

California Environmental Quality Act Findings of Fact
for the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and
Expansion Project EIR

SCH No. 2018062045

Prepared by

Tahoe City Public Utility District
221 Fairway Drive
PO Box 5249
Tahoe City, CA 96145
Contact: Kim Boyd
(530) 580-6286

February 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
1	INTRODUCTION.....1
2	RECORD OF PROCEEDING2
3	FINDINGS ARE DETERMINATIVE.....3
4	MITIGATION MEASURES AND MMRP3
5	DESCRIPTION OF THE TAHOE CROSS-COUNTRY LODGE REPLACEMENT AND EXPANSION PROJECT3
6	ALTERNATIVES.....4
6.1	No Project Alternative.....5
6.2	Site A – Full Project Alternative5
6.3	Site A – Modified Project Alternative6
6.4	Site D – Reduced Project Alternative.....7
7	CEQA SECTION 21081 FINDINGS7
7.1	Biological Resources.....8
7.2	Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources13
7.3	Transportation14
7.4	Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.....16
7.5	Noise19
8	CONCLUSION20
9	REFERENCES.....20

1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines require that a number of written Findings be made by the lead agency in connection with certification of an environmental impact report (EIR) prior to approval of the project (Public Resources Code Section 21081, CEQA Guidelines Section 15091). This document provides the Findings required by CEQA. The potential environmental effects of the proposed Project, Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project, have been analyzed in a Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse [SCH] 2018062045) dated June 2020. A Final EIR has also been prepared that incorporates the Draft EIR and contains comments received on the Draft EIR, responses to the individual comments, revisions to the Draft EIR including any clarifications based on the comments and the responses to the comments, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed project. This document contains the information necessary to support approval of the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project, as set forth below, and reflects the independent judgement of the Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD) Board of Directors.

The TCPUD is the lead agency under CEQA for the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project (Project; also referred to in the Draft and Final EIR as the proposed Project or Site D – Full Project). These Findings of Fact are prepared pursuant to CEQA and State CEQA Guidelines to support the approval of the Project by TCPUD. In describing the purpose of Findings, CEQA states that:

No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless both of the following occur:

- (a) *The public agency makes one or more of the following Findings with respect to each significant effect:*
 - (1) *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.*
 - (2) *Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.*
 - (3) *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.*
- (b) *With respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment. (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21081)*

The Project would repurpose the historic Schilling residence for use as a year-round recreation facility and improve operational efficiencies of the Tahoe Cross-Country Ski Area (Tahoe XC). Reuse of the Schilling residence by Tahoe Cross-Country Ski Education Association (TCCSEA) provides an opportunity to preserve this historic structure, retain it for public use and historic interpretation, and allow for an enhanced and expanded facility that addresses internal space constraints and consolidates a number of outbuildings used for storage into a single building. In addition to relocating, expanding, and adaptively reconstructing the historic Schilling residence into a new building (the Schilling Lodge), the Project would also include a driveway and parking lot, utilities, landscaping, and outdoor community areas. The Schilling Lodge would be a year-round recreation facility to serve existing and anticipated future public recreation and community use and provide opportunities for a limited number of additional special events, community events, and private events.

The current location of the Tahoe XC is on the north shore of Lake Tahoe at the Highlands Park and Community Center (Community Center or Existing Lodge), located approximately 0.65 mile from the Project location on a site off Polaris Road. The Existing Lodge is owned by TCPUD and operated by the Project applicant, TCCSEA, under a

concession agreement with TCPUD. The Project proposes to retain the Community Center, under TCPUD ownership to be used as secondary community space and other allowable uses as needed by TCPUD.

Implementation of the Project would require a portion of development and associated improvements for the Schilling Lodge to occur on property currently owned by the California Tahoe Conservancy (Conservancy). The affected parcel is part of a separate and larger land exchange being contemplated by TCPUD and the Conservancy. The properties being considered in the land exchange are referred to as the Highlands Properties, the Quail Properties, and the Tahoe Cedars Properties. The properties are located along the north and west shores of Lake Tahoe in Placer and El Dorado Counties (see Figures 2-6 and 2-7 in the Draft EIR).

Pursuant to CEQA, these Findings of Fact (Findings), together with the MMRP, for the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project support the issuance of certification of the EIR, which was prepared to evaluate the environmental effects of implementing the Project. Certification means that: (1) the EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA; (2) TCPUD reviewed and considered the information contained in the EIR prior to approving the project; and (3) the EIR reflects TCPUD's independent judgment and analysis. Future actions that may result from the adoption and implementation of the Project have been anticipated and potential impacts resulting from these actions analyzed. Measures have been incorporated, where feasible, to avoid significant environmental impacts from implementation of the project. The design of the Schilling Lodge, associated improvements, and anticipated future activities provides project-level detail of specific construction and other physical changes that could result from implementation of the Project. Therefore, the CEQA analysis is adequate to address the significant and potentially significant environmental impacts of the Project improvements that are within the scope and footprint of the Project analyzed in the Draft and Final EIR.

The Draft and Final EIR identified significant impacts that would occur as a result of the Project and in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines; thus, TCPUD hereby adopts these Findings as part of the approval of the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project. Implementation of the Project would result in nine potentially significant effects that would be reduced to less-than-significant levels after mitigation.

Because no significant unavoidable effects on the environment would remain after implementation of adopted mitigation measures, a Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 is not needed as part of the approval of the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project.

2 RECORD OF PROCEEDING

For all purposes of CEQA compliance, including these Findings of Fact, the administrative record of all TCPUD proceedings and decisions regarding the environmental analysis of the Project includes, but is not limited to:

- ▶ The Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project Draft and Final EIR, together with all appendices and technical reports referred to therein;
- ▶ All reports, letters, applications, memoranda, maps, or other planning documents relevant to the Project prepared by TCPUD, TCCSEA, their environmental consultant, or others and presented to or before the decision-makers or staff;
- ▶ All minutes or notes of any public workshops, meetings or hearings regarding the Project, and any recorded or verbatim transcripts or videotapes thereof;
- ▶ Any letters, reports, illustrations, or other documents or evidence regarding the Project submitted into the record at any public workshops, meetings, or hearings; and
- ▶ Matters of common general knowledge to TCPUD relevant to the Project that TCPUD may consider, including applicable state or local laws, ordinances, and policies.

Documents or other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which these Findings of Fact are made are located in electronic file form at the following location: TCPUD, 221 Fairway Drive, Tahoe City, California 96145.

3 FINDINGS ARE DETERMINATIVE

TCPUD recognizes that there may be differences in and among the different sources of information and opinions offered in the documents and testimony that make up the Draft and Final EIR and the administrative record; that experts can disagree; and that TCPUD must base its decisions and these Findings on the substantial evidence in the record that it finds most compelling. In adopting these Findings, TCPUD ratifies, clarifies and/or makes insignificant modifications to the Draft and Final EIR and resolves that these Findings and the MMRP shall control and are determinative of the significant impacts of and mitigation requirements imposed on the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project in response to those environmental impacts.

Having received, reviewed, and considered the EIR for the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project, as well as other information in the record of proceedings on this matter, the TCPUD Board of Directors adopts the following Findings, in its capacity as the legislative body for the TCPUD, which is the CEQA lead agency. The Findings set forth the environmental and other bases for current and subsequent discretionary actions to be undertaken by TCPUD and responsible agencies for the implementation of the proposed Project.

4 MITIGATION MEASURES AND MMRP

The MMRP defines the approach to implementing required mitigation measures. The mitigation measures avoid or mitigate to a less-than-significant level all of the Project's significant and potentially significant environmental impacts, and attempt to otherwise consider, address, and resolve all of the environmental concerns raised during the public review of the Draft and Final EIR. All feasible mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce the identified significant and potentially significant environmental impacts.

Section 21081.6 of the PRC requires that when a public agency is making the Findings directed by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1) and PRC Section 21081(a)(1), the public agency shall adopt an MMRP for the changes that it has either required of the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures. TCPUD hereby adopts the MMRP, and commits itself and its agents, contractors, Placer County, and TRPA to full and complete implementation of the mitigation measures set forth therein. These mitigation measures are binding and enforceable obligations with which TCPUD, its agents, contractors, and partner agencies must comply.

5 DESCRIPTION OF THE TAHOE CROSS-COUNTRY LODGE REPLACEMENT AND EXPANSION PROJECT

The Project includes a 10,154 square foot (sq. ft.) reconstructed lodge that would adaptively reuse the Schilling residence with an addition and basement for use as a new lodge for Tahoe XC. Compared to the Existing Lodge, the Schilling Lodge would include expanded space for rentals, a lounge area, restrooms, rentals, a wax room, storage, and a café (see Figures 2-3 and 2-4 and Table 2-1 in Chapter 2, "Description of the Proposed Project and Alternative Evaluated in Detail," of the Draft EIR and revised Table 2-2 in Chapter 2, "Revisions to the Draft EIR," in the Final EIR). Other existing uses that would continue to occur in the Schilling Lodge include a ticketing area and retail. Additional uses that would be accommodated at the Schilling Lodge include space for staff administrative functions, meetings, lockers, showers, first aid, a team room, and a garage. Outside amenities at the Schilling Lodge include a larger patio and bike racks. The site would include 100 vehicle parking spaces and two bus parking spaces in addition to the 46 parking spaces that would be retained at the Existing Lodge location. Access to the site would be from a new driveway off Polaris Road. Implementation of the Project would retain the Existing Lodge (i.e., Community Center) under TCPUD ownership. The Existing Lodge would be managed and maintained by TCPUD as the Highlands

Community Center, and would be accessible to the community in the way that other TCPUD-owned facilities, such as the Fairway Community Center, are available.

The location of the Project would allow for a shared-parking agreement with the Tahoe Truckee Unified School District (TTUSD) consistent with Policy T-P-13 of the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan (Area Plan) to allow the adjacent North Tahoe High School and North Tahoe Middle School and the Schilling Lodge to share parking during high-use events. Proximity to the schools would improve connectivity for student athletes accessing the cross-country ski area. The location of the lodge near the schools also improves access for beginning skiers to beginner terrain and provides direct access to more cross-country ski trails compared to the Existing Lodge location.

Implementation of the Project would allow a limited number of public and private events to occur at the lodge. Large special events that are currently based at the Existing Lodge would continue at the relocated Schilling Lodge site and there would be up to an additional three large special events throughout the year. The Project would also increase the number of small meetings and community gatherings that already occur at the Existing Lodge by up to 40 throughout the year. With implementation of the Project, private events could also occur at the proposed lodge, including small meetings and private gatherings. The estimated type, number, and size of community, private, and special events that could occur at the proposed lodge are shown in Table 2-3 in Chapter 2, "Description of the Proposed Project and Alternative Evaluated in Detail," in the Draft EIR. Additionally, a limited number of community events (e.g., recreation classes, community gatherings) could be held at the Community Center (see Table 2-5 in the Draft EIR).

The Draft EIR identifies mitigation measures to address nine significant and potentially significant impacts on the environment that would occur related to construction of the Project. These include:

- ▶ Impact 3.3-1: Disturbance or Loss of Special-Status Plants and Wildlife
- ▶ Impact 3.3-2: Tree Removal
- ▶ Impact 3.3-3: Potential Establishment and Spread of Invasive Plants
- ▶ Impact 3.4-2: Impacts to Unique Archaeological Resources
- ▶ Impact 3.4-3: Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources or Ethnic and Cultural Values
- ▶ Impact 3.5-5: Construction-Related Impacts on Traffic
- ▶ Impact 3.5-6: Result in an Unmitigated Increase in Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
- ▶ Impact 3.7-1: Project-Generated Emissions of Greenhouse Gases (GHGs)
- ▶ Impact 3.8-3: Operational Noise

Mitigation measures would reduce these significant and potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels (see Section 7, "CEQA Section 21081 Findings," below).

6 ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with the Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project that could feasibly attain the basic Project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project was addressed in the Draft and Final EIR. The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to determine whether or not an alternative to the proposed Project would feasibly reduce or eliminate significant project impacts, within the basic framework of the objectives.

The Draft EIR includes an evaluation of three alternatives to the proposed Project. The No Project Alternative, which would be a continuation of existing conditions, would be considered the environmentally superior alternative compared to the proposed Project and the other three action alternatives because it would result in no environmental impacts. However, this alternative would not meet the basic objectives of the Project. As described in

Section 4.8.4, "Beneficial Effects and Project Objectives," in the Draft EIR, from a functional perspective, Alternative A, Site A – Modified Project alternative, and Site D – Reduced Project alternative would not meet some of the project objectives (e.g., maximizing the base elevation of the lodge site and addressing operational deficiencies in the current facility) as well as the proposed Project.

Descriptions of these alternatives are provided below.

6.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

A comprehensive evaluation of the No Project Alternative, as required by Section 15126.6(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, was included in the Draft EIR. Under the No Project Alternative, the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge would continue to function in its current building capacity within the Highlands Community Center (i.e., the Existing Lodge), and serve as a winter cross-country lodge and trail network as well as a summer trailhead and year-round space for other community functions and activities. During the spring, summer, and fall, bicycle rentals could continue to be offered.

With the No Project Alternative, TCPUD could implement improvements or maintenance activities for the Existing Lodge building and address the parking deficiencies at the existing site. Such improvements or maintenance would be required to address issues with the aging facility and onsite parking capacity to reduce spillover onto residential streets. As part of the improvements and maintenance, the No Project Alternative could involve remodeling the interior, making changes to the façade, addressing circulation, and restriping the parking lot. With this alternative, there would not be any anticipated increase in special events. The No Project Alternative would result in no impacts on the environment (see Sections 4.4.1 through 4.4.10 in Chapter 4, "Alternatives," of the Draft EIR).

The No Project Alternative would not meet any of the basic Project objectives described in Section 2.4, "Project Objectives," in the Draft EIR including remedying inadequate interior space, increasing parking, improving access to the lodge and trail system, providing high quality and professionally maintained recreational amenities, and facilitating growth and diversity of recreational opportunities by enhancing summer and winter activities. Additionally, this alternative would not repurpose the historic Schilling residence.

6.1.1 Conclusion

The No Project Alternative is not considered for approval because it would not achieve any of the basic objectives of the Project. It would not remedy inadequate interior space, increase parking, improve access to the lodge and trail system, or repurpose the Schilling residence.

6.2 SITE A – FULL PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Implementation of Site A – Full Project alternative (Alternative A) would replace the Existing Lodge in its current location with a reconstructed lodge of the same size and layout as the proposed Project, which would accommodate the same uses described above for the proposed Project. Alternative A would include the same amount of parking at the Schilling Lodge (i.e., 100 parking spaces) as identified for the proposed Project. Access to the site would be provided from Country Club Drive, consistent with existing conditions. To construct Alternative A, the Existing Lodge would be demolished. Implementation of this alternative would provide an opportunity to minimize ground disturbance on an undeveloped site since it would use the Existing Lodge site. While this alternative could support a shared-parking agreement with TTUSD for shared parking between the lodge and the school, the distance between the two parking lots is less advantageous than the distance between the school parking lot and the parking lot for the proposed Project. Implementation of this alternative would allow for an increase in public and private events at the cross-country lodge similar to that summarized above for the proposed Project.

The Site A – Full Project alternative would result in a greater impact to utilities than the proposed Project. Specifically, water supply infrastructure improvements could be needed to meet fire flow requirements for the lodge at this location. This alternative would be required to implement Mitigation Measure 3.11-1 to reduce the potential impact related to water supply facilities to a less-than-significant level.

6.2.1 Conclusion

Alternative A is not considered for approval because it would not achieve some of the basic objectives of the Project and would result in potentially significant impacts to water supply infrastructure that would not occur with the proposed Project. It would not maximize the base elevation of the lodge site or improve access to the lodge and trail system. Alternative A would expand parking, but because of its distance from the school parking lot, this alternative would not best meet the Project objective to minimize effects on the neighborhood from parking as well as the proposed Project would.

6.3 SITE A – MODIFIED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The Site A – Modified Project alternative would be in the same location as Alternative A but would include a different site configuration with two buildings—the Schilling residence with a basement addition (totaling 6,229 sq. ft.) and renovation of the Existing Lodge building (2,432 sq. ft.; see Table 4-1 and Figure 4-3 in Chapter 4, “Alternatives,” in the Draft EIR). The total building area would be about 1,500 sq. ft. smaller than the proposed Project and Alternative A. Uses under this alternative would be similar to the proposed Project and would include ticket sales, retail, meeting room, café, rental, storage, and community/outdoor space. This alternative would also include the same access and number of bus and vehicle parking spaces as Alternative A on Country Club Drive; however, due to its configuration, it would involve a slightly larger footprint for the parking lot and driveway area. Overall, this alternative would result in less new coverage than for the proposed Project. The number of special events (e.g., large special events, community events, private events) at the lodge and number of attendees at these events (see Table 2-3 in Chapter 2 in the Draft EIR) would be similar to, but would not exceed, those of the proposed Project.

The Site A – Modified Project alternative would result in a greater impact to utilities than the proposed Project. The size of the lodge building associated with the Site A – Modified Project alternative would be smaller than the lodge associated with the proposed Project; thus, the water, wastewater, energy, and solid waste demands would be incrementally less than those of the proposed Project. Like Alternative A, water supply infrastructure improvements could be needed to meet fire flow requirements for the lodge at this location. This alternative would be required to implement Mitigation Measure 3.11-1 to reduce the potential impact related to water supply facilities to a less-than-significant level.

6.3.1 Conclusion

The Site A – Modified Project alternative is not considered for approval because it would not achieve some of the basic Project objectives and would not avoid any significant impacts of the proposed Project. Although this alternative would result in less coverage than the proposed Project, it would have a potentially significant impact on water supply infrastructure, would have a slightly larger parking lot and driveway footprint, and the lodge would be 1,500 sq. ft. smaller than the proposed Project. From a functional perspective, the reduced size of this alternative would not meet some of the Project objectives (e.g., address operational deficiencies in the current facility and improve financial viability) as well as the proposed Project. Additionally, it would not maximize the base elevation of the lodge site or improve access to the lodge and trail system. The Site A – Modified Project alternative would expand parking over existing conditions, but because of its distance from the school parking lot, this alternative would not best meet the Project objective to minimize effects on the neighborhood from parking as well as the proposed Project would.

6.4 SITE D – REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The Site D – Reduced Project alternative would include no addition to the Schilling residence other than a basement. The total building area would be 6,229 sq. ft. (see Table 4-1 and Figure 4-4 in the Draft EIR). Uses under this alternative would be similar to the proposed Project and would include ticket sales, retail, meeting room, café, rental, storage, and community/outdoor space. The Existing Lodge would be retained at its current location. This alternative includes 65 vehicle parking and two bus parking spaces in a 53,184 sq. ft. driveway and parking area. Access to the site would be provided by the same new driveway from Polaris Road as the proposed Project. The number of special events (e.g., large special events, community events, private events) and number of attendees at these events at the lodge (see Table 2-3 in Chapter 2) would be similar to, but would not exceed, those of the proposed Project. This alternative would also provide a shared-parking opportunity with the high school and middle school consistent with Policy T-P-13 of the Area Plan. A connection between the school property and the Site D – Reduced Project alternative site would be constructed.

The Site D – Reduced Project alternative would include a land exchange with the Conservancy or would require some other form of property rights approval from the Conservancy. The properties that would be proposed for the exchange are described under the heading “TCPUD-Conservancy Land Exchange” in Section 2.5.1, “Project Characteristics,” and are shown on Figures 2-5 through 2-7 of the Draft EIR.

Implementation of Site D – Reduced Project alternative would retain the Existing Lodge (i.e., Community Center). As described under the heading “Highlands Community Center” under Section 2.6.1, “Proposed Project (Site D – Full Project),” it would be managed and maintained by TCPUD, would continue to be used for community-related activities, and could be rehabilitated or upgraded if determined necessary by TCPUD.

6.4.1 Conclusion

The Site D – Reduced Project alternative is not considered for approval because it does not have environmental advantages over the proposed Project and would not achieve some of the basic Project objectives. This impact would have the same or similar impacts as the proposed Project. From a functional perspective, the reduced size of this alternative would not meet some of the Project objectives (e.g., address operational deficiencies in the current facility and improve financial viability) as well as the proposed Project would.

7 CEQA SECTION 21081 FINDINGS

The TCPUD Board of Directors has considered the environmental information in the EIR consisting of the Draft EIR, comments on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments, and revisions to the Draft EIR. The TCPUD Board of Directors has also reviewed the MMRP and considered the public record on the Project (references provided in Chapter 6, “References,” in the Draft EIR and Chapter 4, “References,” in the Final EIR).

Pursuant to PRC Section 21081, for each significant effect identified in the Draft EIR, TCPUD must make one or more of the required Findings. TCPUD hereby makes the following Findings regarding the significant effects of the Project, pursuant to PRC Section 21081 and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

TCPUD has defined the approach to implementing mitigation measures for the proposed Project in the MMRP. The mitigation measures avoid or mitigate to less-than-significant levels all significant and potentially significant environmental impacts. PRC Section 21081.6 requires that when a public agency is making Findings, as directed by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1) and PRC Section 21081(a), the public agency shall adopt a MMRP for the changes that it has either required of the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures. The TCPUD Board of Directors hereby adopts the MMRP and commits the Project applicant, TCCSEA, to fulfill and complete implementation of the mitigation measures set forth therein. These mitigation measures are binding and enforceable obligations with which TCCSEA must comply.

The following describes each of the nine potentially significant impacts on the environment identified in the Draft EIR, the applicable CEQA finding, and the facts in support of that finding.

7.1 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

7.1.1 Potentially Significant Effect: Disturbance or Loss of Special-Status Plants and Wildlife (Impact 3.3-1)

Implementing the Project would result in construction and operation of new facilities in habitats that may provide suitable habitat for special-status plants. If special-status plants are present in the Project site, Project construction could cause the disturbance or loss of those species. Loss of special-status plants would be a potentially significant impact. For special-status animals, although implementation of the Project could disturb individuals and a small amount of potential habitat locally, the magnitude and intensity of potential adverse effects would be minor and are not expected to affect the species' distribution, active breeding sites, breeding productivity, viability, or regional populations.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the potentially significant effects of the Project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TCPUD adopts the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the impacts on disturbance and loss of special-status plants and wildlife from the Project.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-1: Avoid, Minimize, and Compensate for Disturbance or Loss of Special-Status Plants

The Project applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce potential impacts on special-status plants:

- ▶ Before commencement of any Project construction for each phase of construction and during the blooming period for the special-status plant species with potential to occur on the Project site, a qualified botanist shall conduct protocol-level surveys for special-status plants in areas that were not surveyed previously and where potentially suitable habitat would be removed or disturbed by Project activities.
- ▶ If no special-status plants are found, the botanist shall document the findings in a letter report to TCPUD and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and no further mitigation will be required.
- ▶ If special-status plant species are found outside the Project footprint, the locations of these occurrences will be clearly marked with fencing, staking, flagging, or another appropriate material. All Project personnel and equipment will be excluded from these areas.
- ▶ If special-status plant species are found that cannot be avoided during construction, the Project applicant shall consult with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and/or CDFW, as appropriate depending on species status, to determine the appropriate mitigation measures for direct and indirect impacts that could occur as a result of Project construction and will implement the agreed-upon mitigation measures to achieve no net loss of occupied habitat or individuals. Mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to, preserving and enhancing existing populations, creating offsite populations on Project mitigation sites through seed collection or transplantation, and/or restoring or creating suitable habitat in sufficient quantities to achieve no net loss of occupied habitat and/or individuals. Potential mitigation sites could include suitable locations within or outside of

the Project area. A mitigation and monitoring plan shall be developed by the Project applicant describing how unavoidable losses of special-status plants will be compensated.

- ▶ If seed collection or transplantation are selected as appropriate mitigation actions, then the following measures will apply.
 - A qualified botanist will collect any plants or mature seeds from the affected plants and store them at an appropriate native plant nursery or comparable facility.
 - Upon the completion of work, a qualified botanist will redistribute the seeds within the original location of the occurrence if not directly within the Project footprint. If the original occurrence is within the Project footprint, then the Project applicant will consult with CDFW and/or TRPA to establish a suitable location for distribution of seeds or transplantation of individual plants.
- ▶ If relocation efforts are part of the mitigation plan, the plan shall include details on the methods to be used, including collection, storage, propagation, receptor site preparation, installation, long-term protection and management, monitoring and reporting requirements, success criteria, and remedial action responsibilities should the initial effort fail to meet long-term monitoring requirements.
- ▶ Success criteria for preserved and compensatory populations shall include:
 - The extent of occupied area and plant density (number of plants per unit area) in compensatory populations will be equal to or greater than the affected occupied habitat.
 - Compensatory and preserved populations will be self-producing. Populations will be considered self-producing when:
 - plants reestablish annually for a minimum of five years with no human intervention such as supplemental seeding; and
 - reestablished and preserved habitats contain an occupied area and flower density comparable to existing occupied habitat areas in similar habitat types in the Project vicinity.
 - If offsite mitigation includes dedication of conservation easements, purchase of mitigation credits, or other offsite conservation measures, the details of these measures will be included in the mitigation plan, including information on responsible parties for long-term management, conservation easement holders, long-term management requirements, success criteria such as those listed above and other details, as appropriate to target the preservation of long term viable populations.

Explanation Regarding Reduction of the Significant Effect

Mitigation Measure 3.3-1 requires that any special-status plants are avoided and protected from construction activities, or that the applicant compensates for those plants that are removed. The impact on special-status plants and wildlife would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

7.1.2 Potentially Significant Effect: Tree Removal (Impact 3.3-2)

Construction of the Project would require the removal of an estimated 183 total trees.

Because Project construction would be focused within areas subject to considerable levels of existing disturbances and habitat fragmentation, Project-related removal of native trees would not substantially affect common or sensitive biological resources or the surrounding environment. Because tree removal for the Project would not substantially degrade biological resources or conflict with TRPA's threshold standard for late seral/old growth ecosystems, tree removal required for the Project would not substantially affect the quality or viability of biological resources. However, the removal of 15 trees greater than 30 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) under the current Project design could conflict with TRPA policy to prohibit the removal of trees larger than 30 inches dbh in westside forest types in lands classified as recreation, without appropriate mitigation and approval by TRPA. This impact would be potentially significant.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the potentially significant effects of the Project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TCPUD adopts the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the impact related to tree removal from the Project.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-2: Minimize Tree Removal, Develop and Implement a Tree Removal and Management Plan

- ▶ Where feasible, the Project will avoid and minimize the removal of trees, especially those larger than 30 inches dbh. This avoidance and minimization will be achieved through Project design to the greatest extent feasible and during the TRPA permitting process. This process typically includes:
 - Minor realignment and reconfiguration of parking, traffic circulation, walkways, sidewalks, patios and other site amenities.
 - A reduction in the parking requirements if approved by the regulatory agencies and acceptable to the project goals.
 - Focusing on retaining healthy trees instead of diseased trees and removing smaller trees instead of larger trees; or attempting to prune trees if possible.
 - Attempting to retain trees that enhance or provide additional scenic and sound barriers to the nearby neighborhood.
- ▶ For any residual removal of trees larger than 30 inches dbh and for any tree removal determined to be substantial tree removal by TRPA, the following measures will be implemented:
 - For trees larger than 30 inches dbh to be removed, a limited forest plan pursuant to TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 61.1.4.C will be prepared by a qualified forester, vegetation ecologist, or other qualified environmental professional. TRPA approval of the limited forest plan will be required before permit issuance and project implementation. The plan will be submitted to a TRPA Registered Professional Forester or other qualified TRPA professional for review, input, and approval, and will be implemented prior to or during the project. The limited forest plan will include the following elements:
 - An assessment of the condition and health of trees greater than 30 inches dbh proposed for removal; this condition and health assessment will provide the basis for any compensatory measures that may be required.
 - Specifications for removal and retention of trees greater than 30 inches dbh, including provisions for vegetation retention and protection during construction to avoid temporary disturbances in accordance with Chapters 33 and 36 of the TRPA Code and with industry standards and recommended practices.
 - Feasible measures to compensate for the removal of trees larger than 30 inches dbh, such as implementation of forest enhancement actions to facilitate growth and development of large trees in appropriate locations on- or offsite, or enhancement of existing late seral/old growth forest stands offsite.
 - Management actions, such as fuels and vegetation treatments, to facilitate and enhance large-tree and/or old-growth habitat development within potential treatment areas.
 - A clear description of how the Project shall contribute to achieving TRPA threshold standards for late seral/old growth forest enhancement, identification of priority locations where forest enhancement actions could be implemented to achieve the plan's objectives, and a funding component (e.g., for late seral/old

growth forest enhancement projects) to ensure plan implementation. Appropriate compensatory actions that meet these standards will be identified and developed in coordination with TRPA.

- A detailed description of performance standards for any compensatory measures included in the plan and how they will be implemented.
- If a timber harvesting plan is required to be submitted to California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and that timber harvesting plan meets the requirements of the limited forest plan described in this mitigation measure, the timber harvesting plan may be submitted to TRPA for review and approval in lieu of a separate limited forest plan.
- If a separate tree harvest plan is required by TRPA for overall tree removal on the site because the removal would qualify as “substantial,” as defined in Section 61.1.8 (Substantial Tree Removal) of the TRPA Code as determined by TRPA, the elements of the limited forest plan described in this mitigation measure may be integrated into the TRPA tree harvest plan.
- All tree protection obligations required in the limited forest plan and/or the tree harvesting or harvest plan will be incorporated into construction contracts. Tree protection measures will be in accordance with TRPA Code and be installed and inspected by staff from TRPA before issuance of a grading permit.

Explanation Regarding Reduction of the Potentially Significant Effect

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-2 would ensure compliance with existing TRPA regulations and policies to identify potentially significant tree removal and would minimize or avoid those impacts through the design and permitting process. The impact on tree removal would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

7.1.3 Potentially Significant Effect: Potential Establishment and Spread of Invasive Plants (Impact 3.3-3)

Construction of the Schilling Lodge and associated facilities for the Project has the potential to introduce and spread noxious weeds and other invasive plants during construction and revegetation periods. These activities would temporarily create areas of open ground that could be colonized by nonnative, invasive plant species from inside or outside of the Project site. Noxious weeds and other invasive plants could inadvertently be introduced or spread on the Project site during grading and construction activities, if nearby source populations passively colonize disturbed ground, or if construction and personnel equipment is transported to the site from an infested area. Soil, vegetation, and other materials transported to the Project site from offsite sources for best management practices (BMPs), revegetation, or fill for Project construction could contain invasive plant seeds or plant material that could become established on the Project site. Additionally, invasive plant species currently present on or near the Project site have the potential to be spread by construction disturbances. The introduction and spread of invasive species would degrade terrestrial plant and wildlife habitats on or near the Project site. The TRPA Code specifically prohibits the release of nonnative species in the Tahoe Basin because they can invade important wildlife habitats and compete for resources. The potential introduction and spread of invasive plant species as a result of the Project would be a potentially significant impact.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the potentially significant effects of the Project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TCPUD adopts the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the impacts of the potential establishment and spread of invasive plants resulting from the Project.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-3: Implement Invasive Plant Management Practices During Project Construction

In consultation with TCPUD and/or TRPA, the Project applicant shall implement appropriate invasive plant management practices during Project construction. Recommended practices include the following:

- ▶ A qualified biologist will conduct a preconstruction survey to determine whether any populations of invasive plants are present within areas proposed for ground-disturbing activities. This could be conducted in coordination with the focused special-status plant survey recommended above under Mitigation Measure 3.3-1.
- ▶ Before construction activities begin, invasive plant infestations will be treated where feasible. Treatments will be selected based on each species ecology and phenology. Control measures may include herbicide application, hand removal, or other means of mechanical control. This would help eliminate the threat of spreading the species throughout the Project site and adjacent areas. All treatment methods—including the use of herbicides—will be conducted in accordance with the law, regulations, and policies governing the land owner. As required by Section 60.1.7, Pesticide Use, of the TRPA Code, any use of herbicides shall be consistent with the TRPA Handbook of Best Management Practices to protect water quality. Land owners will be notified prior to the use of herbicides for invasive plant treatment. In areas where treatment is not feasible, noxious weed areas will be clearly flagged or fenced to clearly delineate work exclusion. Treatments will be implemented by a qualified biologist or other qualified specialist approved by TCPUD and/or TRPA.
- ▶ Vehicles and equipment will arrive at the Project site clean and weed-free. All equipment entering the Project site from weed-infested areas or areas of unknown weed status will be cleaned of all attached soil or plant parts before being allowed into the Project site. Vehicles and equipment will be cleaned using high-pressure water or air at designated weed-cleaning stations after exiting a weed-infested area. Cleaning stations will be designated by a botanist or noxious weed specialist and located away from aquatic resources.
- ▶ To ensure that fill material and seeds imported to the study area are free of invasive/noxious weeds, the Project will use onsite sources of fill and seeds whenever available. Fill and seed materials that need to be imported to the study area will be certified weed-free. In addition, only certified weed-free imported materials (or rice straw in upland areas) will be used for erosion control.
- ▶ If designated weed-infested areas are unavoidable, the plants will be cut, if feasible, and disposed of in a landfill in sealed bags or disposed of or destroyed in another manner acceptable to TCPUD, TRPA, or other agency as appropriate. If cutting weeds is not feasible, layers of mulch, degradable geotextiles, or similar materials will be placed over the infestation area to minimize the spread of seeds and plant materials by equipment and vehicles during construction. These materials will be secured so they are not blown or washed away.
- ▶ Locally collected native seed sources for revegetation shall be used when possible. Plant and seed material will be collected from or near the Project site, from within the same watershed, and at a similar elevation when possible and with approval of the appropriate authority (e.g., U.S. Forest Service [USFS] botanist for collection on USFS land).
- ▶ After construction is completed for each Project phase, the affected Project site shall be monitored on an annual basis for infestations of invasive weeds until the restored vegetation has become fully established. If new populations of invasive weeds are documented during monitoring, they will be treated and eradicated to prevent further spread. Monitoring by a qualified biologist shall occur for up to three years (as feasible) subsequent to Project implementation.

Explanation Regarding Reduction of the Potentially Significant Effect

Mitigation Measure 3.3-3 requires implementation of invasive plant management practices during Project construction, which would prevent the inadvertent introduction and spread of invasive plants from Project construction. The impact related to the potential establishment and spread of invasive plants would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

7.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL, AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

7.2.1 Potentially Significant Effect: Impacts to Unique Archaeological Resources (Impact 3.4-2)

The records search revealed one historic-era archaeological site on the Project site; the pedestrian survey identified no additional sites. The site has been evaluated for the California Register of Historical Resources and was not found to be eligible, and therefore is not considered a unique archaeological resource. However, Project-related ground-disturbing activities for the Project could result in discovery or damage of as-yet undiscovered archaeological resources as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. With implementation of the Project this would be a potentially significant impact.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the potentially significant effects of the Project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TCPUD adopts the following mitigation measure that would reduce impacts on unique archaeological resources to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-2: Halt Ground-Disturbing Activity Upon Discovery of Subsurface Archaeological Features, Assess Discovery, and Implement Measures that will Mitigate Potential Impacts on Archaeological Resources

In the event that any prehistoric or historic-era subsurface archaeological features or deposits, including locally darkened soil ("midden"), that could conceal cultural deposits, are discovered during construction, the construction contractor shall halt all ground-disturbing activity within 100 feet of the resources and shall notify TRPA and TCPUD. A qualified professional archaeologist shall be retained by the applicant to assess the significance of the find. Specifically, the archaeologist shall determine whether the find qualifies as a historical resource, a unique archaeological resource, or tribal artifacts. If the find does fall within one of these three categories, the qualified archaeologist shall then make recommendations to TCPUD regarding appropriate procedures that could be used to protect the integrity of the resource and to ensure that no additional resources are affected. Procedures could include but would not necessarily be limited to, preservation in place, archival research, subsurface testing, or contiguous block unit excavation and data recovery, with preservation in place being the preferred option if feasible. If the find is a tribal artifact, TCPUD shall provide a reasonable opportunity for input from representatives of any tribe or tribes the professional archaeologist believes may be associated with the artifact. The tribal representative will determine whether the artifact is considered a TCR, as defined by PRC Section 21074. TCPUD shall require the applicant to implement such recommended measures if it determines that they are feasible in light of project design, logistics, and cost considerations.

Explanation Regarding Reduction of the Potentially Significant Effect

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-2 would reduce impacts associated with archaeological resources to a less-than-significant level because it would require implementation of feasible, professionally accepted, and legally compliant procedures for the discovery of any previously undocumented unique archaeological resources.

7.2.2 Potentially Significant Effect: Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources or Ethnic and Cultural Values (Impact 3.4-3)

TCPUD sent notification for consultation to two tribes on April 13, 2018. No responses were received during the 30-day response period for AB 52 as defined in PRC Section 21080.3.1; therefore, no resources were identified as tribal cultural resources (TCRs). Additional tribal outreach by the archaeologist resulted in concern expressed by the Washoe Tribe related to unanticipated discoveries. Because Project activities could still uncover or destroy previously unknown archaeological resources with ethnic or cultural values, this impact would be potentially significant.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the potentially significant effects of the Project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TCPUD adopts the following mitigation measure that would reduce the potential impact on TCRs or ethnic and cultural values.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-3: Halt Ground-Disturbing Activity Upon Discovery of Subsurface Archaeological Features, Assess Discovery, and Implement Measures that will Mitigate Potential Impacts on Archaeological Resources and Avoid Degradation of Ethnic and Cultural Values

Implement Mitigation Measure 3.4-2.

Explanation Regarding Reduction of the Potentially Significant Effect

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-3 requires implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-2, which would reduce potentially significant impacts to archaeological and TCRs because implementation of the measure would avoid, move, record, or otherwise treat a discovered resource appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. By providing an opportunity to avoid disturbance, disruption, or destruction of sites, structures, and areas that have religious or sacred significance or other cultural significance to the Washoe people, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

7.3 TRANSPORTATION

7.3.1 Potentially Significant Effect: Construction-Related Impacts on Traffic (Impact 3.5-5)

Construction of the Project may require restricting or redirecting pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular movements on local roadways to accommodate construction activities and modifications to existing infrastructure. Such restrictions could include lane closures, lane narrowing, and detours; and therefore, could result in temporarily degraded roadway operations. Additionally, the addition of heavy vehicles to the local roadway network in the surrounding residential neighborhood devoid of on-street bicycle and pedestrian facilities could potentially lead to a short-term temporary increase in traffic hazards. For these reasons, construction traffic impacts would be potentially significant.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the potentially significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TCPUD adopts the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the construction-related impacts on traffic.

Mitigation Measure 3.5-5: Prepare and Implement a Temporary Traffic Control Plan

Before the beginning of construction or issuance of a building permit, the applicant and/or its construction contractor shall prepare a temporary traffic control (TTC) plan to the satisfaction of the Placer County Public Works Department.

At a minimum, the plan shall include and/or show:

- ▶ a vicinity map including all streets within the work zone properly labeled with names, posted speed limits, and a north arrow;
- ▶ a description of construction work hours and work days;
- ▶ a description of the proposed work zone;
- ▶ a description of detours and/or lane closures (pedestrians, bicyclists, vehicular), no parking zones, and parking restrictions;
- ▶ a description of signalized and non-signalized intersections impacted by the work;
- ▶ a description of construction phasing and staging;
- ▶ a description of anticipated construction truck activity, including: number and size of trucks per day, expected arrival/departure times, truck circulation patterns;
- ▶ a restriction on the operation of heavy vehicles along the roadway network in the residential neighborhood surrounding the Project site to hours that do not conflict with the primary arrival and departures times of the students of the nearby high school;
- ▶ a description of maximum speed limits for heavy vehicles; and
- ▶ a description of signage and notification procedures.

Explanation Regarding Reduction of the Potentially Significant Effect

Mitigation Measure 3.5-5 requires the applicant or its construction contractor to prepare and implement a TTC plan to the satisfaction of the Placer County Public Works Department that minimizes construction-related traffic impacts. Additionally, construction traffic impacts would be localized and temporary. For these reasons, construction traffic impacts of the Project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

7.3.2 Significant Effect: Result in an Unmitigated Increase in Daily VMT (Impact 3.5-6)

The Project would result in an increase in daily VMT. Therefore, implementation of the Project would result in a VMT impact, which would be significant.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the potentially significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TCPUD adopts the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the impacts related to an increase in daily VMT.

Mitigation Measure 3.5-6: Incorporate Design Features and Purchase and Retire Carbon Offsets to Reduce Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions to Zero

The applicant shall implement Mitigation Measures 3.7-1a and 3.7-1b identified in Section 3.7, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change." The applicant shall implement measures to reduce all GHG emissions associated with construction and operation of the Project to zero as detailed therein. More detail about measures to reduce construction-related GHGs, operational GHGs, and the purchase of carbon offsets are provided in Mitigation Measures 3.7-1a and 3.7-1b.

Explanation Regarding Reduction of the Significant Effect

Mitigation Measure 3.5-6 requires the applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 3.7-1a and 3.7-1b that are cross-referenced here and detailed in Section 3.7, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change," which requires the Project to implement measures to reduce all GHG emissions associated with construction and operation to fully mitigate GHG emissions, which includes offsetting any unmitigated GHG emissions to zero by purchasing carbon offsets. In combination with preparation and implementation of a Transportation Demand Management plan required as part of the Placer County development review process, VMT would be reduced to the extent feasible as part of the Project and all remaining GHG emissions would be reduced to zero. For these reasons, the Project would not result in an unmitigated increase in daily VMT and this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

7.4 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

7.4.1 Potentially Significant Effect: Project-Generated Emissions of GHGs (Impact 3.7-1)

The Project would result in construction-related GHG emissions totaling 841 MTCO₂e/year over a period of up to 4 years and would generate operational emissions of 316 MTCO₂e/year. These levels of emissions would not be consistent with Mitigation Measure 12-1 identified in the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan EIR/EIS, which indicates that projects should achieve a no net increase in GHG emissions to demonstrate consistency with statewide GHG reduction goals. Project-generated GHG emissions would be potentially significant.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the potentially significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TCPUD adopts the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the impacts related to Project-generated GHG emissions.

Mitigation Measure 3.7-1a: Incorporate All Feasible Onsite Design Features to Reduce Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The applicant shall implement all feasible measures to reduce all GHG emissions associated with construction and operation of the Project to zero. The GHG reductions achieved by the implementation of measures listed below shall be estimated by a qualified third-party selected by the Placer County as the agency responsible for building permit issuance. All GHG reduction estimates shall be supported by substantial evidence. Mitigation measures should be implemented even if it is reasonable that their implementation would result in a GHG reduction, but a reliable quantification of the reduction cannot be substantiated. The Project applicant shall incorporate onsite design measures into the Project and submit verification to Placer County prior to issuance of building permits. Many of these measures are identical to, or consistent with, the measures listed in Appendix B of the 2017 Scoping Plan (CARB 2017:B-7 to B-8).

Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The applicant shall implement all onsite feasible measures to reduce GHGs associated with Project construction. Such measures shall include, but are not limited to, the measures in the list below. Many of these measures are identical to, or consistent with, the measures listed in Appendix B of the 2017 Scoping Plan (CARB 2017:B-7 to B-8), Appendix F-1 of Placer County Air Pollution Control District's (PCAPCD's) CEQA Thresholds of Significance Justification Report (PCAPCD 2016), and measures listed in Mitigation Measure 12-1 of the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan (TRPA 2017). The effort to quantify the GHG reductions shall be fully funded by the applicant.

- ▶ The applicant shall enforce idling time restrictions for construction vehicles.
- ▶ The applicant shall increase use of electric-powered construction equipment including use of existing grid power for electric energy rather than operating temporary gasoline/diesel powered generators.
- ▶ The applicant shall require diesel-powered construction equipment to be fueled with renewable diesel fuel. The renewable diesel product that is used shall comply with California's Low Carbon Fuel Standards and be certified by the California Air Resources Board Executive Officer.
- ▶ The applicant shall require that all diesel-powered, off-road construction equipment shall meet EPA's Tier 4 emissions standards as defined in 40 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) 1039 and comply with the exhaust emission test procedures and provisions of 40 CFR Parts 1065 and 1068.
- ▶ The applicant shall implement waste, disposal, and recycling strategies in accordance with Sections 4.408 and 5.408 of the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code), or in accordance with any update to these requirements in future iterations of the CALGreen Code in place at the time of Project construction.
- ▶ Project construction shall achieve or exceed the enhanced Tier 2 targets for recycling or reusing construction waste of 65 percent for nonresidential land uses as contained in Sections A5.408 of the CALGreen Code.

Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The applicant shall implement all onsite feasible measures to reduce GHGs associated with operation of the Project. Such measures shall include, but are not limited to, the measures in the list below. Many of these measures are identical to, or consistent with, the measures listed in Appendix B of the 2017 Scoping Plan (CARB 2017:B-7 to B-8), Appendix F-1 of PCAPCD's Thresholds of Significance Justification Report (PCDAPCD 2016), and measures listed in Mitigation Measure 12-1 of the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan EIR/EIS (TRPA 2017). The effort to quantify the GHG reductions shall be fully funded by the applicant.

- ▶ The applicant shall achieve zero net energy (ZNE) if feasible. Prior to the issuance of building permits the Project developer or its designee shall submit a Zero Net Energy Confirmation Report (ZNE Report) prepared by a qualified building energy efficiency and design consultant to the county for review and approval. The ZNE Report shall demonstrate that development within the Project area subject to application of the California Energy Code has been designed and shall be constructed to achieve ZNE, as defined by CEC in its 2015 Integrated Energy Policy Report, or otherwise achieve an equivalent level of energy efficiency, renewable energy generation, or GHG emissions savings. This measure would differ from the achievement of zero net electricity because ZNE also concerns onsite consumption of natural gas.
- ▶ The applicant shall consult with Liberty Utilities to assess the feasibility of onsite solar. If it is determined that onsite solar is feasible, the building shall include rooftop solar photovoltaic systems to supply electricity to the building.
- ▶ If onsite solar is determined to be feasible, the applicant shall install rooftop solar water heaters if room is available after installing photovoltaic panels.
- ▶ Any household appliances required to operate the building shall be electric and certified Energy Star-certified (including dish washers, fans, and refrigerators, but not including tankless water heaters).
- ▶ All buildings shall be designed to comply with requirements for water efficiency and conservation as established in the CALGreen Code.
- ▶ The applicant shall also provide Level 2 electric vehicle charging stations at a minimum of 10 percent of parking spaces that the Project.
- ▶ The applicant shall dedicate onsite parking for shared vehicles.
- ▶ The applicant shall require gas or propane outlets in private outdoor areas for use with outdoor cooking appliances such as grills if natural gas service or propane service is available.
- ▶ The applicant shall require the installation of electrical outlets on the exterior walls of both the front and back of proposed lodge to support the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment.
- ▶ The applicant shall require the use of energy-efficient lighting for all area lighting.
- ▶ Notably, the California Air Pollution Officers Associations (CAPCOA) identifies parking restrictions as a feasible measure to reduce GHG emissions; however, parking restrictions have not been dismissed as infeasible onsite mitigation due to existing and projected community impacts associated with spillover parking into nearby residential neighborhoods during peak seasonal periods. Nonetheless, even without limitations on parking availability, a no net increase in GHG emissions can be achieved.

Mitigation Measure 3.7-1b: Purchase Real, Quantifiable, Permanent, Verifiable, Enforceable, and Additional Carbon Offsets

If, following the application of all feasible onsite GHG reduction measures implemented under Mitigation Measure 3.7-1a, the Project would continue to generate GHG emissions in exceedance of a net-zero threshold, the Project applicant shall offset the remaining GHG emissions before the end of the first full year of Project operation to meet the net-zero threshold by funding activities that directly reduce or sequester GHG emissions or by purchasing and retiring carbon credits.

CARB recommends that lead agencies prioritize onsite design features, such as those listed under Mitigation Measure 3.7-1a, and direct investments in GHG reductions within the vicinity of a project site to provide potential air quality and economic co-benefits locally (CARB 2017). While emissions of GHGs and their contribution to climate change is a global problem, emissions of air pollutants, which have an adverse localized and regional impact, are often emitted from similar activities that generate GHG emissions (i.e., mobile, energy, and area sources). For example, direct investments in a local building retrofit program could pay for cool roofs, solar panels, solar water heaters, smart meters, energy efficient lighting, energy efficient appliances, enhanced energy efficient windows, insulation, and water conservation features for homes within the geographic area of the Project. Other examples of

local direct investments including financing of regional electric vehicle charging stations, paying for electrification of public school buses, and investing in local urban forests. These types of investments result in a decrease in GHG emissions to meet the criteria of being real, quantifiable, permanent, verifiable, enforceable, and additional consistency with the standards set forth in Health and Safety Code Section 38562, subdivisions (d)(1) and (d)(2). Such credits shall be based on protocols approved by CARB, consistent with Section 95972 of Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations, and shall not allow the use of offset projects originating outside of California, except to the extent that the quality of the offsets, and their sufficiency under the standards set forth herein, can be verified by Placer County, TRPA, or PCAPCD. Such credits must be purchased through one of the following: (i) a CARB-approved registry, such as the Climate Action Reserve, the American Carbon Registry, and the Verified Carbon Standard; (ii) any registry approved by CARB to act as a registry under the California Cap and Trade program; or (iii) through the CAPCOA GHG Rx and PCAPCD.

Prior to issuing building permits for Project development, Placer County shall confirm that the applicant or its designee has fully offset the Project's remaining (i.e., after implementation of GHG reduction measures pursuant to Mitigation Measure 3.7-1a) GHG emissions by relying upon one of the following compliance options, or a combination thereof:

- ▶ demonstration that the Project applicant has directly undertaken or funded activities that reduce or sequester GHG emissions that are estimated to result in GHG reduction credits (if such programs are available), and retire such GHG reduction credits in a quantity equal to the Project's remaining GHG emissions;
- ▶ demonstration that the applicant shall retire carbon credits issued in connection with direct investments (if such programs exist at the time of building permit issuance) in a quantity equal to the Project's remaining GHG emissions;
- ▶ undertake or fund direct investments (if such programs exist at the time of building permit issuance) and retire the associated carbon credits in a quantity equal to the Project's remaining GHG emissions; or
- ▶ if it is impracticable to fully offset the Project's GHG emissions through direct investments or quantifiable and verifiable programs do not exist, the applicant or its designee may purchase and retire carbon credits that have been issued by a recognized and reputable, accredited carbon registry in a quantity equal to the Project's remaining GHG Emissions.

Explanation Regarding Reduction of the Potentially Significant Effect

Mitigation Measure 3.7-1a requires the Project applicant prioritize onsite GHG reduction design features prior to the purchase of carbon offsets. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-1b would ensure that the Project would further reduce the net increase in GHG emissions from the Project to achieve a net-zero increase in GHG emissions. Thus, the Project would not conflict with CARB's 2017 Scoping Plan or any established statewide GHG reduction targets (i.e., SB 32 of 2016 and Executive Order B-55-18). The Project's contribution to GHG emissions and climate change would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

7.5 NOISE

7.5.1 Significant Effect: Operational Noise (Impact 3.8-3)

The character and levels of noise after project implementation would be similar to existing conditions. Long-term increases in noise would be associated with outdoor recreational and sporting events at the Schilling Lodge. The increases in noise would not exceed applicable Area Plan noise standards (i.e., 55 dBA CNEL). Use of amplified sound would be required to comply with TCPUD rules and regulations and Placer County noise ordinance for operating hours; however, the use of amplified sound at the Schilling Lodge could result in exposure of sensitive receptors to noise levels that exceed the Placer County daytime (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) noise standard of 50 dBA L_{eq} for amplified sound sources. This impact would be significant for the Project.

FINDING

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the potentially significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TCPUD adopts the following mitigation measure that would reduce impacts related to operational noise to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 3.8-3: Minimize Amplified Sound

Building design and layout shall be such that any outdoor amplified speakers face away from offsite sensitive land uses and oriented/located such that the building structure is between the receiving land use and the attached speaker. Building design, layout, and final speaker location shall be identified in final site plans and approved by Placer County before issuance of building permits.

To ensure receiving land uses are not exposed to noise levels that exceed Placer County daytime noise standards of 50 dBA L_{eq} , outdoor speakers shall be tuned such that combined noise levels from all proposed speakers do not exceed 71 dBA L_{eq} at 50 feet from the source. Sound levels shall be measured in accordance with Placer County Code Chapter 9.36.040 and proof of acceptable noise levels shall be provided to Placer County at the time of final building inspection.

Explanation Regarding Reduction of the Significant Effect

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.8-3 would reduce potentially significant impacts related to operational noise because it requires the building design to act as a barrier between amplified sound sources and receiving land uses, reducing the noise levels at receiving land uses. Further, additional requirements for speakers to meet performance standards (i.e., 71 dBA L_{eq} for the Project) would ensure that noise levels would attenuate to below Placer County noise standards at receiving land uses. The Project impact related to operational noise would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

8 CONCLUSION

The Final EIR concludes that the Project, with the incorporation of mandatory regulatory requirements and permits, and mitigation measures, would not create any significant and unavoidable impacts to the environment. The mitigation measures listed in conjunction with each of the Findings set forth above, as implemented through the MMRP, would eliminate or reduce to a less-than-significant level all significant and potentially significant environmental impacts.

9 REFERENCES

For complete lists of references used in preparing the Draft EIR and the Final EIR, see Chapter 6, "References," and Chapter 4, "References," respectively.

California Air Resources Board. 2017 (November). *California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan: The Strategy for Achieving California's 2030 Greenhouse Gas Target*. Available: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf. Accessed March 2019.

CARB. See California Air Resources Board.

PCAPCD. See Placer County Air Pollution Control District.

Placer County Air Pollution Control District. 2016 (October). *CEQA Thresholds of Significance Justification Report*. Available: <https://www.placer.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/2061/Threshold-Justification-Report-PDF>. Accessed March 2019.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. 2017 (January 25). TRPA Governing Board Agenda Item No. VII.A & B, Certification of the EIS and Adoption of the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan. Errata for Mitigation Measure 12-1. Available: <http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-VII.A-B-ERRATA-MM-12-1.pdf>. Accessed March 2019.

TRPA. See Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

This page intentionally left blank.