

3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES, AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

3.1 APPROACH TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Section 3.1, “Approach to the Environmental Analysis,” of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS lists the regulations and policies that require preparation of an EIR for CEQA purposes, an EIS for TRPA purposes, and an EIS for FHWA. This section notes that overall content requirements of these environmental documents are similar, although some terminology and content details vary between the three sets of environmental statutes and regulations. The Draft EIR/EIS/EIS was prepared in accordance with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Standard Environmental Reference tailored to incorporate TRPA requirements for an EIS.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.1.1 California Environmental Quality Act

Section 3.1.1, “California Environmental Quality Act,” of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS summarizes the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines for contents of an EIR.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.1.2 Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Section 3.1.2, “Tahoe Regional Planning Agency,” of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS summarizes the requirements of the Bi-State Compact, TRPA Code of Ordinances, and Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities for contents and analysis in an EIS.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.1.3 National Environmental Policy Act

Section 3.1.3, “National Environmental Policy Act,” of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS summarizes the NEPA requirements for contents of an EIS.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.1.4 Incorporation by Reference

Section 3.1.4, “Incorporation by Reference,” of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies documents that were incorporated by reference in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS, including the Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy EIR/EIS and the 2017 Regional Transportation Plan and its joint CEQA Initial Study/TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.1.5 Contents of Environmental Analysis Sections

Section 3.1.5, “Contents of Environmental Analysis Sections,” of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS explains the contents of each of the technical topics contained in Sections 3.2 through 3.16, which are organized into these major subsections: Introduction; Regulatory Setting; Affected Environment; Environmental Consequences, Methods and Assumptions; Significance Criteria; Environmental Effects of the Project Alternatives; and Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.2 LAND USE

Section 3.2, “Land Use,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS provides background about land use planning, briefly summarizes public comments received during the scoping process, and identifies issues dismissed from further analysis.

3.2.1 Regulatory Setting

Section 3.2.1, “Regulatory Setting,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies the relevant federal, state, and local regulations and policies governing land use.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.2.2 Affected Environment

Section 3.2.2, “Affected Environment,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS describes existing and planned land use patterns in the study area based on TRPA, the City of South Lake Tahoe, and Douglas County planning documents, including the Tourist Core Area Plan (TCAP), the South Shore Area Plan (SSAP), and relevant plan area statements (PASs).

The following changes have been made to Section 3.2, “Land Use,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

The following sentence has been added after the fifth paragraph under the header, “Existing Land Uses within the Study Area,” on page 3.2-8 of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS:

The area west of US 50 bound by Lodge Road to the south, Pine Boulevard to the west, and Stateline Avenue to the north, contains a number of tourist lodging facilities, commercial uses, and dining establishments.

The Tahoe Meadows Historic District, a private residential community, is located within the study area southwest of the intersection of Pioneer Trail and US 50. Although a small portion of the District is shown within the project site boundary on Exhibits 3.2-1, 3.2-2, and 3.2-3, the project improvements would not make changes to the fence around the District or on any land that falls within the fence.

In Nevada, the four major resort-casinos, Harrah’s, Harvey’s, Hard Rock, and Montbleu, are located along US 50 between Stateline Avenue and Lake Parkway.

The second sentence of the first paragraph under “Surrounding Land Uses,” on page 3.2-8 of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS has been revised to read as follows:

Land uses surrounding the project site are generally similar in nature to the visitor-centered development within the project site. The approximately 100 homes within the Tahoe Meadows Historic District, a private community, is located southwest of the intersection of Pioneer Trail and US 50 are located outside of the project site. Properties to the west of the project site north of Lodge Road consist of a number of tourist lodging facilities with the shore of Lake Tahoe and Lakeside Marina just beyond.

3.2.3 Environmental Consequences

Section 3.2.3, “Environmental Consequences,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes the project’s consistency with land use plans and policies and if the project would impede their implementation, whether or not the project would include uses that are not permissible uses in applicable plans, and if the project would expand or intensify an existing non-conforming use.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.2.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Section 3.2.4, “Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS states that no avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required to reduce any land use impacts for the purposes of CEQA, NEPA, or TRPA.

No changes have been made to this section of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.3 PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

Section 3.3, “Parks and Recreation Facilities,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS provides background about the sources of information used in the analysis of potential

impacts on parks and recreation resources, briefly summarizes public comments received during the scoping process, and identifies issues dismissed from further analysis.

3.3.1 Regulatory Setting

Section 3.3.1, “Regulatory Setting,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies the federal, state, and local regulations and policies relevant to parks and recreation resources.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.3.2 Affected Environment

Section 3.3.2, “Affected Environment,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS describes existing park and recreation facilities and resources in the study area, including Van Sickle Bi-State Park and the Linear Parkway (Linear Park).

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.3.3 Environmental Consequences

Section 3.3.3, “Environmental Consequences,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes the project’s potential to temporarily disrupt public access to public lands and recreation areas, the potential for long-term changes to public access to public lands and recreation areas, the increase demand for and the potential for the project to result in physical deterioration of recreation facilities, and changes to the quality of recreation user experience.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.3, “Parks and Recreation Facilities,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

The fourth and fifth paragraphs on page 3.3-21 have been revised to read as follows:

Impact 3.3-3: Increased demand for or physical deterioration of recreation facilities

To offset displacement of low- and moderate-income housing units acquired to accommodate project construction, Alternatives B, C, and D propose to construct replacement housing as part of mixed-use development at one or more of three locations/sites within the South Lake Tahoe portion of the project site. If the number of housing units that are constructed is equivalent to those displaced, there would be no net increase in demand for recreation facilities, physical deterioration of the study area recreation facilities would not increase, and additional recreation resources would not be required.

However, the mixed-use development at Sites 1, 2, and 3 as conceptualized in Alternatives B, C, and D could include construction of additional housing units above and beyond those necessary to replace units displaced by the project. Alternative B could result in a net increase of 139 housing units, Alternative C an additional 144 housing units, and Alternative D an additional 132 housing

units. Because the type of higher density development and recreation demand associated with the mixed-use development including replacement housing has already been contemplated in the land use assumptions included in the TCAP environmental review and Regional Plan, Alternatives B, C, and D would not substantively increase demand for recreation facilities, increase physical deterioration, or require additional recreation resources.

3.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Section 3.3.4, “Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies mitigation that would reduce disruption of public access to recreation areas and public lands resulting from the project.

No changes have been made to this section of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.4 COMMUNITY IMPACTS

Section 3.4, “Community Impacts,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS addresses three types of community impacts—community character and cohesion, relocations and real property acquisition, and environmental justice—all of which relate to population, employment, and housing. This section also briefly summarizes public comments received during the scoping process.

3.4.1 Community Character and Cohesion

Section 3.4.1, “Community Character and Cohesion,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies federal, state, and local regulations and policies relevant to the community in the study area and describes existing socioeconomic characteristics that are indicators of community character and cohesion. This section also analyzes the project’s potential to physically divide an established community causing changes to community character and cohesion and assesses the potential to alter the location, distribution, or growth of the human population for the Region.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.4.1, “Community Character and Cohesion,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

The third paragraph on page 3.4-7 of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS is revised to read as follows:

Not all vacant housing in the City of South Lake Tahoe, Douglas County, Stateline CDP, and CIA study area is affordable or available to people who would like to live and work in these areas. As described in the City of South Lake Tahoe Housing Element Background Report, the reason is because a large proportion (~~78.8 percent in the City of South Lake Tahoe as of 2010~~) of the vacant housing is considered vacant for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use (City of South Lake Tahoe 2014:4-16 – 4-17). In 2014, approximately 80 percent of the vacant housing units were available as seasonal, recreational, or occasional use rentals (U.S. Census Bureau 2015h). In 2014, the city had approximately 15.11 percent of vacant homes were available for rent long-term renters and approximately 3 less than 1 percent were available for sale (City of South Lake Tahoe 2014:4-17 U.S. Census Bureau 2015h). Similar vacancy data for Douglas County, Stateline CDP, and the CIA study area was not readily available, but it is widely understood that these also supports the general understanding that these other areas within the Tahoe Basin experience similar shortages of long-

term rental vacancies and it is reasonable to assume that these areas experience similar vacancy statistics as the City of South Lake Tahoe.

The last paragraph on page 3.4-10 and Table 3.4-6 on page 3.4-11 are revised to read as follows:

The City of South Lake Tahoe General Plan Housing Element provides information about the jobs-to-housing ratio within the city and county (Table 3.4-6). In 2010/2014, the jobs-to-housing ratio was 0.6 in the city and 1.0 in the county (see Table 3.4-6). This indicates that within the city, there are fewer jobs than available housing. Within the county, the amount of jobs and demand for housing is balanced. The number of housing units used in the jobs-housing ratio identified in Table 3.4-6 represents the total units, regardless of their status as owner-occupied, renter-occupied, or vacation rental; therefore, the jobs-to-housing ratio for housing only used by permanent residents could be greater than what is shown in the table. The jobs-to-available housing ratio focuses on owner- and renter-occupied homes, including vacant housing for rent or for sale, and omitting seasonally occupied homes and homes that are vacant and for vacation rental use. Based on the jobs-to-available housing ratio for the city, CIA study area, and Douglas County, there appears to be ample housing stock. It is important to note that this ratio does not account for housing units that are occupied by multiple wage earners and does not account for housing units that may be solely occupied by retired individuals.

Table 3.4-6 — Jobs-to-Housing Ratio

	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	2000	2010	2000	2010
Housing Units	14,050	15,087	71,278	88,159
Employed Residents	11,953	12,223	73,821	84,829
Jobs-Housing Ratio	0.9	0.8	1.0	1.0

Source: City of South Lake Tahoe 2014:4-22

Table 3.4-6 Jobs-to-Housing Ratio (2014)

Area	Employees	Total Housing Units	Occupied Housing Units	Vacant Housing for Rent or for Sale	Jobs-to-Housing Ratio	Jobs-to-Available Housing Ratio ¹
City of South Lake Tahoe	10,556	16,337	8,585	859	0.6	1.1
Douglas County	20,387	23,677	19,765	426	0.8	1.0
Stateline CDP	601	454	420	0	1.3	1.4
CIA Study Area	3,589	6,306	3,258	294	0.6	1.0

¹ The available housing units used to calculate the jobs-to-available housing ratio is the sum of the occupied housing units and vacant housing for long-term rent or for sale.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2015e, 2015g, 2015h

The third sentence in the fourth full paragraph on page 3.4-19 is revised to read as follows:

The mixed-use development, including replacement housing, associated with Alternative B would introduce several buildings up to three stories tall in locations that are surrounded by commercial and residential uses. At Site 1, the mixed-use development would replace several older commercial buildings and would maintain and extend the Linear Park along the western edge of the site. The mixed-use development at Site 1 would be physically and visually separated from the Tahoe

Meadows Historic District by the Linear Park and existing wrought iron fence; it would replace older commercial development with newer buildings that are consistent in character with other surrounding uses, such as the Holiday Inn Express. At Site 2, the mixed-use development would replace older hotels and apartment buildings along Pioneer Trail with buildings up to three stories tall that are similar in character to other surrounding uses, such as the Heavenly Village Center. Development of Site 2 would introduce buildings that are slightly taller than the existing two-story buildings, but would improve the community character of the neighborhood by replacing hotel units with housing units and commercial uses that would contribute to a stronger sense of community. Site 3 would introduce mixed-use development in an area that is primarily surrounded by commercial development and open space. New development at Site 3 would enhance community character in this area by expanding the existing neighborhood into an area that currently contains no residences. Additionally, the mixed-use development could add new amenities, such as a convenience store or restaurant, that could help maintain community character and cohesion in this neighborhood.

The impact summary on page 3.4-29 is revised to read as follows:

Impact 3.4-3: Alter the location, distribution, or growth of the human population for the Region during operation

Alternatives B, C, and D transportation improvements and Alternative E could result in additional road and facility maintenance needs during operation but would not generate demand for a substantial number of new employees. The transportation improvements do not include components that would increase population and, thus, would not generate additional demand for housing. Alternatives B, C, and D transportation improvements and Alternative E would not alter the location, distribution, or growth of the human population planned for the Region.

Alternatives B, C, and D mixed-use development, including replacement housing, would result in the same needs for additional road and facility maintenance needs described for these alternatives transportation improvements. With development of new commercial and housing units associated with buildout of the mixed-use development, including replacement housing, Alternatives B, C, and D would generate an estimated net increase of up to approximately 180-80 – 210-280 new jobs and an estimated net population increase of approximately 320 – 340 people (after accounting for replacement of housing and employment displaced by the project). The additional demand for employees would likely be met by existing residents in the South Shore area. Furthermore, the employment and population growth generated by the mixed-use development, including commercial and residential uses, has been planned for as part of the Regional Plan and the *Tourist Core Area Plan*. Because employment needs generated by the project could be met by existing residents and the project would include new housing, buildout of the mixed-use development would not generate new employment that would induce substantial population growth such that additional housing would be required to be constructed. Future development at any of the three mixed-use development sites would be subject to subsequent project-level environmental review and permitting by the City of South Lake Tahoe and/or TRPA that would include mitigating any adverse physical effects on the environment associated with a jobs and housing imbalance. Thus, Alternatives B, C, and D mixed-use development, including replacement housing, would not alter the location, distribution, or growth of the human population planned for the Region.

Alternative A would not result in any changes to existing conditions that would increase housing demand. Alternative A would not alter the location, distribution, or growth of the human population planned for the Region.

NEPA Environmental Consequences: The design features of Alternatives B, C, D, and E would avoid or minimize effects related to alteration of the location,

distribution, or growth of the population during operation; No Impact for Alternative A

CEQA/TRPA Impact Determinations: Less Than Significant for Alternatives B, C, D, and E; No Impact for Alternative A

The text beginning on page 3.4-31 is revised to read as follows:

Mixed-Use Development including Replacement Housing

Prior to displacing existing residents, Alternative B would construct replacement housing along with supporting commercial uses that could be located at one or more of three mixed-use development sites identified within the project site (see Exhibits 2-9 and 2-11 in Chapter 2, “Proposed Project and Project Alternatives”). If replacement housing is not constructed at any of these sites, then TTD would construct replacement housing at another location in the South Shore area to be determined prior to displacing any residents. Implementation of Alternative B mixed-use development, including replacement housing, would generate the same demand for maintenance employees as described above. Potential mixed-use development would generate additional demand for up to 269 employees associated with new commercial uses (Table 3.4-9), as well as up to 227 new housing units. Implementation of this alternative would displace up to 88 housing units, but would also result in a net increase of up to 139 jobs, and a net increase of 139 housing units, and 317 residents (see Table 3.4-7). This increase in residential population would represent a 4 percent increase in the CIA study area population and a 1.5 percent increase in the City of South Lake Tahoe population.

The increase in additional employment generated by Alternative B with mixed-use development could lead to an increase in population growth and subsequent housing demand within the South Shore area and a change in the location and distribution of population, employment, and housing in the Region. The existing jobs-to-available housing ratio in the city is 1.1 and the jobs-to-available housing ratio in the CIA study area is 1.0 (see Table 3.4-6). The estimated 77 to 269 new jobs created by implementation of Alternative B with mixed-use development would offset the potential loss of an estimated 92 jobs displaced by construction of the realigned US 50 and new mixed-use development (see Impact 3.4-5 and Table 3.4-14 for further discussion of displaced businesses). After construction of the replacement housing, the net potential increase in new housing units would be up to 139 units. The mixed-use development could include deed-restricted affordable housing and market-rate housing that could meet these needs of these employees. As shown in Table 3.4-4, the unemployment rate in the South Shore area ranges from 5 percent in the CIA study area percent to 12.5 percent in the City of South Lake Tahoe. It is anticipated that demand for employees would likely be partially met by unemployed residents of the South Shore and would not require all new workers to come from outside of this area. As shown in Table 3.4-2, housing vacancy rates range from approximately 7.5 percent in the Stateline CDP to approximately 50 percent in the CIA study area. As described above in “Housing Occupancy,” some of these housing units are likely vacation rentals or seasonal rentals, limiting actual available housing for new employees that may desire to relocate to the South Shore area. and, according to data from the U.S. Census Bureau the City of South Lake Tahoe Housing Element Background Report, approximately 11.5 percent of vacant homes in the city were available as long-term rental units for rent and approximately 13 percent were available for sale. Other portions of the South Shore area and the Lake Tahoe Region have similar limited supplies of long-term rental vacancies. Therefore, because the addition of new jobs in the project site could be partially met by existing unemployed residents of the South Shore, this alternative is not anticipated to result in a substantial increase in population that would lead to an increased demand for housing that could not be met by the supply of existing vacant homes available for rent. If the reasonably foreseeable, conservative increase of up to 269 jobs and net increase of 139 housing units would occur, the project could result in the need to construct additional housing or require employees to commute into the Tahoe Basin. However, existing unemployed residents in the South Shore area would be anticipated to fill the available jobs and

existing available long-term rentals as well as the new housing units could meet the need of any new employees that might move here from outside of the area. For these reasons, buildout of the mixed-use development would not generate new employment that would induce substantial population growth such that additional housing would be required to be constructed. Future development at any of the three mixed-use development sites would be subject to subsequent project-level environmental review and permitting by the City of South Lake Tahoe and/or TRPA, which would consider the actual proposed number of new housing units and a more refined estimate of employee-generating commercial uses.

The location of new jobs and additional residences resulting from Alternative B with mixed-use development would be primarily within the TCAP boundaries. As described for Impact 3.4-2, construction of new housing units and CFA is limited to the number of allocations available, which are capped by the Regional Plan. Additionally, this area is planned (in the Regional Plan and TCAP) for an increase in density and development with a mix of uses and is intended to concentrate development in town centers that are walkable, close to jobs, shopping, and entertainment. Implementation of Alternative B with mixed-use development would help to achieve the intent of the TCAP to provide for orderly, well-planned, and balanced growth and to develop a mix of uses that promote convenience, economic vitality, and a pleasant quality of life with a greater range of facilities and services for visitors and residents (City of South Lake Tahoe 2013:2-6). Furthermore, these types of changes to the density of development within the TCAP boundary were assessed in the TCAP and Regional Plan environmental documents (City of South Lake Tahoe 2013, TRPA 2012a). As shown in Table 3.4-10 and Exhibit 2-9, the estimated density of housing units in the mixed-use development would meet the density standards set forth in the TCAP and PAS 092. The TCAP environmental document determined that future development within the TCAP boundaries and the Region would meet future housing demand, including demand for affordable housing (City of South Lake Tahoe 2013:129-130). The Regional Plan EIS determined that buildout of the Regional Plan would result in a balance between jobs and housing and lead to more concentrated development in community centers, with greater improvements to walkability, feasibility of other alternative transportation, and the resultant benefits (TRPA 2012a:3.12-11 – 3.12-12).

Because employment needs could be met by existing residents and the project would include new housing, buildout of the mixed-use development would not generate new employment that would induce substantial population growth such that additional housing would be required to be constructed. Future development at any of the three mixed-use development sites would be subject to subsequent project-level environmental review and permitting by the City of South Lake Tahoe and/or TRPA that would include mitigating any adverse physical effects on the environment associated with a jobs and housing imbalance. Implementation of Alternative B mixed-use development, including replacement housing, would not change the planned location and distribution of population, employment, and housing planned for the Region. For these reasons, this impact would be **less than significant** for the purposes of CEQA and TRPA.

3.4.2 Real Property Acquisitions, Dislocations, and Relocations

Section 3.4.2, “Real Property Acquisitions, Dislocations, and Relocations,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies federal, state, and local regulations and policies relevant to property acquisitions, displacement of businesses and residents, and relocation. This section also provides background about existing affordable and moderate-income housing in the South Shore area, which supports the analysis of project effects on housing supply availability and displacement of businesses.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.4.2, “Real Property Acquisitions, Dislocations, and Relocations,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

The second paragraph on page 3.4-41 is revised to read as follows:

The list of parcels identified for acquisition is preliminary but represents the maximum number of acquisitions required for implementation of the build alternatives. The complete list of parcels proposed for acquisition for each alternative is included in Appendix B, “Maps Showing Parcel Acquisition Needs and Geometric Approval Drawings for Alternatives B, C, and D,” and represents the maximum number and extent of acquisitions that would occur. Refinements to the final project design could result in a smaller project footprint, which could result in fewer partial and/or full acquisitions. As indicated in Appendix B, no property within Tahoe Meadows, including that which contains the Tahoe Meadows fence, would be acquired by the project. The number of parcels and type of units that would be acquired for the realigned US 50 ROW for each alternative are summarized in Tables 2-1 and 2-2. The number of parcels and type of units that would be acquired for the mixed-use development are summarized in Table 2-3 and Table 2-4.

The third sentence of third full paragraph on page 3.4-43 is revised to read as follows:

The Relocation Study concludes that there would be existing available housing units in the South Shore area that could be used as replacement housing. This remains true; however, the option to purchase and deed restrict or seek other replacement housing options in the South Shore area instead of constructing new housing units would conflict with the project objective related to a no net loss in housing supply. Additionally, as described in Section 3.4.1, “Housing Occupancy,” there is evidence to suggest that about ~~11.45~~ percent of the supply of vacant homes are available for rent by full-time residents (see Section 3.4.1, “Housing Occupancy”).

3.4.3 Environmental Justice

Section 3.4.3, “Environmental Justice,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS summarizes the federal regulations that require analysis of the environmental justice effects of a project. This section assesses the potential for the project to result in disproportionate adverse environmental effects on minority and low-income populations, which includes a description of the efforts of the lead agencies to reach out to affected minority and low-income populations, a summary of environmental effects that could be predominately borne by these populations, identification of avoidance and mitigation measures, and the environmental justice determination.

No changes have been made to this section of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.5 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Section 3.5, “Public Services and Utilities,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS addresses impacts on water supply, wastewater treatment and disposal, electricity, natural gas, solid waste, law enforcement, fire and emergency services, and school facilities; identifies primary sources of information used for the analysis; and briefly summarizes public comments received during the scoping process.

3.5.1 Regulatory Setting

Section 3.5.1, “Regulatory Setting,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies the federal, state, and local regulations and policies relevant to public services and utilities.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.5.1, “Regulatory Setting,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

The third paragraph on page 3.5-3 is revised to read as follows:

According to Code Section 32.4.2, adequate fire flows vary by land use within the study area and include: for a project in the Tourist Core Area Plan requires 750 – 1,000 gallons per minute (gpm) over a 2 hour period at 20 pounds per square inch (psi) residual pressure.

- ▲ Residential Plan Areas (single-family only): 500 – 750 gallons per minute (gpm) at 20 pounds per square inch (psi) for 2 hours
- ▲ Residential Plan Areas (multi-residential): 750 – 1,000 gpm at 20 psi for 2 hours
- ▲ Tourist Plan Areas: 1,000 – 1,500 gpm at 20 psi for 2 hours
- ▲ Hotel - Casino Areas: 3500 - 6000 gpm at 20 psi for 3 to 6 hours

3.5.2 Affected Environment

Section 3.5.2, “Affected Environment,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS describes existing water supply, wastewater, electricity and natural gas, solid waste, fire protection, law enforcement, and public school capacity and facilities.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.5.3 Environmental Consequences

Section 3.5.3, “Environmental Consequences,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes the project’s potential to conflict with existing utility infrastructure, result in inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy, and increase the demand for water supply, wastewater, solid waste, law enforcement and fire and emergency services, and public schools.

The following change has been made to 3.5, “Public Services and Utilities,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

The last sentence of the second full paragraph on page 3.5-11 is revised as follows:

Impact 3.5-1: Conflicts with existing utility infrastructure

Transportation improvements and construction of mixed-use development, including replacement housing, for Alternatives B, C, and D could result in conflicts with existing utility infrastructure and require relocation of utilities or access points to utility infrastructure (i.e., water, sewer, electrical,

and natural gas services). Depending on the alternative, utility infrastructure that could be affected by the build alternatives is generally located at and around the existing US 50/Pioneer Trail and Pioneer Trail/Echo Road intersections and along existing US 50, Fern Road, Moss Road, Montreal Road, and the lake side of Lake Parkway. TTD would be required to coordinate with utility providers to address the project's conflicts with utility infrastructure. However, the extent to which existing utility infrastructure could be adversely affected, and plans for relocation, have not yet been determined, ~~and plans for any necessary relocation have not yet been determined.~~

The fourth sentence of the fifth paragraph on page 3.5-13 is revised as follows:

With regard to mixed-use development Site 2, STPUD has expressed concern related to water lines and sewer gravity lines along Echo Road and Fern Road that extend through this site (Cotulla et al., pers. comm., 2016). The sewer gravity lines connect to a sewer main located in existing US 50. The conceptual plan for mixed-use development does not identify the locations where buildings would be placed on this site; thus, because the STPUD lines are in place under an encroachment permit, access to these lines could be eliminated. Eliminating access at this point in the water and sewer infrastructure system would require STPUD to install additional infrastructure to convey water and sewer flows around this site at the expense of TTD or the project proponent for the mixed-use development, as applicable. Because mixed-use development, including replacement housing, on Site 2 could conflict with STPUD water and wastewater infrastructure at this location, this would be a **potentially significant** impact for the purposes of CEQA and TRPA.

3.5.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Section 3.5.4, "Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures," in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies mitigation that would address potential interference with utility infrastructure and capacity in the wastewater collection and conveyance system.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.5, "Public Services and Utilities," in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

Mitigation Measure 3.5-1 on pages 3.5-42 and 3.5-43 is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 3.5-1: Prepare and implement a Utility Relocation Plan

This mitigation measure is required for Alternatives B, C, and D transportation improvements and mixed-use development, including replacement housing, and Alternative E, for the purposes of NEPA, CEQA, and TRPA.

Before the start of construction-related activities, including demolition of displaced residential, hotel/motel, and commercial buildings, the TTD (and the project proponent for the mixed-use development, as applicable) shall coordinate with STPUD, DCSID, EWC, Lakeside Park Association, Liberty Utilities, NV Energy, and Southwest Gas Corporation to relocate utility infrastructure, which is dependent on the alternative and could include infrastructure at and near the existing US 50/Pioneer Trail and Pioneer Trail/Echo Road intersections and along US 50, Fern Road, Moss Road, Primrose Road, Montreal Road, and the lake side of Lake Parkway. The final design plans for the transportation improvements submitted to Caltrans and NDOT shall be prepared to minimize utility disruption or relocation, and identify all utility relocations affected by the transportation improvements. TTD (and the project proponent for the mixed-use development, as applicable) shall coordinate with the utility companies to minimize impacts to services throughout the project. To minimize disruption to utility services, relocation of the utility lines shall occur after any required

~~clearing and demolition within the study area and before construction of the replacement housing, mixed use development, realigned US 50, and other transportation improvements.~~ Actions needed to comply with this mitigation measure include coordination with each affected utility company to prepare a utility relocation plan that would, at a minimum, include the following:

- ▲ plans that identify the utility infrastructure elements, including access for utility providers and easements, as applicable, that require relocation as a result of constructing the project transportation improvements and mixed-use development, including replacement housing;
- ▲ safety measures to avoid any human health hazards or environmental hazards associated with capping and abandoning some utility infrastructure, such as natural gas lines or sewer lines;
- ▲ timing for completion of the utility infrastructure relocation as part of construction of the transportation improvements and mixed-use development, including replacement housing, which shall be scheduled to minimize disruption to the utility companies and their customers;
- ▲ reparations, if required, and certification of necessary additional environmental evaluations and pertinent processes (e.g., CEQA, NEPA, and/or TRPA documents and requirements), all of which shall be completed, as necessary, before final plans for the mixed-use development, including replacement housing, are permitted;
- ▲ preparation and approval by a licensed civil engineer; and
- ▲ approval as adequate by the affected utility companies and Caltrans, NDOT, TTD, and TRPA, as necessary.

3.6 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

Section 3.6, “Traffic and Transportation,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS addresses impacts on the vehicular, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian components of the transportation system; identifies primary sources of information used for the analysis; briefly summarizes public comments received during the scoping process; and identifies issues dismissed from further analysis.

3.6.1 Regulatory Setting

Section 3.6.1, “Regulatory Setting,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies the federal, state, and local regulations and policies relevant to the traffic and transportation analysis.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.6.2 Affected Environment

Section 3.6.2, “Affected Environment,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS describes existing transportation facilities, historic and existing traffic volumes, intersection and roadway segment levels of service, traffic accidents, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the study area.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.6.3 Environmental Consequences

Section 3.6.3, “Environmental Consequences,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes the project’s potential to impact intersection and roadway segment operations during operation of the project; vehicle miles of travel (VMT); bicycle and pedestrian facilities; transit; vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian safety; emergency access; and parking in the study area on opening day and in 2040. The analysis also assesses impacts from construction-related traffic and daily vehicle trip end (DVTE) impacts.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.6.3, “Environmental Consequences,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

The impact header and first paragraph on page 3.6-31 are revised as follows:

Impact 3.6-1: Impacts on intersection operations related to the redevelopment at any one of the mixed-use development sites to accommodate replacement housing (Before Opening Day)

Redevelopment at any one of the mixed-use development sites to accommodate displaced residents would not affect intersection operations on the existing roadway network. For Alternatives B, C, and D, TTD would construct replacement housing and relocate residents before initiating construction of the transportation improvements in California. This analysis focuses on Site 3, because redevelopment of Site 1 before the transportation improvements is not feasible given its location on existing US 50, and Site 2 is located at the edge of the existing Rocky Point neighborhood and would displace businesses that generate similar traffic volumes where the impact on existing intersection operations is expected to be minimal. The Site 3 redevelopment potential would be the same under all three alternatives. Modeled intersections operations would remain at acceptable levels for Alternatives B, C, and D. Alternatives A and E would not displace residents and would not include any residential displacement or redevelopment. Intersection operations under Alternatives A and E would remain unchanged.

The third paragraph on page 3.6-66 is revised as follows:

Impact 3.6-8: Impacts on vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian safety – 2020 (Opening Day)

Alternatives B, C, D, and E would enhance the existing infrastructure and improve safety throughout the vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian network within the study area. No modifications to the existing vehicular, bicycle, or pedestrian infrastructure would occur under Alternative A, however vehicular traffic would increase within the study area thus impacting bicycle safety and the existing above state average traffic accidents and injuries occurring at the US 50/Lake Parkway Loop intersection. Construction of replacement housing at one or more of the mixed-use development sites would not substantially alter vehicular travel within the study area and would have no direct effect on bicycle or pedestrian infrastructure. However, constructing the mixed-use development in the tourist core achieves the transit-oriented development principles envisioned in the Regional Plan, TCAP, and SSAP that lead to increased use of multi-modal transportation opportunities (e.g., bicycle and pedestrian facilities). Mixed-use development at the remaining site(s) would be constructed between 2020 and 2040; therefore, the Alternatives B, C, and D mixed-use development at these sites is not analyzed under the 2020 (opening day) scenario.

The first paragraph on page 3.6-120 is revised as follows:

Impact 3.6-18: Impacts on vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian safety – 2040 (Design Year)

Alternatives B, C, D, and E would enhance the existing infrastructure and improve safety throughout the vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian network within the study area. Redevelopment at the mixed-use development sites, including housing, in the tourist core achieves the transit-oriented development principles envisioned in the Regional Plan, TCAP, and SSAP that lead to increased use of multi-modal transportation opportunities (e.g., bicycle and pedestrian facilities). No modifications to the existing vehicular, bicycle, or pedestrian infrastructure would occur under Alternative A; however, vehicular traffic would increase within the study area thus impacting bicycle safety and the existing above state average traffic accidents and injuries occurring at the US 50/Lake Parkway Loop intersection.

3.6.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Section 3.6.4, “Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies measures to address traffic impacts of Alternative C as well as project impacts related to parking and DVTEs.

The following change has been made to Section 3.6, “Traffic and Transportation,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

The impact header for Mitigation Measure 3.6-135 on page 3.6-31 of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 3.6-20: Mitigate ~~DT~~DVTE impacts through Air Quality Mitigation Fund contribution

3.7 VISUAL RESOURCES/AESTHETICS

Section 3.7, “Visual Resources/Aesthetics,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS addresses impacts on visual resources, identifies primary sources of information used for the analysis, and briefly summarizes public comments received during the scoping process.

3.7.1 Regulatory Setting

Section 3.7.1, “Regulatory Setting,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies the relevant federal, state, and local regulations and policies governing visual resources and aesthetics.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.7.2 Affected Environment

Section 3.7.2, “Affected Environment,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS includes descriptions of the existing regional and project site landscape character, TRPA scenic thresholds, and key viewpoints used in the analysis.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.7.3 Environmental Consequences

Section 3.7.3, “Environmental Consequences,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes the project’s potential to degrade scenic quality and visual character, interfere with or disrupt scenic vistas or scenic resources, and increase light and glare.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.7.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Section 3.7.4, “Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS includes mitigation measures that address changes in visual character, decreases in visual quality ratings, and headlights shining into residential properties.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.7, “Visual Resources/Aesthetics,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

Mitigation Measure 3.7-1a on page 3.7-49 of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 3.7-1a: Mitigate for Changes in Visual Character from Pioneer Trail to Montreal Road

This mitigation measure would apply to the transportation improvements included in Alternatives B, C, and D for the purposes of NEPA, CEQA, and TRPA.

Realigning US 50 through the existing Rocky Point residential neighborhood between Pioneer Trail and Montreal Road would cause substantial changes in visual conditions. Realigned US 50 would be designed in accordance with all applicable design standards and guidelines and thus would exhibit a high level of visual quality; however, it would result in significant change in visual character on the neighborhood. The addition of noise barriers could also contribute to the adverse change in visual character.

To mitigate for this impact, TTD, TRPA, and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) shall incorporate feasible design treatments (e.g., landscaped berm to reduce visible wall mass, landscaped screening, and wall texture and colors that blend with the surrounding environment) into the final project design.

The last paragraph on page 3.7-49 is revised as follows:

Reducing the scale of the structure associated with Alternative E, by constructing a narrow pedestrian walkways over the highway rather than a deck structure that fully encloses the highway, would reduce the visual impact of the structure, potentially to a less-than-significant level, depending on the design. However, this mitigation would substantially alter the nature and intent of Alternative E because these walkways would not provide enhanced pedestrian facilities or plaza space for pedestrians in the resort-casino portion of the tourist core where people could gather and special events could be held. Additionally, the improvements would be limited to the area within the resort-casino portion of the tourist core. For these reasons, a set of narrow ~~A series of~~ pedestrian walkways would ~~and is likely to not~~ feasibly meet the project purpose and need and project objectives: related to improving the corridor consistent with the Loop Road System concept; improving bicycle safety; implementing regional and local plans, including the Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan, Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program, the TCAP, and the SSAP; improving safety for residents, pedestrians, and bicyclists in local neighborhoods; creating opportunities for redevelopment and revitalization in the study area; creating gateway and streetscape features that align with complete streets principles; redevelopment and revitalization; decreasing dependence on the use of private automobiles; improving connectivity, reliability, travel times, and operations of public transportation modes, including increased mobility and safety for bicycles and pedestrians and enhanced public access to Van Sickle Bi-State Park; and creating gateway and streetscape features that create a sense of place. This alternative could reduce dependence on private vehicles and facilitate the creation of a safe and walkable district that enhances pedestrian and bicycle activities and safety, but to a lesser degree than could occur with Alternatives B, C, and D. Therefore, recognizing the uncertain effectiveness and feasibility, it is important to disclose the potential for Alternative E to result in a **significant and unavoidable** visual impact for purposes of CEQA and TRPA.

3.8 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Section 3.8, “Cultural Resources,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS defines cultural resources, tribal cultural resources, and archaeological resources and identifies primary sources of information used in the analysis.

3.8.1 Regulatory Setting

Section 3.8.1, “Regulatory Setting,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies the relevant federal, state, and local regulations and policies governing cultural resources.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.8.2 Affected Environment

Section 3.8.2, “Affected Environment,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS describes the area of potential effect for the project, prehistory, ethnography, history, records search results, archaeological and built environment survey results, and significant resources on the project site.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.8.3 Environmental Consequences

Section 3.8.3, “Environmental Consequences,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes the project’s potential to affect historical resources, disturb archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources, and encounter previously undiscovered or unrecorded human remains.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.8.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Section 3.8.4, “Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies mitigation related to previously undiscovered archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources.

The following change has been made to Section 3.8, “Cultural Resources,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

The last paragraph beginning on page 3.8-35 is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 3.8-2a: Install an Environmentally Sensitive Area fence

The following mitigation would apply to transportation improvements and mixed-use development, including replacement housing, for Alternatives B, C, and D, and Alternative E for the purposes of NEPA, CEQA, and TRPA.

An Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) fence shall be installed to protect the unevaluated portion of the Johnson’s Cut-Off/Pony Express Trail/Lincoln Highway alignment north of the project area. The fence shall be installed from the entrance to Friday’s Station on US 50 to a point 400 feet east of the Johnson’s Cut-Off/Pony Express Trail/Lincoln Highway segment. A sign shall be installed at the east end of the fence to exclude construction personnel access from the area behind the fence. The fence shall be installed in coordination with a qualified archaeologist prior to ground-disturbing activities and shall remain in place until after the project has been completed. The condition of the fence shall be monitored, and repaired if needed, periodically during the course of construction by the archaeologist who supervised its installation.

3.9 FLOODPLAINS

Section 3.9, “Floodplains,” in the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS provides background information related to changes in hydrologic conditions and floodplains.

No changes have been made to this section following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.9.1 Regulatory Setting

Section 3.9.1, “Regulatory Setting,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies the federal, state, and local regulations and policies relevant to floodplains.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.9.2 Affected Environment

Section 3.9.2, “Affected Environment,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS describes the existing regional and local hydrology and floodplains in the study area.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.9.3 Environmental Consequences

Section 3.9.3, “Environmental Consequences,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes the potential for the project to result in 100-year flood hazard and floodplain impacts.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.9.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Section 3.9.4, “Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS states that no avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required to reduce any floodplain impacts for the purposes of CEQA, NEPA, or TRPA.

No changes have been made to this section of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.10 WATER QUALITY AND STORMWATER RUNOFF

Section 3.10, “Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS provides background information related to water quality and stormwater runoff, identifies primary sources of information used for the analysis, and briefly summarizes public comments received during the scoping process.

3.10.1 Regulatory Setting

Section 3.10.1, “Regulatory Setting,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies the federal, state, and local regulations and policies relevant to water quality and stormwater runoff.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.10.2 Affected Environment

Section 3.10.2, “Affected Environment,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS describes the existing conditions for surface water quality, stormwater management, snow storage, and groundwater.

The following change has been made to Section 3.10, “Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

The first and second paragraphs on page 3.10-14 are revised as follows:

Drainage from the Fern Road, Echo Road, and Moss Road area is collected via storm drains and enters two drainage basins at the Fern Road/Pioneer Trail intersection. Overflow from these basins is routed west for additional treatment in the Upper and Lower Pine basins before discharging via the North Ditch to Lake Tahoe. In addition to drainage basins, several undeveloped lots within the Fern Road area were purchased by City of South Lake Tahoe using grant funds provided by the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) as part of the Rocky Point Erosion Control Project. These lots provide a natural infiltration area for runoff from adjacent impervious areas and reduce the volume of runoff that must be treated in the drainage basin system. Any development on these parcels that affects their ability to accomplish this purpose would require mitigation.

Stormwater runoff from the California portion of US 50 in the tourist core is currently conveyed through a series of storm drains and drainage basins west of US 50, known as the Pine Boulevard Stormwater System or the North Ditch, before being discharged to Lake Tahoe. Flow from Stateline Creek crosses Montreal Road and enters the same storm drain system through a 42-inch reinforced concrete pipe and headwall near the southeast portion of the project site. Portions of the Pine Boulevard Stormwater System were completed using grant funds provided by CTC.

3.10.3 Environmental Consequences

Section 3.10.3, “Environmental Consequences,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes the project’s potential to degrade surface water quality, to affect stormwater management infrastructure, and to degrade groundwater through infiltration of polluted water or during excavation activities.

The following change has been made to Section 3.10, “Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

Table 3.10-7 on page 3.10-37 is revised as follows:

Alternative	New Impervious Surface	Affected Storm Drain Systems
Alternative A: No Build (No Project)	NA	NA
Alternative B: Triangle	5.47 to 7.62 acres	CSLT-Fern Road Stormwater Basins (2) CTC-Rocky Point Stormwater Treatment Parcels: 029-331-12, 029-331-11, and 029-332-01 CTC-Rocky Point Stormwater Easements: 029-170-05, 029-170-04, 029-351-22, 029-341-04, and 029-363-07 Existing Storm Drains: 2.5 miles
Alternative C: Triangle One-Way	1.06 acres	CSLT-Fern Road Stormwater Basins (2) CTC-Rocky Point Stormwater Treatment Parcels: 029-331-12, 029-331-11, and 029-332-01 CTC-Rocky Point Stormwater Easements: 029-170-05, 029-170-04, 029-351-22, 029-341-04, and 029-363-07 Existing Storm Drains: 2.1 miles
Alternative D: PSR Alternative 2	5.76 to 7.91 acres	CSLT-Fern Road Stormwater Basins (2) CTC-Rocky Point Stormwater Treatment Parcels: 029-331-12, 029-331-11, and 029-332-01 CTC-Rocky Point Stormwater Easements: 029-170-05, 029-170-04, 029-343-17, and 029-341-04 Existing Storm Drains: 2.4 miles
Alternative E: Skywalk	NA	NA

CTC – California Tahoe Conservancy; CSLT – City of South Lake Tahoe; NA – not applicable

Source: Wood Rodgers 2015; adapted by Ascent Environmental in 2016

3.10.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Section 3.10.4, “Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies mitigation that would reduce the potential impacts on existing stormwater infrastructure.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.10, “Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

Mitigation Measure 3.10-3 on page 3.10-46 is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 3.10-3: Protect functionality of Rocky Point Existing Stormwater Improvements

This mitigation measure applies to Alternatives B, C, and D transportation improvements and mixed-use development, including replacement housing, for the purposes of NEPA, CEQA, and TRPA.

The project proponent shall demonstrate that all Rocky Point stormwater improvements continue to meet the goals for which they were established. In the case of stormwater improvements purchased or constructed with CTC grant funds (such as the Rocky Point and Fern Road systems), this includes including meeting or exceeding 6.4 pounds of sediment reduction per State of California dollar spent on site improvements. If the functionality of the Rocky Point property and facilities improvements cannot be maintained, the project design would be modified to replace these

facilities with land and infrastructure that is at least as effective as the current facilities, or more effective. In the event that any portion of the project encroaches on the existing City of South Lake Tahoe stormwater basins at Fern Road, these basins would be reconstructed in place or replaced in-kind within available right-of-way. The net result would be the maintenance of existing stormwater facilities or the replacement of affected facilities with equivalently or more effective stormwater management land and infrastructure. The specific location and design of the replacement infrastructure would be defined during detailed design development.

3.11 GEOLOGY, SOILS, LAND CAPABILITY, AND COVERAGE

Section 3.11, “Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Coverage,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS provides background information related to geology, soils, land capability, and coverage; briefly summarizes public comments received during the scoping process; and identifies issues dismissed from further analysis.

3.11.1 Regulatory Setting

Section 3.11.1, “Regulatory Setting,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies the relevant federal, state, and local regulations and policies that protect soil resources and that are related to geology, soils, and seismicity.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.11.2 Affected Environment

Section 3.11.2, “Affected Environment,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS describes the existing geology, soils, land capability, and coverage setting relevant to the study area, including regional geology, site topography, seismicity, soils, and the existing project site land capability and coverage.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.11.3 Environmental Consequences

Section 3.11.3, “Environmental Consequences,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes the project’s potential for impacts related to soil compaction and increased land coverage, erosion and alteration of topography during construction, and exposure to strong seismic shaking, liquefaction, or seiche inundation hazards.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.11.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Section 3.11.4, “Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS states that no avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required to reduce any geology, soils, land capability, and coverage impacts for the purposes of CEQA, NEPA, or TRPA.

No changes have been made to this section of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.12 HAZARDS, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, AND RISK OF UPSET

Section 3.12, “Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Risk of Upset,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS assesses the potential impacts associated with the routine use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials; the potential to encounter hazardous materials during construction; the potential health consequences and increased hazards associated with wildland fire; conflicts with airports; and risk of exposure of schools to hazardous materials. This section also summarizes public comments received during the scoping process and identifies issues dismissed from further analysis.

3.12.1 Regulatory Setting

Section 3.12.1, “Regulatory Setting,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies the relevant federal, state, and local regulations and policies that prevent or mitigate impacts related to the release of hazardous substances and address hazards associated with construction in areas exposed to the risk of wildland fire hazards.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.12.2 Affected Environment

Section 3.12.2, “Affected Environment,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS describes the wildland fire hazard risk and hazardous materials that may be present in the study area (e.g., aerially deposited lead, asbestos containing materials, lead-based paint), as well as Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) resulting from current and/or former activities within the study area.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.12.3 Environmental Consequences

Section 3.12.3, “Environmental Consequences,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes the project’s potential to expose people or the environment to hazards because of the routine storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials or from accidental release or upset; increase the risk of exposure to environmental conditions; and exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildfires.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.12, "Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Risk of Upset," in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

The fourth full paragraph on page 3.12.17 is revised as follows:

No permanent impacts would be associated with use or disposal of hazardous materials during operation of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project. Transportation of hazardous materials on roadways would be routed to the realigned US 50, which would create the potential for a hazardous materials release in an new area that is currently developed primarily as a local road instead of a highway. Implementation of Alternative B is intended to relieve traffic congestion and improve vehicular safety, which could reduce the possibility for traffic accidents that can result in release of hazardous materials that are being transported as well as improve response times of emergency managers. Transport of hazardous materials would be regulated, as discussed above, and operation of Alternative B would not appreciably affect the risk associated with upset of hazardous materials during transportation.

The last paragraph beginning on page 3.12-17 and the first full paragraph on page 3.12-18 are revised as follows:

Mixed-Use Development including Replacement Housing

Alternative B includes development of up to three mixed-use redevelopment sites, which could provide replacement housing for displaced residents as well as other commercial uses (e.g., retail, restaurant).

Asbestos, lead, and petroleum and other hazardous materials could be encountered during demolition and excavation activities that are associated with the mixed use and replacement housing development. Furthermore, the contractor may utilize hazardous materials during construction and may require storage, transportation, and disposal of these materials. The project applicant(s) or subsequent builder(s) would be subject to hazardous materials regulations, including but not limited to California Health and Safety Code, building codes, OSHA and EPA regulations. These measures would be included in contractor's specifications, making the contractor responsible for the implementation and monitoring of all safety measures. If handled properly as required by the above referenced regulations, it would pose minimal risk to workers, future occupants or neighboring land uses.

~~Pursuant to the State of California Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Law of 1985 (Business Plan Act, California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 1), the future project applicant(s) or subsequent builder(s) of commercial facilities would be required evaluate the need to prepare a Hazardous Materials Business Plan and inventory of hazardous materials, if inventory would exceed threshold quantities of 500 pounds or more of solids, 55 gallons or more of liquids, 200 cubic feet or more of compressed gases, or include extremely hazardous substances. The Hazardous Materials Business Plan would be prepared before occupancy of subject buildings and would include:~~

- ~~▲ an inventory of hazardous materials handled;~~
- ~~▲ facility floor plans showing where hazardous materials are stored;~~
- ~~▲ an emergency response plan; and~~
- ~~▲ provisions for employee training in safety and emergency response procedures.~~

~~The project applicant would pay fees in effect at the time of payment and would submit the business plan to the El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management, Hazardous Waste Division,~~

for review and approval. Hazardous materials would not be handled in regulated quantities without notification of El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management.

The last paragraph beginning on page 3.12-20 is revised as follows:

Temporary impacts could occur if construction were to affect sites of known contamination or inadvertently disturb other hazardous materials or wastes in a manner that could release hazardous materials into the environment, or expose construction workers or nearby sensitive receptors to hazardous conditions. Six RECs have been identified within or immediately adjacent to the project site. Five of these sites have all undergone remediation and are not expected to present a substantial hazard to construction. No soil contamination is known or suspected in the project site and, although the potential for groundwater contamination is currently under evaluation at two sites (Tahoe Tom's Gas Station and Caesars Tahoe Hotel and Casino), the potential for contaminated groundwater within the project site is low. Other hazardous materials potentially encountered during demolition of existing structures and project construction could include asbestos, lead-based paint and other coatings, ADL, heavy metals, and polychlorinated biphenyls, and vapor encroachment conditions. Project implementation would be subject to hazardous materials regulations, and measures would be included in contractor's specifications, making the contractor responsible for the implementation and monitoring of all safety measures. If handled properly as required by the above-referenced regulations, Surveys for and removal of these substances are regulated. ~~The project site could also still be affected by undocumented contamination that has not been characterized or remediated and could, therefore, create a hazard to people or the environment.~~

3.12.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Section 3.12.4, "Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures," in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies measures that would minimize the risk of an accidental release of hazardous substances that could adversely affect human health or the environment, which would substantially reduce the potential hazards to construction personnel and the public from encountering documented or undocumented hazardous materials.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.12, "Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Risk of Upset," in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

Under Mitigation Measure 3.12-2a, the third paragraph on page 3.12-31 is revised as follows:

3. Prior to ground disturbance of any soils adjacent to the Tahoe Tom's Gas Station facility, soil samples shall be collected from within the proposed construction footprint along Lake Tahoe Boulevard and Park Avenue at this location to evaluate potential impacts from a petroleum hydrocarbon release that was discovered in 1998. Soil sampling would not be required if evidence can be provided to the El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management, Hazardous Waste Division that demonstrates there is no longer a risk of exposure to petroleum hydrocarbons during construction activities. If soil sampling is necessary, Bbased on the results of the sampling, and consistent with standard industry practice, remediation measures shall be developed and implemented to the satisfaction of the El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management, Hazardous Waste Division.

Under Mitigation Measure 3.12-2b, the fifth paragraph on page 3.12-31 is revised as follows:

A construction hazardous materials management plan shall be developed to address procedures for handling, storage, and disposal of previously unidentified potentially contaminated soil,

contaminated groundwater, lead-based paint, and asbestos-containing materials that may be encountered during project construction activities. The construction hazardous materials management plan shall include provisions for agency notification, managing contaminated materials, sampling and analytical requirements, and disposal procedures. The plan shall include identification of construction site BMPs to minimize the potential for water quality impacts.

Under Mitigation Measure 3.12-2c, the third paragraph on page 3.12-32 is revised as follows:

Prior to the occupancy of housing units associated with the three future mixed-use development sites, the applicant or construction manager shall retain a licensed radon contractor to determine if radon is detected beyond the 4 pCi/L threshold, where necessary. If the amount of radon exceeds the established threshold, the applicant shall retain a licensed radon contractor to reduce the radon in the affected residences to below the established threshold. Methods may include, but are not limited to, the soil suction radon reduction system, which entails the installation of a vent pipe system and fan that pull radon from beneath the house and vent it to the outside. Additionally, passive ventilation can be considered to assure 4 pCi/L thresholds are not exceeded. The radon contractor shall develop clear instructions for proper maintenance of the radon monitoring systems that would be installed in each residence, as well as the radon monitoring and reduction system, if required. The property disclosure statements shall indicate that the site is within an area with a moderate potential for indoor radon levels.

3.13 AIR QUALITY

Section 3.13, “Air Quality,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS provides background information related to the analysis of air quality impacts associated with the project, briefly summarizes public comments received during the scoping process, and identifies issues dismissed from further analysis.

3.13.1 Regulatory Setting

Section 3.13.1, “Regulatory Setting,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies the relevant federal, state, and local regulations and policies governing air quality.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.13.2 Affected Environment

Section 3.13.2, “Affected Environment,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS describes the existing climate, criteria air pollutants, monitoring station data, toxic air contaminants, and sensitive land uses for the study area.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.13.3 Environmental Consequences

Section 3.13.3, “Environmental Consequences,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes the project’s short-term, construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors; consistency with air quality plans and regional transportation conformity; project-level transportation conformity with respect to localized, long-term mobile-source carbon monoxide emissions; and the project’s potential to expose sensitive receptors to Mobile Source Air Toxics/Toxic Air Contaminants.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.13, “Air Quality,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

The impact summary on page 3.13-19 is revised as follows:

Impact 3.13-1: Short-term, construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors

Construction of Alternatives B, C, D, and E would not exceed EDCAQMD’s ROG threshold. Construction of Alternatives B, C, and D would exceed EDCAQMD’s NO_x threshold, and therefore CO, exhaust PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} emissions could be significant. Construction of Alternative E would not exceed EDCAQMD’s NO_x or ROG threshold and therefore exhaust emissions would not be significant. All build alternatives (Alternatives B through E) could result in excessive fugitive dust emissions.

In addition to construction associated with the transportation improvements, construction emissions related to the potential mixed-use development sites for Alternatives B, C, and D would also occur. The mixed-use development would begin prior to the transportation improvements in California but may occur simultaneously with transportation improvements occurring in Nevada. Emissions from the mixed-use developments were evaluated separately and in combination with the construction activities for the transportation improvements. Construction associated with redeveloping the mixed-use sites alone or in combination with the transportation improvements would not exceed EDCAQMD’s threshold for ROG. Construction associated with redeveloping one or more of the mixed-use development sites alone and in combination with the transportation improvements would exceed EDCAQMD’s thresholds for NO_x, and therefore CO, exhaust PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} could be significant. Excessive fugitive dust emissions could occur during construction of the mixed-use sites alone and in combination with the transportation improvements.

3.13.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Section 3.13.4, “Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS states that no avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required to reduce any air quality impacts for the purposes of CEQA, NEPA, or TRPA.

No changes have been made to this section of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.14 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Section 3.14, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS provides background information related to the analysis of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate change impacts associated with the project.

3.14.1 Regulatory Setting

Section 3.14.1, “Regulatory Setting,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies the federal, state, and local regulations and policies relevant to GHG emissions and climate change.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.14.2 Affected Environment

Section 3.14.2, “Affected Environment,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS describes the existing climate, the physical science basis of climate change, existing GHG emission sources, and effects of climate change on the environment.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.14.3 Environmental Consequences

Section 3.14.3, “Environmental Consequences,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes the project’s GHG emissions, consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan, and the project’s vulnerability to climate change risks.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.14.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Section 3.14.4, “Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS states that no avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required to reduce any GHG emissions or climate change impacts for the purposes of CEQA, NEPA, or TRPA.

No changes have been made to this section of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.15 NOISE AND VIBRATION

Section 3.15, “Noise and Vibration,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS provides background information related to the analysis of noise and vibration impacts, briefly summarizes public comments received during the scoping process, and identifies issues dismissed from further analysis.

3.15.1 Regulatory Setting

Section 3.15.1, “Regulatory Setting,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies the regulations and policies applicable to the project for noise-related impacts. This section also provides background information on acoustical fundamentals needed to provide context for the noise and vibration regulatory and planning issues.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.15.2 Affected Environment

Section 3.15.2, “Affected Environment,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies vehicle traffic as the dominant source of noise in the study area and provides existing modeled noise levels in the study area.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.15.3 Environmental Consequences

Section 3.15.3, “Environmental Consequences,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes the project’s potential to result in short-term construction noise impacts, ground vibration during construction, and traffic noise exposure at existing receptors. Section 3.15.3 also discusses the noise/land use compatibility of the mixed-use redevelopment sites.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.15, “Noise and Vibration,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

The first paragraph on page 3.15-22 is revised as follows:

Impact 3.15-1: Short-term construction noise levels

Alternative A would not include any noise-generating construction or demolition activity. Construction and demolition activity that would occur with the Alternatives B, C, and D transportation improvements and replacement housing at one or more of the mixed-use development sites would take place during the less noise-sensitive time of day and comply with the requirements of TRPA’s Best Construction Practices Policy for the Minimization of Exposure to Construction-Generated Noise and Ground Vibration. Alternative E would include construction activity during noise-sensitive evening nighttime hours that could result in exceedances of applicable TRPA land use-based noise thresholds at noise sensitive receptors, as well as exceedances of interior noise standards at nearby hotels and residences.

The second full paragraph on page 3.15-27 is revised as follows:

Impact 3.15-2: Ground vibration during construction

Alternative A would not include any construction or demolition activity that generates ground vibration. Pile driving activity performed during construction of the pedestrian bridge associated with the Alternative B, C, and D transportation improvements along with construction of one or more of

the mixed-use development sites could expose nearby buildings to ground vibration levels that exceed FTA's vibration 80-VdB standard for human response at residential land uses. Pile driving activity performed during construction of the Skywalk under Alternative E could expose nearby buildings and structures to ground vibration levels that exceed FTA's vibration standard of 0.20 in/sec PPV for structural damage and FTA's vibration standard of 80 VdB for human response at residential land uses.

3.15.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Section 3.15.4, "Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures," in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies measures that would reduce the level of noise exposure at receptors located near locations where nighttime construction activity would occur with Alternative E; reduce construction-generated groundborne vibration; reduce traffic noise exposure at affected receptors; and ensure that all common outdoor activity areas, including those associated with the redevelopment sites, would not be exposed to traffic noise levels that exceed applicable noise standards.

No changes have been made to this section of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.16 BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT

Section 3.16, "Biological Environment" in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS provides background information related to the analysis of biological resources, briefly summarizes public comments received during the scoping process, and identifies issues dismissed from further analysis.

3.16.1 Regulatory Setting

Section 3.16.1, "Regulatory Setting," in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies the federal, state, and local regulations and policies relevant to biological resources in the Tahoe Basin.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.16.2 Affected Environment

Section 3.16.2, "Affected Environment," in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS describes land cover and habitat types, and sensitive biological resources (such as sensitive natural communities and special-status plant and animal species) in the study area.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.16.3 Environmental Consequences

Section 3.16.3, “Environmental Consequences,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes the project’s potential to result in the disturbance or removal of common vegetation communities, wildlife habitats, sensitive habitats (i.e., jurisdictional wetlands, riparian vegetation, SEZ, aquatic habitat), and trees and the potential to introduce or result in the spread of invasive plants.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.16, “Biological Environment,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

The last paragraph on page 3.16-14 is revised as follows:

Construction associated with Alternatives B, C, and D would result in permanent loss or temporary disturbance of montane riparian and montane meadow habitats, which are considered sensitive. Additionally, the wetland and aquatic resources delineation prepared for the project (Ascent Environmental 2018) identified ten wetlands and two jurisdictional “other waters” within the project site. Table 3.16-3 summarizes and compares the acreage of sensitive habitats present and affected on a permanent and temporary basis for each realignment alternative. Additionally, the NES for the project (TTD 2015) identified several potential wetlands and other waters of the United States within the project site, based on a preliminary wetland delineation conducted in 2010 and 2011. This preliminary delineation of potential wetlands and other waters of the United States has not been verified by the USACE and will need to be updated prior to permit application and approval. Most of these areas are included within the montane riparian and montane meadow habitat types mapped and quantified in the project site.

Table 3.16-3 on page 3.16-15 is revised as follows:

Table 3.16-3 Acreage of Permanent and Temporary Effects on Sensitive Habitats

Sensitive Habitat Type	Alternative B		Alternative C		Alternative D		Alternative E	
	Perm	Temp	Perm	Temp	Perm	Temp	Perm	Temp
Jurisdictional Waters	<u>0.03</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.04</u>	<u>0.02</u>	<u>0.03</u>	<u>0.001</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Montane Riparian	<u>0.4-0.38</u>	<u>0.5-0.38</u>	<u>0.11</u>	<u>1.0-0.82</u>	<u>0.4-0.38</u>	<u>0.5-0.39</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Montane Meadow	<u>1.2-1.19</u>	<u>1.1-0.97</u>	<u>0.22</u>	<u>0.9-0.82</u>	<u>1.20</u>	<u>1.2-1.05</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Jurisdictional Wetlands	<u>0.06</u>	<u>0.16</u>	<u>0.02</u>	<u>0.19</u>	<u>0.06</u>	<u>0.16</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Total	<u>1.66</u>	<u>1.6-1.52</u>	<u>0.39</u>	<u>1.9-1.85</u>	<u>1.67</u>	<u>1.5-1.60</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>

Source: Data compiled by Ascent Environmental Inc. in ~~2014~~ 2018

The second paragraph on page 3.16-15 is revised as follows:

With Alternative B, ~~1.6~~ 1.66 acres of sensitive habitats occur in the permanent disturbance area, and ~~1.6~~ 1.52 acres are within the temporary disturbance area (see Table 3.16-5); these sensitive habitat features include Edgewood Creek, Golf Course Creek, and Stateline Creek as well the area east of and across Lake Parkway from the Heavenly Village Center and northeast of Montbleu. However, the values presented here are considered a maximum and likely an overestimate of the area of actual impacts. For example, montane riparian habitat is present where the proposed roadway expansion and improvements along Montreal Road and Lake Parkway cross Stateline Creek, Golf Course Creek,

and Edgewood Creek, but the actual impact acreage there would be reduced because the transportation improvements would span much of the riparian habitat, rather than remove it. Additionally, the construction corridor would be reduced in sensitive habitat areas and best management practices (BMPs) would be integrated into the project design (as described in Section 3.10, “Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff”) to avoid and minimize impacts in these areas.

The fourth paragraph on page 3.16-15 is revised as follows:

~~Some of the sensitive habitats~~The wetlands and jurisdictional waters affected by implementation of Alternative B ~~would be considered jurisdictional by~~are regulated by USACE and (on the California side) the Lahontan RWQCB under Section 404 of the federal CWA and the state’s Porter-Cologne Act, and potentially subject to regulation by CDFW under Sections 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code. Additionally, most of the areas within wetland/riparian habitats are also designated as SEZ by TRPA. Fill or reconfiguration of jurisdictional waters of the United States requires a permit from USACE pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. ~~Also, the deciduous riparian vegetation within most or all SEZs would likely be considered jurisdictional habitat by the USACE and would require a permit and mitigation. Additionally~~Also, habitats consisting of deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows (i.e., riparian, wetland, and meadow habitats) are designated by TRPA as habitats of special significance. The TRPA threshold standard for habitats of special significance is non-degradation while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of these habitats.

The eighth paragraph on page 3.16-16 is revised as follows:

With Alternative C, ~~0.30.39~~ 0.30.39 acre of sensitive habitat occurs in the permanent disturbance area, and ~~1.91.85~~ 1.91.85 acres is within the temporary disturbance area (see Table 3.16-5). This impact would be similar to, but less than, that described above for Alternative B because project construction with Alternative C would be located mostly in the same locations and would include the same construction effects as Alternative B. For the reasons discussed above, this impact would be **potentially significant** for the purposes of CEQA and TRPA.

The seventh paragraph on page 3.16-17 is revised as follows:

With Alternative D, ~~1.61.67~~ 1.61.67 acres of sensitive habitats occur in the permanent disturbance area, and ~~1.51.60~~ 1.51.60 acres are within the temporary disturbance area (see Table 3.16-5). This impact would be similar to that described above for Alternative B because project construction with Alternative D would be located mostly in the same locations and would include the same construction effects as Alternative B. For the reasons discussed above, this impact would be potentially significant for the purposes of CEQA and TRPA.

3.16.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Section 3.16.4, “Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies measures that would require the project to implement vegetation protection measures and revegetate disturbed areas, obtain authorization for fill or required permits for impacts to jurisdictional wetlands or other regulated waters, and compensate for unavoidable loss of stream environment zones. Measures are also included that would reduce impacts related to tree removal and include implementation of invasive plant management practices during project construction.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.16, “Biological Environment,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

Mitigation Measure 3.16-2b on page 3.16-25 is revised as follows:

**Mitigation Measure 3.16-2b: ~~Conduct delineation of waters of the United States and~~
Obtain authorization for fill and required permits for impacts to jurisdictional wetlands or
other regulated waters**

The following mitigation applies to the transportation improvements and mixed-use development sites included in Alternatives B, C, and D for the purposes of NEPA, CEQA, and TRPA.

~~A preliminary delineation of potential wetlands and other waters of the United States was conducted in 2010 and 2011 (TTD 2015). However, the preliminary delineation has not been verified by USACE. Additionally, because the delineation was completed more than 5 years before project construction, it is considered expired, and will need to be repeated prior to permit application and approval.~~

~~Before the start of on-site construction activities on any potentially affected jurisdictional resource, a qualified biologist will survey the project site for sensitive natural communities. Sensitive natural communities or habitats are those of special concern to resource agencies or those that are afforded specific consideration, based on Section 404 of the CWA, Sections 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code, and other applicable regulations. If sensitive natural communities or habitats that are afforded specific consideration, based on Section 404 of the CWA are determined to be present, a delineation of waters of the United States, including wetlands that would be affected by the project, will be prepared by a qualified biologist through the formal Section 404 wetland delineation process. The delineation will be submitted to and verified by USACE. If, based on the verified delineation, it is determined that fill of waters of the United States would result from implementation of the project, a~~Authorization for such fill or disturbance of waters of the United States ~~will be secured from USACE through the Section 404 permitting process. The acreage of riparian habitat (deciduous riparian vegetation) and wetlands that would be removed or disturbed during project implementation will be quantified and replaced or restored/enhanced in accordance with USACE and TRPA regulations, which include meeting the no-net-loss standard in accordance with USACE requirements. Habitat restoration, enhancement, and/or replacement will be at a location and by methods agreeable to USACE as determined during the permitting processes for CWA Section 404 and by TRPA during the permitting process for SEZ.~~

In addition, on the California side of the study area, if any project activities would affect aquatic resources and associated riparian habitats subject to regulation by CDFW under Sections 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code (i.e., the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake in California that supports wildlife resources), the project proponent shall consult with CDFW to determine whether a lake and streambed alteration agreement (LSAA) is required. If required under Section 1602, any compensatory mitigation shall be conducted in accordance with the terms of the LSAA, and in coordination with the other requirements of this mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure 3.16-2b) and Mitigation Measure 3.16-2c.

The third bullet of Mitigation Measure 3.16-2c on page 3.16-26 is revised as follows:

- ▲ The project proponent shall retain a qualified restoration ecologist to prepare a restoration plan that will address final clean-up, stabilization, and revegetation procedures for areas disturbed by the project. This restoration plan shall be completed and reviewed by TRPA prior to acknowledgement of the project's permit. The restoration plan for SEZs shall include the following:

3.17 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SHORT-TERM USES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

Section 3.17, “Relationship between the Short-Term Uses of the Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS summarizes the potential short-term and long-term impacts of the project, which are discussed throughout the resources sections. This section also notes the benefits of the project.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.17, “Relationship between the Short-Term Uses of the Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

The third paragraph on page 3.17-1 is revised as follows:

In the long term, the build alternatives would result in increased coverage (see Section 3.11, “Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Coverage”); tree removal and disturbance and loss of sensitive habitats (see Section 3.16, “Biological Environment”); increases in ambient noise levels and visual impacts on neighborhood character in the Rocky Point residential area west of the Heavenly Village Center (see Sections 3.15, “Noise and Vibration,” and 3.7, “Visual Resources/Aesthetics”); and the division of the Rocky Point neighborhood and displacement of residences. These impacts would be ~~reduced~~minimized through implementation of mitigation measures intended to reduce environmental effects. However, the following impacts would remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation: the physical division of the Rocky Point neighborhood (for Alternatives B, C, and D), impacts on roadway segment operations (Alternative C), impacts on emergency vehicle access (for Alternative C), impacts on visual character (for Alternatives B, C, D, and E), impacts on scenic views or vistas (for Alternative E), potential structural damage from groundborne vibration related to construction (Alternative E), and increases in traffic noise (Alternatives B, C, and D).

3.18 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES AND SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Section 3.18, “Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources and Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS provides background information related to the permanent loss of resources for future or alternative purposes.

3.18.1 Consumption of Non-Renewable Resources

Section 3.18.1, “Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources and Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS summarizes the project’s potential for consumption of energy and materials, such as asphalt, concrete, rebar, and paint. This section also notes that use of these resources could result in irreversible changes associated with excavation, grading, and construction activities and would affect air quality, coverage, and water quality.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.18.2 Changes to Land Use Which Would Commit Future Generations to Similar Uses

Section 3.18.2, “Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitments of Resources and Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS summarizes the project’s changes to land use, including replacing woody vegetation with paved surfaces and use of nonrenewable resources during construction.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.18.3 Irreversible Changes Which Would Result from Environmental Accidents

Section 3.18.3, “Irreversible Changes Which Would Result from Environmental Accidents,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS summarizes the project’s minimal use of hazardous materials and the transport, use, and generation of only small volumes of hazardous materials associated with construction.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.19 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Section 3.19, “Cumulative Impacts,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS includes analysis of the project’s cumulative impacts for each resource topic addressed in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

3.19.1 Cumulative Impact Analysis Methodology

Section 3.19.1, “Cumulative Impact Analysis Methodology,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS summarizes the cumulative impact analysis methodology for all environmental resource topics and explains the CEQA, NEPA, and TRPA requirements for addressing cumulative impacts. This section also explains that the cumulative analysis uses a list of past, present, and probable future projects approach to supplement, where needed, the analysis, modeling of projections, and impact evaluation from the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.19.2 Cumulative Setting

Section 3.19.2, “Cumulative Setting,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS identifies the general geographic areas associated with the different resources addressed in the cumulative analysis.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.19.3 Cumulative Impacts Addressed in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS

Section 3.19.3, “Cumulative Impacts Addressed in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS provides background information about the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS and summarizes cumulative impacts that were adequately addressed in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS. These cumulative impacts include cumulative VMT per capita in the region and consistency with air quality plans and transportation conformity.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.

3.19.4 Related Project List Analysis of Cumulative Impacts

Section 3.19.4, “Related Project List Analysis of Cumulative Impacts,” in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS provides background information about using the list of projects in establishing the cumulative settings and impacts. This section also addresses the cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the project for each of the resource topics assessed in Sections 3.2 through 3.16 of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

No changes have been made to this section in the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EIS following its publication and circulation for public review.