



North Tahoe Preservation Alliance
P.O. Box 4
Crystal Bay, Nv. 89402
775-831-0625
www.ntpac.com

"Helping preserve the natural beauty and rural character of North Lake Tahoe"

12/21/2015

via email, fax and hand delivery

Maywan Krach
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
Environmental Coordination Services
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Re: Martis Valley West Draft EIR

Dear Ms. Krach:

This letter provides comments on the above mentioned DEIR. The North Tahoe Preservation Alliance (NTPA) is a Nevada Nonprofit corporation formed in 2008 to ensure that North Lake Tahoe retains its natural beauty and easygoing, rustic lifestyle. Its Board of Directors are comprised of long time Tahoe residents and property owners. This letter provides comments on the DEIR that are in addition to and do not replace or otherwise supersede comments that were previously submitted. Accompanying this letter is a USB flash drive containing electronic copies in pdf format of the documents listed in the appendix to this letter. Please contact us if you have any difficulty displaying the documents.

For the reasons set forth below, the draft EIR needs to be revised and recirculated. On-going mitigation should be required by recorded covenants, conditions, and restrictions on the project site as discussed below. The development agreement should contain similar provisions.

North Tahoe Preservation Alliance appreciates this opportunity to comment on the Martis Valley West DEIR.

After careful review the EIR fails to comply with the requirements of CEQA because it fails to:

- 1) Adequately describe the project 2) analyze the significant environmental impacts of the project or adequately mitigate those impacts and 3) undertake a legally sufficient study of alternatives to the project.**

As a result there can be no meaningful public review of the project. Placer County must revise and recirculate the DEIR in order to permit an adequate understanding of the environmental issues at stake. The project fails to conform to the provision of the Martis Valley Community Plan, the Placer County General Plan and land use ordinance's provisions to protect the fundamental values of the Lake Tahoe and Martis Valley region. Approval of the project would violate CEQA and California Planning and Zoning law., Gov't Code 65000 et seq.

I. The DEIR provides an incomplete description of the project and the project setting.

The DEIR failed to describe the local and regional context of the Project. The same landowner of Martis Valley West; Sierra Pacific Industries has recently applied for the adjacent Brockway Campground (BC) project (inside the Lake Tahoe Basin), which is 550 campsites and 870k sf of coverage. These are two adjacent projects that the DEIR fails to describe and analyze together which constitutes piecemeal planning. Bifurcating the project after the initial NOP into the Martis Valley West (MVW) project (760 units and 6.6 acres of commercial) and then now the applied for adjacent Brockway Campground (BC), has split the larger initial NOP project in two. Each are owned by the same entity and each have a significant impact on the environment and cumulatively have disastrous consequences. It is insufficient to remain silent on the details of the BC and the impacts of these two projects. The DEIR also fails to include any maps describing the two projects. (See attached map- Exhibit 1) showing relationship to nearest development at Northstar, Highlands View Rd., and the potential development of the Brockway Campground and the Northstar Mountain Master Plan, both glossed over in the cumulative analysis. As a full time 40 year plus resident of North Tahoe and a Nv. And Ca. Real Estate Broker since the 70's, I have a deep knowledge of the area and its existing development. I have also had numerous site visits to the MVW project area over the last two years. The Fibreboard Freeway recreation area is a significant recreation resource for the entire region.

The DEIR also fails to give a complete description of the project components. The public deserves to know what the project would look like. How tall will the structures be and how many roads will be cut? How big will the commercial be on top of the peak overlooking Tahoe and Truckee. As previously requested in our NOP comments, the proponent must develop a model of the project and provide story poles to give the public a true picture of the impacts on Truckee and Tahoe.

The Martis Valley West Specific Parcel Plan which included specifics on land use, design and implementation was not part of the DEIR. This omission further limited the Public's ability to analyze potential project impacts.

II. The DEIR improperly segments linked projects.

The MVW and BC projects are linked and must be analyzed together. They are linked since they are directly adjacent and the fact that MVW emergency access road is through the BC (Lake Tahoe Lands) and the fact that both projects share the same bench on a ridge overlooking Martis Valley and Lake Tahoe. In fact one can see Lake Tahoe and the Truckee Airport from the far northern edge of the MVW site. Together these two projects could have a combined population of approx. 4000 people creating a new community in the middle of lands currently zoned forest which is the equivalent of the resident population of Kings Beach. The DEIR must be revised and recirculated considering these linked projects and their environmental impacts. Simply briefly mentioning the BC later under cumulative impacts is insufficient.

III. The DEIR improperly describes the project setting and baseline as it compares to another illusory project ½ mile below the ridge in Martis Valley.

The DEIR skews the results of the environmental analysis by constantly comparing the project to a hypothetical scenario on other lands also owned by the applicant. The phantom baseline comparison lands are ½ mile below the ridge and on the east side of Hwy 267. These lands have a land use designation to potentially allow 1360 units, however no project has been applied for, analyzed, approved or built. It is pure supposition that the east area would have been allowed to be rezoned allowing that number of units. Any potential project could just as easily been significantly reduced in size as approved. During an approval process the east parcel project would have had to fill out an environmental questionnaire which would have brought to the light the following significant concerns:

-The project was not clustered on a reduced footprint. It was in fact sprawl, 1360 units on 670 acres. (see attached subdivision map Exhibit 2)

-The project would have created significant traffic/transportation, air quality, GHG, visual, night sky environmental impacts requiring a DEIR.

The DEIR should correctly analyze the existing conditions of the MVW project site as it exists today on undeveloped forest land.

This DEIR should make no adjustments or justifications for the MVW project's environmental impacts due to potential conservation easements elsewhere in the area.

It is deeply misleading to measure the significance of the project's impacts by comparing the project to a hypothetical "what if" scenario rather than to existing conditions. The DEIR uses this illusory East Project baseline comparison 15 times to justify environmental impacts and skew mitigations:

Land/Forest Impacts-5-1, 5-2, 5-5, 5-6, 5-7, 5-8

Population Impact-6-5

Biologic Impacts-7-1,7-2,7-6,7-7,7-10

Geology/Soils Impacts-14-2, 14-6

Recreation Impact-17-1

Of the 123 environmental impacts discussed in the DEIR an astounding 12% are rationalized by an inappropriate baseline.

IV The DEIR fails to adequately describe the Tahoe Regional Setting.

The regional setting for MVW and BC must be analyzed since the Lake Tahoe Basin is of statewide, regional and area wide significance and requires special attention. The Project will significantly impact population, traffic, biologic resources, air and light pollution, noise, recreation and water. The DEIR may not escape this important regional context simply by claiming the project is located entirely outside the Basin. In fact, the project is located directly adjacent to the Tahoe Basin Boundary line. Also the MVW's secondary Emergency Vehicle Access is located within the Tahoe Basin as it connects to the Fibreboard Freeway. As previously requested in the NOP comments, all maps should describe the BC and distances from other existing development and infrastructure, especially since the DEIR claims MVW is "infill" and close to both, when in reality MVW is in the middle of a forest 1.1 miles west of Hwy 267 and approx. 5 miles by car from Northstar or Kings Beach.

V.The DEIR employs an improper resident occupancy rate for its analysis.

The DEIR uses a resident occupancy rate of 20% and then attempts to reduce the initial claimed population of 1900 by an astounding 80%. Further, the DEIR completely ignores impacts on population created by the allowed use of **secondary dwellings**. Secondary dwellings may be either a detached or attached dwelling unit which provides complete, independent living facilities for one or more persons. (Specific Parcel Plan Exhibit A, pg. A-3)

The DEIR uses the rate of 2.5 people per unit, reduces that figure by 80% and fails to analyze the additive population impacts of secondary dwellings. This drastically underestimates the impacts of all analysis of: population, fire, growth, scenic and lighting, traffic, recreation, water, wildlife, Air quality and GHG and noise.

The DEIR cannot rely on a questionable estimated occupancy, when our area has extreme seasonal and holiday variations in visitor counts. With the increased use of short term rental agencies, internet VRBO and AIRB&B sites; all analysis must be based on the busiest times of the year. If the County thinks a lower occupancy rate is realistic, both full occupancy and a lower rate should be analyzed. The population impacts must also consider the adjacent BC project proposal and its 1375-2000 visitors.

As a full time Lake Tahoe resident since 1970 and a Nevada and California Real Estate Broker practicing since 1972 and elected to the Board of Directors of the Tahoe Sierra Board of Realtors and the Incline Village Board of Realtors, I've handled handling vacation rentals for over 40 years. I can personally attest to the fact that the Lake Tahoe region and its roads are at full capacity in high summer, Christmas and New Year's, and President's Holiday.

VI The project is inconsistent with Regional Goals to redevelop Aging Town Centers.

This project would have impacts on the Tahoe Basin especially since the project itself is located directly adjacent to the Tahoe Basin Boundary. 760 units on 662 acres 1.1 miles from SR 267 and approx. 5 miles from Kings Beach and Northstar is clearly urban sprawl in a car dependent project. (See attached map-760 units Exhibit 3) (See attached map-proximity to existing development-Exhibit 4) How does this project conform to this Tahoe Regional Planning Area policy for Town Centers? How will the project's impact on the Town Center of Kings Beach? And how does this project reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions when it flies in the face of the goal of clustering development in Town Centers?

VII The project plainly conflicts with General Plan Policies.

General Plan Policy 8.C.1- (avoid development in high fire risk areas). The proposed site is within a very high fire hazard risk area. Since the project will cause the area's roadway intersections to operate at a LOS F, the project would expose people to significant risk of injury or death involving wildland fires and the project's traffic would physically interfere with emergency response and evacuation efforts. The project's inconsistency with this General Plan Policy constitutes a significant impact.

General Plan Policy 4.E.15 (Transportation)

The project is inconsistent with General Plan policies relating to Transportation:

The project directly conflicts with fundamental principles that development only be allowed in areas where the circulation and transportation system capacity can accommodate such development. The DEIR claims a significant and unavoidable impact in this area.

General Plan Policy 3.A.7 (maintain minimum levels of service) This car dependent project will cause 5 intersections to operate at a LOS F and thus is clearly in conflict with policy. The existing transportation system does not have the capacity to support traffic generated by this project. (See Joy Dahlgren's attached comments).

VIII The project is inconsistent with General Plan policies pertaining to Visual Resources.

The site is located on an outstanding landscape; a ridge overlooking Lake Tahoe and Martis Valley.

General Plan Policy 1.K.1 (avoid locating structures on ridgelines). The project is in clear violation of this policy and will substantially alter the visual character and quality of the area. Further, the visual analysis should have analyzed maximum massing of allowed uses such as the 5 acre shopping center use and the 34,500 sf commercial use with an allowed 60' height with its potential 1.8m cf of massing. Also a visual analysis of the allowed ski lift use and 100 room hotel should have been performed, but the DEIR visual analysis is silent on these potential impacts much less whether that analysis was performed. (Appendix A)

General Plan Policy 1.L.3 (protect scenic corridors)

Did the project's visual analysis consider the potential for large structures with considerable massing? How large were the considered structures? Will screening even be feasible? Did the visual analysis consider the impacts of ski lifts which are an allowed use? Did the visual analysis consider the impacts of 70 units (Exhibit 3) sited just off SR 267 next to a 100 year floodplain and stream environment? If so, what heights and massing were assumed? How does this development next to SR 267 conform to the MVCP 4.C.1. Scenic routes designated in the Plan area shall include SR 267, Schaffer Mill Road, and Northstar Drive?

General Plan Policy 4.E.15 (incorporate low impact development measures to reduce amount of runoff). Yet, the project would add over 250 acres of development area. How does this huge project conform with that policy?

IX The project is inconsistent with General Plan policies pertaining to Biological Resources.

General Plan Policy 6.C.1 (protect significant ecological resources)

How does actively destroying 536 acres of wildlife habitat home to: Goshawk, mule deer, spotted owl, yellow warblers, olive-sided flycatcher, long eared owl, pallid bat, western red bat and the mountain beaver conform to this policy? The rationale of the illusory east parcel baseline is again used and the equally faulty justification that forest lands are abundant in the area. More worrisome is that "an adequate analysis of the site by a qualified biologist" is deferred to a later date.

(The Point Arena Mountain Beaver, a subspecies of the Mountain Beaver, is on the U.S. Endangered Species List. It is classified as endangered in California. As with so many other animals, the mountain beaver's endangered status followed the degradation of its habitat. The usual culprits can be named, including development, livestock grazing, and logging. Because the remaining populations are isolated and small, threats such as predation by other animals (including pets), poisoning, trapping, and other disturbances, can have a significant affect on the overall numbers, as an entire population can be exterminated quite easily.)

X The project is inconsistent with the Martis Valley Community Plan (MVCP) Policies.

-“The quality of the natural environment will be substantially degraded unless care is taken to direct growth into areas where the least impact will be felt. e. Protection and enhancement of the natural environment will allow Martis Valley to remain a pleasant place to live, work, and pursue recreation.” (MVCP)

(MVCP pg 6) Developing the ridge between Tahoe and Truckee will greatly impact that natural environment-scenic, recreation, open space, biologic, traffic etc.

-“However, Placer County is an active participant in TRPA decision-making and other related activities, and the secondary impacts of development in Martis Valley on the Tahoe Basin, must be considered.” (MVCP Pg 7) Impacts to the Tahoe Basin, including origination and destination of vehicle trips on SR 267 were not analyzed.

-“Any development within the open meadow and sagebrush flats of the Martis Valley visible from SR267, must be considered very carefully. This area cannot support and the Plan does not allow any new residential or commercial development (structures). Development of any new residential or commercial structures in those open meadows and sagebrush areas visible from SR267 would result in significant damage to the scenic vistas this Plan seeks to protect.” (MVCP Pg 13) However, the project will develop the 100 year floodplain stream environment area directly off SR 267 with 70 structures. This is in direct conflict with the MVCP.

XI The DEIR’s Analysis of and mitigation for the Impacts of the Proposed Project are Inadequate.

Placer County fails to give facts and rational justifications for the conclusions in the DEIR thereby failing to fulfil CEQA’s environmental mandate. The DEIR also fails to propose feasible alternatives that would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of the project.

A. The DEIR’s description of Land Use and Forest Resources is Flawed.

Impact 5-1: Alteration of present or planned land uses:

Again the DEIR uses the comparison of lands in another part of Martis Valley as an environmental baseline justification. Justifying a rezoning of undeveloped forest/conservation land to single family, multi-family and commercial uses by removing those uses from another area in Martis Valley DOES NOT make the new proposed land use consistent with existing conditions. Downplaying this significant change in uses by portraying it as simply a “redesignation” in the Martis Valley Community Plan and characterizing it as less than significant environmental impact misleads the public.

LTS Impact 5-2: Compatibility with surrounding land uses

The DEIR rationalization that, “ The proposed MVWPSP land use designations and zoning would be consistent with the intent of the MVCP and the Placer County General Plan” is misleading. The DEIR states that “Implementation of the proposed MVWPSP would result in the construction of residential uses, homeowner amenities, commercial uses, and utilities infrastructure in a forested area that has historically been used for timber harvest and recreation”. That statement clearly contradicts the DEIR’s “consistency” conclusion.

The project site is one mile from Northstar as the crow flies but 5 miles by car. How does Placer County justify the claim in the DEIR that MVW is “near similar residential uses and densities to those proposed in the MVWPSP”? The DEIS also states, “The MVWPSP would prevent conflicts with existing recreational

uses in the surrounding area by siting development away from existing trails and using natural features to screen new buildings and noise”, when in fact, the project will be very near the Tahoe Rim Trail and the Fibreboard Freeway recreation area. Please present the County’s rationale for that conclusion? (See attached map Exhibit 5)

In summary, all the Land Use and Forest Resources environmental analysis instead of considering existing conditions, it’s justified by an erroneous baseline using a phantom unapproved, unapplied for land swap from elsewhere in Martis Valley.

B. The DEIR’s description of the Environmental Setting for Water Supply is Inadequate.

The DEIR fails to consider effects of global warming, rights of downstream water users, groundwater overdraft and the extended current drought which current regulations require a 25% reduction in water use by residents. The DEIR defers analysis continually by stating the impacts will be determined as they happen and mitigation will be worked out then. Are there other uses to which groundwater should be put, rather than approving new luxury gated communities? Why would new development receive priority for water, rather than existing uses and users that are suffering drastic cutbacks? Is the DEIR relying on underestimated occupancy rates to estimate water use? Did the DEIR consider the secondary dwelling population?

C. The DEIR Fails to adequately Analyze and mitigate the Project’s Impact on Biological Resources.

The DEIR states that:

1. * 536 acres of habitat will be disturbed (table 7-7)
 - *30k plus trees will be removed (Appendix E Tree Summary)
 - *70 plus units will be built next to a flood plain habitat (Ex. 9-26)
 - *80 acres of development on very severe and severe erosion soil (Table 14-3)
 - *11 m sf of soil will be disturbed by development (Table 14-3)

Yet the DEIR concludes either through deferred mitigation surveys as in (Impact 7-2, Impact 7-3, Impact 7-5, Impact 7-10) or erroneous baseline comparisons to the phantom project on the east parcel that (Impact 7-1, Impact 7-2, Impact 7-6, Impact 7-7) that all impacts are “less than significant” after mitigation. That since trees are abundant in the area removing 37,000 trees is not a significant contribution to impacts. However, “Beyond their romantic grandeur, big trees play an outsized ecological role. They produce more seeds, resist wildfire damage, and store more carbon than their smaller brethren; rare animals such as spotted owls and flying squirrels live in their cavities.

The loss of such trees thus has important implications for the health of the Golden State’s forests, said University of Washington forest ecologist Jerry Franklin. “It’s not a happy prospect from the standpoint of a lot of different things,” he said.

California has lost half its big trees since the 1930s, according to [a study to be published Tuesday in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences](#)—and climate change seems to be a major factor.

The number of trees larger than two feet in diameter has declined by 50 percent on more than 46,000 square miles of California forests, the new study finds. No area was immune, from the foggy northern coast to the Sierra Nevada Mountains to the San Gabriels above Los Angeles. In the Sierra

high country, the number of big trees has fallen by more than 55 percent; in parts of southern California the decline was nearly 75 percent.

Many factors contributed to the decline, said Patrick McIntyre, an ecologist at the state [Department of Fish and Wildlife](#) who was the lead author of the study. Loggers targeted big trees. Housing development pushed into the woods. Zealous fire suppression has left California forests crowded with small trees that compete with big trees for resources.

<http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2015/01/150119-california-forests-shrinking-climate-drought-science/>

Exhibit 7-2a and 7-2b in the DEIR clearly show:

The East Parcel development area has no: spotted owl or Goshawk detection, however the West Parcel, including the Brockway Campground, has 6 Spotted Owl and 1 Goshawk detection site, yet the DEIR concludes the biological environmental impact is less than significant.

The DEIR fails to provide adequate mitigations for significant impacts to biological resources. The DEIR improperly defers mitigations such as inventories and lacks performance criteria if the inventories are found problematic.

2. The DEIR's analysis of impacts on the California Spotted Owl, Mountain Beaver, Northern Goshawk, Mule Deer and their habitat are inadequate.

The DEIR should provide maps showing the habitat area and species detection in relation to the proposed development and detection on neighboring Northstar property. (See attached maps Exhibit 6 and 7)

The CBI report, Assessment of Conservation Values Martis Valley Opportunity East and West Parcels, dated 9/2012 states: (below is directly from the report)

California Spotted Owl-The higher elevations of the region support home ranges and protected activity centers for the California spotted owl. In fact, these areas surround the Martis Valley on the south (along the Tahoe Rim Trail) and through the Tahoe and Toiyabe National Forests along Highway 89. Suitable nesting and foraging habitat for spotted owls has been identified on the Northstar property adjacent to SPI lands, with nesting on the western most part of Northstar (EDAW/AECOM 2009).

Northern Goshawk -Like spotted owls, goshawks prefer mature forests for nesting, especially near ponds, creeks, or ephemeral streams. Suitable habitat for goshawks has been identified on the Northstar property adjacent to SPI lands, and there is an active nest on the west side of the Northstar property (EDAW/AECOM 2009); so goshawks could use adjacent properties for dispersal and foraging.

Mule Deer- "I'm concerned that both urban development in the Truckee area and exurban (rural) sprawl in the surrounding region are a threat to this herd" However, the Martis Valley area and the western shore of Lake Tahoe form the southernmost part of this herd's summer range and support

fawning areas (Figure 4). Fawning areas on parts of Northstar are closed seasonally to recreation to minimize potential disturbance to does and fawns (EDAW/AECOM 2009). Human encroachment resulting in habitat loss, as well as roads and human recreational disturbance, have displaced and restricted deer from preferred habitats and have increased mortality.”

The CBI report also states-

“Generally speaking, conservation and biological benefits increase where:

- Development is concentrated or clustered at higher densities on a smaller development footprint and located near existing infrastructure and development.
- New development takes advantage of existing infrastructure, thus minimizing habitat fragmentation and the potential for increased mortality due to roadkill.
- Development avoids areas of higher biological value, including critical linkages.
- Development is clustered or concentrated rather than spread out, resulting in habitat fragmentation.”

The Project fails to conform to any of the above CBI recommendations:

- The Project is not clustered on a small footprint. It is 760 homes on 662 acres.
- There is no existing infrastructure to take advantage of.
- Habitat will be fragmented and an important linkage on the west parcel interrupted by a gated community.
- Development is proposed on a ridge connecting an important habitat corridor that runs along the ridgeline between SR 89 and the summit of SR 267, generally along the Fibreboard Freeway. In summary, mountain ridgetops are the freeways for larger mammals and birds that need a large continuous area to hunt, forage, mate, reproduce etc. Global Warming Effects causing wildlife to move to even higher altitudes-

For a century or more humans have massively developed lowlands while pushing wildlife to higher elevations. Global warming will push these creatures even higher into the mountains

-Wildlife v. Recreation- There is overwhelming evidence that human recreation and wildlife habitat cannot possible occur in the same place. Stated simply, the presence of one literally negates the possibility of the other.

The project not only fails to protect unique habitats on several endangered and threatened species on the west parcel, it actively destroys habitats.

D. The DEIR fails to adequately analyze or mitigate the project’s significant Visual Impacts.

The DEIR’s Visual Simulations do not show the severity and extent of the project’s Visual Impacts.

- The DEIR fails to provide a terrain analysis of the MVW site as provided in the Brockway Campground application. (see attached map Exhibit 8) A terrain analysis would clearly show that the site slopes from 7700’ down to 7200’ demonstrating that most of the MVW development site can see Lake Tahoe over the Brockway Campground adjacent site which slopes to a low of 7300’.
- The visual analysis is flawed since it fails to disclose whether the included allowed uses of a 5 acre shopping center or 100 room hotel, 34,500 sf of commercial at 60’ in height and its resultant 1.8m cf of massing or a ski lift were analyzed.

- The project must provide a model of the project and full scale story poles that outline the three dimensional bulk and mass of the proposed structures and or ski lifts.
- Another weakness in the DEIR is it fails to show surrounding or adjacent existing and/or proposed development such as the Brockway Campground and the Northstar Mountain Master Plan's 7500 sf lodge, campground and new lift at Sawmill Flats.(Northstar Mountain Master Plan DEIR) (See attached map Exhibit 9)
- The DEIR's analysis of Light and Glare is deficient.

The existing night conditions are that of a dark forested ridge, yet amazingly the DEIR concludes that the project (760 structures-11m sf soil disturbance-30k+ trees removed) wouldn't be visible from Lake Tahoe even though a person standing on the site can see Tahoe from almost ½ or 300 acres of the site is arrogant and misleading.

- North Tahoe Preservation Alliance has stills and videos from a drone that has flown the site at the elevation of 75' (proposed condo height) and Lake Tahoe can be clearly seen. (see attached photo Exhibit 10a and b).
- The DEIR fails to analyze a mitigation which would remove development from the bench sloping to Lake Tahoe. (see attached map).
- Maintaining dark skies is of critical importance in the mountains because it is one of the dwindling number of locations where one is able to gaze at the stars.
- The DEIR appears not to take into account the effect that snow has on lighting. Snow is quite reflective compared to bare ground.

E. The DEIR fails to adequately analyze the Project's Transportation Impacts and Mitigations. (See Joy Dahlgren's letter attached Exhibit 12)

The Lake Tahoe region must control the growth in motor vehicle traffic if it is to retain its scenic beauty. Increasing traffic and expanded roadways work directly against the attributes that make the area what it is.

The EIR should evaluate the impact on vehicle miles travelled resulting from a project that is preponderantly second home residence which are reportedly occupied only 20 percent of the time or less. Residents owning such homes would frequently travel from distant locations entailing considerable additional vehicle miles travelled by comparison to typical homes. It is also likely that dwellings in the project will be made available for short-term rental which would entail further tourism travel.

The EIR should discuss and the county should adopt a package of mitigation measures designed to reduce transportation and GHG impacts by increasing transit usage on SR 267 as well as on other roads served by Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART). Increased transit usage would offset the project's transportation impacts as well as its GHG emission impacts by increasing reliance on transit.

That mitigation should include funding for a cost-effective program for promoting transit usage through on-going marketing and signage that encourages travelers to use transit. It should include funding for fare-free transit to increase transit ridership. Fare-free transit can be provided by eliminating the fare box for appropriate routes, by not charging riders at selected transit stops, or by providing free-passes to targeted groups such as snow-boarders, skiers, or employees or at targeted locations. Free transit passes could be offered by the project to residents or employees traveling to the Martis Valley project site or to Northstar.

The county should also evaluate using a partially-subsidized fare which would increase transit use by reducing the fare for a larger group of riders without completely eliminating it. These steps incentivize travelers to use more efficient and sustainable modes reducing congestion and vehicle miles travelled.

Project mitigation should include funding transit stop upgrades in the area of the project and around the TART area to encourage travelers to use transit and reduce the traffic and GHG impacts of the project. Improved transit stops increase the convenience, comfort and attractiveness of public travel leading to increased ridership.

The proposed transportation mitigation is ineffective and results in significant and unanalyzed environmental impacts. The county proposes to charge the project an impact fee to provide for roadway expansion. Roadway expansion results in increased reliance on automobile travel and results in additional air quality emissions and GHG emissions. The county should evaluate the environmental impacts of expanding SR 267.

Further, there is no secure funding source for the state portion of the funding required for the SR 267 expansion so the mitigation is ineffective and unenforceable. State funding may not become available for many years, if ever, to complete widening of SR 267.

Transportation impacts were analyzed by categorizing 80 percent of the homes as a second homes and basing the traffic count for those homes on the daily average for recreational homes (ITE Code 260). The analysis is inaccurate because it fails to take into account that during holiday seasons at Lake Tahoe, these second homes are virtually all occupied, and the transportation impact at those times is equivalent to what it would be if all the dwellings were single family or condominium (ITE Code 210 or 230).

The Placer County Regional Bikeway Plan provides for a Class II bike lane on SR 267 from Truckee to Kings Beach. For the section of SR 267 from Brockway Summit to SR 28, TRPA recommends Class II bike lanes as well. The project will add more than 1000 vehicles per day to SR 267 including trucks serving the commercial land uses. Those cars and trucks will be turning in and out of the project entry road. That increased traffic and turning constitutes a considerable contribution to the cumulative adverse impact of automobile and truck traffic on bicycling and bike safety along SR 267 and interferes with the planned Class II bike route. The EIR should evaluate and mitigate those impacts. Mitigation for transportation impacts should include funding for a protected bike lane on SR 267 to encourage cycling.

The county should provide the level of funding for the transit impact mitigation measures or a formula for determining the level of funding. The mitigation is ineffective and the level of funding should not be determined by the developer. Nothing suggests that the amount to be paid would be sufficient to mitigate the impact to transit. The mitigation is vague and unenforceable.

The specific plan provides that there will be a bus shelter within the project near 267. The specific plan should avoid the typical practice of blindly locating the transit stop without considering how to make it most convenient to riders. At 25 miles per hour the bus covers about one-half mile per minute. Since the bus will already be coming into the project under the specific plan, an additional 30 seconds to a minute of travel could make the stop much more convenient and encourage the use of transit. The bus shelter should encourage ridership by being situated at the most convenient location within the project for residents.

Transit should also be encouraged by warmers in the bus shelter at the project. This requires a gas meter be set at the transit stop when the gas lines are brought in and that an overhead loading-dock style gas heater be installed. The heater can be switched with a motion sensor or a timed switch. The specific plan should further specify the design of the bus shelter ensuring that it will have seating, lighting, wind protection, schedule information, and signage.

The transit funding payable under Measure 10-5a and 10-5b should include funding not only to mitigate the transit impacts of the project but also to mitigate the significant impact to SR 267 from the project. This should include funding to promote marketing of transit ridership for trips that include the SR 267 corridor.

The transportation analysis fails to evaluate the number of trips that occur on streets inside the project. It refers to these trips as "internal capture" and excludes them from the transportation impact. The EIR suggests that internal capture will be increased by the commercial land uses within the specific plan area which would reduce trips outside the west parcel. This is speculative because commercial may not be built within the project for many years. Further it is unclear what types of commercial uses will be sited within the project so the number of trips internally captured cannot be projected.

Internal trips are largely single-occupant-vehicle trips on public streets which contribute to air pollution, GHG emissions, energy usage, congestion, and vehicle miles travelled. The EIR should evaluate all the vehicle miles travelled on streets internal to the project and include those trips in the analyses of project impacts. The EIR should evaluate the impacts of a worst case scenario under which the commercial is not built out, until the end of the project development, and there is no internal capture before then.

The project should mitigate its impact on SR 267 by specifying the commercial uses that could be sited within the project that would be most effective at establishing internal capture and then requiring the developer to ensure that such uses do locate within the site by offering economic inducements to attract such uses if necessary.

Transportation impacts, forest impacts, view impacts, and other impacts of the project should be treated as cumulative with the Brockway Campground project which will also be located of SR 267 and will add to the impacts of this project.

The EIR should consider whether congestion on SR 267 would impair emergency evacuation of the area in event of wildfire. Brockway campground should be included in the analysis. The discussion of emergency evacuation contains no information or analysis of the number of vehicles that would be required to evacuate, how those vehicles would interact with emergency responder vehicles, how quickly wildfire might arrive, what other communities would rely on SR 267 for evacuation, how much traffic those communities would produce, or what number of vehicles could safely be evacuated. Further there is no discussion of whether the forest area around the project site will have heavy fuel loads that will increase wildfire risk.

The project should mitigate impacts by providing permanent signage on SR 267 and in transit stops informing travelers that the highway 267 bus connects with Amtrak at the Truckee Depot and encouraging travelers to use Amtrak and the highway 267 bus to avoid taking their car on vacation.

F.The DEIR should evaluate the economic viability of potentially-feasible renewable energy strategies and energy efficiency tools available that could reduce energy demand from the project.

The EIR should evaluate options for putting the entire project on 100 percent renewable electrical energy, or some lesser percentage as may be feasible, using net metering. The EIR should evaluate the extent to which transportation systems associated with the construction and operation of the project can be fueled from renewable electrical generation or other reduced-emission fuels.

Project loads should be estimated based upon typical residential and commercial loads for similar facilities and broken down by type including lighting, space conditioning, battery recharging, equipment, transportation, water heating, etc.

Energy resources potentially available include natural gas, solar radiation, grid-sourced electricity, petroleum, wind, geothermal, biofuels, and biomass. The EIR should evaluate ways in which the projected electric demand can be served in an efficient and environmentally-sustainable way. The EIR should evaluate strategies for reducing reliance on fossil fuels, increasing reliance on renewable resources, reducing peak loads, and reducing the impacts of reliance on remote generation facilities.

The EIR should discuss how failing to implement reliable and efficient local energy generation would pre-empt future clean energy development. By failing to adopt renewable energy when the project is implemented, project occupants become subject to administrative and financial obstacles as well as additional construction costs associated with retrofitting renewable generation, rather than installing it as a component of the initial construction.

District heating should be evaluated for use project-wide in lieu of packaged HVAC units. Chilled water and hot water service could be produced via one or more solar thermal installations. The payback period on such a system can be less than five years. Hot water or chilled water storage can also provide cost-effective energy storage taking advantage of off-peak electricity rates and solar thermal resources.

Ground source or geothermal heat pumps can reduce heating and cooling expenditures for buildings by 40 to 70 percent. Ground source heat pumps take advantage of relatively consistent ground temperatures. The city should evaluate the use of ground source heat pumps and solar water heating to increase project efficiency and reduce impacts. Horizontal or vertical loops could be installed quickly and efficiently prior to initiating foundation work. Applicable federal tax credits increase the economic returns. Ground source heat pumps can supply hot water, or they can be paired with solar water heating.

Energy storage should be evaluated for combinations of thermal storage, vehicle batteries (V2G), and hydrogen electrolysis for vehicle and equipment use.

G. The DEIR fails to adequately analyze the impacts of Timberland Conversion.

A timberland protection zone (TPZ) is a ten-year land-use restriction limiting the property to growing and harvesting timber and is provided in exchange for basing property taxation for the parcel upon its use as timberland. The west parcel is currently entirely in TPZ and the east parcel is also zoned TPZ, except for 670 acres which is zoned commercial and residential under the Martis Valley Community Plan.

The proposed project would convert 662 acres of the west parcel which is a TPZ to residential and commercial. The EIR must compare the acreage that would be converted to residential, commercial and

roadway use with the existing condition of the property which is entirely forestland. The project will result in a significant conversion of forest land on the west parcel to residential and commercial uses and would cause a significant impact to land use.

The EIR concludes that the permanent conversion of up to 536.5 acres of forest land and wildlife habitat on the West Parcel to residential, roadway, and commercial uses would not be a considerable contribution to the cumulative loss of such natural communities. The EIR should contain a discussion of the cumulative loss of habitat and forest land both in the Tahoe region and in the Sierra Nevada. Based on that it should determine whether the loss of 536.5 acres as a result of this project constitutes a considerable contribution to that loss.

The rezoning of 662 acres of the west parcel to residential and commercial is inconsistent with the Martis Valley Plan and inconsistent with surrounding land uses which are primarily managed forest. This would be a substantial conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The county has failed to provide an analysis that illustrates the land use conflicts created by the project.

The project will induce substantial population growth because there are no residences or commercial buildings on the west parcel at this time and the proposed project would add up to 760 units on that parcel, which at 2.5 person per unit would be an increase in population of 1900 persons. The EIR should analyze the increase in the population based upon the existing conditions of the west parcel

H. The DEIR fails to adequately analyze the Project's impact on Recreation.

The Project is located near the Tahoe Rim Trail and the Fibreboard Freeway recreation area which extends west from the summit of SR 267 to SR 89. The distance is approximately 10 miles and includes Watson Lake and US Forest Service Lands. This area is an important amenity to the region. 20 years of construction activities, the Brockway Campground 550 sites and its 870k sf of coverage, the Project's sprawling gated luxury homes and allowed commercial uses of Hotel, School, and restaurants will quite simply ruin the existing natural unspoiled environment. To conclude that the project will result in a less than significant impact is insulting to the public. Both the Project and the BC will result in a new community, a large maximum peak season population of over 4000 people in an area that is currently uninhabited. Again, the DEIR uses the East Parcel's potential unapproved or developed area as justification.

I. The DEIR fails to conduct an adequate impact analysis associated with the risk of wildfire, increased demand for fire protection and adequacy of Emergency Services.

Significantly, the DEIR failed to even mention the cumulative impact of the Brockway Campground's 550 campsites's 2200 visitors (Placer County uses 4 people/campsite). Together with the 1900 population of MVW, that's 4100 people or more at peak periods. This new "town" located in the middle of the forest on the iconic ridgeline between Lake Tahoe and Martis Valley is a Considerable Contribution to Cumulative Impacts. To claim otherwise is dangerously arrogant. Simply paying into a fund to hire one or two more fireman is insufficient. (Mitigation 17-3)

It is vitally important that the DEIR provide a thorough analysis of an adopted emergency evacuation plan. Project traffic would cause LOS F, i.e. gridlock, at five intersections along SR 267- the single means of ingress for residents and visitors attempting to flee in the event of a wildfire.

The DEIR also fails to describe any foreseeable wildfire scenario. The MVW secondary EVA access runs through Tahoe basin lands ending on the Fibreboard Freeway, which is only partially improved, partially dirt/4 wheel drive less than two lane road. The primary EVA travels through a steep avalanche area. The public deserves transparency regarding the public safety impacts of the project. Where is the evidentiary support for a less than significant impact?

J.The project fails to adequately analyze Greenhouse Gas Emissions and mitigations.

The EIR observes that the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020 and states that no specific reduction goal beyond 2020 had been adopted by September, 2015. The EIR incorrectly claims that it would be speculative to establish project-level targets due to the lack of legislative targets. However, GHG targets are in place for the post 2020 time frame. Executive Order B-30-15 calls for 40 percent below 1990 levels of emissions by 2030, and Executive Order S-3-05 calls for reducing GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Further, legislative targets are not a pre-requisite to establishing a threshold.

The EIR proposes that GHG emissions would not be significant if either of two criteria, known as Tier I and Tier II, are satisfied. Under Tier I, project GHG emissions would not be significant if they are less than 1100 MTCO_{2e} per year. Under Tier II, if emissions exceed that level, the project can still establish no impact by calculating what the GHG emissions from the project would have been if statewide regulations had not gone into effect, i.e., comparing to the business as usual scenario. The regulations in question are the low-carbon fuel standard, the advanced clean cars fuel standards, the renewable portfolio standard, and California building efficiency standards.

If projected GHG emissions are at least 21.7 percent less than emissions would be under the business as usual scenario, the emissions would not be deemed significant according to the EIR. The EIR uses 21.7 percent because the California Air Resources Board determined that a 21.7 percent reduction from business as usual would be required to reach the AB 32 target of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels.

The EIR concludes that if the project were completed in 2020, the GHG emissions from project operations would be 35,865 MTCO_{2e} per year. This amount exceeds the Tier I criterion of 1100 MTCO_{2e} per year so the EIR examines whether the project meets the Tier II criterion.

Under a business as usual scenario, the EIR states that GHG emissions would have been 47,568 MTCO_{2e}. Since projected emissions are 35,865 MTCO_{2e}, there would be a reduction below business as usual of 23.2 percent, meaning that the project meets the Tier II criterion.

AB 32 is not a plan that will mitigate the effects of climate change and compliance with AB 32 does not ensure that the project's contribution to cumulative climate impacts would be less than considerable. Climate change will remain a significant cumulative effect even if the AB 32 target is fully achieved. Emissions of 35,865 tons per year greatly exceed the 1100 MTCO_{2e} per year level and are plainly a significant contribution to climate change.

Moreover, the AB 32 reduction measures are not intended to apply uniformly to all projects and all economic sectors. Due to variations in the economic feasibility of reducing emissions from various sources, some sources contribute more to the reductions than others. There is no basis for assuming that that 23.2 percent is the amount that new housing should reduce emissions under the AB 32 Scoping Plan.

The EIR notes that the project area is largely zoned Timberland Production Zone (TPZ), which is a 10 year restriction to growing and harvesting timber, and that forest health has been maintained by harvest procedures. An agreement authorizes Northstar guests to use 16 miles of trails on the West parcel for cross-country skiing, hiking, and mountain biking. The EIR should evaluate the current use of the project site. It should compare the emissions of the project to current environmental conditions at the project site.

The EIR concludes that it is unlikely that the project at build-out would meet the GHG targets in Executive Order B-30-15 or in S-3-05 and that therefore the post-2020 impact would be significant. The county should use the targets set out in the executive orders to analyze GHG impacts after 2020 and find that the project would make a considerable contribution to cumulative climate change effects. The project should be analyzed for consistency with B-30-15 and S-3-05.

The 1990 emission level referred to in AB 32 is the gross statewide emissions level. Saying that a single project is less than what a similar project would have produced in 1990 does not suggest that the AB 32 standards are met because it fails to factor in population growth.

Greenhouse Gas Mitigation

As mitigation the draft EIR states that for subdivision maps submitted after 2020, the applicant will be required to demonstrate whether operation of the project would be compliant with then-adopted state targets. There is no justification for limiting mitigation of impacts prior to 2020. GHG emissions are cumulative and reductions before 2020 are vital to keeping concentrations low after 2020.

If the targets are not met after 2020, the project is to incorporate all feasible measures to reduce emissions to the target level. The EIR provides two examples of mitigation measures-- making the air quality actions in the specific plan mandatory and payment into an ARB-approved GHG reduction program. There is no basis to conclude that ARB has such a program.

The EIR should not defer the analysis of impacts or the formulation of mitigation measures for the GHG impacts of the project. The GHG mitigation is ineffective. The mitigation for GHG emissions does not describe the measures that would be used or establish any measure for what they would be required to accomplish. The City should not rely on the developer to demonstrate whether mitigation is required or feasible.

The conclusion of the EIR that the project could not achieve 40 percent or 80 percent below 1990 levels of GHG emissions in 2030 and 2050 respectively, without statewide regulations, is unsupported.

GHG emissions and the conversion of TPZ should be mitigated by making houses and commercial space in the project net zero, or as close as is feasible to net zero, and by designing the community as a walkable community on a reduced footprint.

The large footprint of the project is energy inefficient, which should be analyzed as an impact to energy and disclosed. The specific plan should provide an overall site plan for the project and a discussion of how the overall site will be laid out for the project. The impacts of the project should be reduced by adopting an overall site plan compliant with smart growth principles.

The specific plan should call for a layout of the streets and lots in the project that reduces car trips inside the project. Mitigation should require modeling the project with UrbanFootprint or an equivalent tool.

XII. DEIR fails to justify the MVW's claimed project Objectives and Goals as consistent with the Martis Valley Community Plan.

A. Inconsistency with the visions, goals and policies of the Martis Valley Community Plan (MVCP)

*Project is not "infill" since it is miles by car to the nearest existing development. (Policy 1.A.1)

*Project develops existing ridgeline forest/conservation zoned open space thereby, does not "preserve intact and interconnected areas of natural open space..." (Policy 1.A.6) Why are 662 acres of land required for 760 units? How is that not considered sprawl?

*Project "fragments habitat by introducing roads and human encroachment" into an area currently with none (Policy 1.A.6)

*Populating a forested undeveloped ridge overlooking Tahoe with 1900 people is NOT considering the Regional Implications on resources outside the Valley, i.e. Lake Tahoe (Policy 1.A.7) Nor is a DEIR that states there are 6 significant environmental impacts and 9-18 more than were considered significant or potentially significant considering the impacts to the region.

*Promoting the development of existing lands zoned TPZ, does not encourage retaining timber producing lands as open space (Policy 1.J.1.)

B. Inconsistency with Developer's Stated Goals.

*"Minimize isolated development"-Developing MVW creates isolated development on the west side of HWY 267 of only 8 less acres than what was proposed on the east side. Nothing is minimized.

*"Limit new infrastructure"-Developing MVW does not limit new infrastructure since project is occurring miles away from existing development.

*Developer's goal of listening to public feedback" is a joke. The community has repeatedly spoken out against the MVW over-development in public meetings, but the applicant has actually increased the impacts by adding the BC project, which the DEIR glosses over. In fact, the two projects units, population and impacts are now considerably larger. Together, MVW and BC totaling 760 acres with 760 units and a 550 site campground (870k sf of coverage). Population of 4000 or more.

*MVW does not "reduce reliance on the car", it increases it as the access road is long and steep thereby requiring a car and the project area is spread over 662 acres..

*A density retirement could just as well be achieved by the proposal of an alternative that has 418 units on the east parcel on 200 acres while still preserving a conservation easement on the balance of the acreage or 6176 acres.

XIII. The DEIR's analysis of Project Alternatives is inadequate.

Under CEQA, a proper analysis of alternatives is essential to comply with the Act's mandate that significant environmental damage be avoided or substantially lessened where feasible, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or be more costly. CEQA guidelines 15126.6(b).

The current zoning for the west parcel is Forest 40:640 acre minimum and the east parcel is largely the same, except for an area of low density residential (1-5 units per acre) and a small amount of commercial. The current zoning of the east parcel yields a maximum of 1360 potential dwellings.

Alternative 4 purports to be a reduced footprint analysis for the west parcel that would reduce the area of disturbance. According to the draft EIR, Alternative 4 would reduce the area zoned for development from 662 acres to 550 acres. It is the only alternative that considers reconfiguring the layout of the project site to reduce impacts, while roughly maintaining the current scale of the project.

Alternative 4 would include a 100-unit resort hotel and a 150-space parking lot while reducing the number of dwelling units. The resort hotel would include commercial area but the land area separately zoned for commercial development would drop from 34,500 to 22,000 square feet.

Alternative 4 would reduce the number of dwellings down from 760 to 500 residential units. The residential units would be divided between 333 single-family residences and 167 townhomes. The space allocated for homeowner amenities would drop proportionately from 22,000 to 14,475 square feet.

Alternative 4 is just as sprawling as the proposed project. The EIR should consider a more compact and less sprawling design for the residential portion of the project. As proposed the project would 662 acres for some 760 units, commercial area, and roadways. Although the county fails to provide information on lot sizes, it is evident from the numbers that lot sizes would be quite large for single family residences to occupy a site of that size. It is evident that some parcels would approach or exceed one acre in size. Connecting widely-spaced parcels requires more land and infrastructure expenditures.

Alternative 4 only reduces the project footprint from 662 acres to 550 acres and consequently does not address the sprawling residential design that is proposed for the project. The 500 homes proposed under Alternative 4 could easily be accommodated on 100 acres assuming an average of five dwellings per acre divided between townhomes which could achieve 20 dwellings per acre and other areas of the project which could provide larger lots.

The environmental advantages of denser, smart growth development are well recognized. More residents are likely to walk or ride bikes to get around in the development because distances will be shorter. This reduces the number of vehicle miles travelled (VMT) connected with the project. Reducing vehicle miles travelled would reduce the significant adverse impact to GHG emissions from the project and reduce energy consumption.

The alternatives analysis for the specific plan should include modeling a layout of the project based on smart growth principles to determine how project impacts such as GHG emissions, congestion, vehicle miles traveled and other impacts can be reduced by comparison to an alternative that involves disbursing 760 dwelling units and related commercial structures over 662 acres. The alternatives analysis should address how environmental impacts would be affected by a design that was accessible to a broader range of income groups.

In the event that a hotel is not feasible for any reason, the EIR should consider a reduced footprint alternative that does not involve a hotel. Further a reduced footprint alternative would provide the opportunity to move the project further from the ridgeline and to reduce the nightlight impacts.

Though there are numerous environmental impacts that the DEIR failed to reveal and there is no magic number for how many alternatives a DEIR should examine,

The DEIR should examine two additional project alternatives:

- A. First- Reduced Density/Footprint East Parcel proposing 418 units on 200 acres and conservation easement on the balance of the east parcel of 6176 acres. Thereby eliminating all development on the west parcel.**

The following environmental impacts would be improved by adopting the east parcel reduced density alternative:

1. **Land Use Change**-Would not require rezoning of existing forest/conservation lands on a ridge overlooking Tahoe/Truckee to residential/commercial development.
2. **Infrastructure/roads**-Would require less new infrastructure and new roads. West parcel has fewer existing roads now. East parcel has many miles of existing logging roads. East lands are closer to existing development at Northstar and existing HWY.
3. **Access/safety**- East parcel is closer to Hwy 267 and is located on the sunny side of the Hwy creating a safer entrance. East parcel doesn't require a bridge over a floodplain as the west parcel does. Project access could be significantly safer, lower elevation, less steep or winding as it is ½ mile below the summit.
4. **Soil Erosion**-considerable less severe and very severe erosion areas on East parcel. Less land disturbance.
5. **Avalanche hazard**- no avalanche hazard on East parcel.
6. **Habitat Corridor**-Not developing West parcel also protects that large block habitat contiguous corridor. Developing the East parcel will not fragment the west side and retains existing connection between Granite Chief Wilderness and Mt. Rose Wilderness on the east parcel with minimal open space disturbance. 6176 acres remain open space on east parcel and 662 acres on west parcel remain open space.
7. **Traffic**-significantly less trips generated.
8. **Scenic**- developing east parcel protects remarkable viewshed of the Lake Tahoe basin and forested ridgeline. Reduced # of units reduces scenic impacts to Truckee. Less tree removal.
9. **Fire and Public Safety**- east parcel will be more easily accessible to fight a fire. EVA is shorter and access won't require traversing through Tahoe Basin lands and avalanche areas. West parcel ridge fires would be considerably more difficult to fight and subject to wind.
10. **Recreation**-East parcel will eliminate impact to Tahoe Rim Trail and Fibreboard Freeway Recreation Area.
11. **Biologic**-NOT developing the west parcel preserves the ridgetop as a wildlife corridors and the since the effects of Global Warming are driving animals to higher elevations; preserving the west parcel and it's ridgetop will be beneficial to animals.

- B. **Second-Reduced Density/Footprint alternative (100 acres) 500 units on the West parcel with access from Highlands View Rd. Location is well off ridge where Lake Tahoe cannot be seen from site. (See attached map Exhibit 11)**

The following environmental impacts would be improved by adopting the west parcel reduced density/footprint alternative:

1. **Land Use Change**-Vast majority of the site (552 acres) remain TPZ. Less land disturbance. Less tree removal.
2. **Infrastructure/roads**-Would require less new infrastructure and new roads due to the shared use of Highlands View Rd.
3. **Access/safety**- Two accesses with LOS F off SR 267 eliminated by shared use of Highlands View Rd. Highlands View access would eliminate access off SR 267 summit, use of Fibreboard Freeway Rd., and EVA through avalanche area and bridge over 100 yr floodplain and destruction of important stream environment biologic area. Also less impact on severe erosion soil through use of Highlands View Rd.
4. **Habitat Corridor**-Not developing ridgeline protects large block habitat contiguous corridor. Since the effects of Global Warming are driving animals to higher elevations; preserving the west parcel ridgetop will be beneficial to animals. 6376 acres on west parcel remain open space and 562 acres on the west parcel.
5. **Scenic**- staying off the ridge where Lake Tahoe cannot be seen from the site protects remarkable viewshed of the Lake Tahoe basin and forested ridgeline. Not developing area off SR 267 protects that view point and maintains integrity of 100 year floodplain adjacent to SR 267.
6. **Fire and Public Safety**- Closer to Northstar Fire Dept. Location off ridge makes fighting a fire easier.
7. **Recreation**-impact on Tahoe Rim Trail and Fibreboard Freeway recreation area will be eliminated.
8. **Traffic**- less trips generated

In summary, for each of these reasons, the NTPA, respectfully request that Placer County as the lead agency distribute a technically and legally adequate DEIR for the Public review and comment that fully complies with the law and is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record.
CEQA Guidelines 15088.5

Respectfully Submitted,



Ann Nichols

On behalf of the North Tahoe Preservation Alliance.

Enclosures

EXHIBITS

- Exhibit 1 Area Contour Map showing MVW is adjacent to Brockway Campground
- Exhibit 2 Map showing 1360 unit proposal on East Parcel on 670 acres
- Exhibit 3 Map showing 760 units on 662 acres on West Parcel directly adjacent to
Campground
- Exhibit 4 Map showing MVW (gold color) and proximity to existing development.
- Exhibit 5 Map showing MVW proximity to Tahoe Rim Trail (blue) and Fibreboard Freeway
(white)
- Exhibit 6 Map showing MVW development area and Campground proximity to Biologic
Resources
- Exhibit 7 Map showing MVW and East parcel's proximity to Biologic Resources
- Exhibit 8 Terrain Analysis map of Brockway Campground-DEIR must provide one for MVW
- Exhibit 9 Map showing proximity to Northstar Mountain Master Plan's new Sawmill Flat
Lodge and lift-not mentioned in DEIR
- Exhibit 10a and 10b Drone photos from MVW site showing Tahoe can be seen from 75' from north
side of site and how site slopes towards Lake Tahoe.
- Exhibit 11 MVW development map with yellow area depicting development area that would
not be seen from Lake Tahoe.
- Exhibit 12 Joy Dahlgren's transportation comments

APPENDICES

Bicycling

- Appendix 1 Handy, S. et al. Impacts of Bicycling Strategies on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Sept. 2014).
- Appendix 2 Pucher, J. et al. Infrastructure, Programs, and Policies to Increase Bicycling: An International Review (2009).

Brockway Campground

- Appendix 3 Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Application for Review.
- Appendix 4 Photos, Graphics, Plans.
- Appendix 5 TRPA Governing Board, Brockway Campground Overview (Sept. 23, 2015).
- Appendix 6 The Brockway Campground Web Site.
- Appendix 7 Brockway Campground, TRPA Application Submittal, Environmental Checklist.

Energy

- Appendix 8 California Attorney General's Office, Addressing Climate Change at the Project Level.
- Appendix 9 New Construction Analysis Modeling Results (Aug. 2015).

Evacuation

- Appendix 10 The Emergency California-Nevada Tahoe Basin Fire Commission Report (May 2008).
- Appendix 11 CalFire, Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA.
- Appendix 12 Cova, Thomas J., Public Safety in the Urban-Wildland Interface: Should Fire-Prone Communities Have a Maximum Occupancy? (Aug. 2005).
- Appendix 13 North Tahoe Fire Protection District, Emergency Preparedness and Evacuation Guide
- Appendix 14 Placer County Office of Emergency Services, East Side Emergency Evacuation Plan (Apr. 2008).

Forest Loss

- Appendix 15 Cornwall, W., *California's Forests: Where Have All the Big Trees Gone?* (Jan. 2015).
- Appendix 16 Wright, Syllas, *How Healthy Are the Sierra Nevada's Forests?* (Jul. 2015).
- Appendix 17 McIntyre, P. et al., *Twentieth-Century Shifts in Forest Structure in California: Denser Forests, Smaller Trees, and Increased Dominance of Oaks* (Jun. 2014).

General Plan

- Appendix 18 Placer County General Plan, Section 1, Land Use.
- Appendix 19 Placer County General Plan, Section 3, Transportation and Circulation.
- Appendix 20 Placer County General Plan, Section 4, Public Facilities and Services.

Climate Impacts

- Appendix 21 California Air Resources Board, *Climate Change Scoping Plan* (Dec. 2008).
- Appendix 22 Governor of the State of California, Executive Order B-30-15.
- Appendix 23 California Climate Change Center, *Our Changing Climate: Assessing the Risks to California*.
- Appendix 24 California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, *CEQA and Climate Change* (Jan. 2008).
- Appendix 25 Placer County Air Pollution Control District, *Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*.
- Appendix 26 Governor of the State of California, Executive Order S-3-05.
- Appendix 27 California Air Resources Board, *First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan* (May, 2014).
- Appendix 28 California Natural Resources Agency. *Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action*. (Dec. 2009).

Heated Bus Stop

- Appendix 29 Rhodes, D., *Do Those CTA Heat Lamps Really Make You Feel Warmer?* (Jan. 2015).
- Appendix 30 Highfield, D., *New Bus Stop Warming Stations Getting Rave Reviews* (Jan. 2014).

Induced Traffic

- Appendix 31 Litman, T., *Generated Traffic and Induced Travel: Implications for Transportation Planning* (Jan. 2015).
- Appendix 32 Handy, S. & Boarnet, M., *Impact of Highway Capacity and Induced Travel on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions* (Sept. 2014).

Internal Capture

- Appendix 33 Institute of Transportation Engineers, *Trip Generation Handbook* (Mar. 2001).

Smart Growth

- Appendix 34 SANDAG, *Designing for Smart Growth*.
- Appendix 35 California Department of Transportation, *Assessment of Local Models and Tools for Analyzing Smart-Growth Strategies* (Jul. 2007).
- Appendix 36 City of Austin, *Smart Growth Criteria Matrix*.
- Appendix 37 Fehr and Peers, *Complete Streets Discussion Paper*.
- Appendix 38 City of Austin, *Complete Streets Policy*.
- Appendix 39 National Complete Streets Coalition, *Elements of an Ideal Complete Streets Policy*.
- Appendix 40 Frank, L. & Pivo, G. *Impacts of Mixed Use and Density on Utilization of Three Modes of Travel: Single-Occupant Vehicle, Transit, and Walking*.
- Appendix 41 International City/County Management Association, *Getting to Smart Growth: 100 Policies for Implementation*.
- Appendix 42 International City/County Management Association, *Getting to Smart Growth II: 100 More Policies for Implementation*.
- Appendix 43 Litman, T., *Land Use Impacts on Transport: How Land Use Factors Affect Travel Behavior* (Aug. 2015).
- Appendix 44 Kansas City Walkability Plan, *Measuring Walkability: Tools and Assessment*.
- Appendix 45 City Austin, *News Release: Austin's Complete Streets Policy Wins National Recognition* (Feb. 2015).

- Appendix 46 Victoria Transport Policy Institute, *Land Use Density and Clustering*.
- Appendix 47 City of Pasadena, *Traffic Reduction Strategies Study: Draft Report I (Nov. 2006)*.
- Appendix 48 Smart Growth Network, *This Is Smart Growth*.
- Appendix 49 Calthorpe Associates, *UrbanFootprint: Technical Summary Model Version 1.0*.

Tourism

- Appendix 50 National Ski Areas Association, *Sustainable Slopes: The Environmental Charter for Ski Areas*.
- Appendix 51 North Lake Tahoe Resort Association, *North Lake Tahoe Tourism and Community Investment Master Plan (Sept. 2004)*.
- Appendix 52 Kelly, J. & Williams, P., *Modelling Tourism Destination Energy Consumption and Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Whistler, British Columbia, Canada (2007)*.

Transit Improvements

- Appendix 53 City and County of San Francisco, *Memo to the Planning Commission (Jan. 2012)*.
- Appendix 54 Cambridge Systematics, *San Francisco Transportation Sustainability Fee Nexus Study (Mar. 2012)*.
- Appendix 55 County of Placer, *Placer County Regional Transportation Plan 2027 (Sept. 2005)*.
- Appendix 56 Ewing, R. & Cervero, *Travel and the Built Environment: A Meta-Analysis (2010)*.
- Appendix 57 American Public Transportation Association, *Public Transportation Reduces Greenhouse Gases and Conserves Energy*.
- Appendix 58 Tahoe Area Regional Transit Route Map Highway 267 (Dec. 2012).
- Appendix 59 Victoria Transport Policy Institute, *Transit Station Improvements (Apr. 2015)*.
- Appendix 60 Victoria Transport Policy Institute, *TDM Marketing (Apr. 2015)*.
- Appendix 61 Victoria Transport Policy Institute, *Tourist Transport Management: Improving Leisure Travel Choices (Jun. 2014)*.
- Appendix 62 Victoria Transport Policy Institute, *First Resort: Resort Community Transportation Demand Management (Feb. 2011)*.
- Appendix 63 Tahoe Area Regional Transit, *TART Bus Route Map*.

Appendix 64 Guerra, E. et al., *The Half-Mile Circle: Does It Best Represent Transit Station Catchments?* (Jul. 2011).

Appendix 65 U.S. Department of Transportation, *Mitigation Traffic Congestion: The Role of Demand Side Strategies*.

Zero-Fare Transit

Appendix 66 Tahoe Area Regional Transit, *TART Fares*.

Transit Cooperative Research Program, *Implementation and Outcomes of Fare-Free Transit Systems* (2