

# **Appendix E**

---

## **Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

## APPENDIX E GOALS AND POLICIES CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

Tables 1 and 2 identify and discuss the project’s consistency with goals and policies from the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements (PAS) 080, PAS 089, PAS 092, the Tourist Core Area Plan, the South Shore Area Plan, the City of South Lake Tahoe General Plan, the Douglas County Master Plan, the Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan, and the Linking Tahoe: Active Transportation Plan that are relevant to the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project.

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination  | Rationale   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Land Use Element</b>   |  |   |
| <b>Land Use</b>   |  |   |
| <b>Goal LU-1: Restore, maintain, and improve the quality of the Lake Tahoe Region for the visitors and residents of the Region.</b>   |  |   |
| <p><i><b>Policy LU-1.2.</b> Redeveloping existing town centers is a high priority.</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>As described in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” objectives of the project include reducing traffic volumes through the tourist core, increasing mobility and safety for bicycles and pedestrians, and facilitating the creation of a safe and walkable district that enhances pedestrian activities and safety.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 2, “Proposed Project and Project Alternatives,” Alternatives B, C, and D include potential mixed-use development that would be located within and directly adjacent to the Tourist Core Area Plan (TCAP) Town Center. The purpose of the redevelopment sites would be to provide potential relocation opportunities for dislocated residents and business owners close to where they currently reside. The potential mixed-use development would also increase the amount of housing and increase opportunities for commercial uses. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, and D would help implement this policy.</p> <p>Alternative E would include a raised pedestrian plaza through the resort-casino area. Alternative E would not result in redevelopment in the town center, but it would not preclude future redevelopment within the town center from occurring.</p> <p>Alternative A would not result in any changes to centers within the TCAP and SSAP; therefore, this policy does not apply to this alternative.</p> |
| <b>Goal LU-3: Provide to the greatest possible extent, within the constraints of the environmental threshold carrying capacities, a distribution of land use that ensures the social, economic, and environmental well-being of the region.</b> |  |   |
| <p><i><b>Policy LU-3.3.</b> Development is preferred in and directed toward centers, as identified on the regional land use map. Centers shall have the following characteristics:</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>A portion of the project site is located within portions of the TCAP designated as Town Center and Regional Center. Similarly, a portion of the site is located within the limits of the SSAP.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 2, “Proposed Project and Project Alternatives,” Alternatives B, C, and D would maintain transit services throughout the project site, including within the Town Centers and Regional Centers for the TCAP and</p>  |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination   | Rationale   |
|---|---|---|
| 1) <i>A concentration of non-residential and mixed-use development at a higher intensity than exists in other areas of the Region.</i><br>2) <i>Existing or planned transit service.</i><br>3) <i>Highway access.</i><br>4) <i>Infill and redevelopment opportunities.</i><br>5) <i>Capacity for receiving transfers of development rights and relocations of existing development.</i><br>6) <i>Existing or planned housing in the vicinity.</i><br>7) <i>Existing or planned street designs with continuous sidewalks, paths and other infrastructure that promotes walking, bicycling and transit use so as to encourage mobility without use of private vehicles.</i> |   | <p>SSAP boundaries. Alternatives B and D would involve conversion of the existing US 50 to a local or main street—also defined as a “complete street” through the tourist core. The reduced number of vehicle travel lanes included in Alternatives B and D would make room for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit enhancements throughout the tourist core, improving connections to the casino core for pedestrians of all abilities and other modes of transportation. Alternative C would maintain existing transit service in the centers.</p> <p>Alternatives B, C, and D also promote walking with development of the pedestrian bridge that would be designed to serve as an attraction for visitors to the area and a gateway into Van Sickle Bi-State Park from the tourist core.</p> <p>Alternative E would include a raised pedestrian plaza through the resort-casino area that is separated from the highway. Although this feature would be disconnected from the pedestrian street environment, it does allow for pedestrian movement through the centers.</p> <p>Alternative A would not result in any changes to centers within the TCAP and SSAP; therefore, this policy does not apply to this alternative.</p> |
| <b>Policy LU-3.4.</b> <i>Existing development patterns in residential neighborhoods outside of centers and environmentally-sensitive lands should be maintained with no significant change.</i>   | Alt A: Consistent<br>Alt B: Not Consistent<br>Alt C: Not Consistent<br>Alt D: Not Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | <p>As described in Impact 3.4-1 in Section 3.4, “Community Impacts,” the realigned US 50 through the Rocky Point neighborhood would change the community character of the neighborhood with the introduction of an increase in traffic noise, changes to neighborhood visual character, physical division of the neighborhood, and removal of residences. These alternatives would be required to implement mitigation measures associated with visual effects, noise, and physical barriers to pedestrian access; however, these impacts on community character and existing development patterns in residential neighborhoods associated with Alternatives B, C, and D, both with and without mixed-use development, would remain. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, and D would not be consistent with Policy LU-3.4.</p> <p>Alternatives A and E do not propose any changes in development patterns and, therefore they would retain existing patterns in residential neighborhoods outside of centers. These alternatives would be consistent with this policy.</p>  |
| <b>Policy LU-3.5.</b> <i>Development is discouraged in and directed away from environmentally-sensitive lands and areas furthest from non-residential support services. These areas are further defined in other plan policies.</i>   | Alt A: Not Applicable<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Not Applicable     | <p>The potential mixed-use development proposed for Alternatives B, C, and D is located within an existing developed area already served by residential support services, such as water, sewer, and electricity infrastructure. These alternatives are consistent with Policy LU-3.5.</p> <p>Alternatives A and E do not propose mixed-use development, which could include residential uses. Policy LU-3.5 does not apply to Alternatives A and E.</p>   |
| <b>Housing</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Goal HS-1: Promote housing opportunities for full-time and seasonal residents as well as workers employed within the region.</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Policy HS-1.3.</b> <i>Facilities shall be designed and occupied in accordance with local, regional, state, and federal standards</i>   | Alt A: Not Applicable<br>Alt B: Consistent  | Implementation of Alternatives B, C, and D without mixed-use development would include construction of replacement housing for residents displaced by the project before taking down existing housing and constructing the  |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale   |
|--|--|---|
| <p><i>for the assistance of households with low and very low incomes. Such housing units shall be made available for rental or sale at a cost to such persons that would not exceed the recommended state and federal standards.</i></p>   | <p>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Not Applicable</p>   | <p>roadway improvements in California so that residents displaced by the project may be relocated to the newly constructed housing if they so choose during the relocation process. The replacement housing would include an equal number of deed-restricted low-income housing to replace low income housing displaced by the project and would also include moderate-income housing equal to those displaced by the project. Construction of new replacement housing would be necessary in order to provide comparable replacement housing to displaced residents in order for the project to move forward in a timely manner because there is a limited supply of comparable housing in the South Shore area. The replacement housing would be constructed in accordance with all City of South Lake Tahoe building standards and state and federal standards. In order to be eligible for use as replacement housing under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Act), the newly constructed replacement housing would be required to demonstrate that they would be available for rent at a cost that would not exceed the recommended state and federal standards for low income and moderate income levels.</p>  |
| <p><b>Policy HS-1.4.</b> <i>Affordable or government assisted housing for lower income households should be located in close proximity to employment centers, government services, and transit facilities. Such housing must be compatible with the scale and density of the surrounding neighborhood.</i></p> | <p>Alt A: Not Applicable<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Not Applicable</p> | <p>The proposed roadway improvements and potential mixed-use development for Alternatives B, C, and D would result in displacement of residents, including low-income and minority residents (see Impact 3.4-4 and “Environmental Justice Effects of the Project Alternatives” in Section 3.4, “Community Impacts”). TTD would be required to assist displaced residents in relocating to comparable replacement housing near their existing neighborhood as required by the Uniform Act and the Relocation Assistance Law and in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, which prohibits discrimination based on race, color, or national origin. Alternatives B, C, and D would construct replacement housing equal to the number of housing units that would be displaced by the roadway improvements and mixed-use development such that there would be no net loss of housing, including affordable housing, in the South Shore. Replacement housing would be completed before construction of roadway improvements in California would begin and before residents are displaced. The replacement housing would include an equal number of deed-restricted low income and moderate income housing units to replace those low income and moderate income housing units displaced by the project. This component of the project would satisfy TRPA requirements to offset the loss of affordable housing. Because the Uniform Act and Relocation Assistance Law require that replacement housing be near their existing neighborhood, it can reasonably be assumed that it would be located in close proximity to employment centers, government services, and transit facilities. The three mixed-use development sites within the project site are the preferred location for the replacement housing and meet these location guidelines. For these reasons, these alternatives are consistent with Policy HS-1.4.</p> <p>Alternatives A and E do not propose potential mixed-use development, which could include residential uses. Policy HS-1.4 does not apply to Alternatives A and E.</p> |
| <p><b>Community Design</b></p>   |  |   |
| <p><b>Goal CD-1: Ensure preservation and enhancement of the natural features and qualities of the region, provide public access to scenic views, and enhance the quality of the built environment.</b></p>   |  |   |
| <p><b>Policy CD-1.1.</b> <i>The scenic quality ratings established by the environmental thresholds shall be maintained or improved.</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: Not Applicable<br/>Alt B: Consistent</p>   | <p>Consequences for TRPA Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities will be discussed as part of the findings made for the adopted alternative.</p>  |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination   | Rationale  |
|---|---|--|
|   | Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent   | Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and, thus, would not change scenic quality ratings.   |
| <b>Noise</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Goal N-2: Community noise equivalent levels shall be attained and maintained.</b>                                  |   |  |
| <p><i>Policy N-2.1. Transmission of noise from the transportation corridors shall be reduced.</i></p>                 | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Not Consistent<br>Alt C: Not Consistent<br>Alt D: Not Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | <p>Transportation-related noise effects of the project are discussed in Impact 3.15-3 of Section 3.15, "Noise and Vibration."</p> <p>Implementation of Alternatives B, C, and D would result in exposing a number of receptors in the Rocky Point neighborhood to traffic noise increases that also exceed applicable FHWA, Caltrans, TRPA, City of South Lake Tahoe, and CEQA significance thresholds.</p> <p>Alternative E would result in fewer receptors exposed to traffic noise level increases that also exceed applicable TRPA, City of South Lake Tahoe, and CEQA significance thresholds.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures 3.15-3a through 3.15-3d identify a menu of noise reduction features that would be required to be implemented for Alternatives B, C, and D, and E to reduce traffic noise levels below applicable standards. Traffic noise levels from Alternatives B, C, and D would not be guaranteed to be reduced to below applicable FHWA, Caltrans, City of South Lake Tahoe, and CEQA significance thresholds. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.15-3a through 3.15-3d would reduce impacts under Alternatives B, C, D, and E to less than significant for applicable TRPA noise thresholds. However, because traffic noise levels from operation of the project would continue to exceed FHWA, Caltrans, City of South Lake Tahoe and CEQA significance thresholds with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.15-3a through 3.15-3d, these alternatives would not be consistent with Policy N-2.1.</p> <p>For Alternatives B, C, and D, there would be no measurable difference in traffic noise levels with or without the potential mixed-use development.</p> <p>With Alternative A, there would be no change in traffic noise levels because this alternative would not result in realignment of any segments of US 50, changes in the traffic volumes or travel speeds of various segments of US 50, Lake Parkway, or other local roads so this policy would not be applicable.</p> |
| <b>Natural Hazards</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Goal NH-1 Risks from natural hazards (e.g., flood, fire, avalanche, earthquake, seiche) will be minimized.</b>     |   |  |
| <p><i>Policy NH-1.1. Development shall be regulated in identified avalanche or mass instability hazard areas.</i></p> | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent                                  | <p>As discussed on page 3.11-1 of Section 3.11, "Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Coverage," the project site does not contain expansive soils or slopes that could become unstable or generate landslides or avalanche.</p>   |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination   | Rationale  |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Policy NH-1.2.</b> Prohibit additional development, grading, and filling of lands within the 100-year flood plain and in the area of wave run-up except for public recreation facilities, public service facilities, necessary crossings, restoration facilities, and as otherwise necessary to implement the goals and policies of the plan. Require all facilities located in the 100-year flood plain and area of wave run-up to be constructed and maintained to minimize impacts on the flood plain.</p> | <p>Alt E: Consistent</p> <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>Alternatives B, C, D, and E would require construction of the US 50 culvert over Edgewood Creek and the Lake Parkway culvert over Golf Course Creek, which would encroach into the 100-year floodplain of both streets. However, the project would comply with all Douglas County floodplain regulations and would be constructed to prevent damage from flooding and not cause flooding. Thus, Alternatives B, C, D, and E would be consistent with 100-year floodplain requirements and none of the build alternatives would encroach into the 100-year floodplain. See Impact 3.9-1 in Section 3.9, "Floodplain," for additional information.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and, as such, would not result in new construction within the 100-year floodplain.</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy NH-1.3.</b> Inform residents and visitors of the wildfire hazard associated with occupancy in the region. Encourage use of fire resistant materials and fire preventative techniques when constructing structures, especially in the highest fire hazard areas. Manage forest fuels to be consistent with state laws and other goals and policies of this plan.</p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p>                          | <p>Wildfire hazards are addressed in Impact 3.12-3 in Section 3.12, "Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Risk of Upset." The potential for standard construction practices to result in wildland fire would be low for Alternatives B, C, D, and E. Furthermore, the realigned US 50 would remove some structures that are not updated with fire resistant materials and with inadequate defensible space. The wildland fire threat could be reduced after construction of the potential mixed-use development because the new development would incorporate fire-resistant roofs, fire suppression systems, fire-resistant vegetation, and defensible space in accordance with the requirements of the City of South Lake Tahoe. Thus, Alternative B, C, D, and E would be consistent with wildfire prevention requirements.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and, as such, would not result in new structures located in a high fire hazard area.</p> |

**Air Quality**

**Goal AQ-1: Attain and maintain air quality in the region at levels that are healthy for humans and the ecosystem, achieve and maintain environmental thresholds and do not interfere with residents' and visitors' visual experience.**

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Policy AQ-1.1.</b> Coordinate with other agencies and jurisdictions to reduce emissions, exposures, and health and environmental risks when developing and implementing programs, plans, and projects.</p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>As discussed in Impact 3.13-2 in Section 3.13, "Air Quality," Alternatives B through E are consistent with the 2013 FTIP, the 2035 RTP, and the State Implementation Plan—multi-agency plans that aim to improve connectivity, reliability, travel times, and operations of public transportation, as well as increased mobility and safety of bicycles and pedestrians.</p> <p>The US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project is also a Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) project. The Lake Tahoe EIP is a partnership of federal, state, and local agencies, private interests, and the Washoe Tribe, created to protect and improve the extraordinary natural and recreational resources of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Reducing emissions, exposures, and health and environmental risks is one of the five EIP program areas.</p> |
|--|--|--|

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>To facilitate on-going agency coordination at a project level a project development team (PDT)—comprised of multiple agencies and stakeholders—was established. The PDT meets regularly to discuss project planning issues, permitting needs, and project status.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and, as such, this policy does not apply.</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy AQ-1.2.</b> Reduce or limit sources of pollutants that degrade visibility.</p>    | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>As discussed under Impact 3.13-1 in Section 4.2, “Air Quality,” construction of Alternatives B, C, D, and E would not exceed EDCAQMD’s ROG threshold. Construction of Alternatives B, C, and D would exceed EDCAQMD’s NO<sub>x</sub> threshold, and therefore CO emissions could be significant, for the purposes of CEQA and TRPA, and could be adverse for the purposes of NEPA. These alternatives would be required to adhere to dust control measures required by TRPA and EDCAQMD (i.e., Rule 202 and 223-1). In addition, NO<sub>x</sub> emissions and fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> dust emissions associated with construction of roadway improvements and potential mixed-use development would be minimized to less than significant, for the purposes of CEQA and TRPA, and would not be adverse, for the purposes of NEPA, with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.13-1a and 3.13-1b.</p> <p>In addition, because the project would not include any open burning or the introduction of new wood-burning fireplaces or other wood-burning devices in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin, the proposed project would not degrade visibility.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and, as such, would not affect visibility.</p>  |
| <p><b>Policy AQ-1.5.</b> Encourage the reduction of emissions through building efficiency.</p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: NA</p>         | <p>Because this policy relates to new building construction, it is most applicable to the potential mixed-use development that is proposed for Alternatives B, C, and D.</p> <p>Energy efficiency effects of the project are described in Impact 3.5-5 in Section 3.5, “Public Services and Utilities.” The project would be required to meet Title 24 standards for energy efficiency. Identified housing and commercial areas would be concentrated within walking distance of retail, restaurants, and services. The demolition and replacement of housing within the study area would provide an opportunity to update outdated infrastructure and improve energy-efficiency of buildings. Fuel consumption associated with vehicle trips generated by the project would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary in comparison to other similar developments in the Region. The project is located near public transportation and in an urban area, consistent with sustainable community design practices. For these reasons, the potential mixed-use development associated with Alternatives B, C, and D would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>The mixed-use developments are consistent with the compact development standards (e.g., density, height, and land coverage) in the TCAP and TRPA Code.</p> <p>Alternatives A and E do not propose to construct any new buildings; therefore, this policy is not applicable to these alternatives.</p> |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale   |
|--|--|---|
| <p><i>Policy AQ-1.7. Promote the reduction of air quality impacts from construction and property maintenance activities in the region.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy AQ-1.2, above.</p>  |
| <p><b>Water Quality</b></p>  |  |   |
| <p><b>Goal WQ-1: Federal, state, regional, local and private water quality management programs should be implemented in a coordinated manner to restore and maintain Lake Tahoe’s unique transparency, color and clarity in accordance with environmental threshold carrying capacity standards.</b></p> |  |   |
| <p><i>Policy WQ-1.3. Require that development and other activities in the Lake Tahoe region mitigate anticipated water quality impacts.</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>Impacts of Alternatives B, C, D, and E on water quality and stormwater runoff are discussed in Impacts 3.10-1, 3.10-2, and 3.10-3. Alternatives B, C, and D would result in an increase in impervious surfaces and implementation would require compliance with stringent SWRCB, Lahontan RWQCB, NDEP, and TRPA construction and post-construction stormwater controls. Storage, infiltration, and treatment measures would be required to minimize runoff flows and volumes and prevent erosion and flooding downstream of the project site. Additionally, stormwater discharges would be required to comply with Lahontan RWQCB, NDEP, and TRPA water quality standards and the Lake Tahoe TMDL.</p> <p>Alternatives B, C, and D would implement Mitigation Measure 3.10-3 that reduces the potential for these alternatives to adversely affect the functionality of existing stormwater infrastructure systems, such as the Rocky Point Stormwater Improvements, and would help safeguard public resources intended for water quality protection.</p> <p>Furthermore, existing development within the Rocky Point neighborhood that is not in compliance with water quality improvement requirements would be replaced by roadway improvements and potential mixed-use development that would be in compliance with water quality requirements.</p> <p>Alternatives B, C, and D would also include additional water quality treatment features, including stormwater improvements along US 50 between Lake Parkway and State Route 207, along the north side of Stateline Avenue, along Azure Avenue, and existing US 50 alignment between Stateline Avenue and Park Avenue and sand traps at existing and proposed drainage inlets, enhancements to the drainage basins at the intersection of Fern Road and Pioneer Trail, and new stormwater basins in excess right-of-way areas. Additional details regarding water quality improvements included in the project are described in Impact 3.10-2 in Section 3.10, “Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff,” and Chapter 2, “Proposed Project and Project Alternatives.”</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and, thus, would not affect water quality.</p> |
| <p><b>Goal WQ-3: Reduce or eliminate non point sources of pollutants which affect, or potentially affect, water quality in the Tahoe region in a manner consistent with the Lake Tahoe TMDL, where applicable.</b></p>   |  |   |
| <p><i>Policy WQ-3.1. Reduce loads of sediment, nitrogen, and phosphorus to Lake Tahoe; and meet water quality thresholds for tributary streams, surface runoff, and groundwater.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent</p>   | <p>See Regional Plan Policy WQ-1.3, above.</p>  |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination   | Rationale  |
|--|---|--|
|  | Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent  |  |
| <p><b>Policy WQ-3.6.</b> All persons engaging in public road maintenance or snow disposal operations in the Tahoe region shall maintain roads and dispose of snow to minimize the discharge of deicers, fine particulates and other contaminants to stream environment zones, groundwater and surface-water in accordance with site criteria and management standards in the Best Management Practices Handbook.</p>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | <p>Currently, snow storage areas along the existing US 50 alignment are limited due to right-of-way constraints. As described in Impact 3.10-1 in Section 3.10, "Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff," provision of adequate snow storage is required by Douglas County, City of South Lake Tahoe, and TRPA regulations. The proposed US 50 alignment for Alternatives B, C, and D would provide potential for snow storage within some parcels acquired for right-of-way purposes. All potential snow storage locations would be designed to drain to BMP facilities capable of treating large sediment loads. In accordance with TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 60.1.4, all snow storage areas would meet the site criteria and management standards in the TRPA <i>BMP Handbook of Best Management Practices</i>.</p> <p>With implementation of Alternative E, snow removal on US 50 through the tourist core would continue as under existing conditions and carried out by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT). Alternative E would not increase the need for snow removal on public roadways or need for additional snow storage.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions. This policy does not apply to Alternative A.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy WQ-3.11.</b> Require all persons who own land and all public agencies which manage public lands in the Lake Tahoe region to install and maintain best management practices (BMPs) improvements in accordance with a bmp manual that shall be maintained and regularly updated by TRPA. BMP requirements shall protect vegetation from unnecessary damage; restore the disturbed soils and be consistent with fire defensible space requirements. As an alternative, area-wide water quality treatment facilities and funding mechanisms may be implemented in lieu of certain site specific BMPs where area-wide treatments can be shown to achieve equal to or greater water quality benefits.</p> | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | <p>The US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project is a Lake Tahoe EIP project. As described in Section 3.10, "Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff," all of the build alternatives (Alternatives B, C, D, and E) would be designed and constructed in accordance with the Lake Tahoe BMP Handbook. Furthermore, implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.11-2a and 3.11-2b would reduce the potential of the project to adversely affect the functionality of existing stormwater infrastructure systems, and would help safeguard public resources intended for water quality protection.</p> <p>Because each of the potential mixed-use development sites exceed one acre, future development of these sites would be required to meet Lahontan RWQCB NPDES permit requirements, which would include implementation of BMPs.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and, as such, this policy does not apply. It should be noted that all parcels within the Tahoe Basin are required to implement BMPs in accordance with the Lake Tahoe BMP Handbook.</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy WQ-3.12.</b> Projects shall be required to meet TRPA BMP requirements as a condition of approval for all projects.<br/>A. New projects on undeveloped parcels shall require application and maintenance of temporary and permanent BMPs as a condition of project approval.</p>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy WQ-3.11, above.   |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>B. Projects which expand structures or land coverage shall require application and maintenance of temporary and permanent BMPs to the project area.</p> <p>C. Rehabilitation projects, other than minor utility projects, shall require the preparation of a plan and schedule for application and maintenance of temporary and permanent BMPs to the entire parcel. The amount of work required pursuant to the project approval shall consider the cost and nature of the project.</p> <p>D. Where area-wide treatments are approved, projects shall install improvements in accordance with the approved area-wide BMP plan.</p> |  |  |
| <b>Transportation Element</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Goal T-1: Promote walkable mixed-use centers, transportation enhancements and environmental improvements that increase the viability of transit systems.</b>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Policy T-1.1.</b> Support mixed-use that encourages walking, bicycling and easy access to existing and planned transit stops in centers.</p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy LU-3.3, above.</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy T-1.5.</b> Support sustainable transportation infrastructure and operational programs that provide environmental and community benefits.</p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>Impacts 3.6-4 and 3.6-14 in Section 3.6, "Traffic and Transportation," discuss potential impacts on bicycle and pedestrian facilities and Impacts 3.6-5 and 3.6-15 address potential impacts on transit. As identified in these impact discussions as well as Chapter 2, "Proposed Project and Project Alternatives," Alternatives B, C, and D would include bicycle lanes, new sidewalks, and a pedestrian bridge to Van Sickle Bi-State Park. These alternatives would also enhance transit by providing wider shoulders, bus pullouts, and new bus shelters at bus stop locations where existing features are limited to signs and, in some cases, benches. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, and D would result in beneficial impacts on sustainable transportation (e.g., biking, walking, and transit) and would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative E would not change transit facilities in the study area; however, the existing pedestrian scramble between the Montbleu Resort and Hard Rock Casino and Hotel would be replaced by a pedestrian skywalk, resulting in improved safety for pedestrians and vehicles, including transit. Implementation of Alternative E would not preclude construction of any other bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities in the future.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions. Implementation of Alternative A would not preclude construction of any other bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities in the future.</p> |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination  | Rationale   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Goal T-2: Encourage bicycle and pedestrian usage as viable and significant modes of transportation at Lake Tahoe.</b>  |  |   |
| <p><b>Policy T-2.2.</b> Construct, upgrade, and maintain pedestrian and bicycle facilities consistent with the Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.</p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy T-1.5, above.</p> <p>The Linking Tahoe: Active Transportation Plan, recently adopted and updates the Lake Tahoe Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, is discussed in Section 3.6, "Traffic and Transportation." Some of the pedestrian and bicycle facilities included in Alternatives B, C, and D (see Impacts 3.6-4 and 3.6-14 in Section 3.6, "Traffic and Transportation," and Chapter 2, "Proposed Project and Project Alternatives") are projects that are identified in the Active Transportation Plan. Additionally, as described in these impacts, Alternatives B through E would not create an inconsistency with any adopted policies related to bicycle or pedestrian systems.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions. Implementation of Alternative A would not interfere with implementation of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities in the future.</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy T-2.4.</b> Design and site intersections and driveways where feasible to minimize impacts on public transportation, adjacent roadways and intersections, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>As described in Impact 3.6-7, Alternatives B, C, D, and E would enhance the existing infrastructure and improve safety throughout the vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian network within the study area. The new pedestrian bridge over existing Lake Parkway into Van Sickle Bi-State Park would reduce pedestrian and bicyclist exposure to vehicular traffic for visitors to the park. Additionally, Alternatives B, C, and D would include a new traffic signal at the Van Sickle Bi-State Park entrance that would provide a dedicated and safe pedestrian crossing phase where none exists today.</p> <p>For Alternative E, the construction of a new pedestrian skywalk between Montbleu Resort and the Hard Rock Hotel and Casino would provide complete grade separation of pedestrians and bicyclists from vehicular traffic, thus reducing pedestrian and bicyclist exposure to vehicular traffic.</p> <p>As described herein, design considerations associated with public transportation, roadways and intersections, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities are incorporated into the design of the action alternatives consistent with this policy.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy T-2.7.</b> Implement safety awareness signage, road markings, educational programs, and programs that encourage bicycling and walking. Implement safety awareness signage, road markings, educational programs, and programs that encourage bicycling and walking.</p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>Alternatives B, C, and D would develop and implement a signage plan. Signage for parking, visitor information centers, and recreation opportunities would be developed and installed at appropriate locations throughout the project site. Other informational and interpretive/educational/way finding signs may also be installed along the tourist core area (all build alternatives) and near the pedestrian overcrossing into Van Sickle Bi-State Park. For these reasons, these alternatives would not conflict with this policy.</p> <p>Because Alternative E would not promote bicycling or walking throughout the study area beyond the resort-casino portion of the tourist core. However, implementation of this alternative would not interfere with implementation of programs that would promote bicycling and walking in the future.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions. Implementation of Alternative A would not interfere with implementation of programs that would promote bicycling and walking in the future. This policy is not applicable for this alternative.</p>   |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination   | Rationale  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Goal T-6: Support the economic vitality of the Lake Tahoe region by preserving and enabling an efficient system to move people and goods.</b>   |   |  |
| <i><b>Policy T-6.2.</b> Enhance the economic vitality of the region by efficiently connecting people to jobs, goods, services, and other communities.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Policies LU-3.3 and HS-1.4, above.   |
| <b>Goal T-10: Upgrade regional roadways as necessary to improve safety and provide for a more efficient, integrated transportation system.</b>   |   |  |
| <i><b>Policy T-10.1.</b> Incorporate transit stops and bicycle and pedestrian facilities in roadway improvement projects.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | <p>With respect to bicycle and pedestrian facilities, see Regional Plan Policies T-2.2 and T-2.4, above.</p> <p>As described in the section titled “Enhanced Transit Features,” in Chapter 2, “Proposed Project and Project Alternatives,” existing US 50 is well served by BlueGo. Existing transit stop locations are shown on Exhibits 2-2 through 2-4. BlueGo’s Stateline Transit Center is located in the center of the tourist core on Transit Way. With Alternatives B, C, and D, the proposed roadway improvements would reduce the number of travel lanes through the tourist core, making transit access more user-friendly with widened shoulders. These build alternatives would also include the construction of new bus shelters at existing transit stop locations where features are limited to signs and in some cases benches. For these reasons, these alternatives would not conflict with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative E would not alter transit stops throughout the study area. However, implementation of this alternative would not interfere with implementation of programs that would incorporate transit stops in the future.</p> <p>Implementation of Alternatives A and E would not interfere with existing transit stops, and transit facilities in the future.</p> |
| <i><b>Policy T-10.5.</b> Consider quality of service for transit, pedestrians, and bicyclists in addition to motor vehicles when analyzing development impacts on the transportation system.</i> | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policies T-2.2, T-2.4, and T-10.1 above.   |
| <i><b>Policy T-10.6.</b> Prohibit the construction of roadways to freeway design standards in the Tahoe region.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent                      | As described in Chapter 2, “Proposed Project and Project Alternatives,” the alternatives have undergone design refinements to reduce the roadway footprint and, in fact, utilize nonstandard design features to achieve a smaller-scale roadway. For example, Alternatives B, C, and D would implement 11-foot travel lanes instead of the standard  |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale  |
|--|--|--|
|  | Alt E: NA  | <p>12-foot lanes. Realignment of US 50 would not convert the roadway to freeway design standards. Therefore, these alternatives are consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternatives A and E do not propose any changes to existing roadways in the project site; therefore, this policy is not applicable to these alternatives.</p>  |
| <p><b>Policy T-10.7.</b> Level of service (LOS) criteria for the region's highway system and signalized intersections during peak periods shall be:</p> <p>A. Level of service "C" on rural recreational/scenic roads.</p> <p>B. Level of service "D" on rural developed area roads.</p> <p>C. Level of service "D" on urban developed area roads.</p> <p>D. Level of service "D" for signalized intersections.</p> <p>E. Level of service "E" may be acceptable during peak periods in urban areas, not to exceed four hours per day.</p> <p>F. These vehicle LOS (level of service) standards may be exceeded when provisions for multi-modal amenities and/or services (such as transit, bicycling, and walking facilities) are adequate to provide mobility for users at a level that is proportional to the project generated traffic in relation to overall traffic conditions on affected roadways.</p> | <p>Alt A: NA</p> <p>Alt B: Consistent</p> <p>Alt C: Not Consistent</p> <p>Alt D: Consistent</p> <p>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>The effects of the project on LOS for intersections and roadways are addressed in Impacts 3.6-1, 3.6-2, 3.6-11, and 3.6-12.</p> <p>After implementation of the roadway improvements proposed for Alternatives B and D, intersection and roadway segment operations would remain at acceptable LOS. In 2020, for Alternatives B and D, operations at some intersections in the study area would improve compared to the No Project (Alternative A). In 2040, with and without potential mixed-use development, these alternatives would not degrade operations to unacceptable levels or worsen already unacceptable operations at intersections and roadways.</p> <p>In 2020, after implementation of the roadway improvements proposed for Alternative C, some intersection and roadway segment operations would exceed acceptable levels. In 2040, with and without potential mixed-use development, this alternative would result in up to three intersections and up two roadway segments would degrade operations to unacceptable levels. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.6-1 and 3.6-11 for Alternative C would reduce these impacts on LOS at intersections, but impacts on roadway segment LOS would remain adverse, for the purposes of NEPA, and significant and unavoidable for the purposes of CEQA and TRPA, even with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.66-2 and 3.6-12. For these reasons, Alternative C would not be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Under Alternative E, LOS intersection and roadway segment operations would remain at acceptable levels in 2020. In 2040, Alternative E would not degrade operations to unacceptable levels or exacerbate already unacceptable operations at the intersections or for any roadway segments.</p> <p>Because no project would be implemented, this policy is not applicable to Alternative A.</p> |
| <b>Goal T-11: Improve the mobility of the elderly, disabled, traditionally under-represented and under-served populations and other transit- dependent groups.</b>   |  |  |
| <p><b>Policy T-11.2.</b> Ensure that transit and pedestrian facilities are ADA compliant and consistent with the TMPO Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan.</p>  | <p>Alt A: NA</p> <p>Alt B: Consistent</p> <p>Alt C: Consistent</p> <p>Alt D: Consistent</p> <p>Alt E: Consistent</p>     | <p>For Alternatives B, C, and D, pedestrian facilities, including the pedestrian overcrossing, sidewalk improvements, and signalized intersections, would be constructed to be compliant with ADA standards. The Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan for the Tahoe Region (Plan) provides an approach to increase access, mobility, and ultimately, independence for those who are transit-dependent. The study area is currently well served by BlueGo, the South Shore area's fixed-route bus service and commuter bus service connecting the area with Carson City and the Carson Valley. With Alternatives B, C, and D, the proposed roadway improvements would reduce the number of travel lanes through the tourist core, making transit access more user-friendly with widened shoulders. These build alternatives would also include the construction of new bus shelters at existing bus stop locations where features are</p>   |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>limited to signs and in some cases benches. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, and D are consistent with Policy T-11.2.</p> <p>For Alternative E, the skywalk would meet ADA standards by providing access via four elevators and escalators located near the walkway endpoints.</p> <p>Alternative A does not propose any changes to existing pedestrian or transit facilities in the project site; therefore, this policy is not applicable to this alternative.</p>   |
| <b>Conservation Element</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Vegetation</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Goal VEG-1: Provide for a wide mix and increased diversity of plant communities in the Tahoe region.</b>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Policy VEG-1.5.</b> <i>Permanent disturbance or unnecessary alteration of natural vegetation associated with development activities shall not exceed the approved boundaries (or footprints) of the building, driveway, or parking structures, or that which is necessary to reduce the risk of fire or erosion.</i></p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>Impacts 3.16-1 and 3.16-3 describe common vegetation and tree removal for Alternatives B through E. The action alternatives are located in a highly disturbed area and the permanent and temporary loss and disturbance that would occur would not substantially reduce the size, continuity, or integrity of any common vegetation community or habitat type or interrupt the natural processes that support common vegetation communities in the project site. Therefore, project-related disturbances on the biological functions of common habitats are not considered substantial. The action alternatives would remove a number of trees 14 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) or greater, which would constitute substantial tree removal under Section 61.1.8 of the TRPA Code. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.16-3, which requires the project proponent to prepare a tree removal, protection, and replanting plan, would reduce potentially significant impacts, for the purposes of CEQA and TRPA, associated with tree removal. For the purposes of NEPA, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.16-3, the projects effects on tree removal would not be adverse. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, and D would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative E would not result in removal of a substantial amount of vegetation or trees and would be implemented in an area that is entirely developed and supports no natural habitat types. Therefore, Alternative E would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not result in permanent disturbance or unnecessary alteration of natural vegetation.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy VEG-1.8.</b> <i>Promote use of native, water-efficient, nutrient-efficient, fire-resistant and non-invasive vegetation in urban areas and during revegetation of disturbed sites.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>Construction activities would include removal of existing pavement, vegetation removal, grading, excavation, and temporary stockpiling of soil. As described in Section 3.10, "Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff," temporary disturbance areas (such as staging areas) would be stabilized and revegetated following construction as required by TRPA Code Section 61.4. Additionally, projects requiring revegetation must submit a revegetation plan that specifies the use of approved plant species and a schedule of the amount and method of application of any necessary fertilizers in accordance with TRPA Code Section 61.4.5. TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 36.7 and the <i>TRPA BMP Handbook</i> (TRPA 2011) require that landscaped areas use native or adapted plant species that require little water</p>  |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>and fertilizer and are appropriate for the site conditions. Because revegetation and landscaping under all action alternatives would be required to comply with these provisions as a condition of permit approval, project implementation would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not result in new conditions that would be inconsistent with this policy.</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy VEG-1.9.</b> All proposed actions shall consider the cumulative impact of vegetation removal with respect to plant diversity and abundance, wildlife habitat and movement, soil productivity and stability, and water quality and quantity.</p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>Section 3.19, "Cumulative Impacts," considers the cumulative impacts on vegetation removal with respect to plant diversity and abundance, wildlife habitat and movement, soil productivity and stability, and water quality and quantity for the action alternatives.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not result in new conditions that would be inconsistent with this policy.</p>  |
| <p><b>Policy VEG-1.10.</b> Work to eradicate and prevent the spread of invasive species.</p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>Impact 3.16-4 evaluates project effects related to the introduction and spread of invasive species. Implementing any of the action alternatives has the potential to introduce and spread noxious weeds and invasive species during project construction and post-construction revegetation activities. However, through implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.16-4 (Implement invasive plant management practices during project construction), invasive plant species management practices would be implemented during project construction and the inadvertent introduction and spread of invasive plants from project construction would be prevented. With this mitigation measure, potential impacts related to invasive species would be reduced to a less-than-significant level, for the purposes of CEQA and TRPA, and would not be adverse, for the purposes of NEPA, and the project would not contribute substantially to the establishment and spread of noxious weeds and invasive species in the project region.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not result in new conditions that would be inconsistent with this policy.</p> |
| <p><b>Goal VEG-2: Provide for the protection, maintenance and restoration of such unique eco-systems as wetlands, meadows, and other riparian vegetation.</b></p>  |  |   |
| <p><b>Policy VEG-2.1.</b> Riparian plant communities shall be managed for the beneficial uses of passive recreation, groundwater recharge, and nutrient catchment, and as wildlife habitats.</p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>Project effects on riparian and other sensitive habitats (jurisdictional wetlands, riparian vegetation, SEZ, aquatic habitat) are addressed in Impact 3.16-2 in Section 3.16, "Biological Resources." Implementing the action alternatives would result in the permanent loss of up to approximately 0.1 to 0.4 acres of montane riparian habitat and approximately 0.2 to 1.2 acres of montane meadow, depending on alternative. Even though the amount of habitat lost would be minor, the affected habitats are recognized as sensitive and important. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.16-2a, Mitigation Measure 3.16-2b, and Mitigation Measure 3.16-2c would minimize, avoid, and compensate for impacts on sensitive habitats because they would require that sensitive habitat is avoided to the extent feasible and that sensitive habitats that cannot be avoided are restored following construction, or if the habitat cannot be restored, that the project proponent compensates for unavoidable losses in a manner that results in no net loss of sensitive habitats and meets TRPA mitigation requirements for impacts on SEZs. Consequences for</p>                      |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>TRPA Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities will be discussed as part of the findings made for the adopted alternative.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not result in new conditions that would be inconsistent with this policy.</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy VEG-2.2.</b> Riparian plant communities shall be restored or expanded whenever and wherever possible. When complete restoration is not feasible, restoration programs shall focus on restoring the natural function of riparian areas to the greatest extent practical.</p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy VEG-2.1, above.</p>   |
| <p><b>Goal VEG-3: Conserve threatened, endangered, and sensitive plant species and uncommon plant communities of the Lake Tahoe region.</b></p>  |  |   |
| <p><b>Policy VEG-3.1.</b> Uncommon plant communities shall be identified and protected for their natural values.</p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>No uncommon plant communities occur on the project site. Consequences for TRPA Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities will be discussed as part of the findings made for the adopted alternative.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not affect uncommon plant communities.</p>  |
| <p><b>Goal VEG-4: Provide for and increase the amount of late seral/old growth stands within the Lake Tahoe region.</b></p>  |  |   |
| <p><b>Policy VEG-4.2.</b> Stands not exhibiting late seral/old growth characteristics shall be managed to progress towards late seral/old growth.</p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>With limited exceptions, Section 61.1.4, "Old Growth Enhancement Protections," of the TRPA Code prohibits the removal of trees greater than 24 and 30 inches dbh in eastside and westside forest types, respectively, in lands classified as conservation or recreation lands. Section 61.1.4.A.7 of the Code allows removal of trees for EIP projects, provided that findings demonstrate that the tree removal is necessary. The US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project site is within both eastside and westside forest areas. The proposed project is exempt from this prohibition because it is on the EIP list of projects, as described in Chapter 2, "Proposed Project and Project Alternatives." However, the project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure 3.16-3, which would reduce potentially significant impacts, for the purposes of CEQA and TRPA, associated with substantial tree removal because a qualified forester would be retained to develop a tree removal plan that would comply with Chapter 61 of the TRPA Code. For the purposes of NEPA, effects on tree removal by the project would not be adverse with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.16-3.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not affect any tree stands.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy VEG-4.5.</b> Retain trees of medium and small size sufficient to provide for large tree recruitment over time, and to provide structural diversity. Preferably, these trees will be the most vigorous in the stand using one of the standard tree</p>                       | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy VEG-1.5, above.</p>   |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination   | Rationale  |
|--|---|--|
| <i>classifications. In addition, species composition should be key consideration in tree retention.</i>  |   |  |
| <b>Goal VEG-5: The appropriate stocking level and distribution of snags and coarse woody debris shall be retained in the regions forests to provide habitat for organisms that depend on such features and to perpetuate natural ecological processes.</b>                 |   |  |
| <b>Policy VEG-5.1.</b> <i>Allow for a sufficient number and an appropriate distribution of snags throughout the region's forests to provide and maintain habitat for species dependent on such features.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy VEG-1.5, above.   |
| <b>Policy VEG-5.2.</b> <i>Allow for an appropriate amount, level and distribution of coarse woody debris (downed woody material) throughout the region's forests to maintain biological integrity, to stabilize soil, and to afford a reasonable level of fire safety.</i> | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy VEG-1.5, above.   |
| <b>Wildlife</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Goal WL-1: Maintain suitable habitats for all indigenous species of wildlife without preference to game or non-game species through maintenance and improvement of habitat diversity.</b>   |   |  |
| <b>Policy WL-1.1.</b> <i>All proposed actions shall consider impacts to wildlife.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | As described in Section 3.16, "Biological Resources," and Appendix M, special status plant and animal species are generally not expected to occur, or have a low probability to occur (because of a lack of suitable habitat, existing disturbance levels, or lack of occurrence records) in the study area and implementation of the proposed build alternatives would not affect those species. Additionally, the project site is not positioned within any known important wildlife movement or migratory corridors. Because the project site is subject to high levels of human disturbance and isolation of habitat patches because of commercial and residential development, presence of major road corridors, and recreational uses, it is not likely to function as an important corridor. Because the analysis contained in Section 3.16 evaluated the impacts to wildlife for all of the build alternatives, they are consistent with this policy.<br><br>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not affect any wildlife. |
| <b>Policy WL-1.2.</b> <i>Riparian vegetation shall be protected and managed for wildlife.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policies VEG-1.5 and WL-1.1, above.  |
| <b>Goal WL-2: Preserve, enhance, and, where feasible, expand habitats essential for threatened, endangered, rare, or sensitive species found in the region.</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Policy WL-2.1.</b> <i>Endangered, threatened, rare, and special interest species shall be protected and buffered against conflicting land uses.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent   | See Regional Plan Policy WL-1.1, above.  |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination   | Rationale   |
|---|---|---|
|   | Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent  |   |
| <b>Soils</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Goal S-1: Minimize soil erosion and the loss of soil productivity.</b>   |   |   |
| <p><b>Policy S-1.2.</b> No new land coverage or other permanent disturbance shall be permitted in land capability districts 1-3 except for those uses as noted in a, b, and c below:</p> <p>C. Public service facilities are permissible uses in land capability districts 1-3 if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The project is necessary for public health, safety or environmental protection;</li> <li>ii. There is no reasonable alternative, which avoids or reduces the extent of encroachment in land capability districts 1-3;</li> <li>iii. The impacts are fully mitigated;</li> <li>iv. Land capability districts 1-3 lands are restored in the amount of 1.5 times the area of land capability districts 1-3 which is disturbed or developed beyond that permitted by the Bailey co-efficient; and</li> <li>v. Alternatively, because of their public and environmental benefits, special provisions for non-motorized public trails may be allowed and defined by ordinances.</li> </ul> | Alt A: Consistent<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | <p>The amount of existing coverage and maximum allowable coverage within the project site is identified in Table 3.11-3. Impact 3.11-1 in Section 3.11, "Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Coverage," identifies the additional land coverage that would be increased under Alternatives B, C, and D. Implementation of Alternatives B, C, and D would result in an increase in land coverage within the project site with the construction of roadway improvements and potential mixed-use development. These alternatives would be required to comply with TRPA land coverage regulations and limitations (Chapter 30 of the TRPA Code), including mitigation of disturbances in low capability lands (LCDs 1a, 1b, 2, and 3) at a ratio of 1.5:1, TRPA permit requirements (e.g., SWPPP, BMPs), and (for potential mixed-use development) transfer of excess allowable land coverage. See Impact 3.11-1 in Section 3.11, "Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Coverage," for additional detail.</p> <p>Alternatives A and E would not result in changes to TRPA-regulated land coverage.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy S-1.7.</b> All existing natural functioning stream environment zones shall be retained as such and disturbed stream environment zones shall be restored whenever possible and maybe treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire.</p>   | Alt A: Consistent<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy S-1.2, above.  |
| <b>Scenic</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Goal SR-1: Maintain and restore the scenic qualities of the natural appearing landscape.</b>   |   |   |
| <p><b>Policy SR-1.1.</b> All proposed development shall examine impacts to the identified landscape views from roadways, bike paths, public recreation areas, and Lake Tahoe.</p>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Not Consistent     | <p>Impacts of the build alternatives on scenic vistas or scenic resources are addressed in Impact 3.7-2 of Section 3.7, "Visual Resources/Aesthetics."</p> <p>As described on page 3.7-17, because the project site does not afford direct views of Lake Tahoe, effects of the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project on such views would not occur and are not discussed further.</p>  |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination  | Rationale   |
|---|--|---|
|   |  | <p>Similarly, the project site is not in view from any TRPA Shoreline Travel Routes. Therefore, effects on Shoreline Travel Route ratings are not discussed further.</p> <p>Currently, views of the project site from the Linear Park bike path are of existing US 50. The types of views of the roadway improvements and mixed-use development that would be seen from the Linear Park bike path would be similar to existing conditions. Recreationists at Van Sickle Bi-State Park would have little or no view of the project site once inside the park because of screening by topography and existing tree cover.</p> <p>Vertical components of the proposed project, such as supports for traffic signals and light standards, have insufficient mass to substantially disrupt scenic views. However, large objects, depending on their location and the location from which they are viewed, could interfere with scenic views. Alternatives B, C, and D include construction of a pedestrian bridge over new US 50 (on Lake Parkway) near the California/Nevada state line. Also, in the neighborhood east of Pioneer Trail, sound walls may be needed along the new section of US 50 to reduce traffic noise on residential properties. These features of the project would not substantially alter scenic vistas or scenic resources, as discussed in Impact 3.7-2. Any new mixed-use development that might occur with Alternatives B, C, and D would be required by the TRPA Code of Ordinances to avoid impacts to scenic vistas and scenic resources through building design and orientation. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, and D would be consistent with Policy SR-1.1.</p> <p>The skywalk structure that would be built with Alternative E would interfere with views of two TRPA-listed scenic resources. This alternative would not be consistent with Policy SR-1.1. Because potential mitigation to reduce the visual impact of the skywalk would substantially alter the nature of Alternative E, there is no feasible mitigation. For these reasons, Alternative E is not consistent with Policy SR-1.1.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not affect any scenic views.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy SR-1.2.</b> Any development proposed in areas targeted for scenic restoration or within a unit highly sensitive to change shall demonstrate the effect of the project on the 1982 travel route ratings of the scenic thresholds.</p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/> Alt B: Consistent<br/> Alt C: Consistent<br/> Alt D: Consistent<br/> Alt E: Not Consistent</p> | <p>Impacts of the build alternatives on TRPA Travel Route ratings of roadway travel units are addressed in Impact 3.7-1 of Section 3.7, "Visual Resources/Aesthetics." Table 3.7-6 includes a summary of the effects of the alternatives on roadway travel units, which shows that there would be increased ratings with implementation of Alternatives B, C, and D on Roadway Travel Units 32, 33, and 45. Consequences for TRPA Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities will be discussed as part of the findings made for the adopted alternative. Because Alternatives B, C, and D would result in improvements to the ratings on these roadway travel units, these alternatives would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>New mixed-use development that would be implemented with Alternatives B, C, and D would be required to comply with all applicable design standards and guidelines, including height standards, and would need to be oriented and designed in ways that avoid impacts to TRPA scenic threshold ratings for travel routes and scenic resources. These alternatives with mixed-use development would be consistent with this policy.</p>   |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>Within Roadway Travel Unit #32, the skywalk proposed by Alternative E would decrease the intactness and unity of the setting causing scenic quality to decline. Furthermore, the visual presence of the skywalk structure and its enclosure of the highway would substantially degrade the character of the roadway corridor as experienced by motorists. For these reasons, this alternative is not consistent with Policy SR-1.2.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not affect any travel route ratings of the scenic thresholds.</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy SR-1.3.</b> <i>The factors or conditions that contribute to scenic degradation, as specified in the Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP), need to be recognized and appropriately considered in restoration programs, plan development, and during project review to improve scenic quality.</i></p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p>         | <p>As described in Impact 3.7-1, Alternatives B, C, and D would maintain or improve the visual character of the project site through implementation of various design elements. The new highway would be designed in accordance with all applicable design standards and guidelines. The project would include improvements to the entrance to Van Sickle Bi-State Park. The retaining walls along the highway and pedestrian overcrossing would be given context-sensitive aesthetic treatments such that the design and construction of the bridge would be compatible with the surrounding natural and human environment and to note the California/Nevada state line. The bridge would be designed to serve as an attraction for visitors to the area and a gateway into Van Sickle Bi-State Park from the tourist core. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, and D would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative E would result in substantial changes to the character of the tourist core; however, it would be designed in accordance with all applicable design standards and guidelines and, as indicated in Table 3.7-6, the Scenic Quality Rating under Alternative E would increase because of an increase in vividness and the variety of modern materials that would be used to develop the Skywalk over U.S. 50 within Roadway Travel Unit 32. For these reasons, Alternative E would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions; therefore, this policy is not applicable.</p> |
| <p><b>Stream Environment Zone</b></p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Goal SEZ-1: Provide for the long-term preservation and restoration of stream environment zones.</b></p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Policy SEZ-1.2.</b> <i>SEZ lands shall be protected and managed for their natural values.</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: Consistent<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy S-1.2, above.</p>  |
| <p><b>Policy SEZ-1.5.</b> <i>No new land coverage or other permanent land disturbance shall be permitted in stream environment zones except for those uses as noted in a, b, c, d, e and f below:</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: Consistent<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy S-1.2, above.</p>  |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination  | Rationale   |
|---|--|---|
| <p>b. <i>Public service facilities are permissible uses in Stream Environment Zones if:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <i>The project is necessary for public health, safety, or environmental protection;</i></li> <li>ii. <i>There is no reasonable alternative, including spans, which avoids or reduces the extent of encroachment in Stream Environment Zones;</i></li> <li>iii. <i>The impacts are fully mitigated; and</i></li> <li>iv. <i>Stream Environment Zone lands are restored in the amount of 1.5 times the area of Stream Environment Zone which is disturbed or developed by the project.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Development within Stream Environment Zones is not consistent with the goal of managing Stream Environment Zones for their natural qualities and shall generally be prohibited except under extraordinary circumstances involving public works. Each circumstance shall be evaluated based on the conditions of this policy. The restoration requirements of this policy can be accomplished on-site or off-site, and shall be in lieu of any coverage transfer or coverage mitigation provisions elsewhere in this plan.</i></p> |  |   |
| <b>Cultural</b>   |  |   |
| <b>Goal C-1: Identify and preserve sites of historical, cultural and architectural significance within the region.</b>  |  |   |
| <p><b>Policy C-1.1.</b> <i>Historical or culturally significant landmarks in the region shall be identified and protected from indiscriminate damage or alteration.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>Section 3.8, "Cultural Resources," describes known cultural resources, including historical or culturally significant landmarks in the region, within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and within 0.5 mile of the APE. Impacts 3.8-1, 3.8-2, and 3.8-4 describe potential impacts on known historical, archaeological, and tribal cultural resources associated with Alternatives B, C, D, and E. Because the project elements would not substantially degrade the existing visual, atmospheric, or auditory setting and would not diminish those aspects of integrity that enable the resources to convey their significance, Alternatives B, C, D, and E would have a less-than-significant impact, for the purposes of CEQA and TRPA, and would not be adverse, for the purposes of NEPA, on these resources. Mitigation Measures 3.8-2 and 3.8-4 would protect unknown cultural and tribal cultural resources from indiscriminate damage or alteration during construction.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions, and as such, would not affect historical or culturally significant landmarks in the region.</p> |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination  | Rationale   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Recreation Element</b>   |  |   |
| <b>Goal R-4: Provide for the appropriate type, location, and rate of development of outdoor recreational uses.</b>  |  |   |
| <p><i><b>Policy R-4.2.</b> Bike trails shall be expanded to provide alternatives for travel in conjunction with transportation systems.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>Alternatives B and D would add 5-foot-wide, designated Class II bicycle lanes, including striping, through the tourist core from Pioneer Trail to SR 207 that would enhance connectivity and improve bicycle travel for those commuting and recreating in the area. Both alternatives would also include widened shoulders (minimum of 5 feet width) on the new US 50 alignment. Alternatives B, C, and D would construct a new pedestrian overcrossing over the new US 50 near the California/Nevada state line to improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity between the tourist core and Van Sickle Bi-State Park. With Alternative C, US 50 West would include a bicycle lane for on-road cyclists. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, and D would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative E does not propose any new bicycle facilities in addition to the raised pedestrian walkway. Alternative E would not preclude future improvements to bicycle facilities in the study area in the future.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions, and as such, would not affect bicycle facilities in the study area.</p> |
| <b>Public Services &amp; Facilities Element</b>   |  |   |
| <b>Goal PS-1: Public services and facilities should be allowed to upgrade and expand to support existing and new development consistent with the regional plan.</b>   |  |   |
| <p><i><b>Policy PS-1.3.</b> All new development shall employ appropriate devices to conserve water and reduce water consumption. Existing development shall be retrofitted with water conservation devices on a voluntary basis in conjunction with a public education program operated by the utility districts.</i></p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: NA</p>         | <p>Existing, older residential, hotel/motel, and commercial buildings would be removed to construct the roadway improvements and potential mixed-use development proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D. It can be reasonably assumed that many of the older structures are not equipped with water-saving devices.</p> <p>The potential mixed-use development would be required to meet water conservation requirements for new buildings that are included in the California Green Building Standard as part of Title 24. Additionally, at the time a specific project proposal for the mixed-use development is submitted, the project would be required to address consistency with this policy. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, and D are consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternatives A and E do not propose any new buildings; therefore, this policy is not applicable to these alternatives.</p>   |
| <b>Goal PS-2: Consider the existence of adequate and reliable public services and facilities in approving new development under the plan.</b>   |  |   |
| <p><i><b>Policy PS-2.1.</b> No additional development requiring water should be allowed in any area unless it can be demonstrated that there is adequate water supply within an existing water right.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: NA</p>         | <p>As described in Impact 3.5-2 in Section 3.5, "Public Services and Utilities," there is adequate water supply and water supply infrastructure to meet future water demands of mixed-use development proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D.</p> <p>Alternatives A and E would not construct new residential, commercial, or other uses that would increase water demand.</p>  |
| <p><i><b>Policy PS-2.3.</b> No additional development requiring water shall be allowed in any area unless there exists adequate storage</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent</p>  | <p>See Regional Plan Policy PS-2.1, above.</p>  |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination   | Rationale  |
|--|---|--|
| <i>and distribution systems to deliver an adequate quantity and quality of water for domestic consumption and fire protection.</i>   | Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA                                   |  |
| <b>Goal PS-3: Prevent liquid and solid wastes from degrading Lake Tahoe and the surface and groundwaters of the region.</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Policy PS-3.1.</b> <i>The discharge of municipal or industrial wastewaters to the surface and groundwaters of the Tahoe region is prohibited, except for existing development discharging wastewaters under a state- or TRPA-approved disposal plan.</i>              | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA | <p>As described in Impact 3.5-3 in Section 3.5, “Public Services and Utilities,” South Tahoe Public Utility District (STPUD) has indicated that the addition of wastewater flows from Alternatives B, C, and D mixed-use development could result in surcharge (exceeding capacity) of one segment of sewer pipe and would contribute wastewater flows to another segment that already experiences surcharge. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.5-3, effects from the mixed-use development on the capacity of the wastewater collection and conveyance system would be reduced to less than significant for the purposes of CEQA and TRPA. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.5-3, there would not be an adverse impact on wastewater collection and conveyance infrastructure for the purposes of NEPA. STPUD has confirmed that it has adequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve wastewater flows from the mixed-use development proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D.</p> <p>Additionally, as described in Section 2.3.8, “Water Quality Enhancements,” and Impact 3.10-2, Alternatives B, C, and D include improvements to the existing stormwater management systems within the project site. These improvements would resolve preexisting detrimental conditions within the project site and add supplemental capacity to water quality treatment basins above required volumes. The project would implement several measures that would enhance the ability of existing systems to protect water quality, and would create water quality benefits through the capture of currently untreated stormwater runoff. Alternative E would not construct additional improvements to the existing stormwater management systems, but all stormwater generated by the pedestrian deck would be treated by the existing Stateline Stormwater Association and would not result in new impacts on water quality.</p> <p>Alternatives A and E would not construct new residential, commercial, or other uses that would increase demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment.</p> |
| <b>Goal PS-4: To ensure protection of the public health, safety and general welfare of the region, educational and public safety services should be sized to be consistent with projected growth levels in this plan.</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Policy PS-4.1.</b> <i>The impact on educational and public safety services shall be considered when reviewing projects and plan amendments proposed within the region. To the extent feasible, adverse impacts should be mitigated as part of the review process.</i> | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA | <p>As described in Impacts 3.5-6, the net population increase associated with the mixed-use development proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D and displacement of existing residents in the project site would not be substantial enough to require additional police, fire, or emergency services.</p> <p>As described in Impact 3.5-7 in Section 3.5, “Public Services and Utilities,” local schools have adequate capacity to meet the demand for school services generated by mixed-use development proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D.</p> <p>Alternatives A and E would not construct new residential, commercial, or other uses that would increase demand for school or public safety services.</p>   |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Implementation Element</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Development and Implementation Priorities</b>   |  |  |
| <b>Goal DP-3. Encourage consolidation of development and restoration of sensitive lands through transfer of development rights and transfer of land coverage programs.</b>   |  |  |
| <p><b>Policy DP-3.1.</b> <i>Transfers of residential development and residential development rights to parcels in areas designated as receiving areas shall be encouraged in accordance with regional plan policies and implementing ordinances.</i></p> <p>A. <i>Residential development and residential development rights may be transferred with approval of TRPA. Residential development rights transferred from undeveloped parcels may only be exercised on a receiving parcel, upon receiving a residential allocation in accordance with the provisions regarding those allocations.</i></p> <p>B. <i>Residential bonus units may be granted to parcels for multi-residential units in conjunction with transfer of development rights from other parcels or other agency incentive programs. Ordinances shall establish detailed provisions which shall provide for bonuses of varying amounts in relation to a right transferred or implementation of an agency incentive program, depending on the public benefits being provided by the project. Bonuses shall be prioritized for affordable housing projects and projects within community plans and Centers. Other benefits to consider shall include the extent of coverage planned, transportation improvements, water quality improvements, scenic improvements, and proximity to essential services. More bonuses shall be granted for projects designed to house local residents at median income or below.</i></p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: NA</p> | <p>Alternatives B, C, and D would construct replacement housing for residents displaced by the roadway improvements and mixed-use development, such that there would be no net loss of housing, including affordable housing, in the region. The replacement housing would be completed prior to construction of roadway improvements in California and displacing residents. The preferred locations for the replacement housing are the three sites identified for the mixed-use development. Portions of mixed-use development sites would be located within the Tourist Core Area Plan, making them eligible for bonus development units that would be deed-restricted for affordable housing. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, and D would be consistent with Policy DP-3.1.</p> <p>Alternatives A and E do not propose potential mixed-use development, which could include residential uses. Policy DP-3.1 does not apply to Alternatives A and E.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy DP-3.5.</b> <i>The residential permit allocation system shall permit the transfer of building allocations from parcels located on sensitive lands to more suitable parcels.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: NA</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy DP-3.1, above.</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy DP-3.6.</b> <i>Before transfer of any development right or land coverage under this goal is effective, the sending lot shall be appropriately restricted or retired. In the case where an</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent</p>   | <p>See Regional Plan Policy DP-3.1, above.</p>   |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination   | Rationale   |
|--|---|---|
| <i>allocation has been transferred, or all the development rights or coverage has been transferred off a parcel deemed inappropriate for future development, the entire parcel shall be retired.</i>   | Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA  |   |
| <b>Goal DP-4. Condition approval of new development and redevelopment in the Tahoe region on positive improvements in off-site erosion and runoff control and air quality.</b>   |   |   |
| <p><b>Policy DP-4.1.</b> <i>New and redeveloped residential, commercial, and public projects shall completely offset their water quality impacts through one of the following methods:</i></p> <p>A. <i>Implementing on-site and/or off-site erosion and runoff control projects concurrent with the impact from the project as a condition of project approval and subject to Agency concurrence as to effectiveness, or</i></p> <p>B. <i>Contributing to a water quality mitigation fund for implementing off-site erosion and runoff control projects. The amount of such contributions is established by Agency ordinance.</i></p> <p><i>This policy continues the water quality mitigation funds established as part of TRPA's Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Management Plan. The fee schedules and distribution formula shall be reviewed and revised as part of the Agency's implementing ordinances and programs.</i></p> | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy WQ-1.3, above.   |
| <p><b>Policy DP-4.2.</b> <i>All projects shall offset the transportation and air quality impacts of their development.</i></p>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | <p>Alternatives B, C, and D would implement Mitigation Measure 3.6-17, which would require the project proponent to contribute to the Air Quality Mitigation Fund in accordance with Chapter 65 – Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program of the TRPA Code. The air quality mitigation fee shall be assessed in accordance with the mitigation fee schedule in the TRPA Rules of Procedure. Fees generated by the air quality mitigation fee are used to support programs/improvements that reduce VMT, improve air quality, and encourage alternative modes of transportation. For these reasons, these alternatives would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative A would include no modifications to the existing conditions. Alternative E would not generate any additional DVTEs.</p> |
| <b>Financing</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Goal FIN-3. Through the environmental improvement program, make progress toward and meet the performance targets identified in the monitoring and evaluation subelement for water quality.</b>  |   |   |
| <p><b>Policy FIN-3.3.</b> <i>All environmental improvement projects shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Best Management Practices Handbook.</i></p>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent   | See Regional Plan Policy WQ-3.11, above.  |

**Table 1 TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Regional Plan Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination   | Rationale   |
|---|---|---|
|   | Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent  |   |
| <b>Goal FIN-4: Through an environmental improvement program, make progress toward and meet the performance targets identified in the management and evaluation subelement for air quality and transportation.</b>   |   |   |
| <p><b>Policy FIN-4.1.</b> <i>The Tahoe Transportation District and local, state, and federal units of government shall be responsible for carrying out the transportation portion of the environmental improvement program, with funding assistance from regional revenue sources, and with the coordination and oversight of TRPA.</i></p> | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Not Consistent | <p>The US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project is an EIP project that would implement transportation improvements. Alternatives B, C, and D include improvements that are included in the EIP definition. TTD is lead agency under CEQA and is responsible for implementation of the roadway improvements. TRPA is lead agency under TRPA and FHWA is lead agency under NEPA.</p> <p>As part of the environmental process for the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project, TTD is also coordinating with Nevada Department of Transportation, California Department of Transportation, California Tahoe Conservancy, Nevada State Parks, City of South Lake Tahoe, and Douglas County.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 1, "Introduction," TTD has funding to complete the environmental review process and full design (preliminary through final) of the approved alternative. TTD also has some Right-of-Way – property acquisition and relocation – funds secured through State Transportation Block Grant (CA and NV) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) grants. Funding for the remaining property acquisition, relocation, and project construction would come from a variety of federal, state, and local sources, including Federal Transportation Act funds incorporated into recently passed legislation, Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund from revenues of the Cap-and-Trade program administered by the California Air Resources Board, and newly adopted taxes from Douglas County, among others.</p> <p>Alternative E would not carry out the US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project as described in the EIP. For this reason, Alternative E is not consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not preclude future implementation of the EIP project identified herein.</p> |

Source: TRPA 2012 and compiled by Ascent Environmental, Inc. in 2016

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination   | Rationale   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>PAS 080 Kingsbury Drainage</b>  |   |   |
| <i>Special Policy 4. The area adjoining Highway 50 should be maintained as a scenic view corridor.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | Alternatives B, C, and D would include minor roadway changes, including a new sidewalk on the mountain side of US 50 between SR 207 and Lake Parkway, that would not interfere with views in this area. Also, see Regional Plan Policy CD-1.1, above.   |
| <b>PAS 089 Lakeside Park: No special policies are applicable to the project</b>  |   |   |
| <b>PAS 090 Tahoe Meadows: No special policies are applicable to the project</b>  |   |   |
| <b>PAS 092 Pioneer/Ski Run: No policies are applicable to the project</b>  |   |   |
| <b>South Shore Area Plan</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Land Use Element</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Land Use</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Goal 4: To encourage alternative modes of transportation in order to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and improve the Lake Tahoe experience.</b> |   |   |
| <i>Policy 4.1. Sidewalks and landscaping shall be required for all new and expanded uses.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy LU-3.3, above.   |
| <b>Goal 5: Enhance the aesthetic character of the built environment to preserve and compliment the natural environment.</b>                            |   |   |
| <i>Policy 5.1. The area adjoining Highway 50 should be maintained as a scenic view corridor.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy SR-1.2, above.   |
| <i>Policy 5.3. Utilities shall be placed underground along scenic corridors and throughout the Tahoe Planning Area.</i>                                | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA         | With Alternatives B through D, overhead utilities lines located along the new US 50, throughout the project site in California and Nevada, would be relocated within the highway footprint and would be relocated underground where feasible.<br><br>No overhead utility lines are located where the proposed skywalk would be constructed. Therefore, Policy 5.3 does not apply to Alternative E.<br><br>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions; therefore, this policy is not applicable. |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination  | Rationale  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><i>Policy 5.4. Maximize views of the Lake and surrounding mountain ridgelines from Highway 50 and public gathering places through appropriate site and building design.</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Not Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy SR-1.2, above.</p>   |
| <p><b>Tourist Core Area Plan</b></p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Land Use</b></p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Goal LU-1 Land Use. Continue to shape the Tourist Core into a pedestrian-oriented destination center for tourist and permanent residents that provide high quality services, accommodations, and recreational experiences.</b></p>                    |  |  |
| <p><i>Policy LU-1.2. Promote the revitalization of the Tourist Core by encouraging a mixed land use pattern that combines tourist accommodation, residential, commercial, public facilities, and public spaces to serve visitors- and locals alike.</i></p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p>     | <p>As described in Chapter 1, "Introduction," objectives of the project include reducing traffic volumes through the tourist core, increase mobility and safety for bicycles and pedestrians, and facilitate the creation of a safe and walkable district that enhances pedestrian activities and safety.</p> <p>The roadway improvements proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D would result in creation of a complete street environment in the tourist core within the boundaries of the Tourist Core Area Plan (TCAP) and South Shore Area Plan (SSAP). Complete street features included in these alternatives include installing a center median (Alternatives B and D) and reducing the number of vehicle travel lanes that would help to slow traffic down through the tourist core. Along with fewer vehicle travel lanes, which would slow traffic speeds and reduce the automobile-oriented environment, Alternatives B and D would construct new bike lanes (or an optional cycle track) and make improvements to sidewalks and existing transit stops. Additionally, these alternatives would construct a pedestrian overcrossing that improves pedestrian and bicyclist connections to Van Sickle Bi-State Park. These roadway changes would help facilitate revitalization of the tourist core and, as discussed under "Economic Impacts" in Section 3.4, "Community Impacts," would also attract more visitors and residents to this area.</p> <p>Portions of the potential mixed-use development sites proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D would be located within the TCAP boundary and would include a mix of residential and commercial uses. The locations of these sites at the edges of the TCAP provide an opportunity to further enhance the feeling of a town center by serving as gateways to the tourist core.</p> <p>Alternative E would only result in limited revitalization improvements to the tourist core within the TCAP and SSAP boundaries. The raised pedestrian walkway would provide a new feature that could serve as a space that could be used for special events and as a central gathering place for visitors and residents.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not result in any changes to the mix of land uses in the tourist core.</p> |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination   | Rationale   |
|--|---|---|
| <i>Policy LU-1.3. Create distinctive, connected, and walkable districts that have a strong sense of identity.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent     | See Regional Plan Policy LU-3.3, above.   |
| <i>Policy LU-1.5. Continue to promote a vibrant pedestrian oriented center that includes retail, entertainment, tourist accommodation and residential uses, and community activity centers such as a public plaza that serves the needs of visitors and residents.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent     | See Regional Plan Policy LU-3.3, above.   |
| <i>Policy LU-1.7. Create a connection to the casino core in Nevada with a seamless pedestrian street environment on both sides of the Hwy 50 and across the state line.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Not Consistent | <p>A description of each of the build alternatives is included in Chapter 2, “Proposed Project and Alternatives.” Alternatives B and D involve conversion of the existing US 50 to a local or main street—also defined as a “complete street” through the tourist core. The reduced number of vehicle travel lanes included in Alternative B and D would make room for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit enhancements throughout the tourist core, improving connections to the casino core for pedestrians and other modes of transportation. A new sidewalk would also be constructed on the lake side of US 50, between new US 50 and SR 207, with each of these build alternatives.</p> <p>The pedestrian bridge included in Alternatives B, C, and D would be designed to serve as an attraction for visitors to the area and a gateway into Van Sickle Bi-State Park from the tourist core. The roadway changes through the tourist core would include enhanced sidewalks with street furniture, such as benches, lighting, public art, and public gathering spaces or common areas along existing US 50. These project components included in Alternatives B, C, and D would help improve the pedestrian street environment to become more seamless.</p> <p>Alternative E would include a raised pedestrian plaza through the resort-casino area that is separated from the highway and primarily outside of the TCAP. Due to the separated nature of the raised pedestrian plaza from the roadway, this feature of Alternative E would be disconnected from the pedestrian street environment. Implementation of Alternative E would result in no other improvements within the project site. Thus, Alternative E would not be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative A would not result in any changes to the resort-casino core; therefore, this policy does not apply to this alternative.</p> |
| <b>Goal LU-2 Community Design. Ensure that the design of new, remodeled, and rehabilitated development improves the community character of the Tourist Core through appropriate site and building design standards that promotes a high quality physical environment that establishes a distinct sense of place.</b> |   |   |
| <i>Policy LU-2.3. Establish pedestrian-scaled and strategically-placed lighting along sidewalks and multiuse paths that promotes pedestrian safety and comfort and enhances</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent   | See TCAP Policy LU-1.7, above.  |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination  | Rationale   |
|---|--|---|
| <p><i>architectural and site design concepts. Prevent unnecessary and intrusive lighting that detracts from the night time dark skies.</i></p>  | <p>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p>   | <p>The build alternatives would minimize the addition of new fixed light sources to the extent possible. New fixed light sources would be added to the new Lake Parkway/Harrah’s driveway intersection on the realigned US 50. The pedestrian bridge overcrossing would also include some light fixtures as a safety precaution for pedestrian users; pedestrian bridge lighting would be low-elevation, illuminating the foot path. A lighting plan would be developed to identify where new light fixtures would be located and where replacement of existing light fixtures would occur as more detailed design level plans are made after selection of an alternative.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions; therefore, this policy is not applicable.</p> |
| <p><b>Goal LU-3 Housing. Provide for adequate housing in close proximity to the Casino Core, Heavenly Village and the Crescent V Shopping Center.</b></p>   |  |   |
| <p><b>Policy LU-3.1.</b> <i>Promote multi-family and condominium units to be constructed as part of a mixed-use development.</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: NA</p>                     | <p>As described in Chapter 2, “Proposed Project and Project Alternatives,” Alternatives B, C, and D include potential mixed-use development that would include multi-family residential uses in addition to other uses.</p> <p>Alternatives A and E do not propose any mixed-use development; therefore, this policy does not apply to these alternatives.</p>  |
| <p><b>Goal LU-7 Noise. To reduce exposure of harmful and annoying effects of excessive noise and groundborne noise levels within the Tourist Core.</b></p>  |  |   |
| <p><b>Policy LU-7.1.</b> <i>The City shall require the mitigation of new transportation noise sources to the levels shown in Table HS-2 of the City General Plan at all outdoor activity areas and interior spaces of existing noise-sensitive land uses.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Not Consistent<br/>Alt C: Not Consistent<br/>Alt D: Not Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy N-2.1, above.</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy LU-7.2.</b> <i>The City shall require an acoustical analysis as part of the environmental review process when noise-sensitive land uses are proposed in areas exposed to existing or anticipated exterior noise levels exceeding the levels shown in Table HS-1 and HS-2 of the City General Plan, so noise mitigation may be included in the project design. All acoustical analysis shall:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Be the financial responsibility of the applicant;</i></li> <li>• <i>Be prepared by a qualified person experienced in the fields of environmental noise assessment and architectural acoustics;</i></li> <li>• <i>Include representative noise level measurements with sufficient sampling periods and locations to adequately describe local conditions and the predominant noise sources; and</i></li> </ul> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p>             | <p>See Regional Plan Policy N-2.1, above.</p> <p>Because Mitigation Measures 3.15-3a through 3.15-3d identify a menu of noise reduction features that address the requirements of Policy LU-7.2, Alternatives B, C, D, and E are consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Additional project-level environmental review for a specific proposal for the mixed-use development proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D would also be required to demonstrate consistency with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions; therefore, this policy is not applicable.</p>  |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination  | Rationale   |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimate existing and projected cumulative (20 year) noise levels in terms of Ldn or CNEL and/or the standards shown in Table HS-1, and compare those levels to the policies in this section;</li> <li>• Recommend appropriate mitigation to achieve compliance with the adopted policies and standards in this section, giving preference to proper site planning and design over mitigation measures which require the construction of noise barriers or structural modifications to buildings which contain noise-sensitive land uses;</li> <li>• Estimate noise exposure after the prescribed mitigation measure(s) has been implemented; and</li> <li>• Describe a post-project assessment program that could be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures.</li> </ul> |  |   |
| <p><b>Policy LU-7.3.</b> The City shall require an analysis of potential vibration impact be conducted for all construction activities that include impact equipment and activities such as pile driving, soil compaction, or vibratory hammers that occur within 200 feet of existing structures. The analysis will address the potential for adverse vibration levels based on the criteria contained in Table 4.6-12 of the City General Plan Draft EIR. 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>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Not Consistent</p> | <p>The project would be consistent with this standard because the potential adverse effects of construction-generated ground vibration are analyzed under Impact 3.15-2 and because Mitigation Measure 3.15-2 requires that measures be implemented to reduce exposure of buildings and other structures to levels of ground vibration that could result in structural damage and to limit the level of human annoyance. Alternatives B, C, and D would be consistent with Policy LU-7.3. Because ground vibration impacts from Alternative E could not be mitigated to less than significant, for the purposes of CEQA and TRPA, and would remain an adverse impact, for the purposes of NEPA, Alternative E would not be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative A would not result in any construction activity. Therefore, this policy is not applicable to this alternative.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy LU-7.4.</b> The City shall incorporate measures to ensure noise/land use compatibility on a project-specific basis. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of barriers, berms, and/or acoustical shielding;</li> <li>• Establishment of setback requirements for new development in specific areas exposed to roadway noise;</li> <li>• Noise-reducing acoustical treatment of existing and proposed buildings; and</li> <li>• Use of building layout and project features for noise-screening purposes.</li> </ul>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p>     | <p>See Regional Plan Policy N-2.1 and TCAP Policy LU-7.2, above.</p>  |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination   | Rationale   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Traffic and Circulation</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Goal T-1: Provide for safe and efficient vehicular circulation for the Tourist Core Area Plan.</b>   |   |   |
| <i><b>Policy T-1.1.</b> Encourage the modification of US Highway 50 to a low speed pedestrian main street through the TSC-C District.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent     | See Regional Plan Policy LU-1.2 and TCAP Policy LU-1.2, above.  |
| <i><b>Policy T-1.2.</b> Strive to maintain a level of service (LOS) D or better on all arterials, collectors and at signalized intersections. This LOS standard may be exceeded during peak periods, not to exceed 4 hours per day when provisions for multi-modal amenities and/or services (such as transit, bicycling, and walking facilities) are adequate to provide mobility for users.</i> | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Not Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy T-10.7, above.   |
| <i><b>Policy T-1.5.</b> The City shall participate with the TMPO, TTD, FHWA, NDOT, Caltrans, Douglas County, the State Parks of California and Nevada in the planning and implementation of the South Shore Community Revitalization Project.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent     | See Regional Plan Policy FIN-4.1, above.  |
| <b>Goal T-2: To create a functional, safe, convenient, and integrated pedestrian and bikeway system which provides access to recreation, retail and entertainment opportunities as an alternative to vehicle trips.</b>   |   |   |
| <i><b>Policy T-2.2.</b> Provide adequate pedestrian and bicycle facilities such as continuous sidewalks, bike paths and bike lanes throughout the plan area that connect commercial, entertainment and recreation areas of the plan.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent     | See Regional Plan Policy LU-3.3, above.   |
| <i><b>Policy T-2.6.</b> Install an integrated way-finding and directional signage program for pedestrians to encourage walking and biking to recreation, commercial and tourist facilities.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent     | See Regional Plan Policy T-2.7, above.  |
| <i><b>Policy T-2.7.</b> Where feasible the City shall strive to maintain sidewalks and bicycle facilities for year-round use.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA             | In order to help the city achieve this policy, Alternatives B, C, and D would show the location of snow storage areas on all site plans or a snow removal plan would be included with the improvement plan submittal to help maintain the ability to use sidewalks and bicycle facilities for year-round use. |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination   | Rationale  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | <p>The raised pedestrian walkway proposed by Alternative E would not be located within the City of South Lake Tahoe; therefore, this policy does not apply to Alternative E.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions; therefore, this policy is not applicable.</p>  |
| <b>Goal T-4: To promote the use and expansion of multi-modal transportation options including transit for visitors and residents.</b>  |   |  |
| <p><b>Policy T-4.1.</b> Collaborate with the Tahoe Transportation District and other transportation entities and service providers to ensure adequate transit service and facilities in the Tourist Core Area Plan. Ensure that the Tourist Core Area Plan is served by frequent bus service along US 50 and along routes that provide access to the lake and other recreation opportunities. Ensure that adequate bus shelters and bus pullout are installed throughout the Tourist Core Area Plan.</p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p>  | <p>See Regional Plan Policy LU-3.3, above.</p>   |
| <b>Goal T-5: To develop complete streets in the South Shore Area that allow for multiple uses including automobiles, bikes and pedestrian.</b>   |   |  |
| <p><b>Policy T-5.1.</b> Develop and adopt complete street roadway design standards for US 50 and the following collector streets: Park Avenue, Heavenly Village Way, Stateline Avenue, and Pioneer Trail and Ski Run Boulevard.</p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p>  | <p>See Regional Plan Policy LU-3.3 and TCAP Policy LU-1.2, above.</p>  |
| <b>Goal T-6: To provide adequate parking facilities that are integrated with and support a walkable, vibrant Tourist Core.</b>   |   |  |
| <p><b>Policy T-6.1.</b> Encourage underground parking where feasible, shared parking, reduce parking, or on-street parking to promote a pedestrian friendly main street in the Tourist Core.</p>   | <p>For roadway improvements:<br/>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: NA<br/>For potential mixed-use development:<br/>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: NA</p> | <p>Alternative E would not remove any existing parking and would not construct any new parking. Therefore, Policy T-6.1 does not apply to Alternative E.</p> <p>As described in Impact 3.6-10 in Section 3.6, "Traffic and Transportation," Alternatives B, C, and D roadway improvements would construct replacement parking either on adjacent right-of-way areas or on other portions of the parcel for parcels subject to partial acquisition that lose parking. These alternatives would permanently remove some parking at Heavenly Village Center and Montbleu Resort and Casino; however, the amount of parking remaining at these locations would continue to be sufficient to meet city and county standards. Additionally, these alternatives would include signage for parking. Alternatives B, C, and D roadway improvements would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>The potential mixed-use development sites proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D would consist of high density development at the edge of the tourist core. For these reasons, the potential mixed-use development would ensure adequate parking for residents and commercial uses that meets minimum parking standards that take advantage</p> |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination  | Rationale   |
|---|--|---|
|   |  | <p>of the close proximity to transit, shopping, and employment. The mixed-use development would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions; therefore, there would be no changes to parking.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy T-6.2.</b> Allow projects in pedestrian areas, areas with concentration of overnight accommodations, and in areas served by transit to reduce the parking requirement of the Citywide Parking Ordinances and waive the onsite parking requirement if a parking study and a plan is completed and approved.</p> | <p>For roadway improvements:<br/>                     Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: NA<br/>                     Alt C: NA<br/>                     Alt D: NA<br/>                     Alt E: NA</p> <p>For potential mixed-use development:<br/>                     Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: NA</p> | <p>See TCAP Policy T-6.1, above.</p>  |

**Natural and Cultural Resources**

**Goal NCR-1 Scenic Resources. To protect and enhance the visual connection between South Lake Tahoe and the Lake Tahoe Region’s scenic resources.**

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Policy NCR-1.1.</b> Improve the visual quality of the built environment consistent with the general recommendations for site planning found in the TRPA Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) to attain threshold attainment for Scenic Roadway Units # 32, 33 and 45.</p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Not Consistent</p>   | <p>See Regional Plan Policies SR-1.2 and SR-1.3, above.</p>  |
| <p><b>Policy NCR-1.2.</b> Maintain Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) restoration sites and stormwater drainage basins as view corridors and scenic resources to relieve the strip commercial character along US 50 within the Tourist Core.</p>  | <p>For roadway improvements:<br/>                     Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p> <p>For potential mixed-use development:<br/>                     Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Not Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Not Consistent</p> | <p>Impacts on existing stormwater detention basins are addressed in Impact 3.10-2 in Section 3.10, “Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff.” The Rocky Point stormwater system is located at the Fern Road/Pioneer Trail intersection, adjacent to US 50.</p> <p>The roadway improvements proposed by Alternatives B, C, D, and E would not eliminate these detention basins. Therefore, these alternatives would be consistent with Policy NCR-1.2.</p> <p>The potential mixed-use development on Site 2 for Alternatives B, C, and D could be constructed on the Rocky Point detention basins, which would require that they be located in an underground vault or relocated. Additional project-level environmental review for a specific proposal for the mixed-use development proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D would also be required to demonstrate consistency with this policy. At this time, the potential mixed-use development for these alternatives are not consistent with Policy NCR-1.2.</p> |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination   | Rationale  |
|---|---|--|
|   | Alt D: Not Consistent<br>Alt E: NA  | Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions; therefore, this policy is not applicable.  |
| <b>Goal NCR-2 Stream Environment Zones. To protect past Stream Environmental Zone (SEZ) restoration projects and areas of undisturbed SEZ within the Tourist Core Area Plan.</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Policy NCR-2.1.</b> Increase the area of naturally functioning SEZs by preserving existing SEZs and initiating and completing the restoration/rehabilitation of 7 acres of disturbed SEZs.   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Not Consistent<br>Alt C: Not Consistent<br>Alt D: Not Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | The effects of implementing the project on SEZ are assessed in Impact 3.16-2 in Section 3.16, "Biological Resources," which determines that Alternatives B, C, and D would result in minor loss or degradation of SEZs protected by Section 6.3 of the TRPA Code. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.16-2a, 3.16-2b, and 3.16-2c, the project would be required to avoid sensitive habitat to the extent feasible and for sensitive habitats that cannot be avoided, those areas would be restored following construction, or if the habitat cannot be restored, the project proponent compensates for unavoidable losses in a manner that results in no net loss of sensitive habitats and meets TRPA mitigation requirements for impacts on SEZs. Although the effects on SEZ from these alternatives would be less than significant, for the purposes of CEQA and NEPA, with implementation of mitigation, the project would not result in restoration or rehabilitation of 7 acres of disturbed SEZs in the TCAP. For this reason, Alternatives B, C, and D would not be consistent with this policy.<br><br>Alternative E would create an elevated pedestrian structure in an area that is entirely developed and supports no sensitive habitat types. Alternative E would be consistent with this policy.<br><br>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions; therefore, this policy is not applicable to this alternative. |
| <b>Policy NCR-2.3.</b> Encourage the use and access to designated open space for passive recreation uses when they conform to resource restrictions.  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA                     | See Regional Plan Policy R-2.2, below.   |
| <b>Goal NCR-3 Water Quality. To protect and enhance the clarity of Lake Tahoe and water quality in the area's rivers, creeks, and groundwater.</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Policy NCR-3.1.</b> Ensure installation and maintenance of Best Management Practices (BMPs) on all projects delegated under the permitting authority of the Memorandum of Understanding between TRPA and the City of South Lake Tahoe. | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent             | See Regional Plan Policy WQ-3.11, above.   |
| <b>Policy NCR-3.5.</b> Coordinate with Caltrans to ensure implementation of water quality improvement projects along US 50 within the Tourist Core Area Plan.   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent             | See Regional Plan Policy WQ-1.3, above.<br><br>Alternatives B, C, and D would realign US 50 around the tourist core and would be required to implement water quality improvement measures as part of the project similar to those that would be included in previously planned   |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination  | Rationale  |
|---|--|--|
|   |  | <p>Caltrans water quality improvement projects along US 50. For these reasons, these alternatives would be consistent with Policy NCR-3.5.</p> <p>As described in Impact 3.10-2, the portion of US 50 that would contain the skywalk contains existing stormwater infrastructure, which would not be affected by Alternative E. This alternative would be consistent with Policy NCR-3.5.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions; therefore, this policy is not applicable.</p> |
| <p><b>Goal NCR-4 Land Coverage. Maximize opportunities to remove or mitigate excess land coverage throughout the Tourist Core Area Plan.</b></p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Policy NCR 4-1.</b> <i>Onsite land coverage reduction will occur primarily through environmental redevelopment by providing development incentives in centers that promote the relocation and transfer of land coverage. The City will endeavor, where feasible, to reduce and avoid creating new coverage in order to benefit the objectives of the TCAP and other areas of South Tahoe.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: Consistent<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy S-1.2, above.</p>  |
| <p><b>Policy NCR-4.2.</b> <i>The City shall consider opportunities for coverage reduction in all private and public redevelopment projects in the Tourist Core.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: Consistent<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy S-1.2, above.</p>  |
| <p><b>Policy NCR-4.3.</b> <i>Encourage onsite landscaping in all private and public redevelopment projects that results in coverage reduction. Landscape features should be integrated with BMPs to treat stormwater runoff.</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p>         | <p>See Regional Plan Policies S-1.2 and WQ-3.11, above.</p>  |
| <p><b>Goal NCR-5 Air Quality. To incorporate air quality improvements and emission reductions in the Tourist Core.</b></p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Policy NCR-5.1.</b> <i>The City shall incorporate measures to reduce construction-generated emissions to the extent feasible on a project-specific basis. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Implement measures recommended by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District.</i></li> <li>• <i>Prohibit open burning of debris from site clearing unless involved with a fuels reduction project.</i></li> </ul> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p>         | <p>See Regional Plan Policy AQ-1.2, above.</p>   |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination   | Rationale   |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilize low emission construction equipment and/or fuels and use existing power sources (e.g., power poles), wherever feasible.</li> <li>Restriction of idling of construction equipment and vehicles.</li> <li>Apply water to control dust as needed to prevent dust impacts offsite.</li> </ul> |   |   |
| <b>Recreation</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Goal R-1. To preserve and enhance the high quality recreational experience in the Tourist Core.</b>   |   |   |
| <p><b>Policy R-1.1.</b> Develop an interconnected system of open spaces, gathering places, bike and pedestrian trails, and other types of public and private spaces as part of new development and redevelopment of existing sites.</p>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent     | See TCAP Policy R-3.1, below.   |
| <b>Goal R-2. To increase open space opportunities within the Tourist Core.</b>   |   |   |
| <p><b>Policy R-2.1.</b> Encourage the reduction of roadway width of US 50 thoroughfare between Park Avenue through the Casino Resort area and increase the amount of landscaping and pedestrian sidewalks on both sides of the highway.</p>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Not Consistent | <p>Roadway improvements proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D would reduce the number of lanes for vehicle travel through the tourist core to two lanes. These alternatives would also implement landscaping, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements in this area.</p> <p>Alternative E would construct a raised pedestrian walkway over existing US 50 through the resort-casino portion of the tourist core. Although this alternative would increase the pedestrian portion of this area, it does not provide opportunities for increasing the landscaping. This alternative would not reduce the number of lanes in this area. For these reasons, Alternative E is not consistent with Policy R-2.1.</p> <p>Implementation of Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not result in changes to US 50.</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy R-2.2.</b> Encourage open space to “spill” into the adjacent roadways, parking lots and commercial areas with planting islands and landscape walking trails.</p>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA             | <p>The extent of the development in the project site limits opportunities for providing visual connections to adjacent open space areas. However, Alternatives B, C, and D would include a pedestrian overcrossing that would improve the connection between the tourist core and Van Sickle Bi-State Park. Additionally, landscaping improvements, such as the addition of street trees, decorative vegetation, and landscaped medians, would be included throughout the project site as part of Alternatives B, C, and D. Street trees and decorative vegetation would line the sidewalks paralleling the roadway to frame views of the mountains in the distance. Along with changes to the existing US 50, landscaped medians would be added to separate eastbound and westbound lanes for Alternatives B and D.</p> <p>The skywalk proposed as part of Alternative E would be limited to the resort-casino portion of the tourist core, which is entirely surrounded by development. For this reason, Policy R-2.2 is not applicable to Alternative E.</p> |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | Implementation of Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not result in changes to open space.  |
| <b>Goal R-3. To increase connection to recreation access and opportunities.</b>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Policy R-3.1.</b> <i>Develop a bike trail system that links Ski Run Marina, Ski Run Boulevard, the pedestrian/tourist center at Stateline, Lakeside Beach area and Van Sickle Bi-State Park.</i></p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Not Consistent</p> | <p>Alternatives B and D would include minimum 5-foot-wide shoulders/bicycle lanes on the new US 50 alignment. The reconfigured existing US 50 with Alternatives B and D would reduce the number of travel lanes that would allow for the inclusion of 5-foot bicycle lanes on both sides of the roadway, which would connect to the Linear Park bike path that extends to the Ski Run Marina and Ski Run Boulevard.</p> <p>Alternative B would include an option for a cycle track instead of the proposed bicycle lanes along the lake side of Old US 50. The cycle track option would extend a two-way track from the existing separated shared-use path that is part of the Linear Park in front of Tahoe Meadows, through the tourist core, to the final future segment of the Nevada Stateline-to-Stateline Bikeway alignment beginning at the corner of Lake Parkway and US 50.</p> <p>With Alternative C, 5-foot-wide bicycle lanes/shoulders would be constructed along the new US 50 westbound alignment.</p> <p>Alternatives B, C, and D would construct a pedestrian overcrossing over US 50 providing access to Van Sickle Bi-State Park from a new path that would run the length of the Conservancy parcel between the Harrah's surface parking lot and Forest Suites Resort. These alternatives would also improve a section of Stateline Avenue, which leads to the Lakeside Beach area, between Lake Parkway and Cedar Avenue with a sidewalk that connects to the existing sidewalk on Stateline Avenue that extends between Cedar Avenue and existing US 50 in the Tourist Center District. Another pedestrian connection created by these alternatives includes new sidewalk to be constructed on both sides of the new US 50 (US 50 West with Alternative C) between Heavenly Village Way and the new US 50/Pioneer Trail intersection. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, and D are consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative E would not include project components that would contribute connections to a bike trail system. Construction of the skywalk for Alternative E would preclude future construction of bike connections through the resort-casino portion of the tourist core. For these reasons, Alternative E would not be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Implementation of Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not result in changes to the bike trail system.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy R-3.2.</b> <i>Provide pedestrian and bicycle access from the Tourist Center District to Lake Tahoe and Van Sickle Bi-State Park along Stateline Avenue and Park Avenue.</i></p>               | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent</p>  | <p>See TCAP Policy R-3.1, above.</p>   |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination   | Rationale   |
|---|---|---|
|   | Alt E: Consistent   |   |
| <i><b>Policy R-3.3.</b> Install an integrated way-finding signage system to direct bicycles and pedestrians to recreation opportunities and the Lake.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy T-2.7, above.  |
| <b>Goal R-5. To create public gathering spaces for visitors and residents to meet, socialize, relax and interact.</b>   |   |   |
| <i><b>Policy R-5.1.</b> Require projects over 50,000 square feet within the TSC-C district to provide informal gathering areas and places for community activities and performances.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA         | No specific site plans have been prepared yet for the potential mixed-use development; therefore, specific informal gathering areas or plazas have not yet been identified. Each individual mixed-use development sites would not exceed 50,000 square feet of commercial floor area. If two or more of these sites are proposed to be constructed as part of one project, then the potential mixed-use development would be required to meet the requirements of this policy. At the time an application is submitted to the city for the potential mixed-use development, the project proponent would undergo project-level environmental review in which the project would be required to demonstrate consistency with this policy, if applicable.<br><br>Alternatives A and E do not propose any new development. Therefore, Policy R-5.1 does not apply to these alternatives. |
| <b>Public/Quasi-Public Facilities and Services</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Goal PS-1. To improve public and quasi-public facilities in the Tourist Core.</b>  |   |   |
| <i><b>Policy PS-1.2.</b> Locate appropriate public service facilities within the Tourist Core so as to increase pedestrian/bicycle transportation and serve as a catalyst for private development.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy LU-3.3, above.   |
| <b>City of South Lake Tahoe General Plan</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Land Use and Community Design Element</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Land Use</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Goal LU-2. To focus future commercial, multi-family residential, tourist, civic, and social gathering space development in community plan areas in order to maximize incentives and create transit-, bicycle-, and pedestrian-oriented places that serve the needs of both residents and visitors.</b> |   |   |
| <i><b>Policy LU-2.12.</b> Stateline Node Purpose. The City shall ensure that the Stateline Node will be an area in the city for tourist-serving commercial uses, tourist accommodation units, workforce housing (e.g., housing affordable to local workers in</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent                      | See Regional Plan Policy LU-1.2, above.   |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><i>all industries), and affordable housing. The City should work with property owners to transform the Node into a pedestrian center served by transit that connects community resources, visitor facilities, recreation, and Lake Tahoe.</i></p>   | <p>Alt E: Consistent</p>   |  |
| <p><b>Goal LU-3. To encourage the creation of more complete and well-designed neighborhoods that promote livability, safety, and sustainability.</b></p>   |  |  |
| <p><b>Policy LU-3.1. Complete Neighborhoods.</b> <i>The City shall promote complete and distinct neighborhoods that promote walking to services, biking, and transit use; foster community pride; enhance neighborhood identity; ensure public safety; and are family-friendly.</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p>             | <p>See Regional Plan Policy LU-3.3, above.</p>   |
| <p><b>Goal LU-11. To ensure the fair treatment of all visitors and residents, regardless of race, culture, and income with respect to land use and environmental decisions.</b></p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Policy LU-11.1. Environmental Justice.</b> <i>The City shall ensure the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of land use and environmental laws, regulations, and policies. The City shall ensure that no part of the community suffers disproportionately from adverse human health or environmental effects, and all residents live in a clean, healthy, and sustainable community.</i></p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Not Consistent<br/>Alt C: Not Consistent<br/>Alt D: Not Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy HS-1.4, above.</p> <p>Environmental justice effects of the project area addressed in Section 3.4.3, “Environmental Justice.” As described therein, the environmental review process has included community outreach and public involvement and would result in project benefits related to implementation of Alternatives B, C, and D would result in beneficial impacts on bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure and connectivity (see Impact 3.6-4); improvements in transit operations (see Impact 3.6-5); and improvements in vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle safety (see Impact 3.6-7). Alternatives B and D would result in LOS improvements at several intersections compared to existing conditions (see Impact 3.6-1). As part of the project planning and development process that has occurred over the past several years, measures have been incorporated into the project to avoid or minimize impacts to the surrounding community. The potential mixed-use development that is proposed in addition to the roadway improvements was developed to address the displacement impacts of the roadway improvements. The potential mixed-use development would also meet the desire of displaced residents to be relocated to housing that is nearby their existing home. However, Alternatives B, C, and D would result in traffic noise and community character and cohesion impacts that could not be mitigated and are unavoidable significant adverse environmental impacts, for the purposes of CEQA and TRPA, that would disproportionately affect the minority and low-income populations. For the purposes of NEPA, these alternatives would result in adverse impacts related to traffic noise and community character and cohesion. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, and D would not be consistent with Policy LU-11.1.</p> <p>Alternative E would be limited to the portion of the tourist core that contains the resort-casinos and the areas directly adjacent to either end of the resort-casinos. Alternative E would not result in any disproportionate direct or indirect effects on a minority population. Alternative E would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions; therefore, this policy is not applicable.</p> |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination   | Rationale  |
|---|---|--|
| <i>Policy LU-11.2. Equal Public Participation. The City shall ensure that all community residents have meaningful opportunities to participate in the decision-making process.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | As described in "Environmental Justice Outreach" in Section 3.4, "Community Impacts," the environmental review process has included, and is required by federal agencies for projects that would receive federal funding to include, public involvement activities that has targeted potentially affected minority and low-income populations. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, D, and E are consistent with this policy.<br><br>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions; therefore, this policy is not applicable.  |
| <b>Recreation and Open Space Element</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Goal ROS-1. To maintain and expand South Lake Tahoe's public park system and recreational opportunities to meet the needs of residents, employees, and visitors.</b>   |   |  |
| <i>Policy ROS-1.2. Recreational Opportunity Access Improvement. The City shall improve connections and access to a wide range of recreational opportunities, which will improve the quality of life for residents and visitors.</i>               | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy R-4.2, above.   |
| <i>Policy ROS-1.10. Public Trail Incorporation in Private Developments. The City shall require public trails and plazas to be incorporated in the development and redevelopment of commercial, industrial, public, and multi-family projects.</i> | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA         | See TCAP Policy R-5.1, above.<br><br>In general, the potential mixed-use development sites would be relatively small in nature and would be located along roadways that would include upgraded or new sidewalk facilities. Due to their size, most of the mixed-use development sites are not conducive for incorporating new public trails. As part of Alternatives B and C, the existing linear park would be extended along the northwestern edge of potential mixed-use development Site 1. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, and D would be consistent with this policy.<br><br>Alternatives A and E do not propose any new development. Therefore, Policy ROS-1.10 does not apply to these alternatives. |
| <b>Housing Element</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Goal HE-1. To provide housing opportunities for South Lake Tahoe residents of all economic levels.</b>   |   |  |
| <i>Policy 1-6. The City shall encourage the production of housing as part of mixed-use projects in commercial nodes, Town Centers and Regional Centers and any other high-density area that may be identified in the future</i>                   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA         | See Regional Plan Policies LU-1.2 and HS-1.4 and TCAP Policy LU-3.1, above.  |
| <i>Policy 1-7. The City shall direct high-density residential development to sites located within walking distance of public</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent  | See Regional Plan Policies LU-1.2 and HS-1.4 and TCAP Policy LU-3.1, above.  |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination   | Rationale   |
|---|---|---|
| <i>transit and services. The City shall consider minimum density requirements in these areas.</i>   | Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA                                   |   |
| <b>Policy 1-8.</b> <i>The City shall support the establishment of Pedestrian and Transit-Oriented Development districts in which developers of mixed-use and high-density residential developments shall receive incentives (i.e., increased density, height, commercial floor area, residential allocations, and the ability to subdivide into condominiums).</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA | See Regional Plan Policies LU-1.2, HS-1.1, and HS-1.4 and TCAP Policy LU-3.1, above.  |
| <b>Goal HE-2. To encourage construction and maintenance of affordable and/or workforce housing in South Lake Tahoe.</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Policy 2-2.</b> <i>The City shall enable opportunities for deed-restricted affordable ownership housing to ensure long-term affordability.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA | See Regional Plan Policies HS-1.1 and HS-1.4, above.  |
| <b>Policy 2-3.</b> <i>The City shall encourage a range of housing options so that people who work in South Lake Tahoe can choose to live in the city.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA | See Regional Plan Policies HS-1.1 and HS-1.4, above.  |
| <b>Policy 2-6.</b> <i>The City shall ensure that deed-restricted affordable housing is created using attractive, long-lasting, low-maintenance materials.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA | The potential mixed-use development proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D would need to comply with all applicable design standards and guidelines. Additional project-level environmental review for a specific proposal for the mixed-use development proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D would also be required to demonstrate consistency with this policy.<br><br>Alternatives A and E do not propose any new development. Therefore, Policy 2-6 does not apply to these alternatives. |
| <b>Goal HE-3. To preserve and enhance the existing supply of housing.</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Policy 3-4.</b> <i>The City shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that proposed redevelopment, mobile home park closures or subdivisions do not result in the displacement of persons of low and moderate income. In the case of displacement, project applicants shall be required to relocate low- and moderate-income tenants and/or replace the lost low- and moderate-income housing units.</i> | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA | See Regional Plan Policy HS-1.4, above.   |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination   | Rationale  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Goal HE-5. To provide decent housing and quality living environment for all South Lake Tahoe residents regardless of age, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, ancestry, national origin, disability, or economic level.</b>  |   |  |
| <i><b>Policy 5-1.</b> The City shall promote housing opportunities for all persons regardless of source of income, age, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, marital/ familial status, national origin, disability, economic level, or other barriers that prevent choice in housing.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: NA             | See Regional Plan Policy HS-1.4, above.                        |
| <b>Transportation and Circulation Element</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Goal TC-1. To develop a transportation network that provides an efficient, comprehensive, and well-maintained roadway system that accommodates vehicular travel while encouraging expanded use of alternative transportation modes.</b>   |   |  |
| <i><b>TC-1.2. Level of Service Standard:</b> The City shall establish a minimum Level of Service (LOS) Standard "D" for all City streets and intersections. Up to four hours per day of LOS "E" shall be considered acceptable. LOS shall be considered based on average delay for the intersection as a whole for signalized intersections, and for the worst approach for intersections controlled by stop signs or roundabouts. LOS shall be evaluated for a busy, but not peak traffic, day in the peak seasons.</i> | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Not Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy T-10.7, above.                        |
| <i><b>Policy TC-1.7.</b> Highway 50 Relocation Project. The City shall coordinate efforts with Caltrans and the Tahoe Transportation District to relocate Highway 50 to south of Heavenly Village in the Stateline Community Plan area. This will allow for reduced numbers of travel lanes on Highway 50 between Pioneer Trail and Stateline, creation of a dedicated transit lane, and enhancement of bicycle and pedestrian amenities.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Not Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy FIN-4.1, above.                       |
| <b>Public/Quasi-Public Facilities and Services Element</b>   |   |  |
| <b>Goal PQP-1. To ensure the timely maintenance, expansion, and upgrade of public facilities and services for the entire community.</b>  |   |  |
| <i><b>Policy PQP-1.7. Ultimate Capacity Needs.</b> The City shall ensure, through the development review process, that public facilities and infrastructure are designed and constructed to meet ultimate capacity needs, pursuant to a master plan, to avoid the need for future replacement to achieve upsizing.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent     | See Regional Plan Policies WQ-3.11, PS-2.1, and PS-3.1, above. |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination   | Rationale   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Goal PQP-4: To protect water quality of streams and Lake Tahoe by reducing pollutant loads associated with urban stormwater runoff.</b>  |   |   |
| <i>Policy PQP-4.3. Stormwater Detention/Retention. The City shall require all projects to either detain or retain stormwater runoff on-site whenever physically possible and economically efficient or, if not possible or efficient, to contribute to the construction and long-term maintenance of off-site water quality measures.</i> | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent                 | See Regional Plan Policy WQ-3-11, above.  |
| <b>Goal PQP-5: To deter crime and to meet the growing demands for police services in South Lake Tahoe</b>   |   |   |
| <i>Policy PQP-5.1. The City shall continue to provide adequate police protection and law enforcement by maintaining a police department capable of meeting the needs of the entire community today and in the future.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent                 | See Regional Plan Policy PS-4.1, above.   |
| <i>Policy PQP-5.5. The City shall continue to strive for response times of three minutes or less from the time law enforcement resources are dispatched.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent                 | See Regional Plan Policy PS-4.1, above.   |
| <b>Goal PQP-6: To deter crime and to meet the growing demands for police services in South Lake Tahoe</b>   |   |   |
| <i>Policy PQP-6.3. The City shall ensure that any traffic controls and calming measures are designed and installed to minimize impacts on emergency vehicle response.</i>   | Alt A: Not Consistent<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Not Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | <p>See Regional Plan Policies T-10.2 and T-10.4, above.</p> <p>Impacts on emergency access are addressed in Impacts 3.6-8 and 3.6-18 in Section 3.6, "Traffic and Transportation." Alternatives B and D would maintain current emergency access routes and points to existing land uses in the study area and even with the narrowing of Old US 50, the improved traffic flow would at the least maintain emergency response time. Alternatives B and D would be consistent with Policy PQP-6.3.</p> <p>With implementation of Alternative C, the change in circulation patterns would result in increased emergency response times due to indirect emergency access routes for some areas and increased congestion along multiple roadway segments. Alternative C would not be consistent with Policy PQP-6.3.</p> <p>With implementation of Alternative E, operational emergency access would be maintained as it currently exists. Alternative E would be consistent with Policy PQP-6.3.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions; however, in 2040, the No Build Alternative would result in traffic conditions worsening to a point to which emergency response times could be affected. For these reasons, Alternative A is not consistent with Policy PQP-6.3.</p> |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale   |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Policy PQP-6.6.</b> <i>The City shall strive to maintain the following response times:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Still Alarms (Single Engine/Apparatus Response). The responding apparatus shall arrive within a four-minute travel time 90 percent of the time.</i></li> <li>• <i>Fire Incidents (Multiple Apparatus Responses). The initial responding engine/apparatus shall arrive within a four minute travel time 90 percent of the time, and the remaining assigned engines/apparatus shall arrive within a 10-minute travel time 90 percent of the time.</i></li> <li>• <i>Emergency Medical Responses. The initial responding fire apparatus shall arrive within a four-minute travel time 90 percent of the time with advanced life support transport (i.e., Paramedic Ambulance) units arriving within a 10-minute travel time 90 percent of the time.</i></li> </ul> | <p>Alt A: Not Consistent<br/>           Alt B: Consistent<br/>           Alt C: Not Consistent<br/>           Alt D: Consistent<br/>           Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See City of South Lake Tahoe General Plan Policy PQP-6.3, above.</p>   |
| <p><b>Goal PQP-8:</b> To promote provisions of adequate levels of utility services by private companies and to ensure that these are constructed in a fashion that minimizes their negative effects on surrounding development and maximize energy efficiency.</p>   |  |   |
| <p><b>Policy PQP-8.2.</b> <i>The City shall continue to require underground installation of electrical distribution utility lines in new and substantially remodeled projects as a condition of permit approval, except where infeasible for operational reasons.</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>           Alt B: Consistent<br/>           Alt C: Consistent<br/>           Alt D: Consistent<br/>           Alt E: NA</p>                         | <p>See South Shore Area Plan Policy 5.3, above.</p>   |
| <p><b>Health and Safety Element</b></p>  |  |   |
| <p><b>Fire Hazards</b></p>   |  |   |
| <p><b>Goal HS-2.</b> To provide minimize fire hazards and provide fire protection services that maintain a safe and healthy community.</p>   |  |   |
| <p><b>Policy HS-2.1.</b> <i>Fire Resistant Construction. The City shall require new, remodeled, and/or rehabilitated developments to be constructed using fire resistant materials, particularly roofing, and state-of-the-art fire prevention techniques.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>           Alt B: Consistent<br/>           Alt C: Consistent<br/>           Alt D: Consistent<br/>           Alt E: NA</p>                         | <p>Existing, older residential, hotel/motel, and commercial buildings would be removed to construct the roadway improvements and potential mixed-use development proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D. It can be reasonably assumed that many of the older structures are not constructed with up-to-date fire resistant materials. The buildings constructed as part of the potential mixed-use development would incorporate fire-resistant roofs, fire suppression systems, fire-resistant vegetation, and defensible space in accordance with the requirements of the City of South Lake Tahoe. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, and D would be consistent with Policy HS-2.1.</p> <p>Alternatives A and E do not propose construction of any new buildings; therefore, this policy is not applicable.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy HS-2.5.</b> <i>Fire Flow Requirements. The City shall require that all new construction meets the minimum fire flow</i></p>   | <p>For roadway improvements:<br/>           Alt A: NA</p>  | <p>Alternatives B, C, and D roadway improvements and Alternatives A and E do not propose to construct any new buildings. Therefore, Policy HS-2.5 is not applicable to these alternatives.</p>  |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination  | Rationale   |
|---|--|---|
| <p><i>requirements as set forth in the California Building and Fire Codes.</i></p>  | <p>Alt B: NA<br/>           Alt C: NA<br/>           Alt D: NA<br/>           Alt E: NA</p> <p>For potential mixed-use development:<br/>           Alt A: NA<br/>           Alt B: Consistent<br/>           Alt C: Consistent<br/>           Alt D: Consistent<br/>           Alt E: NA</p> | <p>As discussed in Impact 3.5-2 in Section 3.5, "Public Services and Utilities," water supplies for fire flow are available to meet demand associated with the potential mixed-use development proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D.</p> <p>Alternatives A and E do not propose construction of any new buildings; therefore, this policy is not applicable.</p>  |
| <p><b>Goal HS-3. To protect lives and property from seismic and geologic hazards and adverse soil conditions.</b></p>   |  |   |
| <p><b>Policy HS-3.1.</b> <i>Seismically Induced Ground Shaking and Related Geologic Hazards.</i><br/> <i>The City shall ensure that all existing and future City buildings and structures are of sufficient construction to withstand seismically induced ground shaking and related geologic hazards.</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>           Alt B: Consistent<br/>           Alt C: Consistent<br/>           Alt D: Consistent<br/>           Alt E: Consistent</p>   | <p>Impact 3.11-3 in Section 3.11, "Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Coverage," addresses potential seismic impacts on the project. Alternatives B, C, D, and E would involve construction in a seismically-active area and deep excavation could encounter soil susceptible to liquefaction, the potential risks due to seismic shaking and liquefaction would be minimized through the required compliance with NDOT, AASHTO, and Caltrans design standards and state and local building codes. For these reasons, these alternatives are consistent with Policy HS-3.1.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not result in new structures that could be affected by seismic hazards.</p> |
| <p><b>Goal HS-4. To protect life and property from seasonal flooding and flooding related to large storm events.</b></p>  |  |   |
| <p><b>Policy HS-4.1.</b> <i>New Development Location Outside of Stream Environment Zones and 100-Year Floodplains. The City shall locate all new development outside of Tahoe Regional Planning Agency-defined Stream Environment Zones (SEZ) and Federal Emergency Management Agency-defined 100-year floodplains.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>           Alt B: Consistent<br/>           Alt C: Consistent<br/>           Alt D: Consistent<br/>           Alt E: Consistent</p>   | <p>With regards to locating development in SEZ, see TCAP Policy NCR-2.1, above.</p> <p>With regards to floodplains, see Regional Plan Policy NH-1.2, above.</p>   |
| <p><b>Goal HS-6. To protect and maintain the safety of residents, businesses, and visitors by reducing, and where possible, eliminating exposure to hazardous materials, waste, and natural substances.</b></p>   |  |   |
| <p><b>Policy HS-6.2.</b> <i>Construction Activity Stoppage due to Contamination. 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</i></p> | <p>Alt A: Not applicable<br/>           Alt B: Consistent<br/>           Alt C: Consistent<br/>           Alt D: Consistent<br/>           Alt E: Consistent</p>   | <p>Impacts associated with the release of hazardous materials are addressed in Impacts 3.12-1 and 3.12-2 in Section 3.12, "Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Risk of Upset."</p> <p>Compliance with the various federal, state, and local regulations would minimize the risk of a spill or accidental release of hazardous materials during construction and operation of the roadway improvements and potential mixed-use development proposed by Alternatives B, C, and D and raised pedestrian walkway proposed by</p>  |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination  | Rationale  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><i>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 Lake Tahoe, depending on the type of contamination.</i></p>  |  | <p>Alternative E. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.12-2a, 3.12-2b, 3.12-2c, and 3.12-2d would further minimize the risk of an accidental release of hazardous substances associated with construction of these alternatives that could adversely affect human health or the environment. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, D, and E would be consistent with Policy HS-6.2.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not result in construction activities or new operational activities that could increase risk of contamination or exposure to contamination.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy HS-6.3:</b> <i>Vibration Impact Analysis. 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, the City shall require an analysis of vibration impacts will be conducted. The analysis will address the potential for adverse vibration levels based on the criteria contained in Table 4.6-12 of the Draft EIR. The City will ensure that construction operations are designed to avoid or mitigate for vibrations above 0.02 inches/second (0.5 mm/second).</i></p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent</p>             | <p>See TCAP Policy LU-7.3, above.</p>  |
| <p><b>Goal HS-8. To protect South Lake Tahoe's residents, workers, and visitors from the harmful and annoying effects of excessive exposure to noise.</b></p>   |  |  |
| <p><b>Policy HS-8.3.</b> <i>Overall Background Noise Mitigation. The City shall not allow any project to increase the overall background noise levels at receiving land uses by three or more decibels (dB) in instances when measured ambient noise levels exceed the standards contained within Table HS-1.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Not Consistent<br/>Alt C: Not Consistent<br/>Alt D: Not Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy N-2.1, above.</p>  |
| <p><b>Policy HS-8.4:</b> <i>Annoying and Excessive Transportation Noise Protection. The City shall not allow noise-sensitive land uses in areas exposed to existing or projected transportation noise levels that exceed the standards shown in Table HS-2, unless the project design includes effective mitigation measures to reduce exterior noise and noise levels in interior spaces to the levels at or below those shown in Table HS-2.</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Not Consistent<br/>Alt C: Not Consistent<br/>Alt D: Not Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy N-2.1, above.</p>  |
| <p><b>Policy HS-8.5:</b> <i>New Transportation Noise Source Mitigation. The City shall require the mitigation of new transportation noise sources to the levels shown in Table HS-2 at all outdoor activity areas and interior spaces of existing noise-sensitive land uses.</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent</p>             | <p>See Regional Plan Policy N-2.1 and TCAP Policy LU-7.2, above.</p>   |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Policy HS-8.6: Acoustical Analysis Preparation</b> The City shall require an acoustical analysis as part of the environmental review process when noise-sensitive land uses are proposed in areas exposed to existing or projected exterior noise levels exceeding the levels shown in Tables HS-1 and HS-2, so noise mitigation may be included in the project design. All acoustical analysis shall:</p> <p>A. Be the financial responsibility of the applicant;</p> <p>B. Be prepared by a qualified person experienced in the fields of environmental noise assessment and architectural acoustics;</p> <p>C. Include representative noise level measurements with sufficient sampling periods and locations to adequately describe local conditions and the predominant noise sources; and</p> <p>D. Estimate existing and projected cumulative (20 year) noise levels in terms of <math>L_{dn}</math> or CNEL and/or the standards shown in Table HS-1, and compare those levels to the policies in this section;</p> <p>E. Recommend appropriate mitigation to achieve compliance with the adopted policies and standards in this section, giving preference to proper site planning and design over mitigation measures which require the construction of noise barriers or structural modifications to buildings which contain noise-sensitive land uses;</p> <p>F. Estimate noise exposure after the prescribed mitigation measure(s) has been implemented; and</p> <p>G. Describe a post-project assessment program that could be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures.</p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy N-2.1 and TCAP Policy LU-7.2, above.</p> |

**Natural and Cultural Resources Element**

**Goal NCR-4: To preserve and maintain sites and structures that serve as significant, visible connections to South Lake Tahoe’s social, cultural, and architectural history.**

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Policy NCR-4.1. Significant Site Preservation.</b> The City shall preserve sites of historical, cultural and architectural significance within the city, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties.</p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy C-1.1, above.</p> |
|--|--|---|

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale   |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Policy NCR-4.2. Historic Landmark Designation.</b> <i>The City shall designate structures or sites having special character or special historic, architectural, or aesthetic interest or value as local historic landmarks. The City shall protect local historic landmarks from demolition and inappropriate alterations, and develop criteria for evaluating the appropriateness for sites or structures to be designated as local historic landmarks, and provide incentives for preservation of local historic landmarks.</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy C-1.1, above.</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy NCR-4.3. Archeological Investigations.</b> <i>The City shall require archeological 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 features). The City shall require the preservation of discovered archeologically-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.</i></p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>As described in Section 3.8, "Cultural Resources," archaeological survey reports were prepared for the California and Nevada portions of the study area (Caltrans 2015, NDOT 2015).</p> <p>See Regional Plan Policy C-1.1, above.</p>  |
| <p><b>Policy NCR-4.5. Human Remains Discovery.</b> <i>The City shall require/condition projects and other ground disturbance activities to notify the City if human remains are discovered and halt work. The County Coroner will be notified according to Section 5097.98 of the State 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 followed.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>Impact 3.8-1 assesses the potential for the project alternatives to result in impacts on human remains. Mitigation Measure 3.8-3 would protect human remains by avoiding, excavating, or otherwise treating the remains appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions, and as such, would not affect historical or culturally significant landmarks in the region.</p> |
| <p><b>Goal NCR-5: To incorporate air quality improvements and emission reductions directly with land use and transportation planning.</b></p>  |  |   |
| <p><b>Policy NCR-5.10. Air Quality-Related Construction Mitigation:</b> <i>The City shall require discretionary projects that have a significant air quality impact to provide construction mitigation to address short-term construction emissions below EDCAQMD thresholds as part of the review of the project application. This</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy AQ-1.2, above.</p>  |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination  | Rationale  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><i>excludes building permits for single-family residential units. This may include the following measures:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Measures currently recommended by EDCAQMD;</i></li> <li>• <i>Prohibition of open burning of debris from site clearing unless involved with a fuels reduction project;</i></li> <li>• <i>Utilization of low-emission construction equipment and/or fuels;</i></li> <li>• <i>Implementation of BMPs in concert with water quality protection measures; and/or</i></li> <li>• <i>Restriction of idling of construction equipment or vehicles.</i></li> </ul> |  |  |
| <b>Douglas County Master Plan</b>   |  |  |
| <b>Transportation Element</b>   |  |  |
| <b>Transportation (TP) Goals, Policies, and Actions</b>   |  |  |
| <b>TP Goal 2: Provide appropriate transportation facilities to ensure a high quality-of-life for Douglas County residents</b>   |  |  |
| <p><b><i>TP Policy 4.6.</i></b> <i>Provide appropriate traffic control devices on new and existing transportation facilities.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p>     | <p>Implementation of Alternatives B, C, D, and E would include all necessary and appropriate traffic control devices as required by Caltrans and NDOT.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions; thus, there would be no changes to traffic control devices.</p>  |
| <p><b><i>TP Policy 4.7.</i></b> <i>Post appropriate speed limits based on current speed limit studies</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p>     | <p>Implementation of Alternatives B, C, D, and E would post appropriate speed limits based on roadway design and appropriate speeds as assessed in the <i>Caltrans Project Report Traffic Operations Analysis Update</i> (see Appendix I).</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions; thus, there would be no changes to speed limits.</p> |
| <p><b><i>TP Policy 4.8.</i></b> <i>Protect public safety by removing snow and other hazards from roadways.</i></p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p>     | <p>See Regional Plan Policy WQ-3.6, above.</p>   |
| <p><b><i>TP Policy 4.13.</i></b> <i>Maintain a traffic LOS C or better on all Douglas County street and roadways.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Not Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy T-10.7, above.</p>   |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination   | Rationale  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Lake Tahoe Transportation (LTT) Goals, Policies, and Actions</b>  |   |  |
| <i><b>LTT Policy 1.</b> Participate and support the planning, design and implementation of transportation projects and transit improvements at Lake Tahoe consistent with the Tahoe Revitalization initiative of the County Economic Vitality Plan and other needs identified through the annual update of the County 5-Year Transportation Plan, County Transportation Plan, and plans of the TRPA, TMPO and TTD.</i> | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy FIN-4.1, above.   |
| <i><b>LTT Action 1.1.</b> Douglas County shall participate with the TTD, TMPO, NDOT, City of South Lake Tahoe, Caltrans, FHWA, Nevada State Parks, and private sector stakeholders in the planning, design and implementation of the U.S. 50 Stateline Corridor/South Shore Revitalization Program.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy FIN-4.1, above.   |
| <i><b>LTT Action 1.2.</b> Douglas County shall continue to participate in efforts to complete the Nevada Stateline-to-Stateline Bikeway Project and other identified bicycle and multi-use trail projects within Douglas County at Lake Tahoe consistent with the Tahoe Revitalization and Tremendous Trails initiatives of the County Economic Vitality Plan.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy FIN-4.1, above.   |
| <b>Economic Development (ED) Element</b>   |   |  |
| <b>ED Goal 3: To emphasize the importance of “place” and promote the development of attractive downtowns centers.</b>  |   |  |
| <i><b>ED Policy 3.1.</b> Promote the revitalization of Tahoe.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policies LU-1.2 and LU-3.3 and TCAP Policy LU-1.2, above.              |
| <i><b>ED Policy 3.4.</b> Support the efforts of the South Shore Vision Plan to create and rebrand the Highway 50 corridor from Kahle Drive to Ski Run.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policies LU-1.2 and LU-3.3 and TCAP Policies LU-1.2 and LU-1.7, above. |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination   | Rationale   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Historic Preservation (HP) Element</b>   |   |   |
| <b>HP Goal 1: To preserve Douglas County's historic, cultural, and archaeological resources as physical reminders of the county's past and as unique focal points to shape the county's identity.</b>   |   |   |
| <i>HP Policy 1.1. Douglas County shall support, whenever feasible, the preservation of the county's rich cultural heritage, including the establishment of additional historic districts to protect significant historic properties.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy C-1.1, above.                              |
| <b>Parks and Recreation (PR) Element</b>  |   |   |
| <b>PR Goal 1: To implement the Parks and Recreation Plan.</b>   |   |   |
| <i>PR Policy 1.1. To protect the natural, cultural, and scenic qualities of Douglas County, including open spaces, public lands, agricultural lands, wetlands, and waterways that are critical to the quality of life in our community. The Department will continue to plan for the needs and preserve the rights of current and future residents, and especially their access to public parks and recreation opportunities, while ensuring high standards of safety and public welfare.</i> | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policies LU-3.3 and T-2.7 and TCAP Policy LU-1.2. |
| <b>Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy Mobility 2035</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Transportation Goals and Related Policies</b>  |   |   |
| <b>GOAL 4: Mass Transit. Encourage efficient and effective expansion of public transit operations and use in the Lake Tahoe Region.</b>   |   |   |
| <i>Policy 4.1. Improve existing transit systems through increased frequency, preferential signal controls, expanded service areas, and extended service hours.</i>  | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy T-1.5, above.                              |
| <b>GOAL 5: Inter- and Intra-Regional Transportation. Strengthen transportation options into and out of the Lake Tahoe Region.</b>   |   |   |
| <i>Policy 5.1. Participate in state and local transportation planning efforts to ensure coordination and consistency amongst various planning agencies inside and outside the Region.</i>   | Alt A: NA<br>Alt B: Consistent<br>Alt C: Consistent<br>Alt D: Consistent<br>Alt E: Consistent | See Regional Plan Policy FIN-4.1, above.                            |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies  | Consistency Determination  | Rationale                                       |
|---|--|---|
| <p><i>Policy 5.3. Work with appropriate public entities, tribal governments, and private interest groups to ensure coordination and consistency.</i></p>            | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p>   | <p>See Regional Plan Policy FIN-4.1, above.</p> |
| <p><b>GOAL 8: Parking. Encourage development of parking management strategies for the Lake Tahoe Region.</b></p>  |  |   |
| <p><i>Policy 8.1. Encourage shared and other parking management strategies.</i></p>   | <p>For roadway improvements:<br/>                     Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: NA<br/>                     Alt C: NA<br/>                     Alt D: NA<br/>                     Alt E: NA</p> <p>For potential mixed-use development:<br/>                     Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: NA</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy T-6.1, above.</p>   |
| <p><i>Policy 8.2. Encourage parking management programs that provide incentives to fund improvements benefiting transit users, pedestrians, and bicyclists.</i></p> | <p>For roadway improvements:<br/>                     Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: NA<br/>                     Alt C: NA<br/>                     Alt D: NA<br/>                     Alt E: NA</p> <p>For potential mixed-use development:<br/>                     Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: NA</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy T-6.1, above.</p>   |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale                                     |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Policy 8.3.</b> Encourage parking management strategies that are tailored to the needs of each specific location and promote pedestrian and transit use.</p> | <p>For roadway improvements:<br/>                     Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: NA<br/>                     Alt C: NA<br/>                     Alt D: NA<br/>                     Alt E: NA<br/>                     For potential mixed-use development:<br/>                     Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: NA</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy T-6.1, above.</p> |

**GOAL 10: Regional Roadways.** Upgrade regional roadways as necessary to improve safety, and provide for a more efficient, integrated transportation system.

**Linking Tahoe: Active Transportation Plan**

**Goals:**

- Increase connectivity by completing the active transportation network.
- Improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Increase and support consistent project implementation through technical assistance and funding.
- Increase encouragement and awareness through implementation of the “5 E’s.”

**Network Design**

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Policy 1.1</b> Accommodate the needs of all travelers by designing and operating roads to provide for safe, comfortable, and efficient travel for roadway users of all ages and abilities, such as pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, motorists, commercial vehicles, and emergency vehicles.</p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy LU-3.3, above.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy 1.5.</b> Balance the needs of all roadway users when considering intersection improvements and impacts to level of service. Encourage implementing agencies to evaluate project design alternatives through methods other than and/or in addition to vehicular Level of Service (LOS) such as reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT), number of increased active transportation trips, Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) and Level of Traffic Stress (LTS).</p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p> | <p>See Regional Plan Policy LU-3.3, above.</p> |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Policy 1.7.</b> Construct, upgrade, and maintain active transportation facilities along major travel routes as part of all roadway improvements. In constrained locations, all design options should be considered such as restriping, signalization, and narrowing travel lanes.</p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p>     | <p>See Regional Plan Policy LU-3.3, above.</p>   |
| <b>Facility Maintenance</b>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Policy 2.1.</b> Every effort should be made to maintain the year-round use and condition of active transportation facilities, including making sure connections are not blocked during snow removal or are quickly made available through clearing. This also includes maintaining and upgrading infiltration devices, clearing snow, sweeping, and re-striping where needed during the season and before major cycling events. State agencies should provide timely highway maintenance in the spring of each year.</p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p>     | <p>See Regional Plan Policy WQ-3.6 and TCAP Policy T-2.7, above.</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy 2.2.</b> Prior to permit issuance, all projects containing active transportation facilities are required to submit a Maintenance Responsibilities Chart and Plan. These plans will clarify roles for annual and capital infrastructure operating and maintenance and identify funding needs and possible sources. This information will be included in approved permits. See Appendix F, for Maintenance Responsibilities Chart and Plan Template.</p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Consistent</p>     | <p>Projects identified in the Active Transportation Plan that would be implemented by Alternatives B, C, and D include a sidewalk along the lake side of US 50 between Lake Parkway and SR 207 and a bike lane on US 50 from the state line to SR 207. These alternatives would also extend the Linear Park Bike Trail to Stateline, Nevada with a combination of Class I/II trails. Alternatives B and D include an option for a cycle track that would connect to the Linear Park. Alternatives B, C, and D would improve connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists between the tourist core and Van Sickle Bi-State Park with a pedestrian overcrossing to be constructed over existing Lake Parkway. The raised pedestrian walkway proposed by Alternative E would be considered an active transportation facility and would be subject to the requirements of this policy. Whichever alternative is approved would demonstrate compliance with this policy as a condition before permit acknowledgement by TRPA.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not be subject to this policy.</p> |
| <b>Multi-Modal Connections</b>   |  |  |
| <p><b>Policy 3.1.</b> Create convenient intermodal connectivity which considers first and last mile facility needs and connects all modal options by providing necessary infrastructure, and schedule coordination.</p>  | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>Alt B: Consistent<br/>Alt C: Consistent<br/>Alt D: Consistent<br/>Alt E: Not Consistent</p> | <p>Alternatives B, C, and D would construct new bus shelters at existing bus stop locations where features are limited to signs and in some cases benches. These alternatives do not propose any additional transit enhancements, but the project would provide some additional pedestrian and bicycle features in the project site (see Active Transportation Policy 2.2, above) that could be utilized by transit users. For these reasons, Alternatives B, C, and D would be consistent with Policy 3.1.</p> <p>Alternative E would be limited to construction of a raised pedestrian walkway in the resort-casino portion of the tourist core. Transit stops located along US 50 in this area would remain. This alternative would not enhance intermodal connectivity. Therefore, Alternative E is not consistent with Policy 3.1.</p>  |

**Table 2 Other Plans Goals and Policies Consistency Analysis**

| Goals and Policies   | Consistency Determination  | Rationale  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not be subject to this policy.  |
| <b>Project Implementation</b>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Policy 4.3.</b> <i>If construction impacts an active transportation route, projects must adhere to the appropriate MUTCD which requires the implementing agency to provide alternate routes and safe accommodations for all modes.</i></p>   | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Consistent</p>     | <p>As discussed in Impact 3.6-6 in Section 3.6, "Traffic and Transportation," Alternatives B, C, and D would be required by Caltrans to implement a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) during construction. In order to address short-term, construction impacts on access to active transportation routes, these alternatives would also implement Mitigation Measure 3.3-1 (see Section 3.3, "Parks and Recreational Facilities) would be implemented by Alternatives B, C, D, and E and would ensure the TMP prepared for the project addresses access to all modes of transportation and includes specifications for the Linear Park and signage provided along roadways and sidewalks alerting pedestrians and bicyclists. The TMP would adhere to FHWA's Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). Alternatives B, C, D, and E would be consistent with Policy 4.3.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not affect access to existing active transportation facilities.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy 4.4.</b> <i>Incorporate segments of the proposed active transportation network into new and redeveloped commercial, tourist, multi-family, public service, and recreation projects consistent with this plan. Implementation of the facilities will be conducted through construction, easements, or in-lieu fees as appropriate to the scale of development per the TRPA Code of Ordinances, section 65.3.2.</i></p> | <p>Alt A: NA<br/>                     Alt B: Consistent<br/>                     Alt C: Consistent<br/>                     Alt D: Consistent<br/>                     Alt E: Not Consistent</p> | <p>See Active Transportation Plan Policy 2.2, which describes active transportation facilities identified in the Active Transportation Plan that would be implemented by Alternatives B, C, and D.</p> <p>Alternative E would not implement any proposed active transportation facilities identified in the Active Transportation Plan. Alternative E project components would be constructed in a location identified for new bike lanes; however, Alternative E would not construct new bike lanes. Alternative E would not be consistent with Policy 4.4.</p> <p>Alternative A would be a continuation of existing conditions and would not be subject to this policy.</p>  |

NA = Not applicable

Source: City of South Lake Tahoe 2013, 2011; Douglas County 2012; Douglas County and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency 2013; TMPO and TRPA 2012, 2016; TRPA 2002a, 2002b; and compiled by Ascent Environmental, Inc. in 2016