

# ERRATA TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This document reflects revisions made to the April 2019 *Squaw Valley | Alpine Meadows Base-to-Base Gondola Project Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report* (Final EIS/EIR) to correct typographical errors, expand discussion of statements requiring further explanation, and clarify statements based on public or agency comments.

## **Final EIS/EIR – Page 4.1-19**

Five Lakes Trail closure Instruction 1 – To clarify the project record, temporary trail closures of the Five Lakes Trail would be expected under Alternative 4 and would occur during the construction of the gondola. Construction of the gondola is estimated to last approximately 6 to 8 months in one summer season and temporary trail closures may occur while towers are installed via helicopter, drilling and/or blasting activities are performed, or other hazardous construction-related activities are completed that could pose a risk to trail users. Effects from trail closures would result in temporary reduced access to TNF lands, including the National Forest System – GCW, during trail closures. RPMs have been developed to reduce impacts from trail closures on users of the Five Lakes Trail, and these RPMs include advanced public notification of trail closures, public outreach, and signage. To provide additional clarity within the record, subsequent discussions were completed with Leitner Poma of America (the selected lift manufacturer/constructor) to better understand and disclose the frequency and duration of potential trail closures. Based on these discussions, it is anticipated that the Five Lakes Trail would only need to be closed for brief periods while construction is occurring within immediate proximity to the trail. These closures would be very infrequent and last only a few hours at a time.

## **Final EIS/EIR Volume 1, Appendix B, Page B-4, RPM MUL-4**

For Alternative 2, the Alpine Meadows mid-station may be open to skier entry/exit through April 15th only, to minimize the potential for adverse effects on Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog at Barstool Lake. For Alternatives 3 and 4, skier entry/exit at the Alpine Meadows mid-station will correspond directly with overall gondola operation and will not be limited to the April 15th date which was specified for Alternative 2. The only operation during the non-winter/ski season would be for short periods associated with maintenance and testing, including occasionally moving individual cabins, or small numbers of cabins, across the system. These operational conditions will be reflected in the Forest Service special use permit (SUP) and the Placer County Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The gondola will only operate during the winter season. For this project, the winter season has defined opening and closing criteria. Opening is defined as when both resorts are open for snow sports recreation or November 1st, whichever is later. Closing is defined as when one resort closes for snow sports recreation or May 31st, whichever is earlier.

## **Final EIS/EIR Volume 1, Appendix B, Pages B-10 through B-11, RPM NOI-6**

To clarify the project record, to correct this error Placer County has adopted an errata to RPM NOI-6 and the Forest Supervisor will include this errata with the final ROD. In this errata, the first sentence of RPM NOI-6 is changed back to the text originally included in the Draft EIS/EIR, with “weekends” converted back to “Sundays.” In addition, in response to the comment that initially precipitated the edit to RPM NOI-6, the following sentence is added clarifying parameters for Saturday construction activities: “Construction could occur on: Saturdays 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., except blasting shall be prohibited on

Saturdays. Helicopters may be used on Saturdays as needed to maintain the project’s single-season construction schedule.”

**Final EIS/EIR Volume 2, Pages 2-173 through 2-174, Comment 0144-51**

The record is clarified that under the Selected Alternative (Alternative 4) gondola activity during the summer would be limited to maintenance activities only. Operational activities (e.g., transportation of guests) would only occur in the winter season. The summer and winter season dates are further clarified elsewhere in the record. Summer operation (e.g., transportation of guests) of the gondola is not proposed or approved at this time. Any future summer gondola operational activities, were they to be proposed, (e.g., transportation of guests) would require subsequent NEPA analysis/authorization, CEQA analysis/authorization, and a modification to the Placer County Conditional Use Permit.

**Final EIS/EIR Volume 2, Pages 2-130 through 2-132, Comment 0144-5**

While the Final EIS/EIR carries forward three alternatives that involve the construction of a gondola of various alignments, many other alternatives were considered in Section 2.3, Alternatives and Design Components Considered but Not Evaluated Further of the Final EIS/EIR. These alternatives included not only additional route alignments (refer to Section 2.3.2.2) but also improving the existing shuttle system (refer to Section 2.3.2.1) and different technologies such as a train or pulse gondola (refer to Section 2.3.2.4). When considering both the alternatives carried forward and those not evaluated further, a wide variety of alternatives was considered that meets the intent of “reasonable range of alternatives.”

To clarify the project record, when considering the alternatives eliminated from detailed study, and including the additional details which have been included in the record, I am comfortable that a reasonable range of alternative was considered in the development of the Final EIS/EIR.

**Final EIS/EIR Volume 2, Pages 2-173 through 2-174, Comment 0144-51**

To clarify the project record, maintenance activities are not the same as summer operations activities. Under maintenance activities, the gondola would run fewer than ten times and would run fewer cars for a shorter duration during the day than operations activities. There would be no transfer of guests using the gondola and no guests disembarking at the mid-stations. Further consideration of summertime gondola maintenance activities does not alter the analysis or conclusions in the EIS/EIR related to potential impacts to SNYLF, which are further clarified in the Seasonal Operations and Maintenance Impacts clarification provided above.

**Final EIS/EIR Volume 2, Page 2-310, Comment 0176-8**

During the summer, the gondola would be in operation exclusively for maintenance purposes, and passengers would not be allowed. Guest passengers would not be allowed on the gondola during summer maintenance activities. Under maintenance activities, the gondola would run fewer than ten times and would run fewer cars for a shorter duration during the day than operations activities. There would be no transfer of guests using the gondola and no guests disembarking at the mid-station. Please refer to pages 2-13 and 2-14 of the Final EIS/EIR for further information.

**Final EIS/EIR Volume 2, Page 2-599, Comment 0202-1**

Wind closures of the gondola would be implemented as necessary to ensure safe operation of the gondola. To clarify the project record, an analysis of impacts from wind was performed to a level to determine feasibility, not design specificity or project engineering. This information is located throughout the

Administrative Record. The Final EIS/EIR is not intended to identify specific wind-based operating procedures, which will be developed during the engineering, post construction, and pre-operations stages of the project. To further clarify the project record, the American National Standard Institute (ANSI) provides safety standards for passenger ropeways, including gondolas, under ANSI B77. These standards do include specifications/tolerances for carrier (gondola cabin) deflection from vertical (wind swing). As is required by law, the design, construction and operation of the gondola system will strictly adhere to ANSI B77.

### **Final EIS/EIR Volume 2, Page 2-599, Comment 0202-3**

The comment provides an opinion regarding the merits or qualities of the project and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Final EIS/EIR. The Forest Supervisor for the TNF and the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors have taken the commenter's opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the project into consideration in making the decision regarding the project. To clarify the project record, the American National Standard Institute (ANSI) provides safety standards for passenger ropeways, including gondolas, under ANSI B77. These standards require minimum vertical and horizontal clearances of obstacles including structures such as lodges, other lifts, and even snow, among other design considerations. ANSI standards do not prohibit the siting of a gondola over existing roads, parking areas, or ski area operated buildings/lodges; in fact, most existing ski areas in the U.S. contain gondola or chairlift alignments that cross these common ski area elements. Engineered design of the gondola is not necessary to sufficiently evaluate public safety as future adherence to ANSI standards is a requirement of State of California and Forest Service permitting and operational conditions. Conceptual design and professional expertise are sufficient for the Final EIS/EIR, and public safety would continue to be evaluated at the appropriate design review stages where engineering/design modifications may be required to comply with the findings of this decision. The alignments evaluated under all action alternatives within the analysis were planned and studied extensively by professional ski area planners and lift system engineers who possess substantial expertise and practical experience with similar installations world-wide.

### **Final EIS/EIR Appendix B, RPM NOI-1**

RPM NOI-1 is amended as follows with underlined text being added and ~~stricken text~~ being omitted:

Squaw Valley Ski Holdings will designate a Disturbance Coordinator, who will be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The Disturbance Coordinator, in consultation with Placer County and Forest Service staff, will determine the nature of the noise complaint and whether a residence or other noise-sensitive receptor is exposed to a noise level that is disruptive of normal activities for the sensitive land use where the complaint occurred and/or whether the construction activities in proximity to the sensitive receptor would occur for an extended period of time. ~~exceeds one or more of the noise level standards established in the Placer County Noise Ordinance (Article 9.36.060 Sound limits) and presented in Table 4.9-9 of the Draft EIS/EIR.~~ If the Disturbance Coordinator, in consultation with Placer County and Forest Service staff, determines that construction noise is creating an unreasonable disturbance, ~~a noise ordinance standard has been exceeded~~ at a sensitive receptor then the Disturbance Coordinator will work with the construction contractor, and in consultation with Placer County and Forest Service staff, to identify and implement site-specific measures to reduce the level of noise exposure ~~to less than the applicable County standard~~, to the extent feasible. The Disturbance Coordinator will conclude its investigation of each local complaint within two full business days of receiving the complaint. If the investigation determines that feasible, effective noise exposure reduction

measures are warranted given the level of disturbance and duration of construction activities in proximity to the sensitive receptor, shall be implemented, then the offending construction activity will not continue until the identified site-specific reduction measures are implemented. Site-specific measures to lessen noise exposure may include the following:

- Stage construction equipment as far from the affected receptors as possible.
- Use quieter equipment for construction activity near affected receptors (e.g., a front-end loader instead of an excavator).
- Limit the number of equipment that are used at the same time in proximity to the affected sensitive receptor.
- Where available and feasible, only use equipment with back-up alarms that is equipped with either audible self-adjusting backup alarms or alarms that only sound when an object is detected. Self-adjusting backup alarms shall automatically adjust to be no more than 10 dBA louder than the surrounding background levels. Set all non-self-adjusting backup alarms to the lowest setting required to be audible above the surrounding noise levels.
- Install temporary noise-reducing enclosures around stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., concrete mixers, generators, compressors).
- Install temporary noise curtains as close as possible to the noise-generating activity such that the curtains obstruct the direct line of sight between the noise-generating construction activity and the nearby sensitive receptors. Temporary noise curtains shall consist of durable, flexible composite material featuring a noise barrier layer bounded to sound-absorptive material on one side. The noise barrier layer shall consist of rugged, impervious, material with a surface weight of at least one pound per square foot.
- Specify routes of trucks hauling materials and equipment to construction sites and hauling debris away from staging areas to avoid exposing sensitive receptors to haul truck noise.
- Change helicopter flight paths to avoid exposing sensitive receptors to helicopter noise.