

## 24.4 CHAPTER 4 - RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

Chapter 4 identifies the goals, policies, and standards in the TRPA Regional Plan, Placer County General Plan, and West Shore Area General Plan with which the Proposed Project and Alternatives must demonstrate compliance. Table 4.2-1, TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis, Table 4.2.2, TRPA Plan Area Statement Consistency Analysis, were updated to include Alternative 1A consistency analysis. The consistency analysis for Alternative 1A mirrors the conclusions presented for the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) in the DEIR/EIS and thus these tables are not reproduced for the FEIR/EIS.

Table 4.3-1, HMR Consistency Analysis with the 1998 West Shore Area General Plan Goals, Policies and Development Standards, and Table 4.3.2, HMR Consistency Analysis with the 1994 Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies and Development Standards, were updated to include Alternative 1A consistency analysis. The consistency analysis for Alternative 1A mirrors the conclusions presented for the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) in the DEIR/EIS and thus these tables are not reproduced here.

## 24.5 CHAPTER 5 - ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Chapter 5 introduces the format for the environmental analysis presented in Chapters 6 through 19. No revisions have been made to Chapter 5 or the format presented in Chapters 6 through 19.

## 24.6 CHAPTER 6 - LAND USE

***Impact LU-1, DEIR/EIS page 6-19, FEIR/EIS page 6-19: Revise text based on public comments***

The Planning Statement for Plan Area 158 states, “This area should remain residential with a density of one single family dwelling per parcel.” This will require an amendment to allow multi-family units within a “Special Area” and increase the allowable density in this special area to 15 units per acre via transfer of existing development rights. The addition of multi-family units and the increase in density confined to a special area are appropriate for a Plan Area classified as “residential”. The character of the area is maintained by ~~limited~~ limiting higher density units to the area at the South Base where ~~adjacent~~ existing land uses include higher density and more commercial uses, such as the existing ski area base lodges and maintenance facilities. This would not affect the overall density character of the Plan Area, but would allow for a greater range of residential options. The Planning Statements for Plan Areas 157 and 159 do not require amendment.

**Table 6-2, DEIR/EIS page 6-21, FEIR/EIS page 6-21: Revise table to update off-site CEP/EIP project commitments**

**Table 6-2**

HMR Ski Area Master Plan - Environmental Improvements and Benefits

Environmental Resource	Improvements/Benefits
EIP Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Number 632 - Homewood Ski Area Master Plan</li> <li>Project Number 86 - Scenic Roadway Unit 11- Homewood</li> <li>Project number 775 - Homewood Area Pedestrian Facilities</li> <li>Project Number 855 - Tahoe City “Y” Realignment (fair share participant)</li> <li>Project Number 725 – Design a stormwater treatment system to treat the 50 year/1 hour storm event within the north and south base areas</li> <li>Project Number 996 – SR 89 stormwater treatment</li> </ul>
Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stormwater treatment in excess of the 20-year/1-hour storm event for redevelopment areas (EIP 725). Capture of stormwater runoff planned through a series of bioretention areas, vaults and infiltration galleriesTreatment of the 50-year/1 hour Storm Event for proposed redevelopment areas (EIP 725). Capture of water runoff planned through a series of vaults and infiltration galleries.</li> <li>Removal of culvert and fill from the SEZ at the South Base area and day lighting Ellis/Homewood Creek channel.</li> <li>Participation in local Homewood elements of EIP 996, the Placer County- Homewood Mountain Resort Water Quality Improvement; a nine mile segment of SR 89 in Placer County by helping to implement runoff treatment facilities and erosion control featuresParticipation in local Homewood elements of environmental improvement project (EIP 996); a 9 mile segment of SR 89 in Placer County by helping to implement runoff treatment facilities, and erosion control features, including high level stormwater treatment vault and a series of additional vegetated basins to treat SR 89 runoff.</li> <li>Substantial land coverage reduction and restoration on the upper mountain areas (there is a commitment in the Master Plan for a total of 500,000 square feet of total land coverage restoration, – all of which must be verified by TRPA for potential relocation, banking or retirement).</li> <li>A majority of building footprints to be located on land capability classes 4 and higher.</li> </ul>

***Impact LU-1, DEIR/EIS page 6-26, FEIR/EIS page 6-26: Revise findings to add analysis of Alternative 1A***

Proposed special uses, as listed in Table 6-3, will require TRPA Code Section 18.1.B(1-3) findings for approval. The findings for Subsection 18.1.B(1-3) follow:

1. *The project, to which the use pertains, is of such a nature, scale, density, intensity and type to be an appropriate use for the parcel on which, and surrounding area in which, it will be located.*

The Project proposes expanded resort facilities that encourage visitation to existing recreational uses, improve land values, provide environmental benefit, provide neighborhood benefits, and plans for development that is located to compliment the urbanized area along SR 89. Although the Project will increase visitation by providing new overnight accommodations and increased density, these are goals of the affected Plan Areas to improve the viability of the existing resort and maintain the tourism based economy of the area.

For Plan Area 157, skiing facilities, recreation services, food/beverage sales and merchandise sales are all uses that either currently exist or that support current ski facilities. Expansion or modification of these uses is appropriate on the site as discussed above. TRPA PAS 157 states, “Upgrading and redevelopment of the Homewood base ski facilities should be encouraged.” As discussed in the Needs Assessment (HMR Master Plan Appendices), there is a need to better serve the skiers while on the mountain to improve the recreation experience. Skiers should not have to come all the way to the bottom of the mountain for food, restrooms, shelter and other related services. The proposed mid mountain lodge will provide these services on the upper mountain.

As discussed above, multi-family dwellings and skiing facilities are proposed for Plan Area 158 within a new “Special District” in which these uses would be confined. Because they are limited to the “Special District” within the existing ski resort property, the nature, scale, intensity, density, and type of use are appropriate at this location and reflect the recreation and tourist uses that exist in this area or that are currently allowed at the resort. Multi-family dwellings are residential uses, reflecting the land classification of this Plan Area and the confinement of these higher density dwellings to the resort property prevents changes to the overall residential character of the Plan Area. In addition, Alternative 1A replaces two of the condominium structures (A1 and B) with 24 two-unit chalets with two-car garages per unit to better reflect and assimilate with adjacent residences. The northernmost units are also located farther up the hillside, increasing the setback from Tahoe Ski Bowl Way. By keeping multi-family dwellings within the urban area, higher density use is appropriately placed within a more urbanized area, instead of the recreational open space area. Likewise, skiing facilities in this area help to tie this special district to the resort to distinctly recognize the special district’s affiliation with the resort base area.

For Plan Area 159, the special uses proposed support or include ski facilities. While some of these uses will expand the degree and intensity of use on the site, the uses are consistent with the primary land use on-site, which is a ski resort. The special uses listed expand upon resort facilities by including a variety of housing opportunities, including employee housing, or by including secondary recreation or entertainment uses that promote the year round viability of the existing and proposed resort facilities. The proposed increased range of uses is designed to allow the ski area to both respond to the Needs Assessment and improve the recreational experience, as well as to provide an economically viable resort so that the ski area

can remain open. Based on HMR calculations (see Section 3.4 of this EIR/EIS), the proposed development levels included in Alternative 6 are the minimum size, scale, density and intensity of use necessary to support an economically viable resort. The proposed density is consistent with limits included in a majority of TRPA and Placer County Plans that allow multi-family residential use. The primary change sought by the Master Plan is the ability to subdivide tourist and residential units, which is not otherwise allowed outside an urban plan area boundary. The Master Plan proposed tourist and residential units could be built under the current TRPA and Placer County plan area regulations in PAS 157 but not subdivided for sale to individual owners. Under existing plan area regulations, the tourist and residential units would have to be owned and rented by HMR. According to HMR, the ability to sell some of the proposed tourist and all of the residential units is critical to the economic survival of the resort. Section 3.2 of this EIR/EIS lists the project objectives developed by HMR for the Project.

2. *The project, to which the use pertains, will not be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood, or general welfare of the region, and the applicant has taken reasonable steps to protect the land, water and air resources of both the applicant's property and that of surrounding property owners.*

The layout of the proposed land uses reflects the current use of the site as well as the surrounding neighborhood. The most intense land uses are proposed along the SR 89 corridor, with less intensive use on the mountainside of the existing ski area facilities. Alternative 1A particularly reflects existing uses by replacing condominium buildings A1 and B with 24 two-unit chalets at the South Base, and by swapping the location of the North Base area parking garage (Building P) with Building C condominiums so that the condominiums are located within the existing gravel parking area south of Fawn Street and across from existing single-family homes along Sacramento Avenue. ~~and~~ The parking garage is located near the intersection of Fawn Street and SR 89 in the existing parking lot. Although some of the land uses will be placed back from the SR 89 ROW, this area is currently used during winter for ski resort operations (e.g., parking and skier services). The removal of substandard structures and large expanses of surface parking and the addition of landscaping will improve the visual appearance of the site. Placement of housing and tourist accommodation units on-site will result in fewer vehicle trips during peak winter operations (e.g., weekends and holidays). The incorporation of ground and water transit, water quality improvements both on and off-site, land coverage restoration throughout the site, and extensive forest fuels reduction will substantially improve the environment of the Project area, as well as improve the public health and safety of surrounding urbanized areas.

3. *The project, to which the use pertains, will not change the character of the neighborhood, detrimentally affect or alter the purpose of the applicable planning area statement, community plan and specific or master plan, as the case may be.*

The ski resort has a large impact on the character of the adjacent residential neighborhood. Each of the proposed special uses either directly reflect the existing uses (ski facilities, commercial uses, housing) or are uses that support the ski resort or enhance its year-round use as a recreational facility. As a whole, the Project maintains the purpose of the Plan Area Statements and locates the various types of uses within the appropriate areas with improved ski facilities on the mountain and more commercial and tourist oriented uses adjacent to the SR 89 corridor where they

presently exist. With the revision to the Proposed Project (Alternative 1A), proposed uses particularly reflect existing uses adjacent to the site or currently onsite. Alternative 1A replaces condominium buildings A1 and B with 24 two-unit chalets at the South Base, and swaps the location of the parking garage (Building P) with Building C condominiums so that the condominiums are located within the existing gravel parking area south of Fawn Street and across from existing single-family homes along Sacramento Avenue. The parking garage is located near the intersection of Fawn Street and SR 89 in the existing parking lot. With the provision of adequate on-site parking located primarily underground or in designated structured parking, adjacent uses should experience fewer land use related conflicts (e.g., noise, congestion, glare from parked cars) with operation of the ski resort during peak winter operations. New summer operations would occur as a result of the inclusion of tourist and residential land uses. However, these uses would also benefit from improved access and parking for the Project area. The replacement of existing surface parking and off-site parking on the street throughout the neighborhood with a day skier parking structure and lodging guest sub-structure parking will substantially improve the access and safety throughout the neighborhood. Moving the parking structure near SR 89 and relocating the condominiums nearer existing residential units under Alternative 1A further better reflects the existing neighborhood land use layout. Also, the addition of improved transit options, neighborhood serving commercial, year round recreation resources, and other accessory facilities will contribute positively to the character of the residential and tourist oriented community.

**Impact LU-2, DEIR/EIS page 6-34, FEIR/EIS page 6-34: Revise text to add analysis of Alternative 1A**

Analysis: *Significant Impact; Alternatives 1/1A, 3 and 6*

**Consistency with Adjacent Land Uses.** The Proposed Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3 and 6 will result in substantial changes to the existing conditions, with proposed new land uses as defined by TRPA, expansion or modification of existing land uses, and overall changes to the layout, height and density of the developed base areas at Homewood Mountain Resort. Existing structures will be deconstructed. As discussed in Chapter 3, the Proposed Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3 and 6 will result in a mixed-use base area (North Base), a residential base area (South Base), and a lodge at the Mid-Mountain Base area, including:

	<b>Alternative 1/1A</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 6</b>
<b>NORTH BASE AREA</b>			
Hotel			
Rooms	75	75	50
Condo/Hotel Units	40	40	25
Penthouse Condos	30	30	0
Residential Condos	36	36	145
Fractional Condos	20	20	0
Townhouses	16	16	0
Residential Lots	0	0	0
Workforce (Affordable) Housing	13	13	12
Commercial	25,000 sf	25,000 sf	25,000 sf
Skier Services	30,000 sf	30,000 sf	20,000 sf
Parking spaces			
Day skier structure	272	272	156
Surface parking	47/568 (Alt 1A)	47	80
Underground	410	410	410
<i>Total Parking</i>	<i>729/73840 (Alt 1A)</i>	<i>729</i>	<i>646</i>
<b>SOUTH BASE AREA</b>			
Residential Condos	99/95 (Alt 1A)	99	50
Maintenance	0	0	0
Parking spaces	117/145 (Alt 1A)	117	65
Residential Lots	0	0	14
Skier Services	2,000 sf	2,000 sf	2,000 sf
<b>MID-MOUNTAIN AREA</b>			
Day Lodge	15,000 sf	15,000 sf	15,000 sf
Gondola terminal	18,000 sf	18,000 sf	18,000 sf
Maintenance facility	15,000 sf	15,000 sf	15,000 sf
Water storage tanks (250,000 gallons each)	2	2	2

In addition to the units described above, Alternatives 1/1A, 3 and 6 will include changes to ski lifts (without any increase to verified PAOT capacity) and the addition of bike trails, a cross-country ski connection, amphitheater, ice skating facilities, swimming facilities, and small miniature golf facility that are either common to a ski resort and compatible with a resort function or are features that are open to the community and enhance overall recreation and community gathering opportunities. These uses will be located on the mountain in Plan Area 157 or at the North Base area in the proposed Plan Area 159 expansion area. Plan Area 157 lists day use areas and riding/hiking trails as acceptable uses and cross-country ski courses, and skiing facilities as special uses. Plan Area 159 lists local assembly and entertainment, day use areas, and participant sports facilities as allowable uses, with cross-country skiing courses, riding/hiking trails and skiing facilities as special uses. Because the project site currently houses recreation facilities, modifications to ski facilities and the addition of new recreation facilities that either expand winter recreation options (cross-country ski connection and ice skating) or expand summer recreation opportunities beyond the existing hiking trails (swimming, biking, miniature golf) are considered to be consistent with existing and adjacent land uses. ~~Neither~~ None of these Alternatives would require an allocation of additional TRPA PAOTs as an adequate number of PAOTs are currently assigned to the mountain and no activities requiring summer PAOTs are proposed.

The proposed hotel is consistent with the existing land uses in the Project area and is an allowable use in both Plan Areas 157 and 159. Condo-hotels, residential condos, employee housing, and single-family dwellings are all special uses within PAS 157 and 159. Only single-family dwellings are allowed in PAS 158. Timeshare units are a special use in Plan Area 159 and are not allowed in Plan Area 157. With the proposed amendment to Plan Area 159 boundaries, each of the proposed Master Plan uses would be located in Plan Area 159 under Alternatives 1/1A, 3 and 6.

Existing uses, ski facilities and ski services, conform to Plan Area 157. These uses will be upgraded, but the TRPA verified PAOT capacity will not increase for resort use because some lifts have already been, or will be removed entirely and others will be replaced with increased capacity (e.g., the existing Madden chair lift will be replaced with a high speed gondola). New uses include non-skiing recreation resources, tourist accommodations and residential use to support the existing and proposed recreation operations, and commercial services that support the recreation operations such as food and beverage sales. Expansion of these recreation and residential uses would enhance the recreation and visitor experience and help achieve the land use direction for the applicable Plan Areas at Homewood. Adjacent land uses include single-family homes, commercial uses, recreation facilities, and tourist accommodations. The existing commercial uses are centered along SR 89 with the majority of single-family homes located off SR 89 to the north and south of the existing base areas. Increased density along the SR 89 corridor, while providing scenic enhancements included in the Master Plan, is consistent with the community planning direction as discussed in Impact LU-1. Therefore, the proposed land uses and their locations in Alternatives 1/1A, 3 and 6 are consistent with adjacent land uses and would not expand/intensify existing non-conforming uses. This is particularly applicable to the revision to the Proposed Project (Alternative 1A), where condominium buildings A1 and B are replaced with 24 two-unit chalets at the South Base, and the location of the parking garage (Building P) is swapped with Building C condominiums. This amendment locates the condominiums within the existing gravel parking area south of Fawn Street and across from existing single-family homes along Sacramento Avenue and places the parking garage near the intersection of Fawn Street and SR 89 in the existing parking lot.

**Impact LU-2, Table 6-4, DEIR/EIS page 6-37, FEIR/EIS page 6-38: Revise Table 6-4 to add analysis of Alternative 1A**

**Table 6-4**

### Proposed Tourist and Residential Units by Alternative

Units	Alt 1/1A	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5	Alt 6
<b>Tourist Accommodation Units (TAU – Hotel and Timeshare Units)</b>					
Proposed TAU:					
Hotel Rooms	75	75	0	75	50
Condo Hotel <sup>2</sup>	60	60	0	0	25
Fractional Units	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<b>TOTAL TAUs</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>
HMR Purchased TAU available for Transfer <sup>1</sup>	102	102	102	102	102
Bonus TAU requested by HMR in CEP <sup>1</sup>	50	50	50	50	50
Total TAU available to HMR	152	152	152	152	152
Additional TAUs Required	3	3	0	0	0
<b>Equivalent Residential Units (ERU – Whole Ownership and Single Family Units)</b>					
Proposed ERU:					
Residential Condominiums	135/131 (1A)	135	0	225	145
Townhouses	16	16	0	0	0
Penthouse Condominiums	30	30	0	0	0
Residential Lots	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>14</u>
<b>TOTAL ERUs</b>	<b>181/177 (1A)</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>159</b>
Homewood owned TAUs to be converted to ERUs (based on low capability restoration match) <sup>1</sup>	50	50	0	50	50
HMR Purchased ERU available for Transfer <sup>3</sup>	3	3	3	3	3
HMR Purchased Development Rights <sup>3</sup>	23	23	23	23	23
Total ERUs and Development Rights Available	76	76	76	76	76
Additional ERUs Required	105/101 (1A)	105	0	165	83
<b>Multi-Family Residential Bonus Units (MRBU - Affordable Housing)</b>					
Proposed MRBU (TRPA bonus pool)	13	13	0	12	12

Source: HMR, September 9, 2009



1 HMR has an inventory of 152 TAUs from two properties in the North Shore (North Shore Lodge – 13 TAU and Tahoe Inn – 139 TAU). HMR proposes to convert 50 of the restored TAU from the Tahoe Inn Class 3 lands to ERUs under the provisions of TRPA Code Chapter 33.7 (one ERU for each TAU with low capability land restoration credit). HMR has requested 50 bonus TAUs from the TRPA special project pool that may be granted as a result of low capability (Class 3) restoration associated with units at the Tahoe Inn.

2 Although 40 units are proposed, the design on the 20 units with lockoffs requires two TAUs per unit with a lockoff. Therefore 60 TAUs are required for the 40 Condo-Hotel units.

3 HMR has an inventory of 26 ERUs and developments rights from two sources – TVI (23 development rights) and the Tahoe Inn (3 ERUs).

Note: Less than 10% of the hotel rooms would include kitchens. All other units (residential condominiums, fractional units, condo hotel, penthouse condominiums, townhouses) would include kitchens.

***Impact LU-2, DEIR/EIS page 6-38, FEIR/EIS page 6-39: Revise text to add analysis of Alternative 1A***

Chapter 33.7 allows the conversion of TAUs to ERUs at a one to one ratio as stated in Section 33.7.A – Transfer from Sensitive Lands, “Conversion of an existing residential or tourist accommodation units to a residential, tourist, or commercial use may be permitted when a residential or tourist unit is transferred from a parcel classified as land capability districts 1, 2, 3, or SEZ, and the parcel is restored.” The 50 TAUs from the Tahoe Inn restoration site may be converted to ERUs based on the provisions of Chapter 33.7.A. With this conversion and transfer included, Alternatives 1/1A and 3 will have 76 ERUs and development rights available, resulting in a demand for 105 additional ERUs to accommodate total buildout of Alternatives 1 and 3, and 101 additional ERUs to accommodate total buildout of Alternative 1A. However, Alternatives 1/1A and 3 require 66 ERUs for Phase 1 (North Base) development and therefore additional ERUs would be needed for Phase 2 (South Base) development. Under Alternative 6, there would be a remaining demand for 83 additional ERUs, but 33 of those additional ERUs would be needed for Phase 1 (North Base) development, leaving Alternative 6 short for both Phase 1 and Phase 2.

## 24.7 CHAPTER 7 - POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

*Table 7-7, DEIR/EIS page 7-9, FEIR/EIS page 7-9: Revise text to add analysis of Alternative 1A*

**Table 7-7**

Estimated Employment Generated, and Employee/Workforce Housing Required, by Alternative

Alternative	New FTEs*	Housing Element Policy C-2 Required Employee/Workforce Housing Units (Employees)	Units Provided (Employees Housed)**	Employee/Workforce Housing Unit Deficit (Employees)
Proposed Project (Alternative 1/1A) – HMR Master Plan	182/181	46 (91)/ 45 (91)	13 (26)/ 13 (26)	33 (65)/ 32(65)
No Project (Alternative 2)	0	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Alternative 3 – No Code Amendment for Building Height	182	46 (91)	13 (26)	33 (65)
Alternative 4 – Close Ski Resort – Estate Lots	35	9 (18)	0 (0)	9 (18)
Alternative 5 – Reduced Urban Boundary Amendment	177	44 (89)	12 (24)	32 (65)
Alternative 6 – Reduced Urban Boundary/Lower Height	166	42 (83)	12 (24)	30 (59)

Source: Hauge Brueck Associates 2009.

\*Limited to new commercial, retail and other new Project developments; does not include the estimated 23 FTEs for ski area operations. Under Alternative 4 it is assumed that the 23 FTEs at the ski resort are removed with the closure of HMR.

\*\*Based on providing housing for 50% of new employees in 2-bedroom units, occupied by a minimum of two persons per unit, rounded to the next whole unit.

Employees not accommodated in employee/workforce housing will require housing elsewhere in the region. New jobs generated by the Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~Alternative 1/1A) or Alternatives 3, 4, 5, or 6, would not result in substantial new population growth or demand for new housing considering the existing population and housing stock in the Placer County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Placer County has approximately 14,588 persons and 11,481 housing units in the Basin.

As documented in the Plan consistency analysis included in Table 7-8, the Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 do not provide sufficient employee/workforce housing to meet the requirements of *Placer County Housing Element Policies B-15, C-2*, and other applicable policies in the *Housing Element* and *1998 West Shore Area General Plan*. The Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~Alternative 1/1A) and Alternative 3 require up to 33 additional units for 65 new employees, Alternative 4 requires up to nine units for 18 employees, Alternative 5 requires up to 32 additional units for 65 employees, and Alternative 6 requires up to 30 additional units for 59 employees. As a condition of receiving 13 MRBUs from TRPA as a CEP Project, the Applicant in its acceptance letter dated January 31, 2008, indicated that it would find employee/workforce housing solutions for the balance of new FTEs generated in excess of those served by the 13 on-site MRBUs. Following Master Plan adoption, HMR intends to identify and secure off-site employee/workforce housing for the balance of new full time equivalent employees generated by the selected alternative. Because the necessary off-site employee/workforce housing is not currently identified, this impact is considered to be significant, and mitigation is required.

***Mitigation Measures PEH-1, DEIR/EIS page 7-10, FEIR/EIS page 7-10: Revise text to clarify that additional environmental review may be required.***

**Mitigation: PEH-1: Develop Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan.**

The Project Applicant shall develop a detailed “Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan” based on the alternative selected for Placer County review and approval. Provision of sufficient housing opportunities to accommodate a minimum of half of new FTEs generated by Project operation will be assured through a combination of one or more of the following:

- Development of new on-site employee/workforce housing;
- Development/renovation of off-site employee/workforce housing;
- Dedication of sufficient land for needed units, and/or;
- Payment of an in-lieu fee.

The designs of applicant-provided on-site and off-site employee/workforce housing shall be reviewed and approved by the County. An approved Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan shall be required prior to the issuance of building permits or recordation of final maps, whichever occurs first. The Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan shall provide an accounting of the final number of net new FTEs expected to be created by the constructed alternative with identified phasing; the number, locations, and capacity of new employee/workforce housing units to be developed; location and capacity of dedicated land for new employee/workforce housing; in-lieu fees paid to the County, and implementation schedule to ensure that sufficient new housing is available for new employees as Project construction is completed and operations begin. In the event that HMR chooses to proceed with in-lieu fees paid to the County, HMR must include a detailed accounting of the actual construction cost of each unit. This will ensure that enough fees are paid to actually build employee housing. 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 employee/workforce housing, the Improvement Plans shall not be approved until subsequent environmental review has been completed.

**Table 7-8, DEIR/EIS page 7-14, FEIR/EIS page 7-14: Update Table 7-8 to clarify consistency with goals and policies**

**Table 7-8**

HMR Consistency Analysis with the 1994 *Placer County General Plan* and 2009 *Housing Element*, and 1998 *West Shore Area General Plan* Goals, Policies, and Development Standards Related to Population, Employment, and Housing

Goals, Policies, and Development Standards	HMR Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<b>PLACER COUNTY 1994 GENERAL PLAN</b>	
<b>B. AFFORDABLE HOUSING</b>	
<b>Goal B. To encourage construction and maintenance of safe, decent and sound affordable housing in the county.</b>	
B-1. The County shall give highest priority for permit processing to development projects that include an affordable residential component.	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (<del>Alternative-4</del><u>Alternative 1/1A/1A</u>) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 include an employee/workforce housing component. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development.</p> <p><b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> Alternative 4 provides only single-family housing affordable to above-moderate income households. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy B-1.</p>
B-4. The County shall require housing for low-income households that is to be constructed on-site in a new residential project to be dispersed throughout the project to the extent practical given the size of the project and other site constraints.	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (<del>Alternative-4</del><u>Alternative 1/1A</u>) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 provide an employee/workforce housing component that will be situated on-site or nearby and accessible by transit. The No Project (Alternative 2) <u>includes no changes to existing development and Alternative 4 include and requires -no employee/workforce housing.</u></p> <p><b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> <u>Alternative 4 provides only single-family housing affordable to above-moderate income households. Mitigation Measure PEH-1 requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy B-1.</u></p>

Goals, Policies, and Development Standards	HMR Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<p>B-6. The County shall require low-income-housing units in density bonus, or other projects that may be required to provide affordable housing, to be developed in a timely manner with the market-rate units in the project to avoid delaying the construction of the affordable units to the end of the project.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development, and no employee/workforce housing is required.</p> <p><b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> The Proposed Project (<del>Alternative 1</del> <u>Alternative 1/1A</u>) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 do not provide a sufficiently detailed employee/workforce housing plan to demonstrate compliance with Policy B-6. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy B-6.</p>
<p>B-7. The County shall facilitate expanded housing opportunities that are affordable to the workforce of Placer County.</p>	<p><u><b>Consistent.</b> The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development, and no employee/workforce housing is required.</u></p> <p><u><b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 do not provide a sufficiently detailed employee/workforce housing plan to demonstrate compliance with Policy B-7. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy B-7.</u></p> <p><del><b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 include employee/workforce housing. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development, and no employee/workforce housing is required.</del></p> <p><del><b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> Alternative 4 does not provide employee/workforce housing. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy B-7.</del></p>

Goals, Policies, and Development Standards	HMR Master Plan Consistency Analysis
	required.  <b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> Alternative 4 does not provide employee/workforce housing. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy B-12.
B-13. The County shall continue to implement the following incentive programs for the construction of affordable housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow second residential units with single-family residences;</li> <li>Allow mobile homes and manufactured housing in all residential zoning districts;</li> <li>Allow “hardship mobile homes” as second residential units in residential and/or agricultural zones; and</li> <li>Allow relief from parking standards and other specified development standards on developments for seniors and for low and very low-income residents.</li> </ul>	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project ( <del>Alternative 4</del> <u>Alternative 1/1A</u> ) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 include employee/workforce housing. The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development, and no employee/workforce housing is required.  <b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> Alternative 4 does not provide employee/workforce housing. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy B-13.
B-15. The County shall require that any privately-initiated proposal to amend a General Plan or Community Plan land use designation of Agricultural/Timberland, Resort and Recreation, Open Space, General Commercial, Tourist/Resort Commercial, or Business Park/Industrial to a land use designation of Residential or Specific Plan shall include an affordable housing component subject to approval by County and/or comply with any adopted County affordable housing program.	<b>Consistent.</b> The No Project (Alternative 2) includes no changes to existing development, and no employee/workforce housing is required.  <b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> The Proposed Project ( <del>Alternative 4</del> <u>Alternative 1/1A</u> ) and Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 do not provide sufficient detail in their employee/workforce housing component to demonstrate compliance with Policy B-15. Alternative 4 provides no employee/workforce housing. <b>Mitigation Measure PEH-1</b> requires the development of a Homewood Employee/Workforce Housing Plan to achieve consistency with Policy B-15.

***Impact PEH-2, DEIR/EIS page 7-71, FEIR/EIS page 7-18: Revised text to add analysis of Alternative 1A***

**IMPACT: PEH-2. Will the Project alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?**

**Analysis:** *Less than Significant Impact; Proposed Project (~~Alternative 4~~Alternative 1/1A) and All Alternatives*

The Proposed Project (~~Alternative 4~~Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives are not expected to result in substantial new population growth. The existing population in the North Lake Tahoe Basin was 26,913 residents in 2007, and the population of the Placer County portion of the Basin was 14,588 and Homewood was 906 persons. As presented in Chapter 3 – Project Description, the Proposed Project (~~Alternative 4~~Alternative 1/1A) and Alternative 3 will include up to 165–181 multifamily residential units, including 165 whole or partial ownership market rate multi-family dwelling units and 16 Townhomes.

The average household size in Placer County in 2007 was 2.6 persons. At this rate, ~~Assuming 2.6 persons per household (average Placer County household size in 2007),~~ the full time resident population may increase by up to 471/460 persons under the Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 1/1A) and 471 under Alternative 3. There will be no population growth under No Project (Alternative 2). Alternative 4 includes 16 estate home sites to be developed, accommodating a population increase of up to 42 persons. Alternative 5 would build 241 single- and multi-family units developed for a population increase of up to 627 persons. Alternative 6 includes 209 single- and multi-family units with a potential population increase of up to 543 persons.

These population estimates would be worst-case scenarios because recent real estate trends show that 50 – 70% of these units would typically be sold to second homeowners not permanently residing in the units. Consequently, permanent populations in these units are expected to be no more than 50% of the estimate above, or 236/230 for the Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 1/1A), 236 for ~~and~~ Alternative 3, 21 for Alternative 4, 314 for Alternative 5, and 272 for Alternative 6.

The Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 1/1A) and Alternative 3 will include 13 employee/workforce housing units with 26 bedrooms with an additional on-site population increase of up to 52 persons. Alternatives 5 and 6 include 12 employee/workforce housing units with 24 bedrooms for an additional on-site population increase of up to 48 persons.

Additional employee/workforce housing units are required to be provided off-site as required by *Placer County General Plan Housing Element Policy C-2* for ~~another 39 up to 65~~ employees under the Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 1/1A) and Alternative 3, bringing total employment-related population growth to 91 workers, or 50% of FTEs generated by the Project. Alternative 4 requires employee/workforce housing for 18 employees. Under Alternatives 5 and 6, additional employee/workforce housing would be provided for 41 and 35 employees, bringing the total employment related population growth to 89 and 78-83 persons for Alternatives 5 and 6, respectively.

Employment related population growth is expected to be zero persons under No Project (Alternative 2) and up to 182 new workers under the Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 1/1A) or Alternative 3. A majority of the employment growth is assumed to currently reside in the region and will commute to the resort from nearby areas such as Homewood, Tahoma, and Tahoe City. Although these employees may add to commuter traffic in the area, employment increases for the Project area will not substantially alter the population growth rate or density in the Placer County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin with an existing population of 14,588 persons.

The Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 will result in temporary population increases from tourists vacationing at the resort, renting housing units, or visiting the commercial facilities. This growth in visitation will not consist of permanent population and will fluctuate according to peak tourist seasons at Lake Tahoe. This population is not counted in official population census totals or planned growth rates for the area, and is not considered to be a population impact.

The increase in permanent residents, including employees in employee/workforce housing on-site and off-site, would be up to 327 persons under the Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 1/1A) and Alternative 3, 39 persons under Alternative 4, 403 persons under Alternative 5, and 355 persons under Alternative 6. This represents a range of population increase in the Placer County portion of the Basin from 2.7% for Alternative 5 to 0.3% for Alternative 4. The expected population increase resulting from



the Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 is expected to be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

***Impact PEH-C1, DEIR/EIS page 7-19, FEIR/EIS page 7-20: Revised text to add analysis of Alternative 1A***

**Impact: PEH-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to population, employment, and housing?**

**Analysis:** *Less than Significant Impact; Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 1/1A) and All Alternatives*

Alternative 2 (No Project) will not substantially contribute to changes in the distribution or composition of population, employment, or housing in the Project area or vicinity and will not result in considerable population or housing changes. The growth in population, employment, and housing in the region is limited by existing land use designations and the availability of lots suitable for new construction or redevelopment.

The Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 will result in population increases, including lower-income population demographic associated with the leisure, retail, and hospitality employment growth. There are multiple projects proposed for the North and West Shore Tahoe region that will expand recreation, commercial, and hospitality services. There are other projects proposed in Tahoe Vista and Kings Beach that are specifically targeted at increasing the amount of employee/workforce housing in the Lake Tahoe Region. There are other employee/workforce housing projects proposed in Kings Beach (84 units) and Tahoe Vista (162 units) that may provide an opportunity for housing new HMR employees. There is existing unmet demand, however, for employee/workforce housing in the region. The Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 are required to provide housing for only half of the new project-related employee/workforce housing demand under *Placer County General Plan Housing Element* policy C-2. Consequently, the Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 contribute to the existing cumulative impact of a lack of employee/workforce housing in the region.

The Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3 will increase unmet demand for approximately ~~23-33~~ employee/workforce housing units for ~~94-65~~ new FTEs, Alternative 4 will increase unmet demand for ~~five-9~~ units for 18 FTEs, Alternative 5 will increase unmet demand for ~~23-32~~ units for ~~89-65~~ FTEs, and Alternative 6 will increase unmet demand for ~~24-30~~ units for ~~83-59~~ FTEs. Based on a supply of 11,481 housing units in the Placer County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin, the potential contributions of the Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 to unmet demand for employee/workforce housing are not expected to be cumulatively considerable. In addition, based on existing employment and residential patterns in the area, a substantial portion of new employees at HMR are expected to be existing residents in the Placer County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Therefore, this potential cumulative impact related to population, employment and housing is considered less than significant.

The Proposed Project (~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 1/1A) and Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 will contribute to a cumulative employment benefit to the region by providing tourist recreational services and vacation homes that draw visitors to the area. In addition to the refurbished and improved winter sports facilities, the added services (hotel, restaurants, retail, hiking and biking trails) and the conversion of Tourist Accommodation Units (TAUs) to residential units will provide new tourist opportunities in conjunction with other tourist features offered at other redeveloped projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Therefore, this potential cumulative impact is considered less than significant.

## 24.8 CHAPTER 8 - BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

*Table 8-6, DEIR/EIS page 8-55, FEIR/EIS page 8-55: Revised text to add analysis of Alternative 1A*

**Table 8-6**

Estimated Tree Removal By Alternative (diameter at breast height)

Alternative	15 to 29 inches	30 inches and greater
<b>Project (Alternative 1) and Alternative 3</b>		
North Base	6	9
Town Homes/Access Road	78 <del>1</del>	4
South Base	6	13
Mid-Mountain	79	7
<i>Total</i>	<i>169<del>2</del></i>	<i>33</i>
<b>Alternative 1A</b>		
<u>North Base</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>Town Homes/Access Road</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>South Base</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>Mid-Mountain</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>7</u>
<i>Total</i>	<i>170</i>	<i>27</i>
<b>Alternative 2 and 4*</b>		
<i>Total</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<b>Alternative 5</b>		
North Base	6	13
<del>Town Homes/Access Road</del>	<del>71</del>	4
South Base	6	13
Mid-Mountain	79	7
<i>Total</i>	<i>91<del>462</del></i>	<i>33<del>7</del></i>
<b>Alternative 6</b>		
North Base	6	9
South Base	6	13
Mid-Mountain	79	7
<i>Total</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>29</i>

Source: HBA 2010

Notes:

- \* Alternative 2 would maintain existing conditions. Alternative 4 includes development of single family homes in currently open ski trails and utilization of existing roadways, therefore no tree removal will be necessary.

***Impact BIO-4, DEIR/EIS page 8-58, FEIR/EIS page 8-58: Revised text to add analysis of Alternative 1A***

California yellow warbler were detected during willow flycatcher surveys along Madden Creek and at Quail Lake (Wildlife Resource Consultants 2008). This species occupies riparian, lake shore, and meadow habitats. Detected yellow warblers are assumed to be extant in the Project area during the summer breeding months. The Proposed Project (Alternative 1/1A) and Action Alternatives (Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6) would not modify riparian vegetation at Quail Lake or along Madden Creek where this species was observed. A stream channel will be restored at the South Base area with the Proposed Project and Alternative 3. Restoration may provide new suitable habitat for this species; however, due to close proximity of human habitation, activity, and presence, the suitability of nesting habitat for this species is considered low. The Proposed Project (Alternative 1/A) and Action Alternatives would not negatively modify other riparian, lake, or meadow habitats at HMR, so this impact is considered less than significant for this species.

***Impact BIO-4, DEIR/EIS page 8-60, FEIR/EIS page 8-60: Revised text based on Agency comments***

Increased nighttime lighting is not expected to have an impact on wildlife species in the area as all new lighting must comply with TRPA design review guidelines that require lighting to be for illumination only and shall not be directed above the horizontal. Compliance with these design guidelines will prevent the dispersal of light into adjacent residential areas and wildlife habitat.

Wildlife surveys determined bat species are roosting within the Homewood Lodge (Wildlife Resource Consultants 2007). Due to noise interference from machinery within the building the species of bat roosting within the Homewood Lodge could not be determined ~~roosting within the Homewood Lodge~~. As there are a number of sensitive species with suitable habitat (Townsend's big-eared bat, Spotted bat, small-footed myotis ~~bat~~, long-eared myotis bat, fringed myotis bat, long-legged myotis, yuma myotis bat) the potential to disturb individuals during demolition is high. Alternatives 1, 1A, 3, 5 and 6 would each result in the demolition of Homewood Lodge at the north base. Due to this potential impact to individuals and the uncertainty of species to be impacted this impact is considered potentially significant.

***Mitigation Measure BIO-4b, DEIR/EIS page 8-60, FEIR/EIS page 8-60: Revised text based on Agency comments***

**BIO-4b. Trash Management Program**

Prior to finalization of construction permits and prior to Improvement Plan Approval for the new mid-mountain lodge, HMR shall prepare a Trash Management Program for review and approval by the TRPA and Placer County. The Trash Management Program shall include measures to prevent wildlife access to trash and refuse generated by the new lodge and associated facilities. Measures to be included at a minimum are wildlife proof trash containers in all outside areas, scheduling for removal of refuse from the lodge area on a daily basis and educational signage outlining the dangers of feeding wildlife.

***Impact BIO-10, DEIR/EIS page 8-71, FEIR/EIS page 7-72: Revised text to add analysis of Alternative 1A***

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

The Proposed Project (Alternative 1/1A) involves tree removal for construction of facilities at the North Base, South Base, townhome sites, gondola alignment and Mid-Mountain Lodge. Table 8-6 details tree removal numbers associated with the base areas and Mid-Mountain Lodge, including the water tank. Detailed plans have not been provided for the utility corridor that would connect the North Base and the Mid-Mountain Lodge. Therefore, accurate tree removal estimates cannot be developed for utility alignments. However, it is anticipated that utilities would utilize existing roadway alignments or ski trails, which have been previously cleared of trees.

The trees to be removed are located in PAS 157 Homewood/Tahoe Ski Bowl, which is a recreational plan area. Table 8-6 identifies a total of 33 trees 30 inches or greater for removal for the Proposed Project (Alternative 1) and Alternative 3. Alternative 1A will result in the removal of 27 trees that are 30 inches dbh or larger. Alternative 5 will result in the removal of ~~33~~ trees that are 30 inches dbh or larger. Alternative 6 will result in the removal of 29 trees that are 30 inches dbh or larger. Of these 27 (Alternative 1A), 33 (Alternatives 1, 3 and 5),~~37~~ and 29 (Alternative 6) trees proposed for removal under the Action Alternatives, a total of nine trees have been identified for potential preservation in the North Base area based on a memorandum from Nichols Consulting Engineers dated May 21, 2009. However, at present, it cannot be determined with certainty that these trees can be retained based on potential modifications to construction activities or building locations. Therefore, they are included in the estimated total tree removal count. It is noted on the May 21, 2009 memo that “Trees proposed to be removed fall in the parameters of the proposed building footprint or hardscape. Building development location was analyzed and selected in order to minimize impacts on scenic, ground water, grading and land coverage criteria.” However, no development area is considered an old growth forest.

***Impact BIO-10, DEIR/EIS page 8-73, FEIR/EIS page 8-74: Revised text to add analysis of Alternative 1A and address comments from California Dept of Forestry and Fire Protection and Placer County***

**Mitigation: BIO-10. Prepare Forest Plan and Tree Protection Plan For Homewood Mountain Resort**

HMR shall prepare and implement a Forest Plan for the Project area that complies with TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 71 and incorporates the Fire Suppression and Management Plan compliance measure as described in Section 3.12.12 of this document. The Forest Plan shall be produced by a Registered Professional Forester and be submitted to TRPA for review and approval to confirm that the plan complies with Chapter 71. The Forest Plan and Fire Suppression Management Plan must both comply with the CA Forest Practices Act and will require a Timberland Conversion Permit to be approved by Cal Fire. The forest plan shall identify and detail trees for removal and other forested areas which may require treatment (thinning) in order to increase the overall health of the forest.

In addition, a Tree Protection Plan shall be prepared for the Project. Included in the Tree Protection Plan shall be tree protection measures to prevent damage to trees that are proposed to remain. The Project applicant shall hire a ~~Certified Arborist~~Registered Professional Forester to develop specific measures to ensure adequate protection to trees slated for retention in the vicinity of proposed development. The tree protection measures shall include the establishment of tree protection zones, and protection measures to prevent damage to the trees (bole, roots and branches). Additionally the Tree Protection Plan shall identify areas where tree roots are to be protected and proper methods for pruning, irrigation and limb removal during construction activities. The Tree Protection Plan shall include monitoring of the trees slated for retention for a period of three years. Mortality of any of the retained trees shall require the replacement of trees lost utilizing the same species and relative location.

The Tree Protection Plan shall be submitted to Placer County and the TRPA for review and approval prior to removal of any trees associated with the Project. Stump removal is not allowed without prior approval of the Development Review Committee and may require a Grading Permit for erosion control and water quality purposes.

***Impact BIO-C1, DEIR/EIS page 8-74, FEIR/EIS page 8-74: Revised text to reference nearby forest habitat projects***

**Impact:** BIO-C1: Will the Project have significant cumulative impacts to biological resources?

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

Under the No Project alternative, the combined effect of reasonable and foreseeable future projects on biological resources, wildlife, and fisheries would be beneficial due to the nature of the projects being implemented. Future projects include projects that will result in the enhancement of habitat through the restoration of riparian habitats and forest thinning projects (USFS Fuels Reduction and Healthy Forests Restoration Projects and Placer 89 Environmental Improvement Project). These restoration and enhancement projects would not necessarily result in immediate increase in quality of habitat, however over time these projects would result in higher quality habitats for sensitive vegetation communities (i.e. riparian) and wildlife species that are associated with such habitats. Other types of projects in the Project area (outlined in Table 20.1-1) are development projects that will not result in significant impacts to sensitive plant or wildlife species. Other known erosion control project and fuels reduction projects will result in modifications to habitats but will require compliance with regulatory measures to avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive species and their respective habitats.

## 24.9 CHAPTER 9 – CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

**Mitigation Measure CUL-4, DEIR/EIS page 9-11, FEIR/EIS page 9-11: Identify and Protect Undiscovered Paleontological Resources.**

**Mitigation:** CUL-4: Identify and Protect Undiscovered Paleontological Resources.

Prior to submittal of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall provide written evidence to the Planning Department that a qualified paleontologist has been retained by the applicant to observe grading activities and salvage fossils as necessary. The paleontologist shall establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance and shall establish, in cooperation with the project developer, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit sampling, identification, and evaluation of fossils. If major paleontological resources are discovered, which require temporary halting or redirecting of grading, the paleontologist shall report such findings to the project developer, and to the Placer County Department of Museums and Planning Department.

The paleontologist shall determine appropriate actions, in cooperation with the project developer, which ensure proper exploration and/or salvage. Excavated finds shall be offered to a State-designated repository such as Museum of Paleontology, U.C. Berkeley, the California Academy of Sciences, or any other State-designated repository. Otherwise, the finds shall be offered to the Placer County Department of Museums for purposes of public education and interpretive displays.

These actions, as well as final mitigation and disposition of the resources shall be subject to approval by the Department of Museums. The paleontologist shall submit a follow-up report to the Department of Museums and Planning Department which shall include the period of inspection, an analysis of the fossils found, and identification of the present repository of in which the fossils are located.