

SUMMARY

S.1 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

The Sierra Colina Village Project is located east of U.S. Highway 50 and south of Lake Village Drive on the south shore of Lake Tahoe in Stateline, an unincorporated community in Douglas County, Nevada (Exhibit 2-1). The 18-acre project site (APN 1318-23-301-001) is bounded by U.S. 50 to the west; Lake Village Drive/Echo Drive to the north; a U.S. Forest Service (USFS) parcel to the east; and Kahle Park and Kahle Community Center, the Burger King/UPS commercial center and a mixture of office, commercial, retail, and recreational uses to the south. Other surrounding land uses include: Rabe Meadow across U.S. 50 to the west, the Lake Village Professional Building and 325-home Lake Village condominium complex to the north, Kingsbury Middle School to the northeast, and the Shady Lane commercial industrial center contiguous to the southeast corner of the project site (Exhibits 2-2 and 2-3).

The project site is currently undeveloped. The topography of the site varies, with moderate north, south and west facing slopes with an approximately 100-foot increase in elevation from the west to the east end of the property. Elevations within the project site range from approximately 6,300 to 6,400 feet above mean sea level (msl).

Burke Creek crosses the parcel in two locations (at the southeast corner and along a portion of the southern boundary line at the southwest corner of the property). Electrical utility lines transect the property in two different locations. A 120-kV line is located along the eastern border of the site and a 14.4-kV line crosses the western portion of the site, traversing the property from U.S. 50 at the southwest corner to Lake Village Drive on the northeast corner of the property. An existing dirt road provides limited fire prevention access and servicing of electrical utility lines. The dirt road runs east-west across the entire property, including through the SEZ. Numerous established but unauthorized and unmaintained foot trails traverse the property, including within the Burke Creek SEZ.

Vegetation on the project site consists primarily of common Jeffrey pine forest on 15.6 acres of the parcel and montane riparian-aspen forest on the 2.4 acres of SEZ on the parcel. In the 6.17-acre portion of the parcel proposed for development, vegetation is representative of east-shore second-growth white fir and Jeffrey pine forest.

An Existing Land Coverage Verification processed by TRPA determined that there are 6,100 square feet of existing coverage on the parcel, including 1,900 square feet of 1b coverage in the SEZ (TRPA 1998 [Appendix C]).

S.2 PROCESS

This document is an environmental impact statement (EIS) prepared on behalf of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) pursuant to Article VII of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact and Chapter 5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. As part of its environmental review process, TRPA prepared and circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) informing responsible agencies and the public that an EIS would be prepared for the project, and soliciting comments on the scope and content of the document. TRPA's NOP was released on October 4, 2006. Public scoping meetings were held October 17, October 24 (before the TRPA Governing Board), and November 8 (before the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission). The public scoping period ended on November 15, 2006. A copy of the NOP and the scoping comments received are included in Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively, of this Draft EIS.

Pursuant to TRPA Code Section 5.8.A (4), this EIS is being circulated for public comment for at least 60 days. During this time, TRPA will hold at least two public hearings to present the conclusions of the Draft EIS and

receive oral comments from the public and responsible agencies. After the 60-day comment period, a Final EIS will be prepared that includes comments received on the Draft EIS, written responses to comments; a list of all persons, organizations, and agencies commenting on the Draft EIS including any necessary revisions.

In its review of the Sierra Colina Village Project and determination for action, the TRPA Governing Board will consider the entire environmental analysis contained in the Final EIS. The Governing Board will then decide whether to certify the document and, in a separate action, whether to approve, deny, or conditionally approve the project.

S.3 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

S.3.1 PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project (Alternative 1) includes construction of 50 residential units (42 residential units in 21 townhouse-style duplexes, plus eight single-family homes, for a total of 29 building footprints), roadway improvements, utility infrastructure improvements, and four linear public facilities, or LPFs (public access facilities, recreation paths). Nine of the residential units would be deed-restricted as moderate-income homes. All residential units would be two-stories. Livable floor area for each style of home would be approximately 1,133 square feet for two-bedroom homes, 2,400 square feet for three-bedroom homes, and 2,800 square feet for four-bedroom homes. The average size of a Sierra Colina Village home would be 2,168 square feet. Average land coverage for each home, including the building footprint, patios and entryways, would be approximately 1,346 square feet. The project also includes underground placement of portions of the existing 14.4-kilovolt (kV) overhead electrical utility line.

Architectural design of the residential buildings would be “Old Tahoe” style. Design elements would include steeply pitched roofs, exposed wood elements (i.e., redwood and cedar shingle siding), shingle and stone exteriors, and wood decks. The building materials would include natural materials, such as rock and wood, and TRPA-approved earth-tone colors would be used.

Each home would include an individual garage and driveway. All two-bedroom homes would have a one-car garage and driveway; all three-bedroom and four-bedroom homes would have two-car garages and driveways. Collectively, the driveways would create 15,168 square feet of land coverage. The proposed project would provide a total of 178 parking spaces in driveways and garages.

The applicant intends to satisfy the building allocation and development right requirements for each of its 41 market units and 9 moderate-income, deed-restricted units proposed in Alternative 1 through the use of a development right on the parcel, a development right to be transferred, existing residential units of use to be transferred, and allocation of bonus units. Details for proposed sources for allocations, development rights, and existing development are provided in Chapter 2, Project Description.

Vehicle access to the project site would be via a single main roadway from two locations on Lake Village Drive. The western access point would be located at the northern edge of the western half of the property. The access road would pass between the residential units located on either side of the roadway and end at the eastern access point on Lake Village Drive. There would be no parking or sidewalks along the roadway. A one-foot wide curb-and-gutter would be constructed along most of the length of both sides of the road to convey roadway runoff first to underground sediment filtration vaults along the roadway and then to retention areas (nhc 2006d).

Currently, one existing linear public facility (LPF) passes through the project site (Lake Village/Echo Drive-LPF 1). The proposed project includes the construction of four new LPFs consisting of three pedestrian/bike paths (LPFs 2, 4, and 5) and one public roadway (LPF 3) for the purpose of providing public access to and through the project site. Upon approval, each of the approved LPF easements will need to be recorded prior to their exclusion from the Sierra Colina project area, which could be satisfied via a condition to a Sierra Colina project permit approval.

The proposed project (including proposed LPFs 2-5) would result in approximately 116,964 square feet of coverage on the Sierra Colina parcel (85,307 square feet for the proposed buildings, driveways, and walkways and 31,657 square feet for LPFs 2-5, excluding the 1.5 to 1 ratio for coverage to meet SEZ mitigation requirements). The proposed alternative would include temporary and permanent best management practices (BMPs) to improve site drainage and water quality. Proposed BMPs have been designed to exceed existing regulatory requirements for stormwater runoff in the Lake Tahoe Basin and result in a high level of water quality performance.

The proposed Sierra Colina Village Project would seek to obtain Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Platinum Certification, although achieving this highest level of LEED certification cannot be guaranteed. The project has been accepted as an Energy Star Partner committed to obtaining Energy Star certification for the proposed homes.

The applicant proposes to convey 10.7 acres of the property to an appropriate public entity for permanent open space protection and conservation, including three of the four LPFs. The 10.7-acre land conveyance would include approximately 5.2 acres of high capability land (Classes 4, 5 and 6) and 5.5 acres of sensitive land (Classes 1a, 1b and 2), including the 2.4 acres of SEZ on the property.

The applicant is participating as a partner with TRPA on restoration efforts under EIP #161 on the portion of Burke Creek located on the Sierra Colina parcel, and with Douglas County on water quality improvement efforts under EIP #679, Phase II.^a EIP #679 Phase II proposes to address the existing erosion and water quality problems affiliated with the public (Douglas County) right of way for Lake Village Drive and Echo Drive within, above and below the project site.

Construction would commence as soon as practicable following receipt of all necessary permits and approvals from regulatory agencies and would be completed in three phases. The first phase is anticipated to begin as early as 2009, with final project completion anticipated for the fall of 2011.

S.3.2 OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

In addition to the proposed project, this EIS addresses four alternatives, as summarized below:

Alternative 2 considers construction of a private single-family estate home and other associated structures including a guest house, entertainment center, fitness center, caretaker home, maintenance equipment building, and sports courts. Alternative 2 would result in approximately 97,285 square feet of land coverage, which is approximately 11,978 square feet more than Alternative 1 (not including the linear public facilities). Alternative 2 would include temporary and permanent best management practices (BMPs), including a retention basin, but would not include the Storm Water Management Approach, LEED or Energy Star certification, open space land conveyance, or linear public facilities proposed under Alternative 1.

Alternative 3 considers construction of a multi-family residential development consisting of 37 market-rate homes (15 townhouse-style duplexes and seven single homes) for a total of 22 building footprints. The development would include 130 parking spaces (65 covered and 65 uncovered) located in driveways and garages, 503 square feet of snow storage, and two retention basins, similar to those proposed under Alternative 1. Alternative 3 would include temporary and permanent BMPs, all of which would be comparable in design, scope, and effectiveness to the Storm Water Management Approach designed for Alternative 1. This alternative would include 4 new linear public facilities for public access through the project site, and conveyance of approximately 12.6 acres for permanent open space. Alternative 3 would result in approximately 97,933 square feet of coverage (73,254 square feet of coverage for buildings and unit driveways and 24,679 square feet of coverage for LPFs 2-5,

^a See Douglas County "Lake Village Phase II Water Quality Improvement Project WQIP EIP Project #679 Draft Design Memorandum" (March 2008); see also Chapter 2, Section 2.4.3 (Lake Village Drive Cooperative Storm Water Project/EIP Project #679 Phase II).

excluding the 1.5 to 1 ratio for coverage within an SEZ mitigation requirement). As under Alternative 1, the applicant would continue to participate as a partner with TRPA and Douglas County in EIP #161 and EIP #679, respectively; a portion of the existing 14.4-kV overhead utility line would be placed underground; and the project would strive for the highest feasible LEED certification level and Energy Star Certification for all residential units. Construction activities and timeframes would be similar to those of Alternative 1.

Alternative 4 considers construction of a multi-family residential development consisting of 54 market-rate homes (15 townhouse-style duplexes, four single homes, and a single Tahoe ‘lodge style’ building containing 20 homes) on the project site, for a total of 20 building footprints. This alternative would include 12 moderate-income deed-restricted homes within the ‘lodge style’ building. One hundred covered and 64 uncovered parking spaces would be provided. Alternative 4 would include 509 square feet of snow storage, and two retention basins with storage space similar to those proposed under Alternative 1. Alternative 4 would include temporary and permanent BMPs, as well as a storm water management and monitoring plan, all of which would be comparable in design, scope and effectiveness to the Storm Water Management Approach designed for Alternative 1. This alternative would include 4 new linear public facilities for public access through the project site, and conveyance of approximately 10.7 acres for permanent open space. Alternative 4 would result in approximately 105,480 square feet of coverage (81,561 square feet of coverage for buildings and unit driveways and 23,919 square feet of coverage for LPFs 2-5, excluding the 1.5 to 1 ratio for coverage within an SEZ mitigation requirement). As under Alternative 1, the applicant would continue to participate as a partner with TRPA and Douglas County in EIP #161 and EIP #679, respectively; a portion of the existing 14.4-kV overhead utility line would be placed underground; and the project would strive for the highest feasible LEED certification level and Energy Star Certification for all residential units. Construction activities and timeframes would be similar to those of Alternative 1.

Under Alternative 5 (No Project Alternative), the project site would remain in its existing condition. The parcel would remain undeveloped and inaccessible to the public. The No Project Alternative would avoid any environmental impacts of development (e.g., construction, traffic generation, noise) and would preclude environmental and public benefits offered by the project. No housing would be developed on the site, no transfer of any portion of the parcel to a public entity would occur, and no LPFs or open space easements would be created. No subdivision of the parcel would occur and PAS 073 (Special Area #1) would not be amended. The approximately 6-foot high fencing along a portion of the property’s perimeter would remain in place.

Alternatives 2 through 5 are described in further detail in Chapter 3 “Alternatives” and analyzed along with Alternative 1 in Chapter 4, “Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences.”

S.4 KEY ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

This EIS identifies and addresses the following key environmental issues that are known to the lead agencies or were raised by agencies or interested parties during the NOP public and agency review period:

- ▶ New development on a previously undeveloped site
- ▶ Population and housing changes
- ▶ Drainage and water quality concerns
- ▶ Changes in traffic patterns
- ▶ Air quality issues associated with traffic
- ▶ Potential impacts to SEZ habitat, and the watershed
- ▶ Potential impacts to vegetation
- ▶ Potential impacts to natural site features
- ▶ Potential impacts to wildlife and/or special status species
- ▶ Potential impacts to cultural resources, such as Washoe artifacts
- ▶ Potential scenic impacts

A complete list of scoping comments received during the public scoping period is included in Appendix B of this Draft EIS.

S.5 ISSUES SUBJECT TO PUBLIC CONTROVERSY

A variety of issues were raised during the public scoping process for the EIS in 2006. Key issues that were raised by multiple commenters and may be issues subject to public controversy include: issues related to drainage and water quality during construction and operations, issues related to Burke Creek, SEZ and wildlife habitat, and archeological resource concerns. As described above, the environmental effects related to these issues are addressed in the analyses in Chapter 4 of this EIS.

This EIS analyzes the environmental effects on the environment generated by Alternative 1, three development alternatives, and one no project alternative. This analysis is intended to provide a comparison of a reasonable range of alternatives that are selected based on their potential ability to feasibly avoid or lessen significant environmental effects and still achieve most of the objectives of the Sierra Colina Village Project as outlined in Chapter 2. The four development alternatives analyzed in this EIS provide realistic and feasible development options if the current owner were to develop the property. The no project alternative addresses how the existing conditions could affect the physical environment over the long term. The alternatives provide flexibility to TRPA in selecting the alternative that best meets the needs of the community and the environment.

S.6 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Chapter 4 of this EIS describes in detail the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of Alternatives 1 through 5. Impacts of the project are classified as: (1) no impact (actions that result in no adverse effects); (2) beneficial (effects that show an improvement or favorable change in the environment); (3) less than significant (adverse effects that are not substantial); (4) significant (substantial or potentially substantial adverse changes in the environment, for which mitigation measures must be recommended, if feasible); (5) 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).

Chapter 4 of this EIS describes in detail the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of Alternatives 1 through 5. Table S-1, "Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures," summarizes the impacts that would result from implementation of the project alternatives and mitigation measures to reduce significant environmental impacts. In addition, Table S-2, "Summary Comparison of the Project Alternatives," presents a comparison of the environmental impacts of the five project alternatives after mitigation.

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
4.2 - Air Quality			
Alternative 1 – Proposed Project			
<p>4.2.1-1 Generation of Short-Term Construction-Related Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors. Absent TRPA-recommended mitigation measures, construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors under Alternative 1 could contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, especially considering the nonattainment status of the LTAB with respect to TRPA standards. This would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.2.1-1. Reduce the Generation of Construction-Related Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀. In accordance with the TRPA Code of Ordinances and Douglas County requirements, the applicant shall implement the following mitigation measures during construction of the proposed project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The applicant shall obtain all necessary TRPA permits and approvals and shall follow all required TRPA codes and procedures with respect to BMPs, grading and excavation for the proposed project and all construction related and emissions generating activities. ▶ The applicant shall obtain all necessary Douglas County permits and approvals and shall follow all required County laws and procedures with respect to BMPs, grading and excavation for the proposed project and all construction related and emissions generating activities. ▶ Construction of the project shall comply with all applicable TRPA, BAQP, and BAPC codes, specifically TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 25 (Best Management Practices), Chapter 64 (Grading Standards), and Chapter 91 (Air Quality Control). ▶ Construction of the project shall comply with all applicable Douglas County codes, specifically including BMPs, grading and excavation for the proposed project and all construction related and emissions generating activities. ▶ The applicant shall require its contractors and suppliers, its general contractor and all of the general contractor’s subcontractors and suppliers to comply with all of the terms and conditions of all project permits, approvals and conditions attached thereto, including all TRPA and Douglas County permits and approvals. 	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Activities disturbing the soil shall not occur between October 15 and May 1 of each year, unless approval has been granted by TRPA. Prior to October 15, all construction sites shall be winterized per the provisions of Chapter 64.2.D of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. ▶ Dust control measures shall be required for any grading activity creating substantial quantities of dust. Dust control measures shall be approved by TRPA prior to groundbreaking and shall comply with the provisions of Chapter 64.4 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. 	
<p>4.2.1-2 Generation of Long-Term Operation-Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors. Long-term operation-related emissions would not exceed TRPA’s stationary source thresholds or the recommended mass emissions threshold for NO_x. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 1 would not violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.2.1-3 Generation of Long-Term Operation-Related Local Mobile-Source Emissions of Carbon Monoxide. Long-term operation-related local mobile-source emissions of CO under Alternative 1 would not violate an air quality standard (i.e., 8-hour TRPA standard of 6 ppm), contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
4.2.1-4 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Odors. Neither project construction nor operation of Alternative 1 would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.2.1-5 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants. Neither construction nor operation of Alternative 1 would result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial emissions of HAPs. As a result, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 2 – Grand Private Estate			
4.2.2-1 Generation of Short-Term Construction-Related Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors. Because construction of Alternative 2 would require the same types of equipment and construction period length, this impact would be similar to, but lower than Impact 4.2.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. Construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors under Alternative 2 could contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, especially considering the nonattainment status of the LTAB with respect to TRPA standards. This would be a significant impact.	S	2.2-1. Reduce the Generation of Construction-Related Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀. See Mitigation Measure 4.2.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
4.2.2-2 Generation of Long-Term Operation-Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors. This impact would substantially lower than Impact 4.2.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 2 would not violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.2.2-3 Generation of Long-Term Operation-Related Local Mobile-Source Emissions of Carbon Monoxide. This impact would be substantially less than Impact 4.2.1-3 described above for Alternative 1. Long-term operation-related local mobile-source emissions of CO under Alternative 2 would not violate an air quality standard (i.e., 8-hour TRPA standard of 6 ppm), contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As a result, this would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.2.2-4 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Odors. Like Alternative 1, Alternative 2 would result in residential land uses. No element of the project would contain features or characteristics that would be known sources of odors. Neither project construction nor operation of Alternative 2 would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.2.2-5 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants. Because Alternative 2 would be constructed on the same site and would result in residential land uses, this impact would be similar to, but lower than Impact 4.2.1-5 described above for Alternative 1. Neither construction nor operation of Alternative 2 would result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial emissions of HAPs. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative			
<p>4.2.3-1 Generation of Short-Term Construction-Related Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors. Because construction of Alternative 3 would require the same types of equipment and construction period length as Alternative 1, this impact would be similar to Impact 4.2.1-1</p>	S	<p>4.2.3-1. Reduce the Generation of Construction-Related Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀. See Mitigation Measure 4.2.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
described above for Alternative 1. As under Alternative 1, absent TRPA-recommended mitigation measures, construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors under Alternative 3 could contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, especially considering the nonattainment status of the LTAB with respect to TRPA standards. This would be a significant impact.			
4.2.3-2 Generation of Long-Term Operation-Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors. Because operation of Alternative 3 would include similar types and sizes of land uses, this impact would be similar to Impact 4.2.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 3 would not exceed TRPA's stationary source thresholds or the recommended mass emissions threshold for NO _x . Therefore, implementation of Alternative 3 would not violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.2.3-3 Generation of Long-Term Operation-Related Local Mobile-Source Emissions of Carbon Monoxide. This impact would be the same as Impact 4.2.1-3 described above for Alternative 1. Therefore, long-term operation-related local mobile-source emissions of CO under Alternative 3 would not violate an air quality standard (i.e., 8-hour TRPA standard of 6 ppm), contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
4.2.3-4 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Odors. Because Alternative 3 would be constructed on the same site and would result in the operation of similar types of land use, this impact would be the same as Impact 4.2.1-4 described above for Alternative 1. Therefore, neither project construction nor operation of Alternative 3 would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.2.3-5 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants. Because Alternative 3 would be constructed on the same site and would result in the operation of similar types of land uses, this impact would be the same as Impact 4.2.1-5 described above for Alternative 1. Therefore, neither construction nor operation of Alternative 3 would result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial emissions of HAPs. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 4 – Increased Density Alternative			
4.2.4-1 Short-Term Construction-Generated Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions. Because construction of Alternative 4 would require the same types of equipment and construction period length, this impact would be similar to Impact 4.2.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. As under Alternative 1, absent TRPA-recommended mitigation measures, construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors under Alternative 4 could contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, especially considering the nonattainment status of the LTAB with respect to TRPA standards. This would be a significant impact.	S	4.2.4-1. Reduce the Generation of Construction-Related Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀. See Mitigation Measure 4.2.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.2.4-2 Generation of Long-Term Operation-Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors. Because operation of Alternative 4 would include similar types and sizes of land uses, this impact would be similar to Impact 4.2.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 4 would not exceed TRPA’s stationary source thresholds or the recommended mass emissions threshold for NO_x. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 1 would not violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.2.4-3 Generation of Long-Term Operation-Related Local Mobile-Source Emissions of Carbon Monoxide. This impact would be the same as Impact 4.2.1-3 described above for Alternative 1. Therefore, long-term operation-related local mobile-source emissions of CO under Alternative 4 would not violate an air quality standard (i.e., 8-hour TRPA standard of 6 ppm), contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.2.4-4 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Odors. Because Alternative 4 would be constructed on the same site and would result in the operation of similar types of land use, this impact would be the same as Impact 4.2.1-4 described above for Alternative 1. Therefore, neither project construction nor operation of Alternative 4 would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.2.4-5 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants. Because Alternative 4 would be constructed on the same site and would result in the operation of similar types of land uses, this impact would be the same as Impact 4.2.1-5 described above for Alternative 1. Therefore, neither construction nor operation of Alternative 4 would result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial emissions of HAPs. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.3 – Archaeological and Historical Resources			
Alternative 1 – Proposed Project			
<p>4.3.1-1 Effects on Known Significant Archaeological and Historical Resources. No archaeological or historical resources inventoried on the project site are significant according to TRPA criteria. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not adversely affect any known significant archaeological or historical resources. This impact is less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.3.1-2 Effects on Previously Undiscovered Archaeological and Historical Resources or Human Remains. Although the archaeological survey and literature search did not identify any significant prehistoric or historic-era resources on the project site, it is possible that buried or concealed prehistoric or historic-era sites, features, artifacts, or human interments could be present and encountered during ground-disturbing activities. If previously undiscovered archaeological or historical resources become disturbed during construction, this could be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.3.1-2. Previously Undiscovered Archaeological and Historical Resources and Human Remains. If previously unknown archaeological or historical resources or human remains are discovered during any project-related ground-disturbing activities, the construction crew shall immediately cease ground-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the find. A qualified archaeologist approved by TRPA and Douglas County shall be consulted to evaluate the resource in accordance with TRPA and County guidelines. Mitigation, subject to approval by TRPA and the County, shall be implemented before ground-disturbing work in the area of the resource find can continue.</p> <p>The State of Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Section 383.170 requires a person to report to the Office of Historic Preservation immediately upon discovery of a previously unreported Native American interment inadvertently disturbed by ground-disturbing</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		activities such as construction, logging, or farming. The Office of Historic Preservation must consult immediately with the Nevada Indian Commission and notify the appropriate Indian tribe. The authorized tribe or their representative, with the permission of the landowner, may inspect the burial site and recommend an appropriate means for the treatment and disposition of the site and all associated artifacts and human remains. If the burial site is located on private land, Section 383.170 allows, at the owner's expense, the re-interment of all human remains and associated artifacts in a location not subject to further disturbance if the Indian tribe fails to make a recommendation within forty-eight hours after it receives notification of the find or if the landowner rejects the recommendation and mediation conducted pursuant to NRS 383.160 fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.	
4.3.1-3 Effects on Paleontological Resources. The project site is located within an area of Pleistocene-age lacustrine terrace deposits on the western part of the site, and within Cretaceous-age granodiorite of the Kingsbury Grade on the remainder of the site. Marine invertebrates may occur in the lacustrine terrace deposits; however, these types of fossils are generally not considered to be a unique paleontological resource. Therefore, project-related construction activities would have a less-than-significant impact on unique, scientifically-important paleontological resources.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 2 – Grand Private Estate			
4.3.2-1 Effects on Known Significant Archaeological and Historical Resources. This impact is the same as Impact 4.3.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. No cultural resources documented on the project site are significant according to TRPA criteria. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not adversely affect any known significant archaeological or historical resources. This impact is less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.3.2-2 Effects on Previously Undiscovered Archaeological and Historical Resources and Human Remains. This impact is the same as Impact 4.3.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. Although the archaeological survey and literature search did not identify any significant archaeological or historical resources or human remains on the project site, it is possible that buried or concealed prehistoric or historic-era sites, features, artifacts, or human interments could be present and encountered during ground-disturbing activities. If previously undiscovered cultural resources or human remains become disturbed during construction, this could be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.3.2-2. Mitigate Impacts to Previously Undiscovered Cultural Resources. See Mitigation Measure 4.3.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>4.3.2-3 Effects on Paleontological Resources. This impact is the same as Impact 4.3.1-3 described above for Alternative 1. While the lacustrine terrace deposits on the western part of the site may contain marine invertebrate fossils, these types of fossils are common and generally not considered to be a unique paleontological resource. Alternative 2 would have a less-than-significant impact on unique, scientifically-important paleontological resources.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative			
<p>4.3.3-1 Effects on Known Significant Archaeological and Historical Resources. This impact is the same as Impact 4.3.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. No cultural resources documented on the project site are significant according to TRPA criteria. Therefore, Alternative 3 would not adversely affect any known significant archaeological or historical resources. This impact is less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.3.3-2 Effects on Previously Undiscovered Archaeological and Historical Resources and Human Remains. This impact is the same as Impact 4.3.1-2 described above for Alternative 1.</p>	S	<p>4.3.3-2. Mitigate Impacts to Previously Undiscovered Cultural Resources. See Mitigation Measure 4.3.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation would apply.</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>Although the archaeological survey and literature search did not identify any significant archaeological or historical resources or human remains on the project site, it is possible that buried or concealed prehistoric or historic-era sites, features, artifacts, or human interments could be present and encountered during ground-disturbing activities. If previously undiscovered, cultural resources or human remains are disturbed during construction, this could be a significant impact.</p>			
<p>4.3.3-3 Effects on Paleontological Resources. This impact is the same as Impact 4.3.1-3 described above for Alternative 1. While the lacustrine terrace deposits on the western part of the site may contain marine invertebrate fossils, these types of fossils are common and generally not considered to be a unique paleontological resource. Alternative 3 would have a less-than-significant impact on unique, scientifically-important paleontological resources.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Alternative 4 – Increased Density Alternative</p>			
<p>4.3.4-1 Effects on Known Significant Archaeological and Historical Resources. This impact is the same as Impact 4.3.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. No cultural resources documented on the project site are significant according to TRPA criteria. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not adversely affect any known significant archaeological or historical resources. This impact is less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.3.4-2 Effects on Previously Undiscovered Archaeological and Historical Resources and Human Remains. This impact is the same as Impact 4.3.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. Although the archaeological survey and literature search did not identify any significant archaeological or historical resources or human remains on the project site, it is possible that buried or concealed prehistoric or historic-era sites,</p>	S	<p>4.3.4-2. Mitigate Previously Undiscovered Cultural Resources. See Mitigation Measure 4.3.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation would apply.</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
features, artifacts, or human interments could be present and encountered during ground-disturbing activities. If previously undiscovered, cultural resources or human remains become disturbed during construction, this could be a significant impact.			
4.3.4-3 Effects on Paleontological Resources. This impact is the same as Impact 4.3.1-3 described above for Alternative 1. While the lacustrine terrace deposits on the western part of the site may contain marine invertebrate fossils, these types of fossils are common and generally not considered to be a unique paleontological resource. Alternative 2 would have a less-than-significant impact on unique, scientifically-important paleontological resources.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.4 – Biological Resources			
Alternative 1 – Proposed Project			
4.4.1-1 Removal of Riparian Vegetation, Potential Fill of Jurisdictional Waters of the United States. No potential jurisdictional wetlands, riparian vegetation, or SEZ occur in the area of Jeffrey pine forest that would be affected by the residential development proposed in Alternative 1. However, a pedestrian/bike path (linear public facility [LPF] 5) crossing Burke Creek would be constructed within the SEZ. Construction of this trail would remove and disturb riparian vegetation in the SEZ. A delineation of waters of the United States, including wetlands, on the project site has not been conducted; however, it is possible that construction on this land capability class (1b, SEZ) would result in limited areas of fill of jurisdictional wetlands and removal of some riparian vegetation. Removal of riparian vegetation and potential fill of a jurisdictional water of the United States would be a significant impact.	S	4.4.1-1. Redesign LPF 5 to Avoid the SEZ, or: (1) Design and Site the Bridge Crossing to Minimize Riparian Vegetation Removal; (2) Delineate Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization of Fill; and (3) Compensate for SEZ Impacts as a Result of LPF 5. The significant impacts discussed above would result only from development of LPF 5 through the SEZ. Due to the sensitivity of this resource, the applicant shall consider redesigning LPF 5 to avoid the SEZ or implement the following. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Design and site the SEZ bridge crossing to minimize riparian vegetation removal. Design considerations shall include, at a minimum, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize the bridge width. As proposed, the bridge crossing would be approximately eight feet wide. However, the purpose of developing this crossing could 	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>be met with a narrower bridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider a narrow pedestrian-only foot bridge, rather than a bridge that would accommodate bicycles. • Site the bridge location to minimize or avoid the removal of riparian shrubs and trees, and cross at a relatively narrow segment of the SEZ. <p>▶ Prior to the start of LPF 5 construction activities at the project site, unless otherwise directed by USACE and TRPA, a delineation of waters of the United States, including wetlands that would be affected by the project, shall be made by a qualified biologist through the formal Section 404 wetland delineation process. The delineation shall be submitted to and verified by USACE. If, based on the verified delineation, it is determined that fill of waters of the United States would result from implementation of the project, authorization for such fill shall be secured from USACE through the Section 404 permitting process. The acreage of riparian habitat (deciduous riparian vegetation) that would be removed or disturbed during project implementation shall be quantified and replaced or restored/enhanced in accordance with USACE and TRPA regulations. Habitat restoration, enhancement, and/or replacement shall be at a location and by methods agreeable to USACE as determined during the permitting processes for CWA Section 404 and by TRPA during the permitting process for SEZ. Restoration of SEZ in relation to the TRPA-directed EIP #161 concerning the Burke Creek Watershed, which analyzes the entire watershed, may also be considered.</p>	
<p>4.4.1-2 Potential Effects on Special-Status Animal Species (Mule Deer, Waterfowl). Implementation of Alternative 1 could disturb or remove habitat for mule deer and waterfowl. However, the project site does not likely function as an important habitat area for these species; and residential</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
development on the site and construction of LPF 5 are not expected to result in the loss of individuals or affect the viability of these species. This potential impact would be less than significant.			
<p>4.4.1-3 Potential Effects on Common Raptors. Implementation of Alternative 1 could remove nesting habitat or disturb active nests of common raptors. Nesting habitat for common raptor species is protected under the TRPA Code of Ordinances, if it is considered critical to the stability or viability of the existing population. However, the site is not considered critical to any raptor species in the Tahoe Basin. Therefore, if the project site functions as nesting habitat for common raptors, disturbance or loss of this habitat would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.4.1-4 Removal of Common Migratory Bird Nests. Implementation of Alternative 1 could adversely affect common migratory birds through disturbance during the breeding season and removal of active nests. Loss of active nests of common species would be inconsistent with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act but would not substantially reduce the number of any species or cause a species to drop below self-sustaining levels. Loss of active nests of common migratory birds would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.4.1-5A Potential Degradation of Wildlife Habitats of Special Significance as a Result of Construction and Use of LPF 5. The construction and use of LPF 5 as proposed under Alternative 1 would remove and disturb riparian wildlife habitat along Burke Creek, which is considered a habitat of special significance by TRPA. This new trail would likely facilitate additional recreation-related uses and disturbances within the riparian zone. Degradation of this resource would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.4.1-5A. Redesign LPF 5 to Avoid the Burke Creek Riparian Zone, or: (1) Design and Site the Bridge Crossing to Minimize Riparian Vegetation Removal; (2) Delineate Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization for Fill; and (3) Minimize and Compensate for Riparian Wildlife Habitat Degradation as a Result of LPF 5. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply. In addition, the project applicant shall develop and install signage that discourages and</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		minimizes effects of trail users on the Burke Creek riparian zone. Signs shall inform residents: (1) that the riparian zone is a sensitive wildlife habitat, (2) to avoid disturbing the riparian vegetation and wildlife, and (3) to keep pets outside the riparian zone (e.g., on leash).	
<p>4.4.1-5B Potential Degradation of Wildlife Habitats of Special Significance as a Result of Residential Development. Residential development adjacent to the riparian area along Burke Creek would reduce the quality of riparian wildlife habitat. Degradation of this resource would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.4.1-5B. Implement SEZ Enhancement Measures to Compensate for Degradation of Riparian Wildlife Habitat as a Result of Residential Development. To compensate for degradation of riparian habitat, the project applicant shall coordinate with TRPA to implement a riparian habitat enhancement plan (Appendix X) that compensates for the habitat functions and values lost as a result of development. The total square footage of development that encroaches within the 100-foot buffer shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio. Therefore, mitigation for development of 16,430 square feet (0.38 acre) within the 100-foot riparian buffer amounts to 49,290 square feet (1.13 acres) of enhancement. (For purposes of implementation of this mitigation measure, the final total combined area of Buildings 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 and their associated facilities located within the buffer area should be calculated based on final design plans.)</p> <p>Enhancement goals include improving riparian wildlife habitat functions, including maintenance of native riparian vegetation communities; provision of continuous habitat linkages within the watershed; and provision of suitable habitat conditions for riparian-obligate wildlife species. Enhancement and restoration measures include a combination of actions, including conifer removal within riparian habitat, revegetating or enhancing vegetation and hydrologic conditions in appropriate locations, and decommissioning and restoring unauthorized trails and stream crossings. Locations and methods of habitat restoration and enhancement are identified in Appendix X, and shall be subject to approval by TRPA, and implementation shall be directed by TRPA. The following provides a list of actions that, based on field investigation and mapping by EDAW and TRPA,</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>would constitute riparian enhancement under this measure (see Appendix X).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Reduction of conifer encroachment within the riparian zone through a combination of mechanical and prescribed fire treatments, where applicable, to improve wildlife habitat. Measurable riparian improvements shall be demonstrated by reduction in lodgepole pine or white fir density, increased vegetative structural diversity, and increased aspen or willow regeneration throughout the watershed. Typical mechanical treatments include simply cutting the encroaching conifers at ground level. ▶ Removal and restoration of unauthorized trails, removing large piles of downed wood (fuels reduction), and erosion control treatments on unstable banks in accordance with the TRPA Handbook of Best Management Practices shall be implemented to enhance vegetation conditions. ▶ Enhancement of hydrologic conditions and water quality through bank stabilization, and removal of debris associated with human activity. <p>The required 3:1 riparian enhancement shall be implemented on the project site to the extent feasible. If sufficient enhancement opportunities do not exist on the project site to fulfill the mitigation acreage requirement, habitat enhancement at appropriate locations elsewhere in the Burke Creek watershed shall be implemented to meet the acreage requirement. Off-site habitat enhancement would require coordination with and approval by the appropriate landowner(s) of the off-site location and TRPA.</p> <p>In June 2008, a field assessment was conducted (as described above) to identify specific locations where enhancement prescriptions to meet this mitigation requirement could be feasibly implemented, and to determine whether enhancement of up to 1.13 acres could be achieved on the project site. Based on</p>	

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>this assessment, it appears that the mitigation requirement can be met through on-site enhancement. Appendix X provides the methods and results of the assessment, including the specific opportunities, locations, and acreages identified for riparian habitat enhancement on the project site.</p> <p>As part of the plan, the project applicant shall develop and install signage that discourages and minimizes effects of residential uses on the Burke Creek riparian zone. Signs shall inform residents: (1) that the riparian zone is a sensitive wildlife habitat, (2) to avoid disturbing the riparian vegetation and wildlife, and (3) to keep pets outside the riparian zone (e.g., on leash).</p>	
<p>4.4.1-6A Potential Degradation of Wildlife Movement Corridors as a Result of Construction and Use of LPF 5. The construction and use of LPF 5 would remove riparian vegetation and facilitate additional recreation-related uses and disturbance within the Burke Creek riparian zone, a potential wildlife movement corridor. This potential impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>4.4.1-6A. Redesign LPF 5 to Avoid the Riparian Zone, or: (1) Design and Site the Bridge Crossing to Minimize Riparian Vegetation Removal; (2) Delineate Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization of Fill; and (3) Minimize and Compensate for Potential Corridor Degradation as a Result of LPF 5. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-1 described above. The same mitigation measure would apply. In addition, the project applicant shall develop and install signage that discourages and minimizes effects of trail users on the Burke Creek riparian zone. Signs shall inform residents: (1) that the riparian zone is a sensitive wildlife habitat, (2) to avoid disturbing the riparian vegetation and wildlife, and (3) to keep pets outside the riparian zone (e.g., on leash).</p>	LTS
<p>4.4.1-6B Potential Degradation of Wildlife Movement Corridors as a Result of Residential Development. Residential development and removal of conifer forest adjacent to the Burke Creek riparian zone (outside of the SEZ setback) could substantially affect its potential to function as a wildlife corridor. This potential impact would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.4.1-6B. Develop and Implement an Enhancement Plan to Compensate for Potential Corridor Degradation as a Result of Residential Development. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-5B described above. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>4.4.1-7 Potential Degradation of Fish Habitat. Under Alternative 1, residential development would occur adjacent to a portion of the Sierra Colina SEZ. Construction activities and</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
conversion to residential uses outside the SEZ could result in short- and long-term increases in erosion and surface runoff into Burke Creek, and adversely affect water in-stream fish habitat. Also, construction of the proposed LPF 5 pedestrian/bicycle stream crossing could result in similar effects. However, through implementation of BMPs (described in Chapter 2, Project Description and Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality of this document), this potential impact would be less than significant.			
4.4.1-8 Loss of Common Vegetation (other than deciduous riparian vegetation), Uncommon Vegetation, and Late Seral/Old Growth Ecosystems. Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in the loss or disturbance of 5.64 acres of common Jeffrey pine forest. This impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.4.1-9 Tree Removal. Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in the removal of an estimated 7 trees measuring 10 inches DBH or greater within sensitive land designations on the 18-acre project site. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.4.1-10 Introduction and Spread of Weeds. Implementation of Alternative 1 could facilitate the introduction and spread of weeds during and after construction. The introduction and spread of terrestrial or aquatic weeds would degrade vegetation and wildlife habitat, including wildlife habitats of special significance (riparian), on the project site and on adjacent lands, as well as degrade the waters of Lake Tahoe downstream of the site. This would be a significant impact.	S	4.4.1-10: Implement Weed Management Practices During the Project Construction Phase. In consultation with TRPA, the project applicant shall implement appropriate weed management practices during project construction. Recommended practices include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Conduct a pre-construction survey by a qualified biologist to determine if any invasive/ noxious weed populations are present within the project area and remove these species prior to start of construction. This would help eliminate the threat of spreading the species farther throughout the project area. 	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ All equipment coming onto the project area from weed-infested areas or areas of unknown weed status should be cleaned of all attached soil or plant parts. ▶ To ensure that fill and seeds are free of invasive/noxious weeds, use on-site sources of fill and seeds when available. Fill and seed should be certified weed-free. Only certified weed-free imported materials (or rice straw in upland areas) should be used for erosion control. 	
Alternative 2 – Grand Private Estate			
<p>4.4.2-1 Removal of Riparian Vegetation, Potential Fill of Jurisdictional Waters of the United States. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.4.1-1 for Alternative 1. Removal of riparian vegetation and potential fill of a jurisdictional water of the United States associated with Alternative 2 would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.4.2-1. Redesign the Bridge Crossing to Avoid the SEZ, or: (1) Design and Site the Bridge Crossing to Minimize Riparian Vegetation Removal; (2) Delineate Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization of Fill; and (3) Compensate for SEZ Impacts. The significant impacts discussed above would result only from development of the proposed bridge crossing through the SEZ. The applicant shall redesign the bridge crossing to avoid the SEZ or implement the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Design and site the SEZ bridge crossing to minimize riparian vegetation removal. Design considerations shall include, at a minimum, the following. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Minimize the bridge width. (2) Site the bridge location to minimize or avoid the removal of riparian shrubs and trees, and cross at a relatively narrow segment of the SEZ. ▶ Prior to the start of construction activities at the project site, unless otherwise directed by USACE and TRPA, a delineation of waters of the United States, including wetlands that would be affected by the project, shall be made by a qualified biologist through the formal Section 404 wetland delineation process. The delineation shall be submitted to and verified by USACE. If, based on the verified delineation, it is determined that fill of waters of the United States would result from implementation of the 	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		project, authorization for such fill shall be secured from USACE through the Section 404 permitting process. The acreage of riparian habitat (deciduous riparian vegetation) that would be removed or disturbed during project implementation shall be quantified and replaced or restored/enhanced in accordance with USACE and TRPA regulations. Habitat restoration, enhancement, and/or replacement shall be at a location and by methods agreeable to USACE as determined during the permitting processes for CWA Section 404 and by TRPA during the permitting process for SEZ. Restoration of SEZ elsewhere in the Burke Creek watershed (upstream or downstream of the project site) may be required by USACE or TRPA for loss of deciduous riparian vegetation.	
4.4.2-2 Potential Effects on Special-Status Animal Species (Mule Deer, Waterfowl). This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-2 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 2 could disturb or remove habitat for mule deer and waterfowl. However, the project site does not likely function as an important habitat area for these species; and residential development on the site and construction of the proposed bridge crossing are not expected to result in the loss of individuals or affect the viability of these species. Therefore, this potential impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.4.2-3 Potential Effects on Common Raptors. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-3 for Alternative 1. If the project site functions as nesting habitat for common raptors, the loss of occupied habitat or active nests as a result of the proposed project would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.4.2-4 Removal of Common Migratory Bird Nests. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-4 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 2 could adversely affect	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>common migratory birds through disturbance during the breeding season and removal of active nests. Loss of active nests of common species would be inconsistent with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act but would not substantially reduce the number of any species or cause a species to drop below self-sustaining levels. Loss of active nests of common migratory birds would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>			
<p>4.4.2-5 Potential Degradation of Wildlife Habitats of Special Significance. This impact is similar to Impacts 4.4.1-5A and 4.4.1-5B for Alternative 1. The construction and use of the road and bridge crossing to access the guesthouse under Alternative 2 would remove and disturb riparian wildlife habitat along Burke Creek, which is considered a habitat of special significance by TRPA. Also, residential development adjacent to the riparian area could reduce the quality of riparian habitat. Degradation of this resource would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.4.2-5A. Redesign the Bridge Crossing to Avoid the Burke Creek Riparian Zone, or: (1) Design and Site the Bridge Crossing to Minimize Riparian Vegetation Removal; (2) Delineate Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization of Fill; and (3) Compensate for Riparian Wildlife Habitat Degradation as a Result of Bridge Construction. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.2-1 described above for Impact 4.4.2-1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>4.4.2-5B. Develop and Implement an Enhancement Plan to Compensate for Degradation of Riparian Wildlife Habitat as a Result of Residential Development. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-5B described above for Alternative 1. The same measure would apply; however, a smaller amount of habitat enhancement would be required for this impact under Alternative 2. Mitigation for developing 12,090 square feet (0.28 acre) adjacent to the riparian zone and within the 100-foot riparian buffer, and degrading riparian habitat quality, under Alternative 2 shall be implemented at a 3:1 ratio (i.e., 3 acres of enhancement to each acre of development); this amounts to 36,270 square feet (0.83 acre) of enhancement. (For purposes of implementation of this mitigation measure, the final total combined area of guesthouse, patio footprint, and driveway located within the buffer area should be calculated based on final design plans.)</p>	LTS
<p>4.4.2-6 Potential Degradation of Wildlife Movement Corridors. This impact is similar to Impacts 4.4.1-6A and 4.4.1-6B for Alternative 1. The construction and use of the road</p>	S	<p>4.4.2-6A. Redesign the Bridge Crossing to Avoid the Burke Creek Riparian Zone, or: (1) Design and Site the Bridge Crossing to Minimize Riparian Vegetation Removal; (2)</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
and bridge crossing to access the guesthouse under Alternative 2 would remove and disturb a portion of the Burke Creek riparian zone, a potential wildlife movement corridor. Residential development and removal of conifer forest immediately adjacent to the riparian zone (outside of the SEZ setback) could substantially affect its potential to function as a wildlife corridor. This impact would be significant.		Delineate Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization of Fill; and (3) Minimize and Compensate for Corridor Degradation as a Result of Bridge Construction. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.2-1 described above for Impact 4.4.2-1. The same mitigation measure would apply. 4.4.2-6B. Develop and Implement an Enhancement Plan to Compensate for Potential Corridor Degradation as a Result of Residential Development. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-5B described above for Alternative 1. The same measure would apply.	
4.4.2-7 Potential Degradation of Fish Habitat. This impact is similar to Impact 4.4.1-7 for Alternative 1. Under Alternative 2, residential development and construction activities would occur adjacent to the SEZ, possibly resulting in short- and long-term increases in erosion and surface runoff into Burke Creek, and adversely affect water in-stream fish habitat. This potential impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.4.2-8 Loss of Common Vegetation (other than deciduous riparian vegetation), Uncommon Vegetation, and Late Seral/Old Growth Ecosystems. This impact is similar to Impact 4.4.1-8 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in the loss or disturbance of 4.05 acres of common Jeffrey pine forest. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.4.2-9 Tree Removal. This impact is similar to Impact 4.4.1-9 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in the loss or disturbance of 4.05 acres of common Jeffrey pine forest. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
4.4.2-10 Introduction and Spread of Weeds. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-10 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 2 could facilitate the introduction and spread of weeds during and after construction. This would be a significant impact.	S	4.4.2-10. Implement Weed Management Practices During the Project Construction Phase. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-10 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative			
4.4.3-1 Removal of Riparian Vegetation, Potential Fill of Jurisdictional Waters of the United States. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-1 for Alternative 1. Removal of riparian vegetation and potential fill of a jurisdictional water of the United States associated with Alternative 3 would be a significant impact.	S	4.4.3-1. Redesign LPF 5 to Avoid the SEZ, or: (1) Design and Site the Bridge Crossing to Minimize Riparian Vegetation Removal; (2) Delineate Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization of Fill; and (3) Compensate for SEZ Impacts as a Result of LPF 5. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
4.4.3-2 Potential Effects on Other Special-Status Animal Species (Mule Deer, Waterfowl). This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-2 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 could disturb or remove habitat for mule deer and waterfowl. However, the project site does not likely function as an important habitat area for these species; and residential development on the site and construction of LPF 5 are not expected to result in the loss of individuals or affect the viability of these species. Therefore, this potential impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.4.3-3 Potential Effects on Common Raptors. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-3 for Alternative 1. If the project site functions as nesting habitat for common raptors, the loss of occupied habitat or active nests as a result of the proposed project would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.4.3-4 Removal of Common Migratory Bird Nests. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-4 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 could adversely affect common migratory birds through disturbance during the breeding season and removal of active nests. Loss of active	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>nests of common species would be inconsistent with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act but would not substantially reduce the number of any species or cause a species to drop below self-sustaining levels. Loss of active nests of common migratory birds would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>4.4.3-5A Potential Degradation of Wildlife Habitats of Special Significance as a Result of Construction and Use of LPF 5. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-5A for Alternative 1. The construction and use of LPF 5 as proposed under Alternative 3 would remove and disturb riparian wildlife habitat along Burke Creek, which is considered a habitat of special significance by TRPA. This new trail would likely facilitate additional recreation-related uses and disturbances within the riparian zone. Degradation of this resource would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.4.3-5A. Redesign LPF 5 to Avoid the Burke Creek Riparian Zone, or: (1) Design and Site the Bridge Crossing to Minimize Riparian Vegetation Removal; (2) Delineate Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization of Fill; and (3) Minimize and Compensate for Riparian Wildlife Habitat Degradation as a Result of LPF 5. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply. In addition, the project applicant shall develop and install signage that discourages and minimizes effects of trail users on the Burke Creek riparian zone. Signs shall inform residents: (1) that the riparian zone is a sensitive wildlife habitat, (2) to avoid disturbing the riparian vegetation and wildlife, and (3) to keep pets outside the riparian zone (e.g., on leash).</p>	LTS
<p>4.4.3-5B Potential Degradation of Wildlife Habitats of Special Significance as a Result of Residential Development. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-5B for Alternative 1. Residential development adjacent to the riparian area along Burke Creek would reduce the quality of riparian wildlife habitat. Degradation of this resource would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.4.3-5B. Develop and Implement an Enhancement Plan to Compensate for Degradation of Riparian Wildlife Habitat as a Result of Residential Development. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-5B described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.4.3-6A Potential Degradation of Wildlife Movement Corridors as a Result of Construction and Use of LPF 5. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-6A for Alternative 1. The construction and use of LPF 5 under Alternative 3 would remove and disturb a portion of the Burke Creek riparian zone, a potential wildlife movement corridor. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>4.4.3-6A. Redesign LPF 5 to Avoid the Riparian Zone, or: (1) Design and Site the Bridge Crossing to Minimize Riparian Vegetation Removal; (2) Delineate Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization of Fill; and (3) Minimize and Compensate for Corridor Degradation as a Result of LPF 5. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply. In addition, the project applicant shall develop and install signage that discourages and minimizes effects of trail users on the Burke Creek riparian zone. Signs shall inform residents: (1) that the riparian zone is a sensitive wildlife habitat, (2) to avoid disturbing the riparian vegetation and wildlife, and (3) to keep pets outside the riparian zone (e.g., on leash).</p>	LTS
<p>4.4.3-6B Potential Degradation of Wildlife Movement Corridors as a Result of Residential Development. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-6B for Alternative 1. Residential development and removal of conifer forest immediately adjacent to the riparian zone (outside of the SEZ setback) could substantially affect its potential to function as a wildlife corridor. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>4.4.3-6B. Develop and Implement an Enhancement Plan to Compensate for Potential Corridor Degradation as a Result of Residential Development. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-6B described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>4.4.3-7 Potential Degradation of Fish Habitat. This impact is similar to Impact 4.4.1-7 for Alternative 1 Under Alternative 3, residential development and construction activities would occur adjacent to the SEZ, possibly resulting in short- and long-term increases in erosion and surface runoff into Burke Creek, and adversely affect in-stream fish habitat. This potential impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.4.3-8 Loss of Common Vegetation (other than deciduous riparian vegetation), Uncommon Vegetation, and Late Seral/Old Growth Ecosystems. This impact is similar to Impact 4.4.1-8 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in the loss or disturbance of 5.20 acres of common Jeffrey pine forest. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
4.4.3-9 Tree Removal. This impact is similar to Impact 4.4.1-9 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in the loss or disturbance of 5.20 acres of common Jeffrey pine forest. This impact and would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.4.3-10 Introduction and Spread of Weeds. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-10 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 could facilitate the introduction and spread of weeds during and after construction. This would be a significant impact.	S	4.4.3-10. Implement Weed Management Practices During the Project Construction Phase. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-10 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
Alternative 4 – Increased Density Alternative			
4.4.4-1 Removal of Riparian Vegetation, Potential Fill of Jurisdictional Waters of the United States. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-1 for Alternative 1. Removal of riparian vegetation and potential fill of a jurisdictional water of the United States associated with Alternative 4 would be a significant impact.	S	4.4.4-1. Redesign LPF 5 to Avoid the SEZ, or: (1) Design and Site the Bridge Crossing to Minimize Riparian Vegetation Removal; (2) Delineate Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization of Fill; and (3) Compensate for SEZ Impacts as a Result of LPF 5. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
4.4.4-2 Potential Effects on Special-Status Animal Species (Mule Deer, Waterfowl). This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-2 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 could disturb or remove habitat for mule deer and waterfowl. However, the project site does not likely function as an important habitat area for these species; and residential development on the site and construction of LPF 5 are not expected to result in the loss of individuals or affect the viability of these species. Therefore, this potential impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.4.4-3 Potential Effects on Common Raptors. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-3 for Alternative 1. If the project	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
site functions as nesting habitat for common raptors, the loss of occupied habitat or active nests as a result of the proposed project would be a less-than-significant impact.			
4.4.4-4 Removal of Common Migratory Bird Nests. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-4 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 4 could adversely affect common migratory birds through disturbance during the breeding season and removal of active nests. Loss of active nests of common species would be inconsistent with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act but would not substantially reduce the number of any species or cause a species to drop below self-sustaining levels. Loss of active nests of common migratory birds would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.4.4-5A Potential Degradation of Wildlife Habitats of Special Significance as a Result of Construction and Use of LPF 5. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-5A for Alternative 1. The construction and use of LPF 5 as proposed under Alternative 4 would remove and disturb riparian wildlife habitat along Burke Creek, which is considered a habitat of special significance by TRPA. This new trail would likely facilitate additional recreation-related uses and disturbances within the riparian zone. Degradation of this resource would be a significant impact.	S	4.4.4-5A. Redesign LPF 5 to Avoid the Burke Creek Riparian Zone, or: (1) Design and Site the Bridge Crossing to Minimize Riparian Vegetation Removal; (2) Delineate Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization of Fill; and (3) Minimize and Compensate for Riparian Wildlife Habitat Degradation as a Result of LPF 5. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply. In addition, the project applicant shall develop and install signage that discourages and minimizes effects of trail users on the Burke Creek riparian zone. Signs shall inform residents: (1) that the riparian zone is a sensitive wildlife habitat, (2) to avoid disturbing the riparian vegetation and wildlife, and (3) to keep pets outside the riparian zone (e.g., on leash).	LTS
4.4.4-5B Potential Degradation of Wildlife Habitats of Special Significance as a Result of Residential Development. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-5B for Alternative 1. Residential development adjacent to the riparian area along Burke Creek would reduce the quality of riparian wildlife habitat. Degradation of this resource would be a significant impact.	S	4.4.4-5B. Develop and Implement an Enhancement Plan to Compensate for Degradation of Riparian Wildlife Habitat as a Result of Residential Development. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-5B described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.4.4-6A Potential Degradation of Wildlife Movement Corridors as a Result of Construction and Use of LPF 5. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-6A for Alternative 1. The construction and use of LPF 5 under Alternative 4 would remove and disturb a portion of the Burke Creek riparian zone, a potential wildlife movement corridor. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>4.4.4-6A. Redesign LPF 5 to Avoid the Riparian Zone, or: (1) Design and Site the Bridge Crossing to Minimize Riparian Vegetation Removal; (2) Delineate Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization of Fill; and (3) Minimize and Compensate for Corridor Degradation as a Result of LPF 5. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply. In addition, the project applicant shall develop and install signage that discourages and minimizes effects of trail users on the Burke Creek riparian zone. Signs shall inform residents: (1) that the riparian zone is a sensitive wildlife habitat, (2) to avoid disturbing the riparian vegetation and wildlife, and (3) to keep pets outside the riparian zone (e.g., on leash).</p>	LTS
<p>4.4.4-6B Potential Degradation of Wildlife Movement Corridors as a Result of Residential Development. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-6B for Alternative 1. Residential development and removal of conifer forest immediately adjacent to the riparian zone (outside of the SEZ setback) could substantially affect its potential to function as a wildlife corridor. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>4.4.4-6B. Develop and Implement an Enhancement Plan to Compensate for Potential Corridor Degradation as a Result of Residential Development. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-6B described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>4.4.4-7 Potential Degradation of Fish Habitat. This impact is similar to Impact 4.4.1-7 for Alternative 1. Under Alternative 4, residential development and construction activities would occur adjacent to the SEZ, possibly resulting in short- and long-term increases in erosion and surface runoff into Burke Creek, and adversely affect water in-stream fish habitat. This potential impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.4.4-8 Loss of Common Vegetation (other than deciduous riparian vegetation), Uncommon Vegetation, and Late Seral/Old Growth Ecosystems. This impact is similar to Impact 4.4.1-8 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in the loss or disturbance of 5.38 acres of</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
common Jeffrey pine forest. This impact would be less than significant.			
4.4.4-9 Tree Removal. This impact is similar to Impact 4.4.1-9 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in the loss or disturbance of 5.38 acres of common Jeffrey pine forest. This impact and would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.4.4-10 Introduction and Spread of Weeds. This impact is the same as Impact 4.4.1-10 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 4 could facilitate the introduction and spread of weeds during and after construction. This would be a significant impact.	S	4.4.4-10. Implement Weed Management Practices During the Project Construction Phase. See Mitigation Measure 4.4.1-10 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
4.5 – Geology, Soils, Land Capability and Coverage			
Alternative 1 – Proposed Project			
4.5.1-1 Land Coverage. There is adequate allowable land coverage available on the project site for construction of the residential development and common areas; however, there is not adequate allowable land coverage available on the project site to construct the new LPFs proposed under Alternative 1. Approximately 26,889 square feet of coverage would need to be transferred to the site for the proposed LPFs. Because the coverage required for the LPFs would be transferred in accordance with Section 20.3 B(4) and 20.4 of TRPA Code of Ordinances, and because Alternative 1 would not exceed the coverage allowed on site per the TRPA land classification system and coverage requirements, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.5.1-2 Site Topography, Grading, and Soil Erosion. Implementation of Alternative 1 would change the site topography, could expose soils and a SEZ to adverse effects from erosion during construction activities, and would result in	PS	4.5.1-2A. Implement Geotechnical Engineering Recommendations and Comply with all TRPA Codes and Douglas County Regulations. The project applicant shall	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
grading in excess of 5 feet, requiring findings pursuant to Code Section 64.7.B. This impact would be potentially significant.		implement the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Submit to TRPA and Douglas County for review and approval, a final geotechnical engineering report produced by a Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer. The report shall address and make final recommendations on the following: (1) road, pavement, and parking area design; (2) structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable); (3) grading practices; (4) erosion/winterization; (5) special problems discovered on-site (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, evidence of previous mining activity); and (6) slope stability. All feasible recommendations made by the engineer shall be implemented by the project applicant. It is the responsibility of the project applicant to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report. ▶ The applicant shall obtain all necessary TRPA permits and approvals and shall follow all required TRPA codes and procedures with respect to grading and excavation, including but not limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 64 of the TRPA Code, including grading requirements, and the requirement that proper erosion control measures shall be applied where soil stockpiling or borrow areas are to remain for more than one construction season; • The applicant shall comply with the pre-construction requirements of Chapters 61 and 62 of the TRPA Code; • The applicant shall comply with the revegetation requirements of Chapter 20 and 77 of the TRPA Code; and • The applicant shall submit a winterization plan to TRPA that shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 64, 	

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>25 and 81 of the TRPA Code.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The applicant shall obtain all necessary Douglas County permits and approvals (including grading permits) and shall follow all required County laws and procedures with respect to the proposed project, and in accordance the Improvement Plans, which shall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List specific conditions for the project; • Demonstrate that the work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance in effect at the time of submittal; and • Provide erosion control measures where roadside drainage is off the pavement. ▶ All earthwork shall be monitored by a geotechnical engineer tasked with the responsibility of providing oversight during all excavation activities, placement of fill, and disposal of materials removed from and deposited on the project site. <p>4.5.1-2B. Implement Best Management Practices Required as Part of Mitigation Measure 4.7.1-1A. The permanent best management practices (BMP) plan to be developed and implemented as part of Mitigation Measure 4.7.1-1A (see Section 4.7, “Hydrology and Water Quality”) shall specifically include BMPs to prevent sediment transport off-site or into Burke Creek and the associated Sierra Colina SEZ. These provisions may include, but may not be limited to, those described in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” Section 2.4.2 Best Management Practices.</p>	
<p>4.5.1-3 Seismic Hazards. Because the fault that underlies the project site is not considered active, the hazard from surface fault rupture is considered negligible. Several active or potentially active faults are located in the Lake Tahoe area that could subject the site to strong seismic ground shaking. Because the Alternative 1 project components would be designed and constructed in accordance with the current design requirements of the IBC, there would be no substantial</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
increased risk of injury or property damage from strong ground shaking or earthquake-induced liquefaction or landslides caused by unstable soils. Since the project site is approximately 100 feet above lake level, adverse affects from a tsunami or seiche are not likely to occur. This would be a less-than-significant impact.			
4.5.1-4 Geologic Hazards Related to Landslides, Expansive Soils, and Corrosive Soils. The project site is not located on or adjacent to any known non-seismic geologic hazards, such as landslides, mudslides, sinkholes, or lava flows. Project site soils have a low shrink-swell potential, and a negligible corrosion potential. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.5.1-5 Geologic Hazards Related to Seasonal Subsurface Water Flows due to Surface Infiltration. Excavation to a maximum depth of 12 feet bgs is not expected to encounter groundwater, but seasonal subsurface flows due to surface infiltration could adversely affect some of the building foundations at the project site. The effects of these flows would be limited to buildings within areas of cut, particularly where the building foundations are constructed at or near an interface of soil and hard rock. This would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	4.5.1-5. Divert Seasonal Flows Away from Building Foundations. The project applicant shall either install French drains as recommended in the Kleinfelder (2005) Geotechnical Investigation Report, or take such other actions as recommended by the geotechnical engineer for the project (approved by TRPA) that would serve to divert seasonal flows caused by surface infiltration away from building foundations. The specifications for the diversion structure(s) shall be shown on project construction drawings.	LTS
4.5.1-6 Geologic Hazards Related to Construction in Bedrock and Rock Outcrops. Most of the rocks visible at the project site are boulders surrounded by grus (disintegrated/decomposed granite) and are not rock outcrops; however, a few buildings are proposed in areas that contain rock outcrops/bedrock where construction is not practical. This would be a significant impact to a limited number of buildings.	S	4.5.1-6. Relocate Buildings as Recommended in the Site Investigation. Site plan C1.0 (Shinault 2006) shall be revised to reflect recommendations in the Kleinfelder (2006c) <i>Site Investigation</i> . Recommendations include building relocation to remove conflict with rock outcrops and bedrock to the maximum extent practicable.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Alternative 2 – Grand Private Estate			
4.5.2-1 Land Coverage. The calculated allowable land coverage available on the project site under Alternative 2 is 97,885 square feet. The amount of available land coverage is greater than the total required for implementation of Alternative 2. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.5.2-2 Site Topography, Grading, and Soil Erosion. This impact is the same as Impact 4.5.1-2 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 2 would change the site topography, could expose soils and a SEZ to adverse effects from erosion during construction activities, and would result in grading in excess of 5 feet, requiring findings pursuant to Code Section 64.7.B. This would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	4.5.2-2A. Implement Geotechnical Engineering Recommendations and Comply with all TRPA Codes and Douglas County Regulations. See Mitigation Measure 4.5.1-2A described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply. 4.5.2-2B. Implement Best Management Practices Required as Part of Mitigation Measure 4.7.1-1A. See Mitigation Measure 4.5.1-2B described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
4.5.2-3 Seismic Hazards. This impact is the same as Impact 4.5.1-3 for Alternative 1. Because the fault that underlies the project site is not considered active, the hazard from surface fault rupture is considered negligible. Alternative 2 project components would be designed and constructed in accordance with the current design requirements of IBC. Therefore there would be no substantial increased risk of injury or property damage from strong ground shaking or earthquake-induced liquefaction or landslides caused by unstable soils. Due to the location and elevation above lake level of the project site, adverse affects from a tsunami or seiche are not likely to occur. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.5.2-4 Geologic Hazards Related to Related to Landslides, Expansive Soils, and Corrosive Soils. This impact is the same as Impact 4.5.1-4 for Alternative 1. The project site is not located on or adjacent to any known non-seismic geologic hazards, such as landslides, mudslides, sinkholes, or lava flows.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Project site soils have a low shrink-swell potential, and a negligible corrosion potential. This would be a less-than-significant impact.			
4.5.2-5 Geologic Hazards Related to Seasonal Subsurface Water Flows due to Surface Infiltration. This impact is the same as Impact 4.5.1 5 for Alternative 1. Excavation to a maximum depth of 12 feet bgs did not encounter groundwater, but seasonal subsurface flows could adversely affect some of the building foundations at the project site. This would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	4.5.2-5. Divert Seasonal Flows Away from Building Foundations. See Mitigation Measure 4.5.1-5 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
4.5.2-6 Geologic Hazards Related to Construction in Bedrock and Rock Outcrops. This impact is the same as Impact 4.5.1 6 for Alternative 1. Most of the rocks visible at the project site are boulders surrounded by grus (disintegrated/decomposed granite) and are not rock outcrops; however, structures are proposed in areas that contain rock outcrops/bedrock where construction is not practical. This would be a significant impact to a limited number of buildings.	S	4.5.2-6. Relocate Buildings as Recommended in a Supplemental Site Investigation. If an alternative site plan is implemented, prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall conduct a supplemental site investigation specifically related to the location of building proposed for Alternative 2 and shall reposition and/or relocate all buildings in order to remove the conflicts with rock outcrops as identified in the Kleinfelder (2006c) Site Investigation with respect to the identification of where conflicts would occur with rock outcrops or bedrock under site plan C1.0 (Shinault 2006) These changes shall be reflected on revised site plans to be submitted and approved by TRPA.	LTS
Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative			
4.5.3-1 Land Coverage. There is adequate allowable land coverage available on the project site for construction of the residential development and common areas; however, there is not adequate allowable land coverage available on the project site to construct the new LPFs proposed under Alternative 3. Land coverage would need to be transferred to the site for the proposed LPFs. Because the coverage required for the LPFs would be transferred in accordance with Section 20.3 B(4) and	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
20.4 of TRPA Code of Ordinances, and because Alternative 3 would not exceed the coverage allowed on site per the TRPA land classification system and coverage requirements, this would be a less-than-significant impact.			
4.5.3-2 Site Topography, Grading, and Soil Erosion. This impact is the same as Impact 4.5.1-2 for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 would change the site topography, could expose soils and a SEZ to adverse effects from erosion during construction activities, and would result in grading in excess of 5 feet, requiring findings pursuant to Code Section 64.7.B. This would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	4.5.3-2A. Implement Geotechnical Engineering Recommendations and Comply with all TRPA Codes and Douglas County Regulations. See Mitigation Measure 4.5.1-2A described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply. 4.5.3-2B. Implement Best Management Practices Required as Part of Mitigation Measure 4.7.1-2A. See Mitigation Measure 4.5.1-2B described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
4.5.3-3 Seismic Hazards. This impact is the same as Impact 4.5.1-3 for Alternative 1. Because the fault that underlies the project site is not considered active, the hazard from surface fault rupture is considered negligible. Alternative 3 project components would be designed and constructed in accordance with the current design requirements of the IBC, therefore there would be no substantial increased risk of injury or property damage from strong ground shaking or earthquake-induced liquefaction or landslides caused by unstable soils. Due to the location and elevation above lake level of the project site, adverse affects from a tsunami or seiche are not likely to occur. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.5.3-4 Geologic Hazards Related to Related to Landslides, Expansive Soils, and Corrosive Soils. This impact is the same as Impact 4.5.1-4 for Alternative 1. The project site is not located on or adjacent to any known non-seismic geologic hazards, such as landslides, mudslides, sinkholes, or lava flows. Project site soils have a low shrink-swell potential, and a negligible corrosion potential. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.5.3-5 Geologic Hazards Related to Seasonal Subsurface Flow Due to Surface Infiltration. This impact is the same as Impact 4.5.1-5 described above for Alternative 1. Excavation to a maximum depth of 12 feet bgs did not encounter groundwater, but seasonal subsurface flow could adversely affect some of the building foundations at the project site. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>4.5.3-5. Divert Seasonal Flows Away from Building Foundations. See Mitigation Measure 4.5.1-2A described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
<p>4.5.3-6 Geologic Hazards Related to Construction in Bedrock and Rock Outcrops. This impact is the same as Impact 4.5.1 6 for Alternative 1. Most of the rocks visible at the project site are boulders surrounded by grus (disintegrated/decomposed granite) and are not rock outcrops; however, structures are proposed in areas that contain rock outcrops/bedrock where construction is not practical. This would be a significant impact to a limited number of buildings.</p>	S	<p>4.5.3-6. Relocate Buildings as Recommended in a Supplemental Site Investigation. See Mitigation Measure 4.5.2-6 described above for Alternative 2. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
Alternative 4 – Increased Density Alternative			
<p>4.5.4-1 Land Coverage. There is adequate allowable land coverage available on the project site for construction of the residential development and common areas; however, there is not adequate allowable land coverage available on the project site to construct the new LPFs proposed under Alternative 4. Land coverage would need to be transferred to the site for the proposed LPFs. Because the coverage required for the LPFs would be transferred in accordance with Section 20.3 B(4) and 20.4 of TRPA Code of Ordinances, and because Alternative 4 would not exceed the coverage allowed on site per the TRPA land classification system and coverage requirements, this would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.5.4-2 Site Topography, Grading, and Soil Erosion. This impact is the same as Impact 4.5.1-2 for Alternative 1. This impact would be essentially the same as Impact 4.5.1-2 for</p>	PS	<p>4.5.4-2A. Implement Geotechnical Engineering Recommendations and Comply with all TRPA Codes and Douglas County Regulations. See Mitigation Measure 4.5.1-2A</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 4 would change the site topography, could expose soils and a SEZ to adverse effects from erosion during construction activities, and would result in grading in excess of 5 feet, requiring findings pursuant to Code Section 64.7.B. This would be a potentially significant impact.		described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply. 4.5.4-2B. Implement Best Management Practices Required as Part of Mitigation Measure 4.7.1-2A. See Mitigation Measure 4.5.1-2B described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	
4.5.4-3 Seismic Hazards. This impact is the same as Impact 4.5.1-2 for Alternative 1. Because the fault that underlies the project site is not considered active, the hazard from surface fault rupture is considered negligible. Alternative 4 project components would be designed and constructed in accordance with the current design requirements of the IBC, therefore there would be no substantial increased risk of injury or property damage from strong ground shaking or earthquake-induced liquefaction or landslides caused by unstable soils. Due to the location and elevation above lake level of the project site, adverse affects from a tsunami or seiche are not likely to occur. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.5.4-4 Geologic Hazards Related to Related to Landslides, Expansive Soils, and Corrosive Soils. This impact is the same as Impact 4.5.1-4 for Alternative 1. The project site is not located on or adjacent to any known non-seismic geologic hazards, such as landslides, mudslides, sinkholes, or lava flows. Project site soils have a low shrink-swell potential, and a negligible corrosion potential. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.5.4-5 Geologic Hazards Related to Seasonal Subsurface Water Flows due to Surface Infiltration. This impact is the same as Impact 4.5.1-5 for Alternative 1. Excavation to a maximum depth of 12 feet bgs did not encounter groundwater, but seasonal surface flows could adversely affect some of the building foundations at the project site. This would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	4.5.4-5. Divert Seasonal Flows Away from Building Foundations. See Mitigation Measure 4.5.1-2A described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.5.4-6 Geologic Hazards Related to Construction in Bedrock and Rock Outcrops. This impact is the same as Impact 4.5.1 6 described above for Alternative 1. Most of the rocks visible at the project site are boulders surrounded by grus (disintegrated/decomposed granite) and are not rock outcrops; however, structures are proposed in areas that contain rock outcrops/bedrock where construction is not practical. This would be a significant impact to a limited number of buildings.</p>	S	<p>4.5.4-6. Relocate Buildings as Recommended in a Supplemental Site Investigation. See Mitigation Measure 4.5.2-6 described above for Alternative 2. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS
4.6 – Human Health/Risk of Upset			
Alternative 1 – Proposed Project			
<p>4.6.1-1 Expose the Public or Environment to Hazardous Materials. Alternative 1 would involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials at the project site during construction activities. However, use of hazardous materials at the site would be typical of such a construction project and would occur in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. There are no nearby sources of hazardous materials or wastes that would pose a significant health risk for people at the project site. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of the public or environment to significant hazards would be would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.6.1-2 Increased Risk of Health Hazards From Vector-borne Diseases. Alternative 1 includes the construction of two stormwater detention basins which could serve as potential breeding areas for mosquitoes. The project would also increase the number of people living in an area recognized as containing several mosquito breeding sites and therefore would increase the number of people potentially exposed to vector-borne diseases carried by mosquitoes. The Tahoe portion of Douglas County is currently serviced by the Douglas County MAD. Over the past two years MAD employees and employees of the</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Kingsbury General Improvement District have employed TRPA-approved mosquito abatement measures in the project area and would continue to do so. No substantial increase in risk of health hazards from vector-borne diseases would occur. This would be a less-than-significant impact.			
4.6.1-3 Increased Exposure to Wildland Fire Hazard. The project site is located in a moderate fire hazard area and received forest health and fuel reduction treatments during summer 2006 in accordance with an approved TRPA permit. Treatments were performed by NDF and under the supervision of a registered professional forester to remove some of the hazardous fuels and diseased trees outside the SEZ that could contribute to wildfire. The residential units proposed for the site would incorporate fire resistant roofs and defensible space, and adequate fire protection services are available to serve the project. A portion of the existing 14.4 kV power line that crosses the project site would be placed underground. These measures reduce the project's potential to increase exposure of people or structures to wildland fires. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 2 – Grand Private Estate			
4.6.2-1 Expose the Public or Environment to Hazardous Materials. This impact is the same as Impact 4.6.1-1 for Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 2 would involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials at the project site during construction activities. Such use would be typical of a residential construction project, and would occur in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.6.2-2 Increased Risk of Health Hazards From Vector-borne Diseases. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.6.1-2 for Alternative 1. Alternative 2 includes the	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>construction of one stormwater detention basin. Vector control activities of the Douglas County Mosquito Abatement Program and KGID would continue. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>			
<p>4.6.2-3 Increased Exposure to Wildland Fire Hazard. This impact is the same as Impact 4.6.1-3 as described above for Alternative 1. The project site is located in a moderate fire hazard area and received forest health and fuel reduction treatments during summer 2006 per an approved TRPA permit. Treatments were performed by NDF and under the supervision of a registered professional forester to remove some of the hazardous fuels and diseased trees outside the SEZ that could contribute to a wildfire. The structures proposed for the grand private estate would incorporate fire resistant roofs and defensible space and adequate fire protection services are available to serve the project. A portion of the existing 14.4 kV power line that crosses the project site would be placed underground. These measures reduce the project's potential to increase exposure of people or structures to wildland fires. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative</p>			
<p>4.6.3-1 Expose the Public or Environment to Hazardous Materials. This impact is the same as Impact 4.6.1-1 for Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 3 would involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials at the project site during construction activities. Such use would be typical of a residential construction project, and would occur in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.6.3-2 Increased Risk of Health Hazards From Vector-borne Diseases. This impact is the same as Impact 4.6.1-2 for Alternative 1. Alternative 3 includes the construction of two stormwater detention basins. Vector control activities of the Douglas County Mosquito Abatement Program and KGID would continue. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.6.3-3 Increased Exposure to Wildland Fire Hazard. This impact is the same as Impact 4.6.1-3 as described above for Alternative 1. The project site is located in a moderate fire hazard area and received forest health and fuels reduction treatments during the summer of 2006 per an approved TRPA permit. Treatments were performed by NDF and under the supervision of a registered professional forester to remove some of the hazardous fuels and diseased trees outside the SEZ that could contribute to a wildfire. The residential units proposed for the site would incorporate fire resistant roofs and defensible space and adequate fire protection services are available to serve the project. A portion of the existing 14.4 kV power line that crosses the project site would be placed underground. These measures reduce the project's potential to increase exposure of people or structures to wildland fires. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 4 – Increased Density Alternative			
<p>4.6.4-1 Expose the Public or Environment to Hazardous Materials. This impact is the same as Impact 4.6.1-1 for Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 4 would involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials at the project site during construction activities. Such use would be typical of a residential construction project, and would occur in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.6.4-2 Increased Risk of Health Hazards From Vector-borne Diseases. This impact is the same as Impact 4.6.1-2 for Alternative 1. Alternative 4 includes the construction of two stormwater detention basins. Vector control activities of the Douglas County Mosquito Abatement Program and KGID would continue. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.6.4-3 Increased Exposure to Wildland Fire Hazard. This impact is the same as Impact 4.6.1-3 for Alternative 1. The project site is located in a moderate fire hazard area and received forest health and fuel reduction treatments during summer 2006 per an approved TRPA permit. Treatments were performed by NDF and under the supervision of a registered professional forester's supervision to remove some of the hazardous fuels and diseased trees outside the SEZ that could contribute to a wildfire. The residential units proposed for the site would incorporate fire resistant roofs and defensible space and adequate fire protection services are available to serve the project. A portion of the existing 14.4 kV power line that crosses the project site would be placed underground. These measures reduce the project's potential to increase exposure of people or structures to wildland fires. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.7 – Hydrology and Water Quality			
Alternative 1 – Proposed Project			
<p>4.7.1-1 Potential Short-Term Accelerated Soil Erosion and Sedimentation and/or Release of Pollutants to Nearby Water Bodies during Construction. Slope and soil disturbance associated with construction of Alternative 1 could cause accelerated soil erosion and sedimentation or the release of other pollutants to adjacent waterways and wetlands. This impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>4.7.1-1. Prepare and Implement a Temporary BMP Plan/Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. The project applicant shall prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that describes the site, erosion and sediment controls, means of waste disposal, implementation of approved local plans, control of post-construction sediment and erosion control measures and maintenance responsibilities, and non-stormwater management controls. This SWPPP shall include measures such</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>as additional temporary BMPs and early installation of permanent BMPs and stormwater treatment facilities, prior to adding coverage for building construction in order to reduce the possibility of impacts noted above. The SWPPP shall be submitted to TRPA for review. BMPs identified in the SWPPP shall be implemented in all subsequent site development activities. Water quality controls shall be consistent with TRPA and NDEP requirements, and shall ensure that runoff quality meets TRPA water quality requirements under the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and maintains beneficial uses of Lake Tahoe, as defined by the Nevada Administrative Code NAC 445A.191. Stormwater quality sampling and reporting requirements contained in the TRPA Code of Ordinances shall be included in the temporary BMP plan, and any associated with the SWPPP shall be the responsibility of the project applicant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The applicant shall obtain all necessary TRPA permits and approvals and shall follow all required TRPA codes and procedures with respect to temporary BMPs and the maintenance thereof, grading and excavation for the proposed project and all construction related water quality issues. ▶ The applicant shall obtain all necessary Douglas County permits and approvals and shall follow all required County laws and procedures with respect to temporary BMPs and the maintenance thereof, grading and excavation for the proposed project and all construction related water quality issues. ▶ Construction of the project shall comply with all applicable TRPA and Douglas County codes with respect to temporary BMPs and the maintenance thereof, specifically including TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 25 (Best Management Practices), Chapter 62 (Grading and Construction Schedules), Chapter 64 (Grading Standards), and Chapter 81 (Water Quality Control). 	

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Implementation of the following temporary construction BMPs may be required at various times throughout the overall development of the plan. At the discretion of TRPA and Douglas County, these measures may be modified, refined, or replaced with equally effective measures that achieve the required performance standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Temporary erosion control facilities shall be installed and maintained to prevent the transport of earthen materials and other waste off the project site. 2. Appropriate TRPA approved source control BMP's shall be used as necessary to prevent discharge of earthen materials from the site during periods of precipitation or runoff. These facilities shall be inspected regularly to ensure that they continue to function properly. 3. Tree protection fencing shall be installed around trees that are to remain in place throughout construction of the project. 4. A minimum of 48-hours notice shall be provided to the appropriate agencies so that a pre-grading inspection could be conducted at the site to ensure proper installation of the temporary erosion control measures. 5. The area and extent of all excavation shall be minimized to avoid unnecessary soil disturbance. 6. After October 15 of each year, construction vehicle movement on-site must be only in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 64.2.D of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. 7. All construction sites shall be winterized by October 15 to reduce the water quality impacts associated with winter weather in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 64.2.D of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. 8. All loose piles of soil, silt, clay, sand, debris, or other earthen material shall be protected in a reasonable manner to prevent 	

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>the discharge of these materials caused by runoff, in accordance with the provisions of Chapters 25, 64 and 65 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances except to the extent permitted in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 64.5 (Disposal of Materials) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.</p> <p>9. Although groundwater is not expected to be encountered during construction (TRPA 1998b), if groundwater is encountered and the excavated area requires dewatering to complete the work, TRPA shall be notified immediately. The SWPPP shall contain a contingency dewatering plan. The excavation and foundation design shall be immediately redesigned so as not to intercept groundwater, except as permitted under TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 64.7.A (2). The revised depth shall be subject to approval by the TRPA Ground Water Technical Advisory Committee (TRPA 1998b).</p> <p>10. Dust shall be controlled to prevent transport of such materials off the project site, into any surface water, or into any drainage course in accordance with the provisions of the requirements of Chapter 64.4 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.</p> <p>11. The discharger shall immediately clean up and transport to a legal disposal site any spilled petroleum products or petroleum-contaminated soils, to the maximum extent possible. The SWPPP shall contain a spill contingency response plan.</p> <p>12. At or before completion of the construction project or at the end of the grading season, all surplus or waste earthen materials shall be removed from the project site and disposed of only at a legal, authorized point of disposal or shall be stabilized on-site, in accordance with previously approved erosion control plans.</p> <p>13. Drainage swales disturbed by construction activities shall be stabilized by appropriate soil stabilization measures to</p>	

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		prevent erosion. 14. All areas of temporary coverage created by construction activities and not intended to become permanent land coverage shall be revegetated in accordance with the requirements of Chapters 7.6, 11.2.C, and 25 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances with native vegetation to create a pervious surface.	
4.7.1-2 Impervious Surface Area and Runoff. Development of Alternative 1 would increase impervious surface coverage and increase runoff volume, as compared to existing conditions. However, implementation of the features detailed in the proposed SWMA (subject to TRPA review and approval), would provide sufficient retention capacity to reduce runoff volumes below existing levels. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.7.1-3 Urban Contaminants in Surface Runoff. The conversion of undeveloped land to urban land uses would ordinarily alter the types, quantities, and timing of contaminant discharges in stormwater runoff. Overall, the potential for Alternative 1 to cause or contribute to long-term discharges of urban contaminants (e.g., oil and grease, fuel, trash) into the stormwater drainage system, Burke Creek, and ultimately Lake Tahoe would increase compared to existing conditions. However, the proposed SWMA (subject to TRPA review and approval) would include BMPs designed to meet or exceed TRPA requirements pertaining to stormwater treatment. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 2 – Grand Private Estate			
4.7.2-1 Potential Short-Term Accelerated Soil Erosion and Sedimentation and/or Release of Pollutants to Nearby Water Bodies during Construction. This impact is essentially	PS	4.7.2-1. Prepare and Implement a Temporary BMP Plan/Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. See Mitigation Measure 4.7.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. The same	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
the same as Impact 4.7.1-1 for Alternative 1. Slope and soil disturbance associated with the Alternative 2 construction would be similar to Alternative 1, although slightly reduced because of the smaller construction footprint. This impact is considered potentially significant.		mitigation measure would apply.	
4.7.2-2 Impervious Surface Area and Runoff. Alternative 2 would result in additional impervious surface coverage to the project site, which would increase runoff volume and decrease runoff quality as compared to existing conditions. The smaller footprint associated with Alternative 2 could result in lower volumes of runoff than Alternative 1, but because Alternative 2 would not include the SWMA, it would not include the retention and treatment features that exceed TRPA requirements. This impact is potentially significant.	PS	4.7.2-2. Develop and Implement a Drainage Plan. The project applicant shall prepare and implement a technical drainage study as part of the development plans for Alternative 2. The drainage plan shall 1) demonstrate adequate capacity to contain runoff volume generated by the 20-year 1-hour design storm; 2) demonstrate that peak flows would not be increased over the pre-development condition; 3) be subject to review and approval by TRPA.	LTS
4.7.2-3 Urban Contaminants in Surface Runoff. Alternative 2 would result in the conversion of undeveloped land to urban land uses and would alter the types, quantities, and timing of contaminant discharges in stormwater runoff. The smaller footprint associated with Alternative 2 could result in lower quantities of pollutants than Alternative 1, but because Alternative 2 would not include the SWMA, it would not include the runoff treatment features that exceed TRPA requirements. This impact is considered potentially significant.	PS	4.7.2-3. Develop and Implement a Permanent BMP Plan. The project applicant shall prepare and implement a permanent BMP plan as part of the development plans for Alternative 2. The BMP plan shall: 1) demonstrate that erosion would be minimized; 2) include permanent BMPs adequate to meet applicable water quality standards; 3) incorporate adequate maintenance activities; and 4) be subject to review and approval by TRPA.	LTS
Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative			
4.7.3-1 Potential Short-Term Accelerated Soil Erosion and Sedimentation and/or Release of Pollutants to Nearby Water Bodies During Construction. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.7.1-1 for Alternative 1, although slightly reduced due to the smaller development footprint associated with Alternative 3. This impact is considered potentially significant.	PS	4.7.3-1. Prepare and Implement a Temporary BMP Plan/Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. See Mitigation Measure 4.7.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.7.3-2 Impervious Surface Area and Runoff. This impact is the essentially same as Impact 4.7.1-2 for Alternative 1. Development of Alternative 3 would increase impervious surface coverage and increase runoff volume, as compared to existing conditions. However, implementation of a SWMA under Alternative 3 containing features similar to those detailed in the SWMA proposed for Alternative 1 (subject to TRPA review and approval) or permanent BMPS similar to those in the SWMA proposed for Alternative 1 would provide sufficient retention capacity to reduce runoff volumes below existing levels. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.7.3-3 Urban Contaminants in Surface Runoff. This impact is the same as Impact 4.7.1-3 for Alternative 1. The conversion of undeveloped land to urban land uses would ordinarily cause or contribute to long-term discharges of urban contaminants (e.g., oil and grease, fuel, trash) into the stormwater drainage system, Burke Creek, and ultimately Lake Tahoe. However, implementation of a SWMA under Alternative 3 containing features similar to those detailed in the SWMA proposed for Alternative 1 (subject to TRPA approval) or permanent BMPS similar to those in the SWMA proposed for Alternative 1 would include BMPs designed to meet or exceed TRPA requirements pertaining to stormwater treatment. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 4 – Increased Density Alternative			
<p>4.7.4-1 Potential Short-Term Accelerated Soil Erosion and Sedimentation and/or Release of Pollutants to Nearby Water Bodies During Construction. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.7.1-1 for Alternative 1, although slightly reduced due to the smaller development footprint associated with Alternative 4. This impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>4.7.4-1. Prepare and Implement a Temporary BMP Plan/Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. See Mitigation Measure 4.7.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.7.4-2 Impervious Surface Area and Runoff. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.7.1-2 for Alternative 1. Development of Alternative 4 would increase impervious surface coverage and increase runoff volume, as compared to existing conditions. However, implementation of a SWMA under Alternative 4 containing features similar to those detailed in the SWMA proposed for Alternative 1 (subject to TRPA review and approval) or permanent BMPS similar to those in the SWMA proposed for Alternative 1 would provide sufficient retention capacity to reduce runoff volumes below existing levels. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.7.4-3 Urban Contaminants in Surface Runoff. This impact is the same as Impact 4.7.1-3 for Alternative 1. The conversion of undeveloped land to urban land uses would ordinarily cause or contribute to long-term discharges of urban contaminants (e.g., oil and grease, fuel, trash) into the stormwater drainage system, Burke Creek, and ultimately Lake Tahoe. However, implementation of a SWMA under Alternative 4 containing features similar to those detailed in the SWMA proposed for Alternative 1 (subject to TRPA approval) or permanent BMPS similar to those in the SWMA proposed for Alternative 1 would include BMPs designed to meet or exceed TRPA requirements pertaining to stormwater treatment. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.8 – Land Use			
Alternative 1 – Proposed Project			
<p>4.8.1-1 Consistency with Regional Plan Land Use Goals and Policies. Alternative 1 would result in 50 single- and multi-family residential units (including 9 moderate-income, deed-restricted units included in the project by the applicant) certified by LEED as green, sustainable homes, four new LPFs consisting of three new public use pedestrian/bicycle pathways</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>(LPFs 2, 4 and 5) and one new public use shared roadway (LPF 3), a 10.7 acre permanent open space land conveyance including 2.4 acres of SEZ (via a subdivision) to a public entity, on the parcel through the land conveyance, preservation of cultural resources SCT-1 and SCT-2 located on the parcel, cooperation with TRPA toward its implementation of EIP #161, and cooperation with Douglas County toward its implementation of EIP #679 Phase II. Following project approval, the project site would be subdivided in accordance with Chapter 43.4 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances into 50 single family homes and a common area, allowing for the development and sale of 50 individual residential units, which would then be considered single-family units. As described in Table 4.8-2, Alternative 1 would be consistent with the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan with implementation of mitigation measures identified in resource sections of this EIS. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>			
<p>4.8.1-2 Potential for Division of an Existing Community (or Land Use Compatibility). Alternative 1 would not divide an established community because the project’s proposed residential land uses would be similar to existing land uses in the surrounding area and therefore Alternative 1 would not pose compatibility issues with nearby commercial, retail, and other businesses. Furthermore, Alternative 1 would include features that would serve to connect the project site with the surrounding community. For these reasons, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Alternative 2 – Grand Private Estate</p>			
<p>4.8.2-1 Consistency with Regional Plan Land Use Goals and Policies. Alternative 2 would result in a private single-family estate home and other associated structures including: a guest house, entertainment center, fitness center, caretaker</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>home, maintenance equipment building and sports courts, and a perimeter rock fence with entry gate. Alternative 2 would be consistent with the Goals and Polices of the Regional Plan with implementation of mitigation measures identified in resource sections of this EIS. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>			
<p>4.8.2-2 Potential for Division of an Existing Community (or Land Use Compatibility). Alternative 2 would not divide an established community because authorized public access conditions to the site would remain the same as under existing conditions. Therefore, there would be no impact.</p>	NI	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative</p>			
<p>4.8.3-1 Consistency with Regional Plan Land Use Goals and Policies. This impact would be essentially the same as Impact 4.5.1-1 for Alternative 1. Alternative 3 would result in 37 single- and multi-family residential units, four new LPFs consisting of three new public use pedestrian/bicycle pathways (LPFs 2, 4 and 5) and one new public use shared roadway (LPF 3), a voluntary 12.5 acre permanent open space land conveyance (via a subdivision) to a public entity, preservation of cultural resources SCT-1 and SCT-2 located on the parcel, the perpetual protection of 2.4 acres of SEZ on the parcel through the land conveyance, cooperation with TRPA toward its implementation of EIP #161 and cooperation with Douglas County toward its implementation of EIP #679 Phase II. Following project approval, the project site would be subdivided in accordance with Chapter 43.4 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances into 37 single family homes and a common area, allowing for the development and sale of 37 individual residential units, which would then be considered single-family units. As described in Table 4.8-2, Alternative 3 would be consistent with the Goals and Polices of the Regional Plan with implementation of mitigation measures identified in resource</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
sections of this EIS. This impact is considered less than significant.			
<p>4.8.3-2 Potential for Division of an Existing Community (or Land Use Compatibility). This impact would be essentially the same as Impact 4.8.1-2 for Alternative 1. Alternative 3 would not divide an established community because the project’s proposed residential land uses would be similar to existing land uses in the surrounding area and therefore Alternative 3 would not pose compatibility issues with nearby commercial, retail, and other businesses. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would include features that would serve to connect the project site with the surrounding community. For these reasons, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 4 – Increased Density Alternative			
<p>4.8.4-1 Consistency with Regional Plan Land Use Goals and Policies. This impact would be essentially the same as Impact 4.5.1-1 for Alternative 1. Alternative 4 would result in 54 single- and multi-family residential units and 12 moderate-income deed restricted homes certified by LEED as green, sustainable homes, four new LPFs consisting of three new public use pedestrian/bicycle pathways (LPFs 2, 4 and 5) and one new public use shared roadway (LPF 3), a 10.7 acre permanent open space land conveyance (via a subdivision) to a public entity, preservation of cultural resources SCT-1 and SCT-2 located on the parcel, the perpetual protection of 2.4 acres of SEZ on the parcel through the land conveyance, cooperation with TRPA toward its implementation of EIP #161 and cooperation with Douglas County toward its implementation of EIP #679 Phase II. Following project approval, the project site would be subdivided in accordance with Chapter 43.4 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances into 54</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
single family homes and a common area, allowing for the development and sale of 54 individual residential units, which would then be considered single-family units. As described in Table 4.8-2, Alternative 3 would be consistent with the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan with implementation of mitigation measures identified in resource sections of this EIS. This impact is considered less than significant.			
4.8.4-2 Potential for Division of an Existing Community (or Land Use Compatibility). This impact would be essentially the same as Impact 4.8.1-2 for Alternative 1. Alternative 4 would not divide an established community because the project’s proposed residential land uses would be similar to existing land uses in the surrounding area and therefore Alternative 4 would not pose compatibility issues with nearby commercial, retail, and other businesses. Furthermore, Alternative 4 would include features that would serve to connect the project site with the surrounding community. For these reasons, this impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.9 – Noise			
Alternative 1 – Proposed Project			
4.9.1-1 Short-Term Project-Generated Construction Noise Levels. Noise-generating construction activities related to implementation of Alternative 1 would be limited to the hours during which noise levels are exempt from the provisions of the applicable standards, therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.9.1-2 Long-Term Project-Generated Stationary- and Area-Source Noise. Long-term project-generated stationary and area noise levels would not exceed applicable noise standards. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.9.1-3 Long-term Project-Generated Traffic Noise Levels. Project-related traffic would not result in a perceptible increase in ambient noise levels on nearby local roadways or highways. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.9.1-4 Land Use Compatibility of Proposed Sensitive Receptors with On-site Noise Levels. Noise from surrounding land uses would not cause applicable standards to be exceeded at proposed sensitive receptors. However, on-site noise levels would exceed applicable land use compatibility standards from future roadway traffic noise levels at one proposed noise-sensitive receptor. This would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.9.1-4 Ensure Compatibility with On-Site Noise Levels at Proposed Sensitive Receptors. The applicant shall include one of the following measures in the design of the proposed project to reduce exposure of proposed sensitive receptors (Building 14) to on-site noise levels in excess of applicable standards.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Redesign Building 14 such that the primary outdoor activity areas of the two homes contained in Building 14 are relocated to the front of the home (the east side of the structure, opposite from U.S. 50) rather than at the back (west side) of the home, so that the structure itself provides shielding adequate to reduce the CNEL at that location to a maximum of 50 dBA; or 2. Screen the rear yard space for each of the two homes in Building 14. A fence/barrier tall enough to intercept line of sight between the outdoor space and U.S. 50 would yield a 5 dBA traffic noise reduction, thereby resulting in compliance with the 50 CNEL dBA standard. This fence/barrier would be designed and constructed to conform to the overall architectural design of the proposed project and other applicable regulatory standards; or 3. Relocate Building 14 farther east (i.e., farther away from U.S. 50) where additional natural and human-made shielding and sound level reduction as the structure moves away from the noise generated by U.S. 50 would achieve compliance with the 50 CNEL dBA standard. 	LTS
<p>4.9.1-5 Vibration Levels. Short-term project-generated construction source vibration levels would not exceed the FTA maximum acceptable vibration standard of 80 vibration</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
decibels (VdB) with respect to human response for residential uses (i.e., annoyance) at existing nearby vibration-sensitive land uses. This would be a less-than-significant impact.			
Alternative 2 – Grand Private Estate			
4.9.2-1 Short-Term Project-Generated Construction Noise Levels. This impact would be similar to Impact 4.9.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 2 would require the same types of construction equipment and activities (including blasting), a 2-year construction schedule, and would occur on the same site. Because noise-generating construction activities related to implementation of Alternative 2 would be limited to the hours during which noise levels are exempt from the provisions of the applicable standards, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.9.2-2 Long-Term Project-Generated Stationary- and Area-Source Noise. Noise generated by stationary- and area-sources for Alternative 2 would be substantially lower than described in Impact 4.9.1-2 for Alternative 1. Stationary- and area-source noise associated with Alternative 2 would be minor and the impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.9.2-3 Long-term Project-Generated Off-Site Traffic Noise Levels. Traffic generated under Alternative 2 would not result in a perceptible increase in ambient noise levels on nearby roadways. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.9.2-4 Land Use Compatibility of Proposed Sensitive Receptors with On-site Noise Levels. Noise from surrounding land uses would not cause any applicable standards to be exceeded at proposed sensitive receptors and on-site noise levels would not exceed applicable land use compatibility standards from future roadway traffic noise levels on U.S. 50 at proposed noise-sensitive receptors. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.9.2-5 Vibration Levels. This impact would be similar to that described above for in Impact 4.9.1-5 for Alternative 1. Alternative 2 would be constructed on the same site as Alternative 1 and would require similar types of heavy-duty construction equipment and blasting. Short-term project-generated construction source vibration levels would not exceed the FTA maximum acceptable vibration standard of 80 vibration decibels (VdB) with respect to human response for residential uses (i.e., annoyance) at existing nearby vibration-sensitive land uses. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative			
<p>4.9.3-1 Short-Term Project-Generated Construction Noise Levels. This impact would be similar to Impact 4.9.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 would require would require the same types of construction equipment and activities (including possible blasting activities), approximately the same construction period, and would occur on the same site as Alternative 1. Because noise-generating construction activities related to implementation of Alternative 3 would be limited to the hours during which noise levels are exempt from the provisions of the applicable standards, this would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.9.3-2 Long-Term Project-Generated Stationary- and Area-Source Noise. This impact would be similar to Impact 4.9.1-2 described above for Alternative 1 Long-term project-generated stationary and area noise levels would not exceed applicable noise standards. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.9.3-3 Long-term Project-Generated Off-Site Traffic Noise Levels. Traffic added to the local roadway network under Alternative 3 would be less than that generated under Alternative 1. Therefore, project-related traffic would not result in a perceptible increase in ambient noise levels on nearby local roadways or highways. This impact would be less-than-significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.9.3-4 Land Use Compatibility with Ambient Noise Levels. Noise from surrounding land uses would not cause any applicable standards to be exceeded at proposed sensitive receptors and, on-site noise levels would not exceed applicable land use compatibility standards from future roadway traffic noise levels at proposed noise-sensitive receptors. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.9.3-5 Vibration Levels. This impact would be similar to that described above for in Impact 4.9.1-5 for Alternative 1. Alternative 3 would be constructed on the same site as Alternative 1 and would require similar types of heavy-duty construction equipment and blasting. Short-term project-generated construction source vibration levels would not exceed the FTA maximum acceptable vibration standard of 80 vibration decibels (VdB) with respect to human response for residential uses (i.e., annoyance) at existing nearby vibration-sensitive land uses. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 4 – Increased Density Alternative			
<p>4.9.4-1 Short-Term Project-Generated Construction Noise Levels. This impact would be similar to Impact 4.9.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 4 would require would require the same types of construction equipment and activities (including possible blasting activities), approximately the same construction</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>period, and would occur on the same site as Alternative 1. Because noise-generating construction activities related to implementation of Alternative 4 would be limited to the hours during which noise levels are exempt from the provisions of the applicable standards, this would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>			
<p>4.9.4-2 Long-Term Project-Generated Stationary- and Area-Source Noise. This impact would be similar to Impact 4.9.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. Long-term project-generated stationary and area noise levels would not exceed applicable noise standards. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.9.4-3 Long-term Project-Generated Off-Site Traffic Noise Levels. Traffic added to the local roadway network under Alternative 4 would be less than that presented under Alternative 1. Therefore, project-related traffic would not result in a perceptible increase in ambient noise levels on nearby local roadways or highways. This would be a less-than-significant impact. .</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.9.4-4 Land Use Compatibility with Ambient Noise Levels. Noise from surrounding land uses would not cause any applicable standards to be exceeded at proposed sensitive receptors and, on-site noise levels would not exceed applicable land use compatibility standards from future roadway traffic noise levels at proposed noise-sensitive receptors. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.9.4-5 Vibration Levels. This impact would be similar to that described above for in Impact 4.9.1-5 for Alternative 1. Alternative 4 would require similar types of heavy-duty construction equipment and blasting. Short-term project-generated construction source vibration levels would not</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
exceed the FTA maximum acceptable vibration standard of 80 vibration decibels (VdB) with respect to human response for residential uses (i.e., annoyance) at existing nearby vibration-sensitive land uses. This would be a less-than-significant impact.			
4.10 – Population and Housing			
Alternative 1 – Proposed Project			
4.10.1-1 Change in Availability of Moderate-Income Housing. Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in the construction of 50 new residential units including nine moderate-income, deed-restricted single-family homes in the Stateline area. The addition of moderate-income housing to the area would be considered beneficial.	B	No mitigation is required.	B
4.10.1-2 Alter the Location, Distribution, Density, or Growth Rate of the Human Population Planned for the Region. Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in 50 new residential units on the project site, which is a permissible land use under PAS 073. This impact would be less-than-significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 2 – Grand Private Estate			
4.10.2-1 Change in Availability of Moderate-income Housing. Alternative 2 would result in the construction of a grand private estate on a currently undeveloped site. No moderate-income housing would be created or lost as a result of Alternative 2. Therefore there would be no impact associated with implementation of Alternative 2.	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.10.2-2 Alter the Location, Distribution, Density, or Growth Rate of the Human Population Planned for the Region. Alternative 2 would result in the construction of one grand private estate, assumed to house one family. This impact would be less-than-significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative			
<p>4.10.3-1 Change in Availability of Moderate-income Housing. Alternative 3 would result in the construction of 37 new residential units on a currently undeveloped site. No moderate-income housing would be created or lost as a result of Alternative 3. Implementation of Alternative 3 would have no impact on moderate-income housing.</p>	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI
<p>4.10.3-2 Alter the Location, Distribution, Density, or Growth Rate of the Human Population Planned for the Region. This impact would be similar to Impact 4.10.1- 2 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in the construction of 37 new residential units on the project site, which is a permissible and planned for land use under the Regional Plan via PAS 073. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 4 – Increased Density Alternative			
<p>4.10.4-1 Change in Availability of Moderate-Income Housing. This impact would be similar to Impact 4.10.1-1 for the proposed project. Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in the construction of 54 new residential units including 12 moderate-income, deed-restricted single-family homes in the Stateline area. The addition of moderate-income housing to the area would be considered beneficial.</p>	B	No mitigation is required.	B

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.10.4-2 Alter the Location, Distribution, Density, or Growth Rate of the Human Population Planned for the Region. This impact would be similar to Impact 4.10.1-2 for the proposed project. Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in 54 new residential units on the project site, which is a permissible and planned for land use under the Regional Plan via PAS 073. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11 – Public Services and Utilities			
Alternative 1 – Proposed Project			
<p>4.11.1-1 Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, Distribution, and Storage. Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in increased water demand. The KGID has confirmed that the existing water supply, treatment facilities, distribution system, and storage facilities are adequate to serve the project. The project applicant would be required to pay the District a water connection fee at the time of issuance of the permit for a water connection. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.11.1-2 Increased Demand for Wastewater Service. Buildout of Alternative 1 would generate an estimated 19,400 gallons per day of wastewater and therefore increase the demand for wastewater service. DCSID has indicated that capacity of sewer lines and capacity of the wastewater treatment facility would be adequate to serve Alternative 1. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.11.1-3 Increased Demand for Electrical Services. Implementation of Alternative 1 would not require installation or extension of service lines to the project site. The existing 120kV and 14.4 kV power lines running above the site provide adequate power to service the development proposed under Alternative 1. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.11.1-4 Increased Demand for Natural Gas Services. Implementation of Alternative 1 would require the provision of natural gas services to the project site. SGC has confirmed that there are adequate supplies and infrastructure to provide natural gas services to the site. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.11.1-5 Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services. Alternative 1 would generate approximately 495 pounds of solid waste per day, necessitating collection and disposal. STR has confirmed it would be able to provide service to the project without adversely affecting STR's existing services or facilities. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.11.1-6 Increased Demand for Telecommunications Service. Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in an increased demand for telecommunications services. Although limited on- and off-site improvements would be necessary to establish service, Verizon has indicated that it would be able to serve the development. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.11.1-7 Increased Demand for Law Enforcement Services. Assuming the Stateline average of 2.2 persons to each unit, implementation of Alternative 1 would result in approximately 110 new residents to the project area. The DCSD has expressed that this would create a minimal increase in demand for services. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.11.1-8 Emergency Access During Construction. Construction activities and construction-related traffic could temporarily interfere with the ability of DCSD and TDFPD to provide emergency services to the project area, particularly to those parcels adjacent to the project site. This impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>4.11.1-8. Ensure Emergency Access During Construction. The project applicant shall prepare and submit an emergency access plan to TRPA, Douglas County, and the TDFPD for review and approval before the pre-construction inspection required under the TRPA Code of Ordinances and permits are issued. The plan shall include detailed descriptions of how emergency access would be maintained throughout project construction.</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.11.1-9 Increased Demand for Fire Protection. Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for fire protection. TDFPD staffing and equipment are adequate to provide service to the proposed project. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.11.1-10 Increased Demand for Emergency Medical Services. Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for emergency medical services. Medical facilities are available in close proximity to the project site, and TDFPD has adequate staffing and facilities to provide emergency life services to the project site. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.11.1-11 Increased Student Enrollment in Stateline Area Schools. Implementation of Alternative 1 would add new students to schools in the project area. The school district has stated that student enrollment for the region has been in a steady decline over the past 10 years. As a result the school district has capacity to accommodate new students generated by the implementation of Alternative 1. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 2 – Grand Private Estate			
<p>4.11.2-1 Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, Distribution, and Storage. This impact is similar to Impact 4.11.1-1 described above for Alternative 1 except that Alternative 2 would require substantially less water because fewer people would reside on the project site. Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in an increase in water demand but would be easily accommodated with existing supplies and infrastructure. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.11.2-2 Increased Demand for Wastewater Service. This impact is similar to Impact 4.11.1-2 described above for Alternative 1 except that Alternative 2 would generate</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
substantially less wastewater because fewer people would reside on the project site. Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in an increase in demand for wastewater service but would be easily accommodated with existing conveyance and treatment capacity. This impact would be less than significant.			
4.11.2-3 Increased Demand for Electrical Services. This impact is similar to Impact 4.11.1-3 described above for Alternative 1 except that Alternative 2 would have lower electrical demand because fewer people would reside on the project site. Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in an increase in demand for electrical service but would be easily accommodated with existing supplies and infrastructure. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.2-4 Increased Demand for Natural Gas Services. This impact is similar to Impact 4.11.1-4 described above for Alternative 1 except that Alternative 2 would have a lower demand for natural gas service because fewer people would reside on the project site. Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in an increase in demand for natural gas service but would be easily accommodated with existing supplies and infrastructure. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.2-5 Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services. This impact is similar to Impact 4.11.1-5 described above for Alternative 1, except that Alternative 2 would generate substantially less solid waste because fewer people would reside on the project site. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.2-6 Increased Demand for Telecommunications Service. This impact is similar to Impact 4.11.1-6 described above for Alternative 1, except that Alternative 2 would require less new infrastructure. Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in an increase in demand for telecommunications	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
services but would be easily accommodated by the service provider. This impact would be less than significant.			
4.11.2-7 Increased Demand for Law Enforcement Services. This impact is similar to Impact 4.11.1-7 described above for Alternative 1, except that implementation of Alternative 2 would result in a much smaller increase in the local population. Demand would be easily accommodated by existing law enforcement services This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.2-8 Emergency Access During Construction. This impact is similar to Impact 4.11.1-8 described above for Alternative 1. Construction activities and construction-related traffic could temporarily interfere with the ability of DCSD and TDFPD to provide emergency services to the project area, particularly to those parcels adjacent to the project site. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	4.11.2-8. Ensure Emergency Access During Construction. See Mitigation Measure 4.11.1-8 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
4.11.2-9 Increased Demand for Fire Protection. This impact is similar to Impact 4.11.1-9 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for fire protection. This demand would be substantially less under Alternative 2 because fewer people would reside on the project site. Demand would be easily accommodated by existing fire protection services. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.2-10 Increased Demand for Emergency Medical Services. This impact is similar to Impact 4.11.1-10 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for emergency medical service. This demand would be substantially less under Alternative 2 because fewer people would reside on the project. Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
emergency medical services but would be easily accommodated by existing service providers. This impact would be less than significant.			
4.11.2-11 Increased Student Enrollment in Stateline Area Schools. Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in the construction of a single-family grand estate, and is not anticipated to substantially increase student enrollment at schools within the project area. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative			
4.11.3-1 Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, Distribution, and Storage. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in increased water demand but would be accommodated with existing supplies and infrastructure. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.3-2 Increased Demand for Wastewater Service. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-2 described above for Alternative 1 except that Alternative 3 would generate less wastewater because fewer people would reside on the project site. Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in an increase in demand for wastewater service but would be accommodated with existing conveyance and treatment capacity. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
4.11.3-3 Increased Demand for Electrical Services. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-3 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in an increase in demand for electrical service but would be accommodated with existing supplies and infrastructure. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.3-4 Increased Demand for Natural Gas Services. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-4 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in an increase in demand for natural gas service but would be accommodated with existing supplies and infrastructure. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.3-5 Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-5 described above for Alternative 1 except that Alternative 3 would generate less solid waste because fewer people would reside on the project site. Adequate collection and disposal capacity exists to accommodate Alternative 3. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.3-6 Increased Demand for Telecommunications Service. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-6 described above for Alternative 1, except that Alternative 3 would require less new infrastructure. Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in an increase in demand for telecommunications services but would be accommodated by the service provider. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.3-7 Increased Demand for Law Enforcement Services. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-7 described above for Alternative 1, except that under Alternative 3 fewer people would reside on the project site and therefore this Alternative would contribute less to an increase in the local	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
population. Demand would be accommodated by existing law enforcement services. This impact would be less than significant.			
4.11.3-8 Emergency Access During Construction. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-8 described above for Alternative 1. Construction activities and construction-related traffic could temporarily interfere with the ability of DCSD and TDFPD to provide emergency services to the project area, particularly to those parcels adjacent to the project site. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	4.11.3-8. Ensure Emergency Access During Construction. See Mitigation Measure 4.11.1-8 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
4.11.3-9 Increased Demand for Fire Protection. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-9 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for fire protection. Demand would be accommodated by existing fire protection services. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.3-10 Increased Demand for Emergency Medical Services. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-10 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for emergency medical services but would be accommodated by existing service providers. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.3-11 Increased Student Enrollment in Stateline Area Schools. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-11 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 could increase student enrollment at schools in the project area and schools have adequate capacity to accommodate the projected increase. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Alternative 4 – Increased Density Alternative			
4.11.4-1 Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, Distribution, and Storage. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in increased water demand but would be accommodated with existing supplies and infrastructure. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.4-2 Increased Demand for Wastewater Service. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-2 described above for Alternative 1 except that Alternative 4 would generate slightly more wastewater because more people would reside on the project site. Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in an increase in demand for wastewater service but would be accommodated with existing conveyance and treatment capacity. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.4-3 Increased Demand for Electrical Services. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-3 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in an increase in demand for electrical service but would be accommodated with existing supplies and infrastructure. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.4-4 Increased Demand for Natural Gas Services. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-4 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in an increase in demand for natural gas service but would be accommodated with existing supplies and infrastructure. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.4-5 Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-5 described above for Alternative 1 except that Alternative 4 would generate slightly more solid waste because more people would	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
reside on the project site. Adequate collection and disposal capacity exists to accommodate Alternative 4. This impact would be less than significant.			
4.11.4-6 Increased Demand for Telecommunications Service. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-6 described above for Alternative 1, except that Alternative 4 could require slightly more new infrastructure. Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in an increase in demand for telecommunications services but would be accommodated by the service provider. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.4-7 Increased Demand for Law Enforcement Services. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-7 described above for Alternative 1, except that implementation of Alternative 4 would result in a slightly greater increase in the local population. Demand would be accommodated by existing law enforcement services. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.11.4-8 Emergency Access During Construction. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-8 described above for Alternative 1. Construction activities and construction-related traffic could temporarily interfere with the ability of DCSD and TDFPD to provide emergency services to the project area, particularly to those parcels adjacent to the project site. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	4.11.4-8: Ensure Emergency Access During Construction. See Mitigation Measure 4.11.1-8 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
4.11.4-9 Increased Demand for Fire Protection. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-9 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for fire protection. Demand would be accommodated by existing fire protection services. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.11.4-10 Increased Demand for Emergency Medical Services. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-10 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in an incremental increase in the local demand for emergency medical services but would be accommodated by existing service providers. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.11.4-11 Increased Student Enrollment in Stateline Area Schools. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.11.1-11 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 4 could increase student enrollment at schools in the project area and schools have adequate capacity to accommodate the projected increase. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.12 – Recreation			
Alternative 1 – Proposed Project			
<p>4.12.1-1 Increase in Use of Parks and Other Recreation Facilities. Implementation of Alternative 1 could increase the Stateline population and thus could result in an incremental increase in the use of existing parks and recreational facilities. However, because the population increase would be modest, and the availability and proximity of recreation facilities near the site, Alternative 1 would not create demand for additional recreational facilities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.12.1-2 Increased Recreational Opportunities. Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in the creation of a permanent 10.7-acre open space area on the project site for public use and recreation, including the construction of four new public-access linear public facilities (LPFs), including three 8-foot wide pedestrian/bicycle paths (LPFs 2, 4 and 5) and one 20-foot wide linear parkway (LPF 3, the main roadway</p>	B	No mitigation is required.	B

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
through the project site). Alternative 1 would support Douglas County’s Recreation Goals and Polices, TRPA’s Goals and Policies from the Recreation Element, as well as support attainment of TRPA’s Recreation Threshold Indicator R1. Therefore, this would be a beneficial recreational impact.			
4.12.1-3 Conflicts with Existing or Proposed Recreation Uses. Implementation of Alternative 1 would not result in substantial conflicts with any existing or planned recreation facilities or any known planned bike/pedestrian trails, including those indicated in the BPMP and the DCMP Comprehensive Trails Plan. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 2 – Grand Private Estate			
4.12.2-1 Increase in Use of Parks and Other Recreation Facilities. This impact would be similar to (but notably less than) Impact 4.12.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in a negligible increase in the Stateline population and no measurable increase in the use of existing parks and recreational facilities. Alternative 2 would not create demand for additional recreational facilities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.12.2-2 Change in Availability of Recreational Opportunities. Alternative 2 includes maintaining the project site as privately-owned property without public access. However, Alternative 2 would not result in a decrease or loss of public access to any public lands, recreation areas or recreation opportunities, as there exists at present no public right to use or access this property. Therefore, there would be no impact to recreation.	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.12.2-3 Conflicts with Existing or Proposed Recreation Uses. Implementation of Alternative 2 would not result in substantial conflicts with any existing or planned recreation facilities or any known planned bike/pedestrian trails, including those indicated in the BPMP and the DCOMP Comprehensive Trails Plan. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative			
<p>4.12.3-1 Increase in Use of Parks and Other Recreation Facilities. This impact is the same as Impact 4.12.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. While Alternative 3 would result in a slight increase in use of existing parks and recreational facilities in the Stateline area, it would not create demand for additional recreational facilities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.12.3-2 Increased Recreational Opportunities. This impact is the same as Impact 4.12.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in the creation of a permanent 12.6-acre open space area on the project site for public use and recreation, including the construction of four new public-access linear public facilities (LPFs), including three 8-foot wide pedestrian/bicycle paths (LPFs 2, 4, and 5) and one 20-foot wide linear parkway (LPF 3, the main roadway through the project site). Alternative 3 would support Douglas County’s Recreation Goals and Policies, TRPA’s Goals and Policies from the Recreation Element, as well as support attainment of TRPA’s Recreation Threshold Indicator R1. Therefore, this would be a beneficial recreational impact.</p>	B	No mitigation is required.	B
<p>4.12.3-3 Conflicts with Existing or Proposed Recreation Uses. This impact is the same as Impact 4.12.1-3 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 would not result in substantial conflicts with any existing or planned recreation facilities or any known planned bike/pedestrian</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
trails, including those indicated in the BPMP and the DCMP Comprehensive Trails Plan. This would be a less-than-significant impact.			
Alternative 4 – Increased Density Alternative			
4.12.4-1 Increase in Use of Parks and Other Recreation Facilities. This impact is the same as Impact 4.12.1-1 described above for Alternative 1. While Alternative 4 would result in a slight increase in use of existing parks and recreational facilities in the Stateline area, it would not create demand for additional recreational facilities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.12.4-2 Increased Recreational Opportunities. This impact is the same as Impact 4.12.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in the creation of a permanent 10.7-acre open space area on the project site for public use and recreation, including the construction of four new public-access linear public facilities (LPFs), including three 8-foot wide pedestrian/bicycle paths (LPFs 2, 4, and 5) and one 20-foot wide linear parkway (LPF 3, the main roadway through the project site). Alternative 4 would support Douglas County’s Recreation Goals and Policies, TRPA’s Goals and Policies from the Recreation Element, as well as support attainment of TRPA’s Recreation Threshold Indicator R1. Therefore, this would be a beneficial recreational impact.	B	No mitigation is required.	B
4.12.4-3 Conflicts with Existing or Proposed Recreation Uses. This impact is the same as Impact 4.12.1-3 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 4 would not result in substantial conflicts with any existing or planned recreation facilities or any known planned bike/pedestrian trails, including those indicated in the BPMP and the DCMP Comprehensive Trails Plan. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
4.13 – Scenic Resources			
Alternative 1 – Proposed Project			
<p>4.13.1-1 Effects on SR-1, TRPA Travel Route Threshold Ratings. Alternative 1 would be partly visible from important surrounding viewpoints including U.S. 50, within Roadway Travel Unit 31, Meadow. The project would occupy land that is currently undeveloped, and flanked by existing residential, commercial, industrial and recreational development. Proposed buildings would be setback a minimum of 200 feet from U.S. 50, as required in Plan Area Statement 073. The 200-foot scenic setback contains pine and fir trees that would provide substantial, although not complete, visual screening of the proposed development. Also, the approximately 30-foot vertical elevation change above U.S. 50 of the western edge of the proposed buildings helps to make the proposed project less apparent from U.S.50. Because of the screening by the trees, the distance that the buildings would be set back from the highway, the upsloping change in elevation, and the muted, earth tone exterior colors proposed for the buildings, the proposed development would be only marginally visible and would appear subordinate to the natural character of the project setting in views from U.S. 50. This is consistent with TRPA goals for development within Transition Visual Environments of Roadway Travel Units. The project site is not visible from any Shoreline Travel Units. Alternative 1 would have a less-than-significant impact on SR-1, TRPA Travel Route Threshold Ratings.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.13.1-2 Effects on SR-2, TRPA Scenic Quality Threshold Ratings. Alternative 1 would be partially visible within Roadway Travel Unit 31, Meadow. Three TRPA Scenic Resources are identified and mapped within Roadway Travel Unit 31, Meadow. The project site does not contain any of these Scenic Resources and is not within their line of sight as</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
viewed from U.S. 50. The project would not obstruct views of the Scenic Resources or affect the character of such views. Alternative 1 would have a less-than-significant impact on SR-2, TRPA Scenic Quality Threshold Ratings.			
4.13.1-3 Effects on SR-3, TRPA Recreation Areas and Bike Trails Threshold. Alternative 1 would not be visible within the context of identified TRPA Scenic Resources seen from TRPA-listed Public Recreation Areas or Bike Trails. Alternative 1 would be partially visible from Rabe Meadow, but not within the same views as TRPA regulated scenic resources. Alternative 1 would have a less-than-significant impact on SR-3, TRPA Recreation Areas and Bike Trails Threshold.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.13.1-4 Effects on SR-4, TRPA Community Design Threshold. Alternative 1 would comply with all relevant aspects of the design standards and guidelines contained in the TRPA Code of Ordinances and Scenic Quality Improvement Program. There are no specific design standards and guidelines in Plan Area Statement 073 (Lake Village), except a policy that all buildings and parking areas in Special Area 1 (the project site) shall be set back 200 feet from the U.S. 50 right-of-way line. Alternative 1 would comply with this policy and guidelines contained in the Code. Alternative 1 would have a less-than-significant impact on scenic quality related to the TRPA Community Design Thresholds.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 2 – Grand Private Estate			
4.13.2-1 Effects on SR-1, TRPA Travel Route Threshold Ratings. Alternative 2 would be located on the same project site as Alternative 1; however, Alternative 2 proposes one private estate home and five accessory buildings, rather than multi-family residential development. As with Alternative 1, some of the buildings in Alternative 2 would be visible to	PS	4.13.2-1. Retain Existing Metal Fence Within the 200-foot Scenic Setback. Special policy #3 in PAS 073, Lake Village specifies that all buildings and parking areas on the project site be set back 200 feet from the U.S. 50 right-of-way line. Within this zone, the existing metal fence that parallels U.S. 50 shall be retained in lieu of the proposed 10-foot tall rock fence. Along the	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>varying degrees from important surrounding viewpoints including U.S.50, within Roadway Travel Unit 31, Meadow. Proposed buildings or other site features would be set back at least 200 feet from U.S. 50, as required in Plan Area Statement 73. A 10-foot tall rock fence at the periphery of the property would surround the project. Existing trees within the 200-foot scenic setback would be retained. The trees would provide substantial, although not complete, screening of the buildings. Also, the approximately 30 foot vertical elevation change above U.S. 50 of the western edge of the proposed buildings located at the setback line helps to make them less apparent from U.S. 50. Except for the rock wall, the proposed development would be only marginally visible and would appear subordinate to the natural character of the project setting in views from U.S. 50. The rock wall, however, would be a highly evident, man-made feature added to Roadway Travel Unit 31, Meadow. This would not be consistent with TRPA goals for development within Transition Visual Environments of Roadway Travel Units. Alternative 2 would have a potentially significant impact on SR-1, TRPA Travel Route Threshold Ratings.</p>		<p>north and south sides of the project site, the existing metal fence shall be retained in the area extending eastward from U.S. 50 to the 200-foot scenic setback line. The proposed rock fence shall be allowed along the north and south sides of the project site beyond the 200-foot scenic setback and all along the east side.</p> <p>As an alternative to the existing metal fence, a fence with a see-through design that provides visibility of the area behind the fence, as viewed from U.S. 50, may be substituted. Any alternative design would require review and approval by the TRPA.</p>	
<p>4.13.2-2 Effects on SR-2, TRPA Scenic Quality Threshold Ratings. Alternative 2 would be partially visible within Roadway Travel Unit 31, Meadow. Three TRPA Scenic Resources are identified and mapped within Roadway Travel Unit 31, Meadow. The project site does not contain any of these Scenic Resources and is not within their line of sight as viewed from U.S. 50. The project would not obstruct views of the Scenic Resources or affect the character of such views. Alternative 2 would have a less than significant impact on SR-2, TRPA Scenic Quality Threshold Ratings.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.13.2-3 Effects on SR-3, TRPA Recreation Areas and Bike Trails Threshold. Alternative 2 would not be visible within the context of identified TRPA Scenic Resources seen from TRPA-listed Public Recreation Areas or Bike Trails. Alternative 2 would be partially visible from Rabe Meadow, but not within the same views as TRPA regulated scenic resources. Alternative 2 would have a less than significant on SR-3, TRPA Recreation Areas and Bike Trails Threshold.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.13.2-4 Effects on SR-4, TRPA Community Design Threshold. Alternative 2 would comply with all relevant aspects of the design standards and guidelines contained in the TRPA Code of Ordinances and Scenic Quality Improvement Program. There are no specific design standards and guidelines in Plan Area Statement 073 (Lake Village), except a policy that all buildings and parking areas in Special Area 1 (the project site) shall be set back 200 feet from the U.S. 50 right-of-way line. Alternative 2 would comply with this policy and guidelines contained in the Code. Alternative 2 would have a less-than-significant impact on TRPA Community Design Thresholds.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative			
<p>4.13.3-1 Effects on SR-1, TRPA Travel Route Threshold Ratings. Alternative 3 would be partly visible from important surrounding viewpoints including U.S. 50, within Roadway Travel Unit 31, Meadow. The current undeveloped project site is flanked by existing residential, commercial, industrial and recreational development. Proposed buildings or other site features would be setback at least 200 feet from U.S. 50. Existing trees within the 200-foot scenic setback would provide substantial, although not complete, screening of the development in Alternative 3. Also, the approximately 30 foot vertical elevation change above U.S. 50 of the western edge of the proposed buildings located at the setback line helps to make</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>them less apparent from U.S. 50. The project would be only partly visible among the trees above the roadway. Muted, earth tone exterior colors are proposed for the buildings. The development would appear subordinate to the natural character of the project setting in views from U.S. 50. This is consistent with TRPA goals for development within Transition Visual Environments of Roadway Travel Units. Alternative 3 would have a less than significant impact on SR-1, TRPA Travel Route Threshold Ratings.</p>			
<p>4.13.3-2 Effects on SR-2, TRPA Scenic Quality Threshold Ratings. Alternative 3 would be partially visible within Roadway Travel Unit 31, Meadow. Three TRPA Scenic Resources are identified and mapped within Roadway Travel Unit 31, Meadow. The project site does not contain any of these Scenic Resources and is not within their line of sight as viewed from U.S. 50. The project would not obstruct views of the Scenic Resources or affect the character of such views. Alternative 3 would have a less than significant impact on SR-2, TRPA Scenic Quality Threshold Ratings.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.13.3-3 Effects on SR-3, TRPA Recreation Areas and Bike Trails Threshold. Alternative 3 would not be visible within the context of identified TRPA Scenic Resources seen from TRPA-listed Public Recreation Areas or Bike Trails. Alternative 3 would be partially visible from Rabe Meadow, but not within the same views as TRPA regulated scenic resources. Alternative 3 would have a less than significant on SR-3, TRPA Recreation Areas and Bike Trails Threshold.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.13.3-4 Effects on SR-4, TRPA Community Design Threshold. Alternative 3 would comply with all relevant aspects of the design standards and guidelines contained in the TRPA Code of Ordinances and Scenic Quality Improvement Program. There are no specific design standards and guidelines in Plan Area Statement 073 (Lake Village), except a policy that all</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>buildings and parking areas in Special Area 1 (the project site) shall be set back 200 feet from the U.S. 50 right-of-way line. Alternative 3 would comply with this policy and guidelines contained in the Code. Alternative 3 would have a less-than-significant impact on TRPA Community Design Thresholds.</p>			
Alternative 4 – Increased Density Alternative			
<p>4.13.4-1 Effects on SR-1, TRPA Travel Route Threshold Ratings. Alternative 4 would be partly visible from important surrounding viewpoints including U.S. 50, within Roadway Travel Unit 31, Meadow. The current undeveloped project site is flanked by existing residential, commercial, industrial and recreational development. Proposed buildings or other site features would be setback at least 200 feet from U.S. 50. Existing trees within the 200-foot scenic setback would provide substantial, although not complete, screening of the proposed development. Also, the approximately 30 foot vertical elevation change above U.S. 50 of the western edge of the proposed buildings located at the setback line helps to make them less apparent from U.S. 50. The project would be only partly visible among the trees above the roadway. Muted, earth tone exterior colors are proposed for the buildings. The development would appear subordinate to the natural character of the project setting in views from U.S. 50. This is consistent with TRPA goals for development within Transition Visual Environments of Roadway Travel Units. Alternative 4 would have a less-than-significant impact on SR-1, TRPA Travel Route Threshold Ratings.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.13.4-2 Effects on SR-2, TRPA Scenic Quality Threshold Ratings. Alternative 4 would be partially visible within Roadway Travel Unit 31, Meadow. Three TRPA Scenic Resources are identified and mapped within Roadway Travel Unit 31, Meadow. The project site does not contain any of</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>these Scenic Resources and is not within their line of sight as viewed from U.S. 50. The project would not obstruct views of the Scenic Resources or affect the character of such views. Alternative 4 would have a less-than-significant impact on SR-2, TRPA Scenic Quality Threshold Ratings.</p>			
<p>4.13.4-3 Effects on SR-3, TRPA Recreation Areas and Bike Trails Threshold. Alternative 4 would not be visible within the context of identified TRPA Scenic Resources seen from TRPA-listed Public Recreation Areas or Bike Trails. Alternative 4 would be partially visible from Rabe Meadow, but not within the same views as TRPA regulated scenic resources. Alternative 4 would have a less-than-significant impact on SR-3, TRPA Recreation Areas and Bike Trails Threshold.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.13.4-4 Effects on SR-4, TRPA Community Design Threshold. Alternative 4 would comply with all relevant aspects of the design standards and guidelines contained in the TRPA Code of Ordinances and Scenic Quality Improvement Program. There are no specific design standards and guidelines in Plan Area Statement 073 (Lake Village), except a policy that all buildings and parking areas in Special Area 1 (the project site) shall be set back 200 feet from the U.S. 50 right-of-way line. Alternative 4 would comply with this policy and guidelines contained in the Code. Alternative 4 would have a less-than-significant impact on TRPA Community Design Thresholds.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.14 – Transportation and Circulation			
Alternative 1 – Proposed Project			
<p>4.14.1-1 Daily Vehicle Trip Generation. Alternative 1 would generate approximately 475 new daily trips in the Zephyr Cove/Stateline area. Pursuant to Chapter 93.3.C of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, an air quality mitigation fee, assessed at a rate per daily vehicle trip, or implementation of regional or cumulative mitigation measures in-lieu of the fee, is required to</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
offset the potential traffic and air quality impacts associated with the project. The applicant would pay the fee or implement in-lieu improvements, subject to the prior approval of TRPA. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in regard to daily vehicle trips.			
<p>4.14.1-2 Existing Plus Alternative 1 Intersection Level of Service. Alternative 1 would add trips to the U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive intersection. This would increase vehicle delay at the Lake Village Drive westbound left-turn movement approach, which currently operations at LOS F. This would be considered a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.14.1-2. Implement U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive Intersection Improvements to Decrease Delay at the Westbound Left-Turn Movement. Mitigation to improve the U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive intersection may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ stripe the westbound Lake Village Drive approach to U.S. 50 to include an exclusive left-turn lane and an exclusive right-turn lane, and ▶ construct a left-turn acceleration lane on U.S. 50 using existing pavement width for west-bound left-turning vehicles exiting Lake Village Drive or develop an alternative acceptable mitigation approach for review and approval by NDOT and TRPA which would reduce the impact of the project on the Lake Village Drive westbound left-turn movement approach to the intersection to a less-than-significant level. <p>The inclusion of separate left- and right-turn lanes at the westbound approach to the U.S. 50/Lake Village intersection would distinguish between the left and right-turn queues to reduce additional delay by left-turn queues blocking right-turning vehicles.</p> <p>The addition of a left-turn acceleration lane would allow vehicles turning left from Lake Village Drive to U.S. 50 to make the turning movement and begin accelerating to free-flow speeds without entering the through travel lane. Vehicles would not need to wait for simultaneous gaps in the northbound and the southbound traffic in order to make the turn. Adequate pavement width appears to be available to accommodate an acceleration</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>lane of approximately 170 feet in length south of the U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive intersection. The project applicant should coordinate with NDOT to determine the appropriate length of the acceleration lane.</p> <p>The applicant shall either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ implement and complete this mitigation measure prior to the occupancy of any residential unit constructed in the proposed project, or ▶ deposit in cash with TRPA the total estimated cost of these mitigation measures as determined by TRPA and NDOT, and agree to fund any reasonable cost overruns in connection with implementing and constructing such mitigation measures. <p>The above improvements would reduce delay and improve level of service at the westbound approach to the Lake Village Drive/U.S. 50 from LOS F (existing conditions) to LOS D (better level of service than existing conditions), under Existing Plus Alternative 1 Conditions. Achieving LOS D for the left-turn movement from Lake Village Drive onto U.S. 50 at this intersection would meet TRPA LOS standards.</p>	
<p>4.14.1-3 Vehicular Access and Circulation – Access from Existing Roadways. Alternative 1 would add one car length to the U.S. 50 southbound left-turn pocket at U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive. The existing turn pocket length is sufficient to accommodate estimated maximum queues. The estimated Lake Village Drive westbound left-turn movement to U.S. 50 queue at this intersection is not expected to increase from existing conditions. This is considered a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.14.1-4 Vehicular Access and Circulation – Internal Circulation. The proposed driveway widths on housing units are narrower than the Douglas County requirement of 12 feet. However, the project applicant has acquired a design exemption from Douglas County for the proposed driveway widths. Internal circulation meets all other standards. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.14.1-5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation. Alternative 1 would add bicycle and pedestrian traffic to the area and would include the construction of three new public-access pedestrian/bicycle paths. LPF 4 would terminate at U.S. 50 and southbound cyclists would be required to ride a short distance against traffic or cross U.S. 50. This may create an unsafe condition at this location resulting in a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>4.14.1-5A. Restrict Direction of Bicycle and Pedestrian Traffic On LPF 4. Through signage or other means, the applicant shall implement measures that restrict bicycle and pedestrian traffic such that it conforms to the flow of vehicle traffic on U.S. 50. The path would allow bicycles traveling north on U.S. 50 to leave the highway and travel through the project site, but would not allow for bicycles to travel south onto U.S. 50 from the project site. Because of the configuration of Alternative 1, northbound bicyclists originating from the project site would likely use Lake Village Drive to access U.S. 50 rather than LPF 4 even if full access were allowed.</p> <p>4.14.1-5B. Do Not Build LPF 4. As a second option, TRPA shall prohibit construction of LPF 4.</p> <p>4.14.1-5C. Restrict Movement to Northbound Bicycle and Pedestrian Traffic Until a Bicycle/Pedestrian Path along the East Side of U.S. 50 is Complete. As a third option, the applicant shall implement measures that restrict bicycle and pedestrian flow such that it conforms to the flow of vehicle traffic until a connecting U.S. 50 path is constructed.</p> <p>4.14.1-5D. Extend existing sidewalk along U.S. 50 in front of the Burger King Commercial Center to connect with LPF 4. As a fourth option, applicant shall coordinate with NDOT, Douglas County, and TRPA to extend the existing sidewalk in along U.S. 50 in front of the Burger King Commercial Center to connect with LPF 4.</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>The applicant shall either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ implement and complete this mitigation measure prior to commencement of construction of LPF 4, or ▶ deposit in cash with TRPA the total estimated cost of this mitigation measure as determined by TRPA and NDOT, and agree to fund any reasonable cost overruns in connection with implementing and constructing such mitigation measure, and ▶ coordinate with TRPA to restrict bicycle and pedestrian flow such that it conforms with the flow of vehicle traffic until the existing sidewalk is extended to connect with LPF 4. 	
<p>4.14.1-6 Parking Supply. Alternative 1 would include on-site parking in excess of Douglas County requirements. Therefore, there would be no impact on parking supply.</p>	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI
<p>4.14.1-7 Construction Traffic. The temporary presence of construction traffic in the study area would result in a less-than-significant increase in DVTE. However, adding traffic to the Lake Village Drive westbound left-turn approach to U.S. 50 that operates at a level of concern would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.14.1-7A. Implement U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive Specified Intersection Improvements to Improve Operations, Prior to Commencement of Construction. See Mitigation Measure 4.14.1-2 described above for Impact 4.14.1-2.</p> <p>4.14.1-7B. Require Construction Traffic Limitations During Afternoon Peak Hours. The westbound approach to the U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive operates at LOS F during Summer PM Peak hours. If construction traffic accesses this approach during this time, delay may be increased. However, if construction traffic were not allowed to make the westbound left-turn movement during the PM peak hours, delay would not increase on this approach.</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Alternative 2 – Grand Private Estate			
4.14.2-1 Daily Vehicle Trip Generation. Alternative 2 would generate approximately 30 new daily trips in the Zephyr Cove/Stateline area, an insignificant increase based on Chapter 93.3 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. This would be considered a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.14.2-2 Existing Plus Alternative 2 Intersection Level of Service. Alternative 2 would add three vehicles in the peak hour to the U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive intersection. The operation of this intersection would be essentially unchanged from existing conditions with the addition of Alternative 2. This would be considered a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.14.2-3 Vehicular Access and Circulation – Access from Existing Roadways. Alternative 2 would add a small number of vehicles to the turning movements at study intersections; however, this would not increase queues at the U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive intersection. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.14.2-4 Vehicular Access and Circulation – Internal Circulation. The main vehicular access location to/from the project site would be a private driveway on Lake Village Drive. The driveway would be built to Douglas County standards and would meet the access and circulation needs of the project. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.14.2-5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation. Alternative 2 would not measurably increase bicycle and pedestrian traffic in the project area. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.2-6 Parking Supply. Alternative 2 includes a private estate with ample parking in garages and driveways. This Alternative 2 would have no impact on parking supply.	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI
4.14.2-7 Construction Traffic. This impact is the same as Impact 4.14.1-7 described above for Alternative 1. The temporary presence of construction traffic in the study area would result in a less-than-significant increase in DVTE. However, adding traffic to the Lake Village Drive westbound left turn approach to U.S. 50 that operates at a level of concern would be a significant impact.	S	4.14.2-7A. Implement U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive Specified Intersection Improvements to Improve Operations, Prior to Commencement of Construction. See Mitigation Measure 4.14.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply. 4.14.2-7B. Require Construction Traffic Limitations During Afternoon Peak Hours. See Mitigation Measure 4.14.1-7B described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative			
4.14.3-1 Daily Vehicle Trip Generation. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.14.1-1 described above for Alternative 1, although Alternative 3 would generate fewer new daily trips. Alternative 3 would generate approximately 352 new daily trips in the Zephyr Cove/Stateline area. Pursuant to Chapter 93.3.C of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, an air quality mitigation fee, assessed at a rate per daily vehicle trip, or implementation of regional or cumulative mitigation measures in-lieu of the fee, is required to offset the potential traffic and air quality impacts associated with the project. The applicant would pay the fee or implement in-lieu improvements, subject to the prior approval of TRPA. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in regard to daily vehicle trips.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.14.3-2 Existing Plus Alternative 3 Intersection Level of Service. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.14.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. Alternative 3 would add trips to the U.S. 50/ Lake Village Drive intersection. This would increase vehicle delay at the Lake Village Drive	S	4.14.3-2 Implement U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive Intersection Improvements to Decrease Delay at the Westbound Left-turn Movement. See Mitigation Measure 4.14.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
westbound left-turn movement approach, which currently operations at LOS F. This would be considered a significant impact.			
4.14.3-3 Vehicular Access and Circulation – Access from Existing Roadways. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.14.1-3 described above for Alternative 1. Alternative 3 would add one car length to the U.S. 50 southbound left-turn pocket at U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive. The existing turn pocket length is sufficient to accommodate estimated maximum queues. The estimated Lake Village Drive westbound left-turn movement to U.S. 50 queue at this intersection is not expected to increase from existing conditions. This is considered a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.14.3-4 Vehicular Access and Circulation – Internal Circulation. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.14.1-3 described above for Alternative 1. The proposed driveway widths on housing units are narrower than the Douglas County requirement of 12 feet. However, the project applicant has acquired a design exemption from Douglas County for the proposed driveway widths. Internal circulation meets all other standards. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.14.3-5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation. This impact is the same as Impact 4.14.1-5 described above for Alternative 1. Alternative 3 would add bicycle and pedestrian traffic to the area, and would include the construction of three new public-access pedestrian/bicycle paths. LPF 4 would terminate at U.S. 50 and southbound cyclists would be required to ride a short distance against traffic or cross U.S. 50. This may create an unsafe condition at this location resulting in a potentially significant impact.	PS	<p>4.14.3-5A. Restrict Direction of Bicycle and Pedestrian Traffic on LPF 4. See Mitigation Measure 4.14.1-5A described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>4.14.3-5B. Do Not Build LPF 4. See Mitigation Measure 4.14.1-5B described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>4.14.3-5C. Restrict Movement to Eastbound Bicycle and Pedestrian Traffic Until a Bicycle/Pedestrian Path Along the</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>East Side of U.S. 50 is Complete. See Mitigation Measure 4.14.1-5C described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>4.14.3-5D. Extend Existing Sidewalk Along U.S. 50 in Front of the Burger King Commercial Center to Connect with LPF 4. As a fourth option, applicant shall coordinate with NDOT, Douglas County, and TRPA to extend the existing sidewalk in along U.S. 50 in front of the Burger King Commercial Center to connect with LPF 4.</p> <p>The applicant shall either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ implement and complete this mitigation measure prior to commencement of construction of LPF 4, or ▶ deposit in cash with TRPA the total estimated cost of this mitigation measure as determined by TRPA and NDOT, and agree to fund any reasonable cost overruns in connection with implementing and constructing such mitigation measure, and ▶ coordinate with TRPA to restrict bicycle and pedestrian flow such that it conforms with the flow of vehicle traffic until the existing sidewalk is extended to connect with LPF 4. 	
4.14.3-6 Parking Supply. Alternative 3 would include on-site parking in excess of Douglas County requirements. Therefore, there would be no impact on parking supply.	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI
4.14.3-7 Construction Traffic. This impact is the same as Impact 4.14.1-7 described above for Alternative 1. The temporary presence of construction traffic in the study area would result in less-than-significant increase in DVTE. However, adding traffic to the Lake Village Drive westbound left turn approach to U.S. 50 that operates at a level of concern would be a significant impact.	S	<p>4.14.3-7A. Implement U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive Specified Intersection Improvements to Improve Operations, Prior to Commencement of Construction. See Mitigation Measure 4.14.1-7A described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>4.14.3-7B. Require Construction Traffic Limitations During Afternoon Peak Hours. See Mitigation Measure 4.14.1-7B described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Alternative 4 – Increased Density Alternative			
4.14.4-1 Daily Vehicle Trip Generation. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.14.1-1 described above for Alternative 1, although Alternative 4 would generate fewer new daily trips. Alternative 4 would generate approximately 434 new daily trips in the Zephyr Cove/Stateline area. Pursuant to Chapter 93.3.C of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, an air quality mitigation fee, assessed at a rate per daily vehicle trip, or implementation of regional or cumulative mitigation measures in-lieu of the fee, is required to offset the potential traffic and air quality impacts associated with the project. The applicant would pay the fee or implement in-lieu improvements, subject to the prior approval of TRPA. Therefore, Alternative 4 would result in less-than-significant impacts in regard to daily vehicle trips.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.14.4-2 Existing Plus Alternative 4 Intersection Level of Service. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.14.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. Alternative 4 would add trips to the U.S. 50/ Lake Village Drive intersection. This would increase vehicle delay at the Lake Village Drive westbound left-turn movement approach, which currently operations at LOS F. This would be considered a significant impact.	S	4.14.4-2 Implement U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive Intersection Improvements to Decrease Delay at the Westbound Left-Turn Movement. See Mitigation Measure 4.14.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.	LTS
4.14.4-3 Vehicular Access and Circulation – Access from Existing Roadways. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.14.1-3 described above for Alternative 1. Alternative 4 would add one car length to the southbound left-turn pocket at U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive. The existing turn pocket length is sufficient to accommodate estimated maximum queues. The estimated westbound queue at this intersection is not expected to increase from existing conditions. This is considered a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.14.4-4 Vehicular Access and Circulation – Internal Circulation. This impact is essentially the same as Impact 4.14.1-4 described above for Alternative 1. The proposed driveway widths on housing units are narrower than the Douglas County requirement of 12 feet. However, the project applicant has acquired a design exemption from Douglas County for the proposed driveway widths. Internal circulation meets all other standards. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.14.4-5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation. This impact is the same as Impact 4.14.1-5 described above for Alternative 1. Alternative 4 would add bicycle and pedestrian traffic to the area and would include the construction of three new public-access pedestrian/bicycle paths. LPF 4 would terminate at U.S. 50 and southbound cyclists would be required to ride a short distance against traffic or cross U.S. 50. This may create an unsafe condition at this location resulting in a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>4.14.4-5A. Restrict Direction of Bicycle and Pedestrian Traffic on LPF 4. See Mitigation Measure 4.14.1-5A described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>4.14.4-5B. Do Not Build LPF 4. See Mitigation Measure 4.14.1-5B described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>4.14.4-5C. Restrict Movement to Eastbound Bicycle and Pedestrian Traffic Until a Bicycle/Pedestrian Path Along the East Side of U.S. 50 is Complete. See Mitigation Measure 4.14.1-5C described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>4.14.4-5D. Extend Existing Sidewalk Along U.S. 50 in Front of the Burger King Commercial Center to Connect with LPF 4. As a fourth option, applicant shall coordinate with NDOT, Douglas County, and TRPA to extend the existing sidewalk in along U.S. 50 in front of the Burger King Commercial Center to connect with LPF 4.</p> <p>The applicant shall either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ implement and complete this mitigation measure prior to commencement of construction of LPF 4, or ▶ deposit in cash with TRPA the total estimated cost of this mitigation measure as determined by TRPA and NDOT, and agree to fund any reasonable cost overruns in connection 	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>with implementing and constructing such mitigation measure, and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ coordinate with TRPA to restrict bicycle and pedestrian flow such that it conforms with the flow of vehicle traffic until the existing sidewalk is extended to connect with LPF 4. 	
<p>4.14.4-6 Parking Supply. Alternative 4 is one parking space short of the Douglas County Code requirement and does not provide sufficient parking for the residential complex. This would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.14.4-6 Provide One Additional Parking Space for Visitors to the Lodge Style Building. Douglas County Code requires two parking spaces per unit plus one additional space for every four units of multi-family housing. In order to meet this requirement, the applicant shall either</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ provide 2.25 spaces for each unit in the lodge style building, which would require one additional parking space to be provided for visitors to for the lodge style building to increase the total lodge-style building guest parking to five spaces in Alternative 4 from the currently provided four spaces, or ▶ obtain a formal waiver or variance from this additional one space parking requirement for Alternative 4 from Douglas County. The spaces may be beneath or outside the building. 	LTS
<p>4.14.4-7 Construction Traffic. This impact is the same as Impact 4.14.1-7 described above for Alternative 1. This impact is the same as Impact 4.14.1-7 described above for Alternative 1. The temporary presence of construction traffic in the study area would result in less-than-significant increase in DVTE. However, adding traffic to the Lake Village Drive westbound left turn approach to U.S. 50 that operates at a level of concern would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.14.4-7A. Implement U.S. 50/Lake Village Drive Specified Intersection Improvements to Improve Operations, prior to commencement of construction. See Mitigation Measure 4.14.1-7A described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>4.14.4-7B. Require Construction Traffic Limitations During Afternoon Peak Hours. See Mitigation Measure 4.14.1-7B described above for Alternative 1. The same mitigation measure would apply.</p>	LTS

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-2 Summary Comparison of the Project Alternatives					
Impacts	Alternative 1 Proposed Project	Alternative 2 Grand Private Estate	Alternative 3 Reduced Density Alternative	Alternative 4 Increased Density Alternative	Alternative 5 No Project
4.2 Air Quality					
4.2-1: Generation of Short-Term Construction-Related Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.2-2: Generation of Long-Term Operation-Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.2-3: Generation of Long-Term Operation-Related Local Mobile-Source Emissions of Carbon Monoxide.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.2-4: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Odors.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.2-5: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.3 Archaeological and Historical Resources					
4.3-1: Effects on Known Significant Archaeological and Historical Resources.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.3-2: Effects on Previously Undiscovered Archaeological and Historical Resources and Human Remains.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.3-3: Effects on Paleontological Resources.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.4 Biological Resources					
4.4-1: Removal of Riparian Vegetation, Potential Fill of Jurisdictional Waters of the United States.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.4-2: Potential Effects on Special-Status Animal Species (Mule Deer, Waterfowl).	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.4-3: Potential Effects on Common Raptors.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.4-4: Removal of Common Migratory Bird Nests.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-2 Summary Comparison of the Project Alternatives					
Impacts	Alternative 1 Proposed Project	Alternative 2 Grand Private Estate	Alternative 3 Reduced Density Alternative	Alternative 4 Increased Density Alternative	Alternative 5 No Project
4.4-5A: Potential Degradation of Wildlife Habitats of Special Significance as a Result of Construction and Use of LPF 5.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.4-5B: Potential Degradation of Wildlife Habitats of Special Significance as a Result of Residential Development.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.4-6A: Potential Degradation of Wildlife Movement Corridors as a Result of Construction and Use of LPF 5.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.4-6B: Potential Degradation of Wildlife Movement Corridors as a Result of Residential Development.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.4-7: Potential Degradation of Fish Habitat.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.4-8: Loss of Common Vegetation (other than deciduous riparian vegetation), Uncommon Vegetation, and Late Seral/Old Growth Ecosystems.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.4-9: Tree Removal.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.4-10: Introduction and Spread of Weeds.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.5 Geology, Soils, Land Capability and Coverage					
4.5-1: Land Coverage.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.5-2: Site Topography, Grading, and Soil Erosion.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.5-3: Seismic Hazards.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.5-4: Geologic Hazards Related to Related to Landslides, Expansive Soils, and Corrosive Soils.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-2 Summary Comparison of the Project Alternatives					
Impacts	Alternative 1 Proposed Project	Alternative 2 Grand Private Estate	Alternative 3 Reduced Density Alternative	Alternative 4 Increased Density Alternative	Alternative 5 No Project
4.5-5: Geologic Hazards Related to Seasonal Subsurface Water Flows due to Surface Infiltration.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.5-6: Geologic Hazards Related to Construction in Bedrock and Rock Outcrops.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.6 Human Health/Risk of Upset					
4.6-1: Expose the Public or Environment to Hazardous Materials.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.6-2: Increased Risk of Health Hazards From Vector-borne Diseases.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.6-3: Increased Exposure to Wildland Fire Hazard.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality					
4.7-1: Potential Short-Term Accelerated Soil Erosion and Sedimentation and/or Release of Pollutants to Nearby Water Bodies During Construction.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.7-2: Impervious Surface Area and Runoff.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.7-3: Urban Contaminants in Surface Runoff.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.8 Land Use					
4.8-1: Consistency with Regional Plan Land Use Goals and Policies.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.8-2: Potential for Division of an Existing Community (or Land Use Compatibility).	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-2 Summary Comparison of the Project Alternatives					
Impacts	Alternative 1 Proposed Project	Alternative 2 Grand Private Estate	Alternative 3 Reduced Density Alternative	Alternative 4 Increased Density Alternative	Alternative 5 No Project
4.9 Noise					
4.9-1: Short-Term Project-Generated Construction Noise Levels.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.9-2: Long-Term Project-Generated Stationary- and Area-Source Noise.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.9-3: Long-term Project-Generated Off-Site Traffic Noise Levels.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.9-4: Land Use Compatibility with Ambient Noise Levels.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.9-5: Vibration Levels.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.10 Population and Housing					
4.10-1: Change in Availability of Moderate-Income Housing.	B	NI	NI	B	NI
4.10-2: Alter the Location, Distribution, Density, or Growth Rate of the Human Population Planned for the Region.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.11 Public Services and Utilities					
4.11-1: Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, Distribution, and Storage.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.11-2: Increased Demand for Wastewater Service.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.11-3: Increased Demand for Electrical Services.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.11-4: Increased Demand for Natural Gas Services.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.11-5: Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.11-6: Increased Demand for Telecommunications Service.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-2 Summary Comparison of the Project Alternatives					
Impacts	Alternative 1 Proposed Project	Alternative 2 Grand Private Estate	Alternative 3 Reduced Density Alternative	Alternative 4 Increased Density Alternative	Alternative 5 No Project
4.11-7: Increased Demand for Law Enforcement Services.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.11-8: Emergency Access During Construction.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.11-9: Increased Demand for Fire Protection.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.11-10: Increased Demand for Emergency Medical Services.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.11-11: Increased Student Enrollment in Stateline Area Schools.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.12 Recreation					
4.12-1: Increase in Use of Parks and Other Recreation Facilities.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.12-2: Increased Recreational Opportunities.	B	NI	B	B	NI
4.12-3: Conflicts with Existing or Proposed Recreation Uses.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.13 Scenic Resources					
4.13-1: Effects on SR-1, TRPA Travel Route Threshold Ratings.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.13-2: Effects on SR-2, TRPA Scenic Quality Threshold Ratings.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.13-3: Effects on SR-3, TRPA Recreation Areas and Bike Trails Threshold.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.13-4: Effects on SR-4, TRPA Community Design Threshold.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-2 Summary Comparison of the Project Alternatives					
Impacts	Alternative 1 Proposed Project	Alternative 2 Grand Private Estate	Alternative 3 Reduced Density Alternative	Alternative 4 Increased Density Alternative	Alternative 5 No Project
4.14 Transportation and Circulation					
4.14-1: Daily Vehicle Trip Generation.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.14-2: Existing Plus Alternative 4 Intersection Level of Service.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.14-3: Vehicular Access and Circulation – Access from Existing Roadways.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.14-4: Vehicular Access and Circulation – Internal Circulation.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.14-5: Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
4.14-6: Parking Supply.	NI	NI	NI	LTS	NI
4.14-7: Construction Traffic.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI

Significance levels for Alternative A through D reflect the levels of significance after mitigation.

NI = No Impact

B = Beneficial

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable