

## **4 RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

The Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) Ski Area Master Plan Project (Proposed Project) falls under the jurisdiction of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and Placer County. Other agencies with jurisdiction over resources in the Tahoe Basin or parcels in the Project Area will require permits and/or approvals for the Proposed Project and Alternatives. These agencies include: California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), California Regional Water Quality Board - Lahontan Region (Lahontan), California State Historic Preservation Office (CASHPO), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), Placer County Public Works and Building and Safety Departments, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Calfire), and the North Tahoe Fire Protection District (NTFPD). Section 3.13, Required Permits and Approvals, lists each permitting agency's responsibility relative to the Project. This chapter 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.

### **4.1 FEDERAL**

Federal regulations that apply to the Proposed Project and Alternatives are associated with the preservation of resources such as wetlands, special-status species, cultural resources, and health and safety on private lands. Various agencies of the State of California and the TRPA are authorized to enforce many of the federal regulations for these resources. For example, TRPA is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for transportation and air quality planning and is charged with the responsibility for implementing federal programs in the Region. TRPA implements the water quality control plan required by Clean Water Act §208 under delegation from the California State Water Resources Control Board (State Board), Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP), and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

Some federal agencies have direct permitting authority over resources potentially affected by the Proposed Project and Alternatives. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) is responsible for the protection of federally listed threatened and endangered species and species that are proposed for listing under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA). Any action that may adversely affect a federally listed or proposed species must be permitted under Section 7 or 10(a) of the FESA. The USFWS regulates the take (loss of habitat or individuals) of bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Candidate or listed species under the ESA or MBTA may have potential to occur in the Project Area and could be affected by development construction and operations under the Proposed Project or Alternatives (see Chapter 8-Biological Resources). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) regulates excavation in and discharge of material into wetlands, lakes, streams, and other jurisdictional waters of the U.S. under Clean Water Act §404. Several jurisdictional lakes, streams, and wetlands occur within the Project Area and vicinity and have the potential to be affected by construction and operations under the Proposed Project or Alternatives (see Chapter 8 – Biological Resources).

### **4.2 REGIONAL - TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY**

The TRPA is a bi-state planning agency with the authority to regulate growth and development within the Lake Tahoe Region. TRPA implements that authority through the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin (Regional Plan). The Regional Plan is composed of numerous documents. The following

components of the Regional Plan are relevant to the Proposed Project and Alternatives and are described below:

- Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities (1982);
- Goals and Policies (September, 1986 as amended);
- Code of Ordinances (May, 1987 as amended);
- Plan Area Statements (August, 1987 as amended);
- Regional Transportation Plan and Air Quality Plan (1992);
- Water Quality Management Plan (1988);
- Scenic Quality Improvement Program (1989); and
- Ski Area Master Plan Guidelines (1990)

#### **4.2.1 Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities**

The Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities (ETCCs) were established for the Lake Tahoe Region to provide a standard for which projects and activities would be measured to achieve goals established in the TRPA Compact. Attainment and maintenance of the ETCCs is required for TRPA and in some cases requires restoration of existing Project Area conditions. An impact that is considered significant based upon ETCC criteria must either be mitigated by avoidance, modification, or removal of the identified project component that would create the threshold-related impact. TRPA ETCCs criteria are identified for environmental resources analyzed in the individual resource chapters of this EIR/EIS, and are incorporated into the criteria of significance for evaluating impacts.

#### **4.2.2 Goals and Policies**

The TRPA Goals and Policies establish an overall framework for development and environmental conservation in the Lake Tahoe Region. The Goals and Policies include elements on Land Use, Transportation, Conservation, Recreation, Public Services and Facilities, and Implementation. Table 4.2-1 analyzes the consistency between the Proposed Project and Alternatives and the Goals and Policies in the TRPA Regional Plan.

#### **4.2.3 Code of Ordinances**

The TRPA Code of Ordinances (Code) contains development standards. The Code is intended to implement the Goals and Policies in a manner that attains and/or maintains the ETCCs. Many Code sections pertain to the Proposed Project and Alternatives. The sections relevant to this environmental review are referenced within individual resource sections of the EIR/EIS. These resource sections include: 6-Land Use; 7-Population, Employment, and Housing; 8-Biological Resources; 9-Cultural Resources; 10-Scenic Resources; 11-Transportation and Circulation; 12-Air Quality; 13-Noise; 14-Soils, Geology, and Seismicity; 15-Hydrology, Water Rights, Surface Quality, and Groundwater; 16-Public Services and Utilities; and 18-Recreation.

#### **4.2.4 Plan Area Statements**

TRPA Plan Area Statements (PAS) tier from the Goals and Policies and provide specific policy and land use direction for smaller geographical areas within the Lake Tahoe Region. The Region is divided into

175 separate plan area statements that provides specific goals and policies, a list of permissible uses, maximum allowable densities, eligibility for bonus programs, recreational or commercial use allocations, and maximum acceptable noise levels. The HMR Ski Area Master Plan Project is situated in PAS 157 (Homewood/Ski Homewood Area), 158 (McKinney Tract), and 159 (Homewood/Commercial). The PASs are described in detail in Chapter 6 – Land Use. Table 4.2-2 analyzes consistency between the Proposed Project and Alternatives and the Special Policies in the applicable PAS. Special policies are included to PASs to provide more definitive direction for certain areas in the Basin.

#### **4.2.5 Regional Transportation Plan/Air Quality Plan**

The purpose of the integrated TRPA Regional Transportation Plan/Air Quality Plan (RTP/AQP) is to attain and maintain the ETCCs established by TRPA in 1982 and applicable federal, state, and local standards for transportation and air quality. The RTP/AQP establishes goals and policies to direct future transportation-related decisions. In addition, the RTP/AQP includes an action element with a list of proposed programs, capital improvements, and a financing strategy to construct or operate these improvements. The TRPA Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) also addresses programs, capital improvements and strategies to finance the improvements. The TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 91, establishes Air Quality Control Regulations.

#### **4.2.6 Water Quality Management Plan**

The TRPA Water Quality Management Plan (208 Plan) for the Lake Tahoe Region fulfills TRPA's responsibilities under Clean Water Act §208 as delegated by the States of California and Nevada and the USEPA. Those parts of the 208 Plan that are enacted as part of TRPA's Regional Plan package include: the Water Quality Management Plan; Handbook of Best Management Practices; Stream Environment Zone Protection and Restoration Program; and the Capital Improvements Program for Erosion and Runoff Control, which is commonly referred to as the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). The EIP also include improvements identified for all other threshold categories. The 208 Plan identifies water quality objectives and sets water quality standards.

#### **4.2.7 Scenic Quality Improvement Program**

The TRPA Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) presents prescriptions for scenic restoration required to attain and maintain the scenic quality thresholds. The sections relevant to the Project are referenced in Chapter 10-Scenic Resources. The SQIP includes design review guidelines and development standards for different visual environments, assigns implementation responsibilities, and identifies potential funding sources.

**Table 4.2-1****TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

<b>Regional Plan Goals and Policies</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<b>Land Use Element</b>	
<b><i>Land Use</i></b>	
<b><u>Goal #1. Restore, maintain, and improve the quality of the Lake Tahoe Region for the visitors and residents of the Region.</u></b>	
Policy 1. The primary function of the Region shall be as a mountain recreation area with outstanding scenic and natural values.	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Existing development at HMR is compliant with TRPA and Lahontan BMPs. Circulation and urban design features do not meet current standards, and would not be corrected under Alternatives 2 and 4.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Although this alternative maintains mountain recreation, the visual impact of the high-density residential structures along SR 89 does not promote outstanding scenic values. In addition, the South Base area SEZ will not be restored.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, and 6.</u> Redevelopment would restore the SEZ and promote recreational/tourist development through continued operation of the ski resort.</p>
Policy 2. The Regional Plan gives a high priority to correcting past deficiencies in land use. The Plan shall encourage a redirection strategy for substantially and adversely altered areas, wherever feasible.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4 and 6.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 4 and 6 include land use changes in an area with a “redirection” mitigation strategy. The uses proposed are either consistent with the “redirection” plan area or promote appropriate development within the plan area with amendment.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 5.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in changes to existing conditions. The visual impact of the high-density residential structure and the substantial density (45 DUA) proposed in Alternative 5 does not support redirection.</p>
Policy 3. The Plan shall seek to maintain a balance between economic health and the environment.	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2, 4, and 5.</u> Without redevelopment of the existing Project area (Alternative 2), the resort would continue to operate at a loss according to HMR and may close resulting in significant economic and recreational loss in the West Shore. Alternative 4 would close the resort, resulting in a long-term economic loss for the West Shore. Although Alternative 5 proposes a new mix of uses, the density of use would result in land uses that are not reflective of the community and that do not enhance existing scenic quality.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6.</u> Redevelopment would restore portions of the disturbed SEZ, reduce coverage, reduce fuels and rehabilitate disturbed areas on the mountain, improve the quality of stormwater runoff, enhance the scenic character and promote recreational/tourist development.</p>

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<b>Goal #2. Direct the amount and location of new land uses in conformance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities and the other goals of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.</b>	
Policy 1. The total population permitted in the region at one time shall be a function of the constraints of the Regional Plan and the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not change existing population. Alternative 4 will increase the population, but not substantially and would not adversely affect carrying capacities. Population increases under Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6 are primarily transient tourist populations, although some increase in resident populations will occur. Transfer units and development rights have been purchased or requested (bonus units) to accommodate the additional tourist accommodation and second home users as well as full time population in the initial phase of MP development.
Policy 2. Specific land use policies shall be implemented through the use of Planning Area Statements for each of the Planning Areas identified in the map included in this Plan. Areas of similar use and character have been mapped and categorized within one or more of the following five land use classifications: Conservation, Recreation, Residential, Commercial and Public Service, and Tourist. These land use classifications shall dictate allowable land uses. More detailed plans, called Community Plans, may be developed for designated commercial areas. Other detailed plans, such as the Airport Master Plan, Ski Area Master Plans, and Redevelopment Plans, may also be developed. These detailed Plans may combine two or more of the five land use classifications.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 6.</u> The Project develops a Ski Area Master Plan for HMR. Alternative 2 does not change the PAS. Alternatives 1, 3, and 6 result in changes to the PAS; however, these changes (including multi-family housing) are consistent with the existing land use classifications and the land uses proposed support existing policies in the PAS. <u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 4 and 5.</u> Alternative 4 changes the land use classification for PAS 157 from recreation to residential and eliminates the primary use for this area. Alternative 5 proposes to amend the PAS to include multi-family dwellings at a density of 45 DUA (in order to place all residential uses in existing parking lots), which does not reflect densities planned for in the region and would not be consistent.
Policy 3. The Planning Area Statements shall also identify the management theme for each Planning Area by designating each area for (1) maximum regulation, (2) development with mitigation, or (3) redirection of development. These designations shall provide additional policy direction for regulating land use.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not change the PAS. Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6 result in changes to the PAS; however, these changes are consistent with the existing management themes.
Policy 4. The Planning Area Statements set forth special policy direction to respond to the particular needs, problems, and future development of a specific area. Each planning area statement may vary in detail or specificity depending on the nature of the area and the detail of specificity of related local jurisdiction plans.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not comply with special policies 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, which are related to redevelopment and continued operation of the ski resort. <u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives will comply with policies 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, with proposed amendments to plan area boundaries. However, under current PAS direction, several PAS 157 policies require the preparation of a Community Plan to allow additional development at the base areas.
Policy 5. All Plan Area Statements, Community Plans, or other specific plans adopted by the agency shall specify the total additional development which may be permitted within the Region, not the exceed the limitations set forth in A, B, C, D and E, below [Policy 6]. Reconstruction and relocation of existing development are not considered additional development (See Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement for growth management and transfer of	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 would not result in increased development. HMR has obtained sufficient development rights and transfer units for Alternative 4. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Transfer units and development rights have been purchased or requested (bonus units) to accommodate additional population. Additional units will need to be obtained to meet the total proposed unit numbers for

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
development provisions.)	Phase II development in Alternatives 1 and 3 and a portion of Phase I development in Alternatives 5 and 6.
Policy 7. No new divisions of land shall be permitted within the Region which would create new development potential inconsistent with the goals and policies of this Plan.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No land divisions that would create new development potential beyond that proposed by each alternative would occur.
<p>Policy 10. Uses, legally existing as of the effective date of this Plan, but which are now prohibited, are considered nonconforming and subject to the following policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Nonconforming uses may continue as they exist except where specifically subject to a program of removal or modification.</li> <li>B. Nonconforming uses may not be modified, expanded, or intensified, nor resumed following a significant interruption without the approval of TRPA. Such approval shall be based on criteria set forth in ordinances to ensure that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The activity shall not increase the extent of nonconformity.</li> <li>ii. The activity shall not make it more difficult to attain and maintain environmental threshold carrying capacities.</li> <li>iii. The use is otherwise consistent with applicable Plan Area Statements and Community Plans.</li> </ul> </li> <li>C. Additional rules regarding excess land coverage are set forth in this land use subelement Goal #3, Policy 3.</li> </ul>	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> There are no existing nonconforming uses within the Project area.
Policy 11. Uses of the bodies of water within the Region shall be limited to outdoor water-dependent uses required to satisfy the goals and policies of this Plan.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not propose water body uses. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 propose water taxi service, which is a water dependent alternative transportation use.
Policy 12. Restoration and rehabilitation shall be a high priority for improving environmental quality and community character of areas designated for redirection but not included in a redevelopment plan.	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2, 4 and 5.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not include new improvements to environmental quality or community character. Alternative 5 includes 4-story structures immediately adjacent to SR 89 that do not reflect community character or scenic quality improvement.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, and 6.</u> These alternatives include environmental improvements as listed in Table 6-2 (Chapter 6 of this EIR/EIS) including extensive restoration of disturbed area and dirt roads on the mountain and over 400 acres of fuel reduction treatments. Architecturally appropriate structures and landscaping improve the overall community character.</p>
Policy 13. Redevelopment shall be encouraged in areas designated for redirection to improve environmental quality and community character.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not propose development within an area designated for redirection. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 result in new commercial and tourist uses within the expanded boundary of PAS 159. Placement of new structures that support other existing tourist and recreation uses in PAS 159, environmental improvements, and improvements to

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
	the community character through improved architecture and landscaping support this designation.
<b>Goal #3. All new development shall conform to the Coefficients of Allowable Land Coverage as set forth in “The Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin, California-Nevada, A Guide for Planning, Bailey, 1974.”</b>	
<p>Policy 1. Allowed base land coverage for all new projects and activities shall be calculated by applying the Bailey coefficients, to the applicable area within the parcel boundary, or as otherwise set forth in A, B, and C of this policy.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 maintain land coverage that exceed allowable limits for land capability districts (LCD) 1a, 1b, and 5; however this land coverage is legally existing and not new coverage. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 each reduce legally existing land coverage and relocate it to higher capability lands located at the base areas.</p>
<p>Policy 3. Rehabilitation, reconstruction, and upgrading of the existing inventory of structures or other forms of coverage in the Tahoe region are high priorities of the Regional Plan. To encourage rehabilitation and upgrading of structures, the following policies shall apply:</p> <p>B. Reconstruction, rehabilitation, modification, relocation, or major repair of structures or coverage other than as specified in A above may be allowed, provided such use is allowed under the Land Use Subelement, Goal #2, Policies 8, 9 and 10. For parcels with existing coverage in excess of the Bailey Coefficients, a land coverage mitigation program shall be set by ordinance, which shall provide for the reduction of coverage in an amount proportional to the cost of the repair, reconstruction, relocation, rehabilitation, or modification, and to the extent of excess coverage.</p> <p>C. Existing coverage may be relocated within a parcel provided it is relocated to areas of equal or superior environmental capability consistent with B above.</p> <p>D. In establishing the rehabilitation fee schedule(s) provided for in (3.B.iii), above, the procedures outlined in items i through iv shall be followed.</p> <p>E. In approving repair, reconstruction, rehabilitation, modification, or relocation of structures or other coverage, the Agency shall also apply other relevant standards, including installation of Best Management practices or compliance with the design review guidelines.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 will not rehabilitate or upgrade the existing structures at HMR. This is inconsistent with both Policy 3 and the policies for PAS 157. The existing structures are primarily base facilities for the ski resort operation that are not suitable for rehabilitation.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives will result in the removal of existing structures and replacement with new structures. Total land coverage will be reduced within the Project area. For Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6, the Project area beyond the base areas will be deed restricted from future non-recreational development.</p>
<b>Goal #4. Provide to the greatest extent possible, within the constraints of the environmental threshold carrying capacities, a distribution of land use that ensures the social, environmental, and economic well-being of the Region.</b>	
<p>Policy 1. All persons shall have the opportunity to utilize and enjoy the Region’s natural resources and</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6.</u> Alternative 2 does not redevelop the Project area and does not alter the</p>

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Regional Plan Goals and Policies</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
amenities.	existing use as to prevent people from utilizing HMR as a ski area. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 provide for a greater mix of land uses because they include the addition of commercial uses as well as community serving uses including concert venues and outdoor gathering areas.  <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 will close HMR and will construct commercial uses and single-family houses. This will eliminate a publicly accessible amenity (the ski resort) and will reduce the recreational opportunities in the Region.
Policy 2. No person or persons shall develop property so as to endanger the public health, safety, and welfare.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 will not result in development change. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include water quality improvements. Public health, safety, and welfare would not be endangered by these alternatives.
<b>Goal #5. Coordinate the regulation of land uses within the Region with the land uses surrounding the Region.</b>	
Policy 1. The Regional Plan shall attempt to mitigate adverse impacts generated by the Plan within the Region, and not export the impacts to surrounding areas.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Appropriate mitigation is included in the EIR/EIS to address adverse impacts.
Policy 2. The Agency shall develop joint review agreements with public entities adjoining the region to consider acts of development or impacts of development that cross jurisdictional boundaries.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The TRPA and Placer County are coordinating the environmental review.
<b><i>Housing</i></b>	
<b>Goal #1. To the extent possible, affordable housing will be provided in suitable locations for the residents of the region.</b>	
Policy 1. Special incentives, such as bonus development units, will be given to promote affordable or government-assisted housing for lower income households (80% of respective County's median income) and for very low income households (50% of respective County's median income). Each County's median income will be determined according to the income limits published annually by the department of housing and urban development.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 4 proposes to increase density and local employment opportunities (Alternative 4 during construction only), but does not provide affordable housing units. Alternative 2 would not provide affordable housing for existing winter day use recreation work force.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3 and 5.</u> Alternatives 1 and 3 will provide 13 workforce/affordable housing units close to the North Base commercial/tourist area. Alternatives 5 and 6 would provide 12 units.
Policy 2. Local governments will be encouraged to assume their "fair share" of the responsibility to provide lower and very low income housing.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not provide affordable housing units.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6 would provide up to 13 workforce/affordable housing units to house up to 50 employees close to the North Base commercial/tourist area.
Policy 3. Facilities shall be designed and occupied in accordance with local, regional, state, and federal standards for the assistance of households with low and very low incomes. Such housing units shall be made available for rental or sale at a cost to such persons that	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not provide affordable housing units or generate a need for new affordable housing, so this policy is not applicable.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6.</u> Alternatives 1, 3,



**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
would not exceed the recommended state and federal standards.	5 and 6 would provide up to 13 workforce/affordable housing units close to the North Base commercial/tourist area. These units will be deed restricted to ensure they remain affordable/employee units.
Policy 4. Affordable or government assisted housing for lower income households should be located in close proximity to employment centers, government services, and transit facilities. Such housing must be compatible with the scale and density of the surrounding neighborhood.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not provide affordable housing units, and this policy is not applicable.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6 would provide up 13 workforce/affordable housing units within the North Base commercial/tourist area.</p>
<b>Goal #2. To the extent feasible, without compromising the growth management provisions of the Regional Plan, the attainment of threshold goals, and affordable housing incentive programs, moderate income housing will be encouraged in suitable locations for the residents of the Region.</b>	
Policy 1. Special incentives, such as bonus development units, will be made available to promote housing for moderate income households (120% of respective County’s median income). Such incentives shall be made available within jurisdictions that develop housing programs that are substantially consistent with and complimentary to the Regional Plan.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives propose moderate-income housing (they do propose low income housing) utilizing special incentives; therefore, this policy is not applicable.
Policy 2. Residential units developed using moderate income housing incentives shall be used to provide housing for full-time residents of the Tahoe Basin. Such units shall not be used for vacation rental purposes.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives propose moderate-income housing utilizing special incentives; this policy is not applicable.
Policy 3. Residential units developed using moderate income housing incentives shall remain permanently within the program.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives propose moderate-income housing utilizing special incentives; this policy is not applicable.
<b>Noise</b>	
<b>Goal #1. Single event noise standards shall be attained and maintained.</b>	
Policy 3. Motor vehicles and motorcycles shall comply with the appropriate noise thresholds.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Proposed construction would be consistent with noise standards through implementation of construction noise-reducing practices and observation of 8 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. (TRPA Code Section 23.8) limits of activities that would potentially violate normal noise standards.
Policy 4. Off-road vehicle use is prohibited in the Lake Tahoe Region except on specified roads, trails, or designated areas where impacts can be mitigated.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No recreational off-road vehicle use is proposed. Off-road vehicle use is not proposed outside the construction corridor.
Policy 5. The use of snowmobiles will be restricted to designated areas.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No recreational snowmobile trails or rentals are proposed under the alternatives.
Policy 6. The Plan will permit uses only if they are consistent with the noise standards. Sound proofing practices may be required on all structures containing uses that would otherwise adversely impact prescribed	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 will not result in uses that increase noise levels.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6.</u> Existing snowmaking noise currently exceeds thresholds</p>

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Regional Plan Goals and Policies</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
noise levels.	in the Project area. These alternatives either maintain existing snowmaking or propose additional snowmaking devices and therefore may increase existing noise levels. Mitigation measures have been proposed to control noise levels to ensure they do not increase at noise sensitive land uses.
<b>Goal #2. Community noise equivalent levels shall be attained and maintained.</b>	
Policy 1. Transmission of noise from the transportation corridors shall be reduced.	<u>Consistent with Mitigation – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area is currently not in attainment for noise. Mitigation measures are proposed to reduce noise level increases associated with the Project within the vicinity of the Project area.
<b><i>Natural Hazards</i></b>	
<b>Goal #1. Risks from natural hazards (e.g., flood, fire, avalanche, earthquake) will be minimized.</b>	
Policy 1. Development shall be regulated in identified avalanche or mass instability hazard areas.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new structures. Structures proposed under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 are not located within the avalanche path area.
Policy 2. Prohibit construction, grading, and filling of lands within the 100-year flood plain and in the area of wave run-up except as necessary to implement the goals and policies of the Plan. Require all public utilities, transportation facilities, and other necessary public uses located in the 100-year flood plain and area of wave run-up to be constructed or maintained to prevent damage from flooding and to not cause flooding.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 includes existing buildings within the floodplain but proposes no new structures or ground disturbing activity. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 include removing structures from the 100-year floodplain located along Homewood Creek through the South Base area.
Policy 3. Inform residents and visitors of the wildfire hazard associated with occupancy in the Basin. Encourage use of fire resistant materials and fire preventative techniques when constructing structures, especially in the highest fire hazard areas. Manage forest fuels to be consistent with state laws and other goals and policies of this Plan.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new structures. Under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 include new structures that will be equipped with appropriate fire protection devices such as sprinklers and extinguishers as required by Placer County Building Codes. Fuel reduction and forest management will continue to occur under Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6.
<b><i>Air Quality</i></b>	
<b>See:</b> Volume II of the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan for standards	<p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 will not result in changes to existing conditions.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6.</u> These alternatives include ground disturbance and potential increases in operational pollutants; however, implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in Chapter 12 of the EIR/EIS will result in compliance with air quality policies.</p>

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<b><i>Water Quality</i></b>	
<b>TRPA §208 Water Quality Control Plan Standards</b>	
<p><u><i>Pelagic Lake Tahoe</i></u></p> <p>1. NUMERICAL STANDARD: Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen (N) loading from all sources by 25% of the 1973-81 annual average. Achieve the following long term water quality standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annual mean phytoplankton primary productivity: 52gmC/m2/yr.</li> <li>- Winter (December - March) mean Secchi disk transparency: 33.4m.</li> </ul> <p>2. POLICY: This threshold is currently being exceeded and will likely continue to be exceeded until some time after full implementation of the loading reductions prescribed by the thresholds.</p> <p>3. MANAGEMENT STANDARD: Reduce the loading of dissolved phosphorus, iron, and other algal nutrients from all sources as required to achieve ambient standards for primary productivity and transparency.</p> <p>4. Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loads from surface runoff by approximately 50%, from groundwater approximately 30%, and from atmospheric sources approximately 20% of the 1973-81 annual average. This threshold relies on predicted reductions in pollutant loadings from out-of-basin sources as part of the total pollutant loading reduction necessary to attain environmental standards, even though the Agency has no direct control over out-of-basin sources. The cooperation of the states of California and Nevada will be required to control sources of air pollution which contribute nitrogen loadings to the Lake Tahoe Region.</p>	<p><b>Consistent – All Alternatives.</b> In the North and South Base areas, stormwater treatment systems and water quality BMPs were installed in 2006 and improved snow management implemented in 2007. Alternative 2 will maintain existing systems, BMPs and snow management. To reduce pollutant loading, Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 will install new stormwater treatment systems designed to meet minimum TRPA standards (and achieve 50 year/1 hour standards for Alts 1, 3, 5 and 6), low impact development (LID) strategies and water quality BMPs, improve SEZ setbacks and remove and restore land coverage.</p>
<p><u><i>Littoral Lake Tahoe</i></u></p> <p>1. NUMERICAL STANDARD: Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loading to Lake Tahoe from all sources by 25% of the 1973-81 annual average.</p> <p>2. MANAGEMENT STANDARD: Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loads from surface runoff by approximately 50%, from groundwater approximately 30%, and from atmospheric sources approximately 20% of the 1973-81 annual average. This threshold relies on predicted reductions in pollutant loadings from out-of-basin sources as part of the total pollutant loading reduction necessary to attain environmental standards, even though the Agency has no direct control over out of Basin sources. The cooperation of the states of California and Nevada will be required to control sources of air pollution which contribute nitrogen loadings to the Lake Tahoe Region.</p> <p>3. NUMERICAL STANDARD: Decrease sediment load as required to attain turbidity values not to exceed three NTU. In addition, turbidity shall not exceed one</p>	<p><b>Consistent – All Alternatives.</b> In the North and South Base areas, stormwater treatment systems and water quality BMPs were installed in 2006 and improved snow management implemented in 2007. Alternative 2 will maintain existing systems, BMPs and snow management. To reduce pollutant loading, Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 will install new stormwater treatment systems to meet minimum TRPA standards (and achieve 50 year/1 hour standards for Alts 1, 3, 5 and 6), low impact development (LID) strategies and water quality BMPs, improve SEZ setbacks and remove and restore land coverage.</p>

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<p>NTU in shallow waters of the Lake not directly influenced by stream discharges.</p> <p>4. Reduce the loading of dissolved inorganic nitrogen, dissolved phosphorus, iron, and other algal nutrients from all sources to meet the 1967-71 mean values for phytoplankton primary productivity and periphyton biomass in the littoral zone.</p>	
<p><u>Tributaries</u></p> <p>1. NUMERICAL STANDARD: Attain applicable state standards for concentrations of dissolved inorganic nitrogen, dissolved phosphorus, and dissolved iron. Attain a 90 percentile value for suspended sediment concentration of 60 mg/l.</p> <p>2. MANAGEMENT STANDARD: Reduce total annual nutrient and suspended sediment load to achieve loading thresholds for littoral and pelagic Lake Tahoe.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> No restoration of the Homewood Creek SEZ would occur and existing impacts to the Homewood Creek alignment and channel stability would persist.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 4, 5 and 6.</u></p> <p>These alternatives do not propose to restore the Homewood Creek SEZ; however, the implementation of SEZ protection and restoration mitigation would result in compliance.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> Alternatives 1 and 3 include the removal of an existing culvert on Homewood Creek and restoring SEZ in the North and South Base areas.</p>
<p><u>Surface Runoff</u></p> <p>1. NUMERICAL STANDARD: Achieve a 90 percentile concentration value for dissolved inorganic nitrogen of 0.5 mg/l, for dissolved phosphorus of 0.1 mg/l, and for dissolved iron of 0.5 mg/l in surface runoff directly discharged to a surface water body in the Basin.</p> <p>2. Achieve a 90 percentile concentration value for suspended sediment of 250 mg/l.</p> <p>3. MANAGEMENT STANDARD: Reduce total annual nutrient and suspended sediment loads as necessary to achieve loading thresholds for tributaries and littoral and pelagic Lake Tahoe.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> In the North and South Base areas, stormwater treatment systems and water quality BMPs were installed in 2006 and improved snow management implemented in 2007. Alternative 2 will maintain existing systems, BMPs and snow management. To reduce pollutant loading, Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 will install new stormwater treatment systems, low impact development (LID) strategies and water quality BMPs, improve SEZ setbacks and remove and restore land coverage.</p>
<p><u>Groundwater</u></p> <p>1. MANAGEMENT STANDARD: Surface runoff infiltration into the groundwater shall comply with the uniform Regional Runoff Quality Guidelines as set forth in Table 4-12 of the <i>Draft Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity Study Report</i>, May, 1982.</p> <p>2. Where there is a direct and immediate hydraulic connection between ground and surface waters, discharges to groundwater shall meet the guidelines for surface discharges, and the <i>Uniform Regional Runoff Quality Guidelines</i> shall be amended accordingly.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> No new underground structures or excavations are proposed.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6.</u> Excavation and fill activities for underground parking will encounter groundwater. Implementation of groundwater mitigation measures to properly collect and infiltrate intercepted groundwater would result in compliance.</p>
<p><b>Goal #1. Reduce loads of sediment and algal nutrients to Lake Tahoe; meet sediment and nutrient objectives for tributary streams, surface runoff, and sub-surface runoff, and restore 80% of the disturbed lands.</b></p>	
<p>Policy 1. Discharge of municipal or industrial wastewater to Lake Tahoe, its tributaries, or the groundwaters of the Tahoe Region is prohibited, except for existing development operating under approved alternative plans for wastewater disposal, and</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Wastewater will be disposed of through local sewer service facilities. No wastewater will be discharged to waterways.</p>

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Regional Plan Goals and Policies</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
catastrophic wildfire protection to prevent the imminent destruction of the Luther Pass Pump Station.	
Policy 2. All persons who own land and all public agencies which manage public lands in the Lake Tahoe Region shall put Best Management Practices (BMPs) in place; maintain their BMPs; protect vegetation on their land from unnecessary damage; and restore the disturbed soils on their land.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 implemented BMPs in 2006/2007 and includes ongoing site maintenance. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 5 include new BMPs, landscaping, restoration, and/or stormwater treatment systems.
Policy 3. Application of BMPs to projects shall be required as a condition of approval for all projects.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 implemented BMPs in 2006/2007 and includes ongoing site maintenance. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include new BMPs, landscaping, restoration, and/or stormwater treatment systems.
Policy 4. Restore at least 80% of the disturbed lands within the region.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> Land restoration would not occur for this alternative.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Existing disturbed land would be restored at various amounts under each alternative.
Policy 5. Restore 25% of the SEZ lands that have been disturbed, developed, or subdivided in accordance with the CIP.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2.</u> SEZ restoration is not proposed under Alternative 2.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6.</u> SEZ restoration at Homewood Creek is proposed for Alternatives 1 and 3. Alternatives 4, 5 and 6 do not propose to restore the Homewood Creek SEZ; however, the implementation of SEZ protection and restoration mitigation would result in compliance. These alternatives would remove land coverage from the SEZ located at the North Base area gravel parking lot.
Policy 6. The use of fertilizer within the Tahoe Region shall be restricted to uses, areas, and practices, identified in the <i>Handbook of Best Management Practices</i> . Fertilizers shall not be used in or near stream and drainage channels or in stream environment zones, including setbacks, and in shorezone areas. Fertilizer use for maintenance of preexisting landscaping shall be minimized in stream environment zones and adjusted or prohibited if found, through evaluation of continuing monitoring results, to be in violation of applicable water quality discharge and receiving water standards.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose landscaping or a change in the use of fertilizer.  <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives include landscaping that may require fertilizer. Mitigation for these alternatives will be implemented, requiring a landscape and fertilizer management plan approved by TRPA and Placer County.
Policy 7. Off road vehicle use is prohibited in the Lake Tahoe Region except on specified roads, trails, or designated areas where the impacts can be mitigated.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives include off-road vehicle use outside the construction area or during operations.
Policy 8. Transportation and air quality measures aimed at reducing airborne emissions of oxides of nitrogen shall be carried out.	<u>Consistent with Mitigation– All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 would not result in new transportation-related air emissions. Alternative 4 results in less vehicle traffic than existing conditions. Alternative 1, 3, 5, and 6 include measures that minimize trips and VMT, including alternative transportation and roadway improvements.

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
	Mitigation measures may include implementation or participation in implementation of transportation and roadway improvements and/or payment into the traffic and air quality mitigation program.
<b>Goal #2. Reduce or eliminate the addition of other pollutants which affect, or potentially affect, water quality in the Tahoe Basin.</b>	
Policy 1. All persons engaging in public snow disposal operations in the Tahoe Region shall dispose of snow in accordance with site criteria and management standards in <i>The Handbook of Best Management Practices</i> .	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Snow will be stockpiled and treated onsite in accordance with management standards.
Policy 2. Discharges of sewage to Lake Tahoe, its tributaries, or the groundwaters of the Lake Tahoe Region are prohibited. Sewage collection, conveyance and treatment districts shall have approved spill contingency, prevention, and detection plans.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The alternatives include permitted sewage collection systems.
Policy 3. All institutional users of road salt in the Lake Tahoe Region shall keep records showing the time, rate, and location of salt application. Storage of road salt shall be in accordance with <i>The Handbook of Best Management Practices</i> .	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> HMR does not propose the use of road salt within the North and South Base areas.
Policy 4. Underground storage tanks for sewage, fuel, or other potentially harmful substances shall meet standards set forth in TRPA ordinances, and shall be installed, maintained, and monitored in accordance with <i>The Handbook of Best Management Practices</i> .	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Fuel storage is not needed for Alternative 4. Above ground fuel storage is an existing use at the South Base area that will be relocated to the Mid-Mountain area for tracked vehicles under Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6. Placement and use of these tanks will be above ground in accordance with the Handbook of Best Management Practices.
Policy 5. No person shall dispose of solid wastes in the Lake Tahoe Region by depositing them on or in the land, except as provided by TRPA ordinance.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives propose to dispose of solid waste on the Project area.
<b>Community Design</b>	
<b>Goal #1. Insure preservation and enhancement of the natural features and qualities of the region, provide public access to scenic views, and enhance the quality of the built environment.</b>	
Policy 1. The scenic quality ratings established by the environmental thresholds shall be maintained or improved.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2, 4 and 5.</u> Alternative 2 would maintain existing structures that are not consistent with design guidelines and would not improve scenic quality. Alternative 4 would not increase public access to scenic views, as it would limit mountain access to private property owners. For Alternative 5, the visual impact of the high-density residential area adjacent to SR 89 does not maintain scenic quality ratings.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, and 6 would improve scenic quality ratings by improving the layout and visual characteristics of the North Base and South Base areas.
Policy 2. Restoration programs based on incentives will be implemented in those areas designated in need	<u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not include restoration programs.

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<p>of scenic restoration to achieve the recommended rating.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> The visual impact of the high-density residential area adjacent to SR 89 does not improve scenic quality ratings.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 6.</u> Each of these alternatives includes the construction of new buildings and landscaping that would improve the scenic quality ratings. Alternatives 1 and 3 include participation in EIP projects that improve the visual quality, such as landscape improvements and utility undergrounding.</p>
<p><b><u>Goal #2. Regional building and community design criteria shall be established to ensure attainment of the scenic thresholds, maintenance of desired community character, compatibility of land uses, and coordinated project review.</u></b></p>	
<p>Policy 1. Regional design review shall include the following to be used in evaluating projects throughout the Region. This review may entail additional requirements or special requirements not listed below.</p> <p><u>A. Site Design:</u> All new development shall consider site design which includes, at a minimum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Existing natural features to be retained and incorporated into the site design.</li> <li>2) Building placement and design to be compatible with adjacent properties and consideration of solar exposure, climate, noise, safety, fire protection, and privacy.</li> <li>3) Site planning to include a drainage, infiltration, and grading plan meeting BMP standards.</li> <li>4) Access, parking, and circulation to be logical, safe, and meet the requirements of the transportation element.</li> </ol> <p><u>B. Building Height, Bulk and Scale:</u> Standards shall be adopted to ensure attractive and compatible development. The following shall be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Building height shall be limited to two stories except that provisions for additional height requirements shall be provided for unique situations such as lighting towers, ski towers, steep sites, redevelopment projects and tourist accommodation facilities.</li> <li>2) Building height limits shall be established to ensure that buildings do not project above the forest canopy, ridge lines, or otherwise detract from the viewshed.</li> <li>3) Buffer requirements shall be established for noise, snow removal, aesthetic, and environmental purposes.</li> <li>4) The scale of structures should be consistent with surrounding uses.</li> <li>5) Viewshed should be considered in all new construction. Emphasis should be placed on lake views from major transportation corridors.</li> </ol> <p><u>C. Landscaping:</u> The following should be considered with respect to this design component of a project:</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new structures, but the lack of appropriate screening and landscaping make this alternative inconsistent.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> The visual impact from the four-story, high-density residential structure does not promote scenic quality ratings or consistency with the scale of surrounding buildings.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4 and 6.</u> Alternatives 1 and 6 include a new height amendment that would allow for additional height within the Project area. The analysis concludes that additional height can be provided and improve existing scenic quality ratings. Alternatives 1, 3 and 6 include new buildings with an Old Tahoe architectural style that includes substantial landscaping and buffering, installation of BMPs, appropriate placement per land use, underground parking, appropriate lighting and signage (to be compliant as stated in mitigation), and incorporation of natural features to buffer views of buildings. Alternative 4 would include new commercial buildings at the North Base area with layout and landscaping/buffering improvements. Although the structures are not yet fully designed, they must be designed in compliance with height, bulk, and scale, lighting, and signage limits.</p>

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<p>1) Native vegetation should be utilized whenever possible.</p> <p>2) Vegetation should be used to screen parking and to alleviate long strips of parking space.</p> <p>3) Plants should be used to give privacy, reduce glare and heat, deflect wind, muffle noise, prevent erosion, and soften the line of architecture.</p> <p><b>D. Lighting:</b> Lighting increases the operational efficiency of a site. In determining the lighting for a project, the following should be considered:</p> <p>1) Exterior lighting should be minimized with an emphasis on safety and should be consistent with the architectural design.</p> <p>2) Overall levels should be compatible with the neighborhood light level. Emphasis should be placed on a few, well placed, low intensity lights.</p> <p>3) Lights should not blink, flash, or change intensity.</p> <p><b>E. Signing:</b> In determining sign design, the following should be considered:</p> <p>1) Off premise signs are prohibited.</p> <p>2) Signs should be incorporated into building design.</p> <p>3) When possible, signs should be consolidated into clusters to avoid clutter.</p> <p>4) Signage should be attached to buildings when possible.</p> <p>5) Standards for height, lighting, and square footage for on premise signs shall be formulated and shall be consistent with the land uses permitted in each district.</p>	
<p>Policy 2. Local jurisdictions are encouraged to adopt design guidelines consistent with the Regional Plan.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Since no TRPA Community Plan was developed, there are no additional TRPA design guidelines for the Project area.</p>
<p><b>Transportation Element</b></p>	
<p><b>Goal #1.</b> It is the goal of the Regional Transportation Plan to fulfill the requirements of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.</p>	
<p><b>Goal #2.</b> It is the goal of the Regional Transportation Plan to attain and maintain the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and federal, state, and local transportation standards.</p>	
<p><b>Goal #3.</b> It is the goal of the Regional Transportation Plan to establish a safe, efficient, and integrated transportation system which reduces reliance on the private automobile, provides for alternative modes of transportation, and serves the basic transportation needs of the citizens of the Tahoe Region, supports the economic base of the Region in the movement of goods and people, and minimizes adverse impacts on man and the environment.</p>	
<p>Policy 2. Plan for and promote land use changes and development patterns which will encourage the use of alternative transportation modes and minimize impacts on the existing transportation system.</p> <p>A. Community Plans shall promote land use development patterns and designs which will increase the ability to use public transportation,</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not include infill or new alternative transportation options.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6.</u> A Community Plan has not been developed for this area; however Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6 include improvements to public transit systems and the addition of new water-taxi, shuttle, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.</p>



Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<p>waterborne, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</p> <p>B. Community Plans shall promote the development of neighborhood commercial areas which will reduce travel distances.</p> <p>C. Development patterns shall provide for the in-fill of existing areas, making use of existing transportation facilities and promoting the use of alternative transportation modes.</p> <p>D. New, expanded or revised developments and land uses shall fully mitigate their regional and cumulative traffic impacts.</p> <p>E. Parking for residential usage shall meet TRPA standards and shall be provided on-site.</p> <p>F. Parking for non-residential uses shall be the minimum/maximum required to meet the demand for parking generated by the use, except as may be offset by reducing parking demand through parking management and trip reduction programs.</p> <p>G. Driveways shall be designed and sited to minimize impacts on public transportation, adjacent roadways and intersections, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</p> <p>H. Public land management agencies shall develop transit services that manage access.</p>	<p>Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 5 include neighborhood commercial uses in the base area. Alternatives 1, 3, and 5 include mixed-use development that attracts and keeps tourism onsite with the addition of summer recreation and other amenities. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include traffic mitigation measures that will be implemented.</p> <p>Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 include parking mitigation to meet Placer County requirements. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include winter ticket sales limits with only those arriving via transit or shuttle obtaining tickets once the parking lots are full. Provision of onsite hotel and timeshare units will reduce the number of day-use vehicles.</p>
<p>Policy 3. Actively pursue programs that promote the use of mass transit as an alternative to the automobile.</p> <p>A. Expansion of transit services shall be provided to residential areas of the Region with the system being appropriate for the area to be served, and shall be consistent with the Action element of the TRPA Regional Transportation Plan.</p> <p>B. Public or private transit services shall be given preference in mitigating traffic and transportation related impacts due to new, expanded or revised development or land use activities.</p> <p>C. Transit facilities shall be provided which encourage the use of public transit services, with new or revised developments incorporating transit facilities into their designs or plans.</p> <p>E. Bus lanes with preferential signal controls should be implemented along U.S. 50, California 89 and California/Nevada 28.</p> <p>F. Alternative transit modes including fixed guideway systems should be implemented.</p> <p>G. Multi-modal transfer facilities shall be located in activity centers in both the North and South Shore areas.</p> <p>H. Transit shelters shall be provided at major transit stops.</p> <p>I. Transit services shall be provided to connect the North and South Shore areas of the Tahoe Region.</p> <p>J. Transit services shall be provided to beaches, campgrounds and other summer-time recreational areas.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new mass transit facilities but would retain the existing transit stops onsite. Alternative 4 will maintain the transit stops onsite, but would not expand alternative transportation options. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include transit shelters, dial-a-ride, shuttle, and water taxi services as well as a free bicycle fleet service and a hybrid electric rental car fleet for HMR guests. These alternatives will result in the extension of the West Shore Bike Trail through the North Base area.</p>

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<p>K. Transit excursion services should be provided in the Region.</p>	
<p>Policy 4. Develop and encourage the use of pedestrian and bicycle facilities as a safe and viable alternative to automobile use.</p> <p>A. There shall be a high priority on constructing pedestrian and bicycle facilities in urbanized areas of the Region and where reductions in congestion will result.</p> <p>B. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities shall be constructed, or upgraded, and maintained along major travel routes.</p> <p>C. Where it is not feasible to construct or maintain Class I bicycle paths along the Region's major travel routes, Class II bicycle lanes should be provided on roadway shoulders.</p> <p>D. Bicycle racks or storage facilities shall be provided at non-residential developments, transit stops, and on transit vehicles.</p> <p>E. Bicycle and pedestrian linkages shall be provided between residential and non-residential areas.</p> <p>F. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities in urbanized areas and along transportation routes used for commuting should be maintained to allow year-around use of the facilities.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent</u> – Alternatives 2 and 4. These alternatives do not include construction of bike trails or pedestrian paths.</p> <p><u>Consistent</u> – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6. These alternatives include an extension of the West Shore Bike Trail, pedestrian pathways through the base areas, and 5 miles of public hiking trails that are accessible from the base areas. They include a free bike-share program for resort guests.</p>
<p>Policy 5. Implement transportation demand management (TDM) measures to reduce the number of vehicle trips on the Region's highways.</p> <p>A. Transit fare reductions, including free fares, should be used to encourage transit use.</p> <p>B. Employers shall implement vehicle trip reduction programs, including carpool and vanpool matching programs, employee shuttles, flexible work hours, and transit use incentives.</p> <p>C. Public and private employers shall develop parking management programs including preferential parking and reduced parking rates for carpools and vanpools, parking charges for employee parking and paid patron parking.</p> <p>D. Condominiums, timeshares, hotels and motels shall participate in public transit and private shuttle programs, and provide transit information and incentives to their guests and residents.</p> <p>E. Commercial interests providing gaming, recreational activities, or excursion services shall provide or participate in joint shuttle services or provide transit use incentives to their guests or patrons.</p> <p>F. Park-and-Ride facilities shall be provided by local jurisdictions to encourage ridesharing.</p> <p>H. Ski areas and other recreational activity areas shall control the rate of departure of patrons from parking areas to minimize the impact on congested transportation facilities.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent</u> – Alternatives 2 and 4. Transportation demand management measures are not proposed under these alternatives.</p> <p><u>Consistent</u> – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6. These alternatives include employee shuttles, employee transit fares, onsite daycare, onsite employee housing (Alternatives 1 and 3 only), scheduled shuttle service, north to south base shuttles, dial-a-ride services, and water taxis. In addition, lift ticket sales will be limited to persons arriving via transit once parking lots are full. A sign at the Tahoe City 'wye' will relay this information to prevent unnecessary vehicle trips. In general, the variety of amenities at the site, housing and tourist accommodation options, and mixed-uses will keep guests and residents onsite to reduce overall vehicle trips.</p>

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<p>Policy 6. Transportation System Management (TSM) measures shall be used to improve the efficiency of the existing transportation system.</p> <p>A. High occupancy and reversible vehicle lanes should be considered in high traffic demand areas, provided existing roadway capacities can be maintained.</p> <p>B. Traffic conflicts should be reduced by limiting or controlling access to major regional travel routes and major local road ways.</p> <p>C. Intersection improvements required to upgrade existing levels of service including lane restriping, turn lanes, channelization and traffic signals should be implemented when warranted.</p> <p>D. Roadway designs shall accommodate bicycle lanes and transit stops and reduce conflicts between vehicles and bicycle and pedestrians.</p> <p>E. New on-street parking shall be prohibited along major regional travel routes and existing parking should be discouraged along major regional travel routes and local roads.</p> <p>F. View turn-outs should be provided along scenic highways.</p> <p>G. Left-turn lanes and right-turn lanes shall be provided to reduce turning conflicts along major travel routes.</p> <p>H. Utilization of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology shall be implemented consistent with the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) Tahoe Basin ITS Strategic Plan.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Although these alternatives do not include TSM measures, they do not place additional burden on the transportation system because they do not expand uses over existing development levels.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives include mitigation measures to improve the SR 89/Granlibakken Rd. intersection. Parking along SR 89 is not proposed. The project participates in EIP Project #855 to improve the Y at Tahoe City.</p>
<p>Policy 7. Limit improvements to the regional highway system to those necessary to meet the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan.</p> <p>A. The construction of roadways to freeway design standards is inappropriate in the Tahoe Region. However, grade separations may be appropriate at locations where traffic volumes exceed the capability of intersection improvements and local trip reduction measures to meet LOS criteria.</p> <p>B. Highway design criteria shall be developed for the Tahoe Region which minimizes the environmental impact of highway projects while providing for the needs of the traveling public.</p> <p>C. New roadways or projects which expand the capacity of existing roadways shall be consistent with traffic and circulation elements of TRPA adopted redevelopment plans or community plans.</p> <p>D. Local roadways connecting residential areas, and connecting residential areas with non-residential areas, may be constructed provided these roadways are designed to improve local circulation and will not induce through traffic.</p> <p>E. Roadway projects designed to correct hazardous roadway conditions shall be encouraged provided</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Although these alternatives do result in highway system improvements they do not place additional burden on the transportation system. The new neighborhood road proposed to serve the single-family lots under Alternative 4 will not connect to other neighborhood roadways to avoid increased traffic on these roads.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives include mitigation measures to improve the SR 89/Granlibakken Rd. intersection. Project area roadways will not induce through traffic through existing neighborhoods. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 participate in EIP Project #855 to improve the “wy” at Tahoe City.</p>

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<p>these projects are limited to needed safety improvements.</p> <p>F. Level of service (LOS) criteria for the Region's highway system and signalized intersections during peak periods shall be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ "C" on rural recreational/scenic roads.</li> <li>◆ "D" on rural developed area roads.</li> <li>◆ "D" on urban developed area roads.</li> <li>◆ "D" for signalized intersections.</li> <li>◆ "E" may be acceptable during peak periods in urban areas, not to exceed four hours per day.</li> </ul>	
<p>Policy 9. Encourage waterborne transportation systems as an alternative to automobile travel within the Region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Waterborne point-to-point services are encouraged.</li> <li>B. Waterborne excursion services are encouraged.</li> <li>C. Waterborne services shall coordinate with, and provide access to, other public and private transportation systems.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Waterborne transportation is not proposed under these alternatives.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives include waterborne taxi service during the summer.</p>
<p>Policy 10. Improve the mobility of the elderly, handicapped and other transit-dependent groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Provide specialized public transportation services with subsidized fare programs for transit, taxi, demand responsive, and accessible van services.</li> <li>B. Ensure access to the public transportation system by providing and maintaining sidewalks with curb cuts and ramps.</li> <li>C. Provide and maintain accessible transit stops and shelters with ramps and paved areas.</li> <li>D. Provide and maintain accessible transportation vehicles with adequate lifts and ramps and wheelchair tie-downs.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Existing transit service to the Project area includes accessible transportation vehicles. The shuttle services provided under Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 will include an accessible vehicle. Pedestrian pathways will be wheelchair accessible, as will the transit stops and shelters.</p>
<p>Policy 11. Postal Carrier service shall be provided Region wide, with the U.S. Postal Service Tahoe Regional Master Plan identifying priority areas and a timeframe for implementation. The following Regional Goals establish the objectives of the U.S. Postal Service, and the TRPA concerning mail service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. The U.S. Postal Service shall provide mail service for areas not currently served in the Tahoe Region that encourages residents to drive fewer miles for the service. U.S. Postal Service facilities and operations shall maximize reductions in vehicle miles traveled by postal customers to the extent practicable.</li> <li>B. In fulfillment of its national environmental values, the U.S. Postal Service will develop future facilities and implement future operations in ways that meet its desire to protect and preserve the environment.</li> <li>C. Locating new or expanded U.S. Postal Service facilities near population and commercial</li> </ul>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives include a U.S. Post Office on site, although postal service will continue to serve the area. A post office is located near HMR at 5375 West Lake Blvd. Street delivery service does not occur and mail will be picked up from post office boxes.</p>

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<p>concentrations is a priority for both the U.S. Postal Service and the TRPA.</p> <p>D. Many existing U.S. Postal Service facilities require replacement and/or renovation to meet minimum health, safety, operational, environmental, and business requirements. Many elements of the Tahoe Regional Master Plan, such as new services, cannot be realized without improvements in facilities.</p> <p>E. U.S. Postal Service facilities and operations that can meet multiple goals require a partnership between the USPS, TRPA, local and regional agencies, and individual and community groups. These groups should work in partnership to conduct collaborative planning, to identify the appropriate organization to undertake the leadership role on specific issues, and to facilitate project approval.</p> <p>F. To maximize benefit from available financial resources, new facilities and operations shall be prioritized in large measure based on their contribution to overall Master Plan goals.</p> <p>G. U.S. Postal Service facilities and operations that implement TRPA RTP/AQP control strategies (including carrier service) shall receive credit for impact fees equal to the financial contribution. Future consideration may be given to provision of alternative fuel fleet vehicles.</p> <p>H. The U.S. Postal Service and TRPA will diligently pursue Master Plan implementation within the constraints of future available resources.</p>	
<p>Policy 12. Increase the use of alternative fuel vehicles within the Lake Tahoe Basin.</p> <p>A. Future public transit vehicles purchased for operations in the Lake Tahoe Basin shall be alternative fuel powered.</p> <p>B. When considering new or replacement vehicles for public and private fleets alternative fuel vehicles should be purchased.</p> <p>C. TRPA shall phase in alternative fuel vehicle requirements for public and private fleet purchases above 15 vehicles in size.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not propose alternative fuel vehicle services; however, they do not prevent Tahoe Area Transit Service from utilizing alternative fuel vehicles. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 offer hybrid/electric vehicles for rent by resort guests.</p>
<b>Conservation Element</b>	
<i>Vegetation</i>	
<p><b>Common Vegetation</b></p> <p>MANAGEMENT STANDARD: Increase plant and structural diversity of forest communities through appropriate management practices as measured by diversity indices of species richness, relative abundance, and pattern.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain the existing species richness of the Basin by providing for the perpetuation of the following</li> </ul>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 will not result in increase or decrease in plant diversity. Alternatives 1 and 3 result in SEZ restoration, which increases species richness and diversity. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include trail and road restoration, which increases species numbers on the site. Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6 would deed restrict the area beyond the base areas from further non-recreational development, which will help maintain plant diversity.</p>

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<p>plant associations:</p> <p><u>Yellow Pine Forest:</u> Jeffrey pine, White fir, Incense cedar, Sugar pine.</p> <p><u>Red Fir Forest:</u> Red fir, Jeffrey pine, Lodgepole pine, Western white pine, Mountain hemlock, Western juniper.</p> <p><u>Subalpine Forest:</u> Whitebark pine, Mountain hemlock, Mountain mahogany.</p> <p><u>Shrub Association:</u> Greenleaf and Pinemat manzanita, Tobacco brush, Sierra chinquapin, Huckleberry oak, Mountain whitethorn.</p> <p><u>Sagebrush Scrub Vegetation:</u> Basin sagebrush, Bitterbrush, Douglas chaenactis.</p> <p><u>Deciduous Riparian:</u> Quaking aspen, Mountain alder, Black cottonwood, Willow.</p> <p><u>Meadow Associations (Wet and Dry Meadow):</u> Mountain squirrel tail, Alpine gentian, Whorled penstemon, Asters, Fescues, Mountain brome, Corn lilies, Mountain bentgrass, Hairgrass, Marsh marigold, Elephant heads, Tinker's penney, Mountain Timothy, Sedges, Rushes, Buttercups.</p> <p><u>Wetland Associations (Marsh Vegetation):</u> Pond lilies, Buckbean, Mare's tail, Pondweed, Common bladderwort, Bottle sedge, Common spikerush.</p> <p><u>Cushion Plant Association (Alpine Scrub):</u> Alpine phlox, Dwarf ragwort, Draba.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relative Abundance -- of the total amount of undisturbed vegetation in the Tahoe Basin: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain at least 4% meadow and wetland vegetation.</li> <li>Maintain at least 4% deciduous riparian vegetation.</li> <li>Maintain no more than 25% dominant shrub association vegetation.</li> <li>Maintain 15-25% of the Yellow Pine Forest in seral stages other than mature.</li> <li>Maintain 15-25% of the Red Fir Forest in seral stages other than mature.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Pattern -- Provide for the proper juxtaposition of vegetation communities and age classes by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limiting acreage size of new forest openings to no more than eight acres.</li> <li>Adjacent openings shall not be of the same relative age class or successional stage to avoid uniformity in stand composition and age.</li> </ol> </li> </ul> <p>A nondegradation standard to preserve plant communities shall apply to native deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations to be consistent with the SEZ threshold. Native vegetation shall be maintained at a maximum</p>	

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<p>level to be consistent with the limits defined in the <i>Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin, California- Nevada, A Guide For Planning</i>, Bailey, 1974, for allowable impervious cover and permanent site disturbance.</p> <p>POLICY STATEMENT: It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board that a nondegradation standard shall permit appropriate management practices.</p>	
<p><b>Late Seral and Old Growth Forest Ecosystems</b>  <b>NUMERICAL STANDARD:</b> Attain and maintain a minimum percentage of 55% by area of forested lands within the Tahoe Region in a late seral or old growth condition, and distributed across elevation zones. To achieve the 55%, the elevation zones shall contribute as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Subalpine zone (greater than 8,500 feet elevation) will contribute 5% (7,600 acres) of the forested lands;</li> <li>• The Upper Montane zone (between 7,000 and 8,500 feet elevation) will contribute 30% (45,900 acres) of forested lands;</li> <li>• The Montane zone (lower than 7,000 feet elevation) will contribute 20% (30,600 acres) of forested lands.</li> </ul> <p>Forested lands within TRPA designated urban areas are excluded in the calculation for threshold attainment. Areas of the montane zone within 1,250 feet of urban areas may be included in the calculation for threshold attainment if the area is actively being managed for late seral and old growth conditions and has been mapped by TRPA. A maximum value of 40% of the lands within 1,250 feet of urban areas may be included in the calculation.</p> <p>Because of these restrictions the following percentage of each elevation zone must be attained to achieve this threshold:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 61% of the Subalpine zone must be in a late seral or old growth condition;</li> <li>• 60% of the Upper Montane zone must be in a late seral or old growth condition;</li> <li>• 48% of the Montane zone must be in a late seral or old growth condition;</li> </ul>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the development areas are considered late seral/old growth.</p>
<p><b>Uncommon Plant Communities</b>  <b>NUMERICAL STANDARD:</b> Provide for the nondegradation of the natural qualities of any plant community that is uncommon to the Basin or of exceptional scientific, ecological, or scenic value. This threshold shall apply but not be limited to (1) the deepwater plants of Lake Tahoe, (2) Grass Lake (sphagnum bog), (3) Osgood swamp, and (4) the Freel Peak Cushion Plant community.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the Alternatives are located in the listed threshold areas. There are no sensitive plant communities within the project area.</p>

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<p><b>Sensitive Plants</b>  <b>NUMERICAL STANDARD:</b> Maintain a minimum number of population sites for each of five sensitive plant species:  <i>Species - Number of Population Sites</i>  <i>Carex paucifructus</i> - 1  <i>Lewisia pygmaea longipetala</i> - 2  <i>Draba asterophora v. macrocarpa</i> - 2  <i>Draba asterophora v. asterophora</i> - 5  <i>Rorippa subumbellata</i> -26</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> There are no known sensitive plant communities within the project area.</p>
<p><b>Goal #1. Provide for a wide mix and increased diversity of plant communities in the Tahoe Basin.</b></p>	
<p>Policy 1. Forest management practices shall be allowed when consistent with acceptable strategies for the maintenance of forest health and diversity, prevention of fire, protection of water quality, and enhancement of wildlife habitats.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> HMR has treated over 400 acres of forested areas to reduce the threat of catastrophic fire. There is a plan to continue the forest thinning/fuels management for forested areas within the 1,253-acre resort as needed. The fuels management program utilizes chipped wood material tilled into and spread onto the forest floor, which helps to reduce storm water runoff and maintain a healthier forest floor.</p>
<p>Policy 2. Opportunities to improve the age structure of the pine and fir plant communities shall be encouraged when consistent with other environmental considerations</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Fuels management is implemented for all alternatives. Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6 would deed restrict the mountain area outside the base areas from future non-recreational development. This may allow future opportunities to improve the age structure. Project mitigation includes the preparation of a Forest Plan to identify treatments to improve forest health.</p>
<p>Policy 3. Forest pattern shall be manipulated whenever appropriate as guided by the size and distribution of forest openings.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in changes to forest openings. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include mitigation for the preparation of a Forest Plan to identify treatments to improve forest health.</p>
<p>Policy 4. Edge zones between adjacent plant communities will be maximized and treated for their special value relative to plant diversity and wildlife habitat.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not propose SEZ restoration located at the South Base.  <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, and 3.</u> Alternatives 1 and 3 include SEZ restoration, which will improve plant diversity and increase the quality of wildlife habitat in the riparian area located at the South Base. Alternatives 5 and 6 will require SEZ restoration as mitigation for development. Each of these Alternatives includes restoration of existing disturbance of mapped SEZ at the North Base area in the gravel parking lot.</p>
<p>Policy 5. Permanent disturbance or unnecessary alteration of natural vegetation associated with development activities shall not exceed the approved boundaries (or footprints) of the building, driveway, or parking structures, or that which is necessary to reduce the risk of fire or erosion.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include new disturbance. The action alternatives propose developments that are limited to building footprints and the surrounding fire suppression area. Existing disturbed roads and trails are being restored to reduce existing disturbance.</p>
<p>Policy 6. The management of vegetation in urban areas shall be in accordance with the policies of this Plan and shall include provisions that allow for the perpetuation</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include new vegetation. The action alternatives include fuels management, SEZ restoration and/or landscaping.</p>



**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
of the natural-appearing landscape.	Landscaping will reflect the surrounding natural environment while improving the overall visual character.
Policy 7. Disturbance or removal of forest litter should be avoided to promote the natural catchment of nutrients.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> HMR has treated over 400 acres of forested areas to reduce the threat of catastrophic fire. There is a plan to continue the forest thinning/fuels management for forested areas within the 1,253-acre resort. The fuels management program utilizes chipped wood material tilled into and spread onto the forest floor, which helps to reduce storm water runoff and maintain a healthier forest floor.
Policy 8. Revegetation of disturbed sites shall require the use of species approved by the Agency. TRPA shall prepare specific policies designed to avoid the unnecessary use of landscaping which requires long-term irrigation and fertilizer use.	<u>Consistent with Mitigation–Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Revegetation of unneeded trails and roads reflect the surrounding plant mixture with approved species. A landscape and fertilizer management plan is proposed mitigation to ensure landscape areas do not use high maintenance and fertilizer reliant species.  <u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not include landscaping. Revegetated areas have used TRPA approved species.
Policy 9. All proposed actions shall consider the cumulative impact of vegetation removal with respect to plant diversity and abundance, wildlife habitat and movement, soil productivity and stability, and water quality and quantity.	<u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives include mitigation to protect nesting raptors, forest health (Forest Plan), and landscape and fertilizer management.  <u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose vegetation removal.
<b>Goal #2. Provide for the maintenance and restoration of such unique ecosystems as wetlands, meadows, and other riparian vegetation.</b>	
Policy 1. Riparian plant communities shall be managed for the beneficial uses of passive recreation, groundwater recharge, and nutrient catchment, and as wildlife habitats.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not include Homewood Creek restoration or protection or SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives include stream restoration on Homewood Creek and SEZ improvements in this area.  <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 4, 5 and 6.</u> These alternatives include mitigation that requires SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.
Policy 2. Riparian plant communities shall be restored or expanded whenever and wherever possible.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not include Homewood Creek restoration or protection or SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives include stream restoration on Homewood Creek and SEZ improvements in this area.  <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 4, 5 and 6.</u> These alternatives include mitigation that requires SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.

<b>Regional Plan Goals and Policies</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<b>Goal #3. Conserve threatened, endangered, and sensitive plant species and uncommon plant communities of the Lake Tahoe Basin.</b>	
Policy 1. Uncommon plant communities shall be identified and protected for their natural values.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> As analyzed in Chapter 8 of this EIR/EIS, no sensitive plant communities are identified in the project area.
Policy 2. The population sites and critical habitat of all sensitive plant species in the Lake Tahoe Basin shall be identified and preserved.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> As analyzed in Chapter 8 of this EIR/EIS, no sensitive plant communities are identified in the project area.
Policy 3. The conservation strategy of Tahoe yellow cress in the Lake Tahoe Basin shall foster stewardship for this species.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> As analyzed in Chapter 8 of this EIR/EIS, no sensitive plant communities are identified in the project area.
<b>Goal #4. Provide for and increase the amount of late seral/old growth stands in the Lake Tahoe Basin.</b>	
Policy 1. Stands exhibiting late seral/old growth characteristics shall be managed to allow these stands to sustain these conditions.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> As analyzed in Chapter 8 of this EIR/EIS, no late seral/old growth stands are identified in the project area.
Policy 2. Stands not exhibiting late seral/old growth characteristics shall be managed to progress towards late seral/old growth	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> As analyzed in Chapter 8 of this EIR/EIS, no late seral/old growth stands are identified in the project area.
Policy 3. Prescriptions for treating these stands will be prepared on stand-by-stand basis. Each prescription will demonstrate/explain how it will promote late seral or old growth characteristics prior to applying any mechanical treatment or prescribed fire. Stand-specific prescriptions will be developed using the best available forest and ecosystem management science, strategies, standards, and guidelines.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> As analyzed in Chapter 8 of this EIR/EIS, no late seral/old growth stands are identified in the project area.
<b>Goal #5. The appropriate stocking level and distribution of snags and coarse woody debris shall be retained in the Region's forests to provide habitat for organisms that depend on such features and to perpetuate natural ecological processes.</b>	
Policy 1. Allow for a sufficient number and appropriate distribution of snags throughout the Region's forests to provide and maintain habitat for species dependent on such features.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> No changes to existing snag distribution would occur.  <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives include mitigation to ensure removed trees/snags are not utilized by nesting raptors. The forest management plan required to be prepared for these alternatives will determine the appropriate number of snags to be retained.
Policy 2. Allow for an appropriate amount, level, and distribution of coarse woody debris (downed woody material) throughout the Region's forests to maintain biological integrity, to stabilize soil, and to afford a reasonable level of fire safety.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The fuels management program utilizes chipped wood material tilled into and spread onto the forest floor, which helps to reduce storm water runoff and maintain a healthier forest floor.

Regional Plan Goals and Policies				HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
Wildlife				
<b>Special Interest Species</b> NUMERICAL STANDARD: Provide a minimum number of population sites and disturbance zones for the following species:				<u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> The project area does not include known populations of these species; however, osprey are known to occur within the vicinity. Mitigation to protect this species includes surveys for nesting raptors and protection of discovered nests during construction.  <u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> No changes will occur under this alternative.
Species of interest	Population sites	Disturbance zone (mi.)	Influence zone (mi.)	
Goshawk	12	0.50	3.50	
Osprey	4	0.25	0.60	
Bald Eagle (Winter)	2	Mapped areas	Mapped areas	
Bald Eagle (Nesting)	1	0.50	Variable	
Golden Eagle	4	0.25	9.0	
Peregrine	2	0.25	7.6	
Waterfowl	18	Mapped areas	Mapped areas	
Deer	-	Meadows	Mapped areas	
<b>Habitats of Special Significance</b> MANAGEMENT STANDARD: A nondegradation standard shall apply to significant wildlife habitat consisting of deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations.				<u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative would not protect Homewood Creek or improve the associated SEZ area.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives daylight the Homewood Creek stream channel and improve the associated SEZ.  <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 4, 5 and 6.</u> These alternatives include mitigation that requires SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.
<b>Goal #1. Maintain suitable habitats for all indigenous species of wildlife without preference to game or non-game species through maintenance of habitat diversity.</b>				
Policy 1. All proposed actions shall consider impacts to wildlife.				<u>Consistent: All Alternatives.</u> This EIR/EIS describes and analyzes potential impacts to wildlife species.
Policy 2. Riparian vegetation shall be protected and managed for wildlife.				<u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not include Homewood Creek restoration or protection or SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives include stream restoration on Homewood Creek and SEZ improvements in this area.  <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 4, 5 and 6.</u> These alternatives include mitigation that requires SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.
Policy 3. Non-native wildlife and exotic species shall be controlled and release of such animals into the wild is forbidden.				<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No Alternative directly or indirectly involves the release or propagation of non-native wildlife species.
Policy 4. Domestic animals and pets shall be controlled and appropriately contained.				<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No Alternative directly or indirectly involves the release or propagation of pets.
<b>Goal #2. Preserve, enhance, and where feasible, expand habitats essential for threatened, endangered, rare, or sensitive species found in the Basin.</b>				
Policy 1. Endangered, threatened, rare, and special interest species shall be protected and buffered against				<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> No new land uses are proposed.

<b>Regional Plan Goals and Policies</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
conflicting land uses.	<u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Listed species potentially occurring onsite may be affected during construction. Implementation of raptor and migratory bird nest protection during construction is proposed.
<b><i>Fisheries</i></b>	
<b>Stream Habitat</b> NUMERICAL STANDARD: Maintain the 75 miles of excellent, 105 miles of good, and 38 miles of marginal stream habitat as indicated by the Stream Habitat Quality Overlay map, as amended May 1997, based upon the re-rated stream scores set forth in Appendix C-1 of the 1996 Evaluation Report.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not include Homewood Creek restoration or protection or SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives include stream restoration on Homewood Creek and SEZ improvements in this area.  <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 4, 5 and 6.</u> These alternatives include mitigation that requires SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.
<b>Instream Flows</b> MANAGEMENT STANDARD: Until instream flow standards are established in the Regional Plan to protect fishery values, a nondegradation standard shall apply to instream flows.  POLICY STATEMENT: It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board to seek transfers of existing points of water diversion from streams to Lake Tahoe.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The alternatives do not propose to affect instream flows.
<b>Lahontan Cutthroat Trout</b> POLICY STATEMENT: It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board to support, in response to justifiable evidence, state and federal efforts to reintroduce Lahontan cutthroat trout.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The alternatives do not prevent reintroduction of Lahontan cutthroat trout.
<b>Lake Habitat</b> MANAGEMENT STANDARD: A nondegradation standard shall apply to fish habitat in Lake Tahoe. Achieve the equivalent of 5,948 total acres of excellent habitat as indicated by the Prime Fish Habitat Overlay Map dated 5/19/97 as may be amended from time to time.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The alternatives do not include changes to the flow in creeks or degradation of surrounding vegetation.
<b>Goal #1. Improve aquatic habitat essential for the growth, reproduction, and perpetuation of existing and threatened fish resources in the Lake Tahoe Basin.</b>	
Policy 1. Development proposals affecting streams, lakes and adjacent lands shall evaluate impacts to the fishery.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Development will not occur within stream channels. BMPs and stormwater improvements will improve water quality.
Policy 2. Unnatural blockages and other impediments to fish movement will be prohibited and removed wherever possible.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> Culvert removal within the Homewood Creek channel at the South Base is proposed.  <u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Culvert removal within the Homewood Creek channel at the South Base is not proposed.
Policy 3. An instream maintenance program should be developed and implemented.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not include Homewood Creek restoration or protection or

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
	<p>SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives include stream restoration on Homewood Creek and SEZ improvements in this area.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 4, 5 and 6.</u> These alternatives include mitigation that requires SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.</p>
Policy 5. Habitat improvement projects are acceptable practices in streams and lakes.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The only projects proposed within stream areas are channel and vegetation restoration and protection.
Policy 6. Instream flows shall be regulated, when feasible, to maintain fishery values.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The alternatives do not include changes to the flow in creeks or degradation of surrounding vegetation. The State Board water rights database identifies six points of diversion within the project area. The project or alternatives do not include actions to develop these points of diversion. Any future diversions would require subsequent environmental analysis.
Policy 7. Existing points of water diversion from streams shall be transferred to the Lake, whenever feasible, to help protect instream beneficial uses.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The alternatives do not propose water diversions from streams.
Policy 8. Support, in response to justifiable evidence, state and federal efforts to reintroduce Lahontan cutthroat trout in appropriate remote locations.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The alternatives do not prevent reintroduction of Lahontan cutthroat trout.
<b>Soils</b>	
<b>Impervious Cover</b> MANAGEMENT STANDARD: Impervious cover shall comply with the <i>Land-Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin, California-Nevada, A Guide For Planning</i> , Bailey, 1974.	
Stream Environment Zones NUMERICAL STANDARD: Preserve existing naturally functioning SEZ lands in their natural hydrologic condition, restore all disturbed SEZ lands in undeveloped, unsubdivided lands, and restore 25% of the SEZ lands that have been identified as disturbed, developed or subdivided, to attain a 5% total increase in the area of naturally functioning SEZ lands.	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2.</u> This alternative does not include Homewood Creek restoration or protection or SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives include stream restoration on Homewood Creek and SEZ improvements in this area.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 4, 5 and 6.</u> These alternatives include mitigation that requires SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.</p>
<b>Goal #1. Minimize soil erosion and the loss of productivity.</b>	
Policy 1. Allowable impervious land coverage shall be consistent with the threshold for impervious land coverage.	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> The existing land coverage under these alternatives exceed coverage limits within Class 1a, 1b, and 5 lands; and will not be removed and restored.</p> <p><u>Consistent– Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6.</u> Existing coverage over base allowable limits will be removed and restored or mitigated with payment of excess land coverage</p>

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
	mitigation fees.
<p>Policy 2. No new land coverage or other permanent disturbance shall be permitted in land capability districts 1-3 except for those uses as noted in A, B and C below:</p> <p>A. Single family dwellings may be permitted in land capability districts 1-3 when reviewed and approved pursuant to the individual parcel evaluation system (IPES). (See Goal #1, Policy 2, Development and Implementation Subelement).</p> <p>B. Public outdoor recreation facilities may be permitted in land capability districts 1-3 under certain conditions (1 through 6).</p> <p>To the fullest extent possible, recreation facilities must be sited outside of Land Capability Districts 1-3. However, the six-part test established by the policy allows encroachment of these lands where such encroachment is essential for public outdoor recreation, and precautions are taken to ensure that such lands are protected to the fullest extent possible. The restoration requirements of this policy can be accomplished on-site or off-site, and shall be in lieu of any coverage transfer or coverage mitigation provisions else where in this Plan.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> The existing land coverage under these alternatives exceed coverage limits within Class 1a and 1b lands; and will not be removed and restored.</p> <p><u>Consistent– Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6.</u> Land coverage in districts 1-3 will be relocated within the Project area and restored as required by TRPA Codes.</p>
<p>Policy 4. TRPA shall develop specific policies to limit land disturbance and reduce soil and water quality impacts of disturbed areas.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Analysis of each of the alternatives includes land disturbance (Chapter 14). BMPs are being installed for all alternatives to reduce erosion and improve water quality.</p>
<p>Policy 6. Grading, filling, clearing of vegetation (which disturbed soil), or other disturbances of the soil are prohibited during inclement weather and for the resulting period of time when the site is covered with snow or is in a saturated, muddy, or unstable condition. Special regulations and construction techniques will apply to all construction activities occurring between October 15 and May 1.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Ground disturbing construction activities are not proposed during the winter season. Appropriate construction techniques will be used and BMPs in place to maintain water quality.</p>
<p>Policy 7. All existing natural functioning SEZs shall be retained as such and disturbed SEZs shall be restored whenever possible.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2.</u> This alternative does not include Homewood Creek restoration or protection or SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives include stream restoration on Homewood Creek and SEZ improvements in this area.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 4, 5 and 6.</u> These alternatives include mitigation that requires SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.</p>
<p><i>Scenic</i></p>	
<p><b>Roadway and Shoreline Units.</b> NUMERICAL STANDARD: Maintain or improve the</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in changes to the existing conditions and will maintain</p>

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<p>numerical rating assigned each unit, including the scenic quality rating of the individual resources within each unit, as recorded in the Scenic Resources Inventory and shown in Tables 13-3, 13-5, 13-8 and 13-9 of the Draft Study Report.</p> <p>Maintain the 1982 ratings for all roadway and shoreline units as shown in Tables 13-6 and 13-7 of the Draft Study Report.</p> <p>Restore scenic quality in roadway units rated 15 or below and shoreline units rated 7 or below.</p>	<p>existing scenic quality ratings, which are not in attainment.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6.</u> New structures and landscaping along SR 89 will improve the roadway unit rating. Although the mid-mountain lodge is not visible from the road, it will be partially visible from the lake. Implementation of mitigation as proposed in Chapter 10 will maintain the shoreline rating.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternative 4.</u> The new structures and landscaping along SR 89 will improve the roadway unit rating with removal of existing structures and surface parking. Since no home designs are available, it is unknown whether units will be visible from the lake. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measure will ensure the shoreline ratings are maintained.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> The height and massing of the 4-story residential structures adjacent to SR 89 would be highly visible and would have a negative impact on scenic quality ratings.</p>
<p><b>Other Areas.</b></p> <p>NUMERICAL STANDARD: Maintain or improve the numerical rating assigned to each identified scenic resource, including individual subcomponent numerical ratings, for views from bike paths and other recreation areas open to the general public as recorded in the <i>1993 Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Evaluation</i>.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 will maintain existing conditions.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, and 6.</u> These alternatives will result in improvements of the slopes through revegetation and erosion control measures and will improve views from the mountain by developing the mid-mountain lodge and expanding hiking trails on the mountain. This will allow non-skiers to enjoy views.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> With the removal of the ski facilities, the recreation area will be closed and views from the mountain will be lost.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> The height of the 4-story multi-family unit structure would be highly visible as viewed from SR 89 and uncharacteristic of the area.</p>
<p><b>Goal #1. Maintain and restore the scenic qualities of the natural appearing landscape.</b></p>	
<p>Policy 1. All proposed developments shall examine impacts to the identified landscape views from roadways, bikepaths, public recreation areas, and Lake Tahoe.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> An analysis of landscape views of each alternative is included in Chapter 10 of the EIR/EIS.</p>
<p>Policy 2. Any development proposed in areas targeted for scenic restoration or within a unit highly sensitive to change shall demonstrate the effect of the project on the 1982 travel route ratings and scenic thresholds.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> An analysis of each alternative's effect on travel route ratings and thresholds is included in Chapter 10 of the EIR/EIS.</p>
<p>Policy 3. The factors or conditions that contribute to scenic degradation in identified areas need to be recognized and appropriately considered in restoration programs to improve scenic quality.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include a restoration program. Each of the action alternatives includes actions that improve the scenic quality from SR 89, which is an area containing features that contribute to scenic degradation though lack of landscaping, poor architecture, and overhead utilities.</p>

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<b><i>Open Space</i></b>	
<b><i>Goal #1. Manage areas of open space to promote conservation of vegetation and protection of watersheds.</i></b>	
Policy 1. Management practices in open space that provide for the long term health and protection of the resource(s) shall be permitted when consistent with other goals and policies of this Plan.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area is a recreation area and not an open space area. Alternatives 1 and 3 will deed restrict future development on the mountain to only recreational uses.
Policy 2. The beneficial uses of open space shall be protected by regulating uses and restricting access as necessary to maintain soil productivity and acceptable vegetative cover.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area is a recreation area and not an open space area. Alternatives 1 and 3 will deed restrict future development on the mountain.
<b><i>Stream Environment Zone</i></b>	
<b><i>Goal #1. Provide for the long-term preservation and restoration of stream environment zones.</i></b>	
Policy 1. Restore all disturbed stream environment zone lands in undeveloped, unsubdivided lands, and restore 25% of the SEZ lands that have been disturbed, developed, or subdivided.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not include Homewood Creek restoration or protection or SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives include stream restoration on Homewood Creek and SEZ improvements in this area. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 4, 5 and 6.</u> These alternatives include mitigation that requires SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.
Policy 2. SEZ lands shall be protected and managed for their natural values.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not include Homewood Creek restoration or protection or SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives include stream restoration on Homewood Creek and SEZ improvements in this area. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 4, 5 and 6.</u> These alternatives include mitigation that requires SEZ improvements at Homewood Creek.
Policy 3. Groundwater development in SEZ lands shall be discouraged when such development could possibly impact associated plant communities or instream flows.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Groundwater development is not proposed in the SEZ.
Policy 5. No new land coverage or other permanent land disturbance shall be permitted in stream environment zones except for those uses as noted in A, B, C, D, and E.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No new land coverage is proposed in the SEZ.
Policy 6. Replacement of existing coverage in stream environment zones may be permitted where the project will reduce impacts on stream environment zones and will not impede restoration efforts.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Replacement of existing coverage is not proposed in the SEZ, although some coverage will be relocated to construct the bridge span proposed under Alternatives 1 and 3.
<b><i>Cultural</i></b>	
<b><i>Goal #1. Identify and preserve sites of historical, cultural and architectural significance within the Region.</i></b>	
Policy 1. Historical or culturally significant landmarks in the Basin shall be identified and protected from indiscriminate damage or alteration.	<u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Although known historical or culturally significant landmarks do not occur on the Project area, excavation



Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
	<p>has the potential to encounter unknown resources. Mitigation proposed in Chapter 9 of this EIR/EIS ensure such resources are protected.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative would not result in new disturbance.</p>
<p>Policy 2. Sites and structures designated as historically, culturally, or archaeologically significant shall be given special incentives and exemptions to promote the preservation and restoration of such structures and sites.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Historical or culturally significant sites and structures are not identified on the site.</p>
<b>Energy</b>	
<b>Goal #1. Promote energy conservation programs and development of alternative energy sources to lessen dependence on scarce and high-cost energy supplies.</b>	
<p>Policy 1. All new development shall comply with state and federal energy efficiency standards.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No new development is proposed under Alternative 2. Each of the development alternatives will comply with minimum energy efficiency standards. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 are designed to meet LEED silver certification.</p>
<p>Policy 3. Development of alternative energy sources should be encouraged when such development is both technologically and environmentally feasible.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No new development is proposed under Alternative 2. No designs are developed for Alternative 4, but alternative energy may be included. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 are designed to meet minimum LEED silver certification</p>
<p>Policy 4. Environmental impacts to the fishery, instream flows, and scenic quality of all proposed hydroelectric project sites shall be considered together with other environmental considerations.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives propose hydroelectric projects.</p>
<b>Recreation Element</b>	
<b>Dispersed Recreation</b>	
<b>Goal #1. Encourage opportunities for dispersed recreation when consistent with environmental values and protection of the natural resources.</b>	
<p>Policy 1. Low density recreational experiences shall be provided along undeveloped shorelines and other natural areas, consistent with the tolerance capabilities and character of such areas.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> None of the alternatives include shoreline areas. Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 include a ski facility and hiking trails (informal hiking/mountain biking under Alternative 2).</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 does not maintain recreation and would preclude public access on the mountain.</p>
<p>Policy 2. Areas selected for nature study and wildlife observation shall be appropriately regulated to prevent unacceptable disturbance of the habitat and wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Alternative 4 does not include nature study areas. For alternatives that include trails, interpretation kiosks will inform hikers to stay on trails to reduce disturbance. Regular site maintenance will manage habitat areas and provide maintenance as needed.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> The existing hiking trails on the mountain are on private land and informally used, but</p>

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
	there is a lack of informational guides to ensure disturbance is limited.
Policy 3. Trail systems linking hiking and horseback riding shall be expanded to accommodate projected demands and provide a link with major regional or interstate trails.	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> No new trail systems would occur under these alternatives. The existing trails under Alternative 2 are informal and do not link to other trails.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives expand the hiking trail system and link the trails to the base areas that are accessible via the West Shore Bike Trail, which will be expanded.</p>
Policy 4. Existing trails that are either underutilized or located in environmentally sensitive areas shall be relocated to enhance their use and to protect natural resources.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Existing roadways or informal trails that are not needed are restored to protect the natural environment.
Policy 5. Off-road vehicle use is prohibited in the Lake Tahoe Basin except on specified roads, trails, or designated areas where the impacts can be mitigated.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Off-road vehicle use is not proposed except for facility maintenance or emergencies in which vehicles utilize access roads on the mountain. During construction, vehicles will be limited to the construction corridor and immediate area of construction and will utilize existing roadways as much as possible.
<b>Goal #2. Provide high-quality recreational opportunities.</b>	
Policy 1. Wilderness and other undeveloped and unroaded areas shall be managed for low-density use.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Wilderness areas are not included in the project as the site is currently an operating ski resort.
Policy 2. Separate use areas shall be established for the dispersed winter activities of snowmobiling, cross-country skiing and snowshoeing when conflicts of use exist.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Snowmobiling is not proposed under of the alternatives. Cross-country skiing is an associated use of the ski resort.
<b>Developed Recreation</b>	
<b>Goal #1. Provide a fair share of the total basin capacity for outdoor recreation</b>	
Policy 1. All existing reservations of services for outdoor recreation shall continue to be committed for such purposes.	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> This alternative would eliminate the ski facilities and would not utilize the existing outdoor recreation reservations.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives maintain the existing reservations for outdoor recreation.</p>
Policy 2. Provisions shall be made for additional developed outdoor recreation facilities capable of accommodating 6,114 PAOT in overnight facilities and 6,761 PAOT in summer day use facilities and 12,400 PAOT in winter day-use facilities.	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> This alternative would eliminate the ski facilities and would not utilize additional reservations.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives maintain the existing reservations for outdoor recreation.</p>
<b>Goal #2. Provide for the appropriate type, location, and rate of development of outdoor recreational uses.</b>	
Policy 1. Expansion of recreational facilities and opportunities should be in response to demand.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> This alternative would eliminate the ski facilities and would not serve existing demand.

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
	<p><u>Consistent</u> – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6. These alternatives maintain or improve ski facilities. Alternatives 1 and 3 include a community swimming pool, which is not currently available in this area, mini-golf, and an ice rink.</p>
<p>Policy 2. Bike trails shall be expanded to provide alternatives for travel in conjunction with transportation systems.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent</u> – Alternatives 2 and 4. Bike trail expansion would not occur under these alternatives.</p> <p><u>Consistent</u> – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6. The West Shore Bike Trail would be expanded within the Project area.</p>
<p>Policy 7. Development of day-use facilities shall be encouraged in or near established urban areas, whenever practical.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent</u> – Alternative 4. Recreation facilities would not be available under this alternative.</p> <p><u>Consistent</u> – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6. These alternatives maintain or improve ski facilities. Alternatives 1 and 3 include a swimming pool, ice rink, and mini-golf within an established community.</p>
<p>Policy 9. Parking along scenic corridors shall be restricted to protect roadway views and roadside vegetation.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent</u> – Alternative 2. The existing parking lot is located adjacent to SR 89 and lacks landscaping or other shielding methods.</p> <p><u>Consistent</u> – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Parking for Alternatives 1, 3, and 5 will be located in below ground parking structures or within the interior of the site so that it is not visible from the roadway. These alternatives include landscaping to buffer views of the site from the roadway.</p>
<p>Policy 10. Transit operations, including shuttle-type boat service, should serve major recreation facilities and attractions.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u> – All Alternatives. Transit service is currently available at the site. Alternatives 1, 3, and 5 will expand transit service by offering shuttles, improved transit shelters, and waterborne taxi service.</p>
<p>Policy 11. Expansion of existing ski facilities may be permitted based on a master plan for the entire ski area. The plan must demonstrate (1) consistency with other goals and policies of this Plan and the requirements of the compact, (2) that the expansion is consistent with the availability of accommodations and infrastructures to support visitors when they are off the ski area, and (3) expansion of existing parking facilities for day use does not occur.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent</u> – Alternative 4. This alternative proposes to eliminate existing ski facilities.</p> <p><u>Consistent</u> – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6. Alternative 2 maintains existing ski facilities. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 propose improved ski facilities within the Master Plan, but do not include an expansion of ski facilities.</p>
<p><b>Goal #3. Protect natural resources from overuse and rectify incompatibility between uses.</b></p>	
<p>Policy 1. Recreation development in the Tahoe Basin shall be consistent with the special resources of the area.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent</u> – Alternative 4. This alternative proposes to eliminate existing ski facilities, which is a compatible and planned use.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent</u> – Alternative 2. Although the ski facilities are a compatible use, this alternative does not include restoration activities that would protect Homewood Creek or the SEZ area.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation</u> – Alternatives 5 and 6. Although these alternatives would not restore the Homewood Creek SEZ, the implementation of SEZ</p>

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
	<p>protection and restoration mitigation would result in compliance.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives include site restoration of Homewood Creek and SEZ, as well as unnecessary roads/trails, with continued use of the ski facilities.</p>
<p>Policy 2. Regulate intensity, timing, type, and location of use to protect resources and separate incompatible uses.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> This alternative proposes to eliminate existing ski facilities, which is a compatible and planned use.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> Although the ski facilities are a compatible use, this alternative does not include restoration activities that would protect Homewood Creek or the SEZ area.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 5 and 6.</u> Although these alternatives would not restore the Homewood Creek SEZ, the implementation of SEZ protection and restoration mitigation would result in compliance.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives include site restoration of Homewood Creek and SEZ, as well as unnecessary roads/trails, with continued use of the ski facilities.</p>
<p><b>Goal #4. Provide for the efficient use of outdoor recreation resources.</b></p>	
<p>Policy 1. Promote the use of underutilized recreation areas through programs that improve the public awareness of recreation opportunities and through an expanded water and inland transit system.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 would not change existing conditions. Alternative 4 would eliminate ski facilities.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives improve ski facilities and provide a swimming pool as well as water-taxi service and improved alternative transportation systems (transit, shuttles, bike systems). Alternatives 1 and 3 include an ice rink and mini-golf at the North Base area.</p>
<p>Policy 2. Seasonal facilities should provide opportunities for alternative uses in the off-season, wherever appropriate.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 would not change existing conditions. Alternative 4 would eliminate ski facilities.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives improve ski facilities and provide a swimming pool as well as water-taxi service and improved alternative transportation systems (transit, shuttles, bike systems). Alternatives 1 and 3 include an ice rink and mini-golf at the North Base area.</p>
<p><b>Urban Recreation</b></p>	
<p><b>Goal #1. Provide sufficient capacity for local-oriented forms of outdoor and indoor recreation in urban areas.</b></p>	
<p>Policy 1. Reserve sufficient public service and facility capacity to accommodate all forms of urban recreation.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 would not change existing conditions. Alternative 4 would eliminate ski facilities.</p>

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
	Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6. These alternatives improve ski facilities and provide a swimming pool as well as water-taxi service and improved alternative transportation systems (transit, shuttles, bike systems). Alternatives 1 and 3 include an ice rink and mini-golf at the North Base area. The pool will be locally accessible, serving an existing need in the west shore community.
Policy 2. Urban outdoor recreational facilities located in sensitive areas should be encouraged to relocate to other suitable sites.	Consistent – All Alternatives. There are no existing urban recreation facilities onsite. Proposed facilities are not located in sensitive areas.
<b>Public Services and Facilities Element</b>	
<b>Goal #1. Public services and facilities should be allowed to upgrade and expand to support existing and new development consistent with the Regional Plan.</b>	
Policy 1. Public services and facilities should be allowed to upgrade and expand consistent with the Land Use Element of the Regional Plan and federal, state, and local standards.	Consistent – All Alternatives. Existing public services are adequate for the development. Expansion of public services and facilities is not proposed beyond the expansion needed to connect to elements of each alternative. Appropriate fees will be paid to each service provider. No expansion is proposed for Alternative 2.
Policy 2. Expansion of public services and facilities should be phased in to meet the needs of new development without creating inefficiencies from overexpansion or under-expansion.	Consistent – Alternative 2. This alternative does not propose an expansion of services.  Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Services will be expanded to serve the new uses. Expanded services and facilities will be sized to only meet the needs of the selected alternative. Mitigation to meet this policy includes new water and sewer infrastructure and payment of development impact fees.
Policy 3. All new development shall employ appropriate devices to conserve water and reduce water consumption. Existing development shall be retrofitted with water conservation devices on a voluntary basis in conjunction with a public education program operated by the utility districts.	Consistent – All Alternatives. New facilities will include water conservation devices, particularly under Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6, which will pursue minimum LEED silver certification. Alternative 2 may include water conservation devices on faucets not already utilizing such devices.
<b>Goal #2. Consider the existence of adequate and reliable public services and facilities in approving new development under the Plan.</b>	
Policy 1. No development requiring water should be allowed in any area unless it can be demonstrated that there is adequate water supply within an existing water right.	Consistent – Alternative 2. This alternative does not propose additional water use.  Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Water services will be expanded to serve the new uses. Mitigation to meet this policy includes a water supply assessment.
Policy 3. No development requiring water should be allowed in any area unless it can be demonstrated that there exists adequate storage and distribution systems to deliver an adequate quantity and quality of water for domestic consumption and fire protection.	Consistent – Alternative 2. This alternative does not propose additional water use.  Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Water services will be expanded to serve the new uses. Mitigation to meet this policy includes a water supply

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Regional Plan Goals and Policies</b>		<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
		assessment.
<b>Goal #3. Prevent liquid and solid wastes from degrading Lake Tahoe and surface and groundwaters of the Region.</b>		
Policy 1. The discharge of municipal or industrial wastewaters to the surface and groundwaters of the Tahoe Region is prohibited, except for the existing development discharging wastewaters under a state- or TRPA-approved disposal plan.		<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose additional wastewater production. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6.</u> Sewer services will be expanded to serve the new uses. Mitigation to meet this policy includes new sewer infrastructure and payment of development impact fees.
Policy 2. All solid wastes shall be exported from the Region. Consolidation and transfer methods shall be developed to achieve a reduction in the volume of wastes being transported to landfills.		<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 will not result in additional solid waste disposal needs beyond existing conditions. The action alternatives result in additional solid waste production that will be handled by Tahoe-Truckee Sierra Disposal Company, which currently serves the area and has the capacity to serve the new facilities.
Policy 3. Garbage pick-up service shall be mandatory throughout the Region, and will be so structured as to encourage clean-ups and recycling.		<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 will not result in additional solid waste disposal needs beyond existing conditions. The action alternatives result in additional solid waste and recyclable production that will be handled by Tahoe-Truckee Sierra Disposal Company, which currently serves the area and has the capacity to serve the new facilities.
<b>Goal #4. To ensure protection of the public health, safety and general welfare of the Region, educational and public safety services should be sized to be consistent with the projected growth levels in this Plan.</b>		
Policy 1. The impact on educational and public safety services shall be considered when reviewing projects and Plan amendments proposed within the Region. To the extent feasible, adverse impacts should be mitigated as part of the review process.		<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative will not require additional educational or public safety services. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives will not impact school capacity, but may impact law enforcement services through population increases. These alternatives are required to pay development impact fees to the County to offset the additional demand.
Policy 2. Educational and emergency service organizations should anticipate and plan for projected demands and needs consistent with the Regional Plan and are encouraged to advise the Agency when development potentials exceed current or anticipated service capabilities or capacities.		<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative will not require additional educational or public safety services. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives will not impact school capacity, but may impact law enforcement services through population increases. These alternatives are required to pay development impact fees to the County to offset the additional demand.
<b>Implementation Element</b>		
<i><b>Institutional</b></i>		
<b>Goal #1. Coordinate all planning and development review activities with the affected jurisdictions and agencies.</b>		
Policy 1. All projects proposed in the Region [other		<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The EIR/EIS is developed

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
than those to be reviewed and approved under special provisions of the Compact relating to gaming] shall obtain the review and approval of the agency.	as part of the project review process.
Policy 2. No project may be approved unless it is found to comply with the Regional Plan and with any ordinances, rules, and regulations enacted to effectuate the Regional Plan.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> This table analyzes consistency with the TRPA Regional Plan. Alternatives 1 and 3 are consistent with inclusion of recommended mitigation measures and adoption of proposed plan amendments.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6.</u> This table shows these alternatives are not always consistent with the Regional Plan.</p>
<b><i>Development and Implementation Priorities</i></b>	
<b>Goal #2. Manage the growth of development consistent with progress toward meeting environmental thresholds</b>	
<p>Policy 2. A maximum of 2,000 additional residential units may be authorized to receive permits for construction during the first 6 years of the Plan, except that this limitation shall not apply to affordable housing units as described in the Housing Subelement. Subject to the provisions below, any allocations which are not utilized may be reallocated by the local jurisdiction. The allocation of these permits shall be made as follows:</p> <p>F. A total of 1,400 additional multi-residential units shall be available for the 20 year life of this Plan as bonus units in conjunction with transfer of development rights or other Agency incentive programs designed to attain the goals and objectives of this Plan. Except for affordable housing as defined in the Housing Subelement, these multi-density residential units shall be included in the allocation limitations above (see Land Use Subelement, Goal #2, Policy 5).</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Only Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6 request MRBU for employee housing. Other residential units are obtained through purchase of existing ERU or development rights, and allocations from Placer County.</p>
Policy 3. A maximum of 200 additional tourist accommodation bonus units may be permitted (See Policy 9 for 200 additional tourist accommodation unit allocations).	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives request more than 50 bonus units and would not exceed available supplies.</p>
<p>Policy 4. A maximum of 400,000 sf of additional gross commercial floor area may be permitted. (See Policy 8 for additional commercial floor area allocations.) Development of additional commercial floor area shall be allocated as follows:</p> <p>Commercial development poses a particularly difficult problem in terms of demands on transportation systems. Controlling the rate of new commercial development will minimize these impacts and provide an opportunity for transportation systems to keep pace.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives request more than 25,000 square feet of CFA. The request is made as part of the CEP and has been adjusted to equal availability.</p>
Policy 5. The development of additional outdoor recreational uses shall be pursuant to short- and long-range programs. Criteria for inclusion in these	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not propose additional recreational uses. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include development of a swimming pool, ice rink,</p>

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
programs shall be developed by ordinance.	mini-golf, hiking trails, and an extension of the bike trail, all of which support the recreation land use classification (PAS 157) and the needs of the community.
<p>Policy 8. A maximum of 400,000 sf of additional gross commercial floor area may be permitted after 1997. Development of additional commercial floor area shall be allocated as follows:</p> <p>The commercial floor area allocations after 1997 shall focus on the implementation of projects listed in the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) and promotion of the transfer and rehabilitation of substandard development.</p> <p>A. A maximum of 100,000 sf of commercial floor area may be permitted in adopted community plans. A portion of this allocation may also be permitted outside community plans when used to replace commercial allocations used in the first ten years for outside community plans and if it is linked to environmental improvements.</p> <p>B. A maximum of 150,000 sf may be allocated to special projects in community plan areas or adopted master plan areas. These projects shall be evaluated on their implementation of environmental improvement projects.</p> <p>C. A maximum of 150,000 sf of commercial floor area may be allocated after 2002. 50,000 sf may be allocated to projects within adopted community plans. A maximum of 100,000 sf of commercial floor area allocation shall be allocated to Special Projects pursuant to “B” above.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose additional CFA. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 require additional floor area; however the additional CFA requested complies with available supply.</p>
Policy 9. A maximum of 200 additional tourist accommodation units may be permitted after 1997 for special projects that retire tourist units from sensitive lands.	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not propose TAUs. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include TAUs, some of which are from restored SEZ areas. The alternatives will not exceed the limit.</p>
Policy 11. From January 1, 2007, the maximum additional residential units that may be authorized is equal to the number of units in the allocation pool carried over from 2006 plus the 236 unused prior to 1996 allocations that shall be added to the pool. This limitation shall not apply to affordable housing units described in the Housing Subelement. All unused distributed allocations as of January 1 of each year shall be reassigned to the allocation pool administered by the TRPA. The allocation pool shall be used to allow property owners who retire sensitive parcels to receive an allocation, applicants for moderate housing units under the moderate housing program, to receive allocations, and for local jurisdictions to earn allocations for each annual distribution. Allocations assigned yearly to each jurisdiction shall be linked to the local jurisdiction’s performance on permit compliance, implementation of water quality and air quality improvements and monitoring, and increased	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose residential units. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include residential units, but only Alternatives 1 and 3 request multi-residential bonus units (MRBU), which is used for employee housing. The residential units needed for these action alternatives have been or will be obtained/purchased by HMR from existing transfer units.</p>



Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
transit operations. The allocation and distribution of allocations each year for local jurisdictions shall not exceed the following: Placer County: 66 maximum yearly allocations.	
<b>Goal #3. Encourage consolidation of development through separate transfer of development rights and transfer of land coverage programs.</b>	
Policy 1. Transfers of residential development rights to parcels in areas designated as receiving areas in plan area statements may be permitted. The number of development rights that may be transferred is limited to one unit for undeveloped parcels, or to the number of residential units existing on a developed parcel.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include transfers. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include the transfer of rights onto land that permits such uses and include PAS amendments to allow transfer of development rights.
Policy 2. Transfers of existing tourist accommodation units into designated areas may be permitted.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not include TAU transfers. Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6 include the transfer of TAUs onto land that permits such uses and include PAS amendments to ensure the types of uses utilizing the TAUs are allowed.
Policy 3. Land coverage may be transferred as set forth in Goal #3, Policy 2, of the Land Use Subelement, within the related hydrologic area, provided the coverage limits set forth in the Land Use Subelement are not exceeded.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No land coverage transfers are proposed.
Policy 4. The residential permit allocation system shall permit the transfer of building allocations from parcels located on sensitive lands to more suitable parcels.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not change existing conditions. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include the transfer of existing units of use from sensitive lands.
Policy 5. Before transfer of any development right or land coverage under this goal is effective, the transferor lot shall be appropriately restricted or retired. In the case where an allocation has been transferred, or all the development rights or coverage has been transferred off a parcel deemed inappropriate for future development, the entire parcel shall be retired.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include transfers. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include the transfer of development rights that will be completed in accordance with the Code of Ordinances. The sending sites will be appropriately restored and restricted.
Policy 6. Transfers of development rights, other than land coverage, shall be limited to equivalent uses with no increase in the parameters by which the uses are measured by this Plan (e.g., floor area, units, PAOT). Equivalent uses shall be defined by ordinance. Development impacts due to the resulting projects shall be addressed as part of the project review process.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include transfers. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include the transfer of development rights that will be completed in accordance with the Code of Ordinances. Development impacts are addressed in this EIR/EIS.
<b>Goal #4. Condition approvals for new development in the Tahoe Region on positive improvements in off-site erosion and runoff control and air quality.</b>	
Policy 1. New residential, commercial and public projects shall completely offset their water quality impacts through one of the following methods:  A. Implementing off-site erosion and runoff control projects as a condition of project approval and subject to Agency concurrence as to effectiveness, or  B. Contributing to a fund established by the Agency for implementing off-site erosion and runoff control projects. The amount of such contributions is established by Agency ordinance.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6 include new onsite erosion and runoff control devices as well as participation in off-site EIP projects that address erosion/runoff. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 does not include participation in EIP projects or other off-site projects.

Regional Plan Goals and Policies	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
Policy 2. All projects shall offset the transportation and air quality impacts of their development.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not result in changes to existing conditions. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives are consistent with implementation of mitigation that reduces and/or offsets impacts.

Source: HBA, 2010

**Table 4.2-2**

TRPA Plan Area Statement Consistency Analysis

TRPA Plan Area Statements	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<b>PAS 157: Homewood/Tahoe Ski Bowl</b>	
<u>Plan Designation:</u> Land Use Classification: Recreation Management Strategy: Mitigation Special Designation: Scenic Restoration Area	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives maintain ski facilities and classification as a recreation area. Site improvements promote the mitigation management strategy as well as improve the scenic character. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 would amend the Special Designation to include “TDR Receiving Area for Existing Development (commercial) to newly created Special Area 1”, which would allow the transfer of CFA. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> This alternative converts the ski facilities to a commercial structure and 16 single-family residential lots. This does not support the recreation land use classification as it would eliminate recreation in the PAS 157.
<u>Planning Statement:</u> This area should continue to provide opportunities for downhill skiing within guidelines prepared through ski area master plans and scenic restoration plans.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives maintain ski facilities and classification as a recreation area. Site improvements promote the mitigation management strategy as well as improve the scenic character. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> This alternative converts the ski facilities to a commercial structure and 16 single-family residential lots. This does not support the recreation land use classification as it would eliminate recreation in the PAS 157.
<b>Special Policies:</b>	
1. A coordinated Homewood Community Plan should include this Plan Area as well as Plan Area 159	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives propose a Community Plan. A Ski Resort Master Plan is proposed. Alternative 2 does not propose changes to existing conditions. Alternative 4 places commercial uses roadside in coordination with existing commercial uses along SR 89 in PAS 159. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include a portion of PAS 159 within the Project area
2. All affected parties should coordinate planning to assess the feasibility and demand for expanded ski facilities.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Although there is no expansion of ski capacity, aging facilities will be improved, including replacement of the Madden triple chair at the north base with an 8-passenger gondola, and

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

TRPA Plan Area Statements	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
	<p>upgrade of the Ellis Chair with a detachable quad chair to improve the recreational experience. In addition, the new recreation (swimming pool, ice skating) and tourist facilities provide a coordinated benefit with the surrounding community.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not establish a ski area master plan. Under Alternative 2, existing conditions persist and under Alternative 4, the ski area is eliminated and replaced with commercial uses and single-family housing.</p>
<p>3. The water in Quail Lake should be used to provide minimum instream flows for Quail Creek.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives result in changes to Quail Lake.</p>
<p>4. Multi-use of ski area base facilities is encouraged, especially joint use agreements between the ski area and local marinas to share parking space.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives expand the base facilities to provide a greater range of tourist accommodations, residences, and commercial uses. The swimming pool would be accessible to area residents. Alternative transportation efforts, including transit and shuttle service would improve access between the resort and local marinas.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Under Alternative 2, existing conditions persist and under Alternative 4, the ski area is eliminated and replaced with commercial uses and single-family housing.</p>
<p>5. Common management and consolidation of the two ski areas is encouraged.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives result in the continued operation of the ski resort. Both the Homewood and Tahoe Ski Bowl areas are managed as one ski facility and the two areas have been combined into the Homewood Mountain Resort.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> This alternative proposes to close the ski resort. While this is common management (closure) it does not support the continued use of the ski facilities.</p>
<p>6. Upgrading and redevelopment of the Homewood ski base facilities should be encouraged.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives upgrade and redevelop the base facilities by providing a mixed-use development that includes landscaping, BMPs, and other environmental benefits.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Under Alternative 2, existing conditions persist and under Alternative 4, the ski area is eliminated and replaced with commercial uses and single-family housing.</p>
<p>7. New commercial facilities are limited to the base areas of the existing facilities.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new facilities. Alternative 4 proposes commercial uses only at the North Base area.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose commercial uses at the North Base area, but also include limited commercial uses at proposed “Special Area 1” at the Mid Mountain as necessary to support year round resort facilities (which may not be accessory to the existing winter day use). The proposed PAS amendment would allow for TRPA defined commercial uses at the Mid Mountain lodge consistent with TRPA goals to encourage year round use of recreational facilities.</p>

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>TRPA Plan Area Statements</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
8. Access for cross country skiing should be improved.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Cross-country skiing opportunities or improved access would not be pursued under these alternatives. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Cross county ski trails, utilizing connections to the 1960 vintage Olympic ski courses, would occur under these alternatives.
9. Any new or additional commercial uses shall be permitted only pursuant to an adopted Community Plan.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new commercial uses. <u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1,3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose new commercial uses; however an amendment to this special policy is proposed to allow new commercial uses pursuant to an adopted Ski Area Master Plan.
<b>Permissible Uses: Allowed (A) and considered under special use provisions (S).</b>	
<u>Residential:</u> Employee housing (S) and single-family dwellings (S).	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new uses. The single-family dwellings proposed for Alternative 4 are allowed as a special use; however, as a special use, TRPA may not approve the special use at the expense of the ski facility closure. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose employee housing and for sale multi-family housing; however this use would be located outside of PAS 157 through amendments to PAS 158 and 159. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 proposes single-family dwellings and multi-family housing in PAS 159 (North Base area); however the density of the multi-family housing exceeds density limits and findings cannot be made for the higher density 45 dwelling units per acre (DUA).
<u>Tourist Accommodations:</u> Bed and breakfast facilities (S) and hotels, motels, and other transient dwelling units (S).	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not propose these uses or non-permissible related uses. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose hotel units. Alternatives 1 and 3 propose timeshare units; however this use would be located outside of PAS 157 through amendment to PAS 159.
<u>Commercial:</u> Eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (A), general merchandise stores (A), outdoor retail sales (S), amusements and recreation services (S), and secondary storage (S).	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in new uses or development. Alternative 4 proposes neighborhood commercial uses. These uses will need to be compliant with the permissible uses list of PAS 157. <u>Consistent with Amendment– Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose an amendment to include personal services (S). Approval of this amendment and approval of the use to support the tourist and neighborhood commercial uses result in consistency.
<u>Public Service:</u> Pipelines and power transmission (S), public safety facilities (S), public utility centers (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), government offices (S), and transit stations and terminals (S).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives propose public services beyond transit stops, which already exist onsite.
<u>Recreation:</u> Cross country skiing courses (S), day use areas (A), outdoor recreation concessions (A),	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in new uses or development. Alternative 4 does not

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

TRPA Plan Area Statements	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
riding and hiking trails (A), skiing facilities (S) and snow mobile courses (S).	propose recreation uses. <u>Consistent with Amendment– Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose an amendment to include participant sports facilities (S) to allow the proposed pool at the Mid Mountain area. Approval of this amendment and approval of the use to support the tourist and neighborhood commercial uses result in consistency.
<u>Resource Management:</u> reforestation (A), regeneration harvest (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), timber stand improvement (A), tree farms (S), early successional stage vegetation management (A), nonstructural fish habitat management (A), nonstructural wildlife habitat management (A), structural fish habitat management (A), structural wildlife habitat management (A), farm/ranch accessory structures (S), grazing (S), range pasture management (S), range improvement (S), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment (A), insect and disease suppression (A), prescribed fire management (A), sensitive plant management (A), uncommon plant community management (A), erosion control (A), runoff control (A), and SEZ restoration (A).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Proposed uses under each alternative are consistent with these resource management uses. No new resource management uses are proposed.
<b>Maximum Densities:</b> <u>Residential:</u> Single family dwelling – 1 unit /parcel Employee housing (multi-family) – 15 DUA. <u>Tourist Accommodation:</u> Bed and Breakfast – 10 units/ac. Hotel, motel, and other transient units – 20 units/ac.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6.</u> None of the alternatives propose changes to or conflict with these densities with the proposed PAS amendments. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 would exceed maximum allowable density (e.g., more than 15 dwelling units per acre) for multi-family residential at the North Base area.
<b>Developed Outdoor Recreation:</b> Summer day uses – 0 PAOT Winter Day Use – 1,100 PAOT Overnight Uses – 280 PAOT	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives will maintain the existing PAOT. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> This alternative will eliminate outdoor recreation from the PAS, resulting in substantially underutilized PAOT.
<b>Other:</b> 5 miles of hiking trails	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not include 5 miles of hiking trails <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose 5 miles of hiking trails, directional signage, and linkages to the base area pedestrian paths.
<b>PAS 158: McKinney Tract</b>	
<u>Plan Designation:</u> Land Use Classification: Residential Management Strategy: Mitigation Special Designation: Scenic Restoration Area	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives (Alts 1 and 3 as amended).</u> Alternatives 2, 4 and 5 do not propose development in this area. Alternatives 1, 3 and 6 propose residential condominiums in this area through a PAS boundary amendment, consistent with the residential land use classification. Improvements to the SEZ area and scenic character as proposed by these alternatives supports the management strategy and special designation. They also propose to amend the PAS by applying the special designation of TDR Receiving Area for 1) existing development, and 2) multi-residential units to the newly

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

TRPA Plan Area Statements	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<p><u>Planning Statement:</u> This area should remain residential with a density of one single-family dwelling per parcel.</p>	<p>created “Special Area”.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4 and 5.</u> These alternatives do not propose development in this area.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6.</u> These alternatives result in the area remaining residential, but the density would increase to allow 15 multi-family units per acre within a newly created special district for the South Base area where condominiums are proposed. With the proposed amendment adoption, these alternatives will be consistent.</p>
<p><b>Special Policies:</b></p>	
<p>1. The Scenic Roadway and Shoreline Unit should be reevaluated for attainment in this area.</p>	<p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 6.</u> These alternatives will result in improvements to the roadway unit and maintenance of the shoreline unit with mitigation. Alternatives 1 and 3 include mitigation to better integrate the mid-mountain lodge from shoreline views. Alternative 4 includes mitigation for site design to ensure consistency with TRPA design guidelines.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 5.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in improvements to the scenic quality ratings and does not promote attainment. Alternative 5 includes a 4-story structure highly visible from SR 89 on the site. Mitigation is not feasible to reduce the massing of the structure. Despite landscaping and other visual improvements proposed by Alternative 5, the inability to mitigate the visibility of the structure results in an adverse impact to the roadway unit rating.</p>
<p><b>Permissible Uses: Allowed (A) and considered under special use provisions (S).</b></p>	
<p><u>Residential:</u> Single-family dwelling (A).</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4 and 5.</u> These alternatives do not propose development in this Plan Area.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6.</u> These alternatives propose to amend PAS 158 to include multi-family dwellings (S) within a new “Special Area”. This will result in consistency by allowing residential condominiums, but only in a limited location at the existing South Base area.</p>
<p><u>Public Service:</u> Local public health and safety facilities (S), transit stations and terminals (S), pipelines and power transmission (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), public utility center (S), and local post offices (S) and day care centers/pre-schools (S).</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> These uses are not proposed by the alternatives.</p>
<p><u>Recreation:</u> Participant sports facilities (S), day use areas (A), riding and hiking trails (A), and beach recreation (A).</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives do not propose development in this PAS.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives propose to amend PAS 158 to include Skiing Facilities (A) within a new “Special Area”. This will result in consistency to reflect the maintenance of existing ski facilities, but only in a limited location for local serving use.</p>
<p><u>Resource Management:</u> Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), early successional stage vegetation management (A),</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Activities proposed in this area are permissible.</p>

TRPA Plan Area Statements	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
structural and nonstructural fish/wildlife habitat management (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment/management (A), insect and disease suppression (A), sensitive plant management (A), uncommon plant community management (A), erosion control (A), runoff control (A), and SEZ restoration (A).	
<p><b>Shorezone:</b> The following structures may be permitted in the shorezone as an allowed (A) or special (S) use only if they are accessory to an existing, allowed use located on the same or adjoining littoral parcel:</p> <p><b>Tolerance District 7:</b></p> <p><u>Primary Uses:</u> Beach recreation (A), and salvage (A).</p> <p><u>Accessory Structures:</u> Mooring buoys (A), piers (A), fences (S), boat ramps (S), breakwaters or jetties (S), floating platforms (A), shoreline protective structures (A), and water intake lines (S).</p>	Consistent- All Alternatives. None of the alternatives are located within this area.
<p><b>Maximum Densities:</b></p> <p>Residential: Single-family dwelling – 1 unit/parcel.</p>	<p>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4 and 5. These alternatives do not propose development within this PAS.</p> <p>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6. These alternatives propose residential condominiums and an amendment to the Plan to include maximum densities for multi-family dwellings at 15 units per acre within the “Special Area”. Adoption of the amendment results in consistency.</p>
<b>159 – Homewood/Commercial</b>	
<p><u>Plan Designation:</u></p> <p>Land Use Classification: Tourist</p> <p>Management Strategy: Redirection</p> <p>Special Designation: Preliminary Community Plan</p> <p>Area TDR Receiving Area for: 1. Existing Development; Scenic Restoration Area</p>	<p>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4. These alternatives do not propose development in this area.</p> <p>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6. These alternatives propose new tourist, commercial and some higher density residential uses at the North Base area, which correspond to the Tourist land use classification. Site improvements including substantial visual quality improvements through architecture, landscaping and utility undergrounding, water quality improvements, erosion control, and expansion of commercial and tourist uses within the development corridor along SR 89 promote redirection and scenic restoration.</p> <p>Inconsistent – Alternative 5. Alternative 5 proposes multi-family housing at the North Base area; however the 4-story structure does not support scenic restoration and findings cannot be made for the higher density 45 dwelling units per acre (DUA) or required height amendment.</p>
<p><u>Planning Statement:</u> This area should continue to be a tourist commercial area. However, there is a need for rehabilitation while maintaining the scale and character of the west shore.</p>	<p>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4. These alternatives do not propose development in this area.</p> <p>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, and 6. These alternatives support this planning statement by providing a mixed commercial and residential area that combines tourist and recreational uses at an appropriate scale and within a “Special Area” so that this type of mixed use is appropriately located along the SR 89 corridor.</p> <p>Inconsistent – Alternative 5. Alternative 5 proposes</p>

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

TRPA Plan Area Statements	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
	mixed use; however the density of the multi-family housing (45 DUA) conflicts with adjoining uses and findings cannot be made to support densities at this level.
<b>Special Policies:</b>	
1. Community planning for development of this area should include consideration of the adjoining ski areas in PAS 157.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not include this area. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 result in joining the ski area with PAS 159 by providing a mixed-use area beneficial to both PAS 157 and 159.
2. The Community Plan or the Homewood Marina Master Plan should consider the sea plane base and establish a noise corridor for the sea plane base.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> This policy is proposed to be eliminated since the sea plane base no longer exists.
3. This area should be considered for a major water borne transit stop.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not include this area. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include water taxi service.
4. The marina facilities should be expanded and upgraded to accommodate increasing boating needs.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The alternatives do not include marina facilities. However, the proposed parking structure is being designed to accommodate boat trailer parking in the summer to remove the trailers off the SR 89 ROW and to improve scenic quality.
5. Tourism and recreation compatible with the west shore scale of development should be encouraged in this Plan Area.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not include this area. Alternatives 1, 3, and 6 result in joining the ski area with PAS 159 by providing a mixed-use area beneficial to both PAS 157 and 159, including tourist accommodations, new recreation opportunities, transit service in the area, and expansion of the bike path to connect to other area recreation and tourism features. Onsite tourist uses reduce the need for winter guests to drive in and out of the project area on a daily basis. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 proposes new tourism and recreation; however the multi-family 4-story structures located immediately adjacent to SR 89 are not compatible with the west shore scale of development as the height of the structure significantly exceeds surrounding height levels and the dwelling density is significantly higher than the surrounding residential densities (45 DUA).
<b>Permissible Uses: Allowed (A) and considered under special use provisions (S).</b>	
<u>Residential:</u> Employee housing (S) and single-family dwelling (S).	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> No residential uses are proposed in this area for these alternatives. <u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose employee housing, multi-family dwellings and single family dwellings (condominiums through a two step subdivision). Multi-family dwellings will be added through amendment as a special use within a newly created “Special District”. This will result in consistency and will limit multi-family units to the area so as not to affect the permissible uses and mix of residential units elsewhere in the area. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> This alternative proposes multi family housing, but the proposed housing density of 45 DUA is not complimentary to the surrounding land uses and an amendment allowing such density is not



**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>TRPA Plan Area Statements</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	feasible.
<u>Tourist Accommodations:</u> Bed and breakfast facilities (A), hotels, motels, and other transient dwelling units (A), timeshare (hotel/motel design) (S), and timeshare (residential design) (S).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No development is proposed in this area for Alternatives 2 and 4. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 propose various tourist accommodations including hotel and timeshare units, which are permissible uses.
<u>Commercial:</u> Auto, mobile home and vehicle dealers (S), building materials and hardware (S), eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (A), furniture, home furnishings and equipment (S), general merchandise stores (A), mail order and vending (A), nursery (A), outdoor retail sales (S), service stations (A), amusements and recreation services (S), outdoor amusements (S), animal husbandry services (S), auto repair and service (S), broadcasting studios (A), business support services (A), contract construction services (S), financial services (A), healthcare services (A), personal services (A), professional offices (A), repair services (A), secondary storage (S), small scale manufacturing (S), storage yards (S), vehicle storage and parking (S), warehousing (S).	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> No residential uses are proposed in this area for these alternatives. <u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 propose to amend the list of permissible uses by adding “Privately Owned Assembly and Entertainment” as a special use within the Special Area to allow the amphitheater use at the North Base area. This will result in consistency and will limit development of this type of use to the north base area of the resort where it is most appropriately located and already occurs as a temporary use.
<u>Public Service:</u> Churches (A), cultural facilities (A), day care centers/preschools (A), government offices (S), local assembly and entertainment (A), local post office (A), local public health and safety facilities (A), membership organizations (A), public utility centers (S), schools – kindergarten through secondary (A), social service organizations (A), pipelines and power transmission (S), transit stations and terminals (S), transportation routes (S) and transmission and receiving facilities (S).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No development is proposed in this area for Alternatives 2 and 4. Public service uses proposed under Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 are permissible uses.
<u>Recreation:</u> Day use areas (A), recreation center (S) participant sports facilities (S), beach recreation (A), boat launching facilities (S), cross-country skiing courses (S), outdoor recreation concessions (A), marinas (S), riding and hiking trails (S), skiing facilities (S), snow mobile courses (S), and visitor information center (S).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No development is proposed in this area for Alternatives 2 and 4. Recreation uses proposed under Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6, such as cross-country skiing and bicycle trails are permissible uses.
<u>Resource Management:</u> Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), timber stand improvement (A), tree farms (S), early successional stage vegetation management (A), nonstructural fish habitat management (A), nonstructural wildlife habitat management (A), structural fish habitat management (A), structural wildlife habitat management (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment (A), insect and disease suppression (A), sensitive plant management (A), uncommon plant community management (A), erosion control (A), runoff control (A), and SEZ restoration (A).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Proposed resource management efforts are permitted in this area.
<b>Maximum Densities:</b> <u>Residential:</u>	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not propose development in this area.

---

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

---

**HOMWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS**

<b>TRPA Plan Area Statements</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<p>Single family dwelling – 1 unit /parcel. Multi family dwelling – 8 units/acre. Employee housing – 8 units/acre.</p> <p><u>Tourist Accommodation:</u> Bed and Breakfast – 10 units/ac. Hotel, motel, and other transient units:     Kitchens in &lt;10% of units – 20 units/ac.     Kitchens in ≥10% of units – 15 units/ac. Timeshare – as per the limitations set forth in this table</p> <p><u>Shorezone:</u> Piers in Visually Dominated Character Unit – Avg. 1 pier/100 linear ft. Piers in Visually Modified Character Unit – Avg. 1 pier/100 linear ft.</p>	<p><u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose to amend the multi-family housing density from 8 units per acre to 15 units per acre within the new “Special Area”. This will accommodate the proposed employee housing and multi-family units, but will limit this higher density to the North Base area to avoid alterations to the overall residential density in PAS 159.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> The proposed multi family density of 45 DUA is not complimentary to the surrounding land uses and findings cannot be made to support an amendment allowing such density.</p>

---

Source: HBA 2010

---

### 4.3 PLACER COUNTY

#### 4.3.1 West Shore Area General Plan

The Placer County West Shore Area General Plan, adopted by Placer County, California in 1998, contains goals, policies, and development standards applicable the Project Area and vicinity in the unincorporated Placer County areas along the West Shore of Lake Tahoe. The goals and policies in Table 4.3-1 are applicable to the HMR Ski Area Master Plan and provide a framework for future direction and development of the area. Table 4.3-1 includes an analysis of the consistency between the West Shore Area General Plan and the Project and Alternatives.

**Table 4.3-1**

**HMR Consistency Analysis with the 1998 West Shore Area General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards**

<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<b>II. Community Development/Land Use Element</b>	
<b>A. Housing Goals and Policies</b>	
1. Continue to administer the TRPA residential allocation program in a fair and efficient fashion for prospective home builders.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new homes. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 follow the TRPA allocation program.
2. Provide opportunities for affordable housing, including affordable senior housing in appropriate areas where public transportation is easily available, close to neighborhood serving retail facilities, and where such development will be compatible with surrounding uses.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 4 proposes to increase density and local employment opportunities (Alternative 4 during construction only), but does not provide affordable housing units.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6 would provide up to 13 workforce/affordable housing units with up to 50 beds close to the North Base commercial/tourist area.
3. Provide for employee housing in appropriate areas, through the use of the affordable housing pool, conversion of existing tourist accommodation multiple unit structures (consistent with density limitations), as a requirement of project approval for large-scale projects, and through other appropriate means.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 4 proposes to increase density and local employment opportunities (Alternative 4 during construction only), but does not provide affordable housing units.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6 would provide up to 13 workforce/affordable housing units close to the North Base commercial/tourist area.
<b>C. Recreation Land Use Objectives and Policies</b>	
2. The recreation plans of the Tahoe City P.U.D. are to be used as a guide for evaluating future recreational development in the Plan Area.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The TCPUD recreation plans were consulted to evaluate recreation-related impacts in Chapter 18-Recreation of this EIR/EIS.
3. The recreation plans of the U.S. Forest Service are similarly to be used as a guide for evaluating future recreational development on federal property under their jurisdiction.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The USFS LTBMU recreation plans were consulted to evaluate recreation-related impacts in Chapter 18-Recreation of this EIR/EIS.

<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
4. The targeted allocations for “Persons at one time” (PAOTS) within the geographic area of this Plan are intended to be consistent with the recreation programs of the TRPA.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> The Project does not increase PAOTs beyond existing capacity. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 decreases the PAOT to zero for PAS 157 resulting in a substantial deficit in reaching the targeted allocation.
<b>III. Circulation Element</b>	
<b>B. Transportation/Circulation Objectives and Policies</b>	
<b>Goal 1. Provide a safe and efficient transportation system for the residents and visitors of the West Shore Plan Area.</b>	
A. Strive to maintain a LOS D or better conditions on the Plan Area roadways. Due to the high degree of peak recreation travel through the area, LOS E may be acceptable during peak periods, not to exceed 4 hours per day.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> A LOS F exists at SR 89/Granlibakken Rd., which will not be improved through these alternatives. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Implementation of mitigation to improve Granlibakken Rd/SR 89 to LOS E will result in consistency.
D. Implement appropriate traffic control to discourage use of residential roads as an alternative to SR 89.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The existing or proposed facilities are appropriately located so that facilities can’t be accessed by residential roads outside the Project area.
E. Require parking management strategies which provides adequate parking, limits traffic conflicts, consider connections between parking lots and encourage community parking lots.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5 and 6.</u> Alternative 2 will keep the existing parking lot, which is used for community events in the off-season and provides adequate parking year-round. Alternative 4 will maintain a parking lot adjacent to SR 89 for the commercial structure. Adequate parking will be provided in this lot as well as for each residence. Alternatives 5 and 6 include adequate parking in underground parking garages. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> While these alternatives include underground parking, there is an excess number of spaces at the North Base and a deficient number of spaces at the South Base per Placer County standards. Implementation of mitigation proposed in Chapter 11 of the EIR/EIS provides consistency with County standards.
<b>Goal 2. Provide funding to finance project and programs to meet the objectives of the Transportation/Circulation element.</b>	
A. Require development to mitigate their impacts on the transportation system. The appropriate level of mitigation shall be determined through project and environmental review pursuant to Chapter 93 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Chapter 11-Transportation and Circulation of this EIR/EIS provides an environmental review of the impacts to the transportation system by the Project and Alternatives, and identifies mitigation measures, consistent with Chapter 93 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. <u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development.
B. Require development to mitigate their regional traffic impacts by paying the appropriate fee as provided in the Countywide traffic fee program.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> New development in the Project Area would mitigate regional traffic impacts through payment of the appropriate fee in the Countywide traffic fee program.
C. All projects shall be subject to the TRPA traffic/air quality mitigation fee program (Chapter 93).	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> New development in the Project Area would be required to pay the appropriate fee under the TRPA traffic/air

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	quality mitigation fee program (Chapter 93). <u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development.
<b>Goal 3. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities/amenities shall be encouraged where appropriate.</b>	
A. Continue to provide for and expand the availability of bike racks on the public transit system.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives expressly place bike racks on transit vehicles, they do not prevent the placement of bike racks on transit vehicles and they maintain or expand transit service to the site.
B. Maximize the visibility of bike/pedestrian and vehicle conflict areas through increased signage.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> No new bike or pedestrian facilities are included in these alternatives. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives expand the West Shore Bike Trail within the Project area. Directional signage for the trail and the hiking trail access points are included within the base area.
C. Construct pedestrian facilities to serve new development.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not include new pedestrian facilities. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives include pedestrian facilities throughout the north and south base areas.
<b>Goal 4. Implement transportation demand management (TDM) measures to reduce the number of vehicles traveling within the community plan area.</b>	
A. Work with the public transit providers in structuring fare rates and schedules aimed at optimizing ridership.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> There are currently two TART stops in the Project area that would remain in operation. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include transit stop improvements, resort shuttle service, transit passes for employees, dial-a-ride services and water taxi services, among others, that would optimize ridership.
B. Encourage tourist-related uses to provide incentives to encourage public and private transit use to their guests (e.g., transit information, discount coupons, etc.)	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> There are currently two TART stops in the Project area that would remain in operation. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include transit stop improvements, resort shuttle service, transit passes for employees, dial-a-ride services and water taxi services, among others, that would optimize ridership.
C. Examine the potential for home mail delivery throughout the Community Plan Area.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> A Community Plan has not been prepared.
D. Examine potential for water taxi service between Tahoe City and West Shore.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not propose water taxi service. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6.</u> These alternatives propose a water taxi service.
<b>IV. Conservation Element</b>	
<b>Air Quality</b>	
<b>Goal 1. Attain and maintain State and Federal Ambient Air Quality Standards for the Plan Area.</b>	
<b>Goal 2. Minimize public exposure to air quality that exceeds adopted standards.</b>	
1. Implement the programs and strategies proposed by the TRPA Goals and Policies Plan and the District's 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan (where appropriate for the LTAB) for achieving air quality standards.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> No changes to existing conditions would occur, including no increase in pollutants and continued TART service to the site. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> The action alternatives include ground disturbance and operational pollutants that do not help to achieve air

<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	quality standards. Implementation of mitigation to reduce emissions will help achieve air quality standards. In addition, the alternative transportation and public transit features of alternatives 1, 3, and 5 will further help to reduce operations emissions by reducing vehicle trips.
3. Encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation by incorporating public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian travel amenities in public and private transportation projects.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> There are currently two TART stops in the Project area that would remain in operation. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include transit stop improvements, resort shuttle service, transit passes for employees, dial-a-ride services and water taxi services, among others, that would optimize ridership. In addition, expansion of the bike trail and pedestrian paths through the site, as well as the free bike fleet for resort guests will reduce vehicle trips.
4. Secure adequate funding for transit services so that transit is a viable transportation alternative.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> There are currently two TART stops in the Project area that would remain in operation. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include transit stop improvements, resort shuttle service, transit passes for employees, dial-a-ride services and water taxi services, among others, that would optimize ridership. In addition, expansion of the bike trail and pedestrian paths through the site, as well as the free bike fleet for resort guests will reduce vehicle trips.
<b>V. Open Space Element</b>	
<b>Goal 1. Maintain and increase the inventory of open space properties in the Plan Area.</b>	
3. Implement the “Parks and Recreation Master Plan” of the Tahoe City PUD as the recreation element of this Plan, along with the planning programs of the California State Parks Department, and the “Forest Plan” of the U.S. Forest Service.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives involves the alteration of dedicated open space. Alternative 4 will result in the loss of the ski resort; however, this is not dedicated open space. Alternative 2 will maintain existing conditions. Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6 will continue to provide recreational opportunities to the site, including hiking trails, and will deed restrict the remainder of the mountain from further development.
<b>VI. Safety Element</b>	
<b>Goal 1. To protect the lives and property of the citizens of the West Shore Area General Plan from unacceptable risks associated with seismic, flooding, or wildfire hazards.</b>	
1. Maintain strict enforcement of seismic safety standards for new construction contained in the Uniform Building Code.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> New construction under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 would meet or exceed UBC and CBC standards for seismic safety. <u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development.
2. Initiate and active program to eliminate unsafe and hazardous structures through a comprehensive survey of building to determine susceptibility to seismic damage.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Redevelopment under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 would construct new buildings that meet or exceed UBC and CBC standards for seismic safety. <u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> Although the existing buildings may not conform to current California

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	Building Code, the structures have not been deemed hazardous or unsafe.
3. Review future development using all available seismic data and taking into account recommendations from the seismic safety element.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 5.</u> New construction under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 would meet or exceed UBC and CBC standards for seismic safety. <u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development.
4. Prohibit construction, grading, and filling of lands within the 100-year flood plain and in the area of wave run-up except as necessary to implement the goals and policies of the plan. Require all public utilities, transportation facilities, and other necessary public uses located in the 100-year flood plain and area of wave run-up to be constructed or maintained to prevent damage from flooding and to not cause flooding. Apply the stream setback provisions of the Placer County General Plan (Section 6/Natural Resources).	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Redevelopment under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 would remove existing structures from 100-year floodplains, and construct new buildings outside of floodplains. Alternatives 1 and 3 include the ecological restoration of SEZs where existing construction, grading or fill occurs in floodplains. <u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development.
5. Continue to implement land development policies which minimize potential loss of property and threat to human life caused by flooding.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Redevelopment under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 5 would remove existing structures from 100-year floodplains, and construct new buildings outside of floodplains. <u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development.
6. Ensure that all proposed developments are reviewed for fire safety standards by all local fire agencies responsible for its protection, including providing adequate water supplies and ingress and egress.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> The NLTFD will be required to approve plans prior to the County issuing a Building Permit. The NLTFD will review plans for emergency vehicle access, evacuation routes, and fire flows (water supply, pressure, and hydrant locations) in local responsibility areas (LRAs). <u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development.
7. Maintain strict enforcement of the Uniform Building Code and the Uniform Fire Code.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> New construction under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 would meet or exceed standards in the UBC, CBC, and UFC. <u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development.
8. Inform residents and visitors of the wildfire hazard associated with occupancy in the basin. Encourage use of fire resistant materials and fire preventative techniques when constructing structures, especially in the highest fire hazard areas. Manage forest fuels to be consistent with state laws and other goals and policies of this Plan.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> New construction under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 would use fire resistant materials and fire preventative techniques that meet or exceed CBC standards. Snow making systems and fuels reduction programs will substantially reduce the wildfire potential threat to the community under Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6. <u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development that would increase wildfire hazard.

West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards		HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis	
VII. Noise Element.			
Goal 1. The adopted CNEL standards are to be observed [as identified in Goal 3, Noise Threshold Levels by Land Use District].			
Goal 2. The Mitigation Measures identified in the environmental document for the Plan shall be observed. These Measures are as follows:		<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area currently exceeds CNEL limits and the area is in non-attainment. The existing and proposed noise levels are discussed in Chapter 13 of the EIR/EIS. Mitigation to shield sensitive uses from noise and building placement to avoid locating sensitive uses near noise-producing uses is proposed as feasible.	
a. To adopt specific policies and an implementation program which require effective noise mitigation measures in the design of the new noise-generating and new noise-sensitive land uses.			
b. To provide sufficient noise exposure information so that the land use planning and project review process may effectively address existing and potential noise impacts.			
c. To protect areas where the present noise environment is within acceptable limits.			
Goal 3. The CNEL for SR 89 is established at 55 dB, measured 300 feet from the edge of the right-of-way.			
Noise Threshold Levels by Land Use District		<u>Consistent with Mitigation – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area is currently not in attainment for transportation corridor noise levels. Mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce project generated noise levels in the vicinity of the Project area.	
Land Use Category	Average Noise Level or CNEL Range (dBA)		
High density residential areas	55		
Low density residential areas	50		
Hotel/motel facilities	55		
Commercial Areas	65		
Urban outdoor recreation areas	55		
Rural outdoor recreation areas	50		
Wilderness and roadless areas	25		
Critical habitat areas	25		
PAS 157: Homewood/Ski Homewood Area			
Plan Designation: Land Use Classification: Recreation Management Strategy: Mitigation Special Designation: Scenic Restoration Area		<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives maintain ski facilities and classification as a recreation area. Site improvements promote the mitigation management strategy as well as improve the scenic character. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 would amend the Special Designation to include “TDR Receiving Area for Existing Development (commercial) to newly created Special Area 1”, which would allow the transfer of CFA. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> This alternative converts the ski facilities to a commercial structure and 16 single-family residential lots. This does not support the recreation land use classification as it would eliminate recreation in the PAS.	
Planning Statement: This area should continue to provide opportunities for downhill skiing within guidelines prepared through ski area master plans and scenic restoration plans for the west shore.		<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives maintain ski facilities and classification as a recreation area. Site improvements promote the mitigation management strategy as well as improve the scenic character. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> This alternative converts the ski facilities to a commercial structure and 16 single-	



<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	family residential lots. This does not support the recreation land use classification as it would eliminate recreation in the PAS.
<b>Special Policies:</b>	
1. All affected parties should coordinate planning to assess the feasibility and demand for expanded ski facilities under a ski area master plan.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Although there is no expansion of ski capacity, aging facilities will be improved, including replacement of the Madden triple chair at the north base with an 8-passenger gondola, and upgrade of the Ellis Chair with a detachable quad chair to improve the recreational experience. In addition, the new recreation (swimming pool, ice skating), amphitheater, and tourist facilities provide a coordinated benefit with the surrounding community.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not establish a ski area master plan. Under Alternative 2, existing conditions persist and under Alternative 4, the ski area is eliminated and replaced with commercial uses and single-family housing.</p>
2. Multi-use of ski area base facilities is encouraged, especially joint use agreements between the ski area and local marinas to share parking space. Further partnerships between the public and private sector should be developed to address transportation needs.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives expand the base facilities to provide a greater range of tourist accommodations, residences, and commercial uses. The swimming pool would be accessible to area residents. The amphitheater would provide a home for local cultural events. Alternative transportation efforts, including transit and shuttle service would improve access between the resort and local marinas.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Under Alternative 2, existing conditions persist and under Alternative 4, the ski area is eliminated and replaced with commercial uses and single-family housing.</p>
3. Upgrading and redevelopment of the Homewood ski base facilities should be encouraged, including landscaping, installation of best management practices (BMP) and upgrading of the lodge facilities.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives upgrade and redevelop the base facilities by providing a mixed-use development that includes landscaping, BMPs, and other environmental benefits.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Under Alternative 2, existing conditions persist and under Alternative 4, the ski area is eliminated and replaced with commercial uses and single-family housing.</p>
4. New commercial facilities are limited to the base areas of the existing facilities, although accessory facilities may be allowed on the mid or upper mountain.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 limit new commercial to the base areas and allow accessory uses at the mid-mountain lodge. Alternative 2 does not propose new facilities. Alternative 4 proposes commercial uses only at the base area.
5. Opportunities exist for development of cross-country skiing on properties of the Tahoe City PUD and access for cross-country skiing should be improved.	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Cross-country skiing opportunities or improved access would not be pursued under these alternatives.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Cross country ski trails, utilizing connections to the 1960 vintage Olympic ski course, would occur under these alternatives.</p>

<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<b>Permissible Uses: Allowed (A) and considered under special use provisions (S).</b>	
<u>Residential:</u> Employee housing (S) and single-family dwellings (S).	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new uses. The single-family dwellings proposed for Alternative 4 are acceptable as a special use; but would result in the ski resort closure.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose employee housing, but not single-family dwellings. Alternatives 1, 3, and 6 propose multi-family housing and single family housing in condominiums via a two step subdivision process; however this use would be located outside of PAS 157 through amendments to PAS 158 and 159.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 proposes single-family dwellings and multi-family housing; however the density of the multi-family housing exceeds density limits and findings cannot be made for the high density (45 DUA).</p>
<u>Tourist Accommodations:</u> Bed and breakfast facilities (S) and hotels, motels, and other transient dwelling units (S).	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not propose these uses or non-permissible related uses.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose hotels. Alternatives 1 and 3 propose timeshare units; however this use would be located outside of PAS 157 through amendments to PAS 159.</p>
<u>Commercial:</u> Eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (A), general merchandise stores (A), outdoor retail sales (S), amusements and recreation services (S), secondary storage (S), outdoor concert events (S), vehicle storage (A) and parking (A).	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in new uses or development. Alternative 4 proposes neighborhood commercial uses. These uses will need to be compliant with the permissible uses list</p> <p><u>Consistent with Amendment– Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose an amendment to include personal services (S) to permit weddings and related activities. Approval of this amendment and approval of the use to support the tourist and neighborhood commercial uses result in consistency.</p>
<u>Public Service:</u> Pipelines and power transmission (S/CUP), public safety facilities (S), public utility centers (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), and transit stations and terminals (S).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives propose public services beyond transit stops, which already exist onsite.
<u>Recreation:</u> Day use areas (A), recreation center (S) participant sports facilities (S), group facilities (S), outdoor recreation concessions (S) and visitor information center (S), cross country skiing courses (S), riding and hiking trails (A), Alpine ski facilities (S) and snow mobile courses (S).	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in new uses or development. Alternative 4 does not propose recreation uses.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> The County includes participant sports facilities (S) to allow the swimming pool (unlike the TRPA PAS 157 that requires this to be added via amendment)</p>
<u>Resource Management:</u> Forest management practices (A), erosion control (A), runoff control (A), and SEZ restoration (A).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Proposed uses under each of the alternatives is consistent with these resource management uses. No new resource management uses are proposed.
<b>Maximum Densities:</b> <u>Residential:</u> Single family dwelling – 1 unit /parcel	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 with Amendment.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 maintain existing densities. Alternatives 1, 3 and 6 propose to add multi-

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<p>Employee housing (multi-family) – 15 DUA.</p> <p><u>Tourist Accommodation:</u></p> <p>Bed and Breakfast – 10 units/ac.</p> <p>Hotel, motel, and other transient units – 20 units/ac.</p>	<p>family housing at a density of 15 DUA, which is considered to be consistent with adjacent uses.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> This alternative will require multi-family residential density at 45 DUA which is not consistent with adjacent uses.</p>
<p><b>Developed Outdoor Recreation:</b></p> <p>Summer day uses – 500 PAOT</p> <p>Winter Day Use – 1,150 PAOT</p> <p>Overnight Uses – 0</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives will maintain the existing PAOT.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> This alternative will eliminate outdoor recreation from the PAS, resulting in substantially underutilized PAOT.</p>
<p><b>Commercial Floor Area Allocation:</b> Future commercial development may be considered, based on the preparation of a Ski Area Master Plan and subject to further environmental documentation.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives either do not propose new commercial development (Alternative 2) or propose new commercial development through the Ski Area Master Plan as analyzed in this EIR/EIS.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> This alternative proposes a new commercial structure in the existing parking lot area; however, this alternative eliminates the ski facilities.</p>
<p><b>Other:</b> 5 miles of hiking trails</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not include 5 miles of hiking trails</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose 5 miles of hiking trails, directional signage, and linkages to the base area pedestrian paths.</p>
<p><b>Parking Requirements:</b></p> <p>a. Single-family dwelling: usable and accessible space for two (2) vehicles located entirely on-site.</p> <p>b. Other uses: refer to <i>Parking Standards</i>.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Alternative 2 will keep the existing parking lot, which is used for community events in the off-season and provides adequate parking year-round. Alternative 4 will maintain a parking lot adjacent to SR 89 for the commercial structure. Adequate parking will be provided in this lot as well as for each residence. Alternatives 5 and 6 include adequate parking in underground parking garages.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> While these alternatives include underground parking, there is an excess number of spaces at the North Base and a deficient number of spaces at the South Base per Placer County standards. Implementation of mitigation proposed in Chapter 11 of the EIR/EIS provides consistency with County standards.</p>
<p><b>Height Restrictions:</b> Established in TRPA Code Chapter 22.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. The buildings proposed for Alternatives 3 and 4 meet existing height standards and additional height allowances.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Amendment– Alternatives 1 and 6.</u> These alternatives propose an amendment to the Chapter 22 to allow additional height on the Project area. The amendments to Chapter 22 would also change the method of measuring height within an adopted Ski Area Master Plan. Adoption of the amendment results in consistency.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 proposes a</p>

<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	height amendment; however the heights proposed and the mass of the structure (4-story multi-family structure) adjacent to SR 89 are not compatible with the surrounding community and do not support visual improvements. Findings for an Alternative 5 height amendment cannot be made.
<b>Setbacks:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The minimum front setback shall be 45 ft. from the centerline of the abutting traveled way, or 20 ft. from the property line, or as required by the TRPA, whichever is more restrictive.</li> <li>Side setbacks: a total of 15 ft., with a 5 ft. minimum, or as required by TRPA, whichever is more restrictive.</li> <li>Rear setback: 10 ft., or as required by TRPA, whichever is more restrictive.</li> </ol>	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Existing buildings are consistent. Proposed buildings will be consistent with setback requirements.
<b>Minimum Building Site:</b> The minimum building site size shall be 10,000 sf.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> All alternatives are consistent.
<b>PAS 158: McKinney Tract</b>	
<u>Plan Designation:</u> Land Use Classification: Residential Management Strategy: Mitigation Special Designation: Scenic Restoration Area	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2, 4 and 5 do not propose non-single family residential development in this area. Alternatives 1, 3 and 6 propose residential condominiums in this area, consistent with the residential land use classification. Improvements to the SEZ area and scenic character as proposed by these alternatives supports the management strategy and special designation. The plan is proposed to be amended by applying the special designation of TDR Receiving Area for 1) Existing Development, and 2) Multi-Residential Units to the newly created “Special Area”.
<u>Planning Statement:</u> This area should remain residential, with a density of one single-family dwelling per parcel.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4, and 5.</u> These alternatives do not propose development in this area. <u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3 and 5.</u> These alternatives result in the area remaining residential, but the density changes to allow 15 multi-family units per acre within a newly created special district. With amendment adoption, these alternatives will be consistent.
<b>Permissible Uses: Allowed (A) and considered under special use provisions (S).</b>	
<u>Residential:</u> Single-family dwellings (S).	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4 and 5.</u> These alternatives do not propose non-single family residential uses in this PAS. <u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6.</u> These alternatives propose to amend PAS 158 to include multi-family dwellings (S) within a new “Special Area”. This will result in consistency by allowing residential condominiums, but only in a limited location.
<u>Public Service:</u> Local public health and safety facilities (S), transit stations and terminals (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S/CUP), public utility center (S), and local post	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> These uses are not proposed by the alternatives.

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
offices (S) and day care centers (S).	
<b>Recreation:</b> Participant sports facilities (S), day use areas (A), riding and hiking trails (A), and each recreation (A).	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives do not propose recreation uses in this PAS. <u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives propose to amend PAS 158 to include Skiing Facilities (A) within a new “Special Area”. This will result in consistency to reflect the ski facilities, but only in a limited location.
<b>Resource Management:</b> Forest management practices (A), erosion control (A), SEZ restoration (A), and runoff control (A).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Activities proposed in this area are permissible.
<b>Shorezone:</b> The following structures may be permitted in the shorezone as an allowed (A) or special (S) use only if they are accessory to an existing, allowed use located on the same or adjoining littoral parcel: <b>Tolerance District 7:</b> <u>Primary Uses:</u> Beach recreation (A), safety and navigational devices (A) and salvage operations (A). <u>Accessory Structures:</u> Buoys (A), fences (S), boat ramps (S), breakwaters or jetties (S), floating docks and platforms (A), shoreline protective structures (S), and water intake lines (S).	<u>Consistent- All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives are located within this area.
<b>Maximum Densities:</b> Residential: Single-family dwelling – 1 unit/parcel.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4 and 5.</u> These alternatives do not propose development within this PAS. <u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6.</u> These alternatives propose residential condominiums and an amendment to the Plan to include maximum densities for multi-family dwellings at 15 units per acre within the “Special Area”. Adoption of the amendment results in consistency.
<b>Parking Requirements:</b> a. Single-family dwelling: usable and accessible space for two (2) vehicles located entirely on-site. b. Other uses: refer to <i>Parking Standards</i> .	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4 and 5.</u> These Alternatives do not propose activity in this PAS. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6.</u> While these alternatives include underground parking, there is an excess number of spaces at the North Base and a deficient number of spaces at the South Base per Placer County standards. Implementation of mitigation proposed in Chapter 11 of the EIR/EIS provides consistency with County standards.
<b>Height Restrictions:</b> Established in TRPA Code Chapter 22.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4 and 5.</u> These Alternatives do not propose new development in this area. <u>Consistent with Amendment– Alternative 1, 3 and 6.</u> Alternatives 1 and 6 propose an amendment to Code Chapter 22 to allow additional height on the Project area. Adoption of the amendment results in consistency. <u>Consistent – Alternative 3.</u> Alternative 3 is consistent with Code Chapter 22 standards.
<b>Setbacks:</b> a. The minimum front setback shall be 45 ft. from the centerline of the abutting traveled way, or 20 ft. from the property line, or as required by the TRPA, whichever is more restrictive.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4 and 5.</u> These alternatives do not propose new development in this area. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6.</u> New development at the south base is designed to meet setback requirements.

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<p>b. Side setbacks: a total of 15 ft., with a 5 ft. minimum, or as required by TRPA, whichever is more restrictive.</p> <p>c. Rear setback: 10 ft., or as required by TRPA, whichever is more restrictive.</p>	
<b>Minimum Building Site:</b> The minimum building site size shall be 10,000 sf.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> All alternatives are consistent.
<b>159 – Homewood/Commercial</b>	
<p><u>Plan Designation:</u>  Land Use Classification: Commercial/Tourist  Management Strategy: Redirection  Special Designation: Preliminary Community Plan  Area TDR Receiving Area for: 1. Existing Development; Scenic Restoration Area</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not propose development in this area.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose new tourist, commercial and some higher density residential uses, which correspond to the Commercial/Tourist land use classification. Site improvements including substantial visual quality improvements through architecture, landscaping and utility undergrounding, water quality improvements, erosion control, and expansion of commercial and tourist uses within the development corridor along SR 89 promote redirection and scenic restoration.  <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 proposes multi-family housing; however the 4-story structure does not support scenic restoration and findings cannot be made for the high density (45 DUA) or required height amendment.</p>
<p><u>Planning Statement:</u> This area should continue to be a mixed residential and commercial area. However, there is a need for rehabilitation while maintaining the scale and character of the west shore. Because of the historic development of the area, for example, residential uses interspersed with commercial, the boundaries of this plan are not contiguous. Special Areas have been created with limitation on permissible uses to minimize conflicts with adjoining land uses.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not propose development in this area.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6.</u> These alternatives support this planning statement by providing a mixed commercial and residential area that combines tourist and recreational uses at an appropriate scale and within a “Special Area” so that this type of mixed use is appropriately located along the SR 89 corridor.  <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 proposes mixed use; however the density of the multi-family housing (45 DUA) conflicts with adjoining uses and findings cannot be made to support densities at this level.</p>
<b>Special Policies:</b>	
1. Planning for development of this area should include consideration of the adjoining ski areas in PAS 157, as well as marina master planning.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not include development in this area. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 result in joining the ski area with PAS 159 by providing a mixed-use area beneficial to both PAS 157 and 159.
2. This area should be considered for a major water borne transit stop.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not include development in this area. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include water taxi service.
3. The marina facilities should be expanded and upgraded to accommodate increasing boating needs.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The alternatives do not include marina facilities. Proposal to allow boat trailer parking in the North Base parking structure will support the boating needs of the public while removing the boat

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	trailers from along the roadway.
4. Tourism and recreation compatible with the historic nature development should be encouraged in this Plan Area.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not include development in this area. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 result in joining the ski area with PAS 159 by providing a mixed-use area beneficial to both PAS 157 and 159, including tourist accommodations, new recreation opportunities, transit service in the area, and expansion of the bike path to connect to other area recreation and tourism features.
5. Outdoor seasonal events shall be regulated in a manner to reduce conflicts with neighboring residential uses and to minimize environmental impacts.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not include development in this area. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include outdoor seasonal events and concerts within an outdoor amphitheater. The amphitheater is designed to move noise up the mountain and away from adjacent land uses. Use of the amphitheater will be regulated to reduce disturbances.
6. The parcels located south of Silver Avenue and east of SR 89 are included in Plan Area 159 (commercial), although some lots have entitlements for development of single-family dwellings. Those lots that developed as homesites may be more appropriate in a residential land use classification in the future.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not include development in this area. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 do not prevent the movement of single-family entitlements to more appropriate locations.
<b>Permissible Uses: Allowed (A) and considered under special use provisions (S).</b>	
<u>Residential:</u> Employee housing (S) and single-family dwellings (S).	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> No residential uses are proposed in this area for these alternatives. <u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose employee housing and multi-family dwellings. Multi-family dwellings will be added through amendment as a special use within a newly created “Special District”. This will result in consistency and will limit multi-family units to the designated area so as not to affect the permissible uses and mix of residential units elsewhere in the area. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> The proposed housing density of 45 DUA is not complimentary to the surrounding land uses and an amendment allowing such density is not feasible.
<u>Tourist Accommodations:</u> Bed and breakfast facilities (A) and hotels, motels, and other transient dwelling units (A) up to 20 units, more than 20 units (S), timeshare (hotel/motel design) (S), and timeshare (residential design) (S).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No development is proposed in this area for Alternatives 2 and 4. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 propose various tourist accommodations including hotel and timeshare units, which are permissible uses.
<u>Commercial:</u> Auto, mobile home and vehicle dealers (S), boat dealers (S), building materials and hardware (conducted within a building) (A), (outside of a building) (S), eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (A), furniture, home furnishings and equipment (S), general merchandise stores (A), mail order and vending (A), nursery (A), outdoor retail sales (S), service stations (S), amusements and recreation services (S), outdoor amusements (S), outdoor concert events (more than	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> No residential uses are proposed in this area for these alternatives. <u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3, and 5.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 propose to amend the list of permissible uses by adding “Privately Owned Assembly and Entertainment” as a special use within the Special Area. This will result in consistency and will limit development of this type of use to the north base area of the resort where it is most appropriately located.

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
one) (S), animal husbandry services (S), auto repair and service (S), broadcasting studios (A), business support services (A), healthcare services (A), personal services (A), professional offices (A), repair services (A), schools – pre-schools (A), secondary storage (S), fuel and ice dealers (S), small scale manufacturing (S), storage yards (S), vehicle storage and parking (S), warehousing (S).	
<b>Public Service:</b> Airfields, landing strips and heliports (new non-emergency sites prohibited) (S), churches (S), cultural facilities (A), day care centers (A), government offices (S), local assembly and entertainment (A), local post office (A), local public health and safety facilities (A), membership organizations (A), public utility centers (S), regional public health and safety facilities (S), schools – kindergarten through secondary (A), social service organizations (A), pipelines and power transmission (S/CUP), transit stations and terminals (S), transportation routes (S/CUP) and transmission and receiving facilities (S).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No development is proposed in this area for Alternatives 2 and 4. Public service uses proposed under Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 are permissible uses.
<b>Recreation:</b> Day use areas (A), recreation center (S) participant sports facilities (S), beach recreation (A), boat launching facilities (S), cross-country skiing courses (S), outdoor recreation concessions (A), marinas (S/CUP), riding and hiking trails (S), skiing facilities (S), snow mobile courses (S), and visitor information center (S).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No development is proposed in this area for Alternatives 2 and 4. Recreation uses proposed under Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6, such as cross-country skiing and hiking/bicycle trails are permissible uses.
<b>Resource Management:</b> Forest management practices (A), erosion control (A), runoff control (A), and SEZ restoration (A).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No development is proposed in this area for Alternatives 2 or 4. Proposed resource management efforts are permitted in this area.
<b>Special Area 1 Permissible Uses:</b> Residential – single-family dwelling (A) Tourist Accommodation – Bed and breakfast facilities (S), but for APN# 97-121-09 new development is restricted to the structure of the size of that existed as of July, 1998.	<u>Consistent- All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives are located within this area.
<b>Special Area 2 Permissible Uses:</b> Residential – single-family dwelling (A), multi-family residences (S), employee housing (S). Tourist Accommodation – Bed and breakfast facility (S), timeshare (S), hotels, motels and other transient dwelling units, less than 20 units (A) more than 20 units (S). Commercial – Sports equipment sales and rentals (A), eating and drinking places (S), general merchandise stores (S), nursery (S), business support services (S), healthcare services (S), personnel services (S), professional offices (A).	<u>Consistent- All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives are located within this area.
<b>Special Area 3 Permissible Uses:</b> Residential – single family dwelling (A), hotel motel, and other transient dwellings (A), up to 20 units,	<u>Consistent- All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives are located within this area.



<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
more than 20 units (S), eating and drinking establishments (A).	
<p><b>Special Area 4 Permissible Uses:</b>  Residential – Employee housing (S) and single family dwelling (A).  Tourist Accommodation – Bed and breakfast facilities (A), hotels, motels and other transient dwelling units, (A) up to 20 units, more than 20 units (S), timeshare (hotel/motel design) (S) and timeshare (residential design) (S).  <u>Commercial:</u> Auto, mobile home and vehicle dealers (S), boat dealers (S), building materials and hardware (conducted within a building) (A), (outside of a building) (S), eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (S), furniture, home furnishings and equipment (S), general merchandise stores (S), mail order and vending (S), nursery (S), outdoor retail sales (S), service stations (S), amusements and recreation services (S), outdoor amusements (S), outdoor concert events (more than one) (S), animal husbandry services (S), auto repair and service (S), broadcasting studios (A), business support services (S), healthcare services (S), personal services (S), professional offices (S), repair services (S), schools – pre-schools (S), secondary storage (S), fuel and ice dealers (S), small scale manufacturing (S), storage yards (S), vehicle storage and parking (S), warehousing (S).  <u>Public Service:</u> Airfields, landing strips and heliports (new non-emergency sites prohibited) (S), churches (S), cultural facilities (S), day care centers (S), government offices (S), local assembly and entertainment (S), local post office (S), local public health and safety facilities (S), membership organizations (S), public utility centers (S), regional public health and safety facilities (S), schools – kindergarten through secondary (S), social service organizations (S), pipelines and power transmission (S/CUP), transit stations and terminals (S), transportation routes (S/CUP) and transmission and receiving facilities (S).  <u>Recreation:</u> Day use areas (S), recreation center (S), participant sports facilities (S), beach recreation (S), boat launching facilities (S), cross-country skiing courses (S), outdoor recreation concessions (S), marinas (S/CUP), riding and hiking trails (S), skiing facilities (S), snow mobile courses (S), and visitor information center.  <u>Resource Management:</u> Forest management practices (A), erosion control (A), and SEZ restoration (A).</p>	<p><u>Consistent- All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives are located within this area.</p>
<p><b>Maximum Densities:</b>  <u>Residential:</u>  Single family dwelling – 1 unit /parcel.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not propose development in this area.  <u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6.</u></p>

<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<p>Multi family housing – 8 DUA.  Employee housing (multi-family) – 8 DUA.  <u>Tourist Accommodation:</u>  Bed and Breakfast – 10 units/ac.  Hotel, motel, and other transient units:  Kitchens in &lt;10% of units – 20 units/ac.  Kitchens in ≥10% of units – 15 units/ac.</p>	<p>These alternatives propose to amend the multi-family housing density from 8 units per acre to 15 units per acre within the new “Special Area”. This will accommodate the proposed employee housing and multi-family units, but will limit this higher density to the North Base area to avoid alterations to the overall residential density in PAS 159.  <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> The proposed housing density of 45 DUA is not complimentary to the surrounding land uses and findings cannot be made to support an amendment allowing such density.</p>
<p><b>Parking Requirements:</b>  a. Single-family dwelling: usable and accessible space for two (2) vehicles located entirely on-site.  b. Other uses: refer to <i>Parking Standards</i>.</p>	<p>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6. Alternatives 2 and 4 do not affect this PAS. Alternatives 5 and 6 include adequate parking in underground parking garages.  <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> While these alternatives include underground parking, there is an excess number of spaces at the North Base and a deficient number of spaces at the South Base per Placer County standards. Implementation of mitigation proposed in Chapter 11 of the EIR/EIS provides consistency with County standards.</p>
<p><b>Height Restrictions:</b> Established in TRPA Code Chapter 22.</p>	<p>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 3, and 4. Alternative 2 does not propose new development. The buildings proposed for Alternatives 3 and 4 will meet existing height standards and additional height allowances.  <u>Consistent with Amendment– Alternatives 1 and 6.</u> These alternatives propose an amendment to Chapter 22 to allow additional height on the Project area. Adoption of the amendment results in consistency.  <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Due to the increased visibility of the proposed 4-story structures along SR 89, findings cannot be made to support a structure of this size and visibility in this location.</p>
<p><b>Setbacks:</b>  a. The minimum front setback shall be 45 ft. from the centerline of the abutting traveled way, or 20 ft. from the property line, or as required by the TRPA, whichever is more restrictive.  b. Side setbacks: a total of 15 ft., with a 5 ft. minimum, or as required by TRPA, whichever is more restrictive.  c. Rear setback: 10 ft., or as required by TRPA, whichever is more restrictive.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Each of the various building layouts for each alternative comply with minimum setback requirements.</p>
<p><b>Minimum Building Site:</b> The minimum building site size shall be 10,000 sf.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> All alternatives are consistent.</p>
<p><b>Tourist Accommodation Bonus Units:</b> 50 units.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not require bonus units. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 have requested 50 bonus units.</p>
<p><b>Commercial Floor Area Allocation:</b> The maximum amount of commercial floor area which may be allocated for new development in the Plan Area,</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not propose development in this area.  <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These</p>

<b>West Shore Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
predicted on an assignment of such commercial allocation by the TRPA, is 15,000 sf for the 10 year period after plan adoption. The addition of an allocation of 5,000 sf is proposed for use in addition to existing commercial development. Future commercial development associated with alpine skiing or marina development may be considered, based on the preparation of a Ski Area Master Plan, or Marina Master Plan, and subject to further environmental documentation.	alternatives propose an additional 25,000 sf (approximately as each alternative varies) of additional CFA under the Master Plan. Since this development is associated with the Ski Area Master Plan, additional CFA may be allocated.

Source: County of Placer. 1998. *West Shore Area General Plan*.  
Adopted October 19, 1998. Placer County. Auburn, CA, HBA 2010

### 4.3.2 Placer County General Plan

The Placer County General Plan, adopted by Placer County, California in 1994, contains goals, policies, and development standards applicable to the Project Area and vicinity in Placer County. The goals and policies in Table 4.3-2 are applicable to the HMR Ski Area Master Plan and provide a framework for future direction and development of the area. Table 4.3-2 includes an analysis of the consistency between the Placer County General Plan and the Project and Alternatives.

**Table 4.3-2**

#### HMR Consistency Analysis with the 1994 Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<b>Generalized Land Uses, Development Standards, and Zoning Districts</b>	
<b>Urban</b>	
<b>Tourist/Resort Commercial (TC)</b> This designation provides for specialized commercial uses serving tourism and the travelling public. This designation is applied along major transportation corridors and at major recreational destinations such as ski areas and other types of resorts. Typical land uses allowed include: overnight lodging facilities of all types, retail services, food services, motorist and vehicle services, medical facilities, parks, churches, libraries and museums, necessary public utility and safety facilities, and similar and compatible uses. Minimum lot area: 6,000 – 20,000 sf. DUA: 11-21 DUA. Maximum Nonresidential Floor Area Ratio (FAR): 0.80. Proposed Community Plan Land Use Designations: Tourist/Resort Commercial.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not affect PAS 159 (Tourist/Commercial). Alternatives 1, 3 and 6 will place resort and commercial facilities within this area. These alternatives maintain the site use as a resort and add lodging, retail and food services, and other commercial/tourist features that support the resort. Multi-family units would be 15 DUA. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 proposes multi-family housing at a density of 45 DUA. Findings cannot be made for this density level as it is not complimentary to the surrounding community.

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
Proposed Consistent Zoning Districts (6,000 to 20,000 sq. ft. min.): Highway Service (HS); Motel (MT); Resort (RES).	
<p><b>Low Density Residential (LDR)</b></p> <p>This designation is applied to urban or urbanizing areas suitable for single-family residential neighborhoods, with individual homes on lots ranging in area from 10,000 square feet to one acre. Typical land uses allowed include: detached single-family dwellings, secondary dwellings, and residential accessory uses; churches, schools, parks, golf courses, child care facilities; and necessary public utility and safety facilities.</p> <p>Minimum lot area: 10,000af – 1.0 acre. DUA: 1-5 DUA. Maximum Nonresidential Floor Area Ratio (FAR): 0.30.</p> <p>Proposed Community Plan Land Use Designations: Low Density Residential.</p> <p>Proposed Consistent Zoning Districts (6,000 to 20,000 sq. ft. min.): Highway Service (HS); Motel (MT); Resort (RES).</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4 and 5.</u> These alternatives do not affect PAS 158 (Residential).</p> <p><u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6.</u> These alternatives place higher density housing (up to 15 DUA) within an area currently serving single-family units at one dwelling per lot. Amending the West Shore Area General Plan to allow higher density housing within a “Special Area” as discussed above will result in consistency.</p>
<p><b>High Density Residential (HDR)</b></p> <p>This designation provides for residential neighborhoods of grouped or clustered single-family dwellings, duplexes, apartments, and other multiple-family attached dwellings such as condominiums. This designation is applied within urban areas where residential development will be near transportation corridors, downtowns, village centers, other major commercial centers, schools and community services. Typical land uses allowed include: detached and attached single-family dwellings, secondary dwellings, all types of multi-family dwellings (e.g., duplexes, apartments, senior housing projects, etc.), and residential accessory uses; churches, schools, parks, golf courses, child care facilities; and necessary public utility and safety facilities.</p> <p>Minimum lot area: 3,500 – 10,000 sf. DUA: 10-21 DUA. Maximum Nonresidential Floor Area Ratio (FAR): 1.05.</p> <p>Proposed Community Plan Land Use Designations: High Density Residential.</p> <p>Proposed Consistent Zoning Districts (6,000 to 20,000 sq. ft. min.): Highway Service (HS); Motel (MT); Resort (RES).</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not propose high density residential.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6.</u> These alternatives propose high density residential in the base areas. Amendments to PASs 158 and 159 are needed to allow such densities in a “Special Area”.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> The proposed housing density of 45 DUA is significantly more than currently allowed and findings cannot be made to support an amendment allowing such density.</p>
<b>Rural Residential</b>	
<p><b>Rural Residential (RR)</b></p> <p>This designation is applied to areas generally located away from cities and unincorporated community centers, in hilly, mountainous, and/or forested terrain and as a</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4, and 5.</u> These alternatives do not affect PAS 158 (Residential).</p> <p><u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3, and 6.</u> These alternatives place higher density housing (up to 15</p>

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<p>buffer zone where dispersed residential development on larger parcels would be appropriate, and compatible with smaller-scale farming and ranching operations. Typical uses allowed include: detached single-family dwellings and secondary dwellings; agricultural uses such as crop production and grazing, equestrian facilities, and limited agricultural support businesses such as roadside stands, farm equipment and supplies sales; resource extraction uses; various facilities and services that support residential neighborhoods, such as churches, schools, libraries, child care and medical facilities; and parks and necessary public utility and safety facilities.</p> <p>Minimum lot area: 1-10 ac.  DUA: 1.0 dwelling unit per lot.  Maximum Nonresidential Floor Area Ratio (FAR): 0.30.</p> <p>Proposed Community Plan Land Use Designations:  Forest Residential, Rural Estate, Rural Residential.</p> <p>Proposed Consistent Zoning Districts (1-10 ac. Minimum lot sizes)*: Farm (F); Residential Agricultural (RA); Residential Forest (RF); Open Space (O).</p>	<p>DUA) within an area currently serving single-family units at one dwelling per lot. Amending the West Shore Area General Plan to allow higher density housing within a “Special Area” as discussed above will result in consistency.</p>
<b>Resource Protection, Greenbelt, Open Space, and Recreation</b>	
<p><b>Resorts and Recreation (REC)</b></p> <p>This designation is applied to mountain, water-oriented, and other areas of existing and potential public and commercial recreational use, where such use can occur without conflict with surrounding rural and/or agricultural uses. Typical land uses allowed include: parks, camping facilities, ski and other resort facilities including residential, transient lodging, and commercial uses in support of such facilities, necessary public utility and safety facilities, and similar and compatible uses.</p> <p>Minimum lot area: 1-160 ac.  DUA: 1.0 dwelling unit per lot.  Maximum Nonresidential Floor Area Ratio (FAR): 0.30.</p> <p>Proposed Community Plan Land Use Designations:  Park, Recreation, Ski Area.</p> <p>Proposed Consistent Zoning Districts*: Forestry (FOR); Resort (RES); Residential Single Family (RS); Residential Multi-Family (RM); Open Space (O); Water Influence (W).</p>	<p>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6. These alternatives maintain PAS 157 as a resort and support the land use designation of Recreation. Alternative 2 would not result in changes to the existing ski facilities. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 propose lodging, residential units, commercial uses and new recreational uses that support the resort outside the winter ski season. Since these alternatives propose to place residential uses within PASs 158 and 159, the dwelling unit density applies in these Plan Areas and not PAS 157.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 proposes to close the ski facilities to construct a commercial lot and single-family residences. Closure of the ski facilities does not support the Recreation land use designation.</p>
<p><u>*Proposed Consistent Zoning Districts for All General Plan Land Use Designations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combining Agriculture (-AG)</li> <li>• Combining Aircraft Overflight (-AO)</li> <li>• Combining Building Site (-B)</li> <li>• Combining Conditional Use Permit (-UP)</li> <li>• Combining Design Review (-Dc, -Ds, -Dh)</li> <li>• Combining Development Reserve (-DR)</li> <li>• Combining Flood Hazard (-FH)</li> </ul>	<p>These combining districts are not applied to the Project area as shown on County Zoning Map S7.</p>

Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Combining Geological Hazard (-GH)</li> <li>Combining Mineral Reserve (-MR)</li> <li>Combining Planned Residential Development (-PD)</li> <li>Combining Traffic Management (-TM)</li> <li>Combining Special Purpose Zone (-SP).</li> </ul>	
<b>LAND USE BUFFER ZONE STANDARDS</b>	
<b>PLANNING STANDARDS</b>	
<p><b>1. Agriculture/Timberland Buffers.</b> These buffer zones are required to separate urban uses (particularly residential) from lands designated Agriculture or Timberland on the Land Use Diagram, where noise from machinery, dust, the use of fertilizers and chemical sprays, and other related agricultural/timber harvesting activities would create problems for nearby residential and other sensitive land uses. These buffers also serve to minimize disturbance of agricultural operations from nearby urban or suburban uses, including trespassing by nearby residents and domestic animals. Figures I-2 and I-3 illustrate how these buffer zones might be used.</p> <p>Timberland Buffer Zone Width:  Residential Exclusion Area = 100 ft., residential structures prohibited; non-habitable accessory structures permitted.  Buffer Width Range = 100 – 400 ft., required buffer dependent on site or project-specific characteristics as determined through County's specific plan, land use permit, and/or subdivision review process.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> While the westernmost portion of the Project area is identified as a timberland production zone no development occurs within this area or near this area. This area remains as ski facilities or undeveloped space.</p>
<p><b>3. Sensitive Habitat Buffers.</b> These buffer zones are required to separate any type of urban development from such sensitive habitat areas as stream corridors, wetlands, sensitive species habitats, and old growth forests, where the land-altering aspects of development itself, and/or the secondary effects of development (e.g., runoff from pavement carrying pollutants, air pollution emissions, traffic, noise, glare, increased pedestrian access) may degrade important habitat areas. Figure I-5 shows an example of a sensitive habitat buffer.</p> <p><b>a. Buffer Dimensions:</b> Sensitive habitat buffers shall, at a minimum, be measured as follows: 100 feet from the centerline of perennial streams, 50 feet from centerline of intermittent streams, and 50 feet from the edge of the sensitive habitats to be protected. (See also policy 6.A.1.).</p> <p><b>b. Uses Allowed in Buffer:</b> Open space and recreational uses including undeveloped greenbelts, nature preserves, parks, hiking trails and bicycle paths. No land use allowed within the buffer that involves grading or the removal of natural</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives propose new structures within the buffer zone of streams. Existing SEZ within the Project area has been developed and the poor quality of the SEZ due to development (parking lots/roads) does not support species habitat. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 will result in removal of some of these disturbance areas and restoration of the SEZ, which will result in a beneficial impact to support this policy.</p>

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
vegetation shall be located any closer than 50 feet to the top of a stream bank or to the outermost extent of riparian vegetation, wetland, or other identified habitat, whichever is greater.	
<b>GENERAL LAND USE</b>	
<b>Goal 1.A: To promote the wise, efficient, and environmentally-sensitive use of Placer County lands to meet the present and future needs of Placer County residents and businesses.</b>	
1.A.1. The County will promote the efficient use of land and natural resources.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose changes to existing conditions. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 propose dynamic use of the Project area that sustains year-round activity, improves water quality and the scenic character of the area, and serves the community.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 would close the ski resort and use the land for estate home lots, removing a vital recreational facility currently open to the public.</p>
1.A.2. The County shall permit only low-intensity forms of development in areas with sensitive environmental resources or where natural or human-caused hazards are likely to pose a significant threat to health, safety, or property.	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 would create a higher density, mixed use village centered on existing developed areas, removing existing structures from flood plains and SEZs. Alternative 4 includes very low density development in the vicinity of sensitive habitats in the ski area. Alternative 2 does not propose new development.</p>
1.A.3. The County shall distinguish among urban, suburban, and rural areas to identify where development will be accommodated and where public infrastructure and services will be provided. This pattern shall promote the maintenance of separate and distinct communities.	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area is identified as an area in need of redevelopment and expansion of tourist and recreation facilities.</p>
1.A.4. The County shall promote patterns of development that facilitate the efficient and timely provision of urban infrastructure and services.	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Expansion of the resort or reuse of the site includes expansion of urban infrastructure and services at the developer's cost. Infrastructure will be in place prior to operation of new facilities.</p>
1.A.5. The County shall not approve intensive forms of development or land divisions into parcels of 10 acres or less within any city's sphere of influence where that city's general plan calls ultimately for urban development except where the County General Plan or applicable Community Plan designates the area for urban development. The County shall inform cities in a timely manner when applications for development within their sphere of influence are filed with the County and shall consider the city's ultimate plans for the relevant area during project review. In such cases, Policy #16 in Part III shall apply to such development projects.	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area is located outside City limits.</p>

Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<b>RESIDENTIAL LAND USE</b>	
<b>Goal 1.B: To provide adequate land in a range of residential densities to accommodate the housing needs of all income groups expected to reside in Placer County.</b>	
<p>1.B.1. The County shall promote the concentration of new residential development in higher-density residential areas located along major transportation corridors and transit routes.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not propose high-density housing.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose higher density housing within “Special Areas” to limit the extent in which higher density housing may occur. These units are appropriately located along SR 89, a major transportation corridor, and where two transit stops currently exist.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 proposes multi-family housing along SR 89; however findings cannot be made to support a density of 45 DUA, nor findings be made to support a height amendment for a 4-story structure highly visible from a scenic corridor and uncharacteristic of the surrounding community.</p>
<p>1.B.2. The County shall encourage the concentration of multi-family housing in and near downtowns, village centers, major commercial areas, and neighborhood commercial centers.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 provide multifamily housing in a mixed-use, village setting adjacent to commercial areas.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 includes no multifamily housing</p>
<p>1.B.3. The County shall encourage the planning and design of new residential subdivisions to emulate the best characteristics (e.g., form, scale, and general character) of existing, nearby neighborhoods.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose residences. Alternatives 1, 3, 4 and 6 include architecture that reflects the “Old Tahoe” characteristic and use natural elements within the design including rock, exposed timbers, and landscaping. While the density may increase for Alternatives 1 and 3 and the concentration of structures along SR 89 is more prevalent for Alternative 3, the overall design will be characteristic of the West Shore and reflective of the surrounding natural environment.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 proposes multi-family housing along SR 89; however findings cannot be made to support a height amendment for a 4-story structure highly visible from a scenic corridor and uncharacteristic of the surrounding residential community.</p>
<p>1.B.4. The County shall ensure that residential land uses are separated and buffered from such major facilities as landfills, airports, and sewage treatment plants.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> New residential land uses include appropriate buffers from major incompatible facilities.</p>
<p>1.B.5. The County shall require residential project design to reflect and consider natural features, noise exposure of residents, visibility of structures, circulation, access, and the relationship of the project to surrounding uses. Residential densities and lot patterns will be determined by these and other factors. As a result, the maximum density specified by General Plan designations or zoning for a given parcel of land may not be realized.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 6 include designs that take into consideration and reflect natural features, noise, visibility, circulation, access, and adjacent land uses.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 proposes multi-family housing along SR 89; however findings cannot be made to support a density of 45 DUA, nor findings be made to support a height amendment for a 4-</p>



<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	story structure highly visible from a scenic corridor and uncharacteristic of the surrounding residential community.
1.B.6. The County shall require new subdivided lots to be adequate in size and appropriate in shape for the range of primary and accessory uses designated for the area.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 4, 5 and 6 include new lots available for development onsite. The lots would be designated for single-family residences, which is appropriate. The commercial lot for alternative 4 would be located along the SR 89 frontage, which is appropriate.
1.B.7. The County shall require multi-family developments to include private, contiguous, open space for each dwelling.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include multifamily housing that includes private contiguous open space for each dwelling. Alternatives 2 and 4 do not propose multi-family developments.
1.B.8. The County shall require residential subdivisions to be designed to provide well-connected internal and external street and pedestrian systems.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternative 4 proposes new residential lots upslope of the neighborhood commercial lot. A road will connect the residences to SR 89. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include residential uses within a mixed-use area. Internal roads and pedestrian paths link the various uses.
1.B.9. The County shall discourage the development of isolated, remote, and/or walled residential projects that do not contribute to the sense of community desired for the area.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area is within an established community. None of the alternatives propose isolated or walled residential projects.
1.B.10. The County shall require that all residential development provide private and/or public open spaces in order to insure that each parcel contributes to the adequate provision of light, air, and open space.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6.</u> The ski facilities will remain in operation under Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include hiking trails on the mountain for year-round access to undeveloped areas. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 will result in the closure of the resort and loss of public access to the upper mountain areas.
<b>MIXED USE SPECIFIC PLAN AREA</b>	
<b>COMMERCIAL LAND</b>	
<b>Goal 1.D: To designate adequate commercial land for and promote development of commercial uses to meet the present and future needs of Placer County residents and visitors and maintain economic vitality.</b>	
<b>General Commercial Areas Policies</b>	
1.D.1. The County shall require that new commercial development be designed to encourage and facilitate pedestrian circulation within and between commercial sites and nearby residential areas rather than being designed primarily to serve vehicular circulation.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new commercial development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include new commercial development. Under Alternative 4, this development will serve the existing neighborhood and will be located along SR 89 and existing transit stops for access. Commercial uses proposed under Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include both resort commercial and neighborhood commercial. The commercial uses will be accessible from SR 89, via transit, and through a system of pedestrian paths and a bike trail that link to other commercial uses in the area.
1.D.2. The County shall require new commercial development to be designed to minimize the visual	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
impact of parking areas on public roadways.	place parking underground. Alternative 4 maintains a portion of the existing parking lot on SR 89, but includes landscaping to buffer views of the parking area from the roadway.
1.D.3. The County shall require that new, urban, community commercial centers locate adjacent to major activity nodes and major transportation corridors. Community commercial centers should provide goods and services that residents have historically had to travel outside of the area to obtain.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 locate commercial uses along SR 89, which is the primary transportation route through the area.
1.D.4. The County shall require that significant new office developments locate near major transportation corridors and concentrations of residential uses. New office development may serve as buffers between residential uses and higher-intensity commercial uses.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No significant office developments are proposed. Proposed commercial uses will be located adjacent to SR 89.
<b>Downtown Areas/Village Centers Policies</b>	
1.D.5. The County shall encourage existing and new downtowns/village centers to provide a variety of goods and services, both public and private.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The project does not propose a new “downtown”; however, Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include mixed uses that support year-round function of the resort and that support the existing neighborhood.
1.D.6. The County shall promote use of first floor space in new buildings in downtowns/village centers for retail, food service, financial institutions, and other high-volume commercial uses.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The project does not propose a new “downtown”; however, Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include mixed uses that support year-round function of the resort and that support the existing neighborhood.
1.D.7. The County shall encourage new downtowns/village centers and new commercial projects and areas to be designed to maintain a continuous retail facade on all street frontages, except for public plazas and pedestrian passages between the front and rear of buildings.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The project does not propose a new “downtown”; however, Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include mixed uses that support year-round function of the resort and that support the existing neighborhood.
1.D.8. The County shall require minimal, or in some cases no, building setbacks for commercial and office uses in new downtowns/village centers.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The project does not propose a new “downtown”; however, Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include mixed uses that support year-round function of the resort and that support the existing neighborhood.
1.D.9. The County shall encourage parking in downtowns/village centers to be consolidated in well-designed and landscaped lots or in well-located parking structures.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The project does not propose a new “downtown”; however, Alternatives 1, 3, and 5 include mixed uses that support year-round function of the resort and that support the existing neighborhood. Parking will be located in underground garages at each base area.
1.D.10. The County shall encourage the preservation of historic and attractive buildings in existing downtowns/village centers, and encourage new development to enhance the character of downtowns/village centers.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> There are no historic or attractive buildings existing onsite.
1.D.11. The County shall require that existing and new downtowns/village centers and development within them be designed to integrate open spaces into the urban fabric where possible, especially taking advantage of	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The project does not propose a new “downtown”; however, Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include mixed uses that support year-round function of the resort and that support the existing

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
any natural amenities such as creeks, hillsides, and scenic views.	neighborhood. These alternatives include public spaces within the development.
<b>PUBLIC AND QUASI-PUBLIC FACILITIES, INFRASTRUCTURE</b>	
<b>Goal 1.F: To designate adequately-sized, well-located areas for the development of public facilities to serve both community and regional needs.</b>	
1.F.1. The County will encourage the concentration of public and quasi-public facilities. New and expanded government offices and other professional offices should be encouraged to locate on land near existing government offices.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> There are no existing government offices onsite or proposed. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include recreation facilities accessible to the public, including a community swimming pool and amphitheater, but no offices are planned.
1.F.2. The County shall seek to locate new public facilities necessary for emergency response, healthcare, and other critical functions outside areas subject to natural or built environment hazards.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Emergency response or healthcare facilities are not proposed.
1.F.3. The County shall require public facilities, such as wells, pumps, tanks, and yards, to be located and designed so that noise, light, odors, and appearance do not adversely affect nearby land uses.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose changes to existing conditions. Alternative 4 does not propose public facilities. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include tanks and maintenance areas that serve the resort and ski facilities. These facilities are located at the mid-mountain lodge to avoid adverse affects on adjacent residential land uses located at the bottom of the resort.
<b>RECREATION LAND USE</b>	
<b>Goal 1.G: To designate land for and promote the development and expansion of public and private recreational facilities to serve the needs of residents and visitors.</b>	
1.G.1. The County will support the expansion of existing winter ski and snow play areas and development of new areas where circulation and transportation system capacity can accommodate such expansions or new uses and where environmental impacts can be adequately mitigated.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose the expansion of ski facilities. Alternative 4 proposes to eliminate the existing ski facilities at HMR. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose expansion of a cross-country ski trail onsite. This trail will restore the 1960 Olympic course and connect it to the Homewood Ski Area Base area and will not result in significant impact.
1.G.2. The County shall strive to have new recreation areas located and designed to encourage and accommodate non-auto mobile access.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not propose new recreation. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 propose new recreation uses within an existing recreation area. The proposed tourist and residential uses onsite, as well as pedestrian paths, transit services, and the bike trail extension onsite encourage non-auto access to the resort and recreational uses.
1.G.3. The County shall continue to require the development of new recreational facilities as new residential development occurs.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 propose new recreational facilities and new residential development. New recreation supports the community year-round. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 proposes new residential development at the expense of existing recreational development. No other recreational development is proposed onsite to offset the loss.

Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<b>OPEN SPACE, HABITAT, AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES</b>	
<b>Goal 1.I: To establish and maintain interconnected greenbelts and open spaces for the protection of native vegetation and wildlife and for the community's enjoyment.</b>	
1.I.1. The County shall require that significant natural, open space, and cultural resources be identified in advance of development and incorporated into site-specific development project design. The Planned Residential Developments (PDs) and the Commercial Planned Development (CPD) provisions of the Zoning Ordinance can be used to allow flexibility for this integration with valuable site features.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area does not include existing dedicated or designated open space. Portions of the mountain that area not developed will be deed restricted to prevent future non-recreational development onsite and will result in the preservation of natural landscape on the mountainside.
1.I.2. The County shall require that development be planned and designed to avoid areas rich in wildlife or of a fragile ecological nature (e.g., areas of rare or endangered plant species, riparian areas). Alternatively, where avoidance is infeasible or where equal or greater ecological benefits can be obtained through off-site mitigation, the County shall allow project proponents to contribute to off-site mitigation efforts in lieu of on-site mitigation. [See also policies/programs under Goal 6.B. Wetland and Riparian Areas; Goal 6.C. Fish and Wildlife Habitat; Goal 6.D. Vegetation; and Goal 6.E. Open Space For the Preservation of Natural Resources]	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. The Project area contains existing development. These disturbed areas will be reused or, where SEZ exists, restored at least partially. Water quality improvements will result in benefits both on (Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6) and offsite (Alternatives 1 and 3). Sensitive areas, such as Quail Lake would not be developed under any Alternative.
<b>VISUAL AND SCENIC RESOURCES</b>	
<b>Goal 1.K: To protect the visual and scenic resources of Placer County as important quality-of-life amenities for County residents and a principal asset in the promotion of recreation and tourism.</b>	
1.K.1. The County shall require that new development in scenic areas (e.g., river canyons, lake watersheds, scenic highway corridors, ridgelines and steep slopes) is planned and designed in a manner which employs design, construction, and maintenance techniques that: a. Avoids locating structures along ridgelines and steep slopes; b. Incorporates design and screening measures to minimize the visibility of structures and graded areas; c. Maintains the character and visual quality of the area.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 6.</u> Alternative 4 includes mitigation to ensure future design maintains the visual quality objectives of the area and includes appropriate architecture and landscaping. Alternatives 1, 3, and 6 include landscaping, placement of the mid-mountain lodge further back from the ridge and mitigation to reduce structural visibility and maintain consistency with design guidelines for the area. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 proposes multi-family housing along SR 89; however findings cannot be made to support a height amendment for a 4-story structure highly visible from a scenic corridor and uncharacteristic of the surrounding residential community.
1.K.2. The County shall require that new development in scenic areas be designed to utilize natural landforms and vegetation for screening structures, access roads, building foundations, and cut and fill slopes.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> New structures will reflect the “Old Tahoe” architectural style that incorporates natural materials in to the design and will maintain large trees along the roadway in addition to new landscaping to screen buildings.
1.K.3. The County shall require that new development in rural areas incorporates landscaping that provides a transition between the vegetation in developed areas and	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include landscaping to screen structures and integrate

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
adjacent open space or undeveloped areas.	them into the surrounding environment.
<p>1.K.4. The County shall require that new development incorporates sound soil conservation practices and minimizes land alterations. Land alterations should comply with the following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Limit cuts and fills;</li> <li>b. Limit grading to the smallest practical area of land;</li> <li>c. Limit land exposure to the shortest practical amount of time;</li> <li>d. Replant graded areas to ensure establishment of plant cover before the next rainy season; and</li> <li>e. Create grading contours that blend with the natural contours on site or with contours on property immediately adjacent to the area of development.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Cut and fill, grading, and ground disturbance will occur under each of these alternatives. Alternative 3 results in greater ground disturbance than Alternative 1 due to decreased height and larger building footprints. Disturbance will be limited as feasible. Exposed areas will be covered to limit exposure time and BMPs will be utilized to reduce erosion. Exposed areas will be replanted and landscaping may include contours if appropriate at each landscape area. Erosion control devices will be used onsite.</p>
<p>1.K.5. The County shall require that new roads, parking, and utilities be designed to minimize visual impacts. Unless limited by geological or engineering constraints, utilities should be installed underground and roadways and parking areas should be designed to fit the natural terrain.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. For Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6, utilities will be placed underground. A majority of parking for Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 will be placed underground.</p>
<p>1.K.6. The County shall require that new development on hillsides employ design, construction, and maintenance techniques that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Ensure that development near or on portions of hillsides do not cause or worsen natural hazards such as erosion, sedimentation, fire, or water quality concerns;</li> <li>b. Include erosion and sediment control measures including temporary vegetation sufficient to stabilize disturbed areas;</li> <li>c. Minimize risk to life and property from slope failure, landslides, and flooding; and</li> <li>d. Maintain the character and visual quality of the hillside.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 6.</u> Hillside ground disturbance will occur under each of these alternatives. Alternative 3 results in greater ground disturbance than Alternative 1 due to decreased height and larger building footprints. Disturbance will be limited as feasible. Exposed areas will be covered to limit exposure time and BMPs will be utilized to reduce erosion and control sediment. Exposed areas will be replanted. Development will be clustered at the lower portion of the mountain to maintain community character. Structures will not be placed in flood areas or on unstable slopes.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Findings cannot be made to support a height amendment for a 4-story structure highly visible from a scenic corridor and uncharacteristic of the surrounding residential community.</p>
<b>SCENIC ROUTES</b>	
<b>Goal 1.L: To develop a system of scenic routes serving the needs of residents and visitors to Placer County and to preserve, enhance, and protect the scenic resources visible from these scenic routes.</b>	
<p>1.L.3. The County shall protect and enhance scenic corridors through such means as design review, sign control, undergrounding utilities, scenic setbacks, density limitations, planned unit developments, grading and tree removal standards, open space easements, and land conservation contracts.</p>	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development or improvements to the site to reach attainment within the scenic corridor.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 6.</u> Alternative 4 includes mitigation to ensure future design maintains the visual quality objectives of the area and includes appropriate architecture and landscaping. Alternatives 1, 3, and 6 include landscaping, placement of the mid-mountain lodge further back from the ridge and mitigation to reduce structural visibility and</p>

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	maintain consistency with design guidelines for the area. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Findings cannot be made to support a height amendment for a 4-story structure highly visible from a scenic corridor and uncharacteristic of the surrounding residential community.
1.L.4. The County shall provide for landscaping and/or landscaped mounding along designated scenic corridors where desirable to maintain and improve scenic qualities and screen unsightly views.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development or improvements to the site to reach attainment within the scenic corridor. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 6.</u> Each of these alternatives includes landscaping along SR 89 to improve the scenic quality of the roadway. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Although landscaping is proposed, the 4-story structure will remain visible from SR 89 and will not improve the scenic quality of the site. Findings cannot be made to support a height amendment for a 4-story structure highly visible from a scenic corridor and uncharacteristic of the surrounding residential community.
1.L.5. The County shall encourage the development of trails, picnicking, observation points, parks, and roadside rests along scenic highways.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives include the ski resort that is accessible to the public. Alternatives 1, 3, and 5 include hiking trails, the mid-mountain lodge, and bike trail extensions that are open to the public. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 eliminates the ski facilities and does not include bike trail extension or observation points.
1.L.6. The County shall protect and maintain historical landmarks and historical monuments along scenic routes.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> There are no historic landmarks or monuments at the Project area.
1.L.7. The County shall encourage the use of bicycles as an alternative mode of travel for recreational purposes in scenic corridors.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> A bike route is located along SR 89 in this location; however, Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include the extension of the West Shore bike trail through the resort and includes a proposal for a free bike-share program for resort guests.
<b>JOBS-HOUSING BALANCE</b>	
<b>Goal 1.M: To work toward a jobs-housing balance.</b>	
1.M.1. The County shall concentrate most new growth within existing communities emphasizing infill development, intensified use of existing development, and expanded services, so individual communities become more complete, diverse, and balanced.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area is currently developed and located within an existing community. The action alternatives propose reuse or expanded use of the site in ways that serve the existing community.
1.M.2. The County shall encourage large residential projects to be phased or timed to occur simultaneously with development that will provide primary wage-earner jobs.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternative 4 proposes new residential units in conjunction with a new commercial development. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include residential development in conjunction with expansion of the ski resort, including new commercial uses. Project phasing develops whole areas of the Project area (North Base vs. South Base) so that there is a balance between housing and jobs. Commercial uses and housing will be developed simultaneously.

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
1.M.3. The County shall encourage the creation of primary wage-earner jobs, or housing which meets projected income levels, in those areas of Placer County where an imbalance between jobs and housing exists.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include new residential uses, many of which will become second homes and not primary residences. Each alternative proposes commercial and/or recreational uses that are viable year-round. While not all residences will be supported by the new jobs, not all residences will be occupied as primary homes.
<b>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</b>	
<b>Goal 1.N: To maintain a healthy and diverse local economy that meets the present and future employment, shopping, recreational, public safety, and service needs of Placer County residents and to expand the economic base to better serve the needs of residents.</b>	
1.N.1. The County shall promote economic expansion based on Placer County's unique recreational opportunities and natural resources.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose expanded use of the site and new recreation facilities that make the site economically viable year-round and enhance the resort experience. <u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not result in economic expansion based on recreational opportunities. Alternative 2 does not change existing conditions and Alternative 4 closes the ski facilities.
1.N.2. The County shall encourage the retention, expansion and development of new businesses, especially those that provide primary wage-earner jobs, by designating adequate land and providing infrastructure in areas where resources and public facilities and services can accommodate employment generators.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area includes a large area with potential for economic growth and that is served by utilities and services.
1.N.3. The County shall endeavor to protect the natural resources upon which the County's basic economy (e.g., recreation, forestry, agriculture, mining, and tourism) is dependent.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Each of these alternatives maintains or expands upon an existing recreation resource. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 expand upon this by encouraging new tourism in the area. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> This alternative closes a significant recreation resource and the potential for tourism, which would be a permanent loss to the County.
1.N.4. The County shall focus economic development efforts on projects that will maximize long-term net revenues to the County.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5.</u> Each of these alternatives maintains or expands upon an existing recreation resource and encourage new tourism in the area for year-round economic viability. <u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose changes to maximize revenues. There is a risk that the ski resort will close without expansion of base areas. While Alternative 4 includes a viable, year-round commercial development, it does so at the expense of tourist and recreation facility with greater revenue potential.
1.N.5. The County shall encourage flexibility in development standards to accommodate uses that provide a substantial economic benefit to the community.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> As needed, the alternatives propose amendments to land use designations and standards to allow a sustainable mix of development.
1.N.7. The County shall strive to coordinate its	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The alternatives support

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
economic development efforts with the efforts of cities and other economic development organizations, including local chambers of commerce.	existing communities and the region by either maintaining a resort, improving a resort, or developing new commercial uses.
<b>High Sierra Policies</b>	
1.N.15. The County shall support development of tourist and recreational facilities that extend the High Sierra's tourist season.	<u>Consistent</u> – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6. These alternatives include mixed-use development, new recreation uses that are viable year-round (swimming pool, hiking trails, etc.) and new tourist accommodations to increase visitor accessibility throughout the year. <u>Inconsistent</u> – Alternatives 2 and 4. Alternative 2 does not propose new facilities to increase year-round visitors. Alternative 4 eliminates the ski facilities and removes a desirable tourism feature.
<b>DEVELOPMENT FORM AND DESIGN</b>	
<b>Goal 1.O: To promote and enhance the quality and aesthetics of development in Placer County.</b>	
1.O.1. The County shall require all new development to be designed in compliance with applicable provisions of the Placer County Design Guidelines Manual.	<u>Consistent</u> – Alternative 2. Alternative 2 does not propose new development. <u>Consistent with Mitigation</u> – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 6. Alternative 4 includes mitigation to ensure future design maintains the visual quality objectives of the area and includes appropriate architecture and landscaping. Alternatives 1, 3, and 6 include landscaping, placement of the mid-mountain lodge further back from the ridge and mitigation to reduce structural visibility and maintain consistency with design guidelines for the area. <u>Inconsistent</u> – Alternative 5. Alternative 5 proposes a 4-story multi-family housing structure along SR 89; however this structure is highly visible from a scenic corridor and uncharacteristic of the surrounding community.
1.O.3. The County shall require that all new development be designed to be compatible with the scale and character of the area. Structures, especially those outside of village, urban, and commercial centers, should be designed and located so that: a. They do not silhouette against the sky above ridgelines or hilltops; b. Roof lines and vertical architectural features blend with and do not detract from the natural background or ridge outline; c. They fit the natural terrain; and d. They utilize building materials, colors, and textures that blend with the natural landscape (e.g., avoid high contrasts).	<u>Consistent</u> – Alternative 2. Alternative 2 does not propose new development. <u>Consistent with Mitigation</u> – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 6. Alternative 4 includes mitigation to ensure future design maintains the visual quality objectives of the area and includes appropriate architecture and landscaping. Alternatives 1, 3, and 6 include landscaping, placement of the mid-mountain lodge further back from the ridge and mitigation to reduce structural visibility and maintain consistency with design guidelines for the area. <u>Inconsistent</u> – Alternative 5. Alternative 5 proposes a highly visible 4-story multi-family housing structure along SR 89. The height and visibility of the structure are incompatible with the surrounding residential community.
1.O.4. The County shall require that new rural and suburban development be designed to preserve and maintain the rural character and quality of the County.	<u>Consistent</u> – Alternative 2. Alternative 2 does not propose new development. <u>Consistent with Mitigation</u> – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 6. Alternative 4 includes mitigation to ensure future design maintains the visual quality objectives of the area and includes appropriate architecture and landscaping.



**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	<p>Alternatives 1, 3, and 6 include landscaping, placement of the mid-mountain lodge further back from the ridge and mitigation to reduce structural visibility and maintain consistency with design guidelines for the area. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 proposes a highly visible 4-story multi-family housing structure along SR 89. The height and visibility of the structure are incompatible with the surrounding residential community.</p>
<p>1.O.5. The County shall require that new development at entrances to rural communities be designed to include elements such as signage, landscaping, and appropriate architectural detailing to help establish distinct identities for such communities.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area is not located within an entrance to a rural community.</p>
<p>1.O.6. Historically or architecturally significant buildings should be preserved and not be substantially changed in exterior appearance in ways that diminish their historical character, unless doing so is necessary to avoid or mitigate hazards, and other means of mitigation are infeasible. Such structures should be preserved and used as focal points of community design.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> There are no historically or architecturally significant buildings onsite.</p>
<p>1.O.7. The County shall require that mixed-use areas include community focal points to serve as gathering and/or destination points. Examples of focal points include civic centers, parks, fountains, monuments, and street vistas. On-site natural features, such as wetlands and streams, can also function as focal points.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include mixed-use. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include tourist and/or commercial uses along the roadway frontage. This includes pedestrian areas, landscaping, and in general, improvements to the scenic quality.</p>
<p>1.O.8. The County shall, where appropriate, require new development to provide activity pockets along public sidewalks as pedestrian amenities, including such features as benches, sitting ledges, and mini-parks.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include mixed-use. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include tourist and/or commercial uses along the roadway frontage. This includes pedestrian areas, landscaping, and in general, improvements to the scenic quality.</p>
<p>1.O.9. The County shall discourage the use of outdoor lighting that shines unnecessarily onto adjacent properties or into the night sky.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not include new lighting.</p>
	<p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Lighting designs have not been prepared for these alternatives. Mitigation requires that lighting plans do not affect the night sky and that light is directed downwards and is purposeful.</p>
<p>1.O.10. The County shall require that in downtowns/village centers the tallest buildings be clustered in the core area and that building heights transition down to the scale of buildings in the surrounding area.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3 and 6 place smaller buildings at the roadside and taller buildings clustered and stepped against the mountain slopes to reduce the scale of buildings and visibility.</p>
	<p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 proposes a highly visible 4-story multi-family housing structure at the periphery of the development adjacent to SR 89.</p>

Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<b>AFFORDABLE HOUSING SUPPLY</b>	
<b>Goal 2.A: To provide a continuing supply of affordable housing to meet the needs of existing and future Placer County residents in all income categories.</b>	
2.A.5. The County shall encourage "mixed-use" projects where housing is provided in conjunction with compatible non-residential uses.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include mixed-use development that includes affordable housing.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> Affordable housing is not proposed for this alternative.</p>
2.A.6. The County shall relax or reduce development standards for low-income housing projects as an incentive for developers.	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> For those alternatives that include affordable housing, development standards will be maintained, although densities will need to be increased.</p>
2.A.11. All new housing projects of 100 or more units on land that has received an increase in allowable density through either a public or privately initiated general plan amendment, community plan amendment, rezoning or specific plan shall be required to provide at least 10% of the units to be affordable to low-income households. The low-income units shall be available concurrently with the market-rate units. All such units shall remain affordable for at least 20 years. In cases where developers actually construct the low-income units, the projects shall be eligible for a 10% density bonus. The Land Use Element and Zoning Ordinance will be amended to avoid potential conflicts with minimum lot size standards in cases where the density bonus option is exercised. In cases where the County determines that it is impractical for the developer to actually construct the units on site, the County may as an alternative allow the dedication of land sufficient to accommodate at least 10% of the units for low-income households and/or the payment of an in-lieu fee. In cases where land dedication is deemed suitable, such land shall be offered in fee to the County or to another public or nonprofit agency approved by the County. The amount of the in-lieu fee shall be determined on a case-by-case basis. The County may require the developer to fund an analysis showing how contributions of in-lieu fees could be best utilized to create the desired number of low-cost units.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not propose 100+ unit housing projects.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6.</u> Alternatives 1 and 3 propose 181 residential housing units and 13 employee housing units with approximately 50 beds, which is less than 10 % of the total units. These units will be deed restricted as affordable housing; however, a deficit of 5 units remains that will require offsite affordable housing. Alternative 5 proposes 241 housing units and 12 employee housing units. Alternative 6 proposes 195 residential units and 12 employee housing units. Alternatives 5 and 6 will require additional offsite affordable housing units or payment of an in-lieu fee will be required for consistency.</p>
2.A.14. Housing for low-income households that is required in a new residential project shall not be concentrated into a single building or portion of the site but shall be dispersed throughout the project, to the extent practical, given the size of the project and other site constraints.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6.</u> Employee housing under Alternatives 1, 3 and 5 would be concentrated in a single location adjacent to the North Base area; however this area provides the greatest number of transportation oriented development features, including transit service, neighborhood commercial, daycare, and is nearest to existing commercial/service uses in the area. It would not be appropriate to disperse housing up the mountain.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do</p>

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	not propose employee housing.
2.A.16. The County shall require low-income housing units in density bonus projects to be available at the same time as the market-rate units in the project.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> For those alternatives that include employee housing, the units would be available in the first phase of development.
2.A.18. The County shall require new resorts in the Sierra Nevada and Lake Tahoe areas to provide for employee housing equal to 50% of the housing demand generated by the project. Employee housing shall be provided for in one of the following ways (in order of preference): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of employee housing onsite.</li> <li>• Construction of employee housing offsite.</li> <li>• Dedication of land for needed units.</li> <li>• Payment of an in-lieu fee.</li> </ul>	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Workforce housing for at least 50% of new employees (full time equivalent) generated under Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6 would be constructed in the North Base area. Workforce housing requirements under Alternative 4 would be through another appropriate means as specified under Policy 2.A.18.
2.A.20. The County will encourage the development of multi-family dwellings in locations where adequate facilities are available and where such development would be consistent with neighborhood character.	Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4. These alternatives do not propose multi-family dwellings and multi-family dwellings are not a permitted land use in this area. <u>Consistent with Amendment – Alternatives 1, 3 and 6.</u> These alternatives propose multi-family dwellings at the base area to concentrate development along SR 89. Such uses would be permitted through the proposed PAS amendments. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> An amendment is not feasible for this alternative, which would result in 45 DUA. In addition, the height and massing of the structure would not be compatible and unlikely that findings can be made to support an amendment.
<b>Goal 2.B: To promote quality residential development in the County.</b>	
2.B.1. The County encourages residential development of high architectural and physical quality, compatible with neighboring land uses.	Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 6. Alternative 2 does not include new development. Architectural design under Alternatives 1, 3, and 6 reflect the “old Tahoe” architectural style that emphasizes natural materials and the surrounding natural characteristic. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternative 4.</u> No architectural plans are currently available for Alternative 4; however, mitigation for this alternative includes architectural treatments that comply with design guidelines for the area. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> This alternative includes a 4-story structure that would be visually incompatible with the neighborhood, regardless of architectural elements.
<b>ENERGY CONSERVATION</b>	
<b>Goal 2.G: To increase the efficiency of energy use in new and existing homes, with a concurrent reduction in housing costs to Placer County residents.</b>	
2.G.1. All new dwelling units shall be required to meet current state requirements for energy efficiency. The retrofiting of existing units shall be encouraged.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Housing under Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 would meet LEED Certification requirements, which exceeds energy conservation standards under Title 24. Single-family homes under Alternative 4 would be required to meet or exceed current State energy conservation standards

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	under Title 24.
2.G.2. New land use patterns should encourage energy efficiency, to the extent feasible.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Housing under Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 would meet LEED Certification requirements, which exceeds energy conservation standards under Title 24. Multi-family in a mixed use area along SR 89 is expected to conserve energy by being compatible with reducing vehicle trips and encouraging pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. By decommissioning the ski area and constructing 16 single-family homes, Alternative 4 is expected to have a next reduction in energy demand.
<b>QUANTIFIED HOUSING OBJECTIVES</b> Very low-income: 1,234 units. Low-income: 918 units. Moderate Income: 1,143 units. Above moderate income: 1,884 units. Total Units: 5,178 units. Tenure: 25% rentals, 75% owner-occupied. Type: 75% single-family detached; 25% multi-family and mobile home.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include new residential uses of various mixes.
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</b>	
<b>STREETS AND HIGHWAYS</b>	
<b>Goal 3.A: To provide for the long-range planning and development of the County's roadway system to ensure the safe and efficient movement of people and goods.</b>	
3.A2. Streets and roads shall be dedicated, widened, and constructed according to the roadway design and access standards generally defined in Section I of this Policy Document and, more specifically, in community plans and the County's Highway Deficiencies Report. Exceptions to these standards may be necessary but should be kept to a minimum and shall be permitted only upon determination by the Public Works Director that safe and adequate public access and circulation are preserved by such exceptions.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> For the alternatives that propose roadway improvements through mitigation, the improvements will be in accordance with County standards.
3.A3. The County shall require that roadway rights-of-way be wide enough to accommodate the travel lanes needed to carry long-range forecasted traffic volumes (beyond 2010), as well as any planned bikeways and required drainage, utilities, landscaping, and suitable separations. Minimum right-of-way criteria for each class of roadway in the County are specified in Part I of this Policy Document (see page 29).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> For the alternatives that propose roadway improvements, landscaping, and drainage improvement, the improvements will be in accordance with County standards.
3.A4. On arterial roadways and thoroughfares, intersection spacing should be maximized. Driveway encroachments along collector and arterial roadways shall be minimized. Access control restrictions for each class of roadway in the County are specified in Part I of this Policy Document (see page 29).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> As analyzed in Chapter 11 of this EIR/EIS, intersection improvements are included as mitigation under Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.
3.A5. Through-traffic shall be accommodated in a manner that discourages the use of neighborhood	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Existing and proposed facilities are located to avoid access through area

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
roadways, particularly local streets. This through-traffic, including through truck traffic, shall be directed to appropriate routes in order to maintain public safety and local quality of life.	neighborhood roadways. Through traffic is directed toward SR 89.
3.A6. The County shall require all new development to provide off-street parking, either on-site or in consolidated lots or structures.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 5, and 6.</u> No new development is proposed for Alternative 2 and no new parking is required. As discussed in Chapter 11 of this EIR/EIS, Alternatives 5 and 6 provide an adequate number of parking spaces.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, and 4.</u> Alternatives 1 and 3 will provide 48 parking spaces at the south base area, which may be taken from the 52 excess parking spaces at the north base. Alternative 4 will provide 66 spaces at the commercial center and 2 off-street parking spaces per residence. These will be implemented through mitigation.</p>
<p>3.A7. The County shall develop and manage its roadway system to maintain the following minimum levels of service (LOS).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LOS "C" on rural roadways, except within one-half mile of state highways where the standard shall be LOS "D".</li> <li>• LOS "C" on urban/suburban roadways except within one-half mile of state highways where the standard shall be LOS "D".</li> </ul> <p>The County may allow exceptions to these level of service standards where it finds that the improvements or other measures required to achieve the LOS standards are unacceptable based on established criteria. In allowing any exception to the standards, the County shall consider the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of hours per day that the intersection or roadway segment would operate at conditions worse than the standard.</li> <li>• The ability of the required improvement to significantly reduce peak hour delay and improve traffic operations.</li> <li>• The right-of-way needs and the physical impacts on surrounding properties.</li> <li>• The visual aesthetics of the required improvement and its impact on community identity and character.</li> <li>• Environmental impacts including air quality and noise impacts.</li> <li>• Construction and right-of-way acquisition costs.</li> <li>• The impacts on general safety.</li> <li>• The impacts of the required construction phasing and traffic maintenance.</li> <li>• The impacts on quality of life as perceived by residents.</li> <li>• Consideration of other environmental, social, or economic factors on which the County may base findings to allow an exceedance of the standards.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> No changes to the LOS would occur for this alternative.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternative 4.</u> The existing intersection delays would decrease under this alternative during winter conditions.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives will result in increased delays, within the same LOS levels. Those intersections that currently operate at unacceptable LOS will receive intersection enhancements to improve the LOS. Participation in EIP Project #855 will improve queuing issues at the Y in Tahoe City.</p>

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
Exceptions to the standards will only be allowed after all feasible measures and options are explored, including alternative forms of transportation.	
3.A.12. The County shall require an analysis of the effects of traffic from all land development projects. Each such project shall construct or fund improvements necessary to mitigate the effects of traffic from the project. Such improvements may include a fair share of improvements that provide benefits to others.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Traffic is analyzed in Chapter 11 of this EIR/EIS and includes mitigation measures to reduce traffic impacts. In addition, Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6 include EIP projects including intersection and traffic flow improvements.
3.A.14. The County shall assess fees on new development sufficient to cover the fair share portion of that development's impacts on the local and regional transportation system. Exceptions may be made when new development generates significant public benefits (e.g., low-income housing, needed health facilities) and when alternative sources of funding can be identified to offset foregone revenues.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 will not result in new development. The remaining alternatives would either decrease traffic (Alternative 4) or result in intersection improvements through mitigation and participation in traffic-related EIP projects.
<b>TRANSIT</b>	
<b>Goal 3.B: To promote a safe and efficient mass transit system, including both rail and bus, to reduce congestion, improve the environment, and provide viable non-automotive means of transportation in and through Placer County.</b>	
3.B.3. The County shall consider the need for future transit right-of-way in reviewing and approving plans for development. Rights-of-way may either be exclusive or shared with other vehicles.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include development plans. Existing right of way would remain, although Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 would enhance transit stops and would expand the bike trail through the site.
3.B.9. The County shall require development of transit services by ski resorts and other recreational providers in the Sierra to meet existing and future recreational demand.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new transit service, but will not eliminate the existing transit stops at the site. Alternative 4 will eliminate the ski resort, but transit stops will remain. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 will enhance the transit stops and will offer a variety of alternative transportation options including shuttle service, dial-a-ride, water taxi service, free bike fleet for resort guests, hybrid electric rental vehicles for resort guests, and expansion of the bike trail through the site.
3.B.12. The County shall encourage the development of facilities for convenient transfers between different transportation systems. (e.g., train-to-bus, bus-to-bus).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area does not include transit connection sites other than the existing transit stops; however, alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 propose water taxi service, dial-a-ride and other skier shuttle services in addition to the TART system operations.
<b>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT (TSM)</b>	
<b>Goal 3.C: To maximize the efficient use of transportation facilities so as to: 1) reduce travel demand on the County's roadway system; 2) reduce the amount of investment required in new or expanded facilities; 3) reduce the quantity of emissions of pollutants from automobiles; and 4) increase the energy-efficiency of the transportation system.</b>	
3.C.1. The County shall promote the use of transportation systems management (TSM) programs that divert automobile commute trips to transit, walking,	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does include new development. Alternative 4 does not include features that divert auto trips to transit, walking,

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
and bicycling.	or bicycling. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 will enhance the transit stops and will offer a variety of alternative transportation options including shuttle service, dial-a-ride, water taxi service, free bike fleet for resort guests, hybrid electric rental vehicles for resort guests, and expansion of the bike trail through the site.
3.C.2. The County shall promote the use, by both the public and private sectors, of TSM programs that increase the average occupancy of vehicles.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include new development. Alternative 4 results in reduced vehicle trips from existing conditions. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 will enhance the transit stops and will offer a variety of alternative transportation options including shuttle service, dial-a-ride, water taxi service, free bike fleet for resort guests, hybrid electric rental vehicles for resort guests, and expansion of the bike trail.
3.C.4. During the development review process, the County shall require that proposed projects meet adopted Trip Reduction Ordinance (TRO) requirements.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include new development. Alternative 4 results in reduced vehicle trips from existing conditions. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 will enhance the transit stops and will offer a variety of alternative transportation options including shuttle service, dial-a-ride, water taxi service, free bike fleet for resort guests, hybrid electric rental vehicles for resort guests, and expansion of the bike trail.
<b>NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Goal 3.D: To provide a safe, comprehensive, and integrated system of facilities for non-motorized transportation.</b>	
3.D.1. The County shall promote the development of a comprehensive and safe system of recreational and commuter bicycle routes that provides connections between the County's major employment and housing areas and between its existing and planned bikeways.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not include development plans. Alternative 4 does not include bike trail expansion. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Existing right of way would remain, although Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 would expand the West Shore Bike Trail through the site.
3.D.2. The County shall work with neighboring jurisdictions to coordinate planning and development of the County's bikeways and multi-purpose trails with those of neighboring jurisdictions.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not include development plans. Alternative 4 does not include bike trail expansion. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 would expand the West Shore Bike Trail through the site. This would expand bike trail availability in the Region.
3.D.3. The County shall pursue all available sources of funding for the development and improvement of trails for non-motorized transportation (bikeways, pedestrian, and equestrian).	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not include development plans. Alternative 4 does not include bike trail expansion. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Existing right of way would remain, although Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 would expand the West Shore Bike Trail through the site.
3.D.4. The County shall promote non-motorized travel	<u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
(bikeways, pedestrian, and equestrian) through appropriate facilities, programs, and information.	not include development plans. Alternative 4 does not include bike trail expansion. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Existing right of way would remain, although Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 would expand the West Shore Bike Trail through the site as well as pedestrian paths linking the various uses onsite.
3.D.5. The County shall continue to require developers to finance and install pedestrian walkways, equestrian trails, and multi-purpose paths in new development, as appropriate.	<u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 does not include bike trail or pathway expansion. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Alternative 2 does not include development plans. Existing right of way would remain, although Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 would expand the West Shore Bike Trail through the site.
3.D.6. The County shall support the development of parking areas near access to hiking and equestrian trails.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in changes from existing conditions. Alternative 4 does not propose hiking or equestrian trails. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include hiking trails that are accessible through pedestrian connections in the base areas that contain parking. Directional signage will be appropriately placed so that hikers can identify access routes.
3.D.7. The County shall, where appropriate, require new development to provide sheltered public transit stops, with turnouts. [See also policies/programs under Goal 5.C. Recreational Trails]	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include development plans. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 would enhance transit stops with shelters. Alternative 4 would maintain existing conditions within roadway ROW.
<b>PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES</b>	
<b>GENERAL PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES</b>	
<b>Goal 4.A: To ensure the timely development of public facilities and the maintenance of specified service levels for these facilities.</b>	
4.A.1. Where new development requires the construction of new public facilities, the new development shall fund its fair share of the construction. The County shall require dedication of land within newly developing areas for public facilities, where necessary.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in changes to existing conditions. New facilities proposed for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 will be funded by HMR.
4.A.2. The County shall ensure through the development review process that adequate public facilities and services are available to serve new development. The County shall not approve new development where existing facilities are inadequate unless the following conditions are met: a. The applicant can demonstrate that all necessary public facilities will be installed or adequately financed (through fees or other means); and b. The facilities improvements are consistent with applicable facility plans approved by the County or with agency plans where the County is a participant.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in changes to existing conditions. New facilities proposed for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 will be funded by HMR.
4.A.3. The County shall require that new urban	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not



<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
development is planned and developed according to urban facility standards.	result in changes to existing conditions. New facilities proposed for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 will be funded by HMR and will be reviewed by the appropriate service providers.
4.A.4. The County shall require proposed new development in identified underground conversion districts and along scenic corridors to underground utility lines on and adjacent to the site of proposed development or, when this is infeasible, to contribute funding for future undergrounding.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in changes to existing conditions and will not result in new development. Utilities through the Project area will be placed underground under alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 proposes new development. Mitigation for this alternative includes undergrounding utilities where new development would be created at the North Base area.
4.A.5. The County shall ensure that library facilities are provided to current and future residents in the unincorporated area. The County shall also require new development to fund its fair share of library facilities.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in changes to existing conditions. Appropriate County funding will be provided through the building permit process for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6; however, these alternatives will not negatively affect County libraries.
<b>PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES FUNDING</b>	
<b>Goal 4.B: To ensure that adopted facility and service standards are achieved and maintained through the use of equitable funding methods.</b>	
4.B.1. The County shall require that new development pay its fair share of the cost of all existing facilities it uses based on the demand for these facilities attributable to the new development; exceptions may be made when new development generates significant public benefits (e.g., low-income housing, needed health facilities) and when alternative sources of funding can be identified to offset foregone revenues.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in changes to existing conditions. New facilities proposed for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 will be funded by HMR.
4.B.2. The County shall require that new development pay the cost of upgrading existing public facilities or construction of new facilities that are needed to serve the new development; exceptions may be made when new development generates significant public benefits (e.g., low-income housing, needed health facilities) and when alternative sources of funding can be identified to offset foregone revenues.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in changes to existing conditions. New facilities proposed for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 will be funded by HMR.
4.B.3. The County shall require, to the extent legally possible, that new development pay the cost of providing public services that are needed to serve the new development; exceptions may be made when new development generates significant public benefits (e.g., low-income housing, needed health facilities) and when alternative sources of funding can be identified to offset foregone revenues. This includes working with the cities to require new development within city limits to mitigate impacts on Countywide facilities and services.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in changes to existing conditions. New facilities proposed for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 will be funded by HMR.
4.B.6. The County shall require the preparation of a fiscal impact analysis for all major land development projects. The analysis will examine the fiscal impacts	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in changes to existing conditions. New facilities proposed for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 will be funded

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
on the County and other service providers which result from large-scale development. A major project is a residential project with 100 or more dwelling units or a commercial, professional office or industrial development on 10 or more acres of land.	by HMR to avoid fiscal impacts on the County.
<b>WATER SUPPLY AND DELIVERY</b>	
<b>Goal 4.C: To ensure the availability of an adequate and safe water supply and the maintenance of high quality water in water bodies and aquifers used as sources of domestic supply.</b>	
4.C.1. The County shall require proponents of new development to demonstrate the availability of a long-term, reliable water supply. The County shall require written certification from the service provider that either existing services are available or needed improvements will be made prior to occupancy. Where the County will approve groundwater as the domestic water source, test wells, appropriate testing, and/or report(s) from qualified professionals will be required substantiating the long-term availability of suitable groundwater.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose additional water use. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Water services will be expanded onsite to serve the new uses. Mitigation to meet this policy includes a final water supply assessment.
4.C.2. The County shall approve new development based on the following guidelines for water supply: a. Urban and suburban development should rely on public water systems using surface supply. b. Rural communities should rely on public water systems. In cases where parcels are larger than those defined as suburban and no public water system exists or can be extended to the property, individual wells may be permitted. c. Agricultural areas should rely on public water systems where available, otherwise individual water wells are acceptable.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose additional water use. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> The Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD) currently serves the site. Water services will be expanded to serve the new uses. Mitigation includes a water supply assessment to ensure adequate supplies have been obtained.
4.C.3. The County shall encourage water purveyors to require that all new water services be metered.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Metering will occur at the discretion of TCPUD.
4.C.4. The County shall require that water supplies serving new development meet state water quality standards.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Water will be supplied by NTPUD, which has water quality standards and treatment in accordance with state standards.
4.C.5. The County shall require that new development adjacent to bodies of water used as domestic water sources adequately mitigate potential water quality impacts on these water bodies.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The project is located near Lake Tahoe and Quail Lake and the area includes Homewood Creek/Madden Creek/Quail Lake Creek. However, it is not immediately adjacent to bodies of water used as domestic water sources. BMPs and sediment treatment are proposed to maintain and improve runoff water quality.
4.C.6. The County shall promote efficient water use and reduced water demand by: a. Requiring water-conserving design and equipment in new construction; b. Encouraging water-conserving landscaping and other conservation measures; c. Encouraging retrofitting existing development with water-conserving devices; and d. Encouraging water-conserving agricultural irrigation	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include new development. Structures under the action alternatives are either pursuing LEED certification or at a minimum will comply with County standards for water conserving devices through the permitting process. Mitigation proposed includes metering, water conservation, and appropriate landscaping materials and irrigation.

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
practices.	
4.C.9. The County shall support opportunities for groundwater users in problem areas to convert to surface water supplies.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area is served by TCPUD and the MCWC.
4.C.11. The County shall protect the watersheds of all bodies of water associated with the storage and delivery of domestic water by limiting grading, construction of impervious surfaces, application of fertilizers, and development of septic systems within these watersheds.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> No new development is proposed. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Watershed protection occurs through the implementation of BMPs, stormwater control and treatment devices, landscaping, SEZ restoration, and limits on impervious surfaces. Mitigation is required to ensure fertilizer use does not affect the watershed.
4.C.12. The County shall limit the annual rate of growth to 3% in areas where domestic water is supplied by individual or community wells. Where surface water supplies provide domestic water, the amount of growth shall be limited to what can be served by available surface water supplies assuming a 4-year drought period and usage of one acre foot of water per year per household.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area is served by TCPUD and MCWC.
<b>SEWAGE COLLECTION, TREATMENT, AND DISPOSAL</b>	
<b>Goal 4.D: To ensure adequate wastewater collection and treatment and the safe disposal of liquid and solid waste.</b>	
4.D.1. The County shall limit the expansion of urban communities to areas where community wastewater treatment systems can be provided.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Sewer service currently exists in the Project area and is provided by the TCPUD.
4.D.2. The County shall require proponents of new development within a sewer service area to provide written certification from the service provider that either existing services are available or needed improvements will be made prior to occupancy.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Adequate sewer capacity exists as discussed in Chapter 16; however HMR will provide new sewer connections and will pay fees to connect to the main. HMR will provide a detailed domestic sewer study engineering report to TCPUD.
4.D.3. The County shall discourage extension of sewer service outside of city spheres of influence and community plan areas, except in limited circumstances to resolve a public health hazard resulting from existing development, or where there is a substantial overriding public benefit.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Sewer service currently exists in the Project area and is provided by the Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD).
4.D.4. The County shall promote efficient water use and reduced wastewater system demand by: a. Requiring water-conserving design and equipment in new construction; b. Encouraging retrofitting with water-conserving devices; and c. Designing wastewater systems to minimize inflow and infiltration to the extent economically feasible.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include new development. Structures under the action alternatives are either pursuing LEED certification or at a minimum will comply with County standards for water conserving devices through the permitting process.

Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards	HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis
<b>STORMWATER DRAINAGE</b>	
<b>Goal 4.E: To collect and dispose of stormwater in a manner that least inconveniences the public, reduces potential water-related damage, and enhances the environment.</b>	
4.E.1. The County shall encourage the use of natural stormwater drainage systems to preserve and enhance natural features.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 1 and 3 will restore the SEZ function at the South Base, remove an existing stream culvert, and upgrade stormwater treatment facilities to a treatment level above existing TRPA standards. Alternatives 5 and 6 will upgrade existing stormwater treatment facilities through redevelopment, but do not propose the removal of the existing culvert in the Public ROW.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose changes to existing conditions. Alternative 4 includes coverage removal in the SEZ, but not the return of SEZ function.</p>
4.E.3. The County shall consider using stormwater of adequate quality to replenish local groundwater basins, restore wetlands and riparian habitat, and irrigate agricultural lands.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Stormwater in the Lake Tahoe basin cannot be re-applied to surface lands. However, Alternatives 1 and 3 will restore the SEZ function at the South Base, remove an existing stream culvert, and upgrade stormwater treatment facilities. Alternatives 5 and 6 will upgrade existing stormwater treatment facilities through redevelopment, but do not propose the removal of the existing culvert in the Public ROW.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose changes to existing conditions. Alternative 4 includes coverage removal in the SEZ, but not the return of SEZ function.</p>
4.E.4. The County shall ensure that new storm drainage systems are designed in conformance with the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District's Stormwater Management Manual and the County Land Development Manual.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Final design for the selected alternative will be reviewed by County staff to ensure compliance prior to permitting.
4.E.5. The County shall continue to implement and enforce its Grading Ordinance and Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Final design for the selected alternative will be reviewed by County staff to ensure compliance prior to permitting.
4.E.6. The County shall continue to support the programs and policies of the watershed flood control plans developed by the Flood Control and Water Conservation District.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Final design for the selected alternative will be reviewed by County staff to ensure compliance prior to permitting.
4.E.7. The County shall prohibit the use of underground storm drain systems in rural and agricultural areas, unless no other feasible alternatives are available for conveyance of stormwater from new development or when necessary to mitigate flood hazards.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> No new systems are proposed.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Underground storm drain systems and groundwater infiltration systems are proposed for the underground parking areas.</p>
4.E.8. The County shall consider recreational opportunities and aesthetics in the design of stormwater ponds and conveyance facilities.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> No new systems are proposed.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Recreational areas and landscaping are considered in stormwater conveyance. Restoration of the SEZ</p>

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	(alternatives 1 and 3) and the implementation of erosion control BMPs within the recreational area will reduce runoff.
4.E.9. The County shall encourage good soil conservation practices in agricultural and urban areas and carefully examine the impact of proposed urban developments with regard to drainage courses.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives include SEZ restoration (Alternatives 1 and 3), BMPs, stormwater infiltration galleries, and streambank restoration and protection (Alternatives 1 and 3).</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternative 4.</u> This alternative does not include SEZ restoration; however the implementation of SEZ restoration and protection required for redevelopment of base areas would result in consistency.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 would not require measures to protect streambanks from further erosion.</p>
4.E.10. The County shall strive to improve the quality of runoff from urban and suburban development through use of appropriate and feasible mitigation measures including, but not limited to, artificial wetlands, grassy swales, infiltration/sedimentation basins, riparian setbacks, oil/grit separators, and other best management practices (BMPs).	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 1 and 3 include SEZ restoration, BMPs, stormwater infiltration galleries, and streambank restoration and protection, as well as offsite stormwater improvements (EIP). Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6 include BMPs to improve runoff quality.</p>
4.E.11. The County shall require new development to adequately mitigate increases in stormwater peak flows and/or volume. Mitigation measures should take into consideration impacts on adjoining lands in the unincorporated area and on properties in jurisdictions within and immediately adjacent to Placer County.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 1 and 3 will restore the SEZ function at the South Base, remove an existing stream culvert, and upgrade stormwater treatment facilities. Alternatives 5 and 6 will upgrade existing stormwater treatment facilities through redevelopment, but do not propose the removal of the existing culvert in the Public ROW.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose changes to existing conditions. Alternative 4 includes coverage removal in the SEZ, but not the return of SEZ function.</p>
4.E.12. The County shall encourage project designs that minimize drainage concentrations and impervious coverage and maintain, to the extent feasible, natural site drainage conditions.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5 and 6.</u> These alternatives include SEZ restoration, BMPs, stormwater infiltration galleries, and streambank restoration and protection.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternative 4.</u> This alternative does not include SEZ restoration; however the implementation of SEZ restoration and protection required for redevelopment of base areas would result in consistency.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 would not require measures to protect streambanks from further erosion.</p>
4.E.13. The County shall require that new development conforms with the applicable programs, policies, recommendations, and plans of the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Final design for the selected alternative will be reviewed by County staff to ensure compliance prior to permitting.</p>
4.E.14. The County shall require projects that have significant impacts on the quantity and quality of surface	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> These alternatives include SEZ restoration (Alternatives 1 and 3), BMPs,</p>

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
water runoff to allocate land as necessary for the purpose of detaining post-project flows and/or for the incorporation of mitigation measures for water quality impacts related to urban runoff.	stormwater infiltration galleries, and streambank restoration and protection (Alternatives 1 and 3), as well as offsite stormwater improvements (EIP). Alternative 2 would not result in changes to runoff and Alternative 4 would include BMPs to maintain runoff quality.
4.E.15. The County shall identify and coordinate mitigation measures with responsible agencies for the control of storm sewers, monitoring of discharges, and implementation of measures to control pollutant loads in urban storm water runoff (e.g., California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Placer County Division of Environmental Health, Placer County Department of Public Works, Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Final design for the selected alternative will be reviewed by County staff to ensure compliance prior to permitting.
4.E.16. The County shall strive to protect domestic water supply canal systems from contamination resulting from spillage or runoff.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> There are no water supply canal systems in the Project area.
<b>FLOOD PROTECTION</b>	
<b>Goal 4.F: To protect the lives and property of the citizens of Placer County from hazards associated with development in floodplains and manage floodplains for their natural resource values.</b>	
4.F.1. The County shall require that arterial roadways and expressways, residences, commercial and industrial uses and emergency facilities be protected, at a minimum, from a 100-year storm event.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> Alternatives 1 and 3 result in the relocation of structures and roads within the 100-year floodplain. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not result in any change to the roadway or structures located in the floodplain in the South Base area. Alternatives 5 and 6 will remove buildings from the floodplain at the South Base, but will maintain the existing roadway within the 100-year flood zone. Neither of these Alternatives propose new development in the floodplain.
4.F.2. The County shall recognize floodplains as a potential public resource to be managed and maintained for the public's benefit.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> Alternatives 1 and 3 result in the relocation of structures and roads within the 100-year floodplain. <u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not result in any change to the roadway or structures located in the floodplain in the South Base area. Alternatives 5 and 6 will remove buildings from the floodplain at the South Base, but will maintain the existing roadway within the 100-year flood zone. Neither of these Alternatives propose new development in the floodplain.
4.F.4. The County shall require evaluation of potential flood hazards prior to approval of development projects. The County shall require proponents of new development to submit accurate topographic and flow characteristics information and depiction of the 100-year floodplain boundaries under fully-developed, unmitigated runoff conditions.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Chapter 15 of the EIR/EIS identifies floodplain areas and evaluates flow characteristics in relation to each alternative.
4.F.5. The County shall attempt to maintain natural conditions within the 100-year floodplain of all rivers	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> Alternatives 1 and 3 result in the relocation of structures and roads within the

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<p>and streams except under the following circumstances:</p> <p>a. Where work is required to manage and maintain the stream's drainage characteristics and where such work is done in accordance with the Placer County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, California Department of Fish and Game regulations, and Clean Water Act provisions administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; or</p> <p>b. When facilities for the treatment of urban runoff can be located in the floodplain, provided that there is no destruction of riparian vegetation.</p>	<p>100-year floodplain and restoration and protection of stream channels, including the removal of an existing culvert.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6 do not result in the restoration or protection of area streams that experience streambank erosion.</p>
<p>4.F.8. The County shall, where possible, view flood waters as a resource to be used for waterfowl habitat, aquifer recharge, fishery enhancement, agricultural water supply, and other suitable uses.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Floodwaters are not a feasible resource for habitat or other uses at this location.</p>
<p>4.F.9. The County shall continue to implement floodplain zoning and undertake other actions required to comply with state floodplain requirements, and to maintain the County's eligibility under the Federal Flood Insurance Program.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> Alternatives 1 and 3 result in the relocation of structures and roads within the 100-year floodplain.</p> <p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not result in any change to the roadway or structures located in the floodplain in the South Base area. Alternatives 5 and 6 will remove buildings from the floodplain at the South Base, but will maintain the existing roadway within the 100-year flood zone. Neither of these Alternatives propose new development in the floodplain.</p>
<p>4.F.10. The County shall preserve or enhance the aesthetic qualities of natural drainage courses in their natural or improved state compatible with flood control requirements and economic, environmental, and ecological factors.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> Alternatives 1 and 3 result in the relocation of structures and roads within the 100-year floodplain and restoration and protection of stream channels, including the removal of an existing culvert.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 2, 4, 5 and 6 do not result in the restoration or protection of area streams that experience streambank erosion.</p>
<p>4.F.12. The County shall promote the use of natural or non-structural flood control facilities, including off-stream flood control basins, to preserve and enhance creek corridors.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> Alternatives 1 and 3 result in the relocation of structures and roads within the 100-year floodplain and restoration and protection of stream channels, including the removal of an existing culvert. While off-stream flood control basins are not feasible on the mountain slopes, infiltration basins are proposed to treat runoff and avoid damage to stream channels.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6 do not result in the restoration or protection of area streams that experience streambank erosion.</p>
<p>4.F.13. The County shall continue to implement and enforce its Grading Ordinance and Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Final design for the selected alternative will be reviewed by County staff to ensure compliance prior to permitting.</p>
<p>4.F.14. The County shall ensure that new storm drainage systems are designed in conformance with the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District's Stormwater Management Manual and the</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Final design for the selected alternative will be reviewed by County staff to ensure compliance prior to permitting.</p>

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
County's Land Development Manual. [See also policies/programs under Goal 8.B. Flood Hazards.]	
<b>LANDFILLS, TRANSFER STATIONS, AND SOLID WASTE RECYCLING</b>	
<b>Goal 4.G: To ensure the safe and efficient disposal or recycling of solid waste generated in Placer County.</b>	
4.G.1. The County shall require waste collection in all new urban and suburban development.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Solid waste collection is currently provided by and will continue to be provided by Tahoe Truckee Sierra Disposal (TTSD).
4.G.2. The County shall promote maximum use of solid waste source reduction, recycling, composting, and environmentally-safe transformation of wastes.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> At a minimum, each of the alternatives includes recycling collection. Structures under LEED certification (alternatives 1 and 3) will include the use of recycled materials.
4.G.7. The County shall require that all new development complies with applicable provisions of the Placer County Integrated Waste Management Plan.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 will comply with the County Integrated Waste Management Plan.
4.G.9. The County shall encourage businesses to use recycled products in their manufacturing processes and consumers to buy recycled products.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> As feasible, recreational and commercial businesses use recycled products and encourage recycling of these materials by their patrons.
<b>LAW ENFORCEMENT</b>	
<b>Goal 4.H. To provide adequate sheriff's services to deter crime and to meet the growing demand for services associated with increasing population and commercial/industrial development in the County.</b>	
4.H.1. Within the County's overall budgetary constraints, the County shall strive to maintain the following staffing ratios (expressed as the ratio of officers to population): a. 1:1,000 for unincorporated areas, b. 1:7 for jail population, c. 1:16,000 total County population for court and civil officers.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> No new development is proposed for Alternative 2. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives will contribute to population increases. Since development fees do not include law enforcement, mitigation includes a fair share payment for law enforcement services.
4.H.2. The County Sheriff shall strive to maintain the following average response times for emergency calls for service: a. 6 minutes in urban areas, b. 8 minutes in suburban areas, c. 15 minutes in rural areas, d. 20 minutes in remote rural areas.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> No new development is proposed for Alternative 2. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives will contribute to population increases. Since development fees do not include law enforcement, mitigation includes a fair share payment for law enforcement services.
4.H.4. The County shall require new development to develop or fund sheriff facilities that, at a minimum, maintain the above standards.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> No new development is proposed for Alternative 2. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives will contribute to population increases. Since development fees do not include law enforcement, mitigation includes a fair share payment for law enforcement services.
4.H.5. The County shall consider public safety issues in all aspects of commercial and residential project design, including crime prevention through environmental design.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not include new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include design that promotes public activity. Alternative 4 places commercial uses roadside with high visibility and the commercial uses will support the existing neighborhood. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include an emphasis on pedestrian design, appropriate mix of



<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	buildings, appropriate safety devices (surveillance, lighting, and security services).
<b>FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES</b>	
<b>Goal 4.I: To protect residents of and visitors to Placer County from injury and loss of life and to protect property and watershed resources from fires.</b>	
4.I.1. The County shall encourage local fire protection agencies in Placer County to maintain the following minimum fire protection standards (expressed as Insurance Service Organization (ISO) ratings): a. ISO 4 in urban areas, b. ISO 6 in suburban areas, c. ISO 8 in rural areas.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include new development and development fees for fire protection. These alternatives include new hydrants, fire protection devices in each structure (extinguishers, sprinklers, etc.) and clusters the development near SR 89 for easier access. By treating the forested areas of the site for fuels reduction, the project reduces the threat of wildfire in the area and may qualify for an “in lieu of” reduction in development mitigation fees.
4.I.2. The County shall encourage local fire protection agencies in the County to maintain the following standards (expressed as average response times to emergency calls): a. 4 minutes in urban areas, b. 6 minutes in suburban areas, c. 10 minutes in rural areas.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include new development and development fees for fire protection. These alternatives include new hydrants, fire protection devices in each structure (extinguishers, sprinklers, etc.) and clusters the development near SR 89 for easier access.
4.I.3. The County shall require new development to develop or fund fire protection facilities, personnel, and operations and maintenance that, at a minimum, maintains the above service level standards.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include new development and development fees for fire protection. These alternatives include new hydrants, fire protection devices in each structure (extinguishers, sprinklers, etc.), and clusters the development near SR 89 for easier access.
4.I.9. The County shall ensure that all proposed developments are reviewed for compliance with fire safety standards by responsible local fire agencies per the Uniform Fire Code and other County and local ordinances.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include new development and development fees for fire protection. These alternatives include new hydrants, fire protection devices in each structure (extinguishers, sprinklers, etc.) and clusters the development near SR 89 for easier access. Final design placement of fire protection devices will be reviewed by the North Tahoe Fire Protection District.
<b>SCHOOLS</b>	
<b>Goal 4.J: To provide for the educational needs of Placer County residents.</b>	
<b>Planning for School Sites/Facilities Policies</b>	
4.J.3. The County shall work cooperatively with school districts in monitoring housing, population, and school enrollment trends and in planning for future school facility needs, and shall assist school districts in locating appropriate sites for new schools.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. There is sufficient existing school capacity to address the population increase that may occur under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.
4.J.4. The County's land use planning should be coordinated with the planning of school facilities and should involve school districts in the early stages of the land use planning process.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. There is sufficient existing school capacity to address the population increase that may occur under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
4.J.5. The County should plan and approve residential uses in those areas that are most accessible to school sites in order to enhance neighborhoods, minimize transportation requirements and costs, and minimize safety problems.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. There is sufficient existing school capacity to address the population increase that may occur under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.
4.J.6. The County should include schools among those public facilities and services that are considered an essential part of the infrastructure that should be in place as development occurs.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. There is sufficient existing school capacity to address the population increase that may occur under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.
<b>Facility Needs/Funding</b>	
4.J.10. The provision of adequate school facilities is a community priority. The County and school districts will work closely to secure adequate funding for new school facilities and, where legally feasible, the County shall provide a mechanism which, along with state and local sources, requires development projects to satisfy an individual school district's financing program based upon their impactation.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. There is sufficient existing school capacity to address the population increase that may occur under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.
4.J.11. The County and residential developers should coordinate with the school districts to ensure that needed school facilities are available for use in a timely manner. The County, to the extent possible, shall require that new school facilities are constructed and operating prior to the occupation of the residences which the schools are intended to serve.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. There is sufficient existing school capacity to address the population increase that may occur under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.
4.J.13. Before a residential development, which includes a proposed general plan amendment, rezoning or other legislative review can be approved by the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, it shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the hearing body that adequate school facilities shall be provided when the need is generated by the proposed development.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. There is sufficient existing school capacity to address the population increase that may occur under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.
<b>RECREATIONAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>	
<b>PUBLIC RECREATION AND PARKS</b>	
<b>Goal 5.A: To develop and maintain a system of conveniently-located, properly-designed parks and recreational facilities to serve the needs of present and future residents, employees, and visitors.</b>	
5.A.1. The County shall strive to achieve and maintain a standard of 5 acres of improved parkland and 5 acres of passive recreation area or open space per 1,000 population.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives do not propose new park areas or open space, but do propose new residential units. The development of the swimming pool, skating rink hiking trails, mini-golf course, amphitheater and bike trail will help to meet this standard for Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6. Mitigation may require the payment of equivalent fees if necessary to achieve consistency.
5.A.2. The County shall strive to achieve the following park facility standards: a. 1 tot lot per 1,000 residents, b. 1 playground per 3,000 residents,	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives do not propose new park areas or

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<p>c. 1 tennis court per 6,000 residents,  d. 1 basketball court per 6,000 residents,  e. 1 hardball diamond per 3,000 residents,  f. 1 softball/little league diamond per 3,000 residents,  g. 1 mile of recreation trail per 1,000 residents,  h. 1 youth soccer field per 2,000 residents,  i. 1 adult field per 2,000 residents,  j. 1 golf course per 50,000 residents.</p>	<p>open space, but do propose new residential units. The development of the swimming pool, skating rink hiking trails, mini-golf course, amphitheater and bike trail will help to meet this standard for Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6. Mitigation requiring the payment of equivalent fees will result in consistency.</p>
<p>5.A.3. The County shall require new development to provide a minimum of 5 acres of improved parkland and 5 acres of passive recreation area or open space for every 1,000 new residents of the area covered by the development. The park classification system shown in Table 5-1 should be used as a guide to the type of the facilities to be developed in achieving these standards.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development.  <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives do not propose new park areas or open space, but do propose new residential units. The development of the swimming pool, skating rink hiking trails, mini-golf course, amphitheater and bike trail will help to meet this standard for Alternatives 1, 3, and 5. Mitigation requiring the payment of equivalent fees will result in consistency.</p>
<p>5.A.4. The County shall consider the use of the following open space areas as passive parks to be applied to the requirement for 5 acres of passive park area for every 1,000 residents.</p> <p>a. Floodways,  b. Protected riparian corridors and stream environment zones,  c. Protected wildlife corridors,  d. Greenways with the potential for trail development,  e. Open water (e.g., ponds, lakes, and reservoirs),  f. Protected woodland areas,  g. Protected sensitive habitat areas providing that interpretive displays are provided (e.g., wetlands and habitat for rare, threatened or endangered species).</p> <p>Buffer areas are not considered as passive park areas if such areas are delineated by setbacks within private property. Where such areas are delineated by public easements or are held as common areas with homeowner/property owner access or public access, they will be considered as passive park areas provided that there are opportunities for passive recreational use.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development.  <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives do not propose new park areas or open space, but do propose new residential units. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 will maintain the ski resort and Alternative 4 will maintain a portion of the mountain for public access. Mitigation requiring the provision of park facilities or payment of equivalent fees will result in consistency.</p>
<p>5.A.5. The County shall require the dedication of land and/or payment of fees, in accordance with state law (Quimby Act) to ensure funding for the acquisition and development of public recreation facilities. The fees are to be set and adjusted as necessary to provide for a level of funding that meets the actual cost to provide for all of the public parkland and park development needs generated by new development.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development.  <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives do not propose new park areas or open space, but do propose new residential units. The development of the swimming pool, skating rink hiking trails, mini-golf course, amphitheater and bike trail will help to meet this standard for Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6. Mitigation requiring the provision of park facilities or payment of equivalent fees will result in consistency.</p>
<p>5.A.8. The County shall strive to maintain a well-balanced distribution of local parks, considering the</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development.</p>

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
character and intensity of present and planned development and future recreation needs.	<u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives do not propose new park areas or open space, but do propose new residential units. The development of the swimming pool, skating rink hiking trails, mini-golf course, amphitheater and bike trail will help to meet this standard for Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6. Mitigation requiring the provision of park facilities or payment of equivalent fees will result in consistency.
5.A.11. Regional and local recreation facilities should reflect the character of the area and the existing and anticipated demand for such facilities.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives do not propose new park areas or open space, but do propose new residential units. The development of the swimming pool, skating rink hiking trails, mini-golf course, amphitheater and bike trail will help to meet this standard for Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6. Mitigation requiring the provision of park facilities or payment of equivalent fees will result in consistency.
5.A.12. The County shall encourage recreational development that complements the natural features of the area, including the topography, waterways, vegetation, and soil characteristics.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development. <u>Consistent– Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 will maintain the ski resort and will develop hiking trails, a bike path, amphitheater, swimming pool and ice rink. <u>Inconsistent - Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 will close the mountain to public access.
5.A.13. The County shall ensure that recreational activity is distributed and managed according to an area's carrying capacity, with special emphasis on controlling adverse environmental impacts, conflict between uses, and trespass. At the same time, the regional importance of each area's recreation resources shall be recognized.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development. <u>Consistent– Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 will maintain the ski resort and will develop hiking trails, a bike path, amphitheater, swimming pool and ice rink. <u>Inconsistent - Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 will close the mountain to public access.
5.A.19. The County shall encourage the development of parks near public facilities such as schools, community halls, libraries, museums, prehistoric or historic sites, and open space areas and shall encourage joint-use agreements whenever possible.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area is not located near a school, library, historic site, or open space. It is located near a museum and the presence of the ski resort, proposed new recreational uses, and tourist facilities will enhance this.
5.A.22. The County shall encourage compatible recreational use of riparian areas along streams and creeks where public access can be balanced with environmental values and private property rights.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Recreational uses are not proposed within riparian areas to protect environmental values, skiing and hiking may occur near such areas, but the area creeks do not support significant recreational use.
5.A.23. The County shall require that park and recreation facilities required in conjunction with new development be developed in a timely manner so that such facilities are available concurrently with new development.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternative 4 would not result in the need for new recreational facilities for new residents. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 would maintain the ski facilities and develop new recreation concurrently.
5.A.24. The County shall encourage public and private park and recreation agencies to acknowledge the natural resource values present at park sites during the design of	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 maintain the ski facilities and expand upon new passive

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
a new facility.	and developed recreation uses. Developed recreation is located within the resort (base area and mid-mountain lodge) while passive recreation is dispersed through the site. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 will eliminate the ski facilities and will not provide new recreational facilities.
<b>PRIVATE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES</b>	
<b>Goal 5.B: To encourage development of private recreational facilities.</b>	
5.B.1. The County shall encourage development of private recreation facilities to reduce demands on public agencies.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives maintain existing ski facilities or expand on them and add new recreational services (swimming pool, ice skating, mini golf, hiking trails). <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 will eliminate the ski facilities and will not provide new recreational facilities.
<b>RECREATIONAL TRAILS</b>	
<b>Goal 5.C: To develop a system of interconnected hiking, riding, and bicycling trails and paths suitable for active recreation and transportation and circulation.</b>	
5.C.1. The County shall support development of a Countywide trail system designed to achieve the following objectives: a. Provide safe, pleasant, and convenient travel by foot, horse, or bicycle; b. Link residential areas, schools, community buildings, parks, and other community facilities within residential developments. Whenever possible, trails should connect to the Countywide trail system, regional trails, and the trail or bikeways plans of cities; c. Provide access to recreation areas, major waterways, and vista points; d. Provide for multiple uses (i.e., pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle); e. Use public utility corridors such as power transmission line easements, railroad rights-of-way, irrigation district easements, and roadways; f. Whenever feasible, be designed to separate equestrian trails from cycling paths, and to separate trails from the roadway by the use of curbs, fences, landscape buffering, and/or spatial distance; g. Connect commercial areas, major employment centers, institutional uses, public facilities, and recreational areas with residential areas; and h. Protect sensitive open space and natural resources.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives include the extension of the West Shore bike trail through the site as well as 5 miles of hiking trails accessible from the base area. The pedestrian trails and bike trail connect the community with onsite commercial uses and transit stops. <u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not propose new hiking or bike trails. The existing bike route would continue, but no dedicated, or mixed-use trails would be provided to encourage pedestrian/bike use.
5.C.3. The County shall work with other public agencies to coordinate the development of equestrian, pedestrian, and bicycle trails.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives include the extension of the West Shore bike trail through the site as well as 5 miles of hiking trails accessible from the base area. <u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not propose new hiking or bike trails.
5.C.5. The County shall encourage the preservation of linear open space along rail corridors and other public	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> There are no rail corridors within the Project area.

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
easements for future use as trails. [See also policies/programs under Goal 3.D., Non-Motorized Transportation.]	
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>	
<b>Goal 5.D: To identify, protect, and enhance Placer County's important historical, archaeological, paleontological, and cultural sites and their contributing environment.</b>	
5.D.6. The County shall require that discretionary development projects identify and protect from damage, destruction, and abuse, important historical, archaeological, paleontological, and cultural sites and their contributing environment. Such assessments shall be incorporated into a Countywide cultural resource data base, to be maintained by the Department of Museums.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development or land disturbance. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Cultural resources and their protection if encountered during excavation are discussed in Chapter 9 of this EIR/EIS.
5.D.7. The County shall require that discretionary development projects are designed to avoid potential impacts to significant paleontological or cultural resources whenever possible. Unavoidable impacts, whenever possible, shall be reduced to a less than significant level and/or shall be mitigated by extracting maximum recoverable data. Determinations of impacts, significance, and mitigation shall be made by qualified archaeological (in consultation with recognized local Native American groups), historical, or paleontological consultants, depending on the type of resource in question.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development or land disturbance. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Cultural resources and their protection if encountered during excavation are discussed in Chapter 9 of this EIR/EIS.
<b>NATURAL RESOURCES</b>	
<b>WATER RESOURCES</b>	
<b>Goal 6.A: To protect and enhance the natural qualities of Placer County's streams, creeks and groundwater.</b>	
6.A.1. The County shall require the provision of sensitive habitat buffers which shall, at a minimum, be measured as follows: 100 feet from the centerline of perennial streams, 50 feet from centerline of intermittent streams, and 50 feet from the edge of sensitive habitats to be protected including riparian zones, wetlands, old growth woodlands, and the habitat of rare, threatened or endangered species (see discussion of sensitive habitat buffers in Part I of this Policy Document). Based on more detailed information supplied as a part of the review for a specific project, the County may determine that such setbacks are not applicable in a particular instance or should be modified based on the new information provided. The County may, however, allow exceptions, such as in the following cases: a. Reasonable use of the property would otherwise be denied; b. The location is necessary to avoid or mitigate hazards to the public; c. The location is necessary for the repair of roads, bridges, trails, or similar infrastructure; or d. The location is necessary for the construction of new	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No new structures will be placed within the buffer zone of streams or sensitive habitat. Structures and coverage will be removed from these areas (culvert – Alternatives 1 and 3, and SEZ coverage removal – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6).

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
roads, bridges, trails, or similar infrastructure where the County determines there is no feasible alternative and the project has minimized environmental impacts through project design and infrastructure placement.	
6.A.2. The County shall require all development in the 100-year floodplain to comply with the provisions of the Placer County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 1 and 3 result in the relocation of structures and roads within the 100-year floodplain. Alternatives 5 and 6 result in the removal of structures within the floodplain. No new structures are proposed within the floodplain and uses within this area will comply with County ordinance.
6.A.3. The County shall require development projects proposing to encroach into a creek corridor or creek setback to do one or more of the following, in descending order of desirability: a. Avoid the disturbance of riparian vegetation; b. Replace riparian vegetation (on-site, in-kind); c. Restore another section of creek (in-kind); and/or d. Pay a mitigation fee for restoration elsewhere (e.g., wetland mitigation banking program).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Each development alternative results in some degree of coverage reduction in the SEZ. Alternatives 1 and 3 include streambank restoration, culvert removal, and SEZ function restoration in Homewood Creek. New structures will not encroach into a creek. Alternative 2 does not propose development.
6.A.4. Where creek protection is required or proposed, the County should require public and private development to: a. Preserve creek corridors and creek setback areas through easements or dedications. Parcel lines (in the case of a subdivision) or easements (in the case of a subdivision or other development) shall be located to optimize resource protection. If a creek is proposed to be included within an open space parcel or easement, allowed uses and maintenance responsibilities within that parcel or easement should be clearly defined and conditioned prior to map or project approval; b. Designate such easement or dedication areas (as described in a. above) as open space; c. Protect creek corridors and their habitat value by actions such as: 1) providing an adequate creek setback, 2) maintaining creek corridors in an essentially natural state, 3) employing creek restoration techniques where restoration is needed to achieve a natural creek corridor, 4) utilizing riparian vegetation within creek corridors, and where possible, within creek setback areas, 5) prohibiting the planting of invasive, non-native plants (such as vinca major and eucalyptus) within creek corridors or creek setbacks, and 6) avoiding tree removal within creek corridors; d. Provide recreation and public access near creeks consistent with other General Plan policies; e. Use design, construction, and maintenance techniques that ensure development near a creek will not cause or worsen natural hazards (such as erosion, sedimentation, flooding, or water pollution) and will include erosion and sediment control practices such as: 1) turbidity screens and other management practices, which shall be used as necessary to minimize siltation, sedimentation,	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6 do not propose creek protection. Creek protection is proposed for Alternatives 1 and 3, which includes culvert removal and day lighting of the stream which restores natural function. The creek is located within a recreation use area accessible by the public.

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
and erosion, and shall be left in place until disturbed areas; and/or are stabilized with permanent vegetation that will prevent the transport of sediment off site; and 2) temporary vegetation sufficient to stabilize disturbed areas. f. Provide for long-term creek corridor maintenance by providing a guaranteed financial commitment to the County which accounts for all anticipated maintenance activities.	
6.A.5. The County shall continue to require the use of feasible and practical best management practices (BMPs) to protect streams from the adverse effects of construction activities and urban runoff and to encourage the use of BMPs for agricultural activities.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> All of the alternatives include the implementation of BMPs.
6.A.6. The County shall require that natural watercourses are integrated into new development in such a way that they are accessible to the public and provide a positive visual element.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Onsite creeks will remain accessible to the public.
6.A.7. The County shall discourage grading activities during the rainy season, unless adequately mitigated, to avoid sedimentation of creeks and damage to riparian habitat.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Grading will not occur during the rainy season and BMPs will be located to avoid sedimentation.
6.A.8. Where the stream environment zone has previously been modified by channelization, fill, or other human activity, the County shall require project proponents to restore such areas by means of landscaping, revegetation, or similar stabilization techniques as a part of development activities.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives result in the removal of SEZ coverage; however, only Alternatives 1 and 3 restore SEZ function. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not remove SEZ coverage.
6.A.9. The County shall require that newly-created parcels include adequate space outside of watercourses' setback areas to ensure that property owners will not place improvements (e.g., pools, patios, and appurtenant structures), within areas that require protection.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No new structures will be placed within the buffer zone of streams or sensitive habitat. Structures and coverage will be removed from these areas (culvert – Alternatives 1 and 3, and SEZ coverage removal – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6).
6.A.12. The County shall encourage the protection of floodplain lands and where appropriate, acquire public easements for purposes of flood protection, public safety, wildlife preservation, groundwater recharge, access and recreation.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives remove existing structures from the floodplain. <u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives maintain some structures or roadways within the floodplain.
<b>WETLAND AND RIPARIAN AREAS</b>	
<b>Goal 6.B: To protect wetland communities and related riparian areas throughout Placer County as valuable resources.</b>	
6.B.1. The County shall support the "no net loss" policy for wetland areas regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the California Department of Fish and Game. Coordination with these agencies at all levels of project review shall continue to ensure that appropriate mitigation measures and the concerns of these agencies are adequately addressed.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives propose new coverage of wetland areas. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include removal of SEZ coverage.
6.B.2. The County shall require new development to mitigate wetland loss in both regulated and nonregulated wetlands to achieve "no net loss" through any	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives propose new coverage of wetland areas. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include removal of SEZ coverage.



<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
combination of the following, in descending order of desirability: (1) avoidance; (2) where avoidance is not possible, minimization of impacts on the resource; or (3) compensation, including use of a mitigation banking program that provides the opportunity to mitigate impacts to rare, threatened, and endangered species and/or the habitat which supports these species in wetland and riparian areas.	
6.B.3. The County shall discourage direct runoff of pollutants and siltation into wetland areas from outfalls serving nearby urban development. Development shall be designed in such a manner that pollutants and siltation will not significantly adversely affect the value or function of wetlands.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Each of the alternatives include BMPs to improve runoff quality. Alternatives 1 and 3 include infiltration galleries to improve stormwater treatment..
6.B.4. The County shall strive to identify and conserve remaining upland habitat areas adjacent to wetlands and riparian areas that are critical to the survival and nesting of wetland and riparian species.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> No new wetland coverage would occur and the areas surrounding the creeks that are not already disturbed would not be further disturbed. Ongoing restoration of disturbed areas on the mountain will also include some additional SEZ restoration efforts. Alternatives 1 and 3 include actions to restore such areas.
6.B.5. The County shall require development that may affect a wetland to employ avoidance, minimization, and/or compensatory mitigation techniques. In evaluating the level of compensation to be required with respect to any given project, (a) on-site mitigation shall be preferred to off-site, and in-kind mitigation shall be preferred to out-of-kind; (b) functional replacement ratios may vary to the extent necessary to incorporate a margin of safety reflecting the expected degree of success associated with the mitigation plan; and (c) acreage replacement ratios may vary depending on the relative functions and values of those wetlands being lost and those being supplied, including compensation for temporal losses. The County shall continue to implement and refine criteria for determining when an alteration to a wetland is considered a less-than-significant impact under CEQA.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the alternatives propose new coverage of wetland areas. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include removal of SEZ coverage.
<b>FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT</b>	
<b>Goal 6.C: To protect, restore, and enhance habitats that support fish and wildlife species so as to maintain populations at viable levels.</b>	
<p>6.C.1. The County shall identify and protect significant ecological resource areas and other unique wildlife habitats critical to protecting and sustaining wildlife populations. Significant ecological resource areas include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Wetland areas including vernal pools.</li> <li>b. Stream environment zones.</li> <li>c. Any habitat for rare, threatened or endangered animals or plants.</li> <li>d. Critical deer winter ranges (winter and summer),</li> </ul>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Each of these alternatives reduces coverage in the SEZ. Alternatives 1 and 3 restore the Homewood Creek stream channel. There are no migratory routes on site. Restoration of SEZ function under Alternatives 1 and 3 may increase use of the area for wildlife travel.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not change existing conditions and maintains coverage in sensitive habitat areas.</p>

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<p>migratory routes and fawning habitat.</p> <p>e. Large areas of non-fragmented natural habitat, including Blue Oak Woodlands, Valley Foothill Riparian, vernal pool habitat.</p> <p>f. Identifiable wildlife movement zones, including but not limited to, non-fragmented stream environment zones, avian and mammalian migratory routes, and known concentration areas of waterfowl within the Pacific Flyway.</p> <p>g. Important spawning areas for anadromous fish.</p>	
<p>6.C.2. The County shall require development in areas known to have particular value for wildlife to be carefully planned and, where possible, located so that the reasonable value of the habitat for wildlife is maintained.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area is not known to have a particular value for wildlife other than it provides general habitat. The value of the habitat would not require additional planning, particularly since the site is currently an active ski facility.</p>
<p>6.C.3. The County shall encourage the control of residual pesticides to prevent potential damage to water quality, vegetation, and wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative would not alter existing conditions.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives may use fertilizers within landscaped areas. To protect water quality mitigation is proposed to manage the use and distribution of fertilizers.</p>
<p>6.C.4. The County shall encourage private landowners to adopt sound wildlife habitat management practices, as recommended by California Department of Fish and Game officials, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Placer County Resource Conservation District.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Wildlife will be managed, as, needed, in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations.</p>
<p>6.C.5. The County shall require mitigation for development projects where isolated segments of stream habitat are unavoidably altered. Such impacts should be mitigated on-site with in-kind habitat replacement or elsewhere in the stream system through stream or riparian habitat restoration work.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 do not place new structures within the stream system. Alternatives 1 and 3 include actions to restore the stream channel.</p>
<p>6.C.6. The County shall support preservation of the habitats of rare, threatened, endangered, and/or other special status species. Federal and state agencies, as well as other resource conservation organizations, shall be encouraged to acquire and manage endangered species' habitats.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> There are no listed species associated with the Project area. Migratory and nesting birds will be protected from impacts due to tree removal through implementation of mitigation that ensures construction does not disturb occupied trees.</p>
<p>6.C.7. The County shall support the maintenance of suitable habitats for all indigenous species of wildlife, without preference to game or non-game species, through maintenance of habitat diversity.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Each of the alternatives maintains portions of the site for ski facilities or public land that may support native species.</p>
<p>6.C.8. The County shall support the preservation or reestablishment of fisheries in the rivers and streams within the County, whenever possible.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives eliminate the existing culvert and day light the stream channel to support stream habitat.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives do not improve stream channels or vegetation and maintain channel disturbance.</p>
<p>6.C.9. The County shall require new private or public developments to preserve and enhance existing native riparian habitat unless public safety concerns require</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives eliminate the existing culvert and day light the stream channel to support stream habitat.</p>

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
removal of habitat for flood control or other public purposes. In cases where new private or public development results in modification or destruction of riparian habitat for purposes of flood control, the developers shall be responsible for acquiring, restoring, and enhancing at least an equivalent amount of like habitat within or near the Project area.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not propose new development. <u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives do not improve the stream channels or vegetation and maintain channel disturbance.
6.C.10. The County will use the California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (WHR) system as a standard descriptive tool and guide for environmental assessment in the absence of a more detailed site-specific system.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Chapter 8 of the EIR/EIS includes a biological resources assessment.
<p>6.C.11. Prior to approval of discretionary development permits involving parcels within a significant ecological resource area, the County shall require, as part of the environmental review process, a biotic resources evaluation of the sites by a wildlife biologist, the evaluation shall be based upon field reconnaissance performed at the appropriate time of year to determine the presence or absence of rare, threatened, or endangered species of plants or animals. Such evaluation will consider the potential for significant impact on these resources, and will identify feasible measures to mitigate such impacts or indicate why mitigation is not feasible. In approving any such discretionary development permit, the decision-making body shall determine the feasibility of the identified mitigation measures.</p> <p>Significant ecological resource areas shall, at a minimum, include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Wetland areas including vernal pools.</li> <li>b. Stream environment zones.</li> <li>c. Any habitat for rare, threatened or endangered animals or plants.</li> <li>d. Critical deer winter ranges (winter and summer), migratory routes and fawning habitat.</li> <li>e. Large areas of non-fragmented natural habitat, including Blue Oak Woodlands, Valley Foothill Riparian, vernal pool habitat.</li> <li>f. Identifiable wildlife movement zones, including but not limited to, non-fragmented stream environment zones, avian and mammalian migratory routes, and known concentration areas of waterfowl within the Pacific Flyway.</li> <li>g. Important spawning areas for anadromous fish.</li> </ul>	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Chapter 8 of the EIR/EIS includes a biological resources assessment. Field reconnaissance and surveys were conducted in 2007 and 2008. Listed species were not identified within the Project area.
6.C.13. The County shall support and cooperate with efforts of other local, state, and federal agencies and private entities engaged in the preservation and protection of significant biological resources from incompatible land uses and development. Significant biological resources include endangered, threatened, or rare species and their habitats, wetland habitats, wildlife	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Local, state, and federal preservation or protection efforts are not present onsite. The development alternatives include SEZ coverage reduction and restoration (Alternatives 1 and 3).

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
migration corridors, and locally-important species/communities.	
6.C.14. The County shall support the management efforts of the California Department of Fish and Game to maintain and enhance the productivity of important fish and game species (such as the Blue Canyon and Loyalton Truckee deer herds) by protecting identified critical habitat for these species from incompatible suburban, rural residential, or recreational development.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Critical habitat is not located onsite.
<b>VEGETATION</b>	
<b>Goal 6.D: To preserve and protect the valuable vegetation resources of Placer County.</b>	
6.D.1. The County shall encourage landowners and developers to preserve the integrity of existing terrain and natural vegetation in visually-sensitive areas such as hillsides, ridges, and along important transportation corridors.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area is currently disturbed and holds little natural vegetation value for the visual environment. Areas further up the mountain provide more visual quality through natural vegetation and these areas will be maintained as part of the ski facilities or as natural screening of homesites. The landscape plans for the base areas include native and adapted species for stabilization of disturbed areas and to provide screening of buildings and parking from view along SR 89.
6.D.2. The County shall require developers to use native and compatible non-native species, especially drought-resistant species, to the extent possible in fulfilling landscaping requirements imposed as conditions of discretionary permits or for project mitigation.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> This alternative does not include landscaping. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6</u> include landscaping utilizing native and adapted species. Mitigation for these alternatives includes the elimination of high-water use plants and alternative irrigation methods.
6.D.3. The County shall support the preservation of outstanding areas of natural vegetation, including, but not limited to, oak woodlands, riparian areas, and vernal pools.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Since the site contains high levels of disturbance, it is not considered an outstanding area of natural vegetation. Continued operation of the ski resort will maintain vegetation on the slopes.
6.D.4. The County shall ensure that landmark trees and major groves of native trees are preserved and protected. In order to maintain these areas in perpetuity, protected areas shall also include younger vegetation with suitable space for growth and reproduction.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Large trees along the roadside are protected. Some large trees onsite will be removed; however none of the trees onsite represent old growth stands.
6.D.5. The County shall establish procedures for identifying and preserving rare, threatened, and endangered plant species that may be adversely affected by public or private development projects.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The 2007 reconnaissance survey for listed plant species did not identify listed species onsite.
6.D.6. The County shall ensure the conservation of sufficiently large, continuous expanses of native vegetation to provide suitable habitat for maintaining abundant and diverse wildlife.	<u>Consistent –All Alternatives.</u> The existing ski facilities will continue under Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6, maintaining large expanses of undeveloped areas. Alternative 4 will convert forested ski resort area to private estate home sites, effectively maintaining the forested conditions.
6.D.7. The County shall support the management of wetland and riparian plant communities for passive recreation, groundwater recharge, nutrient catchment, and wildlife habitats. Such communities shall be	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives restore the SEZ function onsite as well as riparian vegetation within the restored stream channel. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 5 and 6.</u>

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
restored or expanded, where possible.	These alternatives restore SEZ function but do not remove the existing culvert at the South Base area. <u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These Alternatives do not restore SEZ function or channel vegetation.
6.D.8. The County shall require that new development preserve natural woodlands to the maximum extent possible.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Forest areas are preserved in their current state to various degrees under each alternative.
6.D.9. The County shall require that development on hillsides be limited to maintain valuable natural vegetation, especially forests and open grasslands, and to control erosion.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include development on the lower portion of the hillside, stepping structures upslope. Erosion control devices will be utilized.
6.D.10. The County shall encourage the planting of native trees, shrubs, and grasslands in order to preserve the visual integrity of the landscape, provide habitat conditions suitable for native wildlife, and ensure that a maximum number and variety of well-adapted plants are maintained.	<u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Each of these alternatives includes irrigation. Restoration areas will include appropriate native plant species. Mitigation proposes to use native and adapted species of plants that are not heavily reliant on water or fertilizer. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 2.</u> Native plantings are not proposed and the existing landscape will persist.
6.D.12. The County shall support the retention of heavily vegetated corridors along circulation corridors to preserve their rural character.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The area closest to SR 89 is primarily a parking lot with little vegetation.
6.D.13. The County shall support the preservation of native trees and the use of native, drought-tolerant plant materials in all revegetation/landscaping projects.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose landscaping. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include landscaping with plants that are not heavily reliant on irrigation. Native trees will be preserved where possible; however trees will be removed to allow for new development.
6.D.14. The County shall require that new development avoid, as much as possible, ecologically-fragile areas (e.g., areas of rare or endangered species of plants, riparian areas). Where feasible, these areas should be protected through public acquisition of fee title or conservation easements to ensure protection.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Structures proposed under Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 will avoid sensitive habitat areas.
<b>OPEN SPACE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES</b>	
<b>Goal 6.E: To preserve and enhance open space lands to maintain the natural resources of the County.</b>	
6.E.1. The County shall support the preservation and enhancement of natural land forms, natural vegetation, and natural resources as open space to the maximum extent feasible. The County shall permanently protect, as open space, areas of natural resource value, including wetlands preserves, riparian corridors, woodlands, and floodplains.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The site is currently used as a publicly accessible ski facility. This would be maintained through Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6, with the majority of the Project area used for ski facilities. Alternative 4 would close the ski facilities, but would only develop a portion of the mountain, leaving large areas open but unavailable for public use. Dedicated open space is not proposed nor is the property designated as open space.
6.E.2. The County shall require that new development be designed and constructed to preserve the following types of areas and features as open space to the maximum extent feasible: a. High erosion hazard areas;	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 avoid new development within streams, SEZ areas, and hazard areas. BMPs are proposed to reduce erosion onsite. SEZ coverage will be reduced. Development

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<p>b. Scenic and trail corridors;  c. Streams, streamside vegetation;  d. Wetlands;  e. Other significant stands of vegetation;  f. Wildlife corridors; and  g. Any areas of special ecological significance.</p>	<p>along the roadway corridor will improve the scenic quality. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include newly designated public hiking trails to increase year-round scenic views of the area.</p>
<p>6.E.3. The County shall support the maintenance of open space and natural areas that are interconnected and of sufficient size to protect biodiversity, accommodate wildlife movement, and sustain ecosystems.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Public open space does not currently exist onsite and is not proposed. Each of the alternatives would maintain the undeveloped areas or portions of the ski facilities to maintain the landscape.</p>
<b>AIR QUALITY—GENERAL</b>	
<b>Goal 6.F: To protect and improve air quality in Placer County</b>	
<p>6.F.5. The County shall encourage project proponents to consult early in the planning process with the County regarding the applicability of Countywide indirect and area-wide source programs and transportation control measures (TCM) programs. Project review shall also address energy-efficient building and site designs and proper storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Each alternative is analyzed for transportation control, energy efficiency, and hazardous materials use and storage in the EIR/EIS. Each alternative includes transit stops. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include alternative transportation and hazardous materials storage. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include LEED certification and EIP projects that improve traffic flow.</p>
<p>6.F.6. The County shall require project-level environmental review to include identification of potential air quality impacts and designation of design and other appropriate mitigation measures or offset fees to reduce impacts. The County shall dedicate staff to work with project proponents and other agencies in identifying, ensuring the implementation of, and monitoring the success of mitigation measures.</p>	<p><u>Consistent –All Alternatives.</u> Air quality analysis for each alternative is found in Chapter 12 of the EIR/EIS, including mitigation for construction and operations.</p>
<p>6.F.7. The County shall encourage development to be located and designed to minimize direct and indirect air pollutants.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in new air pollutant emissions.  <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives will emit pollutants during construction; however implementation of County construction BMPs will result in compliance. In addition, operations may result in increased pollutants generated by traffic; however, alternative transportation features combined with payment of emissions offset fees will minimize the impact. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 participate in offsite EIP projects that improve traffic flow, which results in fewer traffic emissions in the region. It should be noted that Alternative 4 results in fewer traffic-related emissions as the traffic levels decrease from existing conditions for this alternative.</p>
<p>6.F.8. The County shall submit development proposals to the PCAPCD for review and comment in compliance with CEQA prior to consideration by the appropriate decision-making body.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Development proposals will be provided to the PCAPCD for each development alternative.</p>
<p>6.F.9. In reviewing project applications, the County shall consider alternatives or amendments that reduce emissions of air pollutants.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Each of the alternatives and associated mitigation will be considered by the County through the review process.</p>

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
6.F.10. The County may require new development projects to submit an air quality analysis for review and approval. Based on this analysis, the County shall require appropriate mitigation measures consistent with the PCAPCD's 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan (or updated edition).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Air quality analysis for each alternative is found in Chapter 12 of the EIR/EIS, including mitigation for construction and operations.
<b>AIR QUALITY--TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION</b>	
<b>Goal 6.G: To integrate air quality planning with the land use and transportation planning process.</b>	
6.G.1. The County shall require new development to be planned to result in smooth flowing traffic conditions for major roadways. This includes traffic signals and traffic signal coordination, parallel roadways, and intra- and inter-neighborhood connections where significant reductions in overall emissions can be achieved.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternative 4 results in fewer vehicle trips than existing conditions and therefore fewer traffic-related air emissions. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives will result in more vehicle trips despite proposed alternative transportation features. Mitigation is proposed to improve the intersection of SR 89 and Granlibakken Road to reduce traffic emissions. In addition, offset fees shall be paid. These Alternatives include EIP projects that improve traffic flow in Tahoe City, which will reduce emissions in the region.
6.G.3. The County shall encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation by incorporating public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modes in County transportation planning and by requiring new development to provide adequate pedestrian and bikeway facilities.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 5.</u> These alternatives include public transit, pedestrian paths, vehicle sharing, bike share programs, shuttle services, and dial-a-ride services to the community. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 extend the West Shore bike trail through the site. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 4.</u> Although Alternatives 2 and 4 include the two existing transit stops, they do not include bike trail extensions or pedestrian facilities that connect adjacent land uses.
6.G.6. The County shall require large new developments to dedicate land for and construct appropriate improvements for park-and-ride lots, if suitably located.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The Project area does not connect to mass transit stations. Park-and-ride lots are not suitable at this location. It should be noted that transit service is provided to the Project area under all alternatives, and Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include shuttle services, dial-a-ride, vehicle sharing programs, water taxi service, and other alternative transportation modes.
<b>FOREST RESOURCES</b>	
<b>Goal 7.E: To conserve Placer County's forest resources, enhance the quality and diversity of forest ecosystems, reduce conflicts between forestry and other uses, and encourage a sustained yield of forest products.</b>	
7.E.1. The County shall encourage the sustained productive use of forest land as a means of providing open space and conserving other natural resources.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The alternatives do not conflict with timberland management. The development alternatives include fuels management activities to improve forest health.
7.E.2. The County shall discourage development that conflicts with timberland management.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The alternatives do not conflict with timberland management. The development alternatives include fuels management activities to improve forest health.
7.E.3. The County shall work closely and coordinate	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The alternatives do not

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
with agencies involved in the regulation of timber harvest operations to ensure that County conservation goals are achieved.	conflict with timberland management. The development alternatives include fuels management activities to improve forest health.
7.E.4. The County shall encourage qualified landowners to enroll in the Timberland Production Zone (TPZ) program.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The development area is located outside the TPZ.
7.E.5. The County shall review all proposed timber harvest plans (THPs) and shall request that the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) amend THPs to address public safety concerns, such as requiring alternate haul routes if use of proposed haul routes would jeopardize public health and safety or result in damage to public or private roads.	<u>Consistent with Mitigation – All Alternatives.</u> A forest plan is propose mitigation to ensure tree removal and thinning practices are consistent with policies regarding forest health and timber harvest.
7.E.6. The County shall encourage and promote the productive use of wood waste generated in the County.	<u>Consistent with Mitigation – All Alternatives.</u> A forest plan is propose mitigation to ensure tree removal and thinning practices are consistent with policies regarding forest health and timber harvest.
<b>HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>	
<b>SEISMIC AND GEOLOGICAL HAZARDS</b>	
<b>Goal 8.A: To minimize the loss of life, injury, and property damage due to seismic and geological hazards.</b>	
8.A.1. The County shall require the preparation of a soils engineering and geologic-seismic analysis prior to permitting development in areas prone to geological or seismic hazards (i.e., groundshaking, landslides, liquefaction, critically expansive soils, avalanche).	<u>Consistent –All Alternatives.</u> Kleinfelder has prepared preliminary reports in 2007 and subsequent reports are due in 2010. These reports will be provided to the County and additional engineering that may be required (potentially only at the South Base) will be provided to the County for review.
8.A.2. The County shall require submission of a preliminary soils report, prepared by a registered civil engineer and based upon adequate test borings, for every major subdivision and for each individual lot where critically expansive soils have been identified or are expected to exist.	<u>Consistent –All Alternatives.</u> Kleinfelder has prepared preliminary reports in 2007 and subsequent reports are due in 2010. These reports will be provided to the County and additional engineering that may be required (potentially only at the South Base) will be provided to the County for review.
8.A.3. The County shall prohibit the placement of habitable structures or individual sewage disposal systems on or in critically expansive soils unless suitable mitigation measures are incorporated to prevent the potential risks of these conditions.	<u>Consistent –All Alternatives.</u> Kleinfelder has prepared preliminary reports in 2007 and subsequent reports are due in 2010. These reports will be provided to the County and additional engineering that may be required (potentially only at the South Base) will be provided to the County for review.
8.A.4. The County shall ensure that areas of slope instability are adequately investigated and that any development in these areas incorporates appropriate design provisions to prevent landsliding.	<u>Consistent –All Alternatives.</u> Kleinfelder has prepared preliminary reports in 2007 and subsequent reports are due in 2010. These reports will be provided to the County and additional engineering that may be required (potentially only at the South Base) will be provided to the County for review. Structures are not located on areas of high landslide or rock fall risk.
8.A.5. In landslide hazard areas, the County shall prohibit avoidable alteration of land in a manner that could increase the hazard, including concentration of water through drainage, irrigation, or septic systems; removal of vegetative cover; and steepening of slopes and undercutting the bases of slopes.	<u>Consistent –All Alternatives.</u> Kleinfelder has prepared preliminary reports in 2007 and subsequent reports are due in 2010. These reports will be provided to the County and additional engineering that may be required (potentially only at the South Base) will be provided to the County for review. Structures are not located on



**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	areas of high landslide or rock fall risk. Groundwater interception devices will be used to protect the underground parking garages from damage by subsurface groundwater.
8.A.6. The County shall require the preparation of drainage plans for development in hillside areas that direct runoff and drainage away from unstable slopes.	<u>Consistent –All Alternatives.</u> Kleinfelder has prepared preliminary reports in 2007 and subsequent reports are due in 2010. These reports will be provided to the County and additional engineering that may be required (potentially only at the South Base) will be provided to the County for review. Structures are not located on areas of high landslide or rock fall risk. Groundwater interception devices will be used to protect the underground parking garages from damage by subsurface groundwater.
8.A.7. In areas subject to severe groundshaking, the County shall require that new structures intended for human occupancy be designed and constructed to minimize risk to the safety of occupants.	<u>Consistent –All Alternatives.</u> New structures are engineered to minimize safety risk during severe groundshaking.
8.A.8. County shall continue to support scientific geologic investigations which refine, enlarge, and improve the body of knowledge on active fault zones, unstable areas, severe groundshaking, avalanche potential, and other hazardous conditions in Placer County.	<u>Consistent –All Alternatives.</u> Kleinfelder has prepared preliminary reports in 2007 and subsequent reports are due in 2010. These reports will be provided to the County.
8.A.9. The County shall require that the location and/or design of any new buildings, facilities, or other development in areas subject to earthquake activity minimize exposure to danger from fault rupture or creep.	<u>Consistent –All Alternatives.</u> As discussed in Chapter 14 of the EIR/EIS, risks associated with earthquake activity is low, particularly with appropriate structural engineering.
8.A.10. The County shall require that new structures permitted in areas of high liquefaction potential be sited, designed, and constructed to minimize the dangers from damage due to earthquake-induced liquefaction.	<u>Consistent –All Alternatives.</u> Kleinfelder has prepared preliminary reports in 2007 and subsequent reports are due in 2010. These reports will be provided to the County and additional engineering that may be required (potentially only at the South Base) will be provided to the County for review.
8.A.11. The County shall limit development in areas of steep or unstable slopes to minimize hazards caused by landslides or liquefaction.	<u>Consistent –All Alternatives.</u> New structures are engineered to minimize safety risk. Structures are located outside unstable slope areas.
8.A.12. The County shall not issue permits for new development in potential avalanche hazard areas (PAHA) as designated in the Placer County Avalanche Management Ordinance unless project proponents can demonstrate that such development will be safe under anticipated snow loads and conditions of an avalanche.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> None of the proposed or existing structures are within the avalanche hazard zone.
<b>FLOOD HAZARDS</b>	
<b>Goal 8.B: To minimize the risk of loss of life, injury, damage to property, and economic and social dislocations resulting from flood hazards.</b>	
8.B.1. The County shall promote flood control measures that maintain natural conditions within the 100- year floodplain of rivers and streams.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives remove structures and roads from the floodplain. They remove a culvert from the stream channel and restore the SEZ and stream channels <u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives do not remove roads within the floodplain

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	and Alternative 2 maintains structures in the floodplain. These alternatives do not restore SEZ function or the existing culvert in the stream channel.
8.B.2. The County shall continue to participate in the Federal Flood Insurance Program.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Participation will continue under each alternative, as required.
8.B.3. The County shall require flood-proofing of structures in areas subject to flooding.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1 and 3.</u> These alternatives remove structures and roads from the floodplain. <u>Inconsistent – Alternatives 2, 4, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives do not remove roads within the floodplain and Alternative 2 maintains structures in the floodplain.
8.B.5. The County shall coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions to mitigate the impacts of new development in Placer County that could increase or potentially affect runoff onto parcels downstream in a neighboring jurisdiction.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose changes to existing conditions and the current stormwater system is adequate for the site. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 result in a coverage reduction. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include stormwater infiltration galleries to improve runoff quality. All alternatives include BMPs to address runoff.
8.B.6. The County shall prohibit the construction of facilities essential for emergencies and large public assembly in the 100-year floodplain, unless the structure and access to the structure are free from flood inundation.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> New structures are not proposed within the floodplain.
8.B.7. The County shall require flood control structures, facilities, and improvements to be designed to conserve resources, incorporate and preserve scenic values, and to incorporate opportunities for recreation, where appropriate.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose changes to existing conditions and the current stormwater system is adequate for the site. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 result in a coverage reduction. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include stormwater infiltration galleries to improve runoff quality. All alternatives include BMPs to address runoff.
<b>FIRE HAZARDS</b>	
<b>Goal 8.C: To minimize the risk of loss of life, injury, and damage to property and watershed resources resulting from unwanted fires.</b>	
8.C.1. The County shall ensure that development in high-fire-hazard areas is designed and constructed in a manner that minimizes the risk from fire hazards and meets all applicable state and County fire standards.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Each of the proposed structures includes fire protection measures such as sprinklers and extinguishers and fuels reduction will occur within the Project area. Placement and types of fire protection devices as well as fire protection plans will be reviewed by the North Tahoe Fire Protection District during final design of the selected alternative.
8.C.2. The County shall require that discretionary permits for new development in fire hazard areas be conditioned to include requirements for fire-resistant vegetation, cleared fire-breaks, or a long-term comprehensive fuel management program. Fire hazard reduction measures shall be incorporated into the design of development projects in fire hazard areas.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Fuels reduction will occur during development. Fuels management programs will be reviewed by the North Tahoe Fire Protection District.
8.C.3. The County shall require that new development meets state, County, and local fire district standards for fire protection.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u>

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
	<p><u>6.</u> Each of the proposed structures include fire protection measures such as sprinklers and extinguishers. Forest fuel reduction efforts throughout the resort also contribute to a substantial reduction in the potential threat of wildfire to the project and surrounding areas. Placement and types of fire protection devices will be reviewed by the North Tahoe Fire Protection District during final design of the selected alternative.</p>
<p>8.C.4. The County shall refer development proposals in the unincorporated County to the appropriate local fire agencies for review for compliance with fire safety standards. If dual responsibility exists, then both agencies shall review and comment relative to their area of responsibility. If standards are different or conflicting, the more stringent standards shall be applied.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development.  <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Each of the proposed structures include fire protection measures such as sprinklers and extinguishers. Forest fuel reduction efforts throughout the resort also contribute to a substantial reduction in the potential threat of wildfire to the project and surrounding areas. Placement and types of fire protection devices will be reviewed by the North Tahoe Fire Protection District during final design of the selected alternative.</p>
<p>8.C.5. The County shall ensure that existing and new buildings of public assembly incorporate adequate fire protection measures to reduce the potential loss of life and property in accordance with state and local codes and ordinances.</p>	<p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – All Alternatives.</u> Each of the proposed structures include fire protection measures such as sprinklers and extinguishers. Forest fuel reduction efforts throughout the resort also contribute to a substantial reduction in the potential threat of wildfire to the project and surrounding areas. Placement and types of fire protection devices will be reviewed by the North Tahoe Fire Protection District during final design of the selected alternative.</p>
<p>8.C.10. The County shall continue to implement state fire safety standards through enforcement of the applicable standards contained in the Placer County Land Development Manual.</p>	<p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – All Alternatives.</u> Each of the proposed structures include fire protection measures such as sprinklers and extinguishers. Forest fuel reduction efforts throughout the resort also contribute to a substantial reduction in the potential threat of wildfire to the project and surrounding areas. Placement and types of fire protection devices will be reviewed by the North Tahoe Fire Protection District during final design of the selected alternative.</p>
<p>8.C.12. The County shall support annexations and consolidations of fire districts and services to improve service delivery to the public. [See also policies/programs under Goal 4.1, Fire Protection Services.]</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development.  <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Mitigation for these alternatives includes annexation of the Project area by the North Tahoe Fire Protection District.</p>
<b>HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>	
<b>Goal 8.G: To minimize the risk of loss of life, injury, serious illness, damage to property, and economic and social dislocations resulting from the use, transport, treatment, and disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous materials wastes.</b>	
<p>8.G.1. The County shall ensure that the use and disposal of hazardous materials in the County complies with local, state, and federal safety standards.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> All alternatives will dispose of hazardous materials, if used, in accordance with local, state, and federal requirements.</p>
<p>8.G.2. The County shall discourage the development of residences or schools near known hazardous waste</p>	<p><u>Consistent - All Alternatives.</u> There are no hazardous water disposal or handling facilities within the Project</p>

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
disposal or handling facilities.	area.
8.G.3. The County shall review all proposed development projects that manufacture, use, or transport hazardous materials for compliance with the County's Hazardous Waste Management Plan (CHWMP).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Hazardous materials used during construction (fuels) will be handled in accordance with County requirements. County review will occur for the alternative.
8.G.5. The County shall strictly regulate the storage of hazardous materials and wastes.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Fuels will be stored in tanks at the mid-mountain lodge. Storage will be in accordance with local, state, and federal law.
8.G.6. The County shall require secondary containment and periodic examination for all storage of toxic materials.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Fuels will be stored in tanks at the mid-mountain lodge. Storage will be in accordance with local, state, and federal law.
8.G.9. The County shall require that applications for discretionary development projects that will generate hazardous wastes or utilize hazardous materials include detailed information on hazardous waste reduction, recycling, and storage.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Hazardous material generation is not proposed or anticipated. Hazardous materials may be used during construction and chlorine will be used for the pool at the mid-mountain lodge. Development application for the selected alternative will include material handling information and hazardous event response plans.
<b>AVALANCHE HAZARDS</b>	
<b>Goal 8.H: To minimize the risk of loss of life, injury, and damage to property due to avalanche.</b>	
8.H.2. The County shall require new development in areas of avalanche hazard to be sited, designed, and constructed to minimize avalanche hazards.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Development is not proposed within the avalanche zone.
<b>NOISE</b>	
<b>Goal 9.A: To protect County residents from the harmful and annoying effects of exposure to excessive noise.</b>	
9.A.1. The County shall not allow development of new noise-sensitive uses where the noise level due to non-transportation noise sources will exceed the noise level standards of Table 9-1 as measured immediately within the property line of the new development, unless effective noise mitigation measures have been incorporated into the development design to achieve the standards specified in Table 9-1 (Table 13-8 in this EIR/EIS).	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. With the removal of snow-making guns under Alternative 4, non-transportation noise does not exceed noise levels. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose new lodging and residential uses in an area where snowmaking occurs. Noise from snowmaking currently exceeds threshold levels. Mitigation includes acoustical insulation and noise reducing design of lodging and residential units
9.A.2. The County shall require that noise created by new non-transportation noise sources be mitigated so as not to exceed the noise level standards of Table 9-1 as measured immediately within the property line of lands designated for noise-sensitive uses.	<u>Consistent – Alternative 4.</u> Alternative 4 eliminates snowmaking and therefore results in a noise level decrease. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Existing snowmaking operations currently exceed noise thresholds in the Project area. These alternatives either maintain existing snowmaking or propose additional snowmaking devices that may increase existing noise levels. Mitigation measures have been proposed to control noise levels to ensure they do not increase at noise sensitive land uses.
9.A.3. The County shall continue to enforce the State Noise Insulation Standards (California Code of Regulations, Title 24) and Chapter 35 of the Uniform Building Code (UBC).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. New structures proposed for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 will comply with noise insulation standards.
9.A.4. Impulsive noise produced by blasting should not be subject to the criteria listed in Table 9-1. Single	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> These alternatives do not propose blasting.

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
event impulsive noise levels produced by gunshots or blasting shall not exceed a peak linear overpressure of 122 db, or a C-weighted Sound Exposure Level (SEL) of 98 dBC. The cumulative noise level from impulsive sounds such as gunshots and blasting shall not exceed 60 dB LCdn or CNEL <sub>C</sub> on any given day. These standards shall be applied at the property line of a receiving land use.	<u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Blasting, if needed, would only occur during construction and will be carefully planned and controlled with mitigation such as noise barriers and covers to reduce noise levels.
9.A.5. Where proposed non-residential land uses are likely to produce noise levels exceeding the performance standards of Table 9-1 at existing or planned noise-sensitive uses, the County shall require submission of an acoustical analysis as part of the environmental review process so that noise mitigation may be included in the project design. The requirements for the content of an acoustical analysis are listed in General Plan Table 9-2.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> An acoustical analysis for each alternative is included in Chapter 13 of the EIR/EIS.
9.A.6. The feasibility of proposed projects with respect to existing and future transportation noise levels shall be evaluated by comparison to Figure 9-1.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Potential noise levels are evaluated in Chapter 13.
9.A.8. New development of noise-sensitive land uses shall not be permitted in areas exposed to existing or projected levels of noise from transportation noise sources, including airports, which exceed the levels specified in Table 9-3 (Table 13-9 of this EIR/EIS), unless the project design includes effective mitigation measures to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas and interior spaces to the levels specified in Table 9-3.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternative 4, reduces transportation noise levels. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose new lodging and residential uses in an area where snowmaking occurs. Noise from traffic and snowmaking operations currently exceeds threshold levels. Mitigation includes acoustical insulation and noise reducing design of lodging and residential units
9.A.9. Noise created by new transportation noise sources, including roadway improvement projects, shall be mitigated so as not to exceed the levels specified in Table 9-3 at outdoor activity areas or interior spaces of existing noise-sensitive land uses.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose changes from existing conditions. Alternative 4 results in a traffic reduction and therefore a reduction in transportation noise. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Existing traffic noise currently exceeds thresholds in the Project area. These alternatives would add 1.2 dBA of traffic noise. Mitigation measures are included to reduce traffic noise on adjacent local streets.
9.A.10. Where noise-sensitive land uses are proposed in areas exposed to existing or projected exterior noise levels exceeding the levels specified in Table 9-3 or the performance standards of Table 9-1, the County shall require submission of an acoustical analysis as part of the environmental review process so that noise mitigation may be included in the project design. At the discretion of the County, the requirement for an acoustical analysis may be waived provided that all of the following conditions are satisfied: a. The development is for less than five single-family dwellings or less than 10,000 square feet of total gross floor area for office buildings, churches, or meeting halls;	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> An acoustical analysis for each alternative is included in Chapter 13 of the EIR/EIS.

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<p>b. The noise source in question consists of a single roadway or railroad for which up-to-date noise exposure information is available. An acoustical analysis will be required when the noise source in question is a stationary noise source or airport, or when the noise source consists of multiple transportation noise sources;</p> <p>c. The existing or projected future noise exposure at the exterior of buildings which will contain noise-sensitive uses or within proposed outdoor activity areas (other than outdoor sports and recreation areas) does not exceed 65 dB Ldn (or CNEL) prior to mitigation. For outdoor sports and recreation areas, the existing or projected future noise exposure may not exceed 75 dB Ldn (or CNEL) prior to mitigation;</p> <p>d. The topography in the Project area is essentially flat; that is, noise source and receiving land use are at the same grade; and</p> <p>e. Effective noise mitigation, as determined by the County, is incorporated into the project design to reduce noise exposure to the levels specified in Table 9-1 or 9-3. Such measures may include the use of building setbacks, building orientation, noise barriers, and the standard noise mitigations contained in the Placer County Acoustical Design Manual. If closed windows are required for compliance with interior noise level standards, air conditioning or a mechanical ventilation system will be required.</p>	
<p>9.A.11. The County shall implement one or more of the following mitigation measures where existing noise levels significantly impact existing noise-sensitive land uses, or where the cumulative increase in noise levels resulting from new development significantly impacts noise-sensitive land uses:</p> <p>a. Rerouting traffic onto streets that have available traffic capacity and that do not adjoin noise sensitive land uses;</p> <p>b. Lowering speed limits, if feasible and practical;</p> <p>c. Programs to pay for noise mitigation such as low cost loans to owners of noise-impacted property or establishment of developer fees;</p> <p>d. Acoustical treatment of buildings; or</p> <p>e. Construction of noise barriers.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not alter existing noise levels or land uses. Alternative 4 reduces transportation and operational noise levels. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> Noise levels from existing snowmaking operations and baseline traffic exceed threshold levels. Mitigation measures have been proposed that include acoustical treatment of buildings; no increase of existing snowmaking noise levels at the Base areas; and requirements to reduce noise levels on local streets within the vicinity of the Project area.</p>
<p>9.A.12. Where noise mitigation measures are required to achieve the standards of Tables 9-1 and 9-3, the emphasis of such measures shall be placed upon site planning and project design. The use of noise barriers shall be considered as a means of achieving the noise standards only after all other practical design-related noise mitigation measures have been integrated into the project.</p>	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not require mitigation. Mitigation proposed for Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 emphasizes site planning and acoustical treatment of proposed structures.</p>

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<b>Goal 9.B: To ensure that areas designated for industrial uses pursuant to Goal 1.E. and Policy 1.E.1. are protected from encroachment by noise-sensitive land uses.</b>	
9.B.1. The County shall require that new noise-sensitive land uses established next to existing industrial areas be responsible for self-mitigating noise impacts from industrial activities.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternative 4 reduces noise levels.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose new lodging and residential uses in an area where snowmaking occurs. Noise from traffic noise exceeds threshold levels. Mitigation includes acoustical insulation and noise reducing design of lodging and residential units</p>
9.B.2. The County shall apply noise standards in a manner consistent with encouraging the retention, expansion, and development of new businesses pursuant to Goal 1.N. and Policy 1.N.2.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 2 and 4.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternative 4 reduces noise levels.</p> <p><u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6.</u> These alternatives propose new lodging and residential uses in an area where snowmaking occurs. Noise from traffic noise exceeds threshold levels. Mitigation includes acoustical insulation and noise reducing design of lodging and residential units</p>
9.B.3. Because many industrial activities and processes necessarily produce noise which will likely be objectionable to nearby non-industrial land uses, existing and potential future industrial noise emissions shall be accommodated in all land use decisions.	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose changes to existing conditions. Alternative 4 reduces existing noise levels. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 utilize snowmaking devices that can affect adjacent sensitive land uses; however, such devices are necessary for the continued operation of the ski facilities.</p>
9.B.4. Whenever noise exposure standards herein fall subject to interpretation relative to industrial activities, the benefit of the doubt shall be afforded to the industrial use.	<p><u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose changes to existing conditions. Alternative 4 reduces existing noise levels. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 utilize snowmaking devices that can affect adjacent sensitive land uses; however, such devices are necessary for the continued operation of the ski facilities.</p>
<b>General Plan Amendments</b>	
Any proposal for a General Plan Amendment (GPA) and designation of areas for significant new growth must include a discussion of how the project will meet the following standards and requirements.	
<b>Standards and Requirements</b>	
1. The County shall consider GPAs that designate areas for significant new growth only when they can be comprehensively planned as single units according to an adopted specific plan that complies with these standards and requirements.	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.</u> Alternatives 2 and 4 do not propose General Plan Amendments. Alternatives 1, 3, and 6 propose amendments in support of the Ski Area Master Plan. In addition, the proposed amendments are consistent with area planning or limit the changes to “Special Areas” within the Project area.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> This alternative proposes General Plan Amendments; however the proposed amendments include residential densities that are significantly greater than existing high-density limits and findings cannot be made to support an amendment.</p>
3. The County shall consider GPAs that designate areas for significant new growth where the planning and design carries out the following objectives: a. Concentrate higher-density residential uses and	<p><u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new growth and Alternative 4 does not propose significant growth. New growth under Alternative 4 is proposed along the SR 89 corridor</p>

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
<p>appropriate support services along segments of the transportation system with good road and transit connections to the remainder of the region;</p> <p>b. Support concentrations of medium and high-density residential uses and higher intensities of nonresidential uses within one-quarter mile of transit stops along trunk lines of major transportation systems;</p> <p>c. Support the development of integrated mixed-use areas by mixing residential, retail, office, open space, and public uses while making it possible to travel by transit, bicycle, or foot, as well as by automobile;</p> <p>d. Provide buffers between residential and incompatible non-residential land uses;</p> <p>e. Enhance community identity by creating retail/office commercial centers that also serve as cultural and activity centers for communities;</p> <p>f. Provide a bicycle path and pedestrian walkway network to link public facilities, housing, and commercial centers;</p> <p>g. Provide buffers for major public facilities such as landfills, airports and sewage treatment plants; and</p> <p>h. Provide buffers which create distinct, separate urban communities.</p>	<p>Alternatives 1, 3, and 6 propose new mixed-use growth along SR 89 where transit service exists. These alternatives propose alternative transportation (bike trails and bike sharing programs, pedestrian paths, water taxi) and shuttle services. Design intermixes uses, but concentrates use types to buffer different land uses. Base areas include gathering spaces, such as the amphitheater at the north base. Pedestrian paths would be located throughout the site and the West Shore bike trail would be extended through the site.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent</u> – Alternative 5. This alternative proposes General Plan Amendments; however the proposed amendments include residential densities that are significantly greater than existing high-density limits and findings cannot be made to support an amendment.</p>
<p>4. Prior to consideration of such GPAs the following should have occurred or been demonstrated:</p> <p>a. There is a market demand for additional urban or suburban development within the regional analysis area of the County proposed for such development, following an examination of current growth projections, available land, and existing development.</p> <p>b. It has been positively demonstrated that the legal, financial and practical ability to provide a full range of public services exists.</p> <p>c. It has been positively demonstrated that adequate surface water, sewer capacity, and the necessary distribution and collection systems exist or can be built to serve the area proposed for development.</p>	<p>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6. Alternative 2 does not propose new growth and Alternative 4 does not propose significant growth. Alternatives 1, 3, and 6 propose new mixed-use growth along SR 89 through the Master Plan. Enhancement of the resort and mixed-use development is encouraged in the PAS. Feasibility is demonstrated through the Master Plan submittal.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent</u> – Alternative 5. This alternative proposes General Plan Amendments; however the proposed amendments include residential densities that are significantly greater than existing high-density limits and findings cannot be made to support an amendment.</p>
<p>5. New development areas will be expected to provide a balanced complement of land use types, including residential (very low, low, and moderate cost), commercial, industrial, office, recreational, public, institutional, and open space. Mixed use projects, including residential uses, will be considered where they support the provision of infrastructure and development of industrial uses.</p>	<p>Consistent – All Alternatives. Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternative 4 proposes residences and commercial uses. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include residential, tourist, commercial, and recreational uses on a site that currently provides recreational uses. Industrial uses beyond those that support the ski facilities are not appropriate at this location.</p>
<p>6. New development areas shall provide a range of housing types to serve all income groups in the county, and shall stage development such that a balance of housing types is maintained over time, consistent with the housing goals, objectives, policies and programs of the General Plan.</p>	<p><u>Consistent</u> – Alternatives 1, 2, 3 5, and 6. Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include employee housing and multi-family units. The employee housing will be deed restricted to ensure it's continued use in that capacity.</p> <p><u>Inconsistent</u> – Alternative 4. Alternative 4 does not provide a range of housing.</p>



**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
7. New development areas proposed for urban densities shall be designed to achieve, or shall have a goal of achieving, a jobs-housing balance.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include new residential uses, many of which will become second homes and not primary residences. Each alternative proposes commercial and/or recreational uses that are viable year-round. While not all residences will be supported by the new jobs, not all residences will be occupied as primary homes.
8. New development areas must include appropriate buffer zones to provide separation between potential incompatible land uses, consistent with the standards for buffer zones specified in Part I of this Policy Document. The size of the buffer zone is to be proportionate to the total project size and proposed uses. The location of the buffer will depend upon the location of the proposed development relative to other sensitive land uses and/or environmental features.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternative 4 places commercial use along SR 89 and residential lots surrounding the commercial lot to reflect the community design of commercial uses along the travel corridor and residences beyond the roadway frontage. Alternatives 1, 3, and 6 place commercial or higher activity uses along the roadway frontage. Residential uses are located nearer existing residences. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 proposes a highly visible 4-story multi-family housing structure along SR 89. The height and visibility of the structure are incompatible with the surrounding residential community and buffering does not alleviate this issue.
9. New development areas shall be designed and constructed to provide all public infrastructure, facilities and service necessary to serve both initial and buildout populations, including but not limited to: adequate surface water supplies; sewage collection, treatment, and disposal facilities; public utilities; police and fire protection and emergency services, school and medical facilities where warranted by population; and public transportation. Extensions of new infrastructure, including water, sewer, roads, etc., should be compatible with existing incorporated Cities' General Plans. (See also #16.)	<u>Consistent – Alternative 2.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. <u>Consistent with Mitigation – Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</u> Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 require extension of public infrastructure on the site. Extension of infrastructure will be provided by developer cost. Development fees will be applied to address fire protection and schools. Law enforcement mitigation will be provided through fees if determined to be required. Public transportation exists onsite and will be expanded under those alternatives with the greatest degree of development. The selected alternative will demonstrate adequate water supply and utility service to the site prior to construction.
10. New development areas should assist in the resolution of regional problems, including but not limited to air quality, transportation, regional employment needs, and growth pressures on existing communities.	<u>Consistent – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1 and 3 include participation in EIP projects that improve transportation, water quality, and scenic quality. They provide employee housing. Alternative 4 reduces traffic and associated air emissions and improves the scenic quality. <u>Inconsistent – Alternative 5.</u> Alternative 5 proposes alternatives transportation, landscaping, and economic growth; however this alternative proposes a highly visible 4-story multi-family housing structure along SR 89. The height and visibility of the structure are incompatible with the surrounding community and findings cannot be made to support an amendment.
11. Transit services to serve the Project area shall be provided by new development using available state and	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Two transit stops currently exist within the Project area and serve the

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
federal transportation funding. New development shall be responsible for its fair share of such transit services.	Project area. Alternatives 1, 3, and 5 include transit stop improvements (shelters).
12. The County shall require that land use form and transportation systems in new development areas be designed to provide residents and employees with the opportunity to accomplish a majority of their trips within the new development area by walking, bicycling, and using transit.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternative 4 proposes a new neighborhood commercial development and new residential lots. By providing a new commercial use to serve existing and proposed neighborhoods, vehicle trips may be reduced. The existing transit stops at the Project area will continue to operate. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include commercial and recreation uses onsite that serve onsite residents and the local community. Transit stops onsite will be improved, bike trails and pedestrian paths will be extended and Alternatives 1 and 3 include onsite employee housing.
13. The County shall require development in new development areas to be phased in a manner that ensures a balance between the land use and transportation infrastructure at each stage of development. Transportation infrastructure includes roadways, intersections, interchanges, bikeway and pedestrian facilities, and transit facilities (e.g., turn-outs, shelters, storage and maintenance buildings, parking areas for transit and car-pooling, and mode transfer facilities.).	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternative 4 is phased through the initial development of the commercial lot and future development of the residential lots. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 are phased as discussed in the project description, with alternative transportation improvements occurring within the location of the development phase. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include EIP roadway improvements offsite. Intersection improvements at SR 89 and Granlibakken Road will occur before complete build out of the proposed developments.
14. The County shall encourage the use of appropriate new technologies (e.g., telecommuting, traveler information systems, alternative-fuel vehicles, and continuous monitoring systems) in new development areas.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not propose new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 5, and 6 include alternative transportation systems. In addition, there is potential for signage placement in Tahoe City indicating if the resort is full to avoid unnecessary vehicle trips to the resort. It is unknown what new technologies may be used for Alternative 4; however, alternative technologies may be used as feasible and appropriate.
15. Road systems within new development areas shall provide links to internal commercial core areas without requiring the use of an adjacent arterial, thoroughfare, or state highway.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> Alternative 2 does not result in new development. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 include internal roadways to link residential and commercial/tourist uses, which avoids internal access trips on other area roads.

---

**RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

---

**HOMWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT SKI AREA MASTER PLAN EIR/EIS**

<b>Placer County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Development Standards</b>	<b>HMR Ski Area Master Plan Consistency Analysis</b>
16. In conjunction with the processing of a GPA application for development located within the future study area, the County will enter into an agreement with the adjoining city that would specify acceptable levels of service (including police, fire, park programs, etc.) and measures to mitigate impacts to municipal facilities (transportation, circulation, parks, libraries, etc.). The determination of the impact of development on an adjoining city shall consider the fiscal effects of such development based on a fiscal analysis prepared as a part of the General Plan Amendment proposal. Costs and revenues to both the City and County, resulting from a project, shall be considered in such an analysis.	<u>Consistent – All Alternatives.</u> The EIR/EIS analyzes impacts on utilities and public services, including those services provided by Tahoe City purveyors and service providers. Mitigation is included to annex the Project area into the Fire Protection district, pay fees to support law enforcement and parks and other services, and extend infrastructure, which is funded by HMR.

Source: County of Placer. 1994. *Placer County General Plan Update Countywide General Plan Policy Document*. August 16, 1994. Prepared by Placer County, with Crawford Multari & Starr, DKS Associates, Psomas and Associates, Jones & Stokes Associates, Recht Hausrath & Associates, and J. Laurence Mintier & Associates. Placer County. Auburn, CA, HBA 2010

---