24.11 CHAPTER 11 - TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Section 11.1.2, DEIR/EIS page 11-4, FEIR/EIS page 11-4: Revisions based on public comment

During the summer, the Friday PM peak hour is typically evaluated because this is generally when peak traffic volumes occur on the roadways. ~~At m~~Most study intersections~~,~~ near Homewood has higher traffic volumes ~~were higher~~ on Friday than Saturday, ~~and volumes on SR 89 were higher on Friday~~; therefore, the summer analysis was performed for Friday conditions. The TRPA regional transportation model also evaluates the Friday PM peak hour during the summer. Table 11-1 shows the existing intersection turning movement counts at the study intersections for the Friday PM peak period during summer. Existing intersection lane configurations, control types, and turning movement volumes are displayed on Figure 11-2.

Section 11.1.4, DEIR/EIS page 11-11, FEIR/EIS page 11-12: Revisions made to further clarify existing conditions

The side street approach of SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection currently operates at LOS F during the summer and winter Friday PM peak hour. The remaining study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service.

A two-way left-turn lane on SR 89 at Granlibakken Road has been environmentally cleared through a CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration, NEPA Finding of No Significant Impact, and TRPA Programmatic Environmental Assessment, and is scheduled for construction as part of the Caltrans' *Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project (EIP)*. Level of service analysis was performed for existing conditions assuming the two-way left-turn has been constructed. The improvement resulted in the following LOS at SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection during the summer and winter:

- *Summer - Delay: 3.1* ***(37.9)****, LOS: A* ***(E)***
- *Winter - Delay: 2.3* ***(19.2)****, LOS: A* ***(C)***

Note this analysis is provided for information purposes only. The baseline condition does not include the Placer 89 EIP.

Section 11.1.5 -11.1.7, DEIR/EIS page 11-14, FEIR/EIS page 11-15: Revisions made in response to TCPUD comment letter

The Night Rider – Free Night Service shuttle provides service along the west shore of Lake Tahoe from Squaw Valley, through Tahoe City, to Tahoma, and along the north shore from Tahoe City to the Tahoe Biltmore. The Night Rider also offers a~~nd~~ route along SR 267 ~~to~~ from the north shore of Lake Tahoe to Northstar. The Night Rider offers hourly service from7:00 PM to12:00 AM, from December to April.

Homewood offers a free shuttle service with advance reservations from Tahoe City to Homewood. Scheduled pick-ups are offered from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. Door-to-door service is also available with advance reservation made the day before.

11.1.6 Existing Waterborne Transit Facilities

The Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization has initiated an intra-regional planning effort to assess additional waterborne transit services in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Tahoe Transportation District is potentially launching a pilot waterborne transit project in 2012.

11.1.7 Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Bicycle and pedestrian facilities exist around much of the Lake Tahoe perimeter. The West Shore Trail (also known as the TCPUD bike trail) runs along SR 89 and SR 28 in Tahoe City and continues through Homewood, California terminating just north of Meeks Bay on the west side of Lake Tahoe. The path is a mixed-use path, designated for bicycles and pedestrians. The bicycle and pedestrian path is separated from the roadway throughout most of its route; however there are several locations where the path crosses the roadway at marked crosswalks. At one location in particular, the path crosses SR 89 at signalized intersection actuated by pedestrians/bicyclists. The trail includes a small gap between the SR 89/Cherry Street and Fawn Street/San Souci Terrace intersections. Plans are underway to construct the gap in the trail, however funding has not been secured. Funding is actively being sought and construction could begin as early as 2012. HMR will construct/relocate the proposed TCPUD bike trail through the North Base Area, as shown on Civil Plan Sheet C10.

Section 11.4.1, DEIR/EIS page 11-25, FEIR/EIS page 11-26: Revisions made for clarification of Accessory Uses

11.4 PROJECT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

11.4.1 Summer Trip Generation

Summer Study Period

Typically, traffic volumes in the Lake Tahoe Basin are highest during the summer months. The Friday PM peak hour is usually selected for analysis, as it is generally when peak traffic volumes occur on the roadways. In addition, the TRPA regional transportation model evaluates traffic on a typical summer Friday in August.

Assumed Accessory Uses

The ITE description of the hotel land use category includes accessory uses such as restaurants, cocktail lounges, meeting and banquet rooms or convention facilities, limited recreational facilities (pool, fitness room), and/or other retail and service shops; therefore, the restaurant, bar, meeting space, and fitness center/spa uses were included as accessory uses to the hotel for analysis purposes (Chapter 6, Land Use addresses the findings required for accessory uses).

Section 11.4.1, DEIR/EIS page 11-67, FEIR/EIS page 11-27: Addition of Alternative 1A land uses

Project (Alternative 1/1A) Land Uses

The following land uses were included in the summer trip generation analysis of the Project (Alternative 1):

North Base

- Hotel - 75 rooms

  Accessory uses include: Meeting Space – 3,005 square feet (sf)
  Fitness Center/Spa –10,590 sf
  Restaurant – 1,800 sf
  Bar – 1,260 sf

- Condo/Hotel Rooms – 60 units (40 units, 20 2-bedroom units with lock-off units assumed to be 100% locked off)
- Penthouse Condos – 30 units
- Residential Condos – 36 units
- Fractional Condos (Timeshares) - 20 units
- Townhomes – 16 units
- Apartment (Workforce Housing – 2 bedroom units) – 13 units
- Retail – 25,000 sf (CFA)
- Miniature Golf Course – 12 holes
- ~~North Base Lodge/Skier Services – 30,000 sf (winter only)~~
- Outdoor Amphitheater – 1,500 seats (special events only – infrequent use)

South Base

- Residential Condos – 99 units (95 units under Alternative 1A)
- ~~Skier Services – 2,000 sf (winter only)~~

Mid-Mountain

- Day Lodge – 15,000 sf ~~(winter only)~~

Section 11.4.1, DEIR/EIS page 11-27, FEIR/EIS page 11-28: Addition of average weekly occupancy rate

- The first step to developing summer trip generation is to consider resort occupancy and the fluctuation or "turnover" of resort residents and guests. This study takes a conservative approach and assumes that 100% of the lodging units are occupied on peak weekends. Monday and Thursday occupancy rates are estimated at 50% with mid-week occupancies around 35%, for an average weekly occupancy rate of 67%. Data collected by the Park City Chamber of Commerce (and referenced in the *Dyer Mountain Resort Transportation Impact Analysis*, Fehr & Peers, 2005) indicates that the length of a typical stay at a ski resort is 3 to 5 days, with most arrivals on Fridays and the majority of departures on Sundays. Based on this information, it was assumed that 50% of the lodging guests will arrive at the resort on Friday. To present a conservative analysis, it was further assumed that 50% of the lodging guests arriving on Friday (25% of the total lodging guests) will arrive during the PM peak hour. A trip generation rate of 1.5 vehicles per lodging unit was estimated, based on average parking rates for a Resort Hotel, Rental Townhouse, and Condominium in *Shared Parking, 2nd Edition* (Urban Land Institute, 2005). Note that the *Homewood Mountain Resort Parking Study* (LSC Transporation Consultants, 2011) provides an average parking demand of 1.2 spaces per hotel and condo-hotel lodging unit; therefore, the trip generation rate of 1.5 accounts for lodging guests arriving at the resort, as well as the potential for some of these guests to make an additional trip the same day that they arrive.

Section 11.4.1, DEIR/EIS page 11-29, FEIR/EIS page 11-30: Internal trip clarification

The lodging units were analyzed under the assumption that 50% of trips would be for social or recreational purposes, and 50% of trips would be for other personal business (e.g. shopping, eating at a restaurant, going to ~~the~~a spa, etc.).

Section 11.4.1, DEIR/EIS page 11-30, FEIR/EIS page 11-31: Bike trail clarification

HMR will provide free bicycles for guests and residents, to borrow for up to a week at a time, through a bike-sharing program. The Project (Alternative 1) will also ~~integrate a Tahoe City Public Utility District~~ construct/relocate the proposed ~~(~~TCPUD~~)~~ bike ~~path into~~trail through the North Base area, as shown on Civil Plan Sheet C10. Walking and bicycling trips created were accounted for in the internal capture analysis as residential to recreational, or lodging to recreational trips.

New Table 11-9A, DEIR/EIS page 11-31, FEIR/EIS page 11-34: Alternative 1A analysis added

Table 11-9A

Alternative 1A – Summer Trip Generation

Land Use (ITE Code)	Density[1]	Rates[2]				Trips[3]			
		Daily	PM	PM In	PM Out	Daily	PM	PM In	PM Out
North Base									
*50% of lodging guests arrive on Friday **									
Hotel	38 rooms	1.5	0.75	100%	0%	57	29	29	0
Condo/Hotel	30 rooms	1.5	0.75	100%	0%	45	23	23	0
Penthouse Condos	15 units	1.5	0.75	100%	0%	23	11	11	0
Timeshare	10 units	1.5	0.75	100%	0%	15	8	8	0
Remaining 50% of lodging units, all residential units, and retail use analyzed using typical TRPA and ITE trip generation rates									
Hotel (310)	37 rooms	8.92	0.7	49%	51%	330	26	13	13
Condo/Hotel (310)	30 rooms	8.92	0.7	49%	51%	268	21	10	11
Penthouse Condos (230)	15 units	5.86	0.52	67%	33%	88	8	5	3
Timeshare (265)	10 units	10.1	0.79	40%	60%	101	8	3	5
Residential Condos/ Townhomes (230)	52 units	5.86	0.52	67%	33%	305	27	18	9
Apartment (220)	13 units	6.72	0.62	65%	35%	87	8	5	3
Shopping Center (820)	25 ksf	42.94	3.75	48%	52%	1,074	95	45	49
Meeting Space	3.005 ksf	Accessory Use to Hotel							
Fitness Center/Spa	10.59 ksf	Accessory Use to Hotel							
Restaurant	1.80 ksf	Accessory Use to Hotel							
Bar	1.26 ksf	Accessory Use to Hotel							
Miniature Golf Course (431)	12 holes	3.30	0.33	33%	67%	40	4	1	3
South Base									
Residential Condos (230)	95 units	5.86	0.52	67%	33%	557	49	33	16
Total "Raw" Trip Generation						2,990	317	204	112
Internal Capture Trips						(-1,106)	(-93)	(-56)	(-38)
External Project Trips						1,884	224	148	74
Alternative Mode Trips						(-218)	(-31)	(-16)	(-15)
External Vehicle Trips						1,666	193	132	59
Pass-By Trips [4] (Shopping Center – 34%)						(-210)	(-19)	(-8)	(-11)
Total Net New External Roadway Trips						**1,456**	**174**	**124**	**48**

Source: Fehr & Peers 2009

Notes:
[1] ksf = 1,000 sf
[2] Daily rates are from the TRPA Trip Table and PM rates are from ITE. ITE Daily rates were used where the TRPA Trip Table did not provide rates.
[3] Numbers may differ slightly from the trip generation spreadsheet due to rounding.
[4] Pass-By trips were calculated after internal capture and alternative mode trips were subtracted from the total retail trips.

Section 11.4.2, DEIR/EIS page 11-36, FEIR/EIS page 11-39: Project (Alternative 1/1A) Land Uses

South Base

- Residential Condos – 99 units (95 units under Alternative 1A)
- Skier Services – 2,000 sf

New Table 11-13A, DEIR/EIS page 11-41, FEIR/EIS page 11-45: Alternative 1A analysis added

Table 11-13A

Alternative 1A – Winter Trip Generation

Land Use	Density[1]	Rates[2]				Trips[3]			
		Daily	PM	PM In	PM Out	Daily	PM	PM In	PM Out
North Base									
*50% of lodging guests arrive on Friday**									
Hotel	38 rooms	1.5	0.75	100%	0%	57	29	29	0
Condo/Hotel	30 rooms	1.5	0.75	100%	0%	45	23	23	0
Penthouse Condos	15 units	1.5	0.75	100%	0%	23	11	11	0
Timeshare	10 units	1.5	0.75	100%	0%	15	8	8	0
Remaining 50% of lodging units, all residential units, and retail use analyzed using typical TRPA and ITE trip generation rates									
Hotel (310)	37 rooms	8.92	0.70	49%	51%	330	26	13	13
Condo/Hotel (310)	30 rooms	8.92	0.70	49%	51%	268	21	10	11
Penthouse Condos (230)	15 units	5.86	0.52	67%	33%	88	8	5	3
Timeshare (265)	10 units	10.1	0.79	40%	60%	101	8	3	5
Residential Condos/ Townhomes (230)	52 units	5.86	0.52	67%	33%	305	27	18	9
Apartment (220)	13 units	6.72	0.62	65%	35%	87	8	5	3
Shopping Center (820)	25 ksf	42.94	3.75	48%	52%	1,074	95	45	49
Meeting Space	3.005 ksf	Accessory Use to Hotel							
Fitness Center/Spa	10.59 ksf	Accessory Use to Hotel							
Restaurant	1.80 ksf	Accessory Use to Hotel							
Bar	1.26 ksf	Accessory Use to Hotel							
Day Skier Parking	400 spaces	2.0	0.45	0%	100%	800	180	0	180
South Base									
Residential Condos	95 units	5.86	0.52	67%	33%	557	49	33	16

Table 11-13A

Alternative 1A – Winter Trip Generation

Land Use	Density[1]	Rates[2]				Trips[3]			
		Daily	PM	PM In	PM Out	Daily	PM	PM In	PM Out
Skier Drop Off/ Pick Up	100 skiers (2 skiers per vehicle)	2	1	50%	50%	200	100	50	50
Total "Raw" Trip Generation						3,950	593	253	339
Internal Capture Trips						(-1,190)	(-100)	(-59)	(-41)
External Project Trips						*2,760*	*493*	*194*	*298*
Alternative Mode Trips						(-355)	(-95)	(-48)	(-47)
External Vehicle Trips						*2,405*	*398*	*146*	*251*
Pass-By Trips [4] (Shopping Center - 34%)						(-207)	(-18)	(-8)	(-11)
Total New Project Trips						**2,198**	**380**	**138**	**240**
Existing Homewood Volumes						(-2,535)	(-472)	(-115)	(-357)
Total Net New External Roadway Trips						**(-337)**	**(-92)**	**23**	**(-117)**

Source: Fehr & Peers 2009

Notes:
* An average of 1.5 vehicles per unit was assumed.
[1] ksf = 1,000 sf
[2] Daily rates are from the TRPA Trip Table and PM rates are from ITE. ITE Daily rates were used where the TRPA Trip Table did not provide rates.
[3] Numbers may differ slightly from the trip generation spreadsheet due to rounding.
[4] Pass-By trips were calculated after internal capture and alternative mode trips were subtracted from the total retail trips.

Section 11.4.2, DEIR/EIS page 11-45, FEIR/EIS page 11-50: Alternative 1A analysis added

Alternative 1A, which is substantially the same as Alternative 1 from a transportation perspective, was included following the completion of the Draft EIR/EIS. The Alternative 1A trip generation analysis demonstrates that Alternative 1A will generate less traffic than Alternative 1; therefore, the intersection operations with Alternative 1A will be better than or unchanged than the operations calculated for Alternative 1, and new operations analysis was not performed.

Table 11-17, DEIR/EIS page 11-46, FEIR/EIS page 11-51: Revision to Table, Alternative 1A analysis added

Table 11-17

Project Alternatives Trip Generation Summary

Trip Generation	Alternative					
	1	1A	3	4	5	6
Summer						
"Raw" Daily Project Trip Generation	3,013	2,990	3,013	804	2,940	2,826
Daily Internal Capture and Alternative Mode Trips	(-1,339)	(-1,324)	(-1,339)	(-118)	(-1,349)	(-1,289)
Daily Pass-By Trips	(-208)	(-210)	(-208)	(-196)	(-200)	(-206)
Net New External Daily Project Trips	**1,466**	**1,456**	**1,466**	**490**	**1,391**	**1,331**
"Raw" PM Peak Project Trip Generation	319	317	319	72	283	273
PM Peak Internal Capture and Alternative Mode Trips	(-125)	(-124)	(-125)	(-11)	(-130)	(-125)
PM Peak Pass-By Trips	(-18)	(-19)	(-18)	(-17)	(-17)	(-18)
Net New External PM Peak Project Trips	**176**	**174**	**176**	**44**	**136**	**130**
Winter						
"Raw" Daily Project Trip Generation	3,973	3,950	3,973	804	4,021	3,826
Daily Internal Capture and Alternative Mode Trips	(-1,560)	(-1,545)	(-1,560)	(-118)	(-1,580)	(-1,440)
Daily Pass-By Trips	(-205)	(-207)	(-205)	(-196)	(-192)	(-211)
Net New Project Trips	*2,208*	*2,198*	*2,208*	*490*	*2,249*	*2,175*
Existing Daily Homewood Trip Generation	(-2,535)	(-2,535)	(-2,535)	(-2,535)	(-2,535)	(-2,535)
Net New External Daily Project Trips	**(-327)**	**(-337)**	**(-327)**	**(-2,045)**	**(-286)**	**(-360)**
"Raw" PM Peak Project Trip Generation	595	593	595	72	570	553
PM Peak Internal Capture and Alternative Mode Trips	(-197)	(-195)	(-197)	(-11)	(-203)	(-190)
PM Peak Pass-By Trips	(-18)	(-18)	(-18)	(-17)	(-17)	(-18)
Net New External PM Peak Project Trips	*380*	*380*	*380*	*44*	*350*	*345*
Existing PM Peak Homewood Trip Generation	(-472)	(-472)	(-472)	(-472)	(-472)	(-472)
Net New External PM Peak Project Trips	**(-92)**	**(-92)**	**(-92)**	**(-428)**	**(-122)**	**(-127)**

Source: Fehr & Peers 2009

Notes: Detailed trip generation spreadsheets for Alternatives 1, 1A, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are provided in Tables 11-9 to 11-16.

Table 11-18 and Impact TRANS-1, DEIR/EIS page 11-58, FEIR/EIS page 11-63: Alternative 1A analysis added

Table 11-18

VMT Analysis Comparison – Summer/Winter

Project Alternative	Net New Daily Trip Generation	Existing Homewood VMT	Net New Project VMT
Summer			
1 and 3	1,466	0	8,431
1A	1,456	0	8,396
2 (No Project)	0	0	0
4	490	0	2,362
5	1,391	0	7,045
6	1,328	0	6,796
Winter			
1 and 3	(-327)	13,328	(-1,232)
1A	(-337)	13,328	(-1,266)
2 (No Project)	0	13,328	0
4	(-2,045)	13,328	(-10,966)
5	(-286)	13,328	(-1,869)
6	(-360)	13,328	(-2,172)

Source: Fehr & Peers 2009

IMPACT: **TRANS-1. Will the Project result in generation of 200 or more new Daily Vehicle Trip Ends?**

Analysis: *No Impact; No Project (Alternative 2)*

The No Project (Alternative 2) will not include changes to the existing land uses, densities, and roadway network; therefore, there are no impacts associated with this alternative.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

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

As shown in Table 11-17, the Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 1A, 3, 4, 5, and 6 will not generate more than 200 net new daily vehicle trip ends during the winter months:

- Alternatives 1 and 3: -327 net new daily trips;
- Alternative 1A: -337 net new daily trips;
- Alternative 4: -2,045 net new daily trips;

Impact TRANS-1, DEIR/EIS page 11-59, FEIR/EIS page 11-64: Alternative 1A analysis added

During the summer months, the Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 1A, 3, 4, 5, and 6 will generate more than 200 net new daily vehicle trip ends (Table 11-17):

- Alternatives 1 and 3: 1,466 net new daily trips;
- Alternative 1A: 1,456 net new daily trips;
- Alternative 4: 490 net new daily trips;
- Alternative 5: 1,391 net new daily trips; and
- Alternative 6: 1,331 net new daily trips.

Impact TRANS-2, Mitigation Measure TRANS-2, DEIR/EIS page 11-61, FEIR/EIS page 11-65: Table 11-19 revised, Mitigation Measure TRANS-2 revised, Alternative 1A analysis added, revision made in response to public comment and addition of parking calculations for mid mountain commercial uses

demand for Alternatives 1A, 4, 5, and 6. Table 11-19 provides a summary of the parking supply and demand for each project alternative (Note that this table reflects parking demand assuming 25,000 square feet of retail at the North Base for Alternative 1, 1A, 3, 5, and 6; only 15,000 square feet of retail was included in the *Homewood Mountain Resort Parking Study* prepared by LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc).

Table 11-19

HMR MP Parking Supply and Demand Summary

Parking Location	Alternatives 1 & 3		Alternative 1A		Alternative 4		Alternative 5		Alternative 6	
	Demand	Supply	Demand	Supply	Demand	Supply	Demand	Supply	Demand	Supply
North Base	~~862~~ 867	729	~~862~~ 867	740	46	700	~~965~~ 971	646	~~856~~ 862	646
South Base	128	117	124	145	0	0	0	0	68	65
Town-homes	64	64	64	64	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Single Family Homes	NA	NA	NA	NA	64	64	64	64	56	56
Total	~~1,054~~ 1,059	910	~~1,050~~ 1,055	949	110	764	~~1,029~~ 1,035	710	~~980~~ 986	767

Source: LSC Transportation Consultants, 2011
Fehr & Peers 2011

Notes: NA = Not Applicable

Mitigation: **TRANS-2. Provide Adequate Parking to Meet Placer County Requirements**

The project applicant shall implement a winter and summer Parking Management Plan to ensure adequate parking is available both during construction and post-construction. The Plan shall ~~to~~ be reviewed and approved by the Development Review Committee (DRC) prior to Improvement Plan approval for any and each subsequent project phase. The Parking Management Plan shall address the ~~proposed~~ anticipated off-site peak winter ski day employee parking and any other on-site parking deficiencies. This plan shall be approved by the County and the TRPA with each project phase and will ensure that adequate parking and shuttle service operations are maintained in order to accommodate the ~~proposed~~ required off-site peak ski day ~~employee~~ parking. As part of the Parking Management Plan, HMR may propose to provide Placer County Transit passes to employees to encourage their use of public transit from the Tahoe City Transit Center to the Homewood project. – Off-site parking locations used by HMR shall comply with Placer County parking standards and shall be paved with required BMPs, available for winter weekend use by HMR, designed for adequate snow removal operations (e.g., include properly designed areas for snow storage) and located near SR 89 for convenient access by employees, resort guests and shuttle drivers. Types of existing parking that may be used by HMR for off-site parking needs include but are not limited to commercial establishments, churches, and private recreational facilities. Public parks, community centers or transit centers not fully utilized during winter months may be available if an agreement can be reached with the public agency responsible for the operation of the facility. Based on a review of these types of existing facilities along the SR 89 corridor near HMR and north to Tahoe City, there are hundreds of available parking spaces for potential use by HMR, subject to agreements with the property owners. The Project A~~a~~pplicant shall provide ~~an employee~~ shuttle service between the designated ~~employee~~ off-site parking location(s) and Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR).

Additionally, the Parking Management Plan shall address the following: communication and management strategies for alerting people of when and where parking is available on-site and off-site (e.g. changeable message signs in Tahoe City); an employee parking plan with regulations and off-site parking locations; a boat trailer parking plan for times when boat trailers from adjacent businesses can be parked in the parking structure, including regulations and boat trailer parking locations; special event parking plan that addresses on and off site parking locations for guests of special events; and an enforcement plan to address neighborhood parking.

If additional environmental impacts, other than those already identified, analyzed, and mitigated (if necessary) as part of this Draft EIR/EIS are created as a result of any of the proposed on-site or off-site parking areas or shuttle service operations, the Improvement Plans shall not be approved until subsequent environmental review has been completed.

The P~~p~~roject A~~a~~pplicant has committed to eliminating the existing day skier parking along SR 89 and along County roadways. The Parking Management Plan, to be approved by the County and the TRPA and revised by the applicant as necessary for subsequent County/TRPA review and approval with each project phase, shall outline the measures proposed to fulfill this commitment, including signage, parking enforcement, surveys of on-street parking during peak ski days, and annual reporting to Placer County by May 1 of each year that surveys are required. Surveys shall be required until two years after completion of any new development phase of the project. All costs associated with the

surveys and parking management report are the responsibility of Homewood Mountain Resort.

Timing / Implementation: An agreement between the County, TRPA and the Project A~~a~~pplicant to implement the Parking Management Program, along with the detailed plan, shall be signed before Improvement Plans for any and each subsequent project phase are approved.

After Mitigation: *Less than Significant Impact; Project (Alternative 1) and Alternative 3*

Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-2 will ~~insure~~ ensure adequate on-site and off-site parking management to eliminate any potential parking impacts.

Analysis: *Significant Impact; Alternative 1A*

Alternative 1A will include 738 parking spaces at the North Base, 145 parking spaces at the South Base, and a two-car garage and two driveway spaces with each townhome (64 spaces), for a total of 947 parking spaces for the Project area, with a potential for up to 984 on-site parking spaces. According to Table 1 from Appendix K-3, 62 ski area employees will park off-site during peak ski weekends, resulting in an on-site parking demand of 993 parking spaces for Alternative 1A.

Based on Table 11-19 Alternative 1A parking supply is less than the demand, therefore this impact is considered to be significant.

Mitigation: **TRANS-2. Provide Adequate Parking to Meet Placer County Requirements**

See description of mitigation measure TRANS-2 above under the impact analysis for Alternatives 1 and 3.

After Mitigation: *Less than Significant Impact; Alternative 1A*

Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-2 will ensure adequate on-site and off-site parking management to eliminate any potential parking impacts.

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; Alternative 4*

Based on Table 11-19, Alternative 4 will provide 764 parking spaces for the retail and residential uses. The parking supply exceeds the parking demand of 110 spaces; therefore, the impact is less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Analysis: *Significant Impact; Alternative 5*

Alternative 5 will include 646 parking spaces at the North Base, and at least a two-car garage and two driveway spaces with each single-family home (64 spaces) at the South Base for a total of 710 on-site parking spaces. Based on the parking demand analysis in Appendix K-3 (Table 1), 62 employees will park off-site during peak ski weekends, resulting in an on-site parking demand of ~~967~~ 973 parking spaces for Alternative 5.

Based on Table 11-19, the Alternative 5 parking supply is less than the demand, therefore this impact is considered to be significant.

Mitigation: **TRANS-2. Provide Adequate Parking to Meet Placer County Requirements**

See description of mitigation measure TRANS-2 above under the impact analysis for Alternatives 1 and 3.

After Mitigation: *Less than Significant Impact; Alternative 5*

Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-2 will ~~insure~~ ensure adequate on-site and off-site parking management to eliminate any potential parking impacts.

Analysis: *Significant Impact; Alternative 6*

Alternative 6 will include 646 parking spaces at the North Base, 65 parking spaces at the South Base, and at least a two-car garage and two driveway spaces with each single-family home (56 spaces). Based on the parking demand analysis in Appendix K-3 (Table 1), 62 employees will park off-site during peak ski weekends, resulting in an on-site parking demand of ~~918~~ 924 parking spaces for Alternative 6.

Based on Table 11-19 the Alternative 6 parking supply is less than the demand, therefore this impact is considered significant.

Mitigation: **TRANS-2. Provide Adequate Parking to Meet Placer County Requirements**

See description of mitigation measure TRANS-2 above under the impact analysis for Alternatives 1 and 3.

After Mitigation: *Less than Significant Impact; Alternative 6*

Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-2 will ~~insure~~ ensure adequate on-site and off-site parking management to eliminate any potential parking impacts.

Impact TRANS-3, DEIR/EIS page 11-62, FEIR/EIS page 11-68: Alternative 1A analysis added, Mitigation Measure TRANS-3 revised.

Summer LOS Analysis

Table 11-20 presents a summary of the LOS at the study intersections for existing summer plus project conditions for the Project and Alternatives. Figures 11-15 through 11-18 show the existing plus project traffic volumes at the study intersections for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Alternative 1A has the same land uses as Alternative 1, but fewer units. The PM peak hour trip generation for Alternative 1A is 2 fewer vehicles than the trip generation for Alternative 1. Therefore, separate LOS analysis is not needed for Alternative 1A. A difference of 2 vehicles would not affect delay and LOS at the study intersections. It can be assumed for analysis purposes that the LOS and delay at the study intersections is the same for Alternatives 1 and 1A.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-3, DEIR/EIS page 11-68, FEIR/EIS page 11-74: Revision made in response to public comment

Mitigation: **TRANS-3. Implement Intersection Improvements**

The Project shall construct the following intersection improvement at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection: Add an acceleration lane or two-way left-turn lane (consistent with the *Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project*, 2006) to SR 89 at Granlibakken Road. The mitigation measure will result in the following summer LOS:

- *Delay after mitigation: 3.4* ***(44.2)****, LOS: A* ***(E)****, Project (Alternatives 1/1A) and Alternative 3*
- *Delay after mitigation: 3.3* ***(41.9)****, LOS: A* ***(E)****, Alternative 5*
- *Delay after mitigation: 3.2* ***(40.7)****, LOS: A* ***(E)****, Alternative 6*

Note: A two-way left-turn lane has been environmentally cleared through a CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration, NEPA Finding of No Significant Impact, and TRPA Programmatic Environmental Assessment, and is scheduled for construction at this location as part of the Caltrans' *Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project*. Figures ESL 42 and ESL 43 from the *Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project* show the proposed roadway improvements, and are provided in Appendix L-2. If construction of the improvement is in place prior to being needed by HMR, HMR shall no longer be responsible for the improvement.

Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the Project applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work proposed within the State Highway right-of-way. A copy of said Permit shall be provided to the County Engineering and Surveying Department prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans. Right-of-way dedications shall be provided to the State, as required, to accommodate existing and future highway improvements.

Caltrans will not issue an Encroachment Permit for work within their right-of-way for improvements (other than signals, road widening, striping and signing) without first entering into a Landscape Maintenance Agreement with the County. This agreement allows for private installation and maintenance of concrete curb/gutters, sidewalks, trails, landscaping and irrigation within Caltrans' right-of-way. A similar agreement between the County and the applicant is required prior to the County entering into the agreement with Caltrans. If applicable, both of these maintenance agreements shall be executed prior to approval of the Improvement Plans.

~~The Project shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work within the State right-of-way. A copy of the permit shall be provided to the Placer County Engineering and Surveying department prior to the approval of Improvement Plans.~~

Impact TRANS-3, DEIR/EIS page 11-68, FEIR/EIS page 11-75:

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

Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-3 will improve the LOS at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection to better than existing conditions for the Project and Alternatives. This mitigation does not improve LOS to D or better at the side-street approach, but it does improve intersection operations to better than existing conditions.

Note that for informational purposes, the EIP project improves the LOS at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection to "E" under existing conditions. The proposed project will not degrade LOS to F or E for more than four hours.

Impact TRANS-3, DEIR/EIS page 11-69, FEIR/EIS page 11-75: Alternative 4 update

Summer Queuing Analysis

Queuing analysis was performed at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections. Queuing issues currently exist in the area, particularly near the Fanny Bridge. The *SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study* prepared by LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (2005) details the congestion issues on the bridge. The LSC study, as well as the LOS tables provided in this study, indicate that the congestion in the area is not caused by intersection operations, but rather by the "bottle neck" effect at the Fanny Bridge, and the high number of bicycles and pedestrians that use the bridge. As shown in Table 11-20, the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections operate at LOS D and LOS A, respectively, with and without the project. The *SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study* presents five realignment alternatives to relieve congestion on the Fanny Bridge. Note that the queuing analysis includes the pedestrian signal on SR 89 south of the Fanny Bridge which was installed after the *SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study* was completed. The pedestrian signal in conjunction with a barrier chain between the Fanny Bridge sidewalk and the northbound travel lane has significantly reduced the impact of pedestrian and bicycle activity on traffic conditions. The queuing analysis accounts for the vehicle delay resulting from the pedestrian signal. The Tahoe Transportation District has recently released a Notice of Preparation of an EIR/EIS to study alternatives for relieving congestion of SR 89 south of Tahoe City. One of the projects to be studied in the EIR/EIS is the Fanny Bridge/CA SR 89 Realignment Project.

Impact TRANS-3, DEIR/EIS page 11-71, FEIR/EIS page 11- 77: Tahoe Transportation District information added

After Mitigation: *Significant and Unavoidable Impact; Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6*

Other studies (e.g., SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study) have identified improvement alternatives to relieve congestion and reduce queuing on Fanny Bridge. The Tahoe Transportation District has recently released a Notice of Preparation of an EIR/EIS to study alternatives for relieving congestion of SR 89 south of Tahoe City. One of the projects to be studied in the EIR/EIS is the Fanny Bridge/CA SR 89 Realignment Project. Once these improvements are implemented the Project impact will be less than significant; however, funding for the improvement project (particularly state funding) has not been secured; therefore, the impact is significant and unavoidable. It should be noted that the Fanny Bridge improvement project is identified in the Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan's Project Strategies (Short Term), and ~~is~~ will be partially funded by two sources: the Federal Transportation Improvement Program for the work being done by the Tahoe Transportation District and Placer County Capital Improvement Program traffic impact fees.

The project applicant shall contribute a fair share contribution to the selected Fanny Bridge improvement alternative based on Placer County standards. Note that payment of fees does not mitigate an impact if there is no evidence in the record there is a funding program in place which will get the improvement built.

Impact TRANS-3, DEIR/EIS page 11-71, FEIR/EIS page 11- 78: Alternative 1A analysis added

Winter LOS Analysis

Table 11-22 presents a summary of the LOS at the study intersections for existing winter conditions for the Project and Alternatives. Figures 11-19 through 11-22 show the existing plus project traffic volumes at the study intersections for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Alternative 1A has the same land uses as Alternative 1, but fewer units. The PM peak hour trip generation for Alternative 1A is the same as the trip generation for Alternative 1. Therefore, separate LOS analysis is not needed for Alternative 1A. The LOS and delay at the study intersections is the same for Alternatives 1 and 1A.

Table 11-22, DEIR/EIS page 11-72, FEIR/EIS page 11-79: Analysis for Alternative 1A same as Alternative 1

Table 11-22

Winter LOS Results – Existing and Existing Plus Project
Summary of Project Alternatives

Intersection	Control Type [1]	Existing Conditions	Existing Plus Project Conditions				
			Alt. 1 & 3	Alt. 2	Alt. 4	Alt. 5	Alt. 6
		Delay[2] LOS	Delay[2] LOS	Delay[2] LOS	Delay[2] LOS	Delay[2] LOS	Delay[2] LOS
SR 89/SR 28	Signal	27.3 C	27.2 C	*	27.4 C	27.3 C	27.2 C
SR 89/ Pedestrian Signal	Signal	2.3 A	3.0 A	*	2.1 A	2.3 A	2.3 A
SR 89/ Granlibakken Road	SSSC	5.2 **(55.5)** A **(F)**	6.0 **(67.6)** A **(F)**	*	3.8 **(41.1)** A **(E)**	5.9 **(64.9)** A **(F)**	5.8 **(61.7)** A **(F)**
SR 89/Sequoia Avenue	SSSC	0.5 (17.9) A (C)	0.5 (17.8) A (C)	*	0.5 (15.1) A (C)	0.5 (17.2) A (C)	0.5 (17.1) A (C)
SR 89/Pineland Drive	SSSC	0.8 (19.5) A (C)	0.8 (19.2) A (C)	*	0.9 (15.1) A (C)	0.8 (18.4) A (C)	0.8 (18.4) A (C)
SR 89/Grand Avenue	SSSC	0.6 (17.7) A (C)	0.6 (17.4) A (C)	*	0.6 (13.1) A (B)	0.6 (17.1) A (C)	0.6 (16.8) A (C)
SR 89/Park Avenue	SSSC	0.1 (16.0) A (C)	0.1 (16.0) A (C)	*	0.1 (12.6) A (B)	0.1 (15.6) A (C)	0.1 (15.4) A (C)
SR 89/Silver Street	SSSC	0.3 (15.8) A (C)	0.1 (16.2) A (C)	*	0.1 (10.4) A (B)	0.1 (14.2) A (B)	0.1 (15.6) A (C)
SR 89/ Homewood Entrance	SSSC	3.6 (23.5) A (C)	1.2 (19.5) A (C)	*	1.0 (13.2) A (B)	1.5 (19.2) A (C)	1.3 (19.0) A (C)
SR 89/Fawn Street	SSSC	3.0 (20.7) A (C)	9.7 (38.8) A (E)[3]	*	0.7 (13.0) A (B)	8.1 (32.4) A (D)	8.6 (33.5) A (D)
SR 89/Tahoe Ski Bowl Way	SSSC	4.3 (25.1) A (D)	1.1 (15.6) A (C)	*	1.1 (14.5) A (B)	1.1 (15.5) A (C)	1.1 (15.5) A (C)

Source: Fehr & Peers 2009

Notes:

[1] SSSC = Side Street Stop Control

[2] Delay is report in seconds per vehicle for the overall intersection for signalized intersections, and for the overall intersection (worst movement) for unsignalized intersections.

[3] The analysis period represents the absolute peak hour. The LOS E condition is not expected to exceed 4 hours of the day and therefore is not considered to be a significant impact. The second highest peak hour was analyzed based on the traffic counts collected at the intersection. The following LOS and delay were recorded: Delay - 7.4 (30.9), LOS - A (D).

* No project conditions – Same as existing conditions

Bold indicates deficient operations.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-3, DEIR/EIS page 11-77, FEIR/EIS page 11-84:

- *Delay after mitigation: 2.4 (19.3), LOS: A (C), Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternative 3*
- *Delay after mitigation: 2.5 (19.0), LOS: A (C), Alternative 5*
- *Delay after mitigation: 2.5 (18.9), LOS: A (C), Alternative 6*

Note: A two-way left-turn lane has been environmentally cleared through a CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration, NEPA Finding of No Significant Impact, and TRPA Programmatic Environmental Assessment, and is scheduled for construction at this location as part of the Caltrans' *Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project*. Figures ESL 42 and ESL 43 from the *Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project* show the proposed roadway improvements, and are provided in Appendix L-2. If construction of the improvement is in place prior to being needed by HMR, HMR shall no longer be responsible for the improvement.

Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the Project applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work proposed within the State Highway right-of-way. A copy of said Permit shall be provided to the County Engineering and Surveying Department prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans. Right-of-way dedications shall be provided to the State, as required, to accommodate existing and future highway improvements.

Caltrans will not issue an Encroachment Permit for work within their right-of-way for improvements (other than signals, road widening, striping and signing) without first entering into a Landscape Maintenance Agreement with the County. This agreement allows for private installation and maintenance of concrete curb/gutters, sidewalks, trails, landscaping and irrigation within Caltrans' right-of-way. A similar agreement between the County and the applicant is required prior to the County entering into the agreement with Caltrans. If applicable, both of these maintenance agreements shall be executed prior to approval of the Improvement Plans.

~~The Project shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work within the State right-of-way. A copy of the permit shall be provided to the Placer County Engineering and Surveying department prior to the approval of Improvement Plans.~~

Impact TRANS-4, DEIR/EIS page 11-79, FEIR/EIS page 11-86: Revision to text

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6*

The Project includes implementation of ~~an~~ Alternative Transportation elements ~~Plan~~, which will include year-round, winter and summer elements, including:

- Employee Shuttle Bus;
- Employee Public Bus Transit Fares;
- Scheduled Shuttle Service;

- North Base-South Base Shuttle Service;
- Electric/Hybrid Car Rental Service;
- Free "Bicycle Share" Service;
- Summer and Winter West Shore Dial-a-Ride Service;
- Skier Intercept Shuttle Service; and
- Water Taxi Service.

Implementation of the Project's Alternative Transportation ~~Plan~~ elements will result in increased access to and ridership on alternative modes of transportation. This is considered a less than significant impact.

Impact TRANS-5, DEIR/EIS page 11-80, FEIR/EIS page 11-87: Revision made in response to TCPUD comment letter

Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact; Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6*

The Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 will include ~~an extension of the West Shore Bike Trail~~construction of the proposed Class I TCPUD bike trail through the North Base area, as shown on Civil Plan Sheet C10. The proposed bike trail will be designed to meet the standards of the authorizing jurisdictions. ~~, and a~~The Project and Alternatives will also include a free "Bicycle Share" program. The Project will also maintain five miles of existing hiking trails. This will improve access to and opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian uses. This is considered a less than significant impact.

Peak hour bicycle and pedestrian trips were estimated based on the internally captured recreational trips discussed in Section 11.4.1, which include walking and bicycling recreational trips. The Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) provides signal warrant criteria for a pedestrian signal (Warrant 4, Pedestrian Volume). A pedestrian signal is not warranted based on pedestrian volumes generated by the project.

Table 11-24, DEIR/EIS page 11-81, FEIR/EIS page 11-90: Alternative 1A analysis added

Table 11-24

Grading Truck Trips – Alternatives 1/1A, 3, 5 and 6

Alternative	Net Cut Material[1]	Truck Loads[2]	Trips per Day[3]
1/1A	92,300 cubic yards	4,615	146 - 192
3	240,400 cubic yards	12,020	146 - 192
5	166,500 cubic yards	8,325	146 - 192
6	161,300 cubic yards	8,065	146 - 192

Source: Table 14-8, Soils, Geology and Seismicity Chapter; Fehr & Peers 2009

Notes:

1 Approximate amount of net cut material to be hauled off-site.

2 Long haul trucks would be capable of carrying 20 cubic yards of material. Typically, trucks can be loaded every five minutes, resulting in 96 loads per day. Based on the number of loads required to haul the material, and the number of work days (120), trucks will need to be loaded at least every 6.5 minutes (73 loads per day) to remove all material during one construction season. This trips per day estimate represents a worst case assumption because it is likely that Phase 1 would be constructed over multiple construction seasons.

3 These are two-way trips (includes loaded delivery trip and empty return trip).

Impact TRANS-6, DEIR/EIS page 11-81, FEIR/EIS page 11-88: Assumption clarification added

Grading activity will be limited to the TRPA grading season (May 1 – October 15), which is approximately 120 workdays, assuming a 5-day workweek.

Based on information provided by the project applicant, the maximum number of employees on site during construction is not expected to exceed the number of full time equivalent employees when the Project is built out (approximately 182 employees). As a result, the number of construction related trips generated by the site will not exceed the daily trip generation of the Project. Assuming 4 trips per day per construction employee (1 trip to the site, 1 trip from the site, and 2 lunch time trips – in/out) and 192 trips per day for grading activity, the Project can have up to 318 construction employees on site during grading activity without exceeding the daily trip generation of the Project at build out. Note that 4 trips per day per construction employee is a conservative estimate, as it is unlikely that each construction employee will drive to the site alone and many construction employees will not leave the project site for lunch. Based on TRPA standards (referenced in Section 11.2.7), level of service analysis is not required for construction activity if the estimated trip generation does not exceed the trip generation of the Project under normal operating conditions.

Section 11.6 DEIR/EIS page 11-84, FEIR/EIS page 11-92: Revised text based on comments

Planned Roadway Improvements

The *SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study* prepared by LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. discusses five possible realignment alternatives to alleviate congestion near the Tahoe City "Wye", and particularly across the Fanny Bridge. Improvements to the bridge will improve congestion and are necessary regardless of redevelopment of Homewood. The improvements to Fanny Bridge are not fully funded and do not have a defined timeline; therefore the improvements were not included in the 2030 cumulative conditions analysis. The Tahoe Transportation District has recently released a Notice of Preparation of an EIR/EIS to study alternatives for relieving congestion of SR 89 south of Tahoe City. One of the projects to be studied in the EIR/EIS is the Fanny Bridge/CA SR 89 Realignment Project.

Section 11.6 DEIR/EIS page 11-87, FEIR/EIS page 11-95: Revised text based on comments

The side street approach of SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection currently operates at LOS F during the summer and winter Friday PM peak hour. The remaining study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service.

A two-way left-turn lane on SR 89 at Granlibakken Road has been environmentally cleared through a CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration, NEPA Finding of No Significant Impact, and TRPA Programmatic Environmental Assessment, and is scheduled for construction as part of the Caltrans' *Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project (EIP)*. Level of service analysis was performed for existing conditions assuming the two-way left-turn has been constructed. The improvement resulted in the following LOS at SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection during the summer and winter:

- *Summer - Delay: 3.4* ***(49.6)****, LOS: A* ***(E)***
- *Winter - Delay: 2.6* ***(25.8)****, LOS: A* ***(D)***

Note this analysis is provided for information purposes only. The baseline condition does not include the Placer 89 EIP.

Impact TRANS-C1 and Table 11-26, DEIR/EIS page 11-88, FEIR/EIS page 11-96: Analysis and table notes expanded

11.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

IMPACT: TRANS-C1: Will the project result in a substantial impact upon cumulative transportation systems, including roadways and intersections?

Summer LOS Analysis

Table 11-26 presents a summary of the LOS at the study intersections for cumulative summer plus project conditions for the Project and Alternatives. Figures 11-25 through 11-28 show the cumulative plus project traffic volumes at the study intersections for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Alternative 1A has the same land uses as Alternative 1, but fewer units. The PM peak hour trip generation for Alternative 1A is 2 fewer vehicles than the trip generation for Alternative 1. Therefore, separate LOS analysis is not needed for Alternative 1A. A difference of 2 vehicles would not affect delay and LOS at the study intersections. It can be assumed for analysis purposes that the LOS and delay at the study intersections is the same for Alternatives 1 and 1A.

Table 11-26

Summer LOS Results – Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project
Summary of Project Alternatives

Intersection	Control Type [1]	Cumulative Conditions	Cumulative Plus Project Conditions				
			Alt. 1 & 3	Alt. 2	Alt. 4	Alt. 5	Alt. 6
		Delay[2] LOS	Delay[2] LOS	Delay[2] LOS	Delay[2] LOS	Delay[2] LOS	Delay[2] LOS
SR 89/SR 28	Signal	51.1 D	51.7 D	*	50.6 D	52.2 D	51.6 D
SR 89/ Pedestrian Signal	Signal	5.3 A	5.7 A	*	5.3 A	5.6 A	5.5 A
SR 89/ Granlibakken Road	SSSC	33.4 **(567.5)** D **(F)**	**39.8 (686.1) E (F)**	*	33.5 **(556.6)** D **(F)**	**37.8 (654.6) E (F)**	**36.3 (615.7) E (F)**
SR 89/ Sequoia Avenue	SSSC	0.7 (31.3) A (D)	0.7 (34.6) A (D)	*	0.7 (31.6) A (D)	0.7 (33.2) A (D)	0.7 (33.2) A (D)
SR 89/ Pineland Drive	SSSC	1.1 (37.6) A (E) [3]	1.3 (43.7) A (E) [3]	*	1.1 (37.3) A (E) [3]	1.2 (41.7) A (E) [3]	1.2 (41.6) A (E) [3]
SR 89/Grand Avenue	SSSC	0.6 (26.9) A (D)	0.7 (30.5) A (D)	*	0.6 (27.0) A (D)	0.7 (29.5) A (D)	0.7 (29.2) A (D)
SR 89/Park Avenue	SSSC	0.1 (23.0) A (C)	0.1 (25.6) A (D)	*	0.1 (23.0) A (C)	0.1 (24.8) A (C)	0.1 (24.7) A (C)
SR 89/Silver Street	SSSC	0.0 (13.1) A (B)	0.3 (26.9) A (D)	*	0.0 (13.1) A (B)	0.5 (26.3) A (D)	0.2 (25.1) A (D)
SR 89/ Homewood Entrance	SSSC	0.7 (22.8) A (C)	1.3 (30.5) A (D)	*	1.1 (24.4) A (C)	1.3 (28.1) A (D)	0.9 (25.8) A (D)
SR 89/Fawn Street	SSSC	0.4 (23.1) A (C)	1.3 (30.9) A (D)	*	0.7 (25.0) A (C)	1.2 (29.9) A (D)	1.7 (34.4) A (D)
SR 89/Tahoe Ski Bowl Way	SSSC	1.8 (33.6) A (D)	2.5 (41.5) A (E) [3]	*	2.0 (35.9) A (E) [3]	2.1 (37.9) A (E) [3]	2.3 (38.6) A (E) [3]
SR 89/Elm Street	SSSC	0.7 (22.9) A (C)	0.8 (25.1) A (D)	*	0.8 (23.8) A (C)	0.8 (24.4) A (C)	0.8 (24.7) A (C)
SR 89/Pine Street	SSSC	0.6 (32.1) A (D)	0.7 (36.2) A (E) [3]	*	0.6 (33.1) A (D)	0.6 (34.7) A (D)	0.6 (33.9) A (D)

Source: Fehr & Peers 2009

Notes:

[1] SSSC = Side Street Stop Control

[2] Delay is report in seconds per vehicle for the overall intersection for signalized intersections, and for the overall intersection (worst movement) for unsignalized intersections.

[3] The analysis period represents the absolute peak hour. The LOS E condition is not expected to exceed 4 hours of the day and therefore is not considered to be a significant impact. The second highest peak hour was analyzed based on the traffic counts collected at the intersections. The following LOS and delay were recorded for the SR 89/Tahoe Ski Bowl Way

intersection: Alts. 1 and 3: Delay - 1.2 (22.8), LOS - A (C); Alt. 4: Delay - 1.0 (21.1), LOS - A (C); Alt. 5: Delay - 0.9 (21.9), LOS - A (C); Alt. 6: Delay - 1.1 (21.9), LOS - A (C). The following LOS and delay were recorded for the SR 89/Pine Street intersection: Alts. 1 and 3: Delay - 0.6 (33.1)

* No project conditions – Same as cumulative conditions

Bold indicates deficient operations.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-C1, DEIR/EIS page 11-94, FEIR/EIS page 11-104: Revised text based on comments

Mitigation: **TRANS-C1: Implement Intersection Improvements**

SR 89/Granlibakken Road:

The Project shall construct the following intersection improvement at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection: Add an acceleration lane or two-way left-turn lane (consistent with the *Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project*, 2006) to SR 89 north of Granlibakken Road. The mitigation measure will result in the following summer LOS:

- *Delay after mitigation: 3.7* ***(58.9)****, LOS: A* ***(F)****, Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternative 3*
- *Delay after mitigation: 3.6* ***(55.4)****, LOS: A* ***(F)****, Alternative 5*
- *Delay after mitigation: 3.6* ***(53.7)****, LOS: A* ***(F)****, Alternative 6*

Note: A two-way left-turn lane has been environmentally cleared through a CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration, NEPA Finding of No Significant Impact, and TRPA Programmatic Environmental Assessment, and is scheduled for construction at this location as part of the Caltrans' *Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project (2006)*. Figures ESL 42 and ESL 43 from the *Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project* show the proposed roadway improvements, and are provided in Appendix L-2. If construction of the improvement is in place prior to being needed by HMR, HMR shall no longer be responsible for the improvement.

Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the Project applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work proposed within the State Highway right-of-way. A copy of said Permit shall be provided to the County Engineering and Surveying Department prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans. Right-of-way dedications shall be provided to the State, as required, to accommodate existing and future highway improvements.

Caltrans will not issue an Encroachment Permit for work within their right-of-way for improvements (other than signals, road widening, striping and signing) without first entering into a Landscape Maintenance Agreement with the County. This agreement allows for private installation and maintenance of concrete curb/gutters, sidewalks, trails, landscaping and irrigation within Caltrans' right-of-way. A similar agreement between the County and the applicant is required prior to the County entering into the agreement with Caltrans. If applicable, both of these maintenance agreements shall be executed prior to approval of the Improvement Plans.

~~The Project shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work within the State right of way. A copy of the permit shall be provided to the Placer County Engineering and Surveying department prior to the approval of Improvement Plans.~~

Table 11-27 and TRANS-C1, DEIR/EIS page 11-95, FEIR/EIS page 11-105: Tahoe Transportation District information added

Summer Queuing Analysis

Queuing analysis was performed at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections. Queuing issues currently exist in the area, particularly near the Fanny Bridge. The *SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study* prepared by LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (2005) details the congestion issues on the bridge. The LSC study, as well as the LOS tables provided in this study indicate that the congestion in the area is not caused by intersection operations, but rather by the "bottle neck" effect at the Fanny Bridge, and the high number of bicycles and pedestrians that use the bridge. As shown in Table 11-26, the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections operate at LOS D and LOS A, respectively, with and without the project. The *SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study* presents 5 realignment alternatives to relieve congestion on the Fanny Bridge. Note that the queuing analysis includes the pedestrian signal on SR 89 south of the Fanny Bridge which was installed after the *SR 89 Fanny Bridge Alternatives Traffic Study* was completed. The pedestrian signal in conjunction with a barrier chain between the Fanny Bridge sidewalk and the northbound travel lane has significantly reduced the impact of pedestrian and bicycle activity on traffic conditions. The queuing analysis accounts for the vehicle delay resulting from the pedestrian signal. The Tahoe Transportation District has recently released a Notice of Preparation of an EIR/EIS to study alternatives for relieving congestion of SR 89 south of Tahoe City. One of the projects to be studied in the EIR/EIS is the Fanny Bridge/CA SR 89 Realignment Project.

Table 11-27 and Impact TRANS-C1, DEIR/EIS page 11-96, FEIR/EIS page 11-106: Add analysis for Alternative 1A

Table 11-27

Summer Queuing Analysis – Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project
Summary of Project Alternatives

	Storage Length (ft)	Average Summer Queue Lengths[2] (ft)[3]				
		Cumulative	Alts. 1/1A and 3	Alt. 4	Alt. 5	Alt. 6
SR 89/SR 28						
NBL	405	145	160	135	150	165
NBT	125	**145**	**160**	135	**150**	**165**
NBR	125	**145**	**160**	135	**150**	**165**
EBL	200	55	65	60	60	70
EBT	790	185	180	185	185	195
EBR	250	185	180	185	185	195
WBL	225	175	185	175	180	180
WBT	515	365	440	365	400	365
WBR	225	160	160	160	160	160
SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing						
NBT	515	305	385	280	325	395
SBT	225	165	180	170	165	170

Source: Fehr & Peers 2009

Notes: [1] Storage lengths are defined by the distance to the closest upstream intersection for through movements, and pockets lengths for turn movements.

[2] SimTraffic queuing results are a product of a simulation that is designed to represent "real-life" drivers to the best extent possible. Each simulation run represents a unique set of data. An average of 10 runs is shown in the results table.

[3] Typical practice methodology is to assume an average vehicle length of 25 feet for queuing analysis. A difference of 0-15 feet between scenarios is not considered a change in the number of vehicles.

Bold indicates queue lengths that exceed storage lengths.

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

The Project and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 will have a significant impact at the SR 89/SR 28 and SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing intersections. Although not directly represented in the queuing analysis results in Table 11-27, it should be noted that the analysis does not include bicycle and pedestrian traffic that will contribute additional congestion to the area. Existing congestion at the Fanny Bridge results in delays and vehicle queuing. As discussed, the Fanny Bridge study identifies the congestion issues, as well as improvements to alleviate the congestion (LSC 2005). The Project and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 will contribute additional traffic volumes (Alternatives 1/1A and 3 will add 70 vehicles to the intersection, 10 travelling northbound; Alternative 5 will add 45 vehicles to the intersection, 9 travelling northbound; and Alternative 6 will add 30 to the

Impact TRANS-C1, DEIR/EIS page 11- 97, FEIR/EIS page 11-107: Add analysis for Alternative 1A

Winter LOS Analysis

Table 11-28 presents a summary of the LOS at the study intersections for cumulative winter plus project conditions for the Project. Figures 11-29 through 11-32 show the cumulative plus project traffic volumes at the study intersections for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Alternative 1A has the same land uses as Alternative 1, but fewer units. The PM peak hour trip generation for Alternative 1A is the same as the trip generation for Alternative 1. Therefore, separate LOS analysis is not needed for Alternative 1A. The LOS and delay at the study intersections is the same for Alternatives 1 and 1A.

Table 11-28, DEIR/EIS page 11-98, FEIR/EIS page 11-108: Add analysis for Alternative 1A

Table 11-28

Winter LOS Results – Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project
Summary of Project Alternatives

Intersection	Control Type [1]	Cumulative Conditions	Cumulative Plus Project Conditions				
			Alt. 1/1A & 3	Alt. 2	Alt. 4	Alt. 5	Alt. 6
		Delay[2] LOS	Delay[2] LOS	Delay[2] LOS	Delay[2] LOS	Delay[2] LOS	Delay[2] LOS
SR 89/SR 28	Signal	31.7 C	31.0 C	*	30.0 C	30.8 C	30.6 C
SR 89/ Pedestrian Signal	Signal	3.6 A	3.5 A	*	3.3 A	3.5 A	3.4 A
SR 89/ Granlibakken Road	SSSC	11.5 **(147.5)** B **(F)**	13.4 **(185.5)** B **(F)**	*	7.2 **(95.3)** A **(F)**	13.0 **(177.2)** B **(F)**	12.6 **(167.3)** B **(F)**
SR 89/ Sequoia Avenue	SSSC	0.6 (21.7) A (C)	0.6 (21.5) A (C)	*	0.6 (17.8) A (C)	0.6 (20.6) A (C)	0.6 (20.6) A (C)
SR 89/ Pineland Drive	SSSC	0.9 (24.2) A (C)	0.9 (23.6) A (C)	*	0.9 (17.8) A (C)	0.9 (22.6) A (C)	0.9 (22.5) A (C)
SR 89/Grand Avenue	SSSC	0.6 (20.2) A (C)	0.6 (19.9) A (C)	*	0.6 (14.5) A (B)	0.6 (19.4) A (C)	0.6 (19.1) A (C)
SR 89/Park Avenue	SSSC	0.1 (17.9) A (C)	0.1 (17.8) A (C)	*	0.1 (13.8) A (B)	0.1 (17.4) A (C)	0.1 (17.1) A (C)
SR 89/Silver Street	SSSC	0.3 (17.7) A (C)	0.1 (18.3) A (C)	*	0.0 (10.8) A (B)	0.1 (15.7) A (C)	0.1 (17.5) A (C)
SR 89/ Homewood Entrance	SSSC	4.2 (30.1) A (D)	1.2 (22.6) A (C)	*	1.0 (14.4) A (B)	1.5 (22.4) A (C)	1.3 (22.0) A (C)
SR 89/Fawn Street	SSSC	3.3 (25.4) A (D)	14.9 **(65.2)** B **(F)**	*	0.7 (14.1) A (B)	11.6 **(50.8)** B **(F)**	12.6 **(53.5)** B **(F)**
SR 89/Tahoe Ski Bowl Way	SSSC	5.1 (32.5) A (D)	1.1 (17.4) A (C)	*	1.1 (16.1) A (B)	1.1 (17.3) A (C)	1.1 (17.3) A (C)

Source: Fehr & Peers 2009

Notes:

[1] SSSC = Side Street Stop Control

[2] Delay is report in seconds per vehicle for the overall intersection for signalized intersections, and for the overall intersection (worst movement) for unsignalized intersections.

* No project conditions – Same as cumulative conditions

Bold indicates deficient operations.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-C1, DEIR/EIS page 11-103, FEIR/EIS page 11-114: Revised text based on comments

- *Delay after mitigation: 2.8 (26.2), LOS: A (D), Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternative 3*
- *Delay after mitigation: 2.8 (25.7), LOS: A (D), Alternative 5*
- *Delay after mitigation: 2.9 (25.5), LOS: A (D), Alternative 6*

Note: A two-way left-turn lane has been environmentally cleared through a CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration, NEPA Finding of No Significant Impact, and TRPA Programmatic Environmental Assessment, and is scheduled for construction at this location as part of the Caltrans' *Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project (2006)*. Figures ESL 42 and ESL 43 from the *Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project* show the proposed roadway improvements, and are provided in Appendix L-2. If construction of the improvement is in place prior to being needed by HMR, HMR shall no longer be responsible for the improvement.

Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the Project applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work proposed within the State Highway right-of-way. A copy of said Permit shall be provided to the County Engineering and Surveying Department prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans. Right-of-way dedications shall be provided to the State, as required, to accommodate existing and future highway improvements.

Caltrans will not issue an Encroachment Permit for work within their right-of-way for improvements (other than signals, road widening, striping and signing) without first entering into a Landscape Maintenance Agreement with the County. This agreement allows for private installation and maintenance of concrete curb/gutters, sidewalks, trails, landscaping and irrigation within Caltrans' right-of-way. A similar agreement between the County and the applicant is required prior to the County entering into the agreement with Caltrans. If applicable, both of these maintenance agreements shall be executed prior to approval of the Improvement Plans.

~~The Project shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work within the State right-of-way. A copy of the permit shall be provided to the Placer County Engineering and Surveying department prior to the approval of Improvement Plans.~~

SR 89/Fawn Street:

The project shall construct the following intersection improvement at SR 89/Fawn Street: Add a left-turn pocket on Fawn Street. The pocket should have a minimum length of ~~100~~ 140 feet (based on 95th percentile queue length presented in the Synchro analysis). This mitigation measure will require that Fawn Street be a minimum of 44 feet wide, including three 12-foot wide lanes and two 4-foot wide shoulders to construct.

- *Delay after mitigation: 9.7 (41.6), LOS: A (E), Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternative 3*

- *Delay after mitigation: 8.2 (35.5), LOS: A (E), Alternative 5*

- *Delay after mitigation: 8.6 (35.8), LOS: A (E), Alternative 6*

Note: The analysis period represents the absolute peak hour. The LOS E condition is not expected to exceed 4 hours of the day and therefore is not considered to be a significant impact after implementation of mitigation measures.

Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the Project applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work proposed within the State Highway right-of-way. A copy of said Permit shall be provided to the County Engineering and Surveying Department prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans. Right-of-way dedications shall be provided to the State, as required, to accommodate existing and future highway improvements.

Caltrans will not issue an Encroachment Permit for work within their right-of-way for improvements (other than signals, road widening, striping and signing) without first entering into a Landscape Maintenance Agreement with the County. This agreement allows for private installation and maintenance of concrete curb/gutters, sidewalks, trails, landscaping and irrigation within Caltrans' right-of-way. A similar agreement between the County and the applicant is required prior to the County entering into the agreement with Caltrans. If applicable, both of these maintenance agreements shall be executed prior to approval of the Improvement Plans.

~~The Project applicant shall submit plans and cost estimates to obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for any work within the State right-of-way. A copy of the permit shall be provided to the Placer County Engineering and Surveying department prior to the approval of Improvement Plans.~~

Table 11-29, DEIR/EIS page 11- 105, FEIR/EIS page 11-116: Add analysis for Alternative 1A

Table 11-29

Winter Queuing Analysis – Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project
Summary of Project Alternatives

	Storage Length (ft)	Average Winter Queue Lengths (ft)				
		Cumulative	Alt. 1/1A and 3	Alt. 4	Alt. 5	Alt. 6
SR 89/SR 28						
NBL	405	105	100	105	105	100
NBT	125	70	70	65	70	65
NBR	125	70	70	65	70	65
EBL	200	40	45	40	45	40
EBT	790	100	100	100	95	90
EBR	250	100	100	100	100	100
WBL	225	120	120	110	110	120
WBT	515	105	110	105	110	125
WBR	225	60	65	60	65	65
SR 89/Pedestrian Crossing						
NBT	515	180	160	170	180	170
SBT	225	135	135	135	135	135

Source: Fehr & Peers 2009

Notes: [1] Storage lengths are defined by the distance to the closest upstream intersection for through movements, and pockets lengths for turn movements.