

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The project applicant, the Tahoe Cross-Country Ski Education Association (TCCSEA), is proposing the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project (Project), which repurposes the historic Schilling Residence for use as a year-round recreation facility, with adequate size and site amenities to serve existing and future anticipated public recreation use. With implementation of the Project, the Highlands Park and Community Center (Community Center) would no longer serve as the lodge for the cross-country ski area; instead, the reconstructed Schilling Residence would serve that purpose. The Community Center would be retained in its current located and operated by the Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD).

Adaptive reuse of the Schilling Residence by TCCSEA provides an opportunity to preserve this historic structure, retain it for public use and historic interpretation, and allow for an enhanced and expanded lodge that consolidates outbuildings currently used for storage into a single building. The historic structure would be adaptively reused in compliance with *The Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* (National Park Service 2017).

TCPUD is the lead agency under CEQA. The proposed Project and one alternative are evaluated at an equal level of detail in this EIR: Site D – Full Project (proposed Project) and Site A – Full Project (Alternative A). This EIR is intended to facilitate subsequent environmental review and permitting by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) pursuant to its regulations.

PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

The Project is located along the northwest shore of Lake Tahoe in the Highlands neighborhood near Tahoe City in Placer County (see Figure 2-1). The existing cross-country lodge is located at the Community Center at 925 Country Club Drive. The Project proposes to utilize the historic Schilling Residence to replace and expand the existing cross-country lodge at a site off Polaris Road adjacent to the North Tahoe High School and North Tahoe Middle School (see Figure 2-2). Alternative A would be located at the site of the existing Community Center.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT

The purpose and vision for the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project is to create a welcoming year-round community hub; support activities that build on Tahoe's history and the history of the cross-country ski area; improve visitor experience; advance youth and adult recreation opportunities year-round; provide opportunities for additional special events, community events, and private events; and improve operational efficiencies of the cross-country lodge and the cross-country ski area. The Project would serve both the resident and visitor population by upgrading the only Nordic ski center with a lodge in the Tahoe Region.

The existing cross-country lodge does not adequately meet current and future recreation use, and does not provide a welcoming or aesthetically pleasing lodge facility. TCCSEA indicates that additional deficiencies at the existing cross-country lodge that fail to meet operational needs include:

- ▶ Inadequate space to serve the existing wintertime use and future winter and summer uses, which includes areas for staff, gear rental, ski waxing and repair, retail, café, and equipment storage;
- ▶ The Existing Lodge at the Community Center is separated from the flatter, beginner terrain by a hill that presents obstacles for lessons in both summer and winter. Additionally, poor connectivity exists between the lodge and the existing trail network, particularly as it relates to higher elevation trails that tend to hold snow longer and provide for a longer ski season.

- ▶ Uncertain weather patterns and the poor quality of existing developed facilities stress the financial viability of the TCCSEA operation of the cross-country ski lodge and area. To continue providing subsidized youth programs, environmental education opportunities, and well-maintained access to a high quality trail network for residents and visitors, any facility operator needs more welcoming and attractive facilities that can better serve visitors throughout the year.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

TCPUD and TCCSEA are undertaking the proposed Project for a variety of reasons, many of which are interrelated and include addressing some of the operational deficiencies described above. TCPUD's Project objectives are to:

- ▶ Expand recreational opportunities through construction of a new lodge at Highlands to improve resident and visitor experience.
- ▶ Construct a new lodge that minimizes effects on the neighborhood.
- ▶ Maintain a concessionaire partnership to operate improved and viable recreation opportunities.
- ▶ Preserve financial accountability and transparency of TCPUD property tax funds, while maximizing the use of private funding for construction of the new lodge.
- ▶ Create inviting community areas and public-use spaces.
- ▶ Support the North Lake Tahoe Tourism Plan by capitalizing infrastructure improvements on public lands and recreational assets.

TCCSEA's Project objectives are to:

- ▶ Address operational deficiencies in the current facility and improve financial viability.
- ▶ Repurpose the historic Schilling Residence into a new lodge for community use and recreation activities.
- ▶ Maximize the base elevation of the lodge site.
- ▶ Improve and maintain educational programs and activities offered to adults and youth and create more user-friendly access to the trail system for beginner, disabled, and senior recreationists.

TCPUD and TCCSEA share Project objectives to:

- ▶ Remedy inadequate parking and improve access to the lodge and trail system.
- ▶ Provide high quality and professionally maintained recreational amenities and facilitate growth and diversity of recreational opportunities by enhancing summer and winter activities.

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVE A

The proposed Project (Site D – Full Project) and Alternative A are being considered for implementation of the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project. The potential environmental effects of the proposed Project and Alternative A are analyzed at an equal level of detail in Sections 3.2 through 3.12 and in Chapter 5 of this EIR. Site D – Full Project (proposed Project) is the “proposed project” for purposes of CEQA, and is the project described in the project description of this EIR consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15124. As the lead agency under CEQA, TCPUD elected to evaluate the proposed Project and one alternative at an equal level of detail in this EIR: Site D – Full Project (proposed Project) and Site A – Full Project alternative (Alternative A). While not required by CEQA, this approach was selected by the TCPUD Board of Directors (Board) to provide them with analysis of the proposed Project and Alternative A at an equal level of detail to allow them the flexibility to potentially approve a CEQA compliant project at either location. Possible reasons for this could include insurmountable difficulty in obtaining permitting for the proposed Project, failure to complete the land exchange with the Conservancy,

unavoidable environmental impacts of the proposed Project, and/or strong community and political opposition. In the event that any of these conditions occur, Alternative A is analyzed at this level of detail so that the EIR provides sufficient analysis to enable TCPUD to approve that alternative, should that be the ultimate decision of the TCPUD Board. To be clear, however, Alternative A is not the “proposed project.” The components of the proposed Project and Alternative A are summarized below.

Three additional alternatives to the proposed Project are described and analyzed at a comparative level in Chapter 4 consistent with the requirements of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6.

Site D - Full Project (Proposed Project)

The proposed 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 the lodge for the cross-country ski area. Compared to the Existing Lodge at the Highlands Park and Community Center, 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 Tables 2-1 and Table 2-2 in Chapter 2, “Description of the Proposed Project and Alternative Evaluated in Detail”). 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 staff space for staff administrative functions, meetings, lockers, showers, first aid, a team room, and a garage. Other 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 Highlands Community Center. Access to the site would be from a new driveway off Polaris Road. Implementation of the proposed Project would retain the Existing Lodge (i.e., Highlands 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 proposed Project would allow for a shared-parking agreement with the Tahoe Truckee Unified School District (TTUSD) to allow the adjacent North Tahoe High School and North Tahoe Middle School and the cross-country 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 proposed 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 lodge would continue at the relocated lodge site and there would be up to an additional three large special events throughout the year. The proposed 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 proposed Project, private events could also occur at the 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.” A limited number of community events (e.g., recreation classes, community gatherings) could be held at the Highlands Community Center managed by TCPUD (see Table 2-5).

Site A - Full Project (Alternative A)

Implementation of Alternative A would replace the Existing Lodge at the Community Center 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. To be clear, Alternative A is not the proposed Project or part of the proposed Project. This alternative 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 Community Center 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 also allow for an increase in public and private events at the cross-country lodge similar to that summarized above for the proposed Project and identified in Table 2-3.

AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

The State CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to include a list of areas of potential controversy and issues to be resolved. Appendix A includes a complete list of comments received during the scoping period. The following are key issues related to the Project:

- ▶ Potential traffic impacts in the Highlands neighborhood, effects on emergency access and evacuation routes, and effects on school-related traffic;
- ▶ Public safety related to traffic, pedestrian safety, and serving alcohol at the Schilling Lodge;
- ▶ Construction of a new lodge on an undeveloped site;
- ▶ Noise impacts, including from additional special events and potential disruption to the learning environment of the school; and
- ▶ Parking issues, including on-street parking.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

Chapters 3 and 5 of this Draft EIR describe in detail the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed Project and Alternative A. Impacts are classified as: (1) no impact (actions that result in no adverse effects); (2) less than significant (adverse effects that are not substantial); (3) significant or potentially significant (substantial or potentially substantial adverse changes in the environment, for which mitigation measures must be identified, if feasible); and (4) significant and unavoidable (substantial or potentially substantial adverse changes in the environment that cannot be feasibly reduced with mitigation measures to a less-than-significant level).

Table ES-1 summarizes the potential environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed Project and Alternative A, and mitigation measures to avoid, eliminate, minimize, or reduce significant and potentially significant environmental impacts to less-than-significant levels, where feasible. This table presents a comparison of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Project and Alternative A after mitigation.

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
3.3 Biological Resources			
<p>Impact 3.3-1: Disturbance or Loss of Special-Status Plants and Wildlife</p> <p>Implementing the proposed Project or Alternative A 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 proposed Project or Alternative A sites, 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 proposed Project or Alternative A 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.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-1: Avoid, Minimize, and Compensate for Disturbance or Loss of Special-Status Plants</p> <p>This mitigation measure would apply to the proposed Project and Alternative A. The Project applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce potential impacts on special-status plants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 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 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 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 	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ If seed collection or transplantation are selected as appropriate mitigation actions, then the following measures will apply. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 		
<p>Impact 3.3-2: Tree Removal</p> <p>Construction of the proposed Project and Alternative A would require the removal of an estimated 183 and 79 total trees, respectively.</p> <p>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 proposed Project and Alternative A would not substantially degrade biological resources or conflict with TRPA’s threshold standard for late seral/old growth ecosystems, tree removal required for the proposed Project and Alternative A would not substantially affect the quality or viability of biological resources. However, the removal of 15 trees greater than 30 inches dbh under the current proposed Project design, and the removal of seven trees in this size class for Alternative A, 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 for the proposed Project and Alternative A</p>	<p>Proposed Project, Alternative A = PS</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-2: Minimize Tree Removal, Develop and Implement a Tree Removal and Management Plan</p> <p>This mitigation measure would apply to the proposed Project and Alternative A.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For trees larger than 30 inches dbh to be removed, a limited forest plan pursuant to TRPA Code Section 61.1.4.C will be prepared by a 	<p>Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS</p>	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<p>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 (RPF) 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
		<p>implementation. Appropriate compensatory actions that meet these standards will be identified and developed in coordination with TRPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 		
<p>Impact 3.3-3: Potential Establishment and Spread of Invasive Plants</p> <p>Construction of the Schilling Lodge and associated facilities for the proposed Project and Alternative A have 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 proposed Project site. Noxious weeds and other invasive plants could inadvertently be introduced or spread on the proposed Project site during grading and</p>	<p>Proposed Project, Alternative A = PS</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-3: Implement Invasive Plant Management Practices During Project Construction</p> <p>This mitigation measure would apply to the proposed Project and Alternative A. 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A qualified biologist will conduct a preconstruction survey to determine whether any populations of invasive plants are present within areas 	<p>Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS</p>	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
<p>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 proposed 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 proposed Project site. Additionally, invasive plant species currently present on or near the proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project or Alternative A would be a potentially significant impact.</p>		<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 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 	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
		<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 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. 		
<p>Impact 3.3-4: Potential Degradation or Loss of Wildlife Movement Corridors</p> <p>The sites for the proposed Project and Alternative A are not positioned within known important wildlife movement or migratory corridors. The proposed Project and Alternative A sites are not likely to function as important corridors due to existing disturbance levels and relatively low-quality habitat. However, vegetation removal and facility construction could disrupt potential wildlife movements in the region, particularly for mule deer. No substantial permanent impacts to mule deer fawning, important foraging, or core movement routes are anticipated as a result of implementing the proposed Project or Alternative A, and no habitat loss would occur within any known fawning areas. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project or Alternative A is not expected to substantially affect important movement corridors for mule deer or other wildlife. Any potential impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for this impact.</p>	<p>Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS</p>	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
3.4 Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources			
<p>Impact 3.4-1: Cause the Alteration of, or Adversely Affect a Historical Site, Structure, Object, or Building</p> <p>The Schilling Residence has been evaluated as eligible as a historic resource under Section 67.6 of the TRPA Code and as eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C. Relocation and reassembly of a historic structure, as identified for the proposed Project and Alternative A, could adversely affect its historic status. Consultation with SHPO has resulted in preservation measures, which are conditions of a TRPA permit for the project. Because the preservation measures required by SHPO will be a condition of the TRPA permit, these measures must be met for implementation of the proposed Project or Alternative A. Because these measures require that relocation and reconstruction of the Schilling Residence occur without adversely affecting its historic status, implementation of the proposed Project or Alternative A would result in a less-than-significant impact.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS
<p>Impact 3.4-2: Impacts to Unique Archaeological Resources</p> <p>The records search revealed one historic-era archaeological site on the proposed Project site; the pedestrian survey identified no additional sites. The site has been evaluated for the CRHR and was not found to be eligible, and therefore is not considered a unique archaeological resource. No archaeological sites were identified on the Alternative A site. However, project-related ground-disturbing activities 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 proposed Project or Alternative A, this would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = PS	<p>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</p> <p>This mitigation measure would apply to the proposed Project and Alternative A.</p> <p>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</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
		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.		
<p>Impact 3.4-3: Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources or Ethnic and Cultural Values</p> <p>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 TCRs. Additional tribal outreach by the archaeologist resulted in concern expressed by the Washoe Tribe related to unanticipated discoveries. Because proposed Project activities or activities associated with Alternative A could still uncover or destroy previously unknown archaeological resources with ethnic or cultural values, this impact would be potentially significant.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = PS	<p>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</p> <p>This mitigation measure would apply to the proposed Project and Alternative A. Implement Mitigation Measure 3.4-2.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	
<p>Impact 3.4-4: Impacts to Previously Unidentified Human Remains</p> <p>No evidence exists that suggests any prehistoric or historic-era marked or un-marked human interments are present within or in the immediate vicinity of the proposed Project site or Alternative A site. However, ground-disturbing construction activities could uncover previously unknown human remains. Compliance with California HSC Sections 7050.5 and 7052 and PRC Section 5097 by the proposed Project and Alternative A would render this impact less than significant.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	
<p>3.5 Transportation</p>				
<p>Impact 3.5-1: Potential to Cause Intersection Level of Service to Substantially Worsen</p> <p>The proposed Project and Alternative A would add new trips to the roadway network and would incrementally increase traffic volumes at study intersections that provide access to Tahoe XC. Because the study intersections are anticipated to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS under existing plus project conditions</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
with the increase in Project-related trips, the proposed Project and Alternative A would not substantially worsen the LOS of an intersection. Therefore, the proposed Project and Alternative A would have a less-than-significant impact on LOS.			
<p>Impact 3.5-2: Cause Traffic Volumes on a Residential Roadway to Exceed 2,500 Vehicles per Day</p> <p>The proposed Project and Alternative A would not alter travel patterns or increase traffic volumes to the extent that the capacity of a residential roadway would be exceeded. Because Project-related traffic would not cause traffic volumes on residential roadways to exceed Placer County’s 2,500 vehicles per day standard for residential roadways, this impact would be less than significant for the proposed Project and Alternative A.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS
<p>Impact 3.5-3: Substantially Increase Hazards Due to a Design Feature or Incompatible Uses</p> <p>All Project-related transportation infrastructure (i.e., Project driveway) connecting to existing Placer County roadways would be constructed in accordance with applicable Placer County design and safety standards. Additionally, the Project design and improvement plans are subject to the Placer County design review and plan check processes, respectively. Thus, the Placer County design review and plan check procedures would ensure that that the Project design would comply with the Placer County design and safety standards. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant for the proposed Project and Alternative A.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
<p>Impact 3.5-4: Potential to Result in Inadequate Parking Conditions</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed Project or Alternative A would result in the potential for a maximum of seven peak winter days on which residential street parking may need to be utilized by lodge patrons. Additionally, residential overflow parking may be required on as many as nine additional days per year on which large special events or premier events would be held. However, provisions to minimize the use of residential parking, such as carpooling, would be incorporated into event planning and implemented. Given that overflow residential parking already occurs during large events at the Highlands Community Center, and that the existing parking lot cannot accommodate current demand on peak winter days, which already totals more than seven days per year, implementation of the proposed Project and Alternative A would result in an improvement relative to existing conditions in the neighborhood as a whole. Therefore, this impact would be beneficial for the proposed Project and Alternative A.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = Beneficial	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = Beneficial
<p>Impact 3.5-5: Construction-Related Impacts on Traffic</p> <p>Construction of the proposed Project or Alternative A 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 onstreet 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.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-5: Prepare and Implement a Temporary Traffic Control Plan</p> <p>This mitigation measure would apply to the proposed Project and Alternative A. 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.</p> <p>At a minimum, the plan shall include and/or show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 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; 	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 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. 	
<p>Impact 3.5-6: Result in an Unmitigated Increase in Daily VMT The proposed Project and Alternative A would both result in increases in daily VMT. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project or Alternative A would result in a VMT impact, which would be significant.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-6a: Prepare and Implement a Transportation Demand Management Plan This mitigation measure would apply to the proposed Project and Alternative A. The applicant shall submit to Placer County a Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM) as part of the development review process. A menu of measures that could be included in TDM plans is provided in TRPA Code Section 65.5.3 and Placer County Code Section 10.20. These measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Preferential carpool/vanpool parking; ▶ Shuttle bus program; ▶ Transit pass subsidies; ▶ Paid parking; and ▶ Direct contributions to transit service. <p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-6b: Incorporate Design Features and Purchase and Retire Carbon Offsets to Reduce Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions to Zero This mitigation measure would apply to the proposed Project and Alternative A. The applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 3.7-1 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. More detail about measures to reduce construction-related GHGs, operational GHGs, and the purchase of carbon offsets are provided in Section 3.7.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
3.6 Air Quality			
<p>Impact 3.6-1: Short-Term Construction-Generated Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ The proposed Project and Alternative A would result in short-term construction-related emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀; however, levels of emissions would be lower than PCAPCD’s significance criteria of emission for these pollutants. Thus, construction-generated emission of criteria pollutant and ozone precursors would be less than significant from the proposed Project and Alternative A.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS
<p>Impact 3.6-2: Long-Term Operational Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors Implementation of the proposed Project and Alternative A would not result in long-term operational emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ that exceed applicable significance criteria or substantially contribute to concentrations that would result in, or contribute to, an exceedance of the NAAQS or CAAQS. Therefore, long-term operational related emissions of criteria pollutants and precursors would be less than significant.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS
<p>Impact 3.6-3: Localized Exposure to Mobile-Source Emissions of Carbon Monoxide The increase in vehicle trips associated with operation of the proposed Project would not result in, or contribute to, concentrations of CO at sensitive receptors that exceed unhealthy levels. Due to the demolition of the Existing Lodge, additional trips under Alternative A would be even less than that of the proposed Project. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS
<p>Impact 3.6-4: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminants Implementation of either the proposed Project or Alternative A would not introduce any new long-term operational sources of TACs. Construction-related emissions of TACs associated with the proposed Project or Alternative A would not result in an incremental increase in cancer risk greater than 10 in one million or a hazard index of 1.0 or greater at existing or future planned sensitive receptors. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p style="text-align: center;">NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable</p>			
<p>3.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change</p>			
<p>Impact 3.7-1: Project-Generated Emissions of GHGs</p> <p>The proposed 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. Alternative A would result in construction-related GHG emissions totaling 922 MTCO₂e/year over a period of up to 4 years and would generate operational emissions slightly less than what is emitted for the proposed Project. These levels of emissions would not be consistent with Mitigation Measure 12-1 identified in the 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. Proposed Project- and Alternative A-generated GHG emissions would be potentially significant.</p>	<p>Proposed Project, Alternative A = PS</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.7-1: Incorporate Design Features and Purchase and Retire Carbon Offsets to Reduce Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions to Zero</p> <p>This mitigation measure would apply to the proposed Project and Alternative A. The applicant shall implement measures to reduce all GHG emissions associated with construction and operation of the Project to zero. More detail about measures to reduce construction-related GHGs, operational GHGs, and the purchase of carbon offsets is provided below.</p> <p><u>Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u></p> <p>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 PCAPCD’s CEQA Thresholds of Significance Justification Report (PCDAPCD 2016), and measures listed in Mitigation Measure 12-1 of the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan (TRPA 2017b). The effort to quantify the GHG reductions shall be fully funded by the applicant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 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. 	<p>Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS</p>

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 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. <p><u>Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u> 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 (TRPA 2017b). The effort to quantify the GHG reductions shall be fully funded by the applicant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 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 	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<p>include rooftop solar photovoltaic systems to supply electricity to the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 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 of residential land uses 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 spill-over 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. <p><u>Carbon Offsets</u> In addition to implementing all feasible onsite measures to reduction GHGs associated with construction and operation of the Project, the applicant shall</p>	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
		offset the remaining levels of GHG emissions to zero by funding activities that directly reduce or sequester GHG emissions or by purchasing and retiring carbon credits from any of the following recognized and reputable voluntary carbon registries: (A) American Carbon Registry; (B) Climate Action Reserve; and/or (C) Verra (formally named Verified Carbon Standard). The applicant shall demonstrate that it has purchased and retired a sufficient quantity of carbon offsets prior to receipt of building permits from Placer County. The applicant shall purchase and retire a quantity of carbon credits sufficient to fully offset the Project’s remaining operational emissions multiplied by the number of years of operation between commencement of operation and 2045, which is the target year of Executive Order B-55-18.		
3.8 Noise				
<p>Impact 3.8-1: Construction Noise</p> <p>The proposed Project and Alternative A would result temporary construction-related noise. However, the project would comply with TRPA-required conditions of approval, limiting construction activities from 8:00 a.m. and 6:30 p.m., daily. Therefore, existing nearby sensitive receptors would not be substantially affected by construction noise and the proposed Project and Alternative A would have a less-than-significant impact related to temporary increases in noise.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
<p>Impact 3.8-2: Construction Vibration</p> <p>The proposed Project and Alternative A would result in temporary construction-related vibration. However, sensitive receptors and structures are located beyond distances that could result in disturbance or structural damage. Further, construction activities would be limited to the less sensitive times of the day. Therefore, existing nearby sensitive receptors would not be substantially affected by construction vibration and the proposed Project and Alternative A would have a less-than-significant impact from temporary increases in vibration.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS
<p>Impact 3.8-3: Operational Event Noise</p> <p>The proposed Project and Alternative A would be similar to what occurs in the project vicinity now. Long-term increases in noise 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 proposed Project and Alternative A.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.8-3 Minimize Amplified Sound</p> <p>This mitigation measure would apply to the proposed Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 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. <p>This mitigation measure would apply to Alternative A.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 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. 	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 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 59 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. 		
<p>Impact 3.8-4: Operational Traffic Noise</p> <p>The proposed Project and Alternative A would result in traffic, and associated noise, increases along local roads and SR 28, with the greatest increase occurring during the summer months of the year. However, traffic noise increases would not result in an increase that exceeds applicable Area Plan noise standards (i.e., 55 dBA CNEL) and no increase in noise would occur on SR 28. Therefore, the proposed Project and Alternative A would have a less-than-significant impact from long-term increases in traffic noise.</p>	<p>Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for this impact.</p>	<p>Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS</p>	
<p>3.9 Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Coverage</p>				
<p>Impact 3.9-1: Potential for Substantial Erosion, Loss of Topsoil, or Modifications to Natural Topography</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed Project and Alternative A could expose soils to adverse effects from soil erosion during construction activities related to construction of the Schilling Lodge. Grading and earthmoving activities would be required to obtain grading and excavation permits and approvals in accordance with TRPA Code Chapter 33 and the Placer County grading ordinance. Adherence to existing, standard regulations and permit requirements would maintain the potential for substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil for the proposed Project and Alternative A at a less-than-significant level.</p>	<p>Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for this impact.</p>	<p>Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS</p>	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
<p>Impact 3.9-2: Risk to People and Structures from Strong Seismic Shaking</p> <p>The proposed Project and Alternative A sites are located in a seismically active area and could experience strong shaking in the event of a nearby earthquake. However, the rehabilitation and reuse of the historic Schilling residence would comply with the seismic design and retrofit requirements of the CBC. These measures would reduce the potential threat to life and property from strong seismic ground shaking resulting from implementation of the proposed Project and Alternative A to a less-than-significant level.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS
<p>Impact 3.9-3: Potential for Compaction or Land Coverage Beyond TRPA Limits</p> <p>The proposed Project and Alternative A would result in an increase in land coverage relative to existing conditions. However, the proposed Project and Alternative A would be required to comply with TRPA land coverage regulations as a condition of permit approval. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed Project and Alternative A would have a less-than-significant impact relative to compaction and land coverage</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS
<p>3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality</p>			
<p>Impact 3.10-1: Potential for Project Construction to Degrade Surface or Groundwater Quality</p> <p>The proposed Project and Alternative A would create project specific construction-related disturbance, which would have the potential to degrade water quality. However, existing TRPA, Lahontan RWQCB, and Placer County regulations and standard permit conditions would substantially reduce the risk of construction-related stormwater quality impacts by controlling construction site contaminants (such as sediment-laden runoff and construction chemicals), and by proper management of hazardous materials onsite. Because stringent regulatory protections are in place, construction activities from the implementation of the proposed Project and Alternative A would have a less-than-significant impact on water quality.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
<p>Impact 3.10-2: Potential for Changes in Land Use or Facility Operation to Degrade Surface or Groundwater Quality</p> <p>The proposed Project would result in the development of the Schilling Lodge on forested lands designated for recreation. Similarly, Alternative A would include the redevelopment and expansion of an existing building. The proposed Project and Alternative A have the potential to generate pollutants that could be carried in stormwater runoff to surface waters. However, TRPA and Lahontan RWQCB regulations require the installation and maintenance of water quality BMPs, which would reduce the potential water quality effects the proposed development. Also, TRPA Code provisions would require fertilizer management and snow storage BMPs to prevent potential adverse effects from these activities. Because these stringent protections are in place, the potential for operation of the facilities associated with the proposed Project and Alternative A to degrade water quality would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS
<p>Impact 3.10-3: Potential for Increase in Stormwater Runoff, Impacts to Existing Drainage Systems, or Alteration of Drainage Patterns</p> <p>The proposed Project and Alternative A would include new development, which would create increased impervious surfaces and increased runoff. However, the Project would be required to meet stormwater BMP standards and to demonstrate through subsequent drainage planning that each of the sites for the proposed Project and Alternative A would be able to capture and treat stormwater during peak flows, as required by TRPA and Placer County regulations. For these reasons, the potential for the proposed Project and Alternative A to create substantial adverse effects on stormwater runoff volumes and existing drainage systems would be less-than-significant.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS
<p>3.11 Utilities</p>			
<p>Impact 3.11-1: Increased Demand for Water Supply and Water Conveyance</p> <p>The estimated annual water demand for the proposed Project and Alternative A would be 111,694 gallons. With implementation of the proposed Project, there would also be some water demand associated with continuing operations at the</p>	Proposed Project = LTS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.11-1: Ensure Sufficient Capacity in TCPUD Water Supply Infrastructure to Meet Fire Flow Requirements</p> <p>This mitigation measure is required for Alternative A.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
Existing Lodge. TCPUD has indicated there would be adequate water supply and conveyance infrastructure to serve the Project. Because TCPUD has sufficient water supply to meet water demand for the proposed Project and water conveyance infrastructure would be adequate, this impact would be less than significant for the proposed Project. Although there would be sufficient water supply to meet water demand for Alternative A, TCPUD has indicated that the ability of the 6-inch water line in Country Club Drive to meet fire flow requirements for this alternative is uncertain, requiring additional analysis. This impact would be potentially significant for Alternative A.	Alternative A = PS	As part of the process for TCPUD to authorize the water connection for Alternative A and before NTFPD plan review, the Project applicant shall coordinate with TCPUD to determine any necessary water system improvements in Country Club Drive that would be required to meet current fire flow requirements for the Schilling Lodge. The Project applicant shall coordinate with TCPUD to develop plans for and fund construction of improvements that would allow for conveyance of water supply to the site that meets fire flow requirements. The types of improvements that could be required include replacement of the existing water supply line in Country Club Drive or adding a new line parallel to the existing water line. The specific types of improvements that could be required would be determined in coordination with TCPUD as part of the analysis for the water connection authorization. The Project applicant shall be responsible for covering the cost of improvements that would be needed to serve Alternative A. The improvements shall be constructed to meet fire flow requirements identified in the NTFPD Fire Code. The improvements would be required before construction of the Schilling Lodge. The Project applicant shall provide a will-serve letter from TCPUD that indicates their water supply infrastructure has adequate capacity to meet fire flow requirements for Alternative A and that any necessary improvements to the system have been completed before the issuance of occupancy permits by Placer County.	
Impact 3.11-2: Increased Demand for Wastewater Collection, Conveyance, and Treatment The proposed Project would generate wastewater flows associated with operation of the Schilling Lodge and continued use of the Highlands Community Center, which would result in estimated total annual average wastewater flows of up to 129,315 gallons, an increase of up to 99,940 gallons over existing conditions. Operation of the proposed Project would increase average daily wastewater demand by 273 gpd and peak day wastewater demand by 1,625 gpd over existing conditions. Alternative A would result in the removal of the Highlands Community Center and construction and operation of the Schilling Lodge in its place, resulting in generation of annual average wastewater flows of up to 111,694 gallons, an	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
increase of up to 82,319 gallons over existing conditions. The average day wastewater flows for Alternative A would result in an increase of 225 gpd over existing conditions and an increase of 1,189 gpd over existing peak day wastewater flows. TCPUD has indicated there would be sufficient capacity in their wastewater collection system to convey wastewater flows from the proposed Project and Alternative A to the T-TSA TRI. Additionally, T-TSA has indicated there is sufficient capacity in the T-TSA TRI and WRP to serve the proposed Project. For these reasons, the proposed Project and Alternative A would have a less-than-significant impact on wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment.			
<p>Impact 3.11-3: Increased Demand for Electricity and Natural Gas</p> Implementation of the Project, under either the proposed Project or Alternative A would increase electricity and natural gas consumption at each site relative to existing conditions. Liberty Utilities and Southwest Gas have indicated there would be adequate supplies and facilities to serve the electricity and natural gas needs of the proposed Project and Alternative A. For these reasons, the impact related to construction of new or expanded electricity or natural gas facilities would be less than significant.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS
<p>Impact 3.11-4: Increased Demand for Solid Waste Collection and Disposal</p> Solid waste collection services are currently provided by TTSD. After recyclable materials are sorted by TTSD at the Eastern Regional Landfill and MRF, residual solid waste is disposed of at Lockwood Regional Landfill in Nevada. Implementation of the proposed Project and Alternative A would result in an increase in solid waste generation proportionate to the anticipated increase in visitation at the Schilling Lodge and would generate some construction and demolition debris associated with new facilities. The Eastern Regional Landfill and MRF and Lockwood Regional Landfill both have sufficient capacity to meet the additional construction and operation solid waste collection and disposal demand of the proposed Project and Alternative A. This impact would be less than significant.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
3.12 Energy			
<p>Impact 3.12-1: Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy During Project Construction or Operation</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed Project or Alternative A would increase electricity and natural gas consumption at the proposed Project site and Alternative A site relative to existing conditions; however, the proposed Project and Alternative A would be constructed in compliance with the 2019 California Energy Code, which achieves substantial reductions in overall energy use in nonresidential land uses relative to buildings constructed in compliance with previous versions of the code. Construction energy consumption associated with the proposed Project and Alternative A would be temporary and would not require additional capacity or increased peak or base period demands for electricity or other forms of energy. For these reasons, the impact related to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy during construction or operation of either the proposed Project or Alternative A would be less than significant.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS
<p>Impact 3.12-2: Consistency with a State or Local Plan for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency</p> <p>The proposed Project and Alternative a would comply with the Title 24 California Energy Code. Construction and operation of the proposed Project and Alternative A would not conflict with implementation of the RPS, SB 350, or other programs under the 2017 Scoping Plan that would indirectly reduce energy consumption by reducing GHG emissions. The proposed Project and Alternative A would also not conflict with the applicable policies of the Area Plan. Impacts from the proposed Project and Alternative A related to consistency with a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency would be less than significant.</p>	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Proposed Project, Alternative A = LTS