
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 TYPE AND PURPOSE OF EIR/EIS

This document fulfills the requirements of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Compact process. Placer County and TRPA will use the document to make decisions based on the respective agency's planning policies and statutory requirements.

The purpose of the Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) Ski Area Master Plan Project (Project) is to maintain the viability of the ski facilities through a mixed-use development that provides recreational resources and base amenities attractive to skiers and tourists, supports local and regional needs, and meets the requirements of the *TRPA Ski Area Master Plan Guidelines* (TRPA 1990). This joint EIR/EIS will be used to determine whether the Project meets the regulatory requirements of Placer County (CEQA) and TRPA.

A Program EIR under the Provisions of CEQA Guidelines 15168 evaluates the impacts of a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either:

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

For components evaluated at a program level in this EIR, additional environmental review may be required. As components are designed for implementation, the Project Applicant will conduct the appropriate level of environmental review prior to implementation.

A Project EIR, as defined by CEQA Guidelines 15161, is an EIR that examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project. The Project EIR evaluates the detailed project including planning, construction and operation.

The program and project level components of the Project are detailed in Chapter 3.

1.2 SCOPE OF EIR/EIS AND EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

1.2.1 Scope of the EIR/EIS

This EIR/EIS analyzes a range of environmental resource categories associated with the Project. Placer County and TRPA have determined that the Project may result in environmental impacts to environmental resource categories that are analyzed in detail in the following chapters of this EIR/EIS:

- 6.0 Land Use;
- 7.0 Population, Employment, and Housing;
- 8.0 Biological Resources;
- 9.0 Cultural Resources;
- 10.0 Visual Resources;
- 11.0 Transportation and Circulation;
- 12.0 Air Quality;
- 13.0 Noise;
- 14.0 Soils, Geology and Seismicity;
- 15.0 Hydrology, Water Rights, Surface Water Quality, and Groundwater;
- 16.0 Public Services and Utilities;
- 17.0 Hazardous Materials and Public Safety;
- 18.0 Recreation; and
- 19.0 Climate Change.

The format and content of the EIR/EIS are designed to meet the requirements of CEQA, TRPA, and Placer County. This document is organized as follows:

Chapter 1 “Introduction” – Establishes the purpose and scope of the EIR/EIS and provides an overview of the environmental review process, contents of the document, agency roles and authorities, Project history and background and a definition of terms.

Chapter 2 “Summary” – Summarizes the Proposed Project and Alternatives as well as the findings of the environmental analysis.

Chapter 3 “Project Description” – Describes the location, objectives, and components of the Proposed Project and Alternatives. Chapter 3 indicates the intended uses of the EIR/EIS and lists the agencies associated with this document.

Chapter 4 “Relationship to Existing Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations” – Lists the various federal, TRPA, State, and local plans, policies, and regulations applicable to the Project.

Chapter 5 “Environmental Analysis Introduction” – Provides an introduction to how the Project is analyzed and outlines the general format of resource chapters 6 through 19.

Chapter 6 “Land Use” – Includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, evaluation criteria with points of significance, environmental impacts and recommended mitigation and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures in relation to land use.

Chapter 7 “Population, Employment, and Housing” – Includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, evaluation criteria with points of significance, environmental impacts and recommended mitigation and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures in relation to population, employment and housing.

Chapter 8 “Biological Resources” – Includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, evaluation criteria with points of significance, environmental impacts and recommended mitigation and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures in relation to biological resources.

Chapter 9 “Cultural Resources” – Includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, evaluation criteria with points of significance, environmental impacts and recommended mitigation and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures in relation to cultural resources.

Chapter 10 “Visual Resources” – Includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, evaluation criteria with points of significance, environmental impacts and recommended mitigation and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures in relation to visual resources.

Chapter 11 “Transportation and Circulation” – Includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, evaluation criteria with points of significance, environmental impacts and recommended mitigation and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures in relation to transportation and circulation.

Chapter 12 “Air Quality” – Includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, evaluation criteria with points of significance, environmental impacts and recommended mitigation and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures in relation to air quality.

Chapter 13 “Noise” – Includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, evaluation criteria with points of significance, environmental impacts and recommended mitigation and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures in relation to noise.

Chapter 14 “Soils, Geology, and Seismicity” – Includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, evaluation criteria with points of significance, environmental impacts and recommended mitigation and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures in relation to soils, geology and seismicity.

Chapter 15 “Hydrology, Water Rights, Surface Water Quality, and Groundwater” – Includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, evaluation criteria with points of significance, environmental impacts and recommended mitigation and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures in relation to hydrology, water rights, surface water quality and groundwater.

Chapter 16 “Public Services and Utilities” – Includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, evaluation criteria with points of significance, environmental impacts and recommended mitigation and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures in relation to public services and utilities.

Chapter 17 “Hazardous Materials and Public Safety” – Includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, evaluation criteria with points of significance, environmental impacts and recommended mitigation and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures in relation to hazardous materials and public safety.

Chapter 18 “Recreation” – Includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, evaluation criteria with points of significance, environmental impacts and recommended mitigation and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures in relation to recreation.

Chapter 19 “Climate Change” – Includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, evaluation criteria with points of significance, environmental impacts and recommended mitigation and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures in relation to climate change.

Chapter 20 “Mandated Environmental Review” – Discusses the growth-inducing effects, the relationship between local short-term use of the environment and long-term productivity, the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources, the significant and unavoidable adverse impacts, and the environmentally superior/preferable alternative.

Chapter 21 “Mitigation and Monitoring Program” – Details the mitigation program approach, format, and measures established in the EIR/EIS.

1.2.2 Effects Found not to be Significant

Because initial environmental review of the Project indicated that the Project would not result in significant impacts to certain resources, these resources are not further analyzed in the EIR/EIS. A statement as to why these effects are not discussed in the EIR/EIS is also provided.

CEQA Appendix G Checklist items - Will the Project:

- II Agriculture Resources-a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use? – The Project is not located on farmland.
- II Agriculture Resources-b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? – The Project is not located on agricultural land or land associated with a Williamson Act contract.
- II Agriculture Resources-c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use? – The Project is not located on or adjacent to farmland.
- VI Geology and Soils-e) Have soils incapable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? - The Project does not propose septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.
- VIII Hazards and Hazardous Materials-e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? – The Project is not located within an airport land use plan and there are no airports or airstrips within two miles of the Project area.
- VIII Hazards and Hazardous Materials-f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? - There are no airports or airstrips in the vicinity of the Project area.
- X Land Use and Planning-a) Physically divide an established community? - The Project is redevelopment of an existing resort site along SR 89 and is contained within the resort property limits.
- X Land Use and Planning-c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP)? - There are no HCPs or NCCPs related to the Project area.
- XI Mineral Resources-a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? – The Project area contains no mineral resources.
- XI Mineral Resources-b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? – The Project area contains no mineral resource recovery sites.

- XII Noise-e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? – The Project is not located within an airport land use plan and there are no airports or airstrips within two miles of the Project area.
- XII Noise-f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? – There are no airports or airstrips in the vicinity of the Project area.
- XIII Population and Housing-b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? – There is no existing housing on-site.
- XIII Population and Housing-c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? – There are no existing resident populations or housing proposed to be removed/displaced.

TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist II items - Will the Proposal result in:

- 1. Land-f) Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sand, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion, including natural littoral processes, which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake? – The Project area does not contain shorezone areas.
- 11. Population-b) Include or result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents? – There are no residents on-site and the Project does not propose to displace surrounding residents.
- 12. Housing-b) Will the proposal result in the loss of housing for lower-income and very-low-income households? – There is no housing on-site and no housing units are proposed for removal.

1.3 DEFINITION OF BASELINE

CEQA Guidelines §15125 states, “An EIR must include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, from both a local and regional perspective. This environmental setting will normally constitute the baseline physical conditions by which a Lead Agency determines whether an impact is significant. The description of the environmental setting shall be no longer than is necessary to an understanding of the significant effects of the proposed project and its alternatives.” For this document, the baseline conditions are those conditions, as they existed at the time that the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was published, on September 2, 2008. The baseline condition indicates the conditions present to determine the Project’s impact significance.

1.4 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Significance criteria were determined based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Placer County CEQA Checklist, TRPA Environmental Checklist, TRPA Code of Ordinances, and TRPA Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities (ETCCs). Significance criteria are defined in each of the analysis Chapters (6.0 through 19.0) under the “Evaluation Criteria with Points of Significance” heading.

1.5 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

The HMR Ski Area Master Plan Area (Project area) was developed as a ski area during the 1960s and expanded in the 1970s with the acquisition of Tahoe Ski Bowl. Tahoe Ski Bowl was a small ski area located immediately south of the ski area that was then known as Ski Homewood. In the 1980s Ski Homewood and Tahoe Ski Bowl merged and began operations as a single ski area. The economic viability of the present day Project area has been marginal because of the age and conditions of the lifts, lodges and other facilities. In recent years the ski area has not been profitable.

The current owners and project proponents, Homewood Village Resorts, LLC, purchased the Project area in 2006 and began evaluating the existing conditions for redevelopment and improved economic viability. Under new management, skier visitation has been steady since 2006 (HMR Master Plan, October 2010) but the resort operations must still be subsidized because visitor numbers have dropped and infrastructure left from prior undercapitalized operations has aged. The operations of HMR have been improved but the Project area requires capital improvements for lifts and skier facilities to continue to attract skiers and remain economically competitive. Lodging and basic amenities and services within the Project area are also lacking.

The Project has been proposed to achieve the goals and objectives established by TRPA in the Community Enhancement Program (CEP). TRPA adopted a resolution (No. 2008-11) in February 2008 to list minimum requirements for HMR's continued participation as a qualified CEP project. As required by the CEP, an analysis of the project's compliance with Resolution 2008-11 will be prepared by TRPA staff and provided to the TRPA Governing Board during review of the project application. The analysis will document measures included in the action alternatives to comply with each item in the resolution, and if necessary, will identify additional measures necessary to meet the objectives of the CEP program.

Projects implemented through the CEP are intended to be consistent with the Regional Vision and Planning Concepts for the Lake Tahoe Basin (2007). The CEP focuses on the more developed areas of the Tahoe Basin since much of the past development in these areas offers the greatest potential for environmental, social and economic improvement. Many of these goals and objectives overlap and weave together to create the types of communities the CEP is promoting. Specifically, the goals and objectives of the CEP are as follows:

1. Create/Enhance mixed-use Community Centers

- Enhance community character in town and tourist centers
- Encourage mix of quality housing options, tourist accommodation options and compatible commercial uses that will serve the local population and the tourist population
- Provide a variety of sustainably designed housing, lodging and commercial choices to meet the needs of locals and visitors
- Implement Green Building Design
- Provide a variety of sustainably designed housing and tourist accommodations
- Provide housing that is economically attainable for basin employees
- Maximize density to achieve transit oriented development
- Consolidate commercial uses for economic, social and environmental gain

2. Create a multi-modal transit future

- Enhance and/or create multi-functional pedestrian activity centers that are walkable and provide multi-modal transportation linkages
- Reduce dependence on the automobile

3. Strengthen and create gathering places and economic centers

- Enrich the Lake Tahoe region and improve the quality of life of residents by providing new and improved gathering places, community services and cultural centers
- Encourage incorporation of cultural features, public spaces, and public service areas within project designs

4. Promote projects that result in the construction of threshold-related environmental improvements

- Provide area-wide (not parcel by parcel) urban water quality improvements that leverage private investment for environment gain, linked to existing or future systems, and are maintained in the long term
- Respond to site location and typical neighborhood contextual situations through site design, arrangement of building volumes, and the natural surroundings
- Enhance visual quality of and views from scenic roadway units, shoreline units, and resource areas and increase/enhance viewsheds from these areas to Lake Tahoe
- Provide public access and opportunities to recreational facilities such as trails, bike paths, beaches, and playgrounds/parks
- Be located in community plan core areas and promote pedestrian friendly/ transit oriented development
- Restore and/or protect native vegetation to reduce erosion potential and promote wildlife benefits
- Provide a reduction in overall land coverage
- Protect and enhance existing cultural/historic resources
- Ensure compatible land uses that minimize noise
- Implement an EIP Project

5. Promote transfer of development that results in substantial environmental benefits

- Achieve transit oriented development by transferring existing units of use from outside the community plan core
- Transfer existing development from sensitive lands and restoration of those lands
- Provide a variety of housing options utilizing existing units of use

6. Rehabilitate substandard development

- Create consolidated commercial and mixed-use development in the urban core
- Implement 'green' building design
- Rehabilitate disturbed sites and restore sensitive lands

7. Inform the new Regional, Local and Community Plan updates
8. Promote projects that feature a public/private partnership for cooperative implementation
 - Provide projects that have clear public benefits with strong public support
 - Leverage private investment to provide the local share of Environmental Improvement Program
 - Projects are catalysts for further community revitalization
9. Create a model process for multi-jurisdictional review of project permits, implementation and monitoring
 - Implement on-the-ground projects in a reasonable and timely fashion
 - Provide an effective program designed to facilitate both large-scale and small-scale projects

1.6 PROJECT REVIEW AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS

This EIR/EIS serves as a joint document that will meet the environmental review requirements of CEQA for Placer County and the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, Code of Ordinances and Rules of Procedures. Each agency will use the EIR/EIS to make decisions based on the respective agency's planning policies and statutory requirements. This section explains each agency's roles, policies, and decision responsibilities. Because this document meets these regulatory needs, it is referred to as an EIR/EIS.

1.6.1 California Environmental Quality Act

The Project area is within Placer County and involves lands of the State of California (Caltrans ROW). Placer County is the lead agency under CEQA. As such, the document is prepared in accordance with the CEQA Statutes (Public Resources Code §21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Administrative Code §15000 et seq.). The environmental impact report (EIR) is not, in and of itself, a decision document. The document's purpose is to disclose the environmental consequences of implementing the Proposed Project and Alternatives and identifies measures to avoid, minimize or otherwise mitigate adverse effects.

CEQA requires decision makers to balance the benefits of a project against its unavoidable significant environmental effects in deciding whether to carry out a project. The lead agency will consider the Draft EIR, comments received on the Draft EIR, and response to those comments before making a decision. If significant environmental effects are identified, the lead agency must adopt "Findings" indicating whether feasible mitigation measures or alternatives exist that can avoid or reduce those significant effects. If the significant environmental impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable because there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that render such impacts less than significant, the lead agency may still approve the project if it determines that the social, economic, or other benefits outweigh the unavoidable significant impacts. The lead agency would then be required to prepare a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" that discusses the specific reasons for approving the project, based on information in the EIR and other information in the record.

This disclosure will allow the responsible reviewing officials of Placer County to adopt the Project if they believe the environmental issues are adequately addressed in the EIR. The Placer County Board of Supervisors is the decision-making body under CEQA. The Boards' decisions are whether to:

- Certify the Final EIR;
- Adopt the Proposed Project or an Alternative if applicable; and
- Amend the General Plan and Zoning, if applicable.

1.6.2 Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

The document serves as an EIS for the TRPA. TRPA is the lead agency under the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (PL 96-551 94 Statute 3233). As such, this EIS has been prepared in accordance with Article VIII of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, Chapter 5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and Article IV of the TRPA Rules of Procedure. The purpose of this EIS is defined in TRPA Code of Ordinances §5.8.A:

5.8.A Preparation of EIS: When preparing an EIS, TRPA shall:

- (1) Utilize a systematic interdisciplinary approach, which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decision making which may have an impact on man's environment.
- (2) Study, develop and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action for any project which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources.
- (3) Consult with and obtain the comments of any federal, state or local agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved. Copies of such statement and the comments and views of the appropriate federal, state and local agencies which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards shall be made available to the public and shall accompany the project through the review processes.
- (4) Consult the public during the environmental impact statement process and solicit views during a public comment period of not less than 60 days.

In addition, the TRPA document requires the analysis of impacts in relation to the ETCCs and is intended to ensure consistency with the TRPA Regional Plan. TRPA required findings for an EIS are established in §5.8.D and §6.3 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances:

5.8.D Required Findings: Prior to approving a project for which an EIS was prepared, TRPA shall make either of the following findings for each significant adverse effect identified in the EIS:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into such project which avoid or reduce the significant adverse environmental effects to a less than significant level; or
- (2) Specific considerations such as economic, social or technical, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives discussed in the environmental impact statement on the project.

6.3 Threshold-Related Findings: The following specific findings shall be made, pursuant to Articles V(c), V(g) and VI(b) of the Compact in addition to any other findings required by law.

6.3.A Findings Necessary To Approve Any Project: To approve any project, TRPA must find, in accordance with §6.1 and §6.2, that:

- (1) The project is consistent with, and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, plan area statements and maps, the Code and other TRPA plans and programs.
- (2) The project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities thresholds to be exceeded; and
- (3) Wherever federal, State or local air and water quality standards applicable for the Region, whichever are strictest, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

The EIS provides analysis of proposed amendments to the TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 22 and 64, Plan Area Statements 157 (Homewood/Tahoe Ski Bowl), 158 (McKinney Tract), and 159 (Homewood/Commercial) and Goals and Policies (Chapters II and VII). TRPA required findings for amendment of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, Goals and Policies and Plan Area Statements are listed below.

6.4 Findings Necessary to amend the Regional Plan, including the Goals And Policies and Plan Area Statements and Maps: To approve any amendment to the Regional Plan, TRPA must find, in addition to the findings required pursuant to Subparagraphs 6.3.A(2) and 6.3.A(3) and Subsection 6.3.B, and in accordance with Sections 6.1 and 6.2, that the Regional Plan, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

6.5 Findings Necessary to amend or adopt TRPA Ordinances, Rules or Other TRPA Plans And Programs: To approve any amendment or adoption of the Code, Rules or other TRPA plans and programs which implement the Regional Plan, TRPA must find, in addition to the findings required pursuant to Section 6.3, and in accordance with Sections 6.1 and 6.2, that the Regional Plan and all of its elements, as implemented through the Code, Rules and other TRPA plans and programs, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

13.7.D Findings for Plan Area Amendments: Prior to adopting any plan area amendment, TRPA must find:

- (1) The amendment is substantially consistent with the plan area designation criteria in Subsections 13.5.B and 13.5.C; and
- (2) If the amendment is to expand an existing urban plan area boundary or to add residential, tourist accommodation, commercial, or public service as permissible uses to a non-urban plan area, it must be found that the amendment will make the plan area statement consistent with an adopted policy or standard of the Regional Plan, and that the amendment will satisfy one or more of the following criteria:
 - (a) The amendment is to correct an error which occurred at the time of adoption, including but not limited to a mapping error, an editing error, or an error based on erroneous information; or
 - (b) The amendment is to enable TRPA to make progress toward one or more environmental thresholds without degradation to other thresholds as measured by the Chapter 32 indicators; or

- (c) The amendment is needed to protect public health and safety and there is no reasonable alternative.
- (3) If the amendment is to add multiple-family as a permissible use to a plan area or for one or more parcels, except as provided for in (5) below, the plan area or affected parcel must be found suitable for transit-oriented development (TOD). TRPA shall find that the following factors, or a functional equivalent as provided for in (4) below, are satisfied when determining TOD suitability:
- (a) The area must have access to operational transit within a 10 minute walk; and
 - (b) Neighborhood services within a 10 minute walk, (e.g., grocery/drug stores, medical services, retail stores, and laundry facilities); and
 - (c) Good pedestrian and bike connections; and
 - (d) Opportunities for residential infill (at densities greater than 8 units per acre) or infill with mixed uses; and
 - (e) Adequate public facilities, (e.g., public schools, urban or developed recreation sites, government services, and post offices).
- (4) In order for TRPA to find a proposal is the functional equivalent of one of the factors listed in 13.7.D (3), or 13.7.D (5) (a), the proposal must be found to facilitate TOD in a manner that is equal or superior to that feature.
- (5) If the amendment is to add multiple-family dwellings as a permissible use to a plan area or for one or more parcels, and would result in deed restricted affordable housing units, the plan area or affected parcel must be found suitable for transit-oriented development (TOD). TRPA shall find that the following factors are satisfied when determining TOD suitability:
- (a) access to operational transit within a 10 minute walk, or a functional equivalent as provided for in (4) above; and
 - (b) neighborhood services; or
 - (c) public facilities.

1.6.3 National Environmental Policy Act

The Project does not propose any changes to federally owned or managed lands located in the Project area, or impacts to lands that would fall under the jurisdiction of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or its process.

1.7 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The following public involvement and scoping process was instituted for the Project by Placer County and the TRPA.

1.7.1 Notices

On September 2, 2008 a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR/EIS was distributed to public agencies and interested individuals of the community, including residents within 1,000 feet of the Project area, for 30 days for public comment (Appendix A). Appendix B presents the comments received on the NOP.

1.7.2 Scoping Meetings

Two public scoping meetings were held to take oral comments on the Project on the following dates:

- September 10, 2008 at the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission and
- September 23, 2008 at the Granlibakken Resort.

At each of these meetings, the Placer County and TRPA personnel made presentations to describe the Proposed Project and Alternatives for evaluation in the EIR/EIS and to disclose and discuss key environmental issues identified by the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist and CEQA Initial Study and Checklist.

1.8 DEFINITION OF TERMS

AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic
AB 32	California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006
ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ADT	Average Daily Traffic
AF	Acre-Feet
AF/yr	Acre-Feet per Year
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
APCDs	Air Pollution Control Districts
AQMDs	Air Quality Management Districts
ARMR	Archaeological Resources Management Reports
Basin Plan	Water Quality Control Plan Report for the North Lahontan Basin
bgs	Below Ground Surface
BLM	United States Bureau of Land Management
BMP	Best Management Practice
BOD	Biological Oxygen Demand
BP	Before Present
CAA	Federal Clean Air Act of 1970
CAAA	1990 Clean Air Act Amendments
CalEPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
Cal-OSHA	California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCIC	Central California Information Center
CDF	California Department of Forestry
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CDMG	California Department of Mines and Geology
CDMGB	California State Mining and Geology Board
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFA	Commercial Floor Area
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	Cubic Feet per Second
CIP	Capital Improvement Plan
CNDDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
Cortese List	California's Hazardous Waste and Substance Sites List
CSWGPP	State of Nevada Comprehensive State Groundwater Protection Program
CWA	Clean Water Act of 1972
CWC	California Water Code
CWE	Cumulative Watershed Effect
dB	Decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
dbh	Diameter at Breast Height

DEIR	Draft Environmental Impact Report
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
District	Tahoe City Public Utility District
Division	Nevada Division of Fish and Wildlife
DSOD	California Department of Water Resources, Division of Safety of Dams
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ERU	Equivalent Residential Unit
ETCCs	Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities
FEMA	Flood Emergency Management Agency
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
Forest Service	United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service
Fossils	Paleontological Resources
GBUAPCD	Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District
GHG	Greenhouse Gases
H ₂ S	Hydrogen Sulfide
HABS	Historic American Buildings Survey
HAER	Historic American Engineering Record
HAP	Hazardous Air Pollutants
HAZWOPER	Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response
in/yr	Inches per Year
Lahontan	Regional Water Quality Control Board-Lahontan Region
L _{dn}	Day-night Average Sound Level
L _{eq}	Energy Equivalent Sound Level
LOS	Level of Service
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCWC	Madden Creek Water Company
Mgal/yr.	Million Gallons per Year
mgd	Million Gallons per Day
mg/L	Milligrams per Liter
mg/L ³	Microgram per Cubic Liter
Mmax	Maximum Moment Magnitude
MMI	Modified Mercalli Intensity
μg/m ³	Microgram per Cubic Meter
MMP	Mitigation and Monitoring Program
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MPN	Most Probable Number
MRF	Eastern Regional Materials Recovery Facility
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAC	Noise Abatement Criteria
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NNPS	Nevada Native Plant Society
NO ₂	Nitrogen Dioxide
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Program
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NTFPD	North Tahoe Fire Protection District
NWP	Nationwide Permit

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

O ₃	Ozone
OES	Office of Emergency Services
OPR	California Governor's Office of Planning and Research
OS	Open Space
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PA	Programmatic Agreement
Pb	Lead
PD	Planned Development
PGA	Peak Ground Acceleration
PM ₁₀	Particulate Matter Less than 10 Microns in Diameter
PM _{2.5}	Particulate Matter Less than 2.5 Microns in Diameter
PPM	Parts per Million
PRC	Public Resource Code
Project	Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program
psi	Pounds per square inch
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RIB	Rapid Infiltration Basin
RL	Rural Low
ROW	Right-of-Way
RR	Rural Residential
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Boards
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMARA	Surface Mining Reclamation Act of 1975
SO ₂	Sulfur Dioxide
State Board	California State Water Resources Control Board
Superfund	Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
TCPUD	Tahoe City Public Utility District
TKN	Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
TP	Total Phosphorus
TROA	Truckee River Operating Agreement
TRPA	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
TSS	Total Suspended Solids
TTSA	Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency
TTSD	Tahoe-Truckee Sierra Disposal Company
TTUSD	Tahoe-Truckee Unified School District
UAPCDs	Unified Air Pollution Control Districts
UBC	Uniform Building Code 1997
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
WDR	Waste Discharge Requirements
WMA	Wildlife Management Areas
WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant
yds ³	Cubic Yards