



1.0 Executive Summary

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Town of Mammoth Lakes (Town) undertook analysis of the proposed Inn at the Village (the project or proposed project) and evaluated it against the standards set forth in Public Resources Code, Section 21166 and State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15162. That analysis is set forth in the Modified Initial Study attached hereto as Appendix 11.1, *Modified Initial Study and Notice of Preparation*. The Town is the Lead Agency under CEQA and has determined that a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) is required for the proposed project (State Clearinghouse No. 2014032081)¹. This SEIR has been prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.); CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.); and the rules, regulations, and procedures for the implementation of CEQA, as adopted by the Town. The principal CEQA Guidelines sections governing content of this document include Article 9 (*Contents of Environmental Impact Reports*) (Sections 15120 through 15132), and Section 15162 (*Subsequent EIRs and Negative Declarations*).

1.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The North Village Specific Plan (NVSP) was adopted in 1991 and has been amended several times. The NVSP establishes development regulations for approximately 64 acres located around Minaret Road, Main Street/Lake Mary Road, and Canyon Boulevard. The intent of the NVSP is to develop a cohesive, pedestrian-oriented resort activity node, and to provide a year-round focus for visitor activity within the town. The *Final Environmental Impact Report North Village Specific Plan* (1991 PEIR), dated February 1991, was certified along with the adoption of the NVSP in 1991. In 1994, the *North Village Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report Addendum* (1994 PEIR Addendum), dated May 1994, was prepared for an amendment to the NVSP, and in 2000, the *Subsequent Program Environmental Impact Report for the North Village 1999 Specific Plan Amendment* (1999 SPEIR), dated October 13, 2000, was certified for an update to the NVSP. The most recent amendment to the NVSP was in 2009 for the Mammoth Crossing Project (Mammoth Crossing), which established tailored development standards (e.g., density, height, setbacks, lot coverage) for certain NVSP properties. As part of that effort, the Town also prepared the North Village District Planning Study, which was accepted by the Town Council in July 2009.

Several projects have been approved under the NVSP, resulting in the development or redevelopment of various properties in the area. One of these projects is the 8050 project (encompassing the project site), which consists of a three-phased development. The certified 1999 SPEIR was found to adequately cover and address the 8050 project. The first two phases of the 8050 project, Buildings A and B, have been completed, as well as the parking structure that would serve all three phases, Buildings A, B, and C. On April 27, 2005, the Planning Commission of the Town of Mammoth Lakes approved Tentative Tract Map 36-229 and Use Permit 2005-01, which approved Building C, the third and final building in the 8050 complex. The requisite building permit

¹ The Town determined that a supplemental EIR was not appropriate for the proposed project, since the necessary additions and changes to the SPEIR are not considered to be minor and are of a project-specific nature rather than programmatic, as with the 1999 SPEIR (discussed below).

was subsequently issued by the Town to allow for construction of the approved Building C, which totaled 41,134 square feet and included 21 residential condominiums with a total of 33 bedrooms. The proposed Inn at the Village project is a redesign of Building C.

1.3 PROJECT SUMMARY

The project proposes a seven-story hotel that includes hotel rooms, food and beverage, spa, outdoor pool/jacuzzis, and landscaping elements. The hotel, totaling 64,750 gross square feet of buildable floor area, would consist of a maximum lodging room count of up to 67 rooms. The project would be built on top of the existing parking podium.

The project proposes to amend the approved 8050 project to address the current performance deficiencies in the existing 8050 project and the NVSP area. The project would necessitate three amendments to the NVSP: (1) an increase in the allowable development density for the project site, including allowing a transfer of 30 rooms from the Mammoth Crossing site (MC zone); (2) an increase in the allowable building height; and (3) a reduction in the required front yard setbacks along Minaret Road. The current Application would supersede the approved 8050 project and seek entitlement/permitting for a proposed hotel (with the requisite market requirement to retain flexibility with respect to ownership structures [e.g., traditional hotel, condominium-hotel, etc.]).

The following list summarizes the components of the project:

Density

The maximum allowable building density within the NVSP RG zone is 55 rooms per acre. The 8050 property is 79,798 square feet or approximately 1.83 acres, yielding an allowable density of 101 rooms at 55 rooms per acre². The existing Buildings A and B of the 8050 project include 28 units with an overall total of 57 bedrooms, and the existing commercial in Building B equates to seven rooms. Therefore, a maximum of 37 rooms would be allowed for Building C without a density amendment to the NVSP.

- Given the project's maximum room count of up to 67 rooms, the project proposes a zoning amendment for the shortfall of 30 bedrooms and not including commercial space towards the maximum allowable building density. However, this deficiency is proposed to be mitigated by way of density transfer of a like-kind number of bedrooms from the nearby Mammoth Crossing property that is also owned by the project Applicant. This density transfer requires an amendment to the NVSP because density transfers are not currently permitted between zones (i.e., from the MC zone to the RG zone). The 8050 project would have a maximum density of 72 rooms per acre pursuant to a density transfer of 30 rooms from the Mammoth Crossing property. As such, there would be no net increase in development density in the overall NVSP area associated with the project. The proposed NVSP amendments would ensure that the density transfer would occur prior to development of the proposed project.

² A 79,798 square foot lot equates to 1.832 acres; 1.832 acres multiplied by 55 rooms per acre equals 100.75 rooms, which is rounded up to 101 total rooms allowed.

Building Heights

The maximum permitted height within the NVSP RG zone is 40 feet and the maximum projected height³ is 50 feet with an additional three feet for roof appurtenances. The NVSP also allows up to an additional 12 feet of building height for affordable housing. When a building sits above a parking garage, building height is measured from the garage roof elevation, provided the garage is no more than 20 feet above natural grade. The currently approved design for Building C allows for a total of five stories with a maximum height of 62 feet plus another three feet for roof appurtenances.

- The project proposes a maximum height of seven stories (80 feet), when measured from the top of the existing parking structure podium, with an additional 4 feet, 6 inches, for roof appurtenances. The project proposes a zoning amendment to increase the maximum permitted height allowed for the project site.

Building Setbacks

The proposed project conforms to the minimum of 10-foot side and rear yard setbacks. However, the project would require a zoning amendment for the front yard setback area along Minaret Road for a reduced setback.

The reduced setback along Minaret Road intends to:

- Provide a stepped building façade that includes attractive detailing and articulated design;
- Improve the quality of the streetscape and improve pedestrian safety by providing a pedestrian entrance and roof overhangs; and
- Improve pedestrian circulation and connectivity with the street through a signature building entry at street level (i.e., a welcoming pedestrian porte cochere).

An additional setback is described in a private agreement between Fireside at the Village condominiums to the south and the 8050 property owner (Settlement Agreement, Mutual Release, and Joint Escrow Instructions). Since this is a private agreement, and the Town of Mammoth Lakes is not a party, the Town is not responsible for enforcing the terms and conditions of this agreement.

Site Access

Vehicle access to the project site would occur at the existing site entry at Canyon Boulevard. The proposed project does not seek to alter the existing approved access on the property. In addition, enhanced pedestrian access along Minaret Road and access between the existing 8050 project and Building C are proposed to allow access to and from hotel amenities. The project

³ The NVSP allows a “projected height” above the permitted height, provided that a roughly equivalent reduction in building footprint area above the height is provided below the permitted height, and no more than 50 percent of the building square footage exceeds the permitted height.

features a signature street level pedestrian porte cochere that would serve as gateway access into the project from Minaret Road, allowing for pedestrian integration and improved circulation.

The northeastern portion of the project site would also accommodate a visitor serving public kiosk or retail space at the street level that would open up to a proposed public pocket park.

Site Coverage

The site coverage of the existing on-site buildings and parking structure is approximately 62 percent of the total lot area. The proposed project would be constructed on top of the parking podium with similar site coverage. However, the project would also provide enhanced street frontage improvements along Minaret Road (such as the pedestrian entry feature and public kiosk), which would increase the maximum lot coverage to 70 percent (as allowed within the NVSP RG zone).

Building Floor Area

The overall floor area is approximately 139,446 square feet on the 1.83-acre site (which includes the 8050 Buildings A, B, and C, as proposed by the project), resulting in approximately 76,200 square feet per acre. A maximum allowable building floor area within the NVSP RG zone of 87,000 square feet per acre is allowed.

Drainage

A storm drain inlet would be required to be relocated to the entry way on Minaret Road. Drainage is routed through the subterranean parking structure to an existing Conspan retention structure near the parking structure entrance on Canyon Boulevard. The drainage would not be altered as a result of the proposed project.

Parking

The total parking required in the NVSP for the 8050 site, including the proposed project, is 112 spaces. This includes residential parking for the existing Buildings A and B, including parking for the existing Building B commercial,⁴ and the proposed project. A private parking agreement reserves 50 spaces in the 8050 parking structure for Fireside at the Village condominiums.

Proposed parking for the project would be accommodated via the existing parking structure and the valet parking areas. The valet parking areas and driveway entry would provide storage for vehicles entering the site through vehicle stack parking. The valet parking area can accommodate approximately seven vehicles, and an additional two vehicles can be stored between the Canyon Boulevard curb and the valet drop-off area entry. Three valet parking attendants would be provided.⁵

⁴ This includes 12 commercial parking spaces for Building B per the original approval.

⁵ LSA Associates Inc., *Inn at the Village Valet Operation Analysis*, October 23, 2013.

Parking for delivery vehicles, including large trucks, would occur off of Canyon Boulevard in the driveway area or in the porte cochere.

The property owner, iStar, has an agreement with Mammoth Mountain Ski Area (MMSA) to provide up to 50 parking spaces on property owned by iStar. To date, iStar has been providing these spaces in the existing 8050 parking structure. Once the proposed project is developed, it is assumed that no spaces would be available in the 8050 parking structure for MMSA parking during peak occupancy periods. Consistent with the flexible terms of the above-referenced agreement, iStar anticipates providing the MMSA spaces at one or more other properties owned by iStar, such as the Mammoth Crossing properties along Lake Mary Road and Minaret Road.

Affordable Housing Mitigation Plan

On November 5, 2003, the Town Council adopted Resolution No. 2003-63, by which the Town Council identified the “value of cost gap per Employee Housing Unit (EHU)” in the amount of \$52,802. This resulted in the establishment of an Affordable Housing Mitigation In-Lieu Fee of \$30,889 per Full Time Employee Equivalent (FTEE), which equates to the \$52,802 per EHU. On August 12, 2004, Mammoth 8050, LLC, the original developer of the 8050 project, and the Town entered into an In-Lieu Fee Agreement for the EHUs (AH In-Lieu Fee Agreement) to mitigate the impact the proposed 8050 project would have on the availability of workforce housing within the community, and to provide additional housing credits to the original developer. The AH In-Lieu Fee Agreement confirmed that at the time, the Town’s value of each EHU was \$52,802. Nonetheless, the AH In-Lieu Agreement provides that in exchange for credit for 30 EHUs, the original developer would pay the Town \$3,000,000 (\$100,000 per EHU credit), in three separate payments of \$1,000,000, in connection with each phase of the proposed project (e.g., Buildings A, B, and C). Pursuant to the AH In-Lieu Fee Agreement, the original developer paid the Town in-lieu fees totaling \$2,000,000. The original developer, however, did not construct Building C at 8050 and did not pay the Town the final payment of \$1,000,000 when it became due.

At the rate of \$100,000 per EHU, the \$2,000,000 that the original developer paid the Town in mitigation fees yielded credits for 20 EHUs. In addition, the original developer received credit for two EHUs for demolishing two commercial buildings on the project site, for a total of 22 EHUs. The construction of Buildings A and B by the original developer generated a demand for 17.5 EHUs. Therefore, the 8050 project maintains a credit of 4.5 EHUs.

The AH In-Lieu Fee Agreement provides as follows: “In the event the formula for calculating housing requirements shall be changed prior to the Remaining Credits being utilized to offset housing mitigation requirements, the value of such Remaining Credits shall be applied in conformance with the formulas in effect at the time of use of the Remaining Credits.” Since the effective date of the AH In-Lieu Fee Agreement, the Town has changed its affordable housing policy. The Town’s interim housing policy (Town Council Resolution 09-76) now requires that 10 percent of the total project units be provided for on-site affordable housing; however, an Affordable Housing Mitigation Plan (AHMP) may be approved instead of providing on-site housing if a substantial additional affordable housing benefit is achieved.

The Applicant proposes to construct up to 67 bedrooms in Building C. Pursuant to the Town's interim housing policy, those 67 bedrooms would require the Applicant to provide 6.7 bedrooms (6.7 EHUs) on the project site. Since each of the project's 4.5 existing EHU credits was generated at the rate of \$100,000 per EHU (which is 189% of the then-value of \$52,802 per EHU), the Town has already achieved a substantial additional affordable housing benefit for each of the project's 4.5 EHU credits. Therefore, the Applicant will apply for an AHMP which confirms that no additional housing mitigation is required beyond the Application of the project's existing credit of 4.5 EHUs. The Town and Mammoth Lakes Housing, Inc. would evaluate the Applicant's AHMP request.

Landscaping

Landscaping for the project would include a combination of planting areas. Along the northeast and southeast sides of the building, native plant communities, shrubs, and related groundcover would be utilized. A Zen garden is proposed on the western side of the building. This area would include concrete pavers, accent stone, and cobble paving. Native trees (such as Red Fir, Lodgepole Pine, Mountain Hemlock, Mountain Maple, Mountain Alder, Western Chokecherry, Western Water Birch, and Quaking Aspen) would be installed along the perimeter of the proposed structure.

Although, some vegetation (including sapling trees along Minaret Road) would be removed as a result of the proposed street frontage improvements, several existing trees would be preserved, and new trees would be installed, as discussed above. A Tree Protection/ Preservation Plan would be implemented to preserve and protect existing trees, shrubs, and other plant materials including plants on adjoining properties during grubbing and grading, site preparation, and construction activities. Existing Pine trees to be protected-in-place range from 10 to 24 inches in diameter at breast height (DBH); no trees six inches DBH or greater would be removed as part of the proposed project (as encouraged by the Town's Municipal Code).

The proposed pocket park would be approximately 532 square feet. Decorative pervious and impervious paving and a Zen-style rock garden with public benches and boulders for street-side seating would be installed. The area would be sited under a two-story heavy timber pergola, providing weather protection.

Fire Lane

The project proposes a new fire lane along Minaret Road, to the south of the existing parking structure entrance. The new fire lane would be 60 feet in length by 16 feet in width. The existing retaining wall and sidewalk would be relocated and realigned farther to the west. The relocated retaining wall would appear similar in height as the existing retaining wall. The relocated sidewalk (with new pedestrian safety railing) would be realigned along the relocated wall and then would connect into the future sidewalk planned to the south of the project site, along Minaret Road. Due to the encroachment of the fire lane into California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) right-of-way, Caltrans would need to approve this encroachment.

Energy Saving Measures

The project would incorporate the following energy saving measures:

- South facing units feature deep balconies in front of window walls that act as a sun shade in combination with high, operable windows to provide the desired amount of solar gain and stack effect air circulation.
- A super insulated roof system would minimize thermal transfer through the roof with a combination of built-up rigid insulation above the structural deck and an additional layer of batt insulation applied below the deck.
- Dual method wall insulation would provide a high insular value, and a substantial thermal break in the exterior wall, reducing air infiltration and condensation within the wall cavity to create an extremely robust and long-lived thermal envelope.
- Extensive use of light emitting diode (LED) lighting would be used in a variety of lighting fixtures.
- Weather-lock vestibule at the proposed pedestrian street entry would be positively pressurized to keep warmed or cooled air inside the building and untreated, unfiltered air out.
- The plaza level circulation and amenity spaces would include operable fenestration and, in some areas, fully opening wall panels to embrace the summer season's mild climate.

Grading

A minor amount of grading would be required along the perimeter of the project site, specifically along Minaret Road to allow for pedestrian improvements (the public kiosk and pocket park) and a new fire lane (to the south of the existing parking structure driveway).

Snow Management

Snow storage would be provided for the proposed heated paver sidewalk and heated paved pool deck. The existing Benefit Assessment District (BAD) for the NVSP area would maintain the heated paver sidewalk, and the BAD would haul snow off site, as necessary. Snow storage for the existing driveway located off of Canyon Boulevard would remain unchanged.

Ice build-up on roof eaves would be prevented with heated roof gutters that would convey runoff from the roof and eaves to existing stormwater retention systems. Adequate roof access would also be provided to remove cornices as needed.

Construction Phasing and Staging

The project would commence with above-grade improvements and be completed in a single phase. The construction of the proposed project is anticipated to take 12 months. During construction, the construction offices would be accommodated nearby on the Mammoth

Crossing property located on the northeast corner of Canyon Road and Lake Mary Road while construction phase parking, mobilization, and storage of materials would be located on the southeast corner of Minaret Road and Main Street. During construction staging, the buildings located on these two sites would remain accessible to emergency services.

1.4 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(b), the project description must include “[a] statement of objectives sought by the proposed project.... The statement of objectives should include the underlying purpose of the project.”

TOWN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Town is comprised of 12 districts and four mountain portals, as described in the Neighborhood and District Character Element of the 2007 General Plan. Master planning of these specific districts provides a basis for future land use decisions incorporating the goals, policies, and actions in the Land Use and Community Design Elements as well as the Neighborhood and District Character Element. The characteristics of each district provide a sense of place regarding structure, function, and a district center. The project site is located in the North Village District and the identified characteristics for this district are as follows:

- Viewsheds to Sherwin Range and the Knolls are preserved;
- Landscape that recalls the Eastern Sierra and establishes scale and street edge;
- Create a sense of exploration using pedestrian-oriented sidewalks, plazas, and courtyards with pedestrian comforts;
- Easy pedestrian access across main streets;
- Gateway intersection at Minaret Road and Main Street/Lake Mary Road;
- Visitor-oriented entertainment retail district;
- Active day and evening through all four seasons, designed to achieve a two to three hour visit;
- Resort and resident activities, amenities, and services;
- Animation with retail and significant businesses oriented to the street;
- Retail and services in “storefront” setting located at the sidewalk;
- A variety of resort lodging supported by meeting facilities, outdoor activities, and restaurants, arts, culture, and entertainment;
- Create year-round non-vehicular links to mountain portals;

- Lake Mary Road connected to the North Village District by trails;
- Shared and pooled parking, convenient structured parking, and small-scale street adjacent surface parking; and
- Encourage living and working in close proximity to transit-oriented development.

NVSP GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The NVSP aims to create a set of land use designations and development standards which facilitate the development (or renovation) of the NVSP area as a concentrated, pedestrian-oriented activity center with limited vehicular access. The NVSP is intended to achieve year-round uses and visitor activity, strengthen the existing winter visitor market, and improve Mammoth's attractiveness to spring, summer, and fall resort visitors. The key objective of the NVSP, and consequently the Land Use Element, is to enhance the Town's image as a destination resort community, through the creation of a high profile, pedestrian-oriented, resort activity center where lodging, restaurants, shopping, housing, and recreational opportunities are located within proximity to one another and easily accessible by transit.

There are six land use districts established within the NVSP. As previously noted, the project site is located in the NVSP RG. RG has been assigned to parcels adjacent to and easily accessible to the plaza, but still within the Pedestrian Core Overlay area. The Pedestrian Core area is intended to be a mixed-use village with commercial uses on the ground level and accommodation units on upper floors. The scale of the individual ground level shops vary. RG uses are intended to provide visitor-oriented resort services, but retail uses are limited to multi-tenant complexes or within full-service hotels. Restaurants are generally the only freestanding uses permitted in the NVSP RG district.

The RG objectives identified in NVSP are as follows:

- To provide resort accommodations and supporting commercial facilities for visitor-oriented activities and facilities;
- To provide a transition zone between the Plaza Resort and Specialty Lodging uses within North Village and surrounding residential uses; and
- To provide integrated pedestrian access to and from the plazas.

PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The intent of the proposed project is to create a better relationship and integration with Minaret Road, with a signature street level pedestrian porte cochere and other features that would animate the streetscape and serve as an inviting portal into the proposed hotel. In a commitment to help the NVSP area realize its place-making potential, the key goals and objectives of the project are to:

- Greatly improve the project's relationship with the streetscape by introducing the porosity that allows for ease of pedestrian integration with Minaret Road;

- Populate and animate this section of Minaret Road and allow for ease of access to and from the proposed hotel amenities via the inviting pedestrian porte cochere;
- Provide streetscape features, including an informational kiosk and a pocket park;
- Deliver much needed critical mass in terms of hot beds to substantively help the NVSP area achieve economic sustainability;
- Provide an array of services and amenities that make the NVSP area a much more compelling destination for tourists and locals alike;
- Eliminate the need for any additional curb cuts along Minaret Road, which would be disruptive to pedestrian flows, by utilizing the existing vehicular access to Building C off of Canyon Boulevard;
- Improve the animation and vibrancy of the streetscape along Minaret Road with the addition of terraces for casual gathering or dining;
- Provide an array of amenities and related back-of-the-house functions that would allow for the inn to operate efficiently and attract an experienced and quality hotel operator to reinforce 8050's quality as a compelling year-round destination for visitors and locals alike;
- Deliver a LEED certifiable project consistent with the shared environmental values of the Town and the Applicant;
- Utilize a contextually sensitive architectural vernacular that departs from the repetitive and mostly uninspiring design solutions associated with earlier generation lodging properties within the community;
- Deliver a project that takes into account snow country design issues and constraints; and
- Produce a compelling, iconic, and economically sustainable lodging project that acts as a catalyst for the revitalization and added vibrancy of the NVSP area.

1.5 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

1.5.1 CEQA DOCUMENT TIERING

The project site (the subject site of this SEIR) is located within the North Village Specific Plan (NVSP) area. The NVSP is a set of land use designations and development standards which facilitates the development (or renovation) of the “North Village” area as a concentrated, pedestrian-oriented commercial and visitor accommodation center. Upon adoption of the NVSP, the Town analyzed the potential environmental impacts that would result from the required General Plan Amendments and Zoning Code Amendments necessary for implementation of the NVSP, encompassed in the *Final Environmental Impact Report North Village Specific Plan* (1991 PEIR), dated February 1991. These land use changes were approved by the Town and the 1991 PEIR was certified. Since that time, the NVSP has undergone multiple amendments and associated

environmental compliance documentation, including the following (refer to [Section 1.5, *Incorporation by Reference*](#), for a detailed discussion of each of the past environmental analyses conducted for projects in the NVSP area):

- *Final Environmental Impact Report North Village Specific Plan*, dated February 1991;
- 1994 NVSP Amendment;
- *North Village Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report Addendum* (May 1994);
- 1999 NVSP Amendment;
- *Subsequent Program Environmental Impact Report for the North Village 1999 Specific Plan Amendment* (October 13, 2000);
- 2005 NVSP Amendment;
- 2008 NVSP Amendment;
- 2009 NVSP Amendment; and
- *Final Environmental Impact Report Mammoth Crossing Project* (April 17, 2009).

According to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15168(c), subsequent activities in the program must be examined in the light of the Program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared. If the lead agency finds that pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, no new effects could occur or no new mitigation measures would be required, then the lead agency can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the Program EIR. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c][2].) Otherwise, further environmental review would be required if circumstances under Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 are triggered. The CEQA Guidelines go on to state that where subsequent activities involve site specific operations, the lead agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the Program EIR (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15168[c][4].)

Per Section 15168(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, the Program EIR can be used to simplify the task of preparing environmental documents on later parts of the program. The Program EIR provides the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects; and be incorporated by reference to deal with regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

THE TIERING PROCESS

To avoid repetition, wasted time, and unnecessary speculation, a lead agency may “tier” EIRs for a sequence of actions so that the later EIRs incorporate and build on the information in the previous EIRs. (PRC Sections 21068.5, 21093; CEQA Guidelines Section 15152.) In particular, tiering may be used when the sequence of environmental review begins with an EIR prepared for a program, plan, policy, or ordinance, such as the 1991 PEIR, 1994 PEIR Addendum, and the 1999 SPEIR. (PRC Section 21094[a]; and CEQA Guidelines Section 15152[d].) The first-tier EIR may be followed by an EIR for another plan or policy of lesser scope, or a site-specific EIR for a specific project. (PRC Section 21094[a]; CEQA Guidelines Sections 15152[b], 15385[a].)

Once a first-tier EIR, such as the 1991 PEIR and 1994 PEIR Addendum, has been certified for a program, plan, policy, or ordinance, the significant environmental effects of a later plan or policy of lesser scope or a later development project must be examined using a tiered EIR. (PRC Section

21094[a].) The second-tier EIR, here the 1999 SPEIR for the 1999 NVSP Amendment, is limited to significant environmental effects that were (1) not examined in the 1991 PEIR and 1994 PEIR Addendum, or (2) previously examined and that are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance through project revisions, mitigation measures, or other means. (PRC Section 21068.5, CEQA Guidelines Section 15152[d].) Similar to the second-tier EIR, a third tier would follow a similar methodology.

An SEIR need not examine significant environmental effects that the Town determined were either (1) mitigated or avoided as a result of findings adopted under PRC Section 21081(a)(1) for the 1991 PEIR, 1994 PEIR Addendum, and 1999 SPEIR, or (2) examined in a sufficient level of detail in the previous environmental documentation to allow it to be mitigated or avoided through revisions to the project, imposition of conditions, or other means when the later project is approved. (PRC Section 21094[a][1].) Further, the Town must determine whether the project may cause significant environmental effects that were not adequately addressed in the previous environmental documentation. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15152[f].) The Town may conclude that a significant environmental effect has been adequately addressed in the 1999 SPEIR and earlier documentation if it determines, based on an initial study or other analysis, that either of these statutory standards is met. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15152[f][3].)

Accordingly, the third-tier EIR, the subject SEIR, should not reexamine significant project-related environmental effects that would be mitigated or avoided through measures resulting from the 1999 SPEIR and previous environmental documentation, or impacts that were examined in sufficient detail that they can be mitigated or avoided when the later project is approved. (PRC Section 21094[a][1]; and CEQA Guidelines Section 15152[f][3].) The discussion and analysis in the SEIR is therefore limited to significant environmental effects that were not examined in the previous environmental documentation, and significant effects that were not examined in sufficient detail to allow mitigation measures to be devised, but that can be mitigated or avoided after further study. (PRC Section 21068.5; CEQA Guidelines Section 15152[d].) As such, where the 1999 SPEIR and earlier environmental documentation examined impacts at a general programmatic level and did not evaluate project-level impacts, the SEIR provides an independent analysis of the proposed project's significant environmental impacts. (*See e.g., In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings* [2008] 43 Cal. 4th 1143, 1173.)

TIERING FROM THE PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

Where appropriate, this SEIR tiers off the 1999 SPEIR and earlier environmental documentation. As discussed above, under CEQA Guidelines Section 15152, tiering is appropriate when the sequence of analysis follows from an EIR prepared for a general plan, policy, or program to an EIR of lesser scope, or to a site-specific EIR. Under CEQA, the 1991 PEIR and 1994 PEIR Addendum are considered first-tier documents, the 1999 SPEIR is considered a second-tier document, and this SEIR for the proposed project is considered a third-tier document. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15152(d)(1) and (2), the standard of review for an SEIR is defined as follows:

- (d) *Where an EIR has been prepared and certified for a program, plan, policy, or ordinance consistent with the requirements of this section, any lead agency for a later project pursuant to or consistent with the*

program, plan, policy, or ordinance should limit the EIR or negative declaration on the later project to effects which:

- (1) Were not examined as significant effects on the environment in the prior EIR; or*
- (2) Are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by the choice of specific revisions in the project, by the imposition of conditions, or other means.*

Accordingly, this SEIR will focus its analysis on changes to the project or the surrounding circumstances that may have occurred since the Town of Mammoth Lakes certified the 1999 SPEIR. Under principals of tiering, if first- and second-tier documents found significant impacts, then the third-tier EIR must require implementation of the prior mitigation measures unless the analysis explains that the measures are not applicable or that other mitigation measures can replace the previous measures and similarly reduce the impacts to a level of insignificance. The 1991 PEIR, 1994 PEIR Addendum, and 1999 SPEIR determined that the following significant and unavoidable impacts for the project site would occur with implementation of the NVSP:

- Impacts to school facilities (1991 PEIR);
- Existing view impacts (pertaining to the proposed gondola feature) (1991 PEIR);
- Land use impacts related to the aesthetics of the proposed gondola feature (1991 PEIR);
- Fiscal impacts as a result of an undetermined net cost to Mono County (1991 PEIR); and
- Air Quality (Threshold exceedances established by the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District and cumulative considerations for air quality) (1999 SPEIR).

All other impacts were found to be less than significant through the existing standards, regulations, and/or mitigation measures imposed under the 1991 PEIR, 1994 PEIR Addendum, and the 1999 SPEIR. As discussed previously, this SEIR is “tiered” from the previous environmental documentation. As defined under *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15385, “tiering” refers to the analysis of general matters in broader, programmatic EIRs (such as the 1991 PEIR, 1994 PEIR Addendum, and 1999 SPEIR) with subsequent narrower EIRs for individual projects that concentrate on site-specific issues and incorporate by reference the general discussions in the programmatic EIR. CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines encourage the use of tiered EIRs to reduce delays and excessive paperwork in the environmental review process. This is accomplished in tiered EIRs by eliminating repetitive analyses of issues that were adequately addressed in the Program EIR and by incorporating those analyses by reference. The tiering of the environmental analysis for the proposed project allows this SEIR to rely on the previous environmental documentation (incorporated by reference) for: (1) a discussion of general background and setting information for environmental topic areas; (2) overall growth-related issues; (3) issues that were previously evaluated in sufficient detail in the previous environmental documentation and for which there is no significant new information or changed circumstances that would require further analysis; and (4) cumulative impacts. For those impacts that were determined to be significant and unavoidable for the project site in the 1991 PEIR, 1994 PEIR Addendum, and 1999 SPEIR, and which will remain significant and unavoidable with the implementation of the proposed project, the SEIR is not required to, and does not provide, duplicative analysis. Certain environmental analyses from the previous environmental documentation are reiterated in this SEIR to provide a comprehensive analysis of the environmental factors, but the inclusion of such analyses is not intended to provide a basis for reconsidering the Town’s certification of the previous environmental documentation and its approval of the NVSP and associated Amendments.

EIR FORMAT

Based upon the Modified Initial Study, Town of Mammoth Lakes staff determined that a SEIR should be prepared for the proposed project because there was new information of substantial importance that showed the proposed project could have one or more significant effects not discussed in the 1991 PEIR, 1994 PEIR Addendum, or the 1999 SPEIR. The scope of the SEIR was determined based upon the Town of Mammoth Lakes' Modified Initial Study, comments received in response to the NOP, and comments received at the Scoping Meeting conducted by the Town of Mammoth Lakes. Pursuant to Sections 15126.2 and 15126.4 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the SEIR is organized into 11 sections, as follows:

- Section 1.0, *Executive Summary*, provides a brief project description and summary of the environmental impacts and mitigation measures.
- Section 2.0, *Introduction and Purpose*, provides CEQA compliance information.
- Section 3.0, *Project Description*, provides a detailed project description indicating project location, background, and history; project characteristics, phasing, and objectives; as well as associated discretionary actions required.
- Section 4.0, *Basis of Cumulative Analysis*, describes the approach and methodology for the cumulative analysis.
- Section 5.0, *Environmental Analysis*, contains a detailed environmental analysis of the existing conditions, project impacts, recommended mitigation measures, and unavoidable adverse impacts for a number of environmental topic areas.
- Section 6.0, *Other CEQA Considerations*, discusses significant environmental changes that would be involved in the proposed action, should it be implemented. The project's growth-inducing impacts, including the potential for population growth, are also discussed.
- Section 7.0, *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*, describes a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or to the location of the project that could avoid or substantially lessen the significant impact of the project and still feasibly attain the basic project objectives.
- Section 8.0, *Effects Found Not to be Significant*, provides an explanation of potential impacts that have been determined not to be significant.
- Section 9.0, *Organizations and Persons Consulted*, identifies all Federal, State, or local agencies, other organizations, and individuals consulted.
- Section 10.0, *Bibliography*, identifies reference sources for the SEIR.
- Section 11.0, *Appendices*, contains technical documentation for the project.

1.6 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES/ MITIGATION SUMMARY

The following is a brief summary of the impacts, mitigation measures, and unavoidable significant impacts identified and analyzed in Section 5.0, *Environmental Analysis*, of this SEIR. Impacts are generally classified as potentially significant impact, less than significant impact, or no impact. For the purposes of this environmental analysis, impacts were analyzed in each environmental issue area for the proposed project. If necessary, mitigation measures are recommended in order to reduce any significant impacts. As the SEIR is being prepared for the Project, the 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures are applied as appropriate. The “Mitigation Measures” are project-specific measures that would be required of the project to avoid a significant adverse impact; to minimize a significant adverse impact; to rectify a significant adverse impact by restoration; to reduce or eliminate a significant adverse impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations; or to compensate for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environment. Modifications to the 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures are made in strikethrough and double underline text. Where further Mitigation Measures are required beyond what was recommended in the 1999 SPEIR, Additional Mitigation Measures are prescribed. Refer to the appropriate SEIR Section for additional information.



<u>EIR SECTION</u>	<u>IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION</u>
5.1	LAND USE		
LAND-1	<p>Town of Mammoth Lakes General Plan 2007</p> <p>Project implementation would not conflict with the 2007 General Plan policies or regulations.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
LAND-2	<p>North Village Specific Plan</p> <p>Project implementation would not conflict with the North Village Specific Plan standards or regulations, as amended.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No additional 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area; refer to <u>Section 5.2, Aesthetics/Light and Glare.</u></p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
LAND-3	<p>Town of Mammoth Lakes Municipal Code</p> <p>Project implementation would not conflict with the Town of Mammoth Lakes Municipal Code standards or regulations.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Town of Mammoth Lakes General Plan 2007</p> <p>Development associated with the proposed Project and related cumulative projects would not conflict with the 2007 General Plan policies or regulations.</p> <p>Town of Mammoth Lakes Municipal Code</p> <p>Development associated with the proposed Project and related cumulative projects would not conflict with the Town of Mammoth Lakes Municipal Code standards or regulations.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.



EIR SECTION	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>North Village Specific Plan</p> <p>Development associated with the proposed project and related cumulative projects would not conflict with the North Village Specific Plan standards or regulations, as amended.</p>	<p>Note that Modifications to the 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are made in strike through and <u>double underline</u> text. The changes to the 1999 SEIR mitigation measures have been made to clarify/up-date the information and/or present the measure in a project-specific manner (as these measures are programmatic in nature).</p> <p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
5.2	AESTHETICS		
AES-1	<p>Scenic Views and Vistas</p> <p>Project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic view or vista.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
AES-2	<p>State Scenic Highways</p> <p>Project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on visual resources within a State scenic highway.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
AES-3	<p>Short-Term Visual Character/Quality</p> <p>Project construction activities would temporarily degrade the visual character/quality of the site and its surroundings.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>5.3-1j <u>Construction equipment staging areas shall use appropriate screening (i.e., temporary fencing with opaque material) to buffer views of construction equipment and material from public and sensitive viewers (e.g., residents and motorists/bicyclists/pedestrians), when feasible.</u> Staging locations shall be indicated on <u>the project Building Permit and Grading Plans</u> and shall be subject to review by the Town of Mammoth Lakes Community <u>and Economic Development Department Planning Manager</u> Director in accordance with <u>the</u> Municipal Code requirements.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.



<u>EIR SECTION</u>	<u>IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION</u>
		<p>Note that Modifications to the 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are made in strike through and <u>double underline</u> text. The changes to the 1999 SEIR mitigation measures have been made to clarify/up-date the information and/or present the measure in a project-specific manner (as these measures are programmatic in nature).</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>AES-1 The Applicant shall prepare and submit a construction hauling plan to be reviewed and approved by the Community and Economic Development Department Planning Manager prior to issuance of Grading Permit. The hauling plan shall ensure that construction haul routes minimize impacts to sensitive uses in the project vicinity.</p>	
AES-4	<p>Long-Term Visual Character/Quality</p> <p>Project implementation could degrade the visual character/quality of the site and its surroundings.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>5.3-1d The landscape design for the site shall maximize the use of existing vegetation, and where new plants are introduced, they shall include, and/or blend with, plants native to the Mammoth Lakes environment. <u>Landscaping shall be tolerant of shaded areas, where applicable.</u> Landscape plans for the site shall be completed by a certified landscape architect.</p> <p>5.3-2b The architectural style for the development shall blend with the site's natural setting. Rooflines shall reflect (step down) the slope of the site, and natural "earth tone" colors and materials such as stone and wood shall be emphasized. Conformance shall be assured through the Town's design review procedures.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
AES-5	<p>Light and Glare</p> <p>Development of the proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare into the project area.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>5.3-3c The project shall use minimally reflective glass and all other materials used on <u>the exterior of the proposed buildings and structures</u> (including the gondola cabins and towers) shall be selected with attention to minimizing reflective glare.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.



<u>EIR SECTION</u>	<u>IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION</u>
		<p>Note that Modifications to the 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are made in strike through and <u>double underline</u> text. The changes to the 1999 SEIR mitigation measures have been made to clarify/up-date the information and/or present the measure in a project-specific manner (as these measures are programmatic in nature).</p> <p>5.3-3d Vegetative buffers shall be used to reduce light intrusion on residential development <u>to the south of the project site</u> and on forested areas located adjacent to the project site.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>AES-2 The Applicant shall prepare and submit an outdoor lighting plan pursuant to the Town's Lighting Regulations (Section 17.36.030, of the Municipal Code) to the Community and Economic Development Planning Manager that includes a footcandle map illustrating the amount of light from the project site at adjacent light sensitive receptors.</p> <p>AES-3 Landscape lighting should be designed as an integral part of the project. Lighting levels shall respond to the type, intensity, and location of use. Safety and security for pedestrians and vehicular movements must be anticipated. Lighting fixture locations shall not interfere or impair snow storage or snow removal operations. Light fixtures shall have cut-off shields to prevent light spill and glare into adjacent areas.</p>	
AES-6	<p>Shade/Shadow</p> <p>Development of the proposed project would introduce shade and shadow onto adjacent buildings and roadway right-of-way within the project area.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Scenic Views and Vistas</p> <p>Project implementation would not have a substantial adverse cumulative effect on a scenic view or vista.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.



<u>EIR SECTION</u>	<u>IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION</u>
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>State Scenic Highways</p> <p>Project implementation would not have a substantial adverse cumulative effect on visual resources within a State scenic highway.</p>	<p>Note that Modifications to the 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are made in strike through and <u>double underline</u> text. The changes to the 1999 SEIR mitigation measures have been made to clarify/up-date the information and/or present the measure in a project-specific manner (as these measures are programmatic in nature).</p> <p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Short-Term Visual Character/Quality</p> <p>Development associated with the proposed project and related cumulative projects could result in a significant cumulative short-term aesthetic impact.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: Refer to the 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measure 5.3-1j.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: Refer to the Additional Mitigation Measure AES-1.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.</p>
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Long-Term Visual Character/Quality</p> <p>Development associated with the proposed project and related cumulative projects could result in significant long-term cumulative character/quality impacts.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: Refer to the 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measure 5.3-1d and 5.3-2b.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.</p>
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Light and Glare</p> <p>Development of the proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare into the project area, which could result in cumulatively considerable light and glare impacts.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: Refer to the 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measure 5.3-3c and 5.3-3d.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: Refer to Additional Mitigation Measure AES-2 and AES-3.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.</p>



<u>EIR SECTION</u>	<u>IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION</u>
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Shade/Shadow</p> <p>Development of the proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable shade and shadow impacts within the NVSP area.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
5.3	TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION		
TRA-1	<p>Construction Traffic Generation</p> <p>Project construction would not cause a significant increase in traffic for existing conditions when compared to the traffic capacity of the street system.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>TRA-1 Prior to issuance of any Building Permits, a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Community and Economic Development Department Planning Manager. The Construction Management Plan shall, at a minimum, address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation. • Identify the routes that construction vehicles would utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e., lumber, tiles, piping, windows, etc.), to access the site, traffic controls and detours, and proposed construction phasing plan for the project. • Specify the hours during which transport activities can occur and methods to mitigate construction-related impacts to adjacent streets. 	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.



<u>EIR SECTION</u>	<u>IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION</u>
		<p>Note that Modifications to the 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are made in strike through and <u>double underline</u> text. The changes to the 1999 SEIR mitigation measures have been made to clarify/up-date the information and/or present the measure in a project-specific manner (as these measures are programmatic in nature).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require the Applicant to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris, including but not limited to gravel and dirt as a result of its operations. The Applicant shall clean adjacent streets, as directed by the Town Engineer (or representative of the Town Engineer), of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas. • The scheduling of hauling or transport of oversize loads shall avoid peak hour traffic periods to the maximum extent feasible, unless approved otherwise by the Town Engineer. No hauling or transport shall be allowed during nighttime hours or Federal holidays. All hauling and transport activities shall comply with Municipal Code Chapter 8.16, <i>Noise Regulation</i>. • Haul trucks entering or exiting public streets shall at all times yield to the public traffic. • If hauling operations cause any damage to existing pavement, streets, curbs, and/or gutters along the haul route, the Applicant shall be fully responsible for repairs. The repairs shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer. • All constructed-related parking and staging of vehicles shall be kept out of the adjacent public roadways and shall occur within the identified construction staging area. • This Plan shall meet standards established in the current California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Device (MUTCD) as well as Town of Mammoth Lakes requirements. 	



EIR SECTION	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
TRA-2	<p>Project Traffic Generation</p> <p>Project implementation would not cause a significant increase in traffic for forecast conditions when compared to the traffic capacity of the street system.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
TRA-3	<p>2007 General Plan Buildout Conditions</p> <p>Development associated with the proposed project and buildout of the 2007 General Plan would not result in significant traffic impacts.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Construction of the proposed project, and other related cumulative projects, could increase traffic when compared to the traffic capacity of the existing street system.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: Refer to Additional Mitigation Measure TRA-1.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed project and other related cumulative projects, would not cause a significant increase in traffic when compared to the traffic capacity of the street system.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
5.4	NOISE		
N-1	<p>Short-Term Construction Noise Impacts</p> <p>Grading and construction within the area would result in temporary noise impacts to nearby noise sensitive receivers.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>5.6-1a <u>Prior to issuance of any Grading Permit, the Director of Public Works and the Building Official shall confirm that the Grading Plan, Building Plan, and specifications stipulate that construction activities shall not take place outside of the allowable hours specified by Pursuant to Chapter Section 8.16.090 of the Town's Municipal Code Ordinance, construction activities shall be limited</u></p>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.



<u>EIR SECTION</u>	<u>IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION</u>
		<p>Note that Modifications to the 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are made in strike through and <u>double underline</u> text. The changes to the 1999 SEIR mitigation measures have been made to clarify/up-date the information and/or present the measure in a project-specific manner (as these measures are programmatic in nature).</p> <p>to the hours of (7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and prohibited on Sunday or holidays, or as otherwise permitted by Chapter Section 8.16.090).</p> <p>5.6-1b <u>Prior to Grading Permit issuance, all</u> Cconstruction equipment, <u>fixed or mobile,</u> shall be muffled or controlled, if required, to meet Chapter 8.16 requirements for maximum noise generated by construction equipment. Contracts shall specify that engine-driven equipment be fitted with appropriate noise mufflers.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>N-1 Prior to Grading Permit issuance, the Applicant shall provide a qualified "Noise Disturbance Coordinator." The Disturbance Coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. When a complaint is received, the Disturbance Coordinator shall notify the Town within 24-hours of the complaint and determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and shall implement reasonable measures to resolve the complaint, as deemed acceptable by the Community and Economic Development Department Planning Manager. The contact name and the telephone number for the Disturbance Coordinator shall be clearly posted on-site.</p> <p>N-2 Prior to Grading Permit issuance, during construction, stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receivers (e.g., along Minaret Road and away from the Fireside at the Village condominiums).</p>	
N-2	<p>Vibration Impacts</p> <p>Project implementation would not result in significant vibration impacts to nearby sensitive receptors.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.



EIR SECTION	IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
N-3	<p>Long-Term (Mobile) Noise Impacts</p> <p>Traffic generated by the proposed project would not significantly contribute to existing traffic noise in the area or exceed the Town's established standards.</p>	<p>Note that Modifications to the 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are made in strike through and <u>double underline</u> text. The changes to the 1999 SEIR mitigation measures have been made to clarify/up-date the information and/or present the measure in a project-specific manner (as these measures are programmatic in nature).</p> <p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
N-4	<p>Long-Term (Stationary) Noise Impacts</p> <p>The proposed Project would result in an increase in long-term stationary ambient noise levels.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>N-3 Mechanical equipment shall be placed as far practicable from sensitive receptors. Additionally, the following shall be considered prior HVAC installation: proper selection and sizing of equipment, installation of equipment with proper acoustical shielding, and incorporating the use of parapets into the building design.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Short-Term Construction Noise Impacts</p> <p>Grading and construction within the area combined with other related cumulative projects could result in short-term noise impacts to nearby noise sensitive receivers.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: Refer to 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures 5.6-1a and 5.6-1b.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: Refer to Additional Mitigation Measures N-1 and N-2.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Vibration Impacts</p> <p>Project implementation combined with other related cumulative projects would not result in significant vibration impacts to nearby sensitive receptors.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.



<u>EIR SECTION</u>	<u>IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION</u>
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Long-Term (Mobile) Noise Impacts</p> <p>Traffic generated by the proposed project combined with other related cumulative projects would not significantly contribute to existing traffic noise in the area or exceed the Town's established standards.</p>	<p>Note that Modifications to the 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are made in strike through and <u>double underline</u> text. The changes to the 1999 SEIR mitigation measures have been made to clarify/up-date the information and/or present the measure in a project-specific manner (as these measures are programmatic in nature).</p> <p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Long-Term (Stationary) Noise Impacts</p> <p>The proposed project combined with other related cumulative projects would result in an increase in long-term stationary ambient noise levels.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: Refer to Additional Mitigation Measure N-3.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
5.5	AIR QUALITY		
AQ-1	<p>Short-Term (Construction) Air Emissions</p> <p>Short-term construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in increased air pollutant emission impacts or expose sensitive receptors to increased pollutant concentrations.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>5.5-1a Prior to approval of the project plans and specifications, the Public Works Director, or his designee, shall confirm that the plans and specifications stipulate that excessive fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust preventive measures and that fugitive dust shall not cause a nuisance off-site, as specified in the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District (GBUAPCD) Rules and Regulations. In order to reduce fugitive dust emissions, each development project shall obtain permits, as needed, from the Town and the State APCD and shall implement <u>The following measures shall be implemented</u> during grading and/or construction of the individual development sites <u>project</u> to ensure compliance with permit conditions and applicable Town and <u>GBUAPCD</u> requirements.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.



<u>EIR SECTION</u>	<u>IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION</u>
		<p>Note that Modifications to the 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are made in strike through and <u>double underline</u> text. The changes to the 1999 SEIR mitigation measures have been made to clarify/up-date the information and/or present the measure in a project-specific manner (as these measures are programmatic in nature).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The individual development projects shall comply with State, <u>GBUAPCD</u>, Town, and Uniform Building Code dust control regulations, so as to prevent the soil from being eroded by wind, creating dust, or blowing onto a public road or roads or other public or private property. b. Adequate watering techniques shall be employed on a daily basis to partially mitigate the impact of construction-generated dust particulates. c. Clean-up on construction-related dirt on approach routes to individual development <u>the project sites/improvements</u> shall be ensured by the application of water and/or chemical dust retardants that solidify loose soils. These measures shall be implemented for construction vehicle access, as directed by the Town Engineer. Measures shall also include covering, watering or otherwise stabilizing all inactive soil piles (left more than 10 days) and inactive graded areas (left more than 10 days). d. Any vegetative ground cover to be utilized on the individual development <u>the project sites/improvements</u> shall be planted as soon as possible to reduce the amount of open space subject to wind erosion. Irrigation shall be installed as soon as possible to maintain the ground cover. e. All trucks hauling dirt, soil or other loose dirt material shall be covered. <p>5.5-1b To reduce the potential of spot violations of the CO standards and odors from construction equipment exhaust, unnecessary idling of construction equipment shall be avoided <u>pursuant to CARB anti-idling regulations for in-use Off Road Diesel Vehicles, paragraph (d)(3) (Idling)</u>.</p>	



<u>EIR SECTION</u>	<u>IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION</u>
		<p>Note that Modifications to the 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are made in strike through and <u>double underline</u> text. The changes to the 1999 SEIR mitigation measures have been made to clarify/up-date the information and/or present the measure in a project-specific manner (as these measures are programmatic in nature).</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>AQ-1 Under the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District (GBUAPCD) Rule 200-A and 200B, the project Applicant shall apply for a Permit To Construct prior to construction, which provides an orderly procedure for the review of new and modified sources of air pollution.</p> <p>AQ-2 Under the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District (GBUAPCD) Rule 216-A (New Source Review Requirement for Determining Impact on Air Quality Secondary Sources), the project Applicant shall complete the necessary permitting approvals prior to commencement of construction activities.</p>	
AQ-2	<p>Long-Term (Operational) Air Emissions</p> <p>Development associated with the proposed project would result in increased impacts pertaining to operational air emissions.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>MM 5.5-2a In order to reduce emissions associated with both mobile and stationary sources (i.e., wood burning stoves and fireplaces), all individual development projects the <u>proposed project</u> shall adhere to the regulations contained in the <u>2013</u> Air Quality Management <u>Maintenance</u> Plan for the Town of Mammoth Lakes and Chapter 8.30, Particulate Emission Regulations, of the Town's Municipal Code. The commercial use tenants throughout the Specific Plan area shall, at a minimum, include the following, as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bicycle racks, lockers or secure storage areas for bicycles; • Transit access, including bus turnouts; • Site access design shall avoid queuing in driveways; and • Mulch, groundcover, and native vegetation to reduce dust. <p>MM 5.5-2b Each <u>The proposed</u> project shall contribute on a fair share basis to the Town's street sweeping operations in order to reduce emissions and achieve <u>maintain</u> the required Federal standard.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.



<u>EIR SECTION</u>	<u>IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION</u>
		<p>Note that Modifications to the 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are made in strike through and <u>double underline</u> text. The changes to the 1999 SEIR mitigation measures have been made to clarify/up-date the information and/or present the measure in a project-specific manner (as these measures are programmatic in nature).</p>	
		<p>MM 5.5-2c New development within the Specific Plan area shall not be permitted to utilize wood burning appliances unless the Federal standard is documented to not be exceeded. Prior to approval of building plans, the Applicant shall provide confirmation, to the satisfaction of the Town of Mammoth Lakes Community and Economic Development Department, that wood fired stoves or appliances would not be used on-site.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	
AQ-3	<p>Localized Emissions</p> <p>Development associated with the project would not result in significant localized emissions impacts or expose sensitive receptors to substantial increased pollutant concentrations.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
AQ-4	<p>Consistency with Regional Plans</p> <p>Development associated with the project would be consistent with regional plans.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Short-Term (Construction) Air Emissions</p> <p>Short-term construction activities associated with the proposed project and other related cumulative projects, would result in increased air pollutant emission impacts or expose sensitive receptors to increased pollutant concentrations.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: Refer to 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures 5.5-1a and 5.5-1b.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: Refer to Additional Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.



<u>EIR SECTION</u>	<u>IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION</u>
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Long-Term (Operational) Air Emissions</p> <p>Development associated with the proposed project and other related cumulative projects, would result in increased impacts pertaining to operational air emissions.</p>	<p>Note that Modifications to the 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are made in strike through and <u>double underline</u> text. The changes to the 1999 SEIR mitigation measures have been made to clarify/up-date the information and/or present the measure in a project-specific manner (as these measures are programmatic in nature).</p> <p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: Refer to 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures 5.5-2a through 5.5-2c.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
5.6	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS		
GHG-1	<p>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</p> <p>Greenhouse gas emissions generated by the project would not have a significant impact on global climate change.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: At the time of the 1999 SPEIR document preparation, the CEQA Guidelines did not expressly address global climate change, and GHG analyses were not required under CEQA.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
GHG-2	<p>Consistency with Applicable GHG Plans, Policies, or Regulations</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable greenhouse gas reduction plan, policy, or regulation.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: At the time of the 1999 SPEIR document preparation, the CEQA Guidelines did not expressly address global climate change, and GHG analyses were not required under CEQA.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</p> <p>Greenhouse gas emissions generated by the project and other related cumulative projects, would not have a significant impact on global climate change.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: At the time of the 1999 SPEIR document preparation, the CEQA Guidelines did not expressly address global climate change, and GHG analyses were not required under CEQA.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.



<u>EIR SECTION</u>	<u>IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION</u>
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Consistency with Applicable GHG Plans, Policies, or Regulations</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed project and other related cumulative projects, would not conflict with an applicable greenhouse gas reduction plan, policy, or regulation.</p>	<p>Note that Modifications to the 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are made in strike through and <u>double underline</u> text. The changes to the 1999 SEIR mitigation measures have been made to clarify/up-date the information and/or present the measure in a project-specific manner (as these measures are programmatic in nature).</p> <p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: At the time of the 1999 SPEIR document preparation, the CEQA Guidelines did not expressly address global climate change, and GHG analyses were not required under CEQA.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
5.7	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS		
USS-1	<p>Short-Term Construction (Water Demand and Wastewater Generation)</p> <p>Water demand and wastewater generation during construction would not result in a significant demand on water or generate a significant amount of wastewater.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: No 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures are applicable to this topical area.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact.
USS-2	<p>Water Services</p> <p>Project implementation would increase the demand for water at the project site.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>5.10-8 Prior to building permit issuance, the project a<u>Applicant shall comply with all applicable Municipal and Fire Code requirements and pay the appropriate fees to the MCWD and MLEPD. All new water conveyance facilities shall be installed within public rights-of way or utility easements.</u></p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
USS-3	<p>Wastewater Services</p> <p>Project implementation would result in an increase in wastewater generation at the project site.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>5.10-7 Prior to building permit issuance, the project a<u>Applicant shall comply with all applicable Municipal Code requirements and pay the appropriate fees to the MCWD. All new wastewater</u></p>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.



<u>EIR SECTION</u>	<u>IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION</u>
		<p style="text-align: center;">conveyance facilities shall be installed within public rights of way or utility easements.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	
	<p>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>Development associated with the proposed project and other related cumulative projects could result in cumulatively considerable impacts to the water supply and wastewater generation.</p>	<p>Applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures: Refer to 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures 5.10-7 and 5.10-8.</p> <p>Additional Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

1.7 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, this section describes a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project. The analysis focuses on alternatives capable of avoiding or substantially lessening the project's significant environmental effects, even if the alternative would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the proposed project objectives, or would be more costly. The range of required alternatives is governed by the "rule of reason" that requires the analysis to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives are limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the project's significant effects. Of those alternatives, only the ones that the lead agency has determined could feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives are examined in detail.

TOWN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Town is comprised of 12 districts and four mountain portals, as described in the Neighborhood and District Character Element of the 2007 General Plan. Master planning of these specific districts provides a basis for future land use decisions incorporating the goals, policies, and actions in the Land Use and Community Design Elements as well as the Neighborhood and District Character Element. The characteristics of each district provide a sense of place regarding structure, function, and a district center. The project site is located in the North Village District and the identified characteristics for this district are as follows:

- Viewsheds to Sherwin Range and the Knolls are preserved;
- Landscape that recalls the Eastern Sierra and establishes scale and street edge;
- Create a sense of exploration using pedestrian-oriented sidewalks, plazas, and courtyards with pedestrian comforts;
- Easy pedestrian access across main streets;
- Gateway intersection at Minaret Road and Main Street/Lake Mary Road;
- Visitor-oriented entertainment retail district;
- Active day and evening through all four seasons, designed to achieve a two to three hour visit;
- Resort and resident activities, amenities, and services;
- Animation with retail and significant businesses oriented to the street;
- Retail and services in "storefront" setting located at the sidewalk;
- A variety of resort lodging supported by meeting facilities, outdoor activities, and restaurants, arts, culture, and entertainment;

- Create year-round non-vehicular links to mountain portals;
- Lake Mary Road connected to the North Village District by trails;
- Shared and pooled parking, convenient structured parking, and small-scale street adjacent surface parking; and
- Encourage living and working in close proximity to transit-oriented development.

NORTH VILLAGE SPECIFIC PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The North Village Specific Plan (NVSP) aims to create a set of land use designations and development standards which facilitate the development (or renovation) of the NVSP area as a concentrated, pedestrian-oriented activity center with limited vehicular access. The NVSP is intended to achieve year-round uses and visitor activity, strengthen the existing winter visitor market, and improve Mammoth's attractiveness to spring, summer, and fall resort visitors. The key objective of the NVSP, and consequently the Land Use Element, is to enhance the Town's image as a destination resort community, through the creation of a high profile, pedestrian-oriented, resort activity center where lodging, restaurants, shopping, housing, and recreational opportunities are located within proximity to one another and easily accessible by transit.

There are six land use districts established within the NVSP. As previously noted, the project site is located in the NVSP, Resort General (RG) district. RG district has been assigned to parcels adjacent to and easily accessible to the plaza, but still within the Pedestrian Core Overlay area. The Pedestrian Core area is intended to be a mixed-use village with commercial uses on the ground level and accommodation units on upper floors. The scale of the individual ground level shops vary. RG uses are intended to provide visitor-oriented resort services, but retail uses are limited to multi-tenant complexes or within full-service hotels. Restaurants are generally the only freestanding uses permitted in the NVSP RG district.

The RG objectives identified in NVSP are as follows:

- To provide resort accommodations and supporting commercial facilities for visitor-oriented activities and facilities;
- To provide a transition zone between the Plaza Resort and Specialty Lodging uses within North Village and surrounding residential uses; and
- To provide integrated pedestrian access to and from the plazas.

PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The intent of the proposed project is to create a better relationship and integration with Minaret Road, with a signature street level pedestrian porte cochere and other features that would animate the streetscape and serve as an inviting portal into the proposed hotel. In a commitment to help the NVSP area realize its place-making potential, the key goals and objectives of the project are to:

- Greatly improve the project's relationship with the streetscape by introducing the porosity that allows for ease of pedestrian integration with Minaret Road;
- Populate and animate this section of Minaret Road and allow for ease of access to and from the proposed hotel amenities via the inviting pedestrian porte cochere;
- Provide streetscape features, including an informational kiosk and a pocket park;
- Deliver much needed critical mass in terms of hot beds to substantively help the North Village achieve economic sustainability;
- Provide an array of services and amenities that make the North Village a much more compelling destination for tourists and locals alike;
- Eliminate the need for any additional curb cuts along Minaret Road, which would be disruptive to pedestrian flows, by utilizing the existing vehicular access to Building C off of Canyon Boulevard;
- Improve the animation and vibrancy of the streetscape along Minaret Road with the addition of terraces for casual gathering or dining;
- Provide an array of amenities and related back-of-the-house functions that would allow for the inn to operate efficiently and attract an experienced and quality hotel operator to reinforce 8050's quality as a compelling year-round destination for visitors and locals alike;
- Deliver a LEED certifiable project consistent with the shared environmental values of the Town and the Applicant;
- Utilize a contextually sensitive architectural vernacular that departs from the repetitive and mostly uninspiring design solutions associated with earlier generation lodging properties within the community;
- Deliver a project that takes into account snow country design issues and constraints; and
- Produce a compelling, iconic, and economically sustainable lodging project that acts as a catalyst for the revitalization and added vibrancy of the North Village.

The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision making. The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall also include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, General Plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent). Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the project's significant effects need be considered for inclusion. An alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative need not be considered.

Only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are relevant in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed project. As discussed throughout Section 5.0, *Environmental Analysis*, the proposed project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts, as all potential impacts were concluded to be less than significant or reduced to a less than significant levels with implementation of the Town's standards and regulations, the applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures, and/or the recommended Additional Mitigation Measures.

Since no significant and unavoidable impacts were found, all potential environmental impacts that were considered in this SEIR are being analyzed in comparison with the following alternatives:

- No Project/No Development Alternative;
- No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative; and
- Reduced Height Alternative.

Throughout the following analysis, the alternatives' impacts are analyzed for each environmental issues area, as examined in Section 5.0 of this SEIR. In this manner, each alternative can be compared to the proposed project on an issue-by-issue basis. The end of this section provides an overview of the alternatives analyzed and a comparison of each alternative's impact in relation to the proposed project. This section also identifies alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process. Section 7.3, *Environmentally Superior Alternative*, references the "environmentally superior" alternative, as required by the CEQA Guidelines.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

The following is a discussion of the land use alternatives considered during the scoping and planning process and the reasons why they were not selected for detailed analysis in this SEIR. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

1999 SPEIR ALTERNATIVES

The project site is part of the NVSP. The NVSP was adopted in 1991 and has been amended several times. The NVSP establishes development regulations for approximately 64 acres located around Minaret Road, Main Street/Lake Mary Road, and Canyon Boulevard. The intent of the NVSP is to develop a cohesive, pedestrian-oriented resort activity node, and to provide a year-round focus for visitor activity within the town.

Several projects have been approved under the NVSP, resulting in the development or redevelopment of various properties in the area. One of these projects is the 8050 project (encompassing the project site), which consists of a three-phased development. The certified 1999 SPEIR was found to adequately cover and address the 8050 project. The first two phases of the 8050 project, Buildings A and B, have been completed, as well as the parking structure that would serve all three phases, Buildings A, B, and C. On April 27, 2005, the Planning Commission of the Town of Mammoth Lakes approved Tentative Tract Map 36-229 and Use Permit 2005-01, which

approved Building C, the third and final building in the 8050 complex. The requisite building permit was subsequently issued by the Town to allow for construction of the approved Building C, which totaled 41,134 square feet and included 21 residential condominiums with a total of 33 bedrooms. The proposed Inn at the Village project is a redesign of Building C. The analyses that were conducted as part of the 1999 SPEIR that were considered by the Town, but were rejected as infeasible, are discussed below. It encompasses the alternative development scenarios that were considered, and presents the findings of the environmental impact analyses that were conducted.

1999 SPEIR Chapter 7, *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*, analyzed the following alternatives to the project or to the location of the project:

- *No Project Alternative.* This alternative consisted of the buildout of the 1994 NVSP. The 1994 NVSP included 41 separate parcels under several separate ownerships, totaling 64.1 acres. It created a set of land use designations and development standards to facilitate the development of the NVSP area as a concentrated, pedestrian-oriented activity center with limited demand for automobile use. Buildout of the 1994 NVSP would have resulted in the development of up to 3,020 accommodation rooms, in addition to affordable housing, and 135,000 square feet of commercial uses. The overall NVSP density would be approximately 54 rooms per acre based on three land use districts, the highest intensity district permitting a maximum of 80 rooms per acre and the lowest intensity district permitting a maximum of 48 rooms per acre. While the proposed types of land uses would be similar between the 1994 and 1999 NVSP Amendment, the orientation and distribution of uses differed with the 1999 NVSP Amendment. Despite the differences in development standards and distribution, the No Project Alternative would fulfill the primary project objectives outlined for the 1999 NVSP Amendment.
- *Reduced Density Alternative.* The Reduced Density Alternative assumed a 30 percent reduction in the overall density (square footage) of the 1999 NVSP Amendment. The density reduction would occur proportionally for all permitted land use types. The overall distribution of uses would remain the same as the 1999 NVSP Amendment. The Reduced Density Alternative would fulfill the primary project objectives for the 1999 NVSP Amendment to a lesser degree because of the reduction in size.
- *Alternative Site Alternative.* The Alternative Site Alternative assumed the construction of the same proposed land uses under the 1999 NVSP Amendment on the Lodestar at Mammoth Master Plan site. The Lodestar at Mammoth site is bordered to the north by Main Street, to the south by Meridian Boulevard and Minaret Road, to the west by Lake Mary Road and to the east by Joaquin Road. In May 1991, a Master Plan for development within the area of Lodestar at Mammoth Master Plan was prepared including land use development standards and conditions of approval for all development. A Final EIR was prepared in February 1991 and subsequently certified in April 17, 1991 for the Master Plan based on construction of a 210-acre master planned destination resort, which includes 40 single-family homes, 735 multi-family condominiums, 100 lodges and apartments (employee housing), 515,600 square feet of full-service hotels, an 80,000 square feet commercial village, and a 110-acre 18-hole golf course. Although the Alternative Site Alternative would result in the same amount and type of development proposed, it would not fulfill the primary project objectives of the 1999 NVSP Amendment to facilitate the development (or renovation) of NVSP area as a concentrated, pedestrian oriented activity center with restricted vehicular access.

Based on the analysis presented in Chapter 7 of the 1999 SPEIR, the No Project Alternative was identified as the environmentally superior alternative. CEQA Section 15126.6 indicates that if the “No Project” Alternative is the “Environmentally Superior” Alternative, the EIR should also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives. As the Reduced Density Alternative would result in the least environmental impacts when compared to the 1999 NVSP Amendment project while still meeting many of the project objectives and not increasing the significance of anticipated impacts, the Reduced Density Alternative was considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

As these alternatives do not focus analysis on a project-level basis, the three alternatives analyzed in the 1999 SPEIR have been considered, but rejected from further consideration.

ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT AREAS

CEQA requires that the discussion of alternatives focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(2)(A), the key question and first step in the analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the SEIR. In general, any development of the size and type proposed by the Inn at the Village project would have substantially the same impacts on an environmental basis. Without a site specific analysis, impacts on aesthetics, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and planning, and utilities and service systems cannot be evaluated. However, it could be inferred that other impacts, such as biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, noise, etc., could result in increased impacts, as an alternative site would most likely be undeveloped. The Applicant has a vested right to develop the proposed project on the 8050 Building C project site, pursuant to the building permit issued under the approved Tentative Tract Map 36-229 and Use Permit 2005-01, which approved Building C, the third and final building in the 8050 complex. Although the Applicant does own other properties in the NVSP area, these other properties are not yet entitled for future development (Mammoth Crossing sites located to the south of the project site). Furthermore, it is a key objective of the proposed project, and a key aspect of its design, to enhance pedestrian integration and accessibility while improving animation and vibrancy of the streetscape along Minaret Road at the project site. Consequently, this alternative has been considered and rejected from further analysis.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

Based on the criteria set forth in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 and the new information considered in this SEIR, the “No Project/No Development” Alternative, the “No Project/No Reasonably Foreseeable Development” Alternative, and the “Reduced Height” Alternative were selected and are analyzed in detail in the following sections.

An EIR must identify an “environmentally superior” alternative and where the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify as environmentally superior an alternative from among the others evaluated. Each alternative’s environmental impacts are compared to the proposed project and determined to be environmentally superior, neutral, or inferior. However, only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are

used in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed project. Section 7.3 of this SEIR identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

“NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT” ALTERNATIVE

This alternative assumes that the existing 8050 project would remain in the current state, with Buildings A and B of the project completed as well as the 136-space parking structure that serves the project site. The project site would remain the parking structure podium, and no development would be constructed atop. The seven-story hotel, totaling 64,750 gross square feet that includes up to 67 hotel rooms, food and beverage service, spa, outdoor pool/jacuzzis, lobby, and landscaping elements would not be developed. Under this alternative, the signature pedestrian porte cochere, allowing for pedestrian integration and improved circulation and a visitor serving public kiosk or retail space at street level would not be constructed. Additionally, the existing sidewalk along Minaret Road would not be reconstructed to Town standards.

“NO PROJECT/REASONABLY FORESEEABLE DEVELOPMENT” ALTERNATIVE

The No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative proposes the development of new private residential condominiums on the project site as currently permitted (the approved 8050 Building C), which would total 41,134 square feet including 21 residential condominiums with a total of 33 bedrooms and would be five stories (62 feet) in height. The development associated with this alternative would have a broader building mass, covering the entire existing parking structure podium. The No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would be consistent with the NVSP and amendments would not be required.

Table 1-1, Comparison of Proposed Project and No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative, compares the land use type and overall building height of the proposed project and the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative. Comparatively, this alternative proposes 21 residential condominiums with 33 rooms, resulting in a difference in land use type and a decrease of 23,616 square feet from the proposed project. This Alternative would not require a density transfer from the Mammoth Crossing zone. In addition, this Alternative proposes a maximum height of five stories (62 feet) plus another three feet for roof appurtenances, a decrease of 18 feet and an additional one foot, six inches for roof appurtenances from the proposed project. The Alternative’s maximum height would be consistent with the current NVSP. As this Alternative has a wide building mass, this Alternative would have increased building footprint that increases the proposed building massing along the adjacent Fireside at the Village condominiums to the south. Under the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative, the architecture and landscaping components would be developed as residential condominiums (with fractional ownership) similar to the existing 8050 Buildings A and B. In addition, the remaining accessory components (i.e., food and beverage service, spa, outdoor pool/jacuzzis, lobby, and pedestrian porte-cochere) would not be developed, since this Alternative would not function as a more traditional hotel operation.

**Table 1-1
Comparison of Proposed Project and No Project/
Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative**

Land Use	Proposed Project	No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative
Hotel Rooms ¹	34,840 square feet (67 rooms)	-
Accessory Uses (e.g., lobby, circulation, etc.)	29,910 square feet	-
Residential Condominiums	-	41,134 square feet (21 residential condominiums, 33 rooms)
Building Height	80 feet ²	62 feet ³
Notes: 1. The hotel proposes rooms that would be approximately +/- 520 square feet per room. 2. Building height for the proposed project excludes an additional 4 feet and 6 inches for roof appurtenances. 3. Building height for the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative excludes an additional 3 feet for roof appurtenances.		

“REDUCED HEIGHT” ALTERNATIVE

The Reduced Height Alternative proposes the development of a hotel use (with option for condominium or fractional ownership) on the project site that would have 56 hotel rooms and would be five stories (58 feet) in height. This alternative would have the same building footprint, architecture, and landscaping elements as the proposed project. However, this alternative would have a loss of amenities including the food and beverage service, spa, outdoor pool/jacuzzis, and pedestrian porte-cochere, as this alternative would not function as a more traditional hotel. The development associated with this alternative would still be built on top of the existing parking structure podium; however, the proposed outdoor pool/jacuzzi area would instead be utilized to accommodate outdoor patios for condominium units and modest landscape features. Under the Reduced Height Alternative, the NVSP would need to be amended to increase the allowable development density for the project site (a transfer of 19 rooms from one of the Mammoth Crossing sites [MC zone]). However, amendments pertaining to building heights and setbacks would not be required.

Table 1-2, *Comparison of Proposed Project and Reduced Height Alternative*, compares the overall density, building height, and average daily trips of the proposed project and Reduced Height Alternative. Comparatively, this Alternative proposes a 16.4 percent decrease in hotel units, with 11 fewer hotel rooms, resulting in a decrease in the allowable development density transfer of 19 rooms from the Mammoth Crossing zone. This Alternative would also decrease three peak hour trips. In addition, the Reduced Height Alternative proposes a maximum height of five stories (58 feet) with an additional 4 feet, 6 inches for roof appurtenances, a decrease of 22 feet from the proposed project. The proposed maximum height would be consistent with the current NVSP. As the proposed maximum height decreases, the proposed building also conforms to the building setback requirements in the Resort General (RG) zone. Under the Reduced Height Alternative, the architecture and landscaping components would be developed similar to the proposed project.



However, the remaining accessory components (i.e., food and beverage service, spa, outdoor pool/jacuzzis, pedestrian porte-cochere, public pocket park, and public kiosk) would not be developed.

**Table 1-2
 Comparison of Proposed Project and Reduced Height Alternative**

Land Use	Proposed Project	Reduced Height Alternative	Difference
Hotel ¹	34,840 square feet (67 rooms)	29,120 square feet (56 rooms)	-5,720 square feet (-11 rooms)
Accessory Uses (i.e., circulation)	29,910 square feet	24,135 square feet	-5,775 square feet
Building Height ²	80 feet	58 feet	-22 feet
Peak Hour Trips ³	19	16	-3
Notes: 1. The hotel proposes rooms that would be approximately +/- 520 square feet per room. 2. Building height excludes an additional 4 feet and 6 inches for roof appurtenances. 3. Based on a trip generation rate of 0.28 trips per occupied unit per <i>The Inn at the Village Project – Traffic Analysis</i> , dated May 8, 2014.			

“ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR” ALTERNATIVE

Table 1-3, *Comparison of Alternatives*, summarizes the comparative analysis presented above (i.e., the alternatives compared to the proposed project). Review of Table 1-3 and the analysis presented above indicates the No Project/No Development and No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative are the environmentally superior alternatives, as these alternatives would avoid or lessen impacts associated with development of the proposed project. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e), “No Project” Alternative, “if the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.” Accordingly, the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative. However, this alternative would not achieve most of the project objectives.

Only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are relevant in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed project. As discussed throughout Section 5.0, Environmental Analysis, the proposed project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts, as all potential impacts were concluded to be less than significant or reduced to a less than significant levels with implementation of the Town’s standards and regulations, the applicable 1999 SPEIR mitigation measures, and/or the recommended additional mitigation measures. Thus, although the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would reduce environmental impacts, which would be considered environmental superior to the proposed project, this Alternative would not reduce any significant and unavoidable environmental impacts.

**Table 1-3
Comparison of Alternatives**

Sections	No Project/ No Development	No Project/ Reasonably Foreseeable Development	Reduced Height
Land Use and Relevant Planning	=	=	=
Aesthetics/Light and Glare	∨	∨	∨
Traffic/Circulation	∨	∨	=
Noise	∨	∨	=
Air Quality	∨	∨	=
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	∨	∨	=
Utilities and Service Systems	∨	∨	=
▲ Indicates an impact that is greater than the proposed Project (environmentally inferior). ∨ Indicates an impact that is less than the proposed Project (environmentally superior). = Indicates an impact that is equal to the proposed Project (neither environmentally superior nor inferior). * Indicates a significant and unavoidable impact.			

Further, the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would result in the elimination of the accessory components including the food and beverage service, spa, outdoor pool/jacuzzis, lobby, pedestrian porte-cochere, public kiosk, and public pocket park. This Alternative would not attain most of the Town’s goals and objectives, including those pertaining to creating a sense of exploration using pedestrian-oriented sidewalks, plazas, and courtyards with pedestrian comforts; a visitor-oriented entertainment retail district; active day and evening through all four seasons, designed to achieve a two to three hour visit; resort and resident activities, amenities, and services; animation with retail and significant businesses oriented to the street; retail and services in “storefront” setting located at the sidewalk; and a variety of resort lodging supported by meeting facilities, outdoor activities, and restaurants, arts, culture, and entertainment. The goals and objectives of the NVSP would not be fully realized with this Alternative, as it would not provide facilities or integrated pedestrian access to and from the plazas. Further, only some of the project’s objectives would be met. Dining, casual gathering places, publically accessible landscaped spaces, and hotel-type visitor accommodations for the residents and visitors of the Town would not be provided on the project site. Therefore, unlike the proposed project, the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would not fully act as a catalyst for the revitalization, economic sustainability, and added vibrancy of the NVSP area.