Homewood Mountain Resort
Parking Study

Prepared for:

JMA Ventures, LLC
706 Mission Street, 9th Floor
San Francisco, California 94103
(415) 546-7766

Prepared by:

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.
P. O. Box 5875
2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C
Tahoe City, California 96145
(530) 583-4053

Updated September 26, 2011

LSC # 077060
HMR Parking Study v9.doc

Chapter 1
Introduction

This engineering report documents the findings and conclusions of a parking assessment for the Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) master plan development. The site is located on State Route (SR) 89 approximately 6 miles south of SR 28, along Lake Tahoe's West Shore in the eastern portion of Placer County, California. The purpose of this study is to determine the parking required to accommodate the proposed land uses, to compare these figures with proposed supply, and to identify management strategies that can address peak events (such as large amphitheater events).

Parking issues for the project site are regulated as part of the West Shore Area General Plan (adopted by the Placer County Board of Supervisors on October 19, 1998) and specifically by the *Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design: Lake Tahoe Region of Placer County* included in this plan. This document includes the following guidance statement:

> *"Parking Demand: Placer County and TRPA shall adopt and maintain a parking demand table for the purpose of estimating the minimum and maximum parking demand of uses in the Region. In lieu of the parking demand table, an applicant may submit for TRPA approval a technically adequate parking analysis prepared pursuant to Section A (4)."*

This document is intended to serve as the parking analysis cited in the *Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design: Lake Tahoe Region of Placer County.* Note that designated spaces for persons with disabilities are included in the figures presented in this document. The specific number and location of ADA spaces will be designated per the *Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design: Lake Tahoe Region of Placer County.* It should also be noted that this document does not address the specific location of off-site employee parking (to be used on peak winter days), or the parking requirements for off-site employee housing.

PROPOSED PROJECT

Homewood Mountain Resort has long been an established ski area. In addition to winter skiing and snowboarding, the site is also currently used in summer for several types of special events. The base development consists of a North Base area (with access directly off of SR 89 between Fawn Street and Silver Street, as well as a South Base area (with access provided by Ski Bowl Way). The project would replace the existing base facilities and parking areas with the following:

- North Base – a total of 201 market rate hotel rooms/condo/fractional units, accessory uses to the hotel, 13 employee multifamily housing units, 15,000 square

feet of community pedestrian-oriented retail floor area[1], an earthen area that can serve as an amphitheater with capacity for up to 1,500 attendees, and skier support services. A total of 738 parking spaces are proposed to be entitled, consisting of 272 spaces in a structure south of Fawn Street, 410 underground spaces beneath the hotel/residential uses north of Fawn Street, and 56 onsite surface spaces just north of Fawn Street.

- South Base – a total of up to 47 condo units, 48 chalet units that would each have a 2 car garage and 1 driveway apron parking spaces, as well as 16 townhomes that would each have 2 garage and 2 driveway apron parking spaces. A total of up to 56 parking spaces are proposed to support the condo uses.

All skier access (other than for South Lodge residents) would be provided at the North Base. In addition, a new mid-mountain lodge would provide additional skier services, as well as a seasonal summer-use swimming pool open to the public.

As part of the proposed project, HMR would also operate a Dial-A-Ride transit program (during at least the ski season) serving the West Shore, with up to ten vehicles in operation at peak times. In addition, employee and skier shuttle services would be provided.

[1] In addition, 10,000 is included in the project description for potential use in the mid-mountain lodge.

Chapter 2
Parking Analysis

EXISTING PARKING

Existing off-street parking at Homewood Mountain Resort consists of three major areas: the "North Lot" (on both sides of the North Lodge), the "Gravel Lot" south of Fawn Street between San Souci Terrace and Sacramento Avenue, and the "South Lot" around the existing South Base area. None of these parking areas are striped, and the parking capacity can vary substantially due to snow storage, driver behavior, and the ability of parking management staff to direct drivers. Existing parking capacity is best estimated by a review of daily parking counts conducted on an ongoing basis by Homewood staff. A review of data for the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 ski seasons indicates that the maximum total number of vehicles parked on-site was 942. The top three parking counts were very similar, with the second-highest at 941 and the third-highest at 939. It can be concluded that 942 vehicles is the existing parking supply of the Resort.

In the past, skier parking has also occurred along nearby public streets, notably Tahoe Ski Bowl Way, SR 89, and Fawn Street. As elimination of on-street HMR parking is planned as part of the project, none of this onstreet parking is included in this analysis.

ANALYSIS OF PARKING SPACE NEEDS

Table 1 presents the analysis of parking demand for the proposed development. Note that this analysis focuses on a peak winter day (typically a Saturday), as this is a "worst case" condition in that (1) in other seasons parking used for day skiers in the winter is available for other uses, (2) total HMR employment is substantially lower when the ski area is not in operation, and (3) pedestrian and bicycle travel mode use is higher in the summer than the winter. It should also be noted that Table 1 reflects all parking demand generated by site land uses, including demand that is planned to be accommodated off site. Demand levels generated by the specific land uses were identified as follows:

- The **hotel and condo/hotel** land use base parking demand rate is drawn from the *Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design: Lake Tahoe Region of Placer County* Parking Demand Table. The number of hotel employees is estimated based on the average of 0.9 employees per hotel room (per the Institute of Transportation Engineers *Trip Generation Manual*), and assuming that two-thirds of employees are on-site during the peak shift. Other factors were applied reflecting non-auto access as well as internal trips (which would not generate additional parking demand).

TABLE 1: Homewood Mountain Resort Parking Demand Analysis

Note: Comparison of Demand with Supply Shown in Table 2

Land Use		Unit	Parking Demand Rate	Reduction for Internal Trips	Reduction for Travel Via Non-Auto Modes[1]	% of Demand at Peak Time	Parking Demand: Employee Onsite	Parking Demand: Employee Offsite	Parking Demand: Guest/ Customer	Parking Demand: Total
For Peak Parking Demand Period -- Winter Busy Saturday Evening for Lodging/Residential, Winter Daytime for Retail										
North Base										
1 BR Hotel Units	75	Units	1.00	0%	5%	100%	0	0	71	71
1 BR Condo Hotel Units	20	Units	1.00	0%	5%	100%	0	0	19	19
2 BR Condo Hotel Units	20	Units	1.25	0%	5%	100%	0	0	24	24
Subtotal: Hotel/Condo Hotel	*115*	*Units*								
Hotel Employees	68	Employees	0.50	13%	0%	100%	0	30	0	30
Hotel Meeting/Display Area	4.5	KSF	4.00	50%	0%	100%	0	0	9	9
Hotel Retail	2.5	KSF	2.50	50%	5%	100%	0	0	3	3
Condominium & Fractional Units (In Hotel Structure and Freestanding)										
2 BR Units	22	Units	1.25	0%	5%	100%	0	0	26	26
3 BR Units	37	Units	1.50	0%	5%	100%	0	0	53	53
4 BR Units	27	Units	1.75	0%	5%	100%	0	0	45	45
Total	86	Units					0	0	124	124
Employee Housing										
2 BR Units	9	Units	1.50	0%	0%	100%	0	0	14	14
4 BR Units	4	Units	3.00	0%	0%	100%	0	0	12	12
Total	13	Units					0	0	26	26
Community Retail[2]										
Hardware	5.5	KSF	3.33	40%	5%	100%	0	3	7	10
Grocery Store	8.0	KSF	6.67	40%	5%	100%	0	5	25	30
Ice Cream Store	1.5	KSF	6.67	40%	5%	100%	0	2	4	6
Total	15.0	KSF					0	10	36	46
Ice Skating Pond										
Employees	2	Employees	1.00	14%	25%	100%	0	1	0	1
Skaters	5.0	KSF	5.00	50%	5%	100%	0	0	12	12
Total										13
Ski Area Employees Onsite at Peak	193	Employees	0.50	14%	25%	100%	0	62	0	62
Business Operational Spaces							10	0	0	10
Day Skier Parking							0	0	400	400
Total North Base							10	103	724	837
Subtotal: Lodging/Residential/Business Operations							10	30	250	290
Subtotal: Retail /Ice Skating							0	11	48	59
Subtotal: Employee Housing/Day Skier Parking/Ski Area Employees							0	62	426	488
South Base[3]										
Condominiums										
1 BR Units	10	Units	1.00	0%	5%	100%	0	0	10	10
2 BR Units	28	Units	1.25	0%	5%	100%	0	0	33	33
3 BR Units	9	Units	1.50	0%	5%	100%	0	0	13	13
Total	47	Units					0	0	56	56
Total Winter Required Parking							10	103	780	893
Summer Only Uses										
Miniature Golf Course	18	Holes	3	50%	5%	100%	0	0	26	26
Mid-Mountain Lodge/Pool										
Employees	15	Employees	1	14%	5%	100%	12	0	0	12
Pool Guests	1200	SF Pool Area	1/75 SF	50%	5%	100%	0	0	8	8
Total										20

1. Employee mode share reflects access mode to off-site parking. All ski area employee parking on peak days (other than business operational spaces) assumed to occur off-site. See text.

2. In addition, 10,000 sf of commercial allocation is reserved for mid-mountain lodge use. See text.

3. Excluding parking for 48 chalets, each of which will be provided with 2 garage spaces and 1 driveway space, as well as 16 townhomes, each of which will be provided with 2 garage spaces and 2 driveway spaces.

– For hotel guests, a 5 percent non-auto mode share is estimated, reflecting guests arriving by tour bus or by airport shuttle service such as the North Lake Tahoe Express. This non-auto mode share reflects access mode to/from the Tahoe Region, rather than access mode for all trips generated by the land use (including trips within the Tahoe Region). As a result, it is lower than the non-auto mode share applied to traffic generation in the HMR Draft Environmental Impact Report traffic analysis.

- 11 percent of hotel employees are estimated to be housed on-site, based on the ratio of employees to employee housing units and assuming that 25 percent of persons living in employee housing are hotel employees.

- The **hotel meeting/display area and hotel retail** parking needs are reduced by 50 percent to reflect employees housed on-site, employee non-auto travel mode, as well as that half (if not most) of attendees at meeting/display area events would consist of persons already staying on-site. Note that this assumes that this area would not be used by a "local" event (such as a service club meeting) on a day of peak hotel occupancy (though this does not preclude such use on an off-peak day when other parking demands would be lower).

- The **fitness center** will be available solely to HMR guests and residents, and therefore will not generate additional parking demand.

- The parking demand for the **fractional/timeshare and resort condominium** land uses cannot be based on the existing *Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design: Lake Tahoe Region of Placer County* Parking Demand Table rates due to the specific characteristics of the proposed land uses:

  - Regarding fractional/timeshares, the Parking Demand Table identifies a rate equal to the Hotel rate (effectively 1 space per unit assuming negligible employees on-site during periods of peak guest parking demand). While this may have been appropriate in the past when fractional/timeshare units were very similar to single hotel rooms, it does not reflect the additional parking demand generated by more modern multi-bedroom fractional/timeshare units.

  - Regarding wholly-owned condominium units, the most applicable land use category in the Parking Demand Table is multiple family dwelling unit, which requires 0.5 spaces per bedroom plus 0.5 spaces per bed. For a two-bedroom unit with three beds, this would require 2.5 spaces per unit. While this may be applicable to permanently occupied residences, a large majority of HMR wholly-owned units are expected to be used as vacation residences. A rate reflecting second-home use is therefore more appropriate.

  - As the basis for defining a parking rate more applicable to multi-bedroom units in a resort area, available parking professional literature regarding observed parking demand specific to fractional/timeshare projects was reviewed. Data was provided from the following three sources of information:

  - A survey of parking demand was conducted for the Embassy Suites Resort in South Lake Tahoe, which consists of 400 two-room suites. A survey of parking spaces per occupied suite conducted between July 22 and July 31, 1996,

indicates that the maximum demand was approximately 0.94 spaces per occupied suite (which accommodated both guests and employees).

- The firm of DMJM Harris, Inc. conducted a study in the peak winter season of 2001-2002 that provides parking lot survey data from eleven mountain destination resorts in Colorado and Utah, as a part of the *Parking Study for Beaver Creek Landing at Avon* (2001). Excerpts from this study document are included as Appendix A. According to this study, the average number of parked vehicles over the surveyed properties at the peak time of demand per occupied dwelling unit was 0.86. It should be noted that many of the properties surveyed included multiple bedroom units, and still had a relatively modest observed parking demand:

  - The Beaver Run Resort and Conference Center in Breckenridge, Colorado consists of a total of 426 units, 121 of which contain at least two bedrooms, but still has a maximum observed parking demand rate of 1.01 vehicles per occupied unit.

  - The River Run project in Keystone, Colorado consists of 402 units, 164 of which contain at least two bedrooms, with a maximum observed parking demand rate of 1.09 per occupied unit.

  - The Silverado II project in Winter Park, Colorado consists solely of 72 two-bedroom units, with a maximum observed parking demand of 1.33.

  - The firm of Steven Miner Research and Appraisal conducted a survey of 3,262 members of Interval International (a major nationwide timeshare organization) in 1998. This study, entitled *The Automotive Parking Needs of Timeshare Resorts*, indicated that the average number of spaces needed by size of unit across the country was as follows:

Hotel Room/Efficiency/Studio	1.06 spaces per unit
One-Bedroom	1.16 spaces per unit
Two-Bedroom	1.40 spaces per unit
Three-Bedroom or larger	1.66 spaces per unit

  Properties in the West Coast states were found to generate parking slightly less than the national average.

- The following presents a review of existing fractional/timeshare/tourist accommodation parking requirements in other jurisdictions based on the number of bedrooms:

- Douglas County, Nevada adopted a parking requirement for the Roundhill Timeshare development in Roundhill, Nevada of 1.0 space for each one-bedroom timeshare unit and 1.25 spaces for each two-bedroom unit.

- The ski town of Breckenridge, Colorado requires that condominium hotel units with more than one bedroom provide 1.1 parking space per 1,000 square feet of floor area within the transit system service area or 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit outside the service area. In addition, condominium hotels with "divisible units," i.e., a lockoff unit with a separate entrance within a multi-unit structure, must provide 0.5 spaces for each divisible room.

- The City of Sedona, Arizona has a substantially lower parking requirement of 0.5 spaces per room within each lodging unit with no less than one space per unit.

- Other parking requirements based on the number of dwelling units are as follows:

  - The City of South Lake Tahoe requires 1.0 space per timeshare unit.

  - Jackson, Wyoming requires 1.5 parking spaces per timeshare unit.

  - Vail, Colorado requires 0.7 spaces per timeshare unit. In Vail, fractional fee club units (where there are no less than six and no more than ten owners as well as proximity to transit, restaurants, and recreation) share the same requirement of 0.7 per unit.

In summary, for many jurisdictions reviewed, a second bedroom in a lodging unit does not necessitate additional parking space requirements. However, this is misleading as the typical fractional/timeshare development is a hotel type of development, and probably largely reflects that parking codes have not adjusted to the shift from hotel-room type fractional/timeshare units to multiple-bedroom units. Parking requirements for multi-bedroom fractional/timeshare/tourist accommodation units, which more closely resemble the proposed Homewood Mountain Resort land uses, are based on the number of bedrooms.

Based on this review, the recommended parking rate for the HMR proposal is 1.00 space per fractional/timeshare unit plus 0.25 space per bedroom over one bedroom, for a total of 1.25 spaces per two-bedroom unit, 1.50 per three-bedroom unit, and 1.75 per four-bedroom unit. In particular, this rate is consistent with the typical rates observed in the study conducted by DMJM Harris, Inc. of other mountain resort developments and is also consistent with rates used in other Tahoe jurisdictions. It is also consistent with the parking rate applied for the Cal Neva redevelopment project (in Placer and Washoe Counties), as well as that applied to

the Northstar Northside project. Given that fractional/timeshare and condominium users are less likely to arrive by shuttle bus or tour bus, no reductions for non-auto travel are applied to these parking rates. (Non-auto travel by these guests or residents may reduce vehicle-trips within the area, but their vehicle would still require a parking space at HMR.)

- For the **employee housing** units, a rate of 1.5 spaces per 2-bedroom unit and 3.0 spaces per 4-bedroom unit is applied. Housing specifically provided for employees tends to generate lower parking needs, as a higher proportion of residents have either zero or one car in the household. There are several sources of information available for workforce housing in the greater Tahoe Region:

  - A parking survey was done by LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. for the Lake Vista affordable housing apartment complex in the Tahoe Basin portion of Douglas County, Nevada. This survey indicated a parking demand rate of 0.67 spaces per bedroom.

  - A review of other existing workforce housing projects in the South Shore indicates the following parking supply rates:

    - Tahoe Pines Apartments – 40 spaces provided for 71 bedrooms in 28 units, or a rate of 0.56 spaces per bedroom.

    - Sierra Vista Apartments – 138 spaces provided for 146 bedrooms in 94 units, or a rate of 0.95 spaces per bedroom.

    - Sierra Gardens Apartments – 111 spaces provided for 146 bedrooms in 94 units, or a rate of 0.89 spaces per bedroom.

    While actual parking count information is not available, the individual property managers indicate that parking "spillover" is not an issue at any of these projects.

  - A recent study which analyzed parking rates for workforce housing in North Lake Tahoe is the *Vista Village Workforce Housing Project Draft EIS/EIR* (EDAW, 2007), which identified that a parking rate of 0.69 - 0.70 spaces per bedroom was deemed appropriate for Vista Village. This rate is also similar to workforce housing parking requirements for the Village at Mammoth (0.66 to 1.0 spaces per bedroom).

  Based on this information, it is appropriate to apply a rate of 0.75 spaces per bedroom, or 1.5 spaces per two-bedroom unit and 3.0 spaces per four-bedroom unit. It should also be noted that these units are planned to be adjacent to day skier

parking, providing more than adequate evening parking for guests of the employees housed on-site in the winter, and throughout the day in the summer.

- For the **community retail** land uses, rates of 1 space per 300 square feet (or 3.33 spaces per thousand square feet) are applied for the hardware store floor area, and 1 space per 150 square feet (or 6.67 spaces per thousand square feet) for the grocery store and ice cream parlor floor areas. These rates are drawn from the *Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design: Lake Tahoe Region of Placer County* Parking Demand Table. Per the discussion of internal versus external traffic presented in Chapter 3, it is estimated that 40 percent of community retail customers will consist of persons already at HMR, either as guests/residents or as day skiers, and thus it is appropriate to reduce parking demand by 40 percent.[2]

- **Ski area employee** parking is based on an estimated 193 employees onsite at a peak time, calculated as 20 year-round employees plus 23 additional employees associated with the expansion plus 200 existing seasonal employees, 75 percent of which are on-site at the peak time. This figure is factored by an average vehicle occupancy of 2 employees per car, a 14 percent reduction for employees housed on-site (based on the capacity of the employee housing to the total ski area employment), and a 25 percent estimated non-auto mode split. This latter figure reflects the high level of ski area employee transit ridership currently observed in the North Tahoe area.

- The **ice skating pond** would generate parking need for both employees as well as skaters coming from off-site. Applying the parking demand rate identified in the *Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design: Lake Tahoe Region of Placer County* Parking Demand Table, a 5 percent non-auto travel mode reduction for skaters and a 25 percent reduction for employees, a 14 percent reduction in employee parking reflecting those employees housed onsite, and that half of skaters would come from off-site, a total of 13 parking spaces would be required.

- A total of 10 parking spaces are added for **operational** uses, such as ski area and hotel management vehicles.

- Parking for a maximum of 400 **day skier** vehicles will be provided. No remote parking shuttles will be operated specifically for day skiers.

As shown in Table 1, total parking demand of the individual North Base uses (including all employees and day skiers) on a peak ski day is calculated to equal 837. Of this total, 488 is generated by day skier parking, ski area employees and employee housing (400

[2] An additional 10,000 square feet of retail allocation is being requested for mid-mountain lodge uses. In winter, these uses will all be used by persons already considered elsewhere in this analysis as guests, residents, day skiers or employees and thus will not add to parking needs. Parking associated with summer use of the mid-mountain lodge is discussed below.

by day skiers plus 62 for ski area employees plus 26 for employee housing), 290 by lodging/residential uses/operations, and 59 by the retail/skating uses. The South Base condominium uses generate a peak parking demand of 56 vehicles. Note that these numbers do not reflect any sharing of parking supply or off-site parking for employees and/or day skiers, as discussed below.

Peak Winter Parking Balance

The parking demand figures and proposed parking supply can be compared to identify the overall parking balance, as well as the need for off-site parking. This evaluation is presented in Table 2.

South Base

As shown in Table 2, the South Base area would have a peak parking demand of 56 spaces and a supply of 56 spaces, for a net overall parking balance.

North Base

At the North Base area, peak demand would occur during the day, when day skiers are parking in the area. Overall parking balance was first evaluated assuming no offsite parking of ski area employees. During the day, some shared use of spaces needed at night for lodging/residential uses can occur, as guests/residents staying overnight will vacate spaces in order to ski at other areas. It is estimated that on a particular peak day, 70 percent of the groups staying in the 248 on-site units are skiing, 25 percent of those skiing choose to ski at another ski area in the region, and 10 percent will use public transit to travel to the off-site ski area. This results in 39 spaces that would be available for day skier or other daytime parking needs. This procedure assumes that only one vehicle per unit is used for this purpose (though a specific multi-bedroom unit may generate more than one parked vehicle) and that no spaces are made available during the ski day by turnover of rooms or by guests traveling for other purposes. Including consideration of this shared parking adjustment, at peak the North Base would generate an overall parking demand of 798 vehicles. Compared with the planned parking supply of 738 spaces, there would be a net parking deficit of 60 onsite spaces (again, assuming no offsite parking of ski area employees).

While it is only necessary to park 60 ski area employee vehicles offsite to achieve parking balance at the North Base, JMA has indicated that they prefer to require all ski area employees to park offsite, for ease of administration. This would result in a reduction in onsite parking demand of 62 vehicles, resulting in a net positive parking surplus for the North Base as a whole of 2 spaces. This study does not address the specific location of off-site ski area employee parking, which is indicated by JMA to be provided in the Tahoe City area. JMA has also indicated that employees living south of Tahoe City would be served by free shuttle bus service. This would reduce the required

TABLE 2: Homewood Mountain Resort Parking Balance

For Winter Peak Capacity Ski Day

	North Base	South Base
Planned Number of Spaces (Note 1)		
Structure	272	--
Surface	56	--
Underground	410	56
Total	738	56
Peak Parking Demand		
Day Skiers	400	--
Employee Housing	26	--
Ski Employees	62	--
Retail/Skating Customers	48	--
Retail/Skating Employees	11	--
Lodging/Residential Guests	250	56
Operational	10	--
Lodging/Residential Employees	30	--
Shared Parking Adjustment: Day Skiers Using Spaces Resulting From HMR Overnight Guests Skiing Elsewhere	*-39*	
Total -- Peak Onsite Parking Needs (Without Ski Employees Parking Offsite)	798	56
Net Balance -- Without Offsite Ski Area Employee Parking	-60	0
Impact of Ski Area Employees Parking Offsite on Onsite Parking Demand	-62	--
Net Onsite Balance -- With Ski Area Employee Parking Offsite on Peak Days	2	0

North Base Parking Balance by Parking Area	Demand	Supply	Balance
PEAK DAYTIME			
Structure -- Peak Daytime			
Employee Housing	26		
Day Skier	246		
Total	272	272	0
Surface -- Peak Daytime or Evening			
Retail/Skating Customers	48		
Operational	8		
Total	56	56	0
Underground -- Peak Daytime			
Lodging/Residential Guests & Operational	211		
Lodging/Residential Employees	30		
Day Skiers	154		
Operational	2		
Retail/Skating Employees	11		
Total	408	410	2
Underground -- Peak Night			
Lodging/Residential Guests & Operational	250		
Lodging/Residential Employees	30		
Operational	2		
Retail/Skating Employees	11		
Total	293	410	117

Note 1: Schematic Design Document dated 6/30/10 indicates the following number of spaces:

North Base Structure	272
North Base Surface Lot	56
North Base Underground	410
North Base Total	738
South Base Underground (and Total)	56

This parking analysis is based on the planned number of spaces, not the schematic design document number of spaces. Excludes garage and driveway parking spaces for South Base chalet and townhouse uses.

number of employee parking spaces (depending on the proportion of employees living along the West Shore) and would also reduce traffic along the West Shore.

Parking balance was also evaluated for each of the three parking areas within the North Base, as shown in the bottom portion of Table 2:

- During the peak daytime period, the 272 spaces in the above-ground structure would be used for the on-site employee housing (26 vehicles), with the remaining 246 spaces used for day skier parking.

- During any period, the 56 surface parking spaces would be used by a maximum of 48 retail/skating customers plus 8 operational vehicles, resulting in a net parking balance.

- During the peak daytime period, the 410 spaces in the underground parking facility would be used by lodging/residential guests (211 vehicles), lodging/residential employees (30 vehicles), the 154 day skier vehicles not accommodated in the parking structure, the retail/skating employees (11 vehicles) and 2 operational vehicles, for a total of 410 vehicles. This results in a net positive parking balance of 2 spaces.

- During the peak evening period, parking demand for the underground parking facility would consist of the full 250 vehicles generated by lodging/residential guests, lodging/residential employees (30 vehicles), operational vehicles (2 vehicles) and retail/skating employees (11 vehicles) for a total of 293 vehicles and a net positive parking balance of 117 spaces.

In sum, parking demand would not exceed parking supply in any of the individual North Base parking areas at any time.

Chapter 3
Winter and Summer Parking Management Plan

Recommended Winter Parking Management

The project applicant has committed to eliminating the existing day skier parking occurring along SR 89 and along county roadways. Combined with the reduction in on-site parking availability, ensuring that on-street parking is eliminated during the ski season will require a parking management plan. It should be noted that no parking is currently legally allowed on Placer County roadways from November 1st through April 30th. However, parking is legal along SR 89.

The recommended plan is as follows:

- Signs should be posted stating "No parking" along the cleared sections of Fawn Street, Tahoe Ski Bowl Way, Silver Street, San Souci Terrace, and Sacramento Avenue, with a minimum of 2 signs per block face.

- "2 Hour Parking Only 8 AM – 4 PM December 1 – April 15" signs should be installed along SR 89 between McKinney Drive on the south and Madden Creek on the north. Signs should be located so that at least one sign is visible from all restricted parking spaces.

- Parking enforcement (by Placer County Sheriff's Department personnel or persons deputized by the Sheriff) should be provided as necessary to address periods of potential parking shortages. Reliance on CHP personnel to enforce parking restrictions is not expected to be sufficient.

- Surveys should be conducted of on-street parking in the Homewood area on peak ski days. Surveys should be conducted for a minimum of four days per year (selected to represent the days of greatest skier activity), from 8 AM to 1 PM. Using a minimum of two surveyors, driver destinations should be identified either through direct questioning or through observation. These surveyors should also record total parking counts along public roadways (for as far as necessary to encompass any observed on-street parking) on an hourly basis, as well as whether active parking enforcement is in effect. These surveys should be required until two years after completion of any new development phase of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

- An annual parking management report should be prepared and provided to Placer County by May 1 of each year that surveys are required. This report should present the collected data regarding observed on-street parking and should also identify any proposed changes in parking management for the next ski season.

- All costs associated with the surveys and parking management report should be the responsibility of Homewood Mountain Resort.

Recommended Summer Parking Management

In peak summer periods, the lack of skier and ski area employee parking demand will allow all parking exclusive of the amphitheater to be easily accommodated in the proposed parking areas, along with parking for the miniature golf course summer-only use and parking needs associated with the mid-mountain lodge uses. Parking demand and supply for the South Base area would remain identical to that shown in Table 2 (with a net surplus of 22 spaces). At the North Base, peak parking demand exclusive of amphitheater use is estimated as follows:

- Ski area parking (both day skiers and employees) was subtracted from the North Base totals shown in Table 1.

- In summer, the mid-mountain lodge would have 15 peak employees onsite. The associated pool would operate both as an amenity for HMR guests and residents, and would also be available to other residents of the West Shore area. Applying the parking demand rate identified in the *Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design: Lake Tahoe Region of Placer County* Parking Demand Table, a 5 percent non-auto travel mode reduction, a 14 percent reduction in employee parking reflecting those employees housed onsite, and that half of pool users would come from off-site, a total of 20 parking spaces would be required.

- Parking demand for the miniature golf course was estimated to be 26 spaces, assuming an 18-hole course, the parking demand rate identified in the *Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design: Lake Tahoe Region of Placer County* Parking Demand Table, a 5 percent non-auto travel mode reduction, and that half of golfers would come from off-site.

- No parking reduction was applied reflecting shared use of individual spaces.

In total, peak summer parking demand exclusive of the amphitheater use is estimated to equal 433 vehicles. Compared with the total of 770 proposed spaces, 337 spaces would remain unoccupied, and available for other uses such as boat trailer storage. Other than when the amphitheater is in use for large events, therefore, more than adequate parking will be available at both the North Base and the South Base areas, without any need for off-site parking.

With the proposed development, the North Base area could accommodate concert events with up to 1,500 attendees. HMR staff indicates that 3 to 5 relatively large events could occur over the course of a summer season. Parking demand associated with a maximum 1,500 person event can be estimated as follows:

- **Attendees** – Surveys conducted in 2007 of persons attending a concert event at Commons Beach in Tahoe City indicated that 22 percent arrived via non-auto modes, and that auto travelers had an average vehicle occupancy of 2.5. For HMR, the non-auto travel mode percentage would be relatively lower than in Tahoe City, due to the lower number of residents/lodging rooms within a convenient walk/bike distance, though it can be expected that some of the hotel guests would also attend a concert (perhaps as part of a package promotion). Applying a 10 percent non-auto mode split and the 2.5 persons per auto occupancy rate, a maximum 1,500-attendee event would generate 540 attendee parked vehicles.

- **Event Operations Staff** – A 1,500-attendee event requires on the order of 45 staff persons for ticket handling, lights and sound, security, and cleaning. At 95 percent of access via auto mode and 1.26 persons per vehicle (per TRPA regional travel model data for resident work trips), this generates an additional 34 parked vehicles.

- **Performers** – The number of performers varies greatly depending on the event, as does their travel mode and auto occupancy. Assuming 30 performers, 100 percent auto access and an average vehicle occupancy of 3.5 (per TRPA regional travel model data for external trips), this generates an additional 9 parked vehicles.[3]

- **Event Truck** – Some large concert events require a semi truck to transport stage and lighting gear. If required, a portion of the drop-off/short-term surface parking area just north of Fawn Street could be roped off for truck parking. A total of 7 auto spaces are estimated to be needed to accommodate this use.

In total, a maximum event would require approximately 590 parking spaces. Assuming no event parking in the South Base area, no on-street parking, and that no parking is used for boat trailer parking, 337 vehicles associated with a maximum amphitheater event could be parked in the North Base area, and the remaining 253 vehicles would need to be parked off-site.

[3] For some events, performers can be expected to arrive in a tour bus. When this occurs, parking spaces in the drop-off/short-term surface parking area just north of Fawn Street can be roped off for use as bus parking. As this would require less than the 9 spaces needed for an event where performers arrive in private cars, a group arriving by tour bus would not increase overall parking need.