
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section provides an overview of the proposed City of South Lake Tahoe General Plan Update and its environmental analysis. For additional detail regarding specific issues, please consult the appropriate chapter of Sections 4.1 through 4.15 (Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures) of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR or DEIR).

1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) provides an analysis of the potential environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

This EIR analysis focuses on potential environmental impacts that could arise from implementation of the proposed General Plan Update through development of the land uses within the Planning Area, as regulated and guided by General Plan policies and actions. The EIR adopts this approach in order to provide a credible worst-case scenario of the impacts resulting from project implementation.

1.2 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The proposed project is the adoption and implementation of an updated General Plan for the City of South Lake Tahoe. The updated City of South Lake Tahoe General Plan would replace the existing General Plan, which was adopted in 1999, and is consistent with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's (TRPA) 1987 Regional Plan. The proposed General Plan Update was developed over a two-year period through an extensive outreach process that engaged residents, businesses, stakeholders, and decision-makers. The proposed General Plan Update is based on the foundation of the City's Smart Growth Principles and is intended to be consistent with the intent and general approach of the TRPA Regional Plan Update process.

The proposed City of South Lake Tahoe General Plan Update comprises a Land Use Diagram and policy document that contains ten elements. Each of the elements identifies goals and associated policies and action items. State law requires that general plans address seven topics: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. The proposed General Plan Update covers each of these topics except housing, plus several additional issues, for a total of ten elements. The updated Housing Element was adopted by the City on December 9, 2008, and is not part of this update.

1.3 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project and avoid and/or lessen the environmental effects of the project. Further, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires that a "no project" alternative be evaluated in an EIR. The Draft EIR evaluates the following alternatives:

- **Alternative 1a – Base Case Scenario Alternative (No Project Alternative).** Alternative 1a assumes the continuation of South Lake Tahoe's existing 1999 General Plan. Under this alternative, there would be no change to the City's current planning and regulatory system. It assumes that TRPA would continue to allocate development commodities at the same rate and using the same system as established under the 1987 Regional Plan, but no additional development commodities beyond what are currently provided for in the 1987 Regional Plan and associated TRPA Code of Ordinance would be allocated. Additionally, this alternative assumes no new annexations would occur during the 20-

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

year General Plan time frame. There would be no changes to the existing roadways, transit system, or parking requirements.

- **Alternative 1b – Existing General Plan with New TRPA Allocations Alternative.** Similar to Alternative 1a, Alternative 1b assumes the continuation of South Lake Tahoe's existing 1999 General Plan. However, this alternative also assumes that TRPA would proceed with adoption of a Regional Plan Update and would provide new development allocations to the City. There would be no changes to the existing roadways, transit system, or parking requirements.
- **Alternative 2 – Transect Zoning System Alternative.** This alternative reflects TRPA's Transect Model proposed in the Regional Plan Update (TRPA Alternative 2) as applied to South Lake Tahoe. It assumes that the City and TRPA would establish a Transect Zoning System in which the majority of development is concentrated in two nodes: Tahoe Valley and Stateline. Additionally, minor growth could occur within the three existing community plan areas (South Y Industrial Tract, Bijou/Al Tahoe, and Stateline/Ski Run) and in the proposed Tahoe Valley Community Plan area. Little to no growth would occur in other areas of the city.

Alternative 2 would lead to a further shift in the transportation and circulation system in which transit-oriented design features (e.g., mixed-use development, consolidated parking) would be required to encourage non-auto-oriented travel within the two nodes. All other aspects of the General Plan Update policy document (i.e., policy provisions and development standards provided in Table LU-2) that would guide this alternative would remain as currently identified in the proposed General Plan Update.

1.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The City of South Lake Tahoe was identified as the lead agency for the proposed project. In accordance with Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of South Lake Tahoe prepared and distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study (IS) for the City of South Lake Tahoe General Plan Update that was circulated for public review on September 16, 2009 (SCH2009092049). The NOP and IS included a summary of probable effects on the environment from the implementation of the project. Written comments received in response to the NOP were considered in the preparation of the Draft EIR. The issues raised in the NOP response letters included:

- Consistency and timing of the proposed General Plan Update with proposed Regional Plan Update and Tahoe Valley Community Plan
- Reductions in vehicle miles traveled and traffic congestion
- Public transit and bicycle/pedestrian facilities
- Commercial floor area (CFA) allocations and distribution
- Land coverage and development right incentive programs
- Future annexations
- Park development on residential infill parcels

- Demand for and provision of recreational facilities
- Airport expansion and associated environmental effects
- Population growth and associated environmental effects
- Historical and cultural resource protection
- Affordable housing
- Climate change
- Light pollution
- Storm drainage treatment
- Water quality and implementation of the Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)
- Flooding hazards
- Water supply and groundwater protection
- Snow removal

The complete text of the NOP and NOP comments are included as **Appendix A** to this Draft EIR.

1.5 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Table 2.0-1 displays a summary of impacts for the proposed General Plan Update and proposed mitigation measures that would avoid or minimize potential impacts. In the table, the level of significance is indicated both before and after the implementation of each mitigation measure.

For detailed discussions of all mitigation measures and of proposed General Plan policies and action items that would provide mitigation for each type of environmental impact addressed in this Draft EIR, refer to the appropriate environmental topic section (i.e., Sections 4.1 through 4.14).

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
4.1 Land Use				
Impact 4.1.1 Implementation of the proposed 2030 General Plan Update would not result in the division of an existing community nor would it result in land use compatibility issues. No impact would occur.	Policy LU-1.1, Policy LU-3.1, Policy LU-3.2, Policy LU-4.2	NI	None required.	NI
Impact 4.1.2 Implementation of the proposed 2030 General Plan Update would conflict with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's 1987 Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin and associated plans and regulations. This impact is considered potentially significant .	Policy LU-1.4, Policy LU-10.1, Policy LU-10.2, Policy LU-10.7, IMP-1.1, IMP-1.2, IMP-1.10, IMP-1.11, IMP-4.6, Policy HS-7.1	PS	MM 4.1.2 The City will add the following as an implementation measure to the General Plan: The City shall not implement any provision or standard of the proposed General Plan Update that is in conflict with the 1987 Regional Plan until such time as the Regional Plan has been updated and the General Plan is determined by the City and TRPA to be consistent with the new Regional Plan and TRPA Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities. Implementation of the above mitigation measure would eliminate potential conflicts with the Regional Plan and would reduce this impact to a level that is less than significant .	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>Impact 4.1.3 Implementation of the proposed 2030 General Plan Update would not result in expansion of existing nonconforming uses in the General Plan Planning Area. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Policy LU-1.3, Policy LU-1.4, Policy LU-7.1, Policy LU-7.4, Policy LU-8.6, IMP-1.3</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>4.2 Population, Housing, and Socioeconomics</p>				
<p>Impact 4.2.1 Implementation of the proposed 2030 General Plan Update would result in an increase in the population of the city and would alter the overall distribution and density of this population. However, the extent of development would not be considered substantial in relation to existing development and El Dorado County growth trends. This impact is less than significant.</p>	<p>Policy LU-1.1, Policy LU-1.4, Policy LU-2.3, Policy LU-2.9, Policy LU-2.10, Policy LU-4.2, Policy LU-4.3, Policy LU-4.4, Policy LU-5.1, Policy LU-7.2, Policy LU-8.7, Policy LU-9.2, Policy ED-1.4, Policy TC-2.4, Policy TC-3.1, Policy PQP-1.5, Policy PQP-1.7, Policy PQP-2.10, Policy NCR-1.2, Policy NCR-2.2, Policy NCR-2.3, Policy NCR-3.6, Policy NCR-3.16, Policy NCR-6.2, Policy NCR-6.5</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.2.2 Implementation of the proposed 2030 General Plan Update would not result in the displacement of a substantial number of people or housing units in the Planning Area. This impact would be less than</p>		<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
significant.				
Impact 4.2.3 Implementation of the proposed 2030 General Plan Update would not result in a substantial decrease in the availability of housing, including affordable housing, within the city. This impact would be less than significant .		LS	None required.	LS
4.3 Hazards				
Impact 4.3.1 Land uses and development consistent with the proposed 2030 General Plan Update could result in the transport, storage, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials as a result of normal construction and operation of land uses and improvements within the Planning Area. This impact is less than significant due to federal, state, and local regulations regarding the handling, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials.	Policy HS-6.1 , Policy HS-6.2, Policy HS-6.6	LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.3.2 Land uses and development consistent with the proposed 2030 General Plan Update could result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment under reasonably	Policy HS-6.1 , Policy HS-6.3, Policy HS-6.6	PS	MM 4.3.2a The following shall be incorporated into the proposed General Plan Update as a policy in the Health and Safety	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>foreseeable upset or accident conditions. Exposure to such materials could occur either through routine use or due to accidental release. This impact is potentially significant.</p>			<p>Element:</p> <p>The City shall require existing and new commercial and industrial uses involving the use, handling, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials within the city to disclose their activities in accordance with El Dorado County guidelines and the requirements of state law.</p> <p>MM 4.3.2b</p> <p>The following shall be incorporated into the proposed General Plan Update as a policy in the Health and Safety Element:</p> <p>The City shall require that construction activities cease if contamination is discovered on construction projects until the contamination is reported and its extent is assessed, delineated, and isolated, as appropriate. Remediation shall occur to the satisfaction of the appropriate responsible agency (such as the El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management, Hazardous Waste Division, the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Department of Toxic Substances Control, or the City of South</p>	

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			<p>Lake Tahoe, depending on the type of contamination).</p> <p>Implementation of the above mitigation measures would ensure that site-specific hazardous material contamination and potential exposure from previous, current, or future land uses are addressed prior to development in order to protect public health. Implementation of these mitigation measures would mitigate this impact to less than significant.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.3.3 Implementation of the proposed 2030 General Plan Update could result in siting of schools in the vicinity of land uses involving the use, transport, disposal, or release of hazardous materials. This is considered a less than significant impact, as the siting of schools is required to comply with state statutory and regulatory requirements addressing safety from hazards, including hazardous materials.</p>		LS	None required.	LS
<p>Impact 4.3.4 Implementation of the proposed 2030 General Plan Update could result in safety hazards associated with operations at public airports adjacent to areas proposed for development. This impact is</p>	Policy HS-7.1	LS	None required.	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
considered a less than significant impact due to the proposed General Plan Update policy which prevents development that would pose hazards to aviation or endanger the landing, taking off, or maneuvering of aircraft.				
Impact 4.3.5 Implementation of the proposed 2030 General Plan Update may interfere with adopted emergency response and evacuation plans in the Planning Area. This impact is considered less than significant due to existing City requirements.	Policy HS-1.1, Policy HS-1.3, Policy HS-1.4	LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.3.6 Implementation of the proposed 2030 General Plan Update could expose people or structures to hazards involving wildland fires in wildland-urban interface areas. This impact is considered less than significant due to existing standards and policies in the proposed 2030 General Plan Update.	Policy HS-2.1, Policy HS-2.2, Policy HS-2.3, Policy HS-2.4, Policy HS-2.5, Policy HS-2.6, Policy HS-2.7	LS	None required.	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
4.4 Transportation and Circulation				
Impact 4.4.1 Land uses and development consistent with the proposed General Plan Update would not result in traffic volumes that would cause intersection or roadway level of service to exceed adopted standards. This impact is less than significant .		LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.4.2 Changes in land uses associated with the proposed General Plan Update in addition to anticipated changes in land use under the proposed TRPA Regional Plan Update are anticipated to result in an increase in vehicle miles of travel for the Tahoe region over a peak summer day. This would be a significant impact.	Policy TC-1.1, Policy TC-1.8, Policy TC-1.11, Policy TC-1.15, Policy TC-1.16, Policy TC-1.18, Policy TC-2.1, Policy TC-2.2, Policy TC-2.3, Policy TC-2.4, Policy TC-2.5, Policy TC-2.6, Policy TC-2.7, Policy TC-2.8, Policy TC-3.1, Policy TC-3.2, Policy TC-3.3, Policy TC-3.4, Policy TC-3.5, Policy TC-3.6, Policy TC-3.7, Policy TC-3.8, Policy TC-3.9, Policy TC-3.10, Policy TC-3.11, Policy TC-3.12, Policy TC-3.13, Policy TC-3.14, Policy TC-3.15, Policy TC-3.16, Policy TC-3.17, Policy TC-3.18, Policy TC-3.19, Policy TC-6.1, Policy TC-6.3	S	MM 4.4.2 The following shall be incorporated into the proposed General Plan Update as a policy in the Transportation and Circulation Element: The City shall establish an Alternative Transportation Operating/Maintenance Program that would impose an ongoing annual fee on new development to fund alternative transportation operations and maintenance. Expenditures under this program would be limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operating costs of public transportation programs either operating within the city or directly benefiting city residents and businesses. • Maintenance of older multipurpose bicycle/pedestrian 	SU

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			<p>facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance and/or snow removal on a limited inventory of major sidewalks (not already the responsibility of existing agreements). <p>Even with this VMT reduction, vehicle miles of travel would increase by approximately 168,400 to 191,400 per day, which corresponds to an 8.3 to 9.4 percent increase over current basin-wide VMT. As other strategies are considered to be infeasible, this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.4.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would include adoption of goals and policies that would encourage pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements. This impact would be a beneficial impact.</p>	<p>Policy TC-1.1, Policy TC-1.8, Policy TC-1.9, Policy TC-1.11, Policy TC-1.15, Policy TC-1.16, Policy TC-1.18, Policy TC-3.1, Policy TC-3.2, Policy TC-3.3, Policy TC-3.4, Policy TC-3.5, Policy TC-3.6, Policy TC-3.7, Policy TC-3.8, Policy TC-3.9, Policy TC-3.10, Policy TC-3.11, Policy TC-3.12, Policy TC-3.13, Policy TC-3.14, Policy TC-3.15, Policy TC-3.16, Policy TC-3.17, Policy TC-3.18, Policy TC-3.19</p>	<p>B</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>B</p>

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>Impact 4.4.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in an increase in demand for public transit services in the Planning Area. However, implementation of proposed General Plan Update policy provisions would ensure that transit service opportunities are provided. This is considered a less than significant impact.</p>	<p>Policy TC-1.1, Policy TC-1.8, Policy TC-1.9, Policy TC-1.11, Policy TC-1.16, Policy TC-1.18, Policy TC-2.1, Policy TC-2.2, Policy TC-2.3, Policy TC-2.4, Policy TC-2.5, Policy TC-2.6, Policy TC-2.7, Policy TC-2.8, Policy TC-6.1, Policy TC-6.3</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>4.5 Air Quality and Climate Change</p>				
<p>Impact 4.5.1 Construction-generated emissions associated with subsequent development under the proposed General Plan Update could potentially exceed applicable standards and thresholds. As a result, Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in the development of up to 1,162 new residential units and up to 386,000 square feet of new commercial floor area (CFA) within the Planning Area over the next 20 years as well as public improvements including recreational facilities, transportation, and trails. As discussed above, there are no specific development requests</p>		<p>PS</p>	<p>MM 4.5.1 The City shall include a policy in the Natural and Cultural Resources Element requiring subsequent discretionary projects that would have a significant air quality impact by the City and TRPA as part of the review of the project application to provide air quality construction mitigation to address short-term construction emissions sufficient to reduce construction emissions below EDCAQMD thresholds. This excludes building permits for single-family residential units. Such measures may include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures currently 	<p>LS</p>

LS – Less Than Significant
PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>proposed at this time, and thus no modeling of potential construction emissions was performed. However, future development associated with the proposed General Plan Update would be anticipated to result in an increase in short-term construction-generated emissions. Emissions associated with individual construction projects may exceed the EDCAQMD's significance thresholds as well as result in temporary conflicts with TRPA air quality thresholds (e.g., particulate matter and ozone). Compliance with EDCAQMD's rules, regulations, and mitigation measures for the control of construction-generated emissions would help to reduce this impact, but not necessarily to a less than significant level. As a result, this impact would be considered potentially significant.</p>			<p>recommended by the EDCAQMD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibition of open burning of debris from site clearing unless involved with a fuels reduction project. • Utilization of low emission construction equipment and/or fuels. • Implementation of best management practices in concert with water quality protection measures. • Restriction of idling of construction equipment and vehicles. <p>Implementation of the above mitigation measures would substantially reduce short-term construction emissions and would require subsequent projects to have emissions below EDCAQMD thresholds for construction activities and result in a less than significant impact.</p>	

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>Impact 4.5.2 Emissions of criteria pollutants from subsequent development under the proposed General Plan Update could exceed EDCAQMD and TRPA significance thresholds and could result in a significant contribution to ambient concentrations that exceed applicable standards and thresholds. As a result, this impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	<p>Policy NCR-5.1, Policy NCR-5.2, Policy NCR-5.3, Policy NCR-5.4, Policy NCR-5.6, Policy NCR-5.7, Policy NCR-5.8, Policy NCR-5.9, Policy NCR-6.1, Policy NCR-6.2, Policy NCR-6.3, Policy NCR-6.4, Policy NCR-6.5, Policy NCR-6.6, Policy NCR-6.7, Policy NCR-6.8, Policy NCR-6.9, Policy NCR-6.10, Policy NCR-6.11, Policy NCR-6.12, Policy NCR-6.13, Policy NCR-6.14, Policy NCR-6.15, Policy NCR-6.16, Policy NCR-6.17, Policy NCR-6.18, Policy NCR-6.19, Policy LU-1.1, Policy LU-2.10, Policy LU-3.1, Policy LU-9.1, Policy LU-9.2, Policy LU-9.3, Policy LU-9.4, Policy LU-9.5, Policy LU-9.6, Policy LU-9.7, Policy LU-9.8, Policy TC-2.1, Policy TC-2.2, Policy TC-2.4, Policy TC-2.6, Policy TC-2.7, Policy TC-2.8, Policy TC-3.1, Policy TC-3.2, Policy TC-3.3, Policy TC-3.4, Policy TC-3.5, Policy TC-3.6, Policy TC-3.7, Policy TC-3.8, Policy TC-3.9,</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>MM 4.5.2</p> <p>The following shall be added as a policy to the Natural and Cultural Resources Element:</p> <p>Development projects will include the following as part of project design to address air quality impacts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The installation of wood-burning hearth devices in proposed residential dwelling units shall be prohibited. b. Require that all feasible EDCAQMD-recommended mitigation measures to reduce operational emissions of criteria air pollutants be incorporated into project design. <p>With implementation of the above proposed General Plan Update policies and actions and proposed mitigation measures, including compliance with TRPA's Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	Policy TC-3.10, Policy TC-3.11, Policy TC-3.12, Policy TC-3.13, Policy TC-3.14, Policy TC-3.15, Policy TC-3.16, Policy TC-3.17, Policy TC-3.18, Policy TC-3.19			
<p>Impact 4.5.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not contribute to localized concentrations of mobile-source CO anticipated to exceed applicable ambient air quality standards. This impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	<p>The proposed General Plan Update contains policies that include specific, enforceable requirements and/or restrictions and corresponding performance standards that address this impact. These policy provisions are identified under Impact 4.5.2.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.5.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update may result in the increased exposure of sensitive receptors to odorous emissions. As a result, potential exposure of sensitive receptors to odors would be considered potentially significant.</p>	<p>Policy LU-7.4</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>MM 4.5.4 The following policy will be added in the Land Use Element:</p> <p>When discretionary projects that would be a substantial source of odors is proposed near residences or sensitive receptors, either adequate buffer distances shall be provided (based on recommendations and requirements of the EDCAQMD) or mitigation measures incorporated to reduce the potential exposure to acceptable levels. Examples of such projects could include, are not limited to, recycling facilities, animal care or shelter facilities, restaurants</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			<p>with outdoor barbeque facilities. Potential mitigation associated with this policy requirement will be coordinated with any required permit conditions from EDCAQMD.</p> <p>Use of setbacks, site design considerations, and emission controls in accordance with EDCAQMD permitting requirements are typically sufficient to ensure that receptors located near stationary sources would not be exposed to odorous emissions on a frequent basis. Continued enforcement of EDCAQMD Rule 205 would further ensure that the frequent exposure of sensitive receptors to odorous emissions would remain less than significant. With implementation of proposed General Plan Update policies and proposed mitigation, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.5.5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in increased exposure of existing or planned sensitive receptors to TACs that may exceed applicable standards. As a result, this impact is considered</p>	<p>Policy LU-7.4</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>MM 4.5.5 The following will be added as a policy to the Land Use Element.</p> <p>The City shall include an action in the General Plan requiring that when new or relocated discretionary development that would be a source of TACs such</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
potentially significant.			<p>as those listed in Draft EIR Table 4.5-9 is proposed near residences or sensitive receptors, either adequate buffer distances shall be provided (based on recommendations and requirements of the California Air Resources Control Board and EDCAQMD), or filters or other equipment shall be provided or mitigation measures incorporated to reduce potential exposure to acceptable levels.</p> <p>Implementation of the above proposed General Plan Update policies would require review of proposed and relocated industrial land uses to ensure consistency with EDCAQMD-recommended thresholds of significance and compatibility with adjacent land uses. In addition, the General Plan Update includes policies and actions that would encourage the relocation of existing nonconforming industrial uses that may be minor sources of TACs and have a potential to pose an existing land use conflict with surrounding land uses to designated industrial areas. Future development of other land uses, including commercial and residential uses, would also</p>	

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			<p>be reviewed to ensure compatibility with adjacent and nearby land uses. Implementation of the proposed policies, actions, and mitigation measures would reduce potential health-related risks associated with future development. With implementation of proposed General Plan Update policies and proposed mitigation measures MM 4.5.1 and MM 4.5.5, as well as continued implementation of CARB’s Diesel-Risk Reduction Plan and anticipated reductions in DPM resulting from existing and future regulations for the control of on-road and off-road DPM sources, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.5.6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would contribute to greenhouse gas emissions that could result in significant environmental effects, including water quality impacts to Lake Tahoe. This impact would be considered potentially significant.</p>	<p>Policy NCR-6.1, Policy NCR-6.2, Policy NCR-6.3, Policy NCR-6.4, Policy NCR-6.5, Policy NCR-6.6, Policy NCR-6.7, Policy NCR-6.8, Policy NCR-6.9, Policy NCR-6.10, Policy NCR-6.11, Policy NCR-6.12, Policy NCR-6.13, Policy NCR-6.14, Policy NCR-6.15, Policy NCR-6.16, Policy NCR-6.17, Policy NCR-</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>MM 4.5.6 The following will be added as policies to the Natural and Cultural Resources Element.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support local, TRPA, and statewide efforts to reduce emission of greenhouse gases linked to climate change. • Develop a citywide greenhouse gas emission inventory and establish 	<p>SU</p>

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	6.18, Policy NCR-6.19, Policy NCR-6.20, Policy TC-1.1, Policy TC-1.8, Policy TC-1.11, Policy TC-1.15, Policy TC-1.16, Policy TC-1.18, Policy TC-2.1, Policy TC-2.2, Policy TC-2.3, Policy TC-2.4, Policy TC-2.5, Policy TC-2.6, Policy TC-2.7, Policy TC-2.8, Policy TC-3.1, Policy TC-3.2, Policy TC-3.3, Policy TC-3.4, Policy TC-3.5, Policy TC-3.6, Policy TC-3.7, Policy TC-3.8, Policy TC-3.9, Policy TC-3.10, Policy TC-3.11, Policy TC-3.12, Policy TC-3.13, Policy TC-3.14, Policy TC-3.15, Policy TC-3.16, Policy TC-3.17, Policy TC-3.18, Policy TC-3.19, Policy TC-6.1, Policy TC-6.3, IMP-8.6		regular time frames for updating the inventory. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a greenhouse gas emission reduction target consistent with AB 32 and SB 375 reduction efforts. • Analyze and mitigate significant increases in carbon emissions during project review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Implementation of relevant policies from the proposed General Plan Update, the City's Sustainability Plan (which calls for development of a GHG inventory and reduction target), and associated mitigation measure MM 4.5.6 are anticipated to mitigate GHG emissions. However, the exact extent of the implementation of these policies and other future greenhouse gas reduction measures are not known at this time and it is unclear whether the 15 percent reduction in current GHG emissions set forth in the Climate Change Scoping Plan is feasible for the City to meet. Thus, this impact is	

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance	
considered significant and unavoidable.					
4.6 Noise					
Impact 4.6.1	The proposed General Plan Update could result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of City or TRPA standards. However, the proposed City of South Lake Tahoe General Plan Update policy provisions would adequately address ambient noise issues. This impact would be less than significant.	Policy HS-8.1, Policy HS-8.2, Policy HS-8.3, Policy HS-8.4, Policy HS-8.5, Policy HS-8.6, Policy HS-8.7, Policy HS-8.8, Policy HS-8.9, Policy HS-8.10	LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.6.2	Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in construction activities and associated noise in the city. Construction activities are expected to continue to occur in the city. The proposed General Plan Update does not contain noise level criteria or policies for evaluating noise associated with construction. In addition, the City does not have an ordinance that addresses construction-related noise. However, construction activities would be of short duration and will be required		LS	None required.	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
to comply with the TRPA Chapter 23 Noise Limitations. This impact is less than significant .				
Impact 4.6.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not result in increases in traffic noise levels in excess of TRPA CNEL noise standards. This impact is less than significant .	Proposed General Plan Update policies that include requirements containing specific performance standards addressing traffic noise impacts are identified under Impact 4.6.1.	LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.6.4 The proposed General Plan Update could include additional commercial and light industrial uses and/or expansion to these types of uses. However, the proposed policy provisions would adequately address noise issues. Therefore, noise impacts associated with the development and operation of land uses of the proposed General Plan Update would be less than significant .	Proposed General Plan Update policies that include requirements containing specific performance standards addressing noise impacts associated with proposed land uses are listed under Impact 4.6.1.	LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.6.5 Sensitive land uses constructed near Lake Tahoe Airport and Barton Memorial Hospital could be exposed to excessive aircraft noise. However, implementation of applicable noise standards would address this impact. This impact is	Policy HS-8.4, Policy HS-8.6, Policy HS-8.7, Policy HS-8.8, Policy HS-8.9, Policy HS-8.10	LS	None required.	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
considered less than significant.				
<p>Impact 4.6.6 Subsequent development under the proposed General Plan Update could result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration levels. Activities such as pile driving could result in substantial sources of groundborne vibration. As a result, this impact is considered potentially significant.</p>		PS	<p>MM 4.6.6 The following policy shall be added to the noise section of the Health and Safety Element:</p> <p>All construction activities that include impact equipment and activities such as pile driving, soil compaction, or vibratory hammers could potentially affect nearby structures. Where these activities occur within 200 feet of existing structures, an analysis of vibration impacts will be conducted. The analysis will address the potential for adverse vibration levels based on the criteria contained in the table below. The City will ensure that construction operations are designed to avoid or mitigate for vibrations above 0.02 inches/second (0.5 mm/second).</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.6.6 would ensure that the impacts of groundborne vibration to buildings and associated residents are mitigated to less than significant.</p>	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality				
<p>Impact 4.7.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in increased surface water pumping from Lake Tahoe as well as improvements to an existing beach and boat ramp. These actions would not result in the substantial alteration of surface water levels and/or currents in Lake Tahoe. This impact is considered to be less than significant.</p>		LS	None required.	LS
<p>Impact 4.7.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would increase demand for water supply to the city, requiring increased groundwater production and potentially depleting groundwater supplies. In addition, planned development could interfere with groundwater recharge and/or alter the direction or flow of groundwater supplies. However, implementation of current TRPA standards as well as proposed policy provisions in the proposed General Plan Update would address this impact. New development anticipated under the proposed</p>	<p>Policy PQP-2.1, Policy PQP-2.2, Policy PQP-2.3, Policy PQP-2.5, Policy PQP-2.6, Policy PQP-2.7, Policy PQP-2.9, Policy PQP-2.10, Policy NCR-2.5, Policy NCR-2.7, Policy NCR-2.12, Policy NCR-3.6, IMP-1.11, IMP-5.4</p>	LS	None required.	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
General Plan Update would also not substantially deplete groundwater supplies. This impact is considered less than significant .				
Impact 4.7.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in the discharge of polluted runoff from construction of future urban development, potentially causing harm to the biological integrity of waterways, violating water quality standards, or otherwise substantially degrading surface water quality. However, implementation of current City, TRPA, LRWQCB, and state standards, as well as proposed policy provisions in the proposed General Plan Update, would address this impact. This impact is less than significant .	Policy PQP-4.1, Policy PQP-4.2, Policy PQP-4.3, Policy NCR-2.1, Policy NCR-2.8, Policy NCR-2.11, IMP-1.1, IMP-8.1, IMP-8.2	LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.7.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in the discharge of polluted runoff from operation of future urban development, potentially causing harm to the biological integrity of waterways, violating water quality standards, or otherwise substantially degrading surface	Policy LU-1.1, Policy LU-1.4, Policy LU-1.11, Policy LU-2.3, Policy LU-4.3, Policy LU-4.4, Policy TC-4.6, Policy PQP-1.5, Policy PQP-2.10, Policy PQP-4.1, Policy PQP-4.2, Policy PQP-4.3, Policy PQP-11.8, Policy NCR-2.1, Policy NCR-2.2, Policy NCR-2.3, Policy	PS	MM 4.7.4 The City shall revise Implementation Program IMP-8.1 as follows: Stormwater Management Plan. The City shall adopt and regularly update a stormwater management plan that identifies ways to minimize runoff, improve area-wide stormwater	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>water quality. Implementation of current City, TRPA, LRWQCB, and state standards, as well as proposed policy provisions in the proposed General Plan Update, would address this impact. However, the City currently lacks an operation and maintenance program and funding for the operation of stormwater infrastructure. This impact is potentially significant.</p>	<p>NCR-2.4, Policy NCR-2.5, Policy NCR-2.7, Policy NCR-2.8, Policy NCR-2.9, Policy NCR-2.10, Policy NCR-2.11, Policy NCR-2.12, Policy NCR-2.13, Policy NCR-2.14, Policy NCR-3.6, Policy NCR-3.10, Policy NCR-3.16, IMP-1.1, IMP-8.1, IMP-8.2</p>		<p>retention, and reuse. <u>The stormwater management plan shall also include a program to ensure ongoing operation, maintenance, inspection, and long-term funding of private and public water quality control features.</u></p> <p>Implementation of the above mitigation measure would ensure that stormwater infrastructure is maintained and that funding is provided to ensure long-term operation. Thus, this impact would be mitigated to less than significant.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.7.5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in the degradation of groundwater quality resulting from construction and operation of future land uses. This is considered a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>Policy LU-1.1, Policy LU-1.4, Policy LU-1.11, Policy LU-4.3, Policy LU-4.4, Policy TC-4.6, Policy PQP-2.10, Policy PQP-4.1, Policy PQP-4.2, Policy PQP-4.3, Policy PQP-11.8, Policy NCR-2.1, Policy NCR-2.2, Policy NCR-2.3, Policy NCR-2.4, Policy NCR-2.7, Policy NCR-2.8, Policy NCR-2.9, Policy NCR-2.10, Policy NCR-2.11, Policy NCR-2.12, Policy NCR-2.13, Policy NCR-2.14, Policy NCR-3.6, Policy NCR-3.10, Policy NCR-</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>MM 4.7.5 The City shall revise Policy NCR-2.5 as follows:</p> <p>Pervious Materials in Parking Areas. The City shall explore the use of pervious materials for parking areas and test on some street sections. <u>The City shall incorporate pretreatment features as part of the use of pervious materials in order to protect groundwater quality.</u></p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.7.5 would ensure that the use of pervious materials in parking areas would not degrade groundwater quality.</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	3.16, IMP-8.1, IMP-8.2		This impact is less than significant .	
<p>Impact 4.7.6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would increase impervious surfaces and alter drainage conditions and rates in the city, which could result in increased runoff and potential flooding impacts. The proposed General Plan Update could also potentially provide for development in areas currently subject to flooding. However, implementation of current City and TRPA standards, as well as proposed policy provisions in the proposed General Plan Update, would address this impact. This is considered a less than significant impact.</p>	<p>Policy PQP-1.1, Policy PQP-1.4, Policy PQP-1.5, Policy PQP-1.6, Policy PQP-1.7, Policy PQP-1.8, Policy PQP-4.1, Policy PQP-4.2, Policy PQP-4.3, Policy HS-4.1, Policy HS-4.2, Policy HS-4.3, Policy HS-4.4, Policy HS-4.5, Policy NCR-2.1, Policy NCR-2.9, Policy NCR-2.12, IMP-8.1</p>	LS	None required.	LS
<p>Impact 4.7.7 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could potentially provide for development in areas subject to flooding as a result of dam failure. However, area dams are maintained and inspected for safety and are not expected to fail. This is considered a less than significant impact.</p>		LS	None required.	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>Impact 4.7.8 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would provide for new development in areas subject to flooding as a result of a tsunami, seiche, or mudflow. This is considered a significant impact.</p>	<p>Policy HS-1.1, Policy HS-1.3, Policy HS-1.4</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>MM 4.7.8</p> <p>The City shall include the following as a policy to the General Plan:</p> <p>The City shall update the Local Emergency Operations Plan and Emergency Management Plan to include planning and response provisions for seiche wave hazards. This would include a warning process of when area earthquake events are of 7 magnitude or greater that could generate a seiche wave and a notification and evacuation process for residents, employees and visitors. This may include the provision of directional signage to guide evacuees to areas outside of the seiche wave hazard zone.</p> <p>While the occurrence of a seiche wave is not expected to be a routine hazard, such an event could result in substantial injuries and the loss of life if emergency response is prepared. Implementation of the above mitigation measure would ensure that adequate emergency response is provided to minimize the impact of the hazard and would reduce this impact to less</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
than significant.				
4.8 Geology, Soils, and Land Capability and Coverage				
Impact 4.8.1 The Planning Area is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. All structures associated with development under the proposed General Plan Update would be designed and constructed in accordance with existing regulations to minimize risks associated with seismic ground shaking and seismic-related ground failure. This impact is considered less than significant .		LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.8.2 New development within the Planning Area would be required to comply with numerous regional and local regulations to minimize grading and identify and mitigate for potential hazards related to unstable soils. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant .		LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.8.3 New development resulting from implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in increased land coverage within the Planning Area. All such development	Policy LU-2.3, Policy LU-4.4, Policy NCR-2.9, Policy NCR-2.12, Policy NCR-3.6	LS	None required.	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
would be required to comply with TRPA's land coverage restrictions based on the Bailey System and IPES scoring. This impact is less than significant .				
Impact 4.8.4 Development under the proposed General Plan Update would be required to conform to several existing state, regional, and city regulations intended to minimize the potential for erosion and changes to the natural siltation and deposition processes of surface waters in the Tahoe Basin. This impact is less than significant .	Policy NCR-2.1, Policy NCR-2.3, Policy NCR-2.14	LS	None required.	LS
4.9 Biological Resources				
Impact 4.9.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update may result in the loss of habitat for, and direct mortality of, special-status plant species. However, continued implementation of the TRPA Code of Ordinances as well as proposed policy provisions in the proposed General Plan Update would address this impact. This impact is less than significant .	Policy NCR-2.9, Policy NCR-3.1, Policy NCR-3.2, Policy NCR-3.3, Policy NCR-3.4, Policy NCR-3.5, Policy NCR-3.6, Policy NCR-3.10, Policy NCR-3.11, Policy NCR-3.13, Policy ROS-2.1, Policy ROS-2.2, Policy ROS-2.6, Policy ROS-2.8, Policy ROS-2.9, Policy ROS-2.10, Policy ROS-2.11	LS	None required.	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>Impact 4.9.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in direct and indirect loss of habitat and individuals of endangered, threatened, rare, proposed, and candidate status as well as California fully protected species. However, continued implementation of the TRPA Code of Ordinances as well as proposed policy provisions in the proposed General Plan Update would address this impact. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Policy NCR-3.1, Policy NCR-3.2, Policy NCR-3.3, Policy NCR-3.4, Policy NCR-3.5, Policy NCR-3.6, Policy NCR-3.10, Policy NCR-3.11, Policy NCR-3.13, Policy ROS-2.1, Policy ROS-2.2, Policy ROS-2.6, Policy ROS-2.8, Policy ROS-2.9, Policy ROS-2.10, Policy ROS-2.11</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.9.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in direct and indirect loss of habitat and individuals of wildlife species of concern and other non-listed special-status species. However, continued implementation of the TRPA Code of Ordinances as well as proposed policy provisions in the proposed General Plan Update would address this impact. This impact would be less than significant.</p>		<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies that contain specific, enforceable requirements and/or restrictions and corresponding performance standards that address these potential impacts are identified under Impact 4.9.2. Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update policies would substantially mitigate direct or indirect impacts to non-listed special-status species in the Planning Area; therefore, impacts to non-listed special-status species from implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would be less than significant.</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS – Less Than Significant
PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>Impact 4.9.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in the loss or modification of wet meadow, riparian, or other sensitive natural community and its associated wildlife. However, continued implementation of the TRPA Code of Ordinances as well as proposed policy provisions in the proposed General Plan Update would address this impact. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Policy NCR-3.1, Policy NCR-3.2, Policy NCR-3.3, Policy NCR-3.4, Policy NCR-3.5, Policy NCR-3.6, Policy NCR-3.10, Policy NCR-3.11, Policy ROS-2.1, Policy ROS-2.2, Policy ROS-2.6, Policy ROS-2.8, Policy ROS-2.9, Policy ROS-2.10, Policy ROS-2.11</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.9.5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not interfere substantially with the movement of migratory fish or wildlife species. There would be no impact.</p>	<p>Policy NCR-3.1, Policy NCR-3.2, Policy NCR-3.6, Policy NCR-3.10, Policy ROS-2.1, Policy ROS-2.2, Policy ROS-2.6, Policy ROS-2.8, Policy ROS-2.9, Policy ROS-2.10</p>	<p>NI</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NI</p>
<p>Impact 4.9.6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not conflict with existing biological resource protections of the City and TRPA. Thus, no impact would occur.</p>		<p>NI</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NI</p>

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>Impact 4.9.7 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any adopted biological resources recovery or conservation plan of any federal or state agency. There would be no impact.</p>		NI	None required.	NI
4.10 Cultural Resources				
<p>Impact 4.10.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or structure. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	Policy NCR-4.1, Policy NCR-4.2	LS	None required.	LS
<p>Impact 4.10.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in the potential disturbance of unknown archaeological resources (i.e., prehistoric archaeological sites, historical archaeological sites, and isolated artifacts and features) and human remains. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>		PS	<p>MM 4.10.2a The City will add the following as a policy to the Natural and Cultural Resources Element:</p> <p>The City will require archaeological investigations for all applicable discretionary projects, in accordance with CEQA regulations, for areas not previously surveyed and/or that are determined sensitive for cultural resources (e.g., undeveloped parcels near water</p>	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			<p>features). The City shall require the preservation of discovered archaeologically significant resources (as determined based on TRPA, state, and federal standards by a qualified professional) in place if feasible or provide mitigation (avoidance, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures) prior to further disturbance.</p> <p>MM 4.10.2b</p> <p>The City will add the following as a policy to the Natural and Cultural Resources Element:</p> <p>The City will require/condition projects and other ground-disturbing activities to notify the City if human remains are discovered and to halt work. The County Coroner will be notified according to Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of California's Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission and the procedures outlined in CEQA Section 15064.5(d) and (e) shall be</p>	

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			<p>followed.</p> <p>Implementation of the above mitigation measures would ensure that potential accidental discovery of archaeological resources would not result in significant impacts to these resources or their cultural and ethnic value. Thus, this impact would be mitigated to a less than significant level.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.10.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in the potential disturbance of paleontological resources (i.e., fossils and fossil formations). This impact would be potentially significant.</p>		PS	<p>MM 4.10.3 The City will add the following as a policy to the Natural and Cultural Resources Element:</p> <p>The City will require that a paleontological resource evaluation be prepared and measures to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources shall be identified (avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, and/or data recovery) when fossils are discovered during ground-disturbing activities.</p> <p>Implementation of above mitigation measure would reduce potentially significant impacts resulting from inadvertent damage or destruction to unknown paleontological resources to less than significant.</p>	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance	
4.11 Public Services					
Impact 4.11.1.1	Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical services. However, implementation of proposed General Plan Update policy provisions and continued implementation of City standards would ensure that emergency service impacts are addressed. This impact is less than significant .	Policy PQP-6.1, Policy PQP-6.3, Policy PQP-6.4, Policy PQP-6.5, Policy PQP-6.7, Policy PQP-6.8, Policy HS-2.1, Policy HS-2.2, Policy HS-2.3, Policy HS-2.7, Policy HS-2.8	LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.11.1.2	Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in additional need for water supply and infrastructure to provide adequate fire flows for fire protection. However, implementation of proposed General Plan Update policy provisions would ensure that adequate fire flows are provided. This impact is less than significant .	Policy PQP-6.2, Policy HS-2.4, Policy HS-2.5	LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.11.2.1	Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in increased demand for law enforcement services and could result in the need for new or physically	Policy PQP-5.1, Policy PQP-5.3, Policy PQP-5.4, Policy PQP-5.8, Policy PQP-5.9, Policy PQP-5.10	LS	None required.	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>altered law enforcement facilities. However, implementation of proposed General Plan Update policy provisions and continued implementation of City standards would ensure that law enforcement service impacts are addressed. This impact is less than significant.</p>				
<p>Impact 4.11.3.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would increase population in the LTUSD service area, which would subsequently increase student enrollment in LTUSD schools. New or expanded school facilities would not be necessary to serve the increased demand that would result in physical effects to the environment. This impact is less than significant.</p>	Policy PQP-7.1	LS	None required.	LS
<p>Impact 4.11.4.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update may increase the demand for community facilities and services as well as alter facilities. However, the changes community services and facilities are not expected to result in substantial effects to the physical environment. This</p>		LS	None required.	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
impact is less than significant .				
4.12 Utilities and Service Systems				
Impact 4.12.1.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in increased demand for domestic water supply. The water purveyors in the Planning Area have sufficient existing water supplies/entitlements to meet the demands of this anticipated growth in addition to their existing commitments. Therefore, this impact is considered to be less than significant .		LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.12.1.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could require additional treatment capacity, storage capacity, and conveyance facilities to meet the projected water supply demands. However, proposed General Plan Update policies would address infrastructure needs. This impact is considered to be less than significant .	Policy PQP-1.1, Policy PQP-1.2, Policy PQP-1.3, Policy PQP-1.4, Policy PQP-1.5, Policy PQP-1.7, Policy PQP-2.2, Policy PQP-2.4, Policy PQP-2.5, Policy PQP-2.7, Policy PQP-6.2, Policy HS-2.4, Policy HS-2.5	LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.12.2.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in new development within the		LS	None required.	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>Planning Area, potentially increasing wastewater flows. However, adequate wastewater conveyance and treatment infrastructure exists and expansion would not be required. Therefore, this impact is considered to be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Impact 4.12.3.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in new development within the Planning Area. Such development would increase the city's overall solid waste generation, potentially requiring the expansion of collection and disposal services. However, adequate capacity exists to serve the City. This impact is considered to be less than significant.</p>		LS	None required.	LS
<p>Impact 4.12.4.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in new development within the Planning Area. Such development would result in increased demand for electric, natural gas, telecommunications, and cable television services, potentially</p>		LS	None required.	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>requiring the expansion of associated infrastructure and facilities in the Planning Area. This impact is considered to be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Impact 4.12.4.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in the construction and operation of new development in the Planning Area, requiring the consumption of additional energy supplies. However, this new development would not result in an inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy. This impact is considered to be less than significant.</p>	<p>Policy LU-1.1, Policy LU-1.4, Policy LU-4.1, Policy LU-4.2, Policy LU-4.3, Policy LU-5.1, Policy LU-9.1, Policy LU-9.2, Policy LU-9.3, Policy LU-9.4, Policy LU-9.5, Policy TC-1.9, Policy TC-1.16, Policy TC-2.1, Policy TC-2.2, Policy TC-2.3, Policy TC-2.4, Policy TC-2.6, Policy TC-2.7, Policy TC-2.8, Policy TC-3.1, Policy TC-3.2, Policy TC-3.3, Policy TC-3.6, Policy TC-3.7, Policy TC-3.12, Policy TC-3.13, Policy TC-3.14, Policy TC-3.15, Policy TC-3.16, Policy TC-3.17, Policy TC-3.19, Policy NCR-5.1, Policy NCR-5.2, Policy NCR-5.3, Policy NCR-5.4, Policy NCR-5.7, Policy NCR-5.8, Policy NCR-5.9, Policy NCR-6.2, Policy NCR-6.6, Policy NCR-6.7, Policy NCR-6.8, Policy NCR-6.9, Policy NCR-6.10, Policy NCR-6.11, Policy NCR-6.12, Policy NCR-</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance	
	6.13, Policy NCR-6.14, Policy NCR-6.15, Policy NCR-6.18				
4.13 Scenic Resources					
<p>Impact 4.13.1</p>	<p>Subsequent development under the proposed 2030 General Plan Update would occur under new development and design standards that would improve the overall scenic quality. However, it would also intensify development that may be perceived as out of character with existing conditions in regard to height. This impact is considered significant.</p>	<p>Policy LU-1.1, Policy LU-8.1, Policy LU-8.2, Policy LU-8.3, Policy LU-8.5, Policy LU-8.6, Policy LU-8.7, Policy LU-8.8, Policy LU-8.9, Policy LU-8.11, Policy LU-8.12, Policy LU-10.7, Policy ROS-2.5, Policy ROS-2.7, Policy NCR-1.1, Policy NCR-1.2, Policy NCR-1.3, Policy NCR-1.5, Program IMP-1.2, Program IMP-1.3</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>MM 4.13.1a</p> <p>The City will add the following as a policy to the Land Use Element:</p> <p>As part of the update of the City's Citywide Design Guidelines, the following shall be incorporated into that update process for structures in excess of three stories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structures shall be "stepped back" from the edges of the property; • Building design will incorporate decks and vegetation or other appropriate features into the upper levels to eliminate the possibility of an institutional appearance; and • Building siting and design will not completely obstruct mountain views, views of Lake Tahoe, or stream environment zones from arterial roadways or public 	<p>LS</p>

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			<p>recreation areas.</p> <p>MM 4.13.1b</p> <p>The City will add the following as a policy to the Natural and Cultural Resources Element:</p> <p>Class I bike trails along the Lake Tahoe shoreline shall be designed to visually blend with the natural conditions and features so that the trail does not dominate views.</p> <p>MM 4.13.1c</p> <p>The City shall revise Table LU-2 of the Land Use Element to limit maximum building height within the Town Center and Tourist Center land use designations to three stories except within the designated nodes for Tahoe Valley and Stateline (identified on Figure NPL-1 of the General Plan Update).</p> <p>Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce the visual impact of the height of buildings on the scenic quality of the area as well as future bike trail facilities. Mitigation measure MM 4.13.1c would limit taller buildings to areas of the city where such buildings already exist (Stateline/Ski Run Community</p>	

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			Plan area) and where visual simulations have identified that increased building heights would not result obstruct long-range views of scenic conditions in the South Lake Tahoe area. As such, this impact is reduced to a level that is less than significant .	
<p>Impact 4.13.2 Subsequent development under the proposed General Plan Update would occur under new development and design standards that would improve the overall scenic quality. However, it would also intensify development and would increase potential height that could block views of scenic resources. This impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	<p>Policy LU-8.7, Policy LU-8.8, Policy LU-8.11, Policy LU-10.7, Policy NCR-1.1, Policy NCR-1.2, Policy NCR-1.3, Policy NCR-1.4, Policy NCR-1.5, Policy ROS-2.7</p>	PS	<p>Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.13.1a would ensure that views of scenic resources are not completely obstructed by new development, while mitigation measure MM 4.13.1c would restrict buildings in excess of 3 stories to only the General Plan Update designated Tahoe Valley and Stateline nodes. Implementation of this mitigation measure and the above policies would retain and improve views of scenic resources and would reduce this impact to less than significant.</p>	LS
<p>Impact 4.13.3 Implementation of the proposed 2030 General Plan Update would result in the adoption of new and improved design standards that would benefit existing scenic conditions. No impact would occur.</p>	<p>Policy LU-10.2, Policy LU-10.7, Program IMP-1.1</p>	NI	None required.	NI

LS – Less Than Significant
PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>Impact 4.13.4 Implementation of the proposed 2030 General Plan Update could result in an increase of daytime glare and/or nighttime lighting. This increase in daytime glare sources and nighttime lighting levels could have an adverse effect on adjacent areas and land uses. This impact is considered potentially significant.</p>		PS	<p>MM 4.13.4 The City will add the following as a policy to the Land Use Element:</p> <p>As part of update of the City's Citywide Design Guidelines, the following shall be incorporated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roofs, including mechanical equipment and skylights, shall be constructed of non-glare finishes and earth-tone colors that minimize reflectivity. • Parking lot, walkway, and building lights shall be directed downward. The Design Guidelines shall identify lighting levels to be no more than one foot-candle per square foot of area and shall require the use of shields on light fixtures to avoid sky lighting and off-site visibility. • Exterior lights shall not blink, flash, or change intensity. String lights, building or roofline tube lighting, and reflective or luminescent wall surfaces are prohibited. 	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdoor lighting shall be directed downward and shall not be used for advertisement purposes. <p>Implementation of the above mitigation measure would ensure that subsequent development under the proposed General Plan Update would not result in glare impacts by requiring non-glare finishes and earth-tone colors and would include nighttime lighting standards. Thus, this impact would be mitigated to less than significant.</p>		
4.14 Recreation					
Impact 4.14.1	Implementation of the proposed 2030 General Plan Update would result in population growth in the Planning Area over the next 20 years as well as provide and encourage additional recreational opportunities and facilities. This impact is considered less than significant .	Policy ROS-1.2, Policy ROS-1.4, Policy ROS-1.5, Policy ROS-1.7, Policy ROS-1.9, Policy ROS-1.11, Policy ROS-1.12, Policy ROS-1.13, Policy ROS-2.11	LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.14.2	Implementation of the proposed 2030 General Plan Update would allow for the future construction of numerous recreational		LS	None required.	LS

LS – Less Than Significant
PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
NI – No Impact

Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policy and Action Numbers	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>amenities throughout the Planning Area that could result in environmental effects involving noise (during construction and playfields and playgrounds), air quality (during the construction of the facility), biological resources, historic/cultural resources, public services and utilities (demand for police and fire protection, electric, water, and wastewater service), and traffic on a local neighborhood level. This impact is considered to be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Impact 4.14.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would maintain the existing publicly owned recreational facilities in the Planning Area and would result in additional recreational amenities and better access to public lands through the integration and linkage of existing city bike paths. This is considered a beneficial impact.</p>	<p>Policy ROS-1.1, Policy ROS-1.2, Policy ROS-1.4, Policy ROS-1.5, Policy ROS-1.7, Policy ROS-1.9, Policy ROS-1.10, Policy ROS-1.12, Policy ROS-2.1, Policy ROS-2.3, Policy ROS-2.4, Policy ROS-2.5, Policy ROS-2.6, Policy ROS-2.11</p>	<p>B</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>B</p>

LS – Less Than Significant
 PS – Potentially Significant

S – Significant
 SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B – Beneficial
 NI – No Impact

