evaluation Criteria	Significance Threshold	Justification
	facilities that allow for mosquito breeding	

Source: Hauge Brueck Associates 2009.

17.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION

Impact: **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?**

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; Alternative 2 (No Project)*

Under Alternative 2 (No Project), there would be no changes to land use or facilities at HMR, resulting in a less than significant impact on the exposure of people or structures to wildfire hazards.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Analysis: *Significant Impact; Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6*

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, and multiple ignition sources. Calfire classifies the Project area as a Very High Fire Hazard Area (CAL FIRE 2009a).

NTFPD serves most of the Project area located in an LRA; the Mid-Mountain Base area is in an SRA, served by the USFS through an MOU with Calfire. The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 include annexing the remaining HMR properties into the NTFPD and the adoption and implementation of a fuel reduction program. The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 include upgrading the existing snowmaking system to be compatible with wildland fire suppression needs in the Project area.

Specific fuel reduction measures, building designs and materials, and snowmaking water delivery systems have not been designed. 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.

Mitigation: **PS-1: NTFPD Design Approval and Annexation.**

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 fire protection service 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. The NTFPD shall review and approve building materials and designs, fire protection systems in buildings, landscaping, fire flows to hydrants and the snowmaking system, emergency vehicle access routes, and vegetation treatments in the Project area. Prior to occupancy, the NTFPD shall annex the Project area (subject to a LAFCO process) to provide for an increased level of fire protection. The NTFPD shall enter into mutual aid agreements for wildfire suppression with the USFS LTBMU and Calfire, and coordinate with these agencies on developing and implementing wildland fuel reduction measures as needed in the Project area. NTFPD will have the responsibility and enhanced capability to control fire dangers and respond to emergencies over the entirety of the HMR Project area.

After Mitigation: *Less than Significant Impact; Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alts 3, 4, 5, and 6*

Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-1 will increase the level of fire protection capacity available to the Project area to a level equivalent to that in nearby urban 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.

Impact: PS-2. Will the Project result in an interference with emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans?

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; Alternative 2 (No Project)*

Under Alternative 2 (No Project), there would be no changes to land use or facilities at HMR, resulting in a less than significant impact on emergency response and evacuation plans.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Analysis: *Significant Impact; Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6*

The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 have 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. The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 would follow with construction of the new skier service and related recreational facilities at the North Base area. Construction activities would probably be continuous, except during winter months when some activities would cease due to weather and snow cover.

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.

The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 require 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, the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 are 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. Alternative 4 includes a single road access and driveways over 1,000 feet in length. There are no alternative ingress or egress routes provided. The potential for inadequate internal circulation and access for emergency vehicles in the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5 and 6, and the lack of alternative access and evacuation routes in Alternative 4, result in significant impacts to emergency response or evacuation plans.

Mitigation: **PS-2: Ensure Emergency Access During Construction and Operation**

The Project Applicant shall prepare and submit an emergency access plan to TRPA, Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD), PCSD, 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:

- 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;
- 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.

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.

After Mitigation: *Less than Significant Impact; Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alts 3, 4, 5, and 6*

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.

Impact: **PS-3. Will the Project involve the use of explosives for trenching?**

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; Alternative 2 (No Project)*

Under Alternative 2 (No Project), there would be no changes to land use or facilities at HMR, and no new use of explosives for trenching. Any existing use of explosives to control avalanches at HMR would continue, resulting in a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Analysis: *Significant Impact; Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6*

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 the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5 and 6, any existing use of explosives to control avalanches at HMR would continue unchanged.

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.

Mitigation: **PS-3: Implement Blast Management Techniques to Reduce Adverse Effects**

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:

1. 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.
2. To the greatest extent feasible, blasting area shall occur prior to the occupancy of structures.
3. In areas of controlled blasting, the contractor shall:
    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.

After Mitigation: *Less than Significant Impact; Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alts 3, 4, 5, and 6*

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 NOI-1a and NOI-1b (see Impact NOI-1 in Chapter 13) will also help to reduce potential adverse effects from blasting.

Impact: **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?**

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; Alternative 2 (No Project)*

Under Alternative 2 (No Project), there would be no changes to land use or facilities at HMR, and no new generation, handling, transport, or use of hazardous materials near schools. Alternative 2 would result in a less than significant impact related to the routine transport, use, disposal, or release of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alts 3, 4, 5, and 6*

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 Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 include 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.

The Project Applicant, builders, contractors, business owners, and others would be required to use, store, and transport hazardous materials 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.

Under the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6, 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:

- 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.

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.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Impact: 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?

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; Alternative 2 (No Project)*

Under Alternative 2 (No Project), there would be no changes to land use or facilities at HMR, and no potential to encounter contaminated soils or expose workers or the public to health hazards, including those from a known hazardous waste site. This is considered a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Analysis: *Significant Impact; Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6*

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 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.

Construction of the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 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 the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3 and 5 include 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.

Mitigation: **PS-5: Construction and Design Review by the Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District.**

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 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.

After Mitigation: *Less than Significant Impact; Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6*

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.

17.5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact: PS-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to public safety?

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6*

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.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

17.6 REFERENCES

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Calfire) Forest Resource Assessment Program. (FRAP). 2008. Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA, As Recommended by Calfire. Placer County. November 24, 2008. Accessed online at www.frap.cdf.ca.gov. February 9, 2010. Calfire, FRAP. Sacramento, CA.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Calfire) Forest Resource Assessment Program. (FRAP). 2007a. Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA, Adopted by Calfire on November 7, 2007. Placer County. November 6, 2007. Accessed online at www.frap.cdf.ca.gov. February 9, 2010. Calfire, FRAP. Sacramento, CA.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Calfire) Forest Resource Assessment Program. (FRAP). 2007b. State Responsibility Areas for Fire Protection. Placer County. January 2, 2007. Accessed online at www.frap.cdf.ca.gov. February 9, 2010. Calfire, FRAP. Sacramento, CA.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Calfire) Forest Resource Assessment Program. (FRAP). 2001. Communities At Risk From Wildfire. April 13, 2001. Accessed online at www.frap.cdf.ca.gov. February 9, 2010. Calfire, FRAP. Sacramento, CA.

County of Placer. 1994. *Placer County General Plan Update Countywide General Plan Policy Document*. August 16, 1994. Prepared by Placer County, with Crawford Multari & Starr, DKS Associates, Psomas and Associates, Jones & Stokes Associates, Recht Hausrath & Associates, and J. Laurence Mintier & Associates. Placer County. Auburn, CA.

County of Placer. 1998. *West Shore Area General Plan*. Adopted October 19, 1998. Placer County. Auburn, CA.

North Tahoe Fire Protection District. 2009. NOP Comment Letter. January 14.

Placer County Fire Alliance, 2009. Accessed at www.placerfirealliance.org October 24, 2009.

Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District (District). 2009. Accessed at www.placermosquito.org. November 3 2009.

Robinson Engineering Company. 2005. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Prepared for the Homewood Mountain Resort Property*. December 12, 2005. Robison Engineering Company. Reno, NV.

State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (BOF) and California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire). 2006. General Guidelines for Creating Defensible Space. Adopted by BOF on February 8, 2006. Approved by Office of Administrative Law on May 8th, 2006. BOF and CalFire. Sacramento, CA.

State of California, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2010. Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. Accessed online at: www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public. January 28, 2010.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). 1986. *Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, Goals and Policies*. Adopted by the Governing Board September 17, 1986. Updated October 25, 2006. Printed December 2004. TRPA. Zephyr Cove, NV.

USDA Forest Service (USFS), Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU). 1988. *Land and Resource Management Plan*. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit. USFS LTBMU. South Lake Tahoe, CA.

USDA Forest Service (USFS), Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU). 2006a. Fuels Treatments and Wildfire Risk Reduction in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit. *Fact Sheet,* March 2006. USFS LTBMU. South Lake Tahoe, CA.

USDA Forest Service (USFS), Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU). 2006b. National Forest System Urban Intermix Parcels in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit. *In Brief,* March 2006. USFS LTBMU. South Lake Tahoe, CA.

USDA Forest Service (USFS), Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU). 2006c. Prescribed Fire. *In Brief*, March 2006. USFS LTBMU. South Lake Tahoe, CA.