TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
NOTICE OF MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, December 7, 2011 at the TRPA Offices, located at 128 Market Street, Stateline, NV. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

November 30, 2011

[Signature]

Joanne S. Marchetta
Executive Director
AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Any member of the public wishing to address the Advisory Planning Commission on any item listed or not listed on the agenda including items on the Consent Calendar may do so at this time. TRPA encourages public comment on items on the agenda to be presented at the time those agenda items are heard. Individuals or groups commenting on items listed on the agenda will be permitted to comment either at this time or when the matter is heard, but not both.

NOTE: THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION IS PROHIBITED BY LAW FROM TAKING IMMEDIATE ACTION ON, OR DISCUSSING ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC THAT ARE NOT LISTED ON THIS AGENDA.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

V. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

VI. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Notice of Preparation and Determination of Scope, US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Environmental Impact Statement

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director
B. General Counsel

C. APC Members

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

IX. ADJOURNMENT
I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Advisory Planning Commission Chair Mr. Tolhurst called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

Members Present: Mr. Buelna, Mr. Donohue, Ms. Garcia, Mr. Gaskin, Mr. Greene, Ms. Huggins, Mr. Jepsen, Ms. Krause, Mr. Lefevre, Mr. Maurer, Ms. McMahon, Ms. Merchant, Mr. Riley, Mr. Smith, Mr. Tolhurst, Mr. Upton

Members Absent: Ms. Feeley, Mr. Loftis, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Plemel

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Upton moved approval. Motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

No public comment.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. Jepson moved approval. Motion carried unanimously.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Recommendation to the Governing Board on the Technical Adequacy and Certification of the Final EIR/EIS, Adoption of the Proposed Amendments to Chapter II and VII of the TRPA Goals and Policies, Amendment to TRPA Plan Area Statements 157, 158 and 159, Amendments to TRPA Code Chapter 22 (Height Standards), Chapter 33 (Allocation of Development), Chapter 35 (Bonus Unit Incentive Program) and Chapter 64 (Grading Standards), Adoption of Ski Area Master Plan as
Ms. Marchetta introduced this milestone project that has been under consideration since about 2007. The update of the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan and its associated project is proposing to revitalize a ski area in the style of the former Tahoe Tavern, but on up-to-date terms. This, if recommended, will allow change and put long needed environmental gain on the ground, as well as delivering much needed economic revitalization to the Basin.

Mr. Landry presented today’s agenda for the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan CEP project. We are asking the Advisory Planning Commission to make a recommendation to the Governing Board on the technical adequacy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. We are also asking the Advisory Planning Commission to recommend approval of amendments to the Goals & Policies, Chapter 2 and 7, TRPA Plan Area Statements 157, 158 and 159, adoption of amendments to the TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 22, 33, 35 and 64, and adoption of the multi-phase ski area master plan, as an amendment to the Regional Plan. A finding of the proposed Phase I project as conditioned in the draft permit, is consistent with the final EIS and in compliance with the Community Enhancement Program (CEP).

Mr. Chapman presented details of the proposed project and the future of Homewood.

Mr. Landry passed around a binder with additional public comments received after the packet was mailed.

Mr. Brueck, Hauge Brueck Associates, presented a summary of alternatives that was analyzed in the EIS.

Committee Comments & Questions:

Ms. Merchant asked why are we allocating 10,000 square footage floor area for summer use of the mid-mountain area. This seems excessive.

Mr. Landry said in the TPRA Code, if you keep that use open year round you would have to transfer in CFA. If it is an accessory and only used during the wintertime, that would not require an allocation of CFA.
Ms. Merchant said there have already been a lot of environmental improvements already put in place prior to any kind of mitigation or CEP above and beyond. Do you have the amount of money that has been invested so far?

Mr. Chapman said several million dollars have been invested in fuels management, restoration and sediment reduction work.

Ms. Merchant asked what will the cost of future restoration cost.

Mr. Chapman said probably a similar amount of money, because we have only treated 1/3 of the mountain in terms of fuels management.

Ms. Merchant asked regarding transit oriented development, is this actual language that is included in the finding, as the word “promote” is a little squishy.

Mr. Landry said that language is out of the resolution, but the matrix clarifies what is expected.

Mr. Brueck said that word was associated with the list of alternative transportation measures that they are implementing and are conditioned.

Mr. Riley said you mentioned 180 fulltime employees. Is this additional employees to what you have now?

Mr. Chapman said this will be the total number of year round employees. Because there is no summer operation right now, there are very few year round employees.

Mr. Upton asked clarification on the measurement of winter traffic volumes Friday afternoon versus Saturday afternoon.

Ms. Cole, Fehr & Piers said they looked at multiple scenarios. Friday afternoon for winter is currently the time period where the new project would add the majority of new traffic. On a Saturday today in winter, there is a lot of activity already at Homewood. Friday there would be a lot of lodging guests arriving at the site, so that is when you would have a huge inbound traffic that today does not exist. That is why this particular period was selected.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Brueck to explain if the environmental document discusses what the water quality improvements offsite are, not just for the project area but for the road right-of-way for Placer County, Caltrans, etc.

Mr. Brueck said most of the analysis is within the project area. The CEP program required Homewood to contribute an offsite water quality improvement project.
From the time the draft was published to the time of the final, we chose with Placer County’s assistance, to change the offsite project that Homewood would contribute to. They will now contribute to a Placer County sponsored water quality improvement project (EIP project) immediately north of the Homewood Project and is North of Silver.

Mr. Greene asked how often pervious pavement needs to be replaced compared to impervious and what is the cost.

Mr. Brueck said the impervious pavers were counted in the environmental document as land coverage. They did not get any credit for land coverage reduction, but were given credit in the analysis of stormwater for the attenuation that they generate.

Mr. Tolhurst asked is there any road work to be completed on the road in front of Homewood?

Mr. Brueck said in Homewood right at the project area there is a new roadway that goes to the hotel. There is also a Placer County requirement that they put in a pullout and new shelter on the West side of Highway 89. There is also a proposal to modify Fawn Street where it comes out onto Highway 89, to make sure there is a left and a right turn lane.

Mr. Tolhurst asked if the mitigation for traffic is the realignment at the Fanny Bridge.

Mr. Brueck said there is one other mitigation measure. At the Granlibakken intersection, there will be a left turn pocket on Highway 89. The conclusions in the document are this would add 2 more vehicles per minute then currently on Highway 89. This would represent a small change in the vehicle use on that highway at any one time, compared to other projects that we have studied. In the winter, more people will be staying onsite and not leaving as a day use, as it currently is now.

Public Comments:

Rene Kojjane supports the project.

Maureen O’Keefe, Realtor, Community Member, Homewood, Tahoma are very depressed and she supports the project.

Caryn Parker, Alpine Peak Association said she supports the project.

Joe Lynch Tahoma supports the project.
Andy Samms supports the project.

Michael Turnquist supports the project.

Michael Hogan supports the project.

Rob Westin supports the project.

Sandy Evans Hall supports the project.

Jan Collier, Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Association supports the project.

Alex Mourelatos Lake Shore Resort supports the project.

Gary Davis supports the project.

Dolores Jones does not support the project.

Greg Jones, Sierra Business Council supports the project.

Renhn Kreling supports the project.

Bobby Peugh supports the project.

Steve Knoll supports the project.

Mason Overstreet, Friends of the West Shore does not support the project.

Nicole Gergans League to Save Lake Tahoe does not support the project, but would support a smaller version with less environmental impacts.

**Committee Comments & Questions:**

Mr. Tolhurst asked for clarification on the Phasing of the project.

Mr. Chapman said Phase I is all of the mitigation measures and the commercial areas at the North Base. This would include the hotel, the replacement of the two lifts, the mid-mountain lodge, the day lodge at the base, the bicycle path, and the contribution to the Fanny Bridge project. The project will take approximately 2 years to build. It can’t start until May, 2013. In order to keep the mountain open to the public, we would leave the South base alone. During the construction period where the North base would be impacted, we would
continue to allow the public to access the mountain and ski through the South Base. Anywhere from 3-5 years after commencement of construction, we would be able to have the public access the mountain through the North Base.

Mr. Tolhurst asked how long is the Phase I permit in effect.

Mr. Landry said the Phase I project permit would be valid for a 3 year period. They would have to demonstrate diligent pursuit in order for an extension to be granted. They would then come back for approval of Phase II within that five year period.

Mr. Tolhurst asked if the Regional Plan Update will affect any of this.

Mr. Marshall said the EIS is a programmatic EIS for subsequent phases, so additional environmental documentation will be done to support Phase II or later Phases.

Mr. Tolhurst asked if the initial EIS would be valid.

Mr. Marshall said yes.

Mr. Riley asked about affordable housing and what that entails.

Mr. Bruek said what is proposed in the current project which is included in Phase I, is 13-2 bedrooms units which would be wrapped around the proposed parking structure. The EIS identified the 180 fulltime equivalent employees, and per Placer County’s requirement, they have to show beds for those workforce units up to ½ of the 180 employees, or 90 beds. Currently onsite they have the 13 unites which could handle about 26 employees. They have to be used for employees. There is an affordable housing mitigation program that requires them to identify either other units that could be used for affordable housing. Or a project where they could build additional affordable housing, or an in lieu fee per Placer County’s requirements, that could help them purchase and make available additional affordable housing.

Mr. Tierman, JMA Ventures, clarified that 9 of the 13 units have 4 bedrooms and 4 of the 13 have two bedrooms, so the total employee count that can be accommodated is approximately 40-44. The balance will be secured offsite.

Mr. Smith asked if TRPA staff did coverage verification for the Phase I project.

Mr. Landry said there have been numerous coverage verifications on the mountain to-date. They are not totally complete. This is because there are
other roads that are targeted to be retired. We have also generated a banking letter that goes along with the verifications.

Mr. Smith asked how TRPA defines land coverage.

Mr. Marshall said it is a structure improvement. Coverage shall not be considered as land coverage, if it permits at least 75% of normal precipitation directly to reach the ground that prevents normal precipitation from directly reaching the surface, underlying the structure. There is no specific infiltration rate that is defined.

Mr. Buelna asked while all of the coverage verifications have not been conducted is there enough coverage available on the site to support the project.

Mr. Landry said yes.

Mr. Upton moved approval of the final EIS, the staff summary and the complete administrative record and a motion to find the final EIS technically adequate and to recommend to Governing Board certification of the final EIS for the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan and the Community Enhancement Program project.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Upton moved to recommend Governing Board adoption of the proposed Ordinance, Attachment A amending the Goals & Policies, Plan Area Statements, Code of Ordinances and adoption of the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan as an amendment to the Regional Plan.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Upton moved to find that the proposed project for Phase I as conditioned in the draft permit is consistent with the FEIS and in compliance with the Community Enhancement Program.

Motion carried unanimously.

B. An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 87-9, as Amended, by Amending the Code of Ordinances, Chapter 1, Introduction to Code of Ordinances, Chapter 2, Definitions, Chapter 3, Special Provisions Governing Certain Projects, Uses and Activities, Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities, Chapter 5, Environmental Documentation, Chapter 6, Findings Required, Chapter 7, Temporary Uses, Structures and Activities, Chapter 8, Compliance, Chapter 9, Remedial Action Plans, Chapter 11,
Foundations, Chapter 12, TRPA Regional Plan Maps, Chapter 13, Plan Area Statements and Plan Area Maps, Chapter 14, Community Plans, Chapter 15, Redevelopment Plans, Chapter 16 Specific and Master Plans, Chapter 18, Permissible Uses, Chapter 20, Land Coverage Standards, Chapter 21, Density, Chapter 22, Height Standards, Chapter 23, Noise Standards, Chapter 24, Driveway and Parking Standards, Chapter 25, Best Management Practice Requirements, Chapter 26, Signs, Chapter 27, Basic Service Requirement, Chapter 28, Natural Hazard Standards, Chapter 29, Historic Resource Protection, Chapter 30, Design Standards, Chapter 31, Environmental Improvement Program, Chapter 32, Regional Plan and Threshold Review, Chapter 33, Allocation of Development, Chapter 34, Transfer of Development, Chapter 35, Bonus Unit Incentive Program, Chapter 36, Interim Single-Family Review System, Chapter 37, Individual Parcel Evaluation System, Chapter 38, Tracking, Accounting and Banking, Chapter 41, Permissible Subdivisions, Chapter 43, Subdivision Standards, Chapter 50, Review Of Projects in the Shorezone and Lakezone, Chapter 51, Permissible Uses and Accessory Structures in the Shorezone and Lakezone, Chapter 52, Existing Structures, Chapter 53, Shorezone Tolerance Districts and Development Standards, Chapter 54, Development Standards Lakeward of High Water, Chapter 55, Development Standards in the Backshore, Chapter 56, Mitigation Fee Requirements, Chapter 61, Special Information Reports and Plans, Chapter 62, Grading and Construction Schedules, Chapter 64, Grading Standards, Chapter 65, Vegetation Protection During Construction, Chapter 71, Tree Removal, Chapter 72, Prescribed Burning, Chapter 73, Livestock Grazing, Chapter 74, Vegetation Protection and Management, Chapter 75, Sensitive and Uncommon Plant Protection and Fire Hazard Reduction, Chapter 77, Revegetation, Chapter 78, Wildlife Resources, Chapter 79, Fish Resources, Chapter 81, Water Quality Control, Chapter 82, Water Quality Mitigation, Chapter 83, Source Water Protection, Chapter 91, Air Quality Control, Chapter 93, Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program, Chapter 95, Rental Car Mitigation Program, Chapter 97, Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program; by Deleting Existing Chapters 1 Through 97; by Adopting Replacement Chapter 1, Introduction to Code of Ordinances, Chapter 2, Applicability of the Code of Ordinances, Chapter 3, Environmental Documentation, Chapter 4, Required Findings, Chapter 5, Compliance, Chapter 6, Tracking, Accounting and Banking, Chapter 10, TRPA Regional Plan Maps, Chapter 11, Plan Area Statements and Plan Area Maps, Chapter 12, Community Plans, Chapter 13, Redevelopment Plans, Chapter 14, Specific And Master Plans, Chapter 15, Environmental Improvement Program, Chapter 16, Regional Plan And Environmental Threshold Review, Chapter 20, Form Districts (Reserved), Chapter 21, Permissible Uses, Chapter 22, Temporary Uses, Structures and Activities, Chapter 23, Structures
Ms. Marchetta introduced the proposed Code cleanup.

Mr. Nielsen said today’s presentation will focus on only the changes that occurred since the workshop. Since then staff has met with a number of stakeholders. As a result of those meetings there are two additional changes that we are proposing to the Code and this is reflected in a memo that is dated November 8, 2011. He ran through the memo with the Commission. The effective date that we are recommending for the document to take effect is March 1, 2012. We will be holding workshops and training sessions, as well as updating our forms. We will educate our staff and allow the applicants and consultants to get familiar with the Code.

Committee Comments & Questions:

None

Public Comment:

Kristina Hill supports the Code changes.

Nick Exline, Midkiff & Associates support the Code changes.
John Pang, Meeks Bay Fire said they agree with the March effective date and support the Code changes.

Tim Alameda, North Tahoe Fire, supports the Code changes.

Marty Sherman, South Lake Tahoe Fire, supports the Code changes.

Mr. Maurer moved to recommend that the Governing Board approve the required findings, with a finding of no significant effect.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Maurer moved to recommend to the Governing Board adoption of the Ordinance as described in Attachment B, Exhibits 1 & 2 including the changes provided in the memo dated November 8, 2011.

Motion carried unanimously.

VI. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Report

Ms. Marchetta gave the Executive Directors Report.

Mr. Stockham provided the Commission with the list of items that the Regional Plan Update Committee is trying to achieve.

B. General Counsel Report

No report.

B. APC Members

Ms. Huggins thanked staff for the timeliness and the willingness to work through the issues put forth by the League. Staff was wonderful to work with.

Mr. Smith said the Lahonton Water Board is meeting on 12/6-7 and there are two main items on the agenda. One is a proposed Basin Plan amendment that would allow proposals to come forward for using pesticides in the Lahonton Region. Item two is the Tahoe Municipal Stormwater permit or the NPDS permit that is proposed for adoption.
Ms. McMahon said they are working to get a draft 2011 Master Plan on their website prior to Thanksgiving for public review.

Ms. Krause said after sitting on this Commission for 10 years, today’s Code amendment was the easiest we have ever done. She compliments TRPA staff for getting this prepared. Also her boss Kim Robinson is going to be the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency Director and will be leaving their office.

Mr. Lefevre said their Washington D. C. office has tasked them with completing their forest plan by December 2012. The draft plan is currently before our Regional office for review.

Mr. Donohue said their Legislative Council Bureau has asked us to help spread the word that their computer system had a glitch and noticing for the initial interim committee meeting of the Nevada Oversight Committee & Marlette Water System is taking place at the Chateau next Monday at 9:00 a.m.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mr. Tolhurst adjourned the meeting at 3:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Nikkel
Clerk to the Advisory Planning Commission

The above meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA Office, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada.
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 30, 2011
To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Determination of Scope, US 50 South Shore Community Revitalization Project Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS/EIS) in Douglas County and the City of South Lake Tahoe

Proposed Action: No formal action is proposed for this item at this time. The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) and TRPA staff are requesting comments from the members of the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) and the public on the scope and content of a proposed joint EIR/EIS/EIS for the project referenced above. Once the public scoping period of the EIR/EIS/EIS has been completed, the final scope for the document will be prepared to reflect comments received. In addition, certain components of the proposed project may be changed to address comments and/or concerns raised during the scoping process.

Project Location/Existing Conditions: The project is located within the City of South Lake Tahoe and Douglas County. The project is proposing construction of an improved circulation network in and around the Stateline casino corridor area, between a location 0.25 miles southwest of Pioneer Trail in the City of South Lake Tahoe, California and Nevada State Route (SR) 207 (i.e., Kingsbury Grade) in Douglas County, Nevada. This project is identified in the Regional Transportation Plan and the Lake Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

Project Description: The US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project will realign US Highway 50 (US 50) around the Stateline casino corridor area between Lake Parkway in Douglas County, Nevada and a location southwest of Pioneer Trail in South Lake Tahoe, California and create a safer pedestrian and bicycle-friendly roadway with streetscape enhancements within the existing US 50 corridor. The affected segment of US 50 is approximately 1.1 miles long.

Currently, the majority of US 50 in this area consists of four lanes with a continuous center turn lane, and limited sidewalks, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The highway corridor between Pioneer Trail and Kingsbury Grade is often congested during peak winter and summer travel times, does not readily support transit, and does not optimize safety for motorists, transit riders, pedestrians, or bicyclists. During peak-hours in the winter and summer seasons, the US 50 corridor operates at near-capacity conditions through the casino corridor and between Ski Run Boulevard and Stateline Avenue.

Alternatives: The EIR/EIS/EIS will evaluate three potentially feasible alternatives, each at an equal level of detail. The alternatives are described in detail in the attached Notice of Preparation (NOP).
Scope of Environmental Document and Notice of Preparation: The proposed scope and official Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the EIR/EIS/EIS is included as Attachment “A”.

The TTD and TRPA have retained Ascent Environmental to prepare the EIR/EIS/EIS through a three party agreement, with the expenses to be paid by the applicant (TTD). TRPA and the TTD will direct the preparation of the EIR/EIS/EIS.

TTD, TRPA, and Federal Highway Administration (FWHA) are initiating preparation of a joint EIR/EIS/EIS for the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project. This joint document is an EIR prepared by TTD pursuant to CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.); an EIS prepared by FWHA pursuant to NEPA (42 U.S. Code 4321 – 4347), the Council on Environmental Quality’s Regulations Implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500 – 1508), FHWA Environmental Impact and Related Procedures (23 CFR 771), and the FHWA NEPA Environmental Guidebook; and an EIS prepared by TRPA pursuant to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, Code of Ordinances, and Rules of Procedure. This notice meets the CEQA and TRPA noticing requirements for a NOP, and provides local notice of a Notice of Intent (NOI) for NEPA purposes. The NOI has been published in the Federal Register in accordance with NEPA requirements.

The purpose of the public scoping is to solicit views of interested persons, organizations, and agencies as they relate to the scope and content of the information to be included and analyzed in the EIR/EIS/EIS. Agencies should comment on the elements of the environmental information that are relevant to their legal authority and statutory responsibilities in connection with the project. The designated public scoping period began on November 2, 2011 and will extend for 44 calendar days, concluding on December 16, 2011. Comments would be most helpful if received within the designated scoping period. Please send your comments and contact information to Alfred Knotts, TTD Project Manager by any of the following:

Via Mail: Alfred Knotts  
P.O. Box 499  
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448  
Via Phone: (775) 589-5503  
Via Fax: (775) 588-0917  
Via Email: aknotts@tahoetransportation.org

Please see Attachment A for the full Notice of Preparation/Notice and Intent and complete Project Description, including proposed alignments.

Contact Information: If you have any questions, please contact Nick Haven at nhaven@trpa.org or 775-589-5256.

Attachment:  
A. Notice of Preparation

NH/jw  
AGENDA ITEM VI.A.  
2
This notice is being issued jointly by the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) in preparation of a joint California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Environmental Impact Report (EIR), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and TRPA EIS. The NEPA EIS component is being led by the FHWA California Division in coordination with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), and the FHWA Nevada Division.

NOTICE OF PREPARATION / NOTICE OF INTENT

To: California State Clearinghouse
   Nevada State Clearinghouse
   California Responsible Agencies
   California Trustee Agencies
   Other Interested Public Agencies
   Interested Parties and Organizations
   Affected Property Owners (within 300 feet of the project boundary)

Subject: Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a CEQA Draft EIR and TRPA Draft EIS and Notice of Intent (NOI) to Prepare a Draft EIS for the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project.

Lead Agencies:

TTD
P.O. Box 499
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448
Contact: Alfred Knotts
Project Manager
Phone: (775) 589-5503
Fax: (775) 588-0917
aknotts@tahoetransportation.org

FHWA
California Division
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 4-100
Sacramento, CA 95814
Contact: Larry Vinzant
Senior Environmental Specialist
Phone: (916) 498-5040
Fax: (916) 498-5008
larry.vinzant@dot.gov

TRPA
P.O. Box 5310
128 Market Street
Stateline, Nevada 89449-5310
Contact: Brian Judge
Principal Environmental Specialist
Phone: (775) 589-5262
Fax: (775) 588-4527
bjudge@trpa.org

Project Title: US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project

Project Location: The project is located along and within the vicinity of the US 50 Stateline corridor between a location 0.25 mile southwest of Pioneer Trail in the City of South Lake Tahoe, California and Nevada State Route (SR) 207 (Kingsbury Grade) in Douglas County, Nevada.

Project Overview: The US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project would realign US 50 in the Stateline casino corridor area and convert the existing US 50 roadway, between a location southwest of Pioneer Trail in California and Lake Parkway in Nevada, into a two-lane roadway (one travel lane in each direction) with a center, landscaped median and turn pockets at major driveways and intersections. Expanded sidewalks and bicycle lanes would be constructed in this section within the casino corridor to improve pedestrian safety and encourage use of alternative transportation modes, and traffic signals would be installed and synchronized to improve the flow of traffic. Several alternatives for the realignment of US 50 have been considered over the years. The current proposal involves realigning US 50 from its intersection at Lake Parkway in Nevada along Lake
ATTACHMENT A

Parkway East on the mountain (southeast) side of the Stateline casino corridor area behind the Montbleu and Harrah’s casinos. West of the casinos, the realigned US 50 would continue behind (south of) Heavenly Village Center (Raley’s Shopping Center and formerly Crescent V) and then along a new alignment between Fern and Echo Roads, rejoining the existing US 50 at its intersection with Pioneer Trail. The new US 50 alignment would be four lanes (two travel lanes in each direction) with left-turn pockets at intersections and entrances to businesses.

TTD, FHWA, and TRPA are initiating preparation of a joint EIR/EIS/EIS for the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project. This joint document is an EIR prepared by TTD pursuant to CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.); an EIS prepared by FHWA pursuant to NEPA (42 U.S. Code 4321 – 4347), the Council on Environmental Quality’s Regulations Implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1500 – 1508), FHWA Environmental Impact and Related Procedures (23 CFR 771), and the FHWA NEPA Environmental Guidebook; and an EIS prepared by TRPA pursuant to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, Code of Ordinances, and Rules of Procedure. This notice meets the CEQA and TRPA noticing requirements for an NOP, and provides local notice of an NOI for NEPA purposes. The NOI will also be published in the Federal Register in accordance with NEPA requirements.

A brief description of the alternatives likely to be evaluated in the EIR/EIS/EIS and a summary of the probable environmental effects of the proposed project are attached hereto, or are available for review on the TRPA website at: www.trpa.org, and on the TTD website at: www.tahoetransportation.org.

Public Scoping: The purpose of this NOP/NOI is to solicit views of interested persons, organizations, and agencies as they relate to the scope and content of the information to be included and analyzed in the EIR/EIS/EIS. Agencies should comment on the elements of the environmental information that are relevant to their legal authority and statutory responsibilities in connection with the project.

The designated public scoping period will extend for 44 calendar days beginning on November 2, 2011 and concluding on December 16, 2011. Comments would be most helpful if received within the designated scoping period. Please send your comments and contact information to Alfred Knotts, TTD Project Manager, by mail, fax, or email to the address shown above.

Two public scoping meetings will be held to provide the opportunity to learn more about the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project and to receive comments from the public and other interested parties and agencies regarding the issues that should be addressed in the EIR/EIS/EIS. The scoping meetings will be held as follows:

Thursday, November 10, 2011
Beginning at 1:00 p.m.
Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) 
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency – Board Room
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Wednesday, December 7, 2011
Beginning at 9:30 a.m.
TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC)
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency – Board Room
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

The TTD and TRPA APC meetings will begin at 1:00 p.m. and 9:30 a.m., respectively; however, scoping for the proposed project is not time certain. Please refer to the agendas posted at www.trpa.org and www.tahoetransportation.org no more than 1 week prior to the meetings for updated information.

If you have further questions or require additional information, please contact Alfred Knotts at TTD by mail, fax, or email at the address shown above.
US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project EIR/EIS/EIS
South Lake Tahoe, California and Douglas County, Nevada
Project Information

PROJECT OVERVIEW AND LOCATION

The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) is proposing construction of an improved circulation network in and around the Stateline casino corridor area, between a location 0.25 mile southwest of Pioneer Trail in the City of South Lake Tahoe, California and Nevada State Route (SR) 207 (i.e., Kingsbury Grade) in Douglas County, Nevada (Exhibit 1). The US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project would realign US Highway 50 (US 50) around the Stateline casino corridor area between Lake Parkway in Douglas County, Nevada and a location southwest of Pioneer Trail in South Lake Tahoe, California and create a safer pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly roadway with streetscape enhancements within the existing US 50 corridor. The affected segment of US 50 is approximately 1.1 miles long.

US 50 is one of two major east-west connections between northern California and northern Nevada in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Currently, the majority of US 50 in this area consists of four lanes with a continuous center turn lane, and limited sidewalks, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The highway corridor between Pioneer Trail and Kingsbury Grade is often congested during peak winter and summer travel times, does not readily support transit, and does not optimize safety for motorists, transit riders, pedestrians, or bicyclists. During peak-hours in the winter and summer seasons, the US 50 corridor operates at near-capacity conditions through the casino corridor and between Ski Run Boulevard and Stateline Avenue.

PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project is to improve the corridor in a manner consistent with the Loop Road System concept; reduce congestion; improve vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle safety; advance multi-modal transportation opportunities; improve the environmental quality of the area; enhance visitor and community experience; and promote the economic vitality of the area. The project will fulfill the following specific needs:

A. Article V(2) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (Public Law 96-551), 1980 (Compact), requires a transportation plan for the integrated development of a regional system of transportation within the Tahoe Region. The Compact requires the transportation plan to include consideration of the completion of the Loop Road System in the States of California and Nevada. Improvements are required to the corridor to meet the intent of the Loop Road System concept.

B. Ongoing and proposed resort redevelopment in the project area has increased pedestrian traffic, creating a need for improved pedestrian safety, mobility, and multi-modal transportation options. Improvements to pedestrian facilities, bicycle lanes, and transit are needed to connect the outlying residential and retail-commercial uses with employment and entertainment facilities, including hotels and gaming interests. Currently, there are no bicycle lanes on US 50 through the project area, and sidewalks are either not large enough to meet the increased demand, or do not exist. These issues adversely affect safety, and the visitor and community experience of the area.

C. Environmental improvements are needed in the area to help achieve the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency’s (TRPA’s) adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities (ETCCs or thresholds), including water quality and air quality. Improvements to stormwater runoff collection and treatment facilities are needed to meet TRPA, Nevada Department of Environmental Protection (NDEP), and Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) regulations and requirements. Reduction of vehicle congestion and numbers of vehicles on the roadway through enhanced pedestrian and multi-modal opportunities is needed to provide for improved air quality. Landscape improvements are needed to enhance the scenic quality of the project area, to facilitate compliance with TRPA’s scenic thresholds, and to enhance the community and tourism experience.
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D. The project is needed to implement the various regional and local plans for the area, including the Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan, the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program, and the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan.

E. The project is needed to mitigate severe summer and winter peak period traffic congestion along US 50 in the project area by achieving and maintaining acceptable levels of service for existing and future traffic demand. During peak hours, traffic often operates at Level of Service (LOS) “F” (breakdown) when tourism is at its peak during the summer and winter months.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project area includes the US 50 corridor and vicinity between an area southwest of the Pioneer Trail/US 50 Intersection in the City of South Lake Tahoe, California and SR 207 in Douglas County, Nevada, as well as the land generally bounded by Lake Parkway East, Montreal Road, and Echo Road on the southeast side, or “mountain side”, of the state line area.

The existing US 50 corridor between Kingsbury Grade and Ski Run Boulevard is one of the most densely developed areas within the Lake Tahoe Basin. At the northern end of the project area, property on both sides of US 50 between SR 207 and Lake Parkway is owned by the Edgewood Companies. This property includes the Edgewood Tahoe Golf Course and Friday’s Station, a historic military post and one-time staging area for both Wells Fargo and the Pony Express. Also in Nevada, casinos are located along both sides of the highway from the intersection of US 50 and Lake Parkway to the California state line. At the state line, land uses on the California side change to resort facilities, including Heavenly Village and the Heavenly Village Center (Raley’s Shopping Center) on the mountain side (southeast side) of US 50 and various tourist establishments, such as motels and retail stores on the lake side (northwest side) of the highway. Tahoe Meadows, a private residential community listed on the National Register of Historic Places, borders US 50 on the lake side at the southwestern end of the project area. Within the project area, US 50 is a four-lane arterial with a continuous two-way left-turn median lane that transitions to dedicated left-turn pockets at major intersections.

Lake Parkway and Montreal Road (which is the continuation of Lake Parkway to the south) are two-lane (one lane in each direction) roadways. Van Sickle Bi-State Park and forested open space lie to the east and southeast (mountain side), and casinos, Heavenly Village, and the Heavenly Village Center occupy land to the west and northwest (lake side). Echo Road is approximately 0.2 miles long and runs perpendicular to US 50 between US 50 and Lake Parkway/Montreal Road through a predominantly residential area (single-family homes and multi-family complexes) just south of the Heavenly Village Center complex. Motels, businesses, and residences are located adjacent to Pioneer Trail in this area.

The project area includes two streams, Edgewood Creek located between Lake Parkway and SR 207, and a tributary of Edgewood Creek located on the north side Lake Parkway (opposite Harrah’s) that drains into an existing culvert under the roadway.

ALTERNATIVES

The US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project has undergone more than a decade of study. The first comprehensive report on the project was released by TRPA in May 2004. The report “US Highway 50/Stateline Transportation Planning Study – Final Report,” identified five potentially feasible action alternatives, Alternatives A, B, C, D, and E to improve the circulation network in and around the Stateline casino corridor area. Alternative E is a variant of Alternative C and D wherein a temporary closure (in both directions) is proposed during special events, and is not considered a standalone action alternative. These alternatives, and variations thereof, have since been the subject of numerous technical evaluations, meetings, design charrettes, reports, and public input sessions.

The action alternatives (Alternatives A, B, C, and D) were subjected to the following evaluation criteria to identify those suitable to carry forward through detailed environmental review: (1) project status (extent of agency and public support); (2) system linkage (consistency with transportation and land use planning documents); (3) capacity (ability of projected LOS in 2035 to meet Caltrans’ standards); (4) legislation (ability to satisfy Purpose and Need and implement the Loop Road Concept); (5) social demands (ability to encourage
community enhancements, tourism, and support special events by allowing roadway closures; (6) modal interrelationships (ability to demonstrate pedestrian, bicycle, and transit mobility enhancements); (7) safety; and (8) roadway deficiencies (stormwater quality, maintenance agreements and driver expectations).

Maps showing the action alternatives, including those that have been dismissed from further evaluation, and a memorandum that details the alternatives evaluation are available for review on the TRPA website at: www.trpa.org, and on the TTD website at: www.tahoetransportation.org.

Modified versions of two of the original proposed action alternatives, C and D, have been determined to best satisfy the project’s Purpose and Need and are described below. These, and potentially one or more other action alternatives that address identified impacts and achieve project goals, and the No Project/No Action Alternative will be evaluated at an equal level of detail in the EIR/EIS/EIS.

For the purposes of the EIR/EIS/EIS, the alternatives are identified as the follows:

- Alternative 1 – this alternative reflects the No Project/No Action Alternative.
- Alternative 2 – this alternative reflects the proposed action and a modified version of Alternative D from prior project planning documents.
- Alternative 3 – this alternative reflects the modified version of the Alternative C from prior project planning documents.

A brief description of these alternatives follows below.

**Alternative 1**

Alternative 1, the No Project/No Action alternative, assumes that the transportation system and facilities in the project area would remain unchanged. Existing roadway, pedestrian, and streetscape conditions would continue into the foreseeable future.

**Alternative 2**

Alternative 2 reflects the proposed action. Under Alternative 2, US 50 would be realigned around the Stateline casino corridor area between Lake Parkway in Nevada and a location southwest of Pioneer Trail in California (Exhibit 2). The new US 50 alignment would be four lanes (two travel lanes in each direction) with a dedicated left-turn lane and left-turn pockets at intersections, and would follow Lake Parkway south from its intersection with US 50 in Nevada. Alternative 2 involves realigning US 50 along Lake Parkway on the mountain side behind Montbleu and Harrah's casinos. East of the casinos, the realigned US 50 would continue behind the Heavenly Village Center (Raley's Shopping Center) and then along a new alignment between Fern and Echo Roads, rejoining US 50 at its intersection with Pioneer Trail. Two new cul-de-sacs would be constructed at the end of Fern and Montreal Roads. The new US 50 would require right-of-way acquisition from private property owners and state-owned land from Van Sickle Bi-State Park along Lake Parkway and Montreal Road, and the connection between Montreal Road and the Pioneer Trail/US 50 Intersection would displace existing residences and businesses southwest of the Heavenly Village Center (Exhibit 2). The number of residences and businesses to be displaced is unknown at this time.

To address the residential and business displacement, the lead agencies have initiated preparation of a Relocation Assistance Plan (RAP) that will involve door-to-door residential interviews to estimate the number of households to be displaced and to collect socioeconomic baseline information. Residential interviews are expected to begin in winter 2011. Caltrans/FHWA will follow the requirements of their Relocation Assistance Program in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended) and Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 24, as well as California Relocation Assistance Law (California Government Code Section 7260 et seq.), the California Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 25 and Chapter 6, Section 6000 et seq.), and Caltrans’ Right of Way Manual, Chapter 10. The Relocation Assistance Program includes assignment of a relocation counselor who will work with displaced residents and business owners, starting with an explanation of relocation assistance and payments, depending on eligibility. Residential displaces may be entitled to advisory assistance, moving costs, and replacement housing payments.
Exhibit 2

Location of Action Alternatives - Alternatives 2 and 3

Diagram showing the location of action alternatives, including Alternative 3 and Alternative 2 - Proposed Action (includes other Alternative 3 improvements).
Between Pioneer Trail and Lake Parkway within the casino corridor, US 50 would become a local street and would be converted to two lanes, one way in each direction, with a landscaped median and turn pockets at major driveways and intersections. The respective sections of this stretch of existing US 50 would be relinquished to the City of South Lake Tahoe and Douglas County. Expanded sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and traffic signals would be installed to improve the flow of traffic, improve pedestrian safety, and encourage the use of alternative transportation modes along the roadway. The project also includes landscaped buffers between US 50 and the sidewalks, streetscape amenities (e.g., light fixtures, trash receptacles, and seating areas), and use of more aesthetic road materials such as pavers or colored concrete in certain locations. Landscape improvements would include native plants. The narrowing of US 50 through the casino corridor may involve existing right-of-way to be relinquished.

Under Alternative 2, the existing signalized US 50/Lake Parkway intersection would be replaced with a two-lane roundabout (Exhibit 2). The proposed roundabout would be constructed with the intention of creating a gateway experience into the Stateline casino corridor area and would be designed to provide pedestrian and bicycle safety and crossing ease.

The Alternative 2 roadway improvements would also include new curb and gutter, striping, retaining wall structures, and other stormwater drainage, capture, and treatment facilities. The proposed improvements could result in the relocation of existing utility lines.

**Alternative 3**

Alternative 3 proposes the same overall design and improvements included under Alternative 2 with one exception. Under Alternative 3, the existing signalized US 50/Lake Parkway intersection would be retained (Exhibit 2).

**Alternatives Considered But Eliminated from Further Evaluation**

Alternatives A and B, evaluated in prior project planning studies, would involve realigning US 50 from its intersection at Lake Parkway in Nevada along Lake Parkway West on the lake side (northwest) of the Stateline casino corridor area behind the Horizon and Harvey’s casinos.

Under Alternative A, the existing US 50 roadway between Lake Parkway and Park Avenue would be converted to two eastbound travel lanes plus one transit-only lane. Lake Parkway West, Pine Boulevard, and Park Avenue on the lake side of US 50 would be improved to provide two westbound travel lanes, plus a single eastbound lane for local access and a continuous center turn lane. The existing US 50 would be redesignated as US 50 East, and the Lake Parkway West/Pine Boulevard/Park Avenue alignment would become US 50 West. Signal improvements would be implemented as needed at existing signalized intersections, and new signals would be provided at the US 50 West/Park Avenue and US 50 West/Stateline Avenue intersections.

Alternative B is similar to Alternative A with the new US 50 alignment on the lake side of existing US 50. Alternative B would also convert the existing US 50 roadway between Lake Parkway and Park Avenue to two eastbound travel lanes plus one transit-only lane. With Alternative B, Lake Parkway West, Cedar Avenue, and Park Avenue would be improved to provide two westbound travel lanes, plus a single eastbound lane for local access and a continuous center turn lane. The existing US 50 would be redesignated as US 50 East, and the Lake Parkway West/Cedar Avenue/Park Avenue alignment would become US 50 West. A new transition roadway segment would be required between the Cedar Avenue/Stateline Avenue Intersection and the existing Lake Parkway West alignment, north of Harvey’s. Signal improvements would be implemented, as needed, at existing signalized intersections, and new signals would be provided by US 50 West/Stateline Avenue.

These alternatives were subjected to the above-described evaluation criteria and it was determined that they did not satisfactorily meet the Purpose and Need, primarily because both alternatives are predicted to operate at an annual average LOS F in 2035, which is below Caltrans’ LOS standard. In addition, neither alternative would allow for closure of US 50 East through the casino corridor for special events, nor would they divert vehicles away from areas with high pedestrian and bicycle volumes. Alternatives A and B would also pose certain design and maintenance challenges: both alternatives lack readily available opportunities for stormwater treatment facilities and would require design variances that could result in driver confusion.
**Probable Environmental Effects**

Probable environmental effects associated with the proposed project are described briefly below. Mitigation measures will be recommended for any identified significant or potentially significant effects. The following subject areas will be analyzed in detail in the EIR/EIS/EIS.

**Land Use and Plan Consistency.** The project would include right-of-way changes: right-of-way would be acquired from private and public landowners to accommodate the new US 50 alignment, and right-of-way may be relinquished in the existing US 50 corridor. The project would not alter the nature and types of land uses in the project area. It would displace existing residences and businesses southwest of the Heavenly Village Center. Potential land use conflicts related to the remaining parcels would be addressed. Acquisition of parcels would affect setbacks, parking, community character, and other related issues for businesses and residences. The EIR/EIS/EIS will also evaluate the project’s consistency with applicable TRPA community plans and plan area statements (PAS), ordinances, and goals and policies; the City of South Lake Tahoe General Plan; Nevada Division of State Parks and California Tahoe Conservancy planning guidance for Van Sickle Bi-State Park; and other relevant planning and policy documents. The need for any TRPA community plan and/or PAS amendments will also be evaluated and discussed in the EIR/EIS/EIS.

**Socioeconomic Impacts and Environmental Justice.** The realignment of US 50 would displace businesses and residences and provide relocation assistance for the affected parties. Executive Order 12898 of 1994 requires federal agencies to address environmental justice in minority populations and low-income populations. The EIR/EIS/EIS will address socioeconomic and environmental justice concerns including: 1) community character and cohesion; 2) required residential relocation; 3) issues related to a higher than average concentration of low-income, senior citizens, or minority/ethnic individuals; and 4) potential environmental justice issues, including potentially disproportionate impacts to these populations as a result of the proposed project and/or alternatives. Mitigation measures (temporary and permanent) will be proposed, if needed.

**Recreation and Section 4(f).** The project includes new on-road striped bicycle lanes through the casino corridor and along the new US 50 that would provide alternative transportation means to access retail businesses and connectivity to planned shared-use paths in the area (e.g., the Nevada Stateline-to-Stateline Bikeway, the Daggett Trail System, and the South Tahoe Greenway). The new US 50 would encroach on existing parklands at Van Sickle Bi-State Park owned by the Nevada Division of State Parks and California Tahoe Conservancy and maintained by the Tahoe Rim Trail Association. The effects on Van Sickle Bi-State Park and the South Tahoe Greenway connection through the park, as well as a Section 4(f) evaluation will be included in the EIR/EIS/EIS. Mitigation measures (temporary and permanent) will be proposed where needed.

**Scenic/Visual Resources.** The proposed realignment of US 50 is intended, in part, to improve the scenic character through the casino corridor by adding new light fixtures, expanded sidewalks, and other streetscape fixtures. Although the roadway improvements are not expected to substantially affect visual resources, some existing native conifer trees and non-native ornamental landscaping will be removed. In addition, views to and from the roadway and from public recreation areas may have an effect on the visual environment, including views of Lake Tahoe and/or the mountain backdrop. The visual impact assessment in the EIR/EIS/EIS will use the Federal Highway Administration “Visual Impact Assessment for a Highway Project” methodology and guidance. Mitigation measures (temporary and permanent) will be proposed, if needed.

**Archaeological/Historical Resources.** The EIR/EIS/EIS will provide an overview of the project area’s prehistory, ethnography, and history, study methodology, and a discussion of documented archaeological and historical resources. The US 50 Stateline Corridor and project area has been developed since the 1950s and contains buildings that may be 50 years old or older. Friday’s Station at the northeastern end of the project area and Tahoe Meadows at the southwestern end are both listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The potential for the project to adversely affect these known sites and potentially, other unrecorded sites, features, or objects will be evaluated, and suitable measures designated to mitigate project-related impacts will be identified as necessary. For any potentially affected resources, the EIR/EIS/EIS will include an evaluation for National, Nevada, and California Register eligibility in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA; Public Law 89-665 and amendments thereto; 16 USC 470 et seq.), Chapter 29 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 5024 et seq. of the California Public Resources Code, and Chapter 383 of the Nevada Revised Statutes. The evaluation methodology will also include consultation with the Washoe Tribe. Mitigation measures (temporary and permanent) will be proposed, if needed.
Hydrology, Water Quality, and Floodplains. The project area is located in Zone X and Zone D on Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Zone Designation maps. Zone X is determined to be outside of the 200-year annual flood zone and Zone D is an area where flood hazards are undetermined, but possible. The proposed improvements would cross a single drainage, a tributary of Edgewood Creek, south of Lake Parkway. The realignment of US 50 could affect hydrologic function of this drainage and the stream environment zone (SEZ) surrounding the creek. The realignment could also affect existing drainage basins and features in the project area. Both pre- and post-construction impacts to these features will be identified and analyzed in the EIR/EIS/EIS. This will include non-point pollution sources from the project, potential contaminants, proposed source control methods, and proposed temporary and permanent best management practices (BMPs) to address potential impacts on water quality. The EIR/EIS/EIS will also address potential flooding and floodplain effects, potential short-term and long-term changes in sediment rate and transport as it relates to altered landscapes, total maximum daily load (TMDL) effects, source water protection (wells and intake lines), and long-term water quality monitoring needs. Mitigation measures (temporary and permanent) will be proposed, if needed.

Earth Resources: Geology and Soils, and Land Capability and Coverage. The proposed project includes roadway improvements that would realign US 50. Excavation, grading and alteration of the existing site topography would be required for the proposed roadway and utility improvements, particularly on the mountain side of Lake Parkway where the terrain slopes steeply away from the roadway. The project would likely increase existing land coverage in the project area and may require banking land coverage to be transferred to the project in accordance with TRPA regulations; the increased coverage would occur in both low and high capability lands. The EIR/EIS/EIS will include a general discussion of topographic alteration, slope stability, and erosion potential. In addition, the EIR/EIS/EIS will evaluate the potential for unstable cut and fill slopes; collapsible and expansive soil; erosion of graded areas; geologic/geomorphological hazards (e.g., avalanche, earthquake, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, subsidence, and liquefaction); and unprotected drainage ways. If soil export outside of the study area is necessary, potential disposal sites will be identified and evaluated. Mitigation measures (temporary and permanent) will be proposed, if needed.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The proposed project would involve the transportation of hazardous materials (e.g., fuel, paint) to the project site for construction purposes. The potential for these materials to be released to the environment will be evaluated in the EIR/EIS/EIS. Historical uses and the potential for site contamination will be documented in the EIR/EIS/EIS, and areas of potential soil or groundwater contamination in the project area will be described. In addition, this analysis will also address potential effects on emergency response plans and fire hazard risks. Mitigation measures (temporary and permanent) will be proposed, if needed.

Air Quality and Conformity. Air Quality is an important resource issue in the Lake Tahoe Basin and is related to multiple factors, including transportation and circulation. Currently the TRPA air quality threshold indicators for the Lake Tahoe Air Basin for carbon monoxide ozone, particulate matter, and vehicle miles of travel (VMT) are in non-attainment. The EIR/EIS/EIS will include an assessment of ambient air quality conditions as well as short-term (i.e., construction) air quality impacts and long-term (i.e., operational) regional air pollutant emissions, including mobile and area source emissions. The potential for long-term air quality benefits will also be evaluated from its use as an alternative to the private automobile and potential reduction in VMT. The analysis will identify sensitive receptors within and in the vicinity of the project area, discuss potential emissions of odors and/or hazardous air pollutants generated by stationary and area sources in the area, General Conformity and Transportation Conformity, and determine the significance of air quality impacts in comparison with applicable local, state, and federal standards and significance thresholds. Mitigation measures (temporary and permanent) will be recommended for significant impacts, if necessary.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change. The EIR/EIS/EIS will include an analysis of potential project impacts relative to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate change. This analysis will include a quantitative estimate of operational carbon dioxide emissions from mobile sources. Carbon dioxide will be used as a proxy for all GHGs potentially emitted as a result of project operation. GHG emissions from project construction will also be discussed qualitatively. Mitigation measures (temporary and permanent) will be recommended for significant impacts, if necessary.

Noise and Vibration. The realignment of US 50 could result in noise levels that exceed applicable local, state, regional, and federal standards, particularly in undeveloped forested areas, Van Sickle Bi-State Park, and residential areas near the US 50/Pioneer Trail intersection. The EIR/EIS/EIS will assess potential short-term (i.e.,
construction-related) noise impacts relative to sensitive receptors and their potential exposure. Noise levels of specific construction equipment will be determined based on published resources and a list of construction equipment likely to be used during project construction. The resultant noise levels at nearby receptors (at given distances from the sources) will be calculated. Long-term (i.e., operational) noise impacts, including increased noise from mobile and area sources will be assessed based on applicable local, state, regional, and federal noise standards. The potential for construction and operation-related vibration to adversely affect sensitive receptors or result in structural damage will also be evaluated. Mitigation measures (temporary and permanent) will be recommended for significant impacts, if necessary.

**Transportation, Circulation, and Parking.** The proposed realignment of US 50 is intended to improve circulation and transit patronage, LOS at project intersections, safety through the casino corridor, and to reduce VMT by increasing transit use and providing pedestrian and bicycle-friendly facilities through the casino corridor. The proposed project would generate short-term, construction related traffic. Long-term traffic impacts are anticipated to be beneficial. The transportation analysis will include identification of major roadways that may be affected by the proposed project, a discussion of traffic volumes and vehicle mix on those roadways, and their overall operating conditions, and potential impacts to traffic flow, safety, snow removal operations, and road wear. Mitigation measures (temporary and permanent) will be recommended for significant impacts, if necessary.

**Public Services and Utilities.** The public services and utilities section of the EIR/EIS/EIS will evaluate potential effects on power, solid waste collection and disposal, police services, fire protection services, water treatment and distribution, and wastewater collection – including any impacts associated with disturbance or relocation of existing overhead and underground utility lines. Mitigation measures (temporary and permanent) will be proposed, if necessary.

**Biological Resources: Fisheries and Aquatic Resources, Vegetation, and Wildlife.** Construction and use of the action alternatives could affect the distribution, extent, and quality of sensitive and common biological resources that may be located within the project area. Lands within the project area are generally disturbed or developed. The area on the mountain side of Lake Parkway East, near Van Sickle Bi-State Park and Friday’s Station, is undeveloped. A tributary of Edgewood Creek and associated SEZ is located across Lake Parkway East from Harrah’s. The stream crosses underneath Lake Parkway via a corrugated pipe culvert. Upstream from the culvert the stream is lined with willows (Salix sp.) and supports wetlands. A jurisdictional wetland delineation will be conducted in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act to identify waters of the United States. Trees and shrubs that occur within the project area may provide suitable nesting sites for protected raptors and other nesting birds. The EIR/EIS/EIS will evaluate biological resources effects in accordance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 USC 703-712), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA; Public Law 93-205; 16 USC 1531 et seq.), and the California Endangered Species Act (Fish & Game Code Section 2050 et seq.). The relationship of the TRPA vegetation and wildlife threshold carrying capacities will be discussed along with tree removal related to construction of the action alternatives. Impacts on native vegetation, fisheries and aquatic resources, and wildlife will be described based on the proposed site development. The potential for the project to result in the spread of noxious weeds (e.g., cheatgrass) will also be discussed. Mitigation measures (temporary and permanent) will be proposed where needed.

**Cumulative and Indirect Effects.** The EIR/EIS/EIS will identify past, recently approved, and reasonably foreseeable projects likely to occur in the vicinity of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project and the implications of major planning efforts that are underway, including the TRPA Regional Plan Update, the Edgewood Hotel and Golf Course Realignment Project, Redevelopment Project No. 3, and the South Shore Vision Plan, as well as growth contemplated in the nearby community plans that may result in cumulative impacts when combined with the proposed project. The EIR/EIS/EIS will evaluate the project’s direct and indirect contribution to the cumulative effects of these activities.

**Growth-Inducing Impacts.** The proposed project and action alternatives would increase the number of jobs available in the region on a temporary basis during construction. Given the growth restrictions that existing in the Lake Tahoe Basin (limited commodities and restrictions on development), project implementation is not anticipated to result in long-term growth-inducing impacts.

**TRPA Threshold Carrying Capacities.** The EIR/EIS/EIS will include assessment of the project alternatives’ compliance with and contribution to the attainment and maintenance of threshold carrying capacities adopted by TRPA.