
20 MANDATORY ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

20.1 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 5.8.B(2) requires an EIS to include the significant environmental impacts of a project (TRPA 1987). Impacts are defined as direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of a project. Cumulative impacts are those that result from the incremental impact of an action when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Cumulative impacts are discussed for each topic section when the project's incremental impact is "cumulatively considerable." The projects that may have a cumulative impact on the resources in the project area are often referred to as "related projects."

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an EIR contain an assessment of the cumulative impacts that could be associated with the proposed project. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a), "an EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable." "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects (as defined by Section 15130). As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, a cumulative impact consists of an impact that is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. A cumulative impacts occurs from:

...the change in the environmental which results from the incremental impacts of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

Individual resource area chapters in this EIR (Chapters 6-19) include a discussion of the cumulative impacts associated with the section topic based on the list of other related projects. The list of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects considered for this cumulative analysis are those projects that have occurred or are planned to occur in the vicinity of the north shore of Lake Tahoe (Table 20-1). Table 20-1 identifies related projects in the area, the parcel number, if available, a brief description of the project, and the status of the project. Agencies contacted to develop Table 20-1 include the TRPA, Placer County, USDA Forest Service LTBMU, Tahoe City Public Utility District, Caltrans, and the California Tahoe Conservancy.

Table 20-1**List of Related Projects in Placer and El Dorado Counties - Lake Tahoe Basin Area**

Project Name	APN(s)	Project Description	Status
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Community Enhancement Program			
Domus Development Kings Beach Housing	090-064-012 090-064-013 090-067-017 090-122-035 090-122-036 090-122-037 090-126-026 090-222-050	<p>Phased affordable workforce housing (studio to 3-bedroom units), environmental improvement, and commercial (8,175 sf) development in Kings Beach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16 units, housing up to 80 tenants in five structures, and 32 parking spaces on 0.64 acre on three parcels along Deer Street between Golden and Rainbow. • Six units, housing up to 28 tenants, and 12 parking spaces on 0.32 acre on three parcels along Trout Street. • 12 units, housing up to 56 tenants, and 24 parking spaces on 0.43 acre along Fox Street near the intersection with Brook Street. • 40 units, housing up to 101 tenants, and 51 parking spaces on 1.5 acres on Chipmunk Street near the intersection with Highway 28. <p>The project includes 250 sf of pedestrian/bike trail, underground utilities, 7,636 sf of impervious cover removed and treated/ revegetated, 26,018 sf of area revegetated and treated with erosion source control and runoff practices, and 2,050 sf of roadway stormwater treatment.</p> <p>Existing Development Rights To Be Removed: 12 ERU, 20 TAU</p>	Approved

Table 20-1**List of Related Projects in Placer and El Dorado Counties - Lake Tahoe Basin Area**

Project Name	APN(s)	Project Description	Status
Boulder Bay Project	123-042-01 123-042-02 123-052-02 123-052-03 123-052-04 123-053-02 123-053-04 123-054-01 123-071-04 123-071-34 123-071-35 123-071-36 123-071-37	<p>Mixed-use redevelopment that consists of the following uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 300 tourist accommodation units (hotel); • 59 whole ownership condominiums; • 14 affordable housing units (up to 38 total bedrooms); • 20,715 square feet of commercial floor area; • 89,187 square feet of hotel and casino accessory uses (including 19,089 square foot health and wellness center; 9,860 square foot fitness center; 21,253 square foot convention and meeting space; 1,665 square foot day care center; 750 square foot convenience retail; 750 square foot bar; 3,680 square foot restaurant; and approximately 32,158 square feet of lobby area, mechanical, electrical and plumbing space, and administrative services) • 10,000 square feet of casino (reduced from 29,744 square feet of NTRPA certified gaming area); • 540 total parking spaces (530 in underground structures); and • 5.7 acres of open space with 1.87 acres designated for two public parks to be built and maintained by Boulder Bay and 1.20 acres for passive hiking trails and overlook. <p>Existing Development Rights: 56,322 sf CFA, 3 ERU, 111 TAU</p>	Proposed

Table 20-1**List of Related Projects in Placer and El Dorado Counties - Lake Tahoe Basin Area**

Project Name	APN(s)	Project Description	Status
Kings Beach Town Center (BB LLC)	090-126-020	Redevelopment of the existing downtown commercial/residential site with pedestrian friendly mixed use consisting of residential, retail, office uses, and parking on 4.3 acres. The project is located between Coon and Fox Street on the north side of Highway 28. The town center would include eleven new employee/workforce housing units, 30 market-rate condominiums, and 30 fractional ownership units. Residential units would range in size from studios to three-bedroom, two-bath units. The project also includes a 22,000-sf potential Placer County Government Center building, and up to 66,000 sf of retail/commercial uses. A 397-space parking structure would be constructed on Salmon Avenue between the post office and Fox Street. The project also includes improved storm water collection and water quality treatment systems.	Proposed
	090-126-021		
	090-126-022		
	090-126-024		
	090-126-039		
	090-126-040		
	090-133-003		
	090-133-005		
	090-133-006		
	090-133-007		
	090-133-008		
	090-133-009		
	090-133-010		
	090-133-011	Existing Development Rights To Be Removed: 19,000 sf CFA, 16 ERU, 10 TAU	
	090-133-012		
090-133-015			
090-133-016			
090-133-018			
Pastore Ryan, Kings Beach	090-222-012	Mixed-use redevelopment project including retail, non-profit/public, educational programs, cafe, and residential units at the former Foothill Motel site at 8931 North Lake Blvd. The project would include 5,526 sf of coverage, including a community room, offices, a deli/coffee shop, nine parking spaces, and between two and five residential units. This project would result in a 263-sf reduction to site coverage, green building and BMP demonstrations, pervious concrete, stormwater collection improvements, and native landscape enhancement.	Proposed
		Existing Development Rights: 1 ERU, 7 TAU	

Table 20-1**List of Related Projects in Placer and El Dorado Counties - Lake Tahoe Basin Area**

Project Name	APN(s)	Project Description	Status
Kings Beach Lakeside Resort	7 parcels	<p>Mixed-use redevelopment project on 2.08 acres in King's Beach. Includes 64 new tourist units consisting of 30 fractional units with kitchens and 34 studio hotel rooms with kitchens, two parking structures for 50 parking spaces, 3,850 sf of restaurant space with 1,400 sf of decking (outside seating), 8,560 sf of retail space, and an enlarged boardwalk and viewing area of the lake. Stormwater treatment would be constructed to serve a 20-year, 1-hour storm event and land coverage would be reduced by 5%, including some reductions within sensitive soils.</p> <p>Existing Development Rights: 19,000 sf CFA, 16 ERU, 10 TAU</p>	Proposed
Ferrari Family Resort, Kings Beach	NA	<p>Redevelopment of an existing mixed-use area with 44 new residential housing units, workforce housing (in cooperation with DOMUS), a resort, over 30,000 sf of enhanced and new retail opportunities, parking, and environmental improvements including transit center enhancements and improved lake access/views. Located on SR 28 between Secline and Deer Streets, the project would include a pedestrian overpass linking the 320-space parking structure to be developed on the north side of SR 28 with the resort on the lakeside of SR 28. The three-story resort would include a café, waterfront restaurant, and a view corridor of the lake. The resort will continue to provide 93 tourist accommodation units. A new 16,000-sf commercial space is proposed on the existing RiteAid site. Stormwater runoff would be controlled and treated onsite and 7,000 sf of coverage would be removed from lakefront lands.</p> <p>Existing Development Rights: 5,972 sf CFA, 27 ERU, 93 TAU</p>	Proposed

Table 20-1**List of Related Projects in Placer and El Dorado Counties - Lake Tahoe Basin Area**

Project Name	APN(s)	Project Description	Status
Placer County CEQA Current Projects, November 2010			
Northstar-At-Tahoe Alpine Coaster	110-050-006-000	The project proposes to construct an all-weather toboggan with 2,935 lf uphill and 4,260 lf downhill ride to enhance the year-round attraction at Village at Northstar. Located in the Martis Valley Community Plan Area.	Proposed (Applicant 1st submittal received 2/18/2010; Project on hold)
	110-050-006-000		
	110-050-058-000		
	110-050-058-000		
	110-050-058-000		
	110-081-017-000		
	110-081-020-000		
	110-081-020-000		
	110-081-021-000		
	110-081-021-000		
	110-400-005-000		
	110-400-005-000		
	110-400-005-000		

Table 20-1**List of Related Projects in Placer and El Dorado Counties - Lake Tahoe Basin Area**

Project Name	APN(s)	Project Description	Status
Northstar-At-Tahoe Ski Trail Widening	080-260-013-000	The project proposes to widen the existing ski trails over 2,252 acres with associated snowmaking hydrant relocation and the Martis Camp lift access ski trail. Located in the Martis Valley Community Plan Area.	Approved (Application deemed complete 8/23/10; Mitigated Negative Declaration mailed to applicant for signature 9/30/10)
	091-100-022-000		
	110-050-015-000		
	110-050-015-000		
	110-050-017-000		
	110-050-038-000		
	110-050-038-000		
	110-050-040-000		
	110-050-041-000		
	110-050-041-000		
	110-050-047-000		
	110-050-047-000		
	110-050-047-000		
	110-050-047-000		
	110-050-050-000		
	110-050-053-000		
	110-050-053-000		
	110-070-008-000		
	110-070-009-000		
	110-070-010-000		
	110-070-014-000		
Tahoe Timeshare	117-071-015-000 117-071-044-000	Construction of 10 new timeshare duplexes, workforce housing, and related structures on the 5.19 acre parcel at the northwest corner of North Lake Boulevard and Anderson Road in Tahoe Vista.	Proposed (Comments sent 11/16/10 and applicant 5th submittal due 12/8/10)

Table 20-1**List of Related Projects in Placer and El Dorado Counties - Lake Tahoe Basin Area**

Project Name	APN(s)	Project Description	Status
Denny's Trailer Park	090-124-024-000	The project proposes to reconfigure the seven existing non-conforming lots to conform to the layout of the existing manufactured homes in order to allow ownership to the rental park. No physical changes to the property are being proposed. In the North Tahoe Community Plan area.	Proposed (County comments sent 03/10/10; Applicant 4 th resubmittal pending NTPUD approval)
Northstar Highlands Phase III	110-030-068-000 110-030-068-000 110-030-068-000 110-050-047-000 110-050-047-000 110-050-047-000 110-050-047-000	Northstar Mountain Properties, LLC proposes to develop up to 30 single-family lots located within the approved 342-acre Northstar Highlands Master Plan in 2005.	Proposed (Mitigated Negative Declaration public review ends 12/7/10; PC hearing scheduled for 12/9/10)
Northstar Overall Mountain Master Plan	080-260-001 080-260-002 080-260-008 080-260-010 080-260-013 080-260-015 080-260-016 080-260-017 091-100-002 091-100-022 091-100-027 110-030-018 110-030-022 110-030-050 110-030-051 110-030-069 110-030-070 110-050-006 110-050-015	Northstar-at-Tahoe proposes an Overall Mountain Master Plan for the existing ski resort area. This will involve both project-level and program-level components. The project-level will include six new lifts and associated terrain, snowmaking and associated infrastructure, additional trails and trail widening, four skier bridges, new half pipe and existing half pipe relocation, new skier service, site improvements to existing sites, cross country center relocation and campsite area, relocated ropes course and tree canopy tours, additional mountain bike park trails. Entitlements include Rezone and General Plan Amendment. The future development that will be considered at the program level will include two additional lifts and the Intercept Parking Lot Gondola and associated terrain, additional skier service sites, and the Backside campsite area. In the Martis Valley Community Plan Area.	Proposed (Notice of Preparation public review period pending)

Table 20-1

List of Related Projects in Placer and El Dorado Counties - Lake Tahoe Basin Area

Project Name	APN(s)	Project Description	Status
	110-050-017		
	110-050-026		
	110-050-029		
	110-050-030		
	110-050-034		
	110-050-038		
	110-050-039		
	110-050-040		
	110-050-041		
	110-050-047		
	110-050-061		
	110-070-008		
	110-070-009		
	110-070-010		
	110-070-014		
	through -017		
	110-081-041		
	114-010-001		
	through -017		

Table 20-1**List of Related Projects in Placer and El Dorado Counties - Lake Tahoe Basin Area**

Project Name	APN(s)	Project Description	Status
Sena at Squaw Valley	096-230-052-000	The Sena at Squaw Valley project is a custom designed 240-unit condominium development comprised of 98 townhouse style condominiums, 112 time share condominiums and 30 affordable units, an approximately 25,000 square foot clubhouse and three smaller clubhouses (approx 1,260 square feet, 2,653 square feet, and 6,078 square feet respectively). The 98 townhouse-style condominiums will be three stories and will have a mixture of two, three or four bedrooms with an attached one- or two-car garage. The units will range in size from approx 1,800 square feet to 2,400 square feet. The 112 timeshare condominiums will be constructed in a 2-3 story building and will be mixed with two, three or four bedroom units. There will be an underground garage for approx 200 cars dedicated to the timeshare condominiums. The units will range in size from approx 1,350 square feet to 1,870 square feet. The 30 affordable units will be single story units and have 2-3 bedrooms of mixed square footages. The units will be built in a 2-story structure with immediately adjacent exterior parking provided. The main clubhouse will be designed to have a weight room, locker facility, spa and massage areas, a pool, tennis courts; a children's play area, and a community room and offices. The smaller clubhouses will feature a spa and small weight room with a design potential for a second pool area. The project has also been designed to provide a Squaw Valley ski bus drop off and pick up location on-site as a project amenity and to reduce traffic impacts to valley traffic..	Proposed (Scope of Work being reviewed before EIR contract can be prepared; Project inactive since August 2009)
Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project	NA	The SR 28 beautification project includes modification of the roadway, pedestrian access improvements, water quality improvements, and replacement parking. Placer County approved alternative is three lanes with one-lane roundabouts at Coon and Bear Streets, sidewalks, bike lanes and seasonal on-street parking. The project would also include pedestrian markings, a single 3.6 m traffic lane in each direction, a single 3.6 m dual access center turn lane, a 2.9 m sidewalk and landscape area in each direction, a 1.5 m bike lane on both sides of the roadway, a 2.4 m parking lane in each direction with 63 on-street parking spaces for the non-peak winter period, and off-street parking on side streets and in new parking lots.	County and TRPA Approved; Not Built

Table 20-1**List of Related Projects in Placer and El Dorado Counties - Lake Tahoe Basin Area**

Project Name	APN(s)	Project Description	Status
Kings Beach Town Center	090-126-020-000 090-126-021-000 090-126-022-000 090-126-024-000 090-126-039-000 090-126-040-000 090-133-003-000 090-133-005-000 090-133-006-000 090-133-007-000 090-133-008-000 090-133-009-000 090-133-010-000 090-133-011-000 090-133-012-000 090-133-015-000 090-133-016-000 090-133-018-000	The Kings Beach Town Center project proposes to redevelop an existing commercial/residential site with a pedestrian friendly mixed-use development which would include a combination of residential, commercial, medical and professional offices, public facilities (e.g. civic, governmental, quasi-governmental offices) and parking uses. The project proposes a Tentative Subdivision Map, which would merge the existing 18 parcels into seven parcels and would include both residential and commercial air space condominiums. Residential units would range from three bedroom two bath units to studio units. Commercial units would range from 500 square feet to 3,500 square feet. Additional entitlements required include: a Conditional Use Permit, as required by the Kings Beach Community Plan for residential, public facility and parking uses, Design Review and amendments to both the Kings Beach Community Plan and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's (TRPA) Code of Ordinances. Amendments to the Community Plan and TRPA Code may be needed to address increases to building height and building setback reductions, residential and commercial lot sizes, increased residential density, increased lot coverage and a reduction to the parking requirement. The Kings Beach Town Center project site is located within the downtown commercial area of Kings Beach Community. The project encompasses a city block fronted by Highway 28 at the south, Salmon Avenue at the north, Fox Street at the east and Coon Street at the west. The project also includes six parcels located on the north side of Salmon Avenue, but does not include the existing post office and community clinic.	Proposed (Additional information required before the 1st Draft Notice of Preparation can be prepared; Project inactive since January 2009)
Tahoe City Transit Center	094-180-065 094-180-020	Transit center and parking facility.	Approved (Three-year permit extension granted November 2008)

Table 20-1**List of Related Projects in Placer and El Dorado Counties - Lake Tahoe Basin Area**

Project Name	APN(s)	Project Description	Status
North Tahoe Marina Expansion	NA	An expansion of the marina is planned that could include: extending marina facilities by 800 feet in length and 350 feet in width into Lake Tahoe, expanding marina to include 200 additional slips with water and electric hookups and an offshore gasoline pumping station, construction of an open pier, floating dock and crib wall, buoy removal, accommodation of future water taxi and public boat slips, relocation of an existing transit stop to provide marina access, and expanded parking. There is no application for this project at this time; however, an application is anticipated in the future.	TRPA Application (Not on County's List)
Tahoe City Marina Expansion	NA	Marina expansion including 144 new slips, a 3-story parking garage, and BMP improvements.	Phase 1 Approved
Lake Tahoe Basin Biomass Facility	090-030-029-000 090-030-029-000 090-041-006-000	The project proposes to construct a 1-3 megawatt biomass energy facility on a 1.3-acre site and install a connection, either underground or aboveground, to NV Energy's Kings Beach Substation on the adjacent 21.8-acre parcel.	Proposed (Notice of Preparation public review ended 8/19/10; 1st Administrative Draft EIR being prepared)
El Dorado County, CA Projects			
County Service Area (CSA) Number 5 Erosion Control Project (EIP Project 10062)	NA	Erosion control for Tahoma Subdivision that drains into Lake Tahoe and Placer County watershed just north of the El Dorado County line.	Proposed for construction in 2013.
Tahoe City Public Utility District			
Lakeside Trail Phase VII	NA	Construction of the remaining phase of the Lakeside Trail, located within the California State Recreation Area next to the Lighthouse Center in Tahoe City, CA.	Proposed for construction October 2010.
Homewood Bicycle Trail Design and Permitting	NA	Design of the TCPUD Bike Trail extension in Homewood, CA located partially within the Homewood Mountain Resort North Base Area (included in HMR Master Plan).	Design and Permitting in 2011

Table 20-1**List of Related Projects in Placer and El Dorado Counties - Lake Tahoe Basin Area**

Project Name	APN(s)	Project Description	Status
McKinney-Quail Water Service Area Water Treatment Plant Replacement	NA	Replace existing temporary water treatment plant with new plant sized for the District's domestic water needs and the Homewood Mountain Resort South Base area water needs.	2012
McKinney Estates/Chambers Interconnection	NA	Emergency interconnection of water systems	Summer 2011
Lower Meadow Road and Highway 89 Water Line Replacement	NA	Upsize existing water lines and 2 new fire hydrants	Summer 2011
Ellis and Quail Creek Road Water Line Replacement	NA	Upsize existing water lines and 2 new fire hydrants	Summer 2011
USDA Forest Service, LTBMU			
Sierra Pacific Power Line Upgrade	NA	Rebuild existing power lines from Truckee to Kings Beach and Kings Beach to Tahoe City. Including an upgrade in capacity from 60kV to 120kV..	Scoping to Start early 2011
Carnelian Fuels Reduction and Healthy Forest Restoration Project	NA	Mechanical, hand, and prescribed burning treatments to reduce surface fuels and conifer density within Cedar Flat, Carnelian Bay, Tahoe Vista, and Kings Beach.	Scoping Started May 2010
California Department of Transportation			
Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project	NA	Roadway and drainage improvements for SR 89 between El Dorado County Line and SR 28 at the Tahoe City Wye.	October 2011. Awaiting Funding
El Dorado 89 Environmental Improvement Project	NA	Roadway and drainage improvements for SR 89 starting about 8.3 miles north of South Lake Tahoe from north of the Sidehill Viaducts to Meeks Creek.	October 2012
California Tahoe Conservancy			
Kings Beach Pier Expansion	NA	Expand the Kings Beach Pier to provide greater recreational opportunities.	On Hold
NA = Not Available			
Source: Placer County March 2010; California Tahoe Conservancy 2008; North Tahoe Public Utility District 2009; TRPA 2006/2008; USDA Forest Service 2008			

20.2 GROWTH-INDUCING EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

CEQA and the TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 5, Subsection 5.8.B (8) requires the inclusion of “the growth-inducing impact of the proposed project” in an EIS (TRPA 1987). This section discusses the potential of the alternatives to foster economic or population growth, to prompt the construction of new housing in the surrounding environment, or to remove obstacles to population growth. Growth inducement may result from direct employment, population, or housing growth; secondary or indirect growth; or provision of new infrastructure which will remove obstacles to population growth. To examine growth inducement, the Project’s effect has been evaluated on the following growth factors and their relationship to the growth defined in the region’s General Plans: population; employment; housing demand; and infrastructure.

Alternative 1 – Proposed Project

Plan Area Statements (PAS) are one set of guiding documents included in the TRPA Regional Plan and Placer County West Shore Area General Plan through which TRPA and Placer County implement their authority to regulate growth and development in the Lake Tahoe region. Land uses and development intensities are set forth in PAS throughout the Basin.

The Project area is located in PAS 157 – Homewood/Tahoe Ski Bowl. The primary land use classification for the project area is recreation. The list of permissible land uses includes employee housing (S), single-family dwelling (S), hotel, motels and other transient dwelling units (S), and skiing facilities (S). The PAS allows one single family dwelling units per parcel, 15 employee housing units per acre, and 20 hotel, motel or other transient units per acre. The PAS does not presently allow multi-family housing at any density. Therefore, development of the multi-family condominiums is currently inconsistent with planning direction for the Project area. As such, Alternative 1 proposes amendments to PAS boundaries to allow for multi-family residential units at the North and South Base areas at densities of 15 units per acre.

Alternative 1 (Proposed Project) would directly induce population growth in the immediate vicinity of the project site by constructing new residential units and new tourist accommodation and commercial uses. As described in Chapter 7, Population, Employment, and Housing, this increase in population would likely be, at a maximum, approximately 471 persons. However, it is likely that some of the future residential unit occupants would include people that already reside within the Tahoe Basin, and consistent with existing trends, many of the units would be purchased by second home owners. In addition, HMR is proposing to transfer existing development rights or existing residential units of use (ERUs) to the site necessary for the project per the requirements of Chapter 34, Transfer of Development, of the Code of Ordinances, subject to TRPA’s approval. ERUs transferred to the site would not contribute to an increase in the overall Basin population because new residential units of use would not be created for each of the proposed ERUs. Therefore, the maximum population increase generated by the project would be substantially less than the 471 persons estimated in Chapter 7. As documented in Chapter 7, the anticipated increase in population is not considered to be a significant impact.

Neither of the development Alternatives would require the extension of new public utility service and other public services to the site, as they already serve existing land uses. However, the Alternatives would increase demand on public utility and service providers. Potential impacts to these public utilities and services are discussed in Chapter 16, Public Services and Utilities. Neither of the alternatives include the installation of utilities sized to accommodate growth beyond that which would occur on the project site.

Alternative 1 would require the extension of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way from the South Base area to the proposed Townhomes located above the North Base area. However, construction of this Roadway would not provide access to parcels currently inaccessible from other existing roadways.

Alternative 2 – No Project (Existing Conditions)

Alternative 2 will have no associated growth-inducing effects. No change to the existing land uses or facilities will occur. It will not increase population, provide new employment opportunities, provide housing, or increase the capacity of area infrastructure.

Alternative 3 – No Code Amendment for Building Height

Plan Area Statements (PAS) are one set of guiding documents included in the TRPA Regional Plan and Placer County West Shore Area General Plan through which TRPA and Placer County implement their authority to regulate growth and development in the Lake Tahoe region. Land uses and development intensities are set forth in PAS throughout the Basin.

The Project area is located in PAS 157 – Homewood/Tahoe Ski Bowl. The primary land use classification for the project area is recreation. The list of permissible land uses includes employee housing (S), single-family dwelling (S), hotel, motels and other transient dwelling units (S), and skiing facilities (S). The PAS allows one single family dwelling units per parcel, 15 employee housing units per acre, and 20 hotel, motel or other transient units per acre. The PAS does not presently allow multi-family housing at any density. Therefore, development of the multi-family condominiums is currently inconsistent with planning direction for the Project area. As such, Alternative 1 proposes amendments to PAS boundaries to allow for multi-family residential units at the North and South Base areas at densities of 15 units per acre.

Alternative 3 would directly induce population growth in the immediate vicinity of the project site by constructing new residential units and new tourist accommodation and commercial uses. As described in Chapter 7, Population, Employment, and Housing, this increase in population would likely be, at a maximum, approximately 471 persons. However, it is likely that some of the future residential unit occupants would include people that already reside within the Tahoe Basin, and consistent with existing trends, many of the units would be purchased by second home owners. In addition, HMR is proposing to transfer existing development rights or existing residential units of use (ERUs) to the site necessary for the project per the requirements of Chapter 34, Transfer of Development, of the Code of Ordinances, subject to TRPA's approval. ERUs transferred to the site would not contribute to an increase in the overall Basin population because new residential units of use would not be created for each of the proposed ERUs. Therefore, the maximum population increase generated by the project would be substantially less than the 471 persons estimated in Chapter 7. As documented in Chapter 7, the anticipated increase in population is not considered to be a significant impact.

Neither of the development Alternatives would require the extension of new public utility service and other public services to the site, as they already serve existing land uses. However, the Alternatives would increase demand on public utility and service providers. Potential impacts to these public utilities and services are discussed in Chapter 16, Public Services and Utilities. Neither of the alternatives include the installation of utilities sized to accommodate growth beyond that which would occur on the project site.

Alternative 3 would require the extension of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way from the South Base area to the proposed Townhomes located above the North Base area. However, construction of this Roadway would not provide access to parcels currently inaccessible from other existing roadways.

Alternative 4 – Close Ski Resort – Estate Lots

Alternative 4 is expected to have no associated growth-inducing effects. Alternative 4 would decommission the ski resort and replace it with 16 new single-family residences and a new 15,000 sf commercial development. Construction would temporarily generate new employment opportunities in the region, and operation of the commercial area would generate new permanent employment jobs. HMR removal is expected to result in a net loss of employment opportunities in the region under Alternative 4. The loss of employment opportunities is expected to decrease demand for housing, utilities, and public services. Consequently, Alternative 4 is not expected to have a net growth-inducing effect.

Alternative 5 – Compact Project Area

Plan Area Statements (PAS) are one set of guiding documents included in the TRPA Regional Plan and Placer County West Shore Area General Plan through which TRPA and Placer County implement their authority to regulate growth and development in the Lake Tahoe region. Land uses and development intensities are set forth in PAS throughout the Basin.

The Project area is located in PAS 157 – Homewood/Tahoe Ski Bowl. The primary land use classification for the project area is recreation. The list of permissible land uses includes employee housing (S), single-family dwelling (S), hotel, motels and other transient dwelling units (S), and skiing facilities (S). The PAS allows one single family dwelling units per parcel, 15 employee housing units per acre, and 20 hotel, motel or other transient units per acre. The PAS does not presently allow multi-family housing at any density. Therefore, development of the multi-family condominiums is currently inconsistent with planning direction for the Project area. As such, Alternative 5 proposes amendments to PAS boundaries to allow for multi-family residential units at the North Base areas. However, under Alternative 5 all multi-family residential units would be consolidated in the existing parking lots at the North Base area and would require density of 45 units per acre. As a result, Alternative 5 has been determined to be inconsistent with adjacent land uses and the Regional Plan goals and policies.

Alternative 5 would directly induce population growth in the immediate vicinity of the project site by constructing new residential units and new tourist accommodation and commercial uses. As described in Chapter 7, Population, Employment, and Housing, this increase in population would likely be, at a maximum under Alternative 6, approximately 627 persons. However, it is likely that some of the future residential unit occupants would include people that already reside within the Tahoe Basin and that consistent with existing trends, many of the units would be purchased by second home owners. In addition, HMR is proposing to transfer existing development rights or existing residential units of use (ERUs) to the site necessary for the project per the requirements of Chapter 34, Transfer of Development, of the Code of Ordinances, subject to TRPA's approval. ERUs transferred to the site would not contribute to an increase in the overall Basin population because new residential units of use would not be created for each of the ERUs transferred to the site. Therefore, the maximum population increase generated by the project would be substantially less than 627 persons estimated in Chapter 7. As documented in Chapter 7, the anticipated increase in population is not considered to be a significant impact.

Neither of the development Alternatives would require the extension of new public utility service and other public services to the site, as they already serve existing land uses. However, the Alternatives would increase demand on public utility and service providers. Potential impacts to these public utilities and services are discussed in Chapter 16, Public Services and Utilities. Neither of the alternatives include the installation of utilities sized to accommodate growth beyond that which would occur on the project site.

Alternative 6 – Reduced Project

Plan Area Statements (PAS) are one set of guiding documents included in the TRPA Regional Plan and Placer County West Shore Area General Plan through which TRPA and Placer County implement their authority to regulate growth and development in the Lake Tahoe region. Land uses and development intensities are set forth in PAS throughout the Basin.

The Project area is located in PAS 157 – Homewood/Tahoe Ski Bowl. The primary land use classification for the project area is recreation. The list of permissible land uses includes employee housing (S), single-family dwelling (S), hotel, motels and other transient dwelling units (S), and skiing facilities (S). The PAS allows one single family dwelling units per parcel, 15 employee housing units per acre, and 20 hotel, motel or other transient units per acre. The PAS does not presently allow multi-family housing at any density. Therefore, development of the multi-family condominiums is currently inconsistent with planning direction for the Project area. As such, Alternative 6 proposes amendments to PAS boundaries to allow for multi-family residential units at the North and South Base areas at densities of 15 units per acre.

Alternative 6 would directly induce population growth in the immediate vicinity of the project site by constructing new residential units and new tourist accommodation and commercial uses. As described in Chapter 7, Population, Employment, and Housing, this increase in population would likely be, at a maximum, approximately 543 persons. However, it is likely that some of the future residential unit occupants would include people that already reside within the Tahoe Basin, and consistent with existing trends, many of the units would be purchased by second home owners. In addition, HMR is proposing to transfer existing development rights or existing residential units of use (ERUs) to the site necessary for the project per the requirements of Chapter 34, Transfer of Development, of the Code of Ordinances, subject to TRPA's approval. ERUs transferred to the site would not contribute to an increase in the overall Basin population because new residential units of use would not be created for each of the proposed ERUs. Therefore, the maximum population increase generated by the project would be substantially less than the 543 persons estimated in Chapter 7. As documented in Chapter 7, the anticipated increase in population is not considered to be a significant impact.

Neither of the development Alternatives would require the extension of new public utility service and other public services to the site, as they already serve existing land uses. However, the Alternatives would increase demand on public utility and service providers. Potential impacts to these public utilities and services are discussed in Chapter 16, Public Services and Utilities. Neither of the alternatives include the installation of utilities sized to accommodate growth beyond that which would occur on the project site.

20.3 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL SHORT-TERM USE OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 5, Subsection 5.8.B(6) requires the inclusion of “the relationship between local short-term uses of man’s environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity” in an EIS (TRPA 1987). This analysis normally entails a balancing of social, economic, and environmental impacts over time. In some cases, a relatively short-term benefit may have adverse long-term effects, with the possibility that future generations may be burdened with unwarranted social and environmental costs. It is also possible to have long-term benefits at the expense of short-term costs. Balancing of such impacts from this project is the responsibility of the TRPA and regulatory agencies.

Table 2-2 (Summary Chapter) summarizes benefits associated the CEP Alternatives (Proposed Project Alternative 1 and Alternatives 3, 5 and 6) by applicable impact. More detailed analysis of potential benefits is included in the individual resource chapters 6-19 in this EIR. Table 2-2 illustrates how the CEP Alternatives result in a variety of environmental and community benefits that are above and beyond baseline TRPA and Placer County plan requirements.

Alternative 2 would maintain existing conditions. However, according to HMR statements, maintaining existing conditions is not sustainable and without proposed redevelopment, the existing ski resort operation would likely close. Alternative 4 would close the existing ski resort and develop the site as 16 estate home sites and a 15,000 square foot commercial development at the North Base area. These Alternatives may therefore result in the loss of winter day use recreational capacity that would likely be a long-term loss because of the lack of suitable sites for relocating the recreational capacity.

20.4 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 5, Subsection 5.8.B(7) requires an EIS to include an analysis of “the significant irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed project should it be implemented” (TRPA 1987). CEQA §21100(b)(2)(B) requires that an EIR identify any significant irreversible changes that would result from project implementation. CEQA Guidelines §15126.2(c) provides guidance as to what sorts of changes might be considered irreversible. Such changes include use of nonrenewable resources, commitment of future generations to similar uses, and environmental accidents that could occur as a result of the project.

Construction and operation of the Project (Alternative 1) and Action Alternatives 3, 4, 5 and 6 would consume non-renewable resources. The use of building materials and energy resources, including electricity and fossil fuels, during construction will largely be irreversible and irretrievable. However, the use of these nonrenewable resources will not account for more than a small portion of the resources that are used in the Lake Tahoe Region and will not preclude the availability of these resources for other needs. The North Base area has been accepted into and will be designed under the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) for Neighborhood Development Pilot Program as an example of exemplary green and sustainable development. The LEED certification standards put a great emphasis on the reuse of building materials and the limiting of waste disposal for previously developed sites. The Project area has a number of existing buildings that will be taken down as part of the redevelopment process. The architecture of the new buildings will utilize the some of the existing materials from these dismantled structures.

The potential for irreversible damage to the environment resulting from project-related activities is described in Chapters 6.0 through 19.0 of this document. However, compliance with applicable state, federal, and TRPA regulatory requirements (through mitigation plans and standard permit conditions) during construction will reduce the potential for irreversible damage to a less than significant level.

20.5 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

CEQA §2100(b)(2)(A) of and TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 5, Subsection 5.8.B(3) require that an EIR/EIS identify any significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the project were implemented (TRPA 1987). Significant unavoidable impacts, impacts that remain significant after implementation of recommended mitigation measure, for individual resources are identified in the Chapters 6-19 of this EIR/EIS. Although the Project has the potential to result in a number of significant

environmental impacts, most impacts can be mitigated through the application of standard practices and adoption of appropriate mitigation measures that will reduce net impacts to a less than significant level.

Prior to approving the Project or an alternative, TRPA must make either of the following findings for each significant adverse effect identified in the EIR/EIS:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the 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.

Significant unavoidable impacts of the project are summarized in Table 20-2. These impacts are considered to be significant even with implementation of identified mitigation measures. As shown in the table, Alternative 5 results in the highest number (10) of significant and unavoidable impacts, followed by Alternative 2 with eight and Alternatives 3 and 6, which each have seven significant and unavoidable impacts. Alternative 2 (No Project) would result in 8 significant and unavoidable impacts attributed to maintenance of existing conditions that do not meet existing regulatory standards or plan guidance.

Table 20-2

Significant and Unavoidable Impacts by Alternative

Impact	Alternative					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Chapter 6.0 Land Use						
LU-1. Will the Project be consistent with the land use plan or zoning plan, or land use goals, policies, and provisions of the TRPA Regional Plan, including the Goals and Policies, Code of Ordinances, Plan Area Statements, or Ski Area Master Plan Guidelines, and the Placer County General Plan and West Shore Area General Plan?		X		X	X	
LU-2. Will the Project be consistent with adjacent land uses or expand/intensify existing non-conforming uses?					X	
LU-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to land use?				X	X	
Chapter 10.0 Scenic Resources						
SCENIC-1. Will the Project be inconsistent with a County General Plan or TRPA regulations, standards, or guidelines applicable to the Project area?		X				
SCENIC-2. Will the Project be visible from or cause an adverse effect on foreground or middle ground views from a high volume travel way, recreation use area, or other public use area, including Lake Tahoe, TRPA designated bike		X				

Impact	Alternative					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
trail, or state or federal highway?						
Chapter 11.0 Transportation, Parking and Circulation						
TRANS-3. Will the Project result in a substantial impact upon the existing transportation systems, including roadways and intersections? <i>Summer Queuing</i>	X		X		X	X
TRANS-C1. Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to transportation or circulation? <i>Summer Queuing</i>	X		X		X	X
Chapter 12.0 Air Quality						
AQ-1. Will the Project generate construction emissions in excess of applicable standards?			X		X	X
AQ-4. Will the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X		X	X
AQ-C1. Would the Project result in a cumulative short-term impact on air quality?			X		X	X
Chapter 14.0 Soils, Geology, and Seismicity						
GEO-3. Will the Project result in compaction or covering of the soil beyond the limits allowed in the land capability system, including coverage within sensitive Class 1a and 1b lands?		X				
Chapter 15.0 Hydrology, Water Rights, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater						
HYDRO-1. Will the construction or long-term operations of the Project violate existing waste discharge permit provisions or result in discharges into surface waters (streams, SEZs or Lake Tahoe) so that beneficial uses and water quality standards are not maintained?		X				
HYDRO-2. Will Project construction or operation alter the existing surface water drainage patterns or cause increased runoff resulting in flooding or stream bank erosion or contribute runoff in rates or volumes that will exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems so that a 20-yr, 1-hr storm runoff (approximately 1 inch per hour) cannot be contained on the site?		X				
HYDRO-4. Will the Project alter the course or flow of the 100-year floodwaters or expose people or structures to water related hazards such as flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occurrence or seiches?		X				

Impact	Alternative					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
HYDRO-C1. Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to water resources?		X				
Chapter 18.0 Recreation						
REC-2. Will the Project create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed?				X		
REC-C1. Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to recreation?				X		
Chapter 19.0 Climate Change						
CC-C1. Will the Project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	X		X		X	X
CC-C2. Will the Project conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?	X		X		X	X
Totals By Alternative	4	8	7	4	10	7

Source: Hauge Brueck Associates 2011

20.6 CEQA ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

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

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

- reduce the amount of existing land coverage (approximately 23 percent) the most among viable CEP Alternatives (Alternative 5 is not viable because of proposed density and adverse impacts to scenic quality ratings), which would reduce soils, hydrologic, and stream zone impacts;

- include the greatest decrease of winter vehicle trips and VMT of the CEP Alternatives (see Table 11-17);
- include the smallest increase of summer vehicle trips and VMT of the CEP Alternatives (see Table 11-17); and
- implement the proposed environmental benefits included in the HMR Master Plan and summarized in Table 2-2 of this EIR/EIS.

20.7 TRPA ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERABLE ALTERNATIVE

TRPA Requirements

The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (TRPA 1980), along with other state and federal environmental legislation, establishes TRPA's mission. As directed by the Compact, TRPA adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities in 1982 for the Lake Tahoe Region (TRPA 1982). The Compact defines an "environmental threshold carrying capacity" as "an environmental standard necessary to maintain a significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific or natural value of the region or to maintain public health and safety within the region."

The threshold standards guide TRPA's planning and operating functions. The adopted thresholds address nine components of the environment of the Lake Tahoe Basin: water quality, soil conservation, air quality, vegetation preservation, wildlife, fisheries, noise, recreation, and scenic resources.

TRPA's Code of Ordinances requires a finding for any action that the project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded (TRPA 1987). When evaluating alternatives, TRPA identifies the alternative that will best maintain and/or achieve environmental thresholds. The Compact and the Code of Ordinances allow for the consideration of social, technical or economic impacts when selecting an alternative (TRPA 1980, 1987).

Selection of the Environmentally Preferable Alternative

Based on the analysis of impacts to individual resources in Chapters 6 – 19 of this EIR, it is recommended that Alternative 6 be selected as the Environmentally Preferable Alternative as it would result in the least amount of impact of the CEP Alternatives (e.g., land coverage, trip generation, VMT) and would include the environmental benefits included in the HMR Master Plan and summarized in Table 2-2.