


Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl Feasibility Report

December 22, 2005



This feasibility study was funded by a Planning and Technical Assistance Community Development Block Grant, from the California Department of Housing and Community Development and by the Plumas County Community Development Commission.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	5
TASK 1 (CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN)	6
COST ASSUMPTIONS	6
FINANCING SCENARIOS	8
<i>Private investments</i>	9
<i>Grants and Donations</i>	9
TASK 2 (ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS)	11
INTRODUCTION	11
BACKGROUND AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT	11
PLANNING DOCUMENTS.....	12
<i>1966 Master Plan</i>	12
<i>1998 Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl Business Plan</i>	13
<i>2003 Coordinated Resource Management Plan MOU</i>	14
<i>2004 Performance Management Report</i>	15
PURPOSE AND NEEDS.....	17
ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED	20
<i>Alternative 1 (No Action)</i>	20
<i>Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) – Replace Squaw lift with a Chairlift</i>	20
<i>Alternative 3 – Replace and Realign Squaw Lift with a Chairlift</i>	23
<i>Alternative 4 – Replace and Extend Squaw lift</i>	26
<i>Alternative 5 – 1966 Plan</i>	27
<i>Map of Mohawk Valley</i>	27
ENVIRONMENTAL (CEQA) CHECKLIST FORM	28
TASK 3 (OPERATIONS PLAN)	44
THE HISTORY OF SMALL SKI AREAS IN THE US	44
OPERATING THROUGH A CONCESSIONAIRE	44
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE.....	45
MANAGEMENT	45
SEASONAL WORKERS	45
FUNDRAISING AND VOLUNTEER WORK.....	45
OPERATING INCOME	46
TASK 4 (TARGETED INCOME GROUP JOBS)	47
CONCLUSION	48
FIGURE 1 (ALTERNATIVE 1, NO ACTION)	49
FIGURE 2 (ALTERNATIVE 2, REPLACE SQUAW LIFT WITH CHAIRLIFT)	50
FIGURE 3 (ALTERNATIVE 3, REPLACE AND REALIGN SQUAW LIFT WITH CHAIRLIFT)	51
FIGURE 4 (ALTERNATIVE 4, REPLACE AND EXTEND SQUAW LIFT WITH CHAIRLIFT)	52
FIGURE 5 (VISUAL SIMULATION OF ALTERNATIVE 3)	53
FIGURE 6 (MAP OF MOHAWK VALLEY)	54
APPENDIX 1 (CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN)	55
APPENDIX 2 (DOPPELMAYR CTEC COST ESTIMATE)	56

APPENDIX 3 (GENERATOR COST ESTIMATE) 57
APPENDIX 4 (ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL PUBLIC WORKS CONTRACT COSTS) 60
APPENDIX 5 (NON-PROFIT SKI AREAS) 61
APPENDIX 6 (ORGANIZATIONAL CHART) 62
APPENDIX 7 (JOB DUTIES & RESPONSIBILITIES)..... 63
APPENDIX 8 (JOBS AND SALARIES) 70
APPENDIX 9 (MOUNTAIN RULES & POLICIES)..... 71
APPENDIX 10 (OPERATING PRO FORMA STATEMENT) 72
APPENDIX 11 (TOTAL HOURS AND WAGES) 73

Introduction

SE GROUP was retained by Mr. David Keller and the Plumas County Community Development Commission to provide consulting services to Plumas Corporation for the PESB Feasibility Report. This work included the completion of four distinct components: a proposed capital improvements plan, an environmental analysis, an operations plan and a targeted income group jobs plan. The result of this work is included in the following sections.

The purpose and need document identifies the appropriate infrastructure upgrades for the Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl (PESB). These upgrades are necessary to maintain reliable lift service to the ski area and allow Plumas Eureka to become a marketable ski area. The alternatives document outlines four different alternatives for PESB. Three of these four alternatives include upgrades to the current facilities and lifts. The preferred alternative 2 includes a replacement of the Squaw surface lift with a chairlift, improvements to the lodge, new maintenance facilities, water source, storage and conveyance upgrades. This report has been completed based on the preferred alternative 2.

Task 1 (Capital improvements plan)

The anticipated cost associated with the action items identified in Alternative 2 has been outlined in the Capital Improvements Plan (Appendix 1). Alternative 2, proposed action, is described in detail in Task 2 of this report. This proposed action includes:

- Replacement of the Squaw surface lift with a chairlift within existing alignment
- Improvements to the lodge
- A new maintenance / generator facility
- Water Source, Storage and Conveyance Upgrades.
- Updated Operations and Vegetation Maintenance Plans

The rationale for the installation of such a lift is explained in the purpose and need statement (see Task 2). The number of skier visits to the PESB was estimated based on the past visitation to the ski area and by estimating an increased demand due to the new facilities. A triple fixed chairlift will satisfy the anticipated demand and satisfy uphill capacity for the foreseeable future.

Cost assumptions

This capital improvement plan assumes that these improvements will be implemented in one year. The costs have been based on one new lift cost estimate submitted Doppelmayr CTEC. The lift costs are based on one preliminary cost estimate, assuming a 2006 delivery and installation, as outlined in Appendix 2. Prices are subject to the approval of the lift equipment and specifications. Lift installation costs were estimated based on some use of helicopter and fairly good access to the terminals. The cost estimate includes lift houses and one evacuation drive. The cost estimates include the additional costs associated with a larger engine (250 HP), which would allow for extension of the lift in the future without replacing the engine. The cost estimate also included the cost of installing a mid terminal. This terminal was considered for this lift as it would allow less experienced skiers to get off before reaching the top of the mountain.

The final cost of the lift could go up or down from the figures in Appendix 2 depending on access and the exact configuration worked up from the profile. The lift cost is an estimate from one lift manufacturer. SE GROUP encourages every client to evaluate bids from multiple manufacturers prior to purchasing a chairlift.

The permit costs were estimated based on SE GROUP'S experience in providing the plans, statement and materials necessary to obtain the permits needed to build the structures. The actual costs associated with getting the necessary permits can vary substantially depending on the type of review and the political challenges that can occur throughout this process. This environmental process has already been initiated through our work on the PESB Feasibility Report.

There are available used lifts on the market (double and triple chairlifts) that would satisfy the anticipated uphill demand for Plumas Eureka, and SE GROUP has evaluated the option to install a used lift. Most such lifts on the market are old, and are sold due to ski areas upgrading to higher capacity quads or detachable quads. A used double or triple fixed grip chairlift would provide reliable service and provide PESB with adequate lift service. Although the initial cost of a previously installed lift is lower compared to new comparable lifts, there are significant additional costs associated with the lift installation at the site. These costs include uninstalling, packaging and transportation. Uninstall cost can vary significantly with terrain and access, sometimes requiring helicopter service. The used lift has to be packed onto flatbed trucks and transported to Plumas Eureka. The lift will then have to be refurbished including replacement of worn parts and the necessary engineering modification to bring the lift up to code. Finally, the engineering and installation work has to be completed. At this point it has been determined that a new lift is the best alternative.

The PESB Business Plan from January 1998 identifies the need for a new groomer. This need for a new groomer is not identified in the Proposed Action under review in the CEQA process but is included in this capital improvements plan. A medium sized used groomer with the necessary blades and tillers and reasonably low hours will cost \$40,000 at a minimum. PESB currently has a LMC groomer. SE GROUP recommends that this groomer be maintained and used for secondary purposes. The new groomer will allow operators to build certain terrain park features, but does not include equipment to construct a half pipe.

The cost of the upgrades to the existing base lodge has been calculated based on previous estimates in the business plan while allowing for the increase in cost following the completion of this plan. These costs associated with the upgrades to the water source, storage and conveyance systems were estimated, however, costs were not validated through contacting local contractors at this time.

The construction cost of a new maintenance facility is based on a facility using current construction costs of \$125 - \$150 per square foot and state prevailing wages to complete the necessary work. These costs reflect a 2,000 square foot, very simple, insulated garage building on a slab foundation with electric and water installed. The price range per square foot was confirmed through a local construction firm in the Lake Tahoe region¹. Other infrastructure costs include the cost of the electrical generator and installing the utility corridor between the base lodge and the new lift. The cost of the generator was based on the installation of this unit within the new maintenance facility which decreases the costs associated with building a separate enclosure. This cost estimate is based on the anticipated power needs associated with the new lift. The new 250 horse power lift requires a 500KW generator, and power needs for the base lodge and the lift house should be approximately 20KW. An estimated price for an appropriate electric generator was obtained from Caterpillar (see Appendix 3). SE GROUP inquired about the possibility of installing either a diesel or a propane generator. We learned that propane generators with the same capacities are about two times the size and cost of diesel generators. Due to the relative savings, the cost of the diesel generator was used for this cost estimate. It is important to note that diesel generators may require additional exhaust filters to comply with the appropriate emissions regulations, and the cost of such filters was not included.

¹ Conversations with Mike Geney at Geney-Gassiot Inc Wednesday November 30, 2005.

The option to access the electrical network in the area was briefly evaluated². It was clear that there is no simple way to install a three phase system due to the distance to neighboring lines. A single phase system can be located approximately 1-1.5 miles away but has to be installed underground. Due to the rocky environment, the depth of the cable installation (42 inches at the minimum) and safety considerations, it may be necessary to install a concrete protective lid to protect the cable. The preliminary estimate for installation of this type of cable includes approximately \$12 per lineal foot, and approximately \$30 per lineal foot for the trench, conduit and the concrete (\$42 per lineal foot total). This is significantly lower than (\$75) that was quoted for the utility line between the maintenance facility and the lift. Based on the relatively affordable installation of the electrical cable to the site, this installation totals between \$230,000 and \$330,000 depending on the distance to the closest line. In addition, such an installation also requires a system to convert the single phase current to three phase (the price of this system has not been determined at this time). The option to install and connect to the electrical networks in the area was not considered in our final cost estimate.

We estimated the construction cost of a 1,200 foot utility corridor including power, communication and water between the new maintenance facility and the new lift. A local contractor³ was contacted regarding installing a generic utility corridor. His estimate was approximately \$75 per lineal foot depending on the soils and material that was on site. We estimate that these costs could be somewhat reduced due to the simple nature of the utility corridor (water, communications and electricity only) and the soils at the site. Other infrastructure costs include the water supply upgrade, communication upgrade and project management.

The total costs of these upgrades are projected to be less than \$2,200,000 including a 5% contingency. SE GROUP was made aware that our cost estimate for the current project may have been underestimating the cost associated with a public works contract⁴. Based on this information, we sought additional information from State Parks to make sure that our cost estimates included these additional costs. In response to our questions, Hayden W. Sohm, Sierra District Superintendent at the California State Parks, Department of Parks and Recreation, presented an estimate of what these costs may include. These percentage increases above the initial direct cost of the contract are included in Appendix 4. If all these costs are applicable to this project, the total cost may approach \$3.5 million dollars. We have assumed that the cost will be incurred during the first year of the implementation of the plan. All of these upgrades are necessary to become fully operational for the first season. A summary of the capital improvement costs is provided in Appendix 1.

Financing scenarios

SE GROUP has worked to identify various financing scenarios during our engagement and preparation of this report. On November 15, 2005, SE GROUP received news from our client per e-mail (John Sheehan to various parties) that Senator Dave Cox had agreed to seek

² Conversation with Greg Lohn at the Plumas Sierra Rec. Thursday December 1, 2005

³ Conversations with Mike Geney at Geney-Gassiot Inc Wednesday September 30, 2005.

⁴ E mail from John Sheehan regarding meeting with Senator Dave Cox, November 15, 2005

the needed funds from the legislature to fund this project (the alternative where the chair lift was located in the same footprint as the existing lift). The state department had at that time⁵ agreed to accept those funds and carry out the project. Regardless of the new developments and possible funding from the state, SE GROUP has included a summary of the alternative financing scenarios available for making the improvements.

Private investments

The financing options provided in this analysis are based on the capital improvement of the preferred alternative. It should be clear that calculations based on the total capital improvement costs, the expected visitation and income do not provide sufficient return on investments to attract private funding.

The foundation for private investment would be the investor's ability to continue a long term/perpetual lease on the land, and a reasonable expectation of continued profitable operations. The long-term nature of the lease and the reasonable expectation of profitable operation should be written into the lease/permit. Therefore, it will be necessary to solidify the "partnership" with Plumas Eureka State Park as early on the CEQA/capital improvement process is possible. This partnership would include incorporation of the ski areas goals and objectives, including the Capital Improvements Plan, into the Master Plan on the Plumas Eureka State Park (e.g., in a MOA) in addition to the existing Memorandum of understanding (MOU).

While many and most western ski resorts are operating on public land under long term lease agreements, most such resorts have substantial infrastructure in place and maintain private ownership of the base area of the resort. Due to the location of the PESB on state park land, a private investor will not have the opportunity to develop land at the base of the mountain. As a result, a private investor at Plumas Eureka will have to bear the burden of the capital costs outlined in this capital improvements plan, but will not be able to leverage the investment into the ski area operations to generate lodging and real estate revenues. *The inability to generate significant operational profits and the limited lodging and real estate opportunities reduces the potential for attracting private investors to fund the initial capital improvements.*

Our proforma calculations found that following the installation of the capital improvements (through grants and private fundraising), PESB is expected to become a stable and profitable operation. To justify the initial investment, investors must understand and value the positive effects the ski area will have on the community and the state park in general. This includes the additional recreational opportunities at the ski area, enhanced awareness of the historic fabric of the area, including the "birth" of lift-served skiing, social and health benefits, along with the numerous secondary economic benefits to the community.

Grants and Donations

⁵ Meeting on November 14, 2005 with State Senator Dave Cox, Dave Keller and John Sheehan

The most likely source of funds for the PSC and MOU signatories is to obtain funding through donations and grants. This would be a significant investment that would require long term commitment from the community. The foundation for such commitment is provided in the MOU (2003), the 1998 business plan and the continued effort of the PSC. The community has shown clear desire to undertake this investment to enjoy the common benefits of the Ski Bowl. *If the mountain improvements are funded primarily from community and public funding, it is recommended that the Ski Bowl operate as a non-profit organization.*

Task 2 (Environmental analysis)

Introduction

The Eureka Ski Bowl (Plumas Eureka) is situated in Plumas County in the Sierra Nevada Range of eastern California (see Figure 1). Specifically, Plumas-Eureka is located at the end of Graeagle-Johnsville Road (County Road A-14), near Eureka Lake, approximately one half mile northwest of Johnsville, CA at (Sec. 13,14,23/T22N/R11E). Plumas-Eureka is a day use ski area with no overnight accommodations, and therefore, relies on the local and regional market for most guest visits (Johnsville, Quincy, Portola, etc). Plumas Ski Club is the holder of the Special Use Permit (SUP) on the Plumas Eureka State Park. The Plumas Eureka permit encompasses approximately 160 acres and has a term extending until December 31, 2005. It is important to note that California State Parks administers the SUP for Plumas-Eureka Ski Bowl in conjunction with its operation of the Plumas Eureka State Park.

The existing ski area includes a 1,600 square foot lodge, two Poma lifts – the Squaw lift with a length of 2,800 feet and a vertical drop of 665 feet, and the Rainbow lift, with a length of 900 feet and a vertical drop of 170 feet, a parking lot with a capacity of 200 cars, and generator and maintenance facilities. The ski area has not operated since 2003 due to the lack of an entity to operate the facility. The PSC and its partners in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) seek to improve the facility to better meet the mission of California State Parks and to serve the local and regional skiing public with a unique recreational and cultural experience at Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl.

Background and Historical Context

Gold mining on Eureka Peak has played an important role in Plumas County history. In the summer of 1851, gold mining operations began on the Plumas-Eureka Mine, located along the east slope of Eureka Peak. In the 1870s, William Johns, general manager of the Plumas-Eureka Mine, established a new village between Jamison Creek and Eureka Peak – this village became Johnsville. For approximately 40 years, lode mining was carried out by several different mining companies. As the 1900s approached and claims were mined out, operations on Eureka Peak reduced. By 1943, the last major mining activity on Eureka Peak was completed. Present day Johnsville contains less than 200 residents and the Johnsville Museum documents the rich mining history at Plumas Eureka Mine.

Plumas Eureka and the surrounding region are well-documented as the birthplace of organized downhill sport skiing and racing in the Western Hemisphere. Skiing started in the region as a result of gold mining activities on and surrounding Eureka Peak. Ski races between miners were held beginning in the 1850s on the same ski runs still used today. The original ore buckets and tramways used during the spring through fall in the mining operations are believed to be used as the first ski lift in the world.

The community of Plumas County has operated a winter ski facility at this site since the 1954, when the PSC was incorporated as a 501 (c) (3) non-profit organization. The PSC operated surface tows and lifts from 1955 onward, under a SUP from the US Forest Service. In 1958, the lodge was constructed, and in 1959, Plumas Eureka State Park was established by the legislature of California to celebrate the gold mining legacy on Eureka Peak, the skiing legacy, and the natural beauty surrounding Eureka Peak. PSC installed the existing Squaw Poma lift in 1963. In 1970, the Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl was incorporated into the state park through a land exchange with the US Forest Service. PSC continued operation of the ski area under a concessionaire agreement with State Parks, installing a second Poma lift, Rainbow, in 1975. In the spring of 1999, the Gold Mountain Foundation took over operation of the ski area and controlled the area until its closure in 2003. The SUP reverted to PSC after The Gold Mountain Foundation determined that it could no longer continue the operation.

Over the past several years, the equipment and facilities at the ski area have become too outmoded and unreliable for the PSC to operate consistently during the ski season, with no operations during 2003 or 2004. Currently, during the winter season, the area is used by the ski club to conduct the Longboard Race Revival Series, which features longboard racers in period garb, using hand-made versions of the original 12 – 16-foot wooden skis that are reflective of the rich skiing and mining history at Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl. Under current operations, Plumas-Eureka is currently closed for business due to the need to replace the outdated Squaw lift, which provides the only lift access to the top of the ski area and is no longer reliably operable.

When operational the ski area received over 10,000 visits per year, including local residents and visitors. As the only downhill skiing facility in this region, Plumas Eureka is a focal point of a unique skiing and mining heritage, providing an opportunity to educate the public about the mining heritage of the site and offering outdoor winter recreation.

Planning Documents

Since its inception, little planning analysis has taken place for the ski area. The most comprehensive analysis of the potential for the ski hill was prepared in 1966 by California State Parks, prior to incorporation of the ski area into the State Park. Prior to its closure, the PSC prepared a 1998 Business Plan for improvements to the facilities and operating plan for the ski area. With the closure of the ski operation in 2003, PSC, private entities and public agencies entered into a MOU to cooperate in the coordinated management of the ski hill. In 2004, California State Parks released a report documenting the goals of the department for all State Park holdings in the State of California. The following presents a summary of these documents.

1966 Master Plan

In 1966, California State Parks prepared the Plumas-Eureka Snow Sports Facilities Study, as instructed under House Resolution No. 80. This Study incorporated the 1960 California Public Outdoor Recreation Plan, which recommended that the State of California “promote

snow areas as a part of its general tourist population” and that “Private developments combined with State Park System plans will provide attractive facilities for all seasons.”

The 1966 Plan evaluated the development potential for the Plumas Eureka State Park and represents the original vision of State Parks for the Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl Master Plan. The 1966 Plan anticipated:

- Adequate parking for 800 cars, including the existing lot
- Summer and winter camping at the base of a 6,000 foot-long lift
- Six additional lifts (in addition to the Squaw lift)
- A warming hut/snack bar at Eureka Lake
- Lift service to the summit of Eureka Peak
- Lifts covering a horizontal length of 12,000 feet and a vertical drop of 2,150 feet
- Ice skating, tobogganing, snowmobile rides, and other family-oriented facilities
- A new lodge with convention facilities
- Tennis courts, a swimming pool and other summer recreation opportunities

In its conclusions, the 1966 Study finds that, “Such a pioneering venture must provide sufficient promise of a reasonable return on investment to warrant consideration as an economic use of private capital....It is anticipated that the indicated net profit after payment of all expenses will be sufficient to attract bids from prospective concessionaires.”

1998 Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl Business Plan

The PSC prepared a business plan in 1998 to evaluate the future operations of the ski area. The goal of this plan was to re-establish a reliable, community-oriented skiing facility, which sustains business revenues needed to operate the historic Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl. The business plan lays out a strategy for improving the facility (as it was in 1998) and the operation. Specifically:

“This non-profit based business strategy relies on substantial, initial community and corporate re-investment donations combined with grant type revenues. These initial investments will be used primarily to complete major lift improvements including installation of a chair lift by the 1999-2000 ski season. The source of ongoing revenue to support the upgraded Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl operation will primarily be ski ticket revenues. The general principle that guides the business is to provide a quality community oriented ski experience in a friendly, semi-rustic and uniquely historic setting.”

The business plan stresses the role of a successful ski area in the local economy:

- “With a reliable, uniquely historic, and upgraded ski operation, the potential for enhancement of the local economy particularly in the eastern Plumas County area should not be underestimated.”
- “This strategy will take hard work and community commitment to implement. However skiing is a unique part of Plumas County’s heritage and must be sustained.

[emphasis in original]. Careful implementation of this plan will lead to long term success and stability of the special ski operation on Johnsville's Eureka Peak."

- "A greatly emphasized historic longboarding and mining theme is proposed for the Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl facility... This would be the only "themed" ski area in California... Accordingly, Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl has developed a niche strategy which initially emphasizes 90% local customers and 10% out of area traffic."
- "An improved ski facility at Johnsville can be an important marketing amenity for property owners and real estate investors in Graeagle, Plumas Pines, Whitehawk, Gold Mountain and other areas. The upgraded ski area can certainly be a marketing amenity to attract winter and early spring visitors to eastern Plumas County."

The plan also recognizes the scale of the ski area in the regional marketplace:

- "Currently, few northern California skiers are aware that a ski area even exists in Plumas County and may not yet even know where Plumas County is."

2003 Coordinated Resource Management Plan MOU

In 2003, a Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl Coordinated Resource Management Plan Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed by the Central Plumas Recreation District, Eastern Plumas Recreation District, City of Portola, California Department of Parks and Recreation, County of Plumas, Feather River Community College District, Graeagle Community Services District, Plumas Unified School District, U.S. Forest Service, Plumas Ski Club, Gold Mountain Foundation, Plumas Eureka State Park Association, Eastern Plumas Chamber of Commerce, Johnsville Junior Ski Team, Plumas Corporation and Graeagle Merchants.

The MOU is intended to serve as a framework for the development of a continuing and community-oriented winter sports management strategy, and establishment of guidelines for joint and cooperative planning and management.

The signatories of the 2003 MOU recognize the value of coordinating management and planning activities for the Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl. The MOU focuses on revenues, operations, and upgrades within the regulatory framework and historical context of the area. The MOU identifies opportunities, including the following:

- Constructing a new lift(s) to replace the aging Poma lifts
- Developing the ability to better serve snowboarders, cross country, and challenged skiers
- Reinstating education and training programs for local youth
- Developing and implementing an operational plan that will respond to user and regulatory issues
- Maintaining the winter operation in an environmentally sound manner
- Bringing the ski bowl operations toward a financial break even point

These opportunities, if taken, would improve the economic opportunities and continue the operation of Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl as an enjoyable place to recreate, while ensuring that

the State Park carries out its mission. The Johnsville Junior Ski Team and Portola and Quincy high school racing programs and Feather River Community College would also use the facility.

Among the signatories of the MOU are nine public agencies, including the California Department of Parks, Plumas County and the City of Portola. Private signatories include the PSC, Gold Mountain Foundation, and Plumas Corporation. The MOU cites goals, which include the following:

- “Initiate the collaborative effort to balance the competing and changing interests of current and future users, the protection of Plumas Eureka State Park’s and the town of Johnsville’s environment, while sustaining and improving the ski bowl facilities and operations.”
- “Improve the ski bowl facilities to improve the economic prospects of the ski bowl operations.”

2004 Performance Management Report

The Performance Management Report (California State Parks, 2004) summarizes the mission, vision, values and strategic initiatives of California State Parks, and provides details of the Department’s Performance Management System. This document articulates the Mission of the California Department of Parks and Recreation:

“The mission of the California Department of Parks and Recreation is to provide for the health, inspiration, and education of the people of California by helping to preserve the state’s extraordinary biological diversity, protecting its most valued natural and cultural resources, and creating opportunities for high-quality outdoor recreation.” (California State Parks, 2004, p. 2)

The eight Strategic Initiatives articulated in the report plan include:

- Increase Diversity – Improve the visibility and relevancy of the department for a large portion of the public we serve.
- Increase Leadership in Parks and Recreation – Re-engage with the broader park, recreation and resource management community.
- Focus on Cultural Resources – Increase the focus and awareness of our priceless heritage.
- Utilize Technology – Expand Opportunities in the utilization of technology to accomplish our mission.
- Increase Leadership in Natural Resource Management – Protect and manage the biological diversity and self-sustaining natural systems that support the individual park units, and establish the department as a major player in environmental issues in California.

- Develop a New Image – Communicate a clear and consistent image as it meets the challenges ahead and communicate the richness of values contained within California State Parks.
- Create an Urban Connection – Become more relevant to the major population centers of the state.
- Expand Recreational Opportunities – Provide additional outdoor recreation opportunities to keep pace with the needs of California’s growing, diverse population and changing lifestyles.

These initiatives represent the implementation strategy for the department’s vision.

Purpose and Needs

PSC seeks to restore the Plumas Eureka Skibowl in such a manner as to provide a marketable ski area - one that meets the original vision for the area as desirable to a concessionaire; while addressing the Strategic Initiatives of California State Parks, as specified in the 2004 Performance Management Report (California State Parks, 2004). The following describes the purpose of the Proposed Action and the needs that support the PSC's proposal.

Purpose #1: To revitalize recreational opportunities at Plumas Eureka State Park, consistent with the California State Parks Strategic Initiatives, by upgrading deteriorated and sub-standard facilities.

Need: Reliable Lift Service – The existing lift network at Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl is comprised of two 40-year old Poma surface lifts: Rainbow and Squaw. The Rainbow lift provides access to the lower ability terrain located in the south and east portions of the ski area and, although antiquated, is operable. Rainbow does not access the top of the ski area. The Squaw lift provides access to the remaining terrain at Plumas Eureka, including Sun Bowl to the south and Eureka Ridge to the north. Both lifts have exhibited unreliability during operations, which has detracted from the recreational experience at the ski area, resulting in closure of the ski facilities. There is a need to replace the Squaw lift with an operable lift in order to provide reliable access to existing terrain, while maintaining the cultural relevance of the ski area relative to its previous family-oriented ski operation and its mining history.

Need: Updated Lift Service – The Squaw lift is a Poma surface lift, which requires that riders grab the lift between the legs, allowing the lift to pull them up the hill with their skis or snowboard on the snow surface. While effective in the 1960s, the ski industry has moved away from such technology in favor of more comfortable chairlift technology, in which the rider is lifted from the snow surface. In addition, snowboarding and a youth culture have become an ever more important component of skier visitation in the United States (Kottke, 2003). Riding a Poma surface lift on a snowboard is an extremely uncomfortable experience, requiring that the rider stand sideways, with the lift pulling on the inside of the uphill leg. There is a need to replace the Squaw lift with a more modern, comfortable chairlift in order to insure that all snow enthusiasts can access the upper mountain and therefore, meet the demands of today's youth market.

Need: Accessible Lift Service – The current Squaw and Rainbow surface lifts do not readily accommodate disabled skiers, who often ski on modified equipment. Those with disabilities of the legs often ride a monoski, which is comprised of a chair, suspension/folding mechanism, and a ski. To provide stability, these riders also use ski poles with small skis on the end. In order to ride a Poma lift up the mountain, such skiers are required to hold onto the Poma by hand, with the Poma pulling the skier and his/her equipment up the hill, and detracting from the skier's

experience. As a result, the current operation does not effectively serve disabled skiers. The monoski is capable of loading and unloading on a chairlift; however, is very difficult to use on a surface lift. There is a need to replace the Poma lift technology with a chairlift in order to allow disabled skiers to access the ski terrain.

Need: Improved Lodge – The existing lodge is outdated and is not accessible to disabled users. Evaluations by Plumas County Planning and Building Services, as well as California State Parks, have identified numerous deficiencies that need to be addressed for the lodge to operate, including items such as deck and stair handrails and supporting posts that are in need of structural repair, needed electrical, plumbing and venting updates, and accessibility. There is a need to provide the necessary improvements to the lodge.

Need: More Reliable Power Supply – The existing power supply for the ski area operation is comprised of a semi-permanent, self contained portable Continental generator, which is outdated and requires extensive maintenance. Three-phase power is not available to the site. There is a need to provide more reliable power to the site.

Need: Safe Water Supply – The existing water supply infrastructure meets all necessary requirements for operation with adequate maintenance. A redwood tank (approximately 10,000 gallon capacity) stores spring water which is gravity fed to the lodge. The water is currently used for hand-washing and dishwashing. There is a need to upgrade the water supply infrastructure to provide water suitable for consumption by ski area guests under regulations and inspection by the State Department of Health Services.

Need: Upgraded Maintenance Facility – The maintenance facility at Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl is located near the base lodge and is comprised of an approximately 20-foot by 40-foot structure, which is sufficient for storage of the existing snowcat, but does not provide sufficient space for maintenance on the groomer or other maintenance activities. In the vicinity of the existing shop are several inoperable generators, as well as the diesel fuel storage and secondary containment areas. Historically, the viability of these existing facilities has been questioned by State Parks, with evidence of fuel/oil leaks in the area. A maintenance program was undertaken by Plumas County Planning Dept. to remediate the site (Sipe, 2005). No paved roads access the maintenance area and the area is clearly in view of ski area guests. An upgraded maintenance facility is needed to provide sufficient maintenance space, to house the generator and fuel storage facilities, and to insure easier access for fuel delivery trucks.

Purpose #2 – To improve the operations plan and vegetation maintenance plan to allow Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl to better support the economic vitality of the ski area, consistent with the California State Parks Strategic Initiatives.

Need: Longer Operating Hours – Under previous operations (prior to closure of the area), Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl operated on weekends only (Friday through Sunday). Under this operations schedule, it has been difficult for the operator to

maintain management and employees at the facility while providing for a successful concession operation. There is a need for an opportunity to expand the operating hours of the ski area in order to provide an appropriate management and employee base.

Need: Revised Vegetation Maintenance Plan – The existing vegetation management in the existing ski runs is not sufficient to provide quality skiing during low snow coverage (i.e., early and late season). The predominance of dense, woody manzanita in the ski area creates potential hazards to skiers during these periods. There is a need for a scheduled vegetation maintenance plan for the ski trails to insure a quality skiing experience at Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl.

Alternatives Considered

In the development of the Proposed Action, the PSC and the MOU Partners analyzed numerous alternatives in order to best meet the Purpose and Need while minimizing impacts on the environment. These include a total of five alternatives for the ski area:

- Alternative 1 – No Action
- Alternative 2 – Replace Squaw lift with a Chairlift
- Alternative 3 – Replace and Re-align Squaw lift with Chair lift
- Alternative 4 – Replace and Extend Squaw lift
- Alternative 5 – 1966 Plan

The following presents a brief description of each alternative considered, and the rationale for consideration of the alternative, or elimination of the alternative from further consideration in this Initial Study. Each alternative is depicted in figures 1-4.

Alternative 1 (No Action)

Alternative 1 (Figure 1) would add no improvements to Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl and any operations would be conducted using the existing facilities and infrastructure. The existing Rainbow Poma lift would remain at 900 feet long, with its bottom terminal at 5,590' and top terminal at 5,660' for a total vertical change of 170'. Similarly, the Squaw lift would remain at a length of 2,800', with the bottom terminal at 5,485' and the top terminal at 6,150', for an elevation change of 665'.

Rationale for Elimination

With the shortcomings described in the Purpose and Need, neither PSC, nor any known entity, would operate the ski area due to the needed maintenance and facility upgrades, as well as the lack of market draw associated with the unreliability of the two Poma lifts.

Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) – Replace Squaw lift with a Chairlift

Alternative 2 was developed to address issues associated with ground disturbance, vegetation removal and aesthetics. By constructing the lift in the current Squaw alignment, Alternative 2 would place the chairlift terminals at the existing terminal sites, which have already been disturbed for installation of the Poma lift. In addition, the visual effects of chairlift installation in this alignment would be similar to the existing situation.

At this time, the PSC and the MOU Partners are submitting a new proposal to California State Parks to upgrade the existing facilities at Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl. The Proposed Action includes:

- Replacement of the Squaw surface lift with a chairlift within existing alignment
- Improvements to the lodge
- A new maintenance / generator facility
- Water Source, Storage and Conveyance Upgrades.
- Updated Operations and Vegetation Maintenance Plans

Squaw Lift

Under Alternative 2 (Figure 2), the Squaw Poma lift would be replaced with a triple chairlift in the existing alignment. The new chairlift would be located in the exact same footprint as the original Poma lift; there would be no vertical gain in length. PSC and the MOU Partners are currently evaluating chairlifts for this installation. The proposed lift would most likely be a triple chairlift with a capacity of 1,800 people per hour, with a 200 HP motor. For purposes of this Initial Study, the triple chairlift will be assumed to account for the largest possible infrastructure requirement. The new lift would not require any tree removal as it would be located entirely within the existing alignment (Figure 2).

Potential ground disturbance would occupy a maximum of 0.5 acre at the bottom and top terminals, as well as a midway-get-off, located near the existing get-off, for a total of 1.5 acres of grading for lift construction.

No revisions to the Rainbow surface lift are proposed.

Lodge Improvements

Under Alternative 2, PSC and the MOU Partners would implement improvements to the lodge, including code and other repairs, repairs to the stair and deck railings, electrical, plumbing and venting updates and accessibility for handicapped individuals. All facility upgrades would take place on the existing lodge footprint, with the exception of wheelchair access to the deck, which will include the addition of a ramp to the deck. The footprint of this deck will occupy approximately 150 square feet.

Power Supply

Alternative 2 includes the development of a new power generation facility on the northeast side of the existing parking lot (Figure 2). The existing generators would be removed from the area behind the lodge, and the sites would be revegetated with native vegetation as approved by State Parks. A new generator building would be constructed in conjunction with a new maintenance facility (see below). The new generator would be powered by propane or diesel which would be stored in tanks immediately adjacent to the new building.

Maintenance Facility

A new maintenance facility would be constructed along the northeast side of the parking lot (Figure 2) or at another location adjacent to the parking lot. The building would occupy a footprint of approximately 2,000 square feet.

The maintenance facility would house the groomer and all maintenance equipment. In addition, the building would house the new generator facility, with propane storage adjacent to the building, as described above.

A new utility corridor would be established to supply power to the bottom terminal of the upgraded Squaw lift (Figure 2). The corridor would be installed in an existing road, for a

total length of approximately 1,200 feet and total disturbance to approximately 0.3 acre, including approximately 0.1 acre of manzanita shrubland. The utility corridor would include power, communication, and water.

Water Source, Storage and Conveyance

Under Alternative 2, the existing water storage and conveyance system would be upgraded to meet State Department of Health Services (DHS) requirements. Under supervision by the DHS, the existing spring source, storage facility and conveyance system would be upgraded to provide potable water to the lodge, according to DHS standards.

Operations Plan

PSC and the MOU partners strongly believe that the failure of the previous operation lies in the failure of the facility to draw skiers, largely due to the shortcomings identified in the Purpose and Need. However, as PSC and the MOU partners has evaluated various operating strategies since the Gold Mountain Foundation ceased operations, it has become apparent that the limited operating schedule may play a key role in the operation. With a facility that operates on weekends only, it is difficult to find quality employees, particularly in management roles. PSC and the MOU Partners are convinced that coupled with the improvements to the facility itself, the operating schedule for the ski area should be of sufficient duration to provide for a full-time General Manager, and to allow the operation to employ quality employees. As a result, the Proposed Action includes a broader operating schedule that will include mid-week operations. The broader operating schedule would allow the ski area to better serve the local public as well as high school and college activities at the mountain.

Vegetation Maintenance Plan

In conjunction with the planning and approval for the facility upgrades, PSC and the MOU Partners will prepare a vegetation maintenance plan to address the periodic removal of shrubs from the existing ski runs. The plan will be designed to insure that the ski area can provide a quality recreation experience during periods of low snow coverage while insuring that sufficient vegetation remains to provide protection from erosion. The plan will also insure that no visual impacts result from vegetation maintenance.

The Vegetation Maintenance Plan will include no new clearing of trees for ski trails; however removal/selective trimming of existing shrubs (manzanita) on the existing ski trails will be included in the plan. Fire protection would also be included in the plan as would monitoring and maintenance of revegetation efforts. A process for State Parks approval of any vegetation maintenance will be developed. This process will include several discrete steps:

- Determination of areas to be treated in an Annual Vegetation Maintenance Plan
- Presentation of the proposed maintenance to State Parks
- Site visit with State Parks to address concerns
- Revision to the Annual Vegetation Maintenance Plan
- Implementation of the maintenance

Rationale for Consideration

The prior operation of the Poma lifts has resulted in a dwindling market, and ultimately, closure of the Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl. In order to provide reliable, modern lift service, PSC and the MOU Partners believe that a chairlift is necessary. On this basis, the proposal includes a chairlift.

The proposed maintenance facility and power upgrades will provide for a reliable source of power and more modern maintenance of the groomer and other ski area facilities. The incorporation of a modern generator will provide for cleaner power generation (as compared to the existing operation facilities). The location of the maintenance/generator facility adjacent to the parking lot would facilitate fuel delivery as compared to the current location. Power generation would be the most economically viable source of power as compared to burying power from Johnsville to the ski area.⁶

Alternative 3 – Replace and Realign Squaw Lift with a Chairlift

Alternative 3 (Figure 3) contains similar elements to Alternative 2, except that the Squaw surface lift would be replaced by a longer, revised alignment. As a result, the chairlift would have an extended alignment allowing skiers to access more terrain at higher elevations than the existing lift.

Alternative 3 includes the following components:

- Replacement of the Squaw surface lift with a chairlift
- Placement of the chairlift in a longer, revised alignment
- Improvements to the lodge
- A new maintenance / generator facility
- Water Source, Storage and Conveyance Upgrades.
- Overflow parking at the Johnsville Museum
- Updated Operations and Vegetation Maintenance Plans

Squaw Lift

Under Alternative 3 (Figure 3), the Squaw Poma lift would be removed and the ground along the surface lift would be blended to the surrounding contours, stabilized and revegetated with native grasses and shrubs, as approved by California State Parks. A chairlift would be installed with the bottom terminal located approximately 500' north (downhill) of the lodge at 5,470'. The top terminal would be higher than the existing Poma, with an elevation of 6,270'. The resulting chairlift would provide 800' of vertical gain over a 3,400' length.

⁶ In fact, power at Johnsville is single phase. A three-phase converter would be required to power the new lift at the ski area. The lift would require more horsepower than could be provided for using a three-phase converter.

The proposed lift would most likely be a triple chairlift with a capacity of 1,800 people per hour, with a 240 HP motor, a 181 Kilowatt requirement and a line rating of 212 Kilovolt-Amperes.

For purposes of this initial study, the triple chairlift will be assumed to account for the largest possible infrastructure requirement. With a 50-foot lift corridor, the lift installation would require selective removal of trees in approximately 0.1 acre of an existing tree island (Figure 3), including removal of approximately five large trees.

Ground disturbance would occupy a maximum of 0.5 acre at the bottom and top terminals, as well as a midway-get-off, located near the existing get-off, for a total of 1.5 acres of grading for lift construction. In addition, approximately 600 feet of new road would be constructed to provide access to the top terminal site. The road would be approximately 20 feet wide, for a total ground disturbance 0.4 acre, including a 30-foot disturbance corridor for road construction.

In order to reduce the visual impacts of the top terminal site, as viewed from Eureka Lake, the top terminal is proposed to be enclosed in a building that would be designed to resemble a mining shack, based on the architectural theme of the mining facilities that historically occupied the area. A simulation of the visual impact of this alternative is included in figure 5.

No revisions to the Rainbow surface lift are proposed.

Lodge Improvements

Lodge improvements, including code updates, wheelchair access, and repairs, would be as described under Alternative 2.

Power Supply

The development of a new power generation facility would be as described under Alternative 2.

Maintenance Facility

Under Alternative 3, the new maintenance facility and utility corridor would be as described under Alternative 2 (Figure 3).

Water Source, Storage and Conveyance

Under Alternative 3, the existing water storage and conveyance system would be upgraded to meet State Department of Health Services (DHS) requirements. Under supervision by the DHS, the existing spring source, storage facility and conveyance system would be upgraded to provide potable water to the lodge, according to DHS standards.

Overflow Parking

Alternative 3 includes the use of a peak day overflow parking area to reduce crowded parking conditions at the ski area. Drivers would park in an existing equipment storage area behind the Johnsville Museum. The area is currently cleared of shrub and herbaceous vegetation, with scattered trees remaining. In its current configuration, the area encompasses approximately one acre, providing space for up to 100 cars. The equipment storage area would require minor grading to reduce slope gradients and gravel would be placed over the native surface to reduce erosion. No tree removal would be required to convert the area to overflow parking.

During peak days, signage would be placed along Road A14 to warn drivers when the parking lot at the ski area is full. Skiers would park at the overflow lot and a shuttle bus would transport skiers from the museum to the ski area and back. The bus would be provided by Plumas Transit (Cordeman, 2005).

Operations Plan

The Operations Plan under Alternative 3 would be as described under Alternative 2.

Vegetation Maintenance Plan

The Vegetation Maintenance Plan for Alternative 3 would be as described under Alternative 2.

Rationale for Consideration

The prior operation of the Poma lifts has resulted in a dwindling market and ultimately, closure of the Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl. In order to provide reliable, modern lift service, PSC and the MOU Partners believe that a chairlift is necessary. On this basis, the proposal includes a chairlift.

The new lift alignment would provide access to the top of the ski area, which currently requires that skiers hike from the top of the existing Poma lift. While no new terrain is proposed with the upgrade to a chairlift, the revised top terminal location would provide skier access to Eureka Ridge and Upper Sun Bowl, which currently requires people to traverse from the Poma. Similarly, the bottom terminal location would be lower than the existing Poma lift in order to reduce the traverse that is required to access the bottom of the lift when exiting Eureka Ridge.

In addition to the skier circulation patterns, the proposed lift has been aligned to avoid any contiguous forest or mature trees, an issue raised during the planning process. The proposed maintenance facility and power upgrades will provide for a reliable source of power and more modern maintenance of the groomer and other ski area facilities. The incorporation of a propane-powered generator will provide for cleaner power generation (as compared to diesel). The location of the maintenance/generator facility adjacent to the parking lot would facilitate fuel delivery as compared to the current location. Power

generation would be the most economically viable source of power, as compared to burying power from Johnsville to the ski area.⁷

Rationale for Elimination

While Alternative 2 would improve the lift access for snowboarders and other alternative snow sliders, extending the chairlift alignment to access additional terrain at the top of Eureka Peak would result in increased environmental impacts to the area's natural resources. In addition, an extended lift would result in visual impacts to the local area. As a result, Alternative 3 was excluded from consideration because Alternative 2 would meet the Purpose and Need while eliminating the potential for visual and environmental impacts.

Alternative 4 – Replace and Extend Squaw lift

Alternative 4 (Figure 4) contains the same elements as Alternatives 2 and 3, except for the lift length and alignment. Under Alternative 4, the Squaw Poma lift would be replaced with a chairlift; however, the top terminal location would be increased to approximately 6,200 feet - higher than the existing Poma yet within the existing alignment. The resulting chairlift would provide 730' of vertical gain over a 3,400' length.

Alternative 4 was developed to address issues associated with ground disturbance and aesthetics. Alternative 4 would utilize the current bottom terminal location for the Squaw replacement, thereby reducing the need for new ground disturbance. In addition, the top terminal would be sited to the north of the Alternative 3 location, requiring 200 feet of road construction, which is 400 feet less than Alternative 3 (Figure 4). Finally, Alternative 4 would place the top terminal in a location that is less visible from the Eureka Lake dam in order to address visual impacts.

Alternative 4 would require the removal of approximately 14 large trees to accommodate the extended lift alignment (50-foot corridor).

Rationale for Elimination

Alternative 4 would provide a similar elevation gain to Alternative 3 with less road construction; however approximately 0.5 acre of mature forest would be removed from a contiguous stand for the construction of the lift corridor along upper Squaw Ridge. As a result, lift construction would increase fragmentation of mature forest in the vicinity of Eureka Peak, as compared to Alternative 3, which removes fewer trees from an isolated tree island in the ski area. While the department's strategic initiatives call for the expansion of recreation opportunities, they also seek to increase leadership in natural resource management (California State Parks, 2004). On this basis, Alternative 2 meets the Purpose and Need without the removal of mature trees.

⁷ In fact, power at Johnsville is single phase. A three-phase converter would be required to power the new lift at the ski area. The lift would require more horsepower than could be provided for using a three-phase converter.

Alternative 5 – 1966 Plan

The 1966 Plan evaluated the development potential for the Plumas Eureka State Park and represents the original vision of State Parks for the Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl Master Plan. The 1966 Plan anticipated:

- Adequate parking for 800 cars, including the existing lot
- Summer and winter camping at the base of a 6,000 foot-long lift
- Six additional lifts (in addition to the Squaw lift)
- A warming hut/snack bar at Eureka Lake
- Lift service to the summit of Eureka Peak
- Lifts covering a horizontal length of 12,000 feet and a vertical drop of 2,150 feet
- Ice skating, tobogganing, snowmobile rides, and other family-oriented facilities
- A new lodge with convention facilities
- Tennis courts, a swimming pool and other summer recreation opportunities

Rationale for Elimination

This original vision for the Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl would provide almost three times the lift length and vertical drop of Alternative 2. Developed in 1966, this plan envisioned a significantly greater regional role for Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl in serving the skiing public. With the development of destination ski resorts in the Lake Tahoe region, Plumas Eureka developed into a local, day use ski hill. In addition, the vision presented by the California Department of Parks and Recreation in 1966 has been dramatically revised to a much “lighter on the land” ethic, as displayed in the strategic initiatives (California State Parks, 2004). Development of the original 1966 Plan would constitute a major shift in policy for the department. Such development would substantially alter the current character of the site, including development of ski lifts and other facilities outside of the current ski area, including lift service on Eureka Peak. Development of this plan would require significant tree removal, earthwork, and financial investment. It would also require a substantially larger market to support such an economic investment. Based on the previous operations at Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl and the substantial environmental effects of this plan, the 1966 Plan has been eliminated from consideration.

Map of Mohawk Valley

As part of our evaluation of the PESB, SE GROUP produced a map of the Mohawk Valley and significant real estate developments. This map has been included as figure 6.

Environmental (CEQA) Checklist Form

1. Project title: *Plumas-Eureka Ski Bowl Initial Study*
2. Lead agency name and address: *California State Parks*
3. Contact person and phone number: _____
4. Project location: *Eureka State Park, Johnsville, CA*
5. Project sponsor's name and address:
6. General plan designation: _____ 7. Zoning: _____
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

See Attachment (Initial Study Support Document)

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

The Plumas Eureka Ski Area is situated near the northern Sierra Nevada crest where winter activities of native plants and animals are limited by severe climate. The Plumas Eureka Ski Area is located on a northeast facing slope of Eureka Peak. Elevation for the project ranges from a low of approximately 5480 feet to a high of about 6240 feet; all but western exposures are present in the project area. Much landscape modification is evident in the area due to past aggressive mining operations. The growing season is limited to a few months and plant and animal reproductive seasons are correspondingly short. While there are some trees around the lodge and on the crests of the slope, most of the vegetation consists of manzanita, whitethorn, and similar shrub species, which generally becomes thicker toward the top of the slope. The trees are typical of a mixed coniferous forest including Douglas fir, yellow pine, and white fir. There are no sources of natural fresh water on the hillside although Eureka Creek is located about one third of a mile to the north. Present improvements at the site include a ski lodge, rest rooms, several outbuildings including a garage, two Poma surface lifts and a rope tow surface lift. With the exception of a warming hut on skids, which is now used as a storage shed, all of these improvements date from the 1960's or later.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or

participation agreement.)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving no "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR

or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Signature

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were

incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? <i>Proposed development would be similar in form to the existing development. The chairlift Top terminal would be enclosed in a building resembling a mining shack (see attached rendering and visual simulation), consistent with the history of Plumas Eureka State Park as a significant site for Gold mining in the 1800s.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? <i>No new sources of light are proposed (no night lighting is proposed).</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? Research plan – call George Ozanich at N. Sierra Air Quality Mgmt. District.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? <i>environment with no known air quality violations. While skier cars and groomers emit CO, PM10 and PM2.5, the levels generated onsite are expected to be well below NAAQS or any other standards.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

The site is in an alpine environment with no known air quality violations. While skier cars and groomers emit CO, PM10 and PM2.5, the levels generated onsite are expected to be well below NAAQS or any other standards. Cumulatively, the majority of vehicle use at the ski area will be during the winter. The cumulative Average Daily Traffic (ADT) near Johnsville (see attachment) would cumulatively increase ADT near Johnsville by a total of XX (from Herrin and KD) cars per day. These cars would generally operate mostly during the non-winter seasons. The project area is not known to be in non-attainment for any criteria pollutants.

While skier cars and groomers emit CO, PM10 and PM2.5, the levels generated onsite are expected to be well below NAAQS or any other standards.

No objectionable odors would be produced by the proposed development.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? *No such species, or its habitat, have been identified on the site.*

X

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? *No such habitat, has been identified on the site.*

X

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of

X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
An archeological reconnaissance was completed by Gregory H. Henton, Eleana Incorporated. This report concluded that the proposed chair lift has the potential to adversely affect a potential historic site given the temporary site number 090499GH01. Mitigation requires that the chair lift be designed to avoid the site as prescribed.				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. <i>Fault lines are mapped within the vicinity of the ski hill, however none are identified within the immediate vicinity of the proposed project. No activities are proposed that would rupture any fault lines.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? <i>Operation of the proposed chairlift would not shake the ground beyond the levels of the existing operations.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? <i>No soils that are susceptible to liquefaction are documented on the site (see attached soils report).</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
iv) Landslides? <i>No mapped landslide hazard areas have been documented onsite (see attached soils report).</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Grading is proposed on 1.9 acres, including the top and bottom terminal site and access roads. Topsoil, where present, would be stockpiled and replaced after construction. Construction would include erosion and sediment control BMPs, as well as stabilization of the site after construction.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>See attached soils report.</i>				
Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? <i>See attached soils report.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? <i>No modifications to the wastewater treatment facility are proposed.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS B Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? <i>Outside of the existing operation (propane, diesel), no hazardous materials would be transported to or from the site. The proposed development would move the maintenance facility to a more accessible site, adjacent to the existing parking lot, for delivery of fuels.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY
 -- Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
				X

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Potentially Significant Impact



Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation



Less Than Significant Impact



No Impact

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

X

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

X

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

X

XI. NOISE B Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

X

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

X

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

X

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

X

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

X

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

X

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for

X

example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? X

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? X

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection? X

Police protection? X

Schools? X

Parks? X

Other public facilities? X

XIV. RECREATION --

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? X

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? X

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on X

roads, or congestion at intersections)?

The project is intended to improve the facilities and experience of the users. Overall use is not expected to increase historic or peak usage. Use of the facility has declined over the recent past. This is generally attributed to the inability of the local ski club to maintain the facilities and provide improvements consistent with the demands of the users. The proposed project is intended to restore the ski area to its original capacity and use. The 30-year average usage is 4500 skiers per winter. The busiest season ever was 11,000 skiers in one winter. The average number of skier visits per season is projected to be 10,000 to 12,000 per winter, assuming that the ski area will be open seven days per week. Exceptional seasons may see some increase in this projection.

Alternative 2 includes the use of a peak day overflow parking area to reduce crowded parking conditions at the ski area. Drivers would park in an existing equipment storage area behind the Johnsville Museum. The area is currently cleared of shrub and herbaceous vegetation, with scattered trees remaining. In its current configuration, the area encompasses approximately one acre, providing space for up to 100 cars. The equipment storage area would require minor grading to reduce slope gradients and gravel would be placed over the native surface to reduce erosion. No tree removal would be required to convert the area to overflow parking. During peak days, signage would be placed along Road A14 to warn drivers when the parking lot at the ski area is full. Skiers would park at the overflow lot and a shuttle bus would transport skiers from the museum to the ski area and back. The bus would be provided by Plumas Transit

Current volumes on Road A-14 (Graeagle-Johnsville Road) and County Road 506C (Johnsvilee-Eureka Lake Road) are judged to be approximately half of design volume thresholds (KD Anderson traffic study). Proposed improvements will add approximately 160 daily and 40 peak period trips to Road A-14 east of the satellite parking lot. With appropriate signage installed, no additional traffic will be allowed past the satellite lot.

Worst case basis would be an increase in the number of days when the parking lots were full from 1 to 2 per season to 4 to 5 per season should favorable weather occur all year (KD Anderson traffic study).

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? *No LOS has been established.*



X

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? X

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? X

The maximum volume of cars passing through Johnsville on peak days should not increase due to this proposal, however the number and frequency of peak days may increase. To discourage speeding through the community of Johnsville, the following measures should be implemented:

1. *The ski area will install signs requesting drivers to obey the posted speed limits through town. These signs will be located at the ski area parking lot and lodge, as well as at either end of town.*
2. *A ninety-degree curve approximately midway between Johnsville and the main parking lot would be signed at 15 mph coming from both directions.*
3. *The downhill curves before the Jamison Creek Bridge traveling eastbound would be posted at 25mph on these curves.*

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? X

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? X

See above discussion regarding traffic and parking.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? X

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS B
Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? X

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? X

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? X

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? X

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project=s projected demand in addition to the provider=s existing commitments? X

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project=s solid waste disposal needs? X

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? X

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? X

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? X

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? X

Task 3 (Operations plan)

SE GROUP has received limited documentation on the past operations at the PESB. This information includes the following:

1. The number of skier visits in the years from 1965-1999
2. Current inventories at the facilities (11/20/02)
3. Review of facilities by John Knott, Superintendent at the Department of Parks and Recreation (6/28/2002)
4. Inspection report by Harry Scott Howsden, Plumas County Building Official (11/25/2002)
5. Use of the ski Bowl at Plumas Eureka State park by Feather River College
6. The PESB Business plan (01/01/1998)
7. PESB Operations Issues & Costs(10/25/2005)

SE GROUP has reviewed these documents and has done a brief competitive analysis of the surrounding ski facilities and mountain operations. SE GROUP also estimated the population of the nearby towns and cities to determine the source of demand for skiing in the region.

The upgrades and continued operation of the PESB should be evaluated from an economic standpoint. PESB has the possibility to become profitable on its own but will also bring significant economic benefits to the surrounding area. In addition the Ski Bowl should be seen in combination with the benefits to the community and State Parks.

The history of small ski areas in the US

The United States has seen a significant reduction in the number of ski areas in the last decades and considerable consolidation. Many small ski areas have been shut down to the dismay of the surrounding communities. The operations at many of these resorts have been discontinued due to the large capital expenditures needed to maintain their facilities and the increased competition from larger ski areas. It is rare today to see areas with less than 3-4 lifts that continue to operate profitably. Despite the negative trend, there are numerous examples of small ski areas that continue to operate as non-profits and in local communities. Some of these resorts are operated by the community, while others are operated through a concessionaire. Examples of such resorts are included in the table of non profit ski areas in Appendix 4.

Operating through a concessionaire

The option to operate the resort through a concessionaire has been utilized by smaller ski resorts as a means to attract better, more experienced or knowledgeable resources. Due to the size of the operations and because of the needed capital improvements, it seems unlikely that an outside party would be interested in operating the ski area to gain a profit at this time. Upon completion of the Capital Improvements and successful operation of the area (i.e., realizing projected visitation and cash flow), a concessionaire may be willing to operate the area under a concession agreement with PSC and the State Parks.

Organizational structure

SE GROUP recommends that PSC hire a permanent professional manager to oversee the implementation of the capital improvements and continued operation of the ski area. This Construction Manager/General Manager should operate under the direction of the Plumas Ski Club (a non-profit organization), Eastern Plumas Recreational District (A public entity) or Feather River Community College (a public entity), Management at the PESB could be best organized according to the organizational chart provided in Appendix 5. This organizational structure identifies the different operating departments needed while recognizing the small size of the resort and the limited staff. It is anticipated that one or more of the management positions could be combined into one position at PESB.

Management

The General Manager will be hired as the only year round full time employee at the discretion of the board of the directors. The general manager will oversee all aspects of mountain operations and take on several of the duties of the assistant managers throughout the off season. The GM position should be salaried to provide a “family wage”, such that the GM is able to focus his/her efforts on the operation of the ski hill in a manner that is consistent with the goals and objectives of the PSC and the MOA signatories.

The General Manger will have the responsibility to hire additional personnel as needed. The duties of the General Manager and other mountain personnel are outlined in Appendix 6 (Job duties and responsibilities). The General Manager will perform most of his duties during the season but lead and maintain all other aspects of the operation during the remainder of the year. The General Manager will take on the responsibilities of assistant managers’ duties during slow times. The General Manager must remain focused on tasks that are critical to the continued operation of the resort. The estimated salary structure is outlined in Appendix 7. The rules and policies document is included in Appendix 8

Seasonal workers

The winter season will require that PESB hire seasonal workers at the various positions.

Fundraising and volunteer work

Due to the size of the mountain following the improvements, SE GROUP recommends that Plumas Ski Club initiate the funding activities to raise the additional funds needed for maintenance and working capital. The PSC should continue to operate as a non-profit through public and community support. The income generated from the continued operations of the resort will be used to maintain the facilities and provide for modest improvements.

Operating income

A pro forma statement was generated to illustrate the income and expenses that can be estimated for the continued operations at the resort following the capital improvements. Current industry averages were used to estimate revenue per skier visit, and expenses were estimated depending on labor force estimates and by bringing cost ratios in line with industry averages. Margins on operations were kept in line with the industry at 18 percent.

Plumas Eureka may be able to achieve lower labor cost compared to the rest of the industry due to volunteer involvements and favorable wages. This will be somewhat outweighed by the fact that the operations, as they are outlined in this preferred alternative, will have no capabilities for high margin operations such as rental and retail. Depreciation on capital investment was based on the capital improvements costs as outlined in the capital improvement plan. These costs were significantly higher per skier visit compared to industry averages, in part due to the projected visitor volume at PESB. Please refer to Appendix 9 for the operating pro forma statement.

Task 4 (Targeted Income Group Jobs)

SE GROUP has considered the proposed physical and operational changes and reviewed the prior workforce estimations prepared by the Plumas Eureka Ski Club. Based on our experience and the work completed by the ski club, we have projected the type of jobs/positions, wages and hours worked under the projected capacity (8,640 skier visits per year). The list is an estimate of the positions and personnel needed to run the mountain following the capital improvements. Most positions have been calculated based on working and operating 5 days each week. Position and needs have also been estimated based on a 4 month operating season. Total hours, wages and total labor costs are included in Appendix 10. The total labor costs were compared and adjusted to industry standards based on projected revenue. It is anticipated that only the General Manager would be hired as a full time employee. As a result, the General Manager may also take on one or more of the roles identified as a part-time position (i.e., Marketing Director, On-Snow Assistant Manager).

Conclusion

This report includes the final findings and conclusions of our work for the PESB. This work included four distinct components: a proposed capital improvements plan, an environmental analysis, an operations plan and a targeted income group jobs plan.

The capital improvements plan has gone through several iterations and alternatives. In the end, these changes were made to upgrade the existing facilities to maintain reliable lift service to the ski area and to allow PESB to become a marketable ski area while avoiding an extensive permit process and the initiation of a general plan analysis. The capital improvements plan identifies the critical improvements to the ski area lifts, maintenance facilities and the day lodge, but also represents our efforts to reduce costs for the upgrades and to insure buy-in from State Parks. The process has culminated in Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative (i.e., replacement of the Squaw with a chairlift). SE GROUP has suggested some alternative financing scenarios for making the improvements based on the capital costs throughout the process. It has been made clear that the infrastructure investment in the PESB is unlikely to generate the required return to be attractive for a private investor. Despite this, the resort is likely to generate significant positive cash flow following the improvements. SE GROUP maintains that the ski area should not only be evaluated based on the internal economic benefits but also in terms of the positive effects on the community and the state park in general, along with the numerous secondary benefits to the community. SE GROUP has made suggestions to raise money through grants and local support to fund the initial investments and has made calculations to indicate the amount of grants/donations/equity and debt that has to be generated for the successful implementation of the project. At this time, the project is seeking appropriated state funds for the installation of a new chairlift in the existing Squaw footprint.

The operations plan has been completed with a recommendation as to how the ski area should be operated. As part of this process, SE GROUP evaluated several smaller ski areas that operate as not profit corporations. The completion of our work includes an operational structure, job duties and responsibilities, salary structure and policies. These documents should be used to provide the organizational structure once the new infrastructure improvements are in place. It is important to note that a full-time, experienced manager is needed to implement the changes at PESB and to perpetuate its operation.

SE GROUP has completed the targeted income Group Jobs portion of the assignment. This included a projection of the type of jobs/positions, wages and hours required for operation of the facilities under the projected capacity.

SE GROUP is very excited to see the PESB improvements move forward, and we would like to be part of the project in the future should the opportunity arise. We are confident that the completion of the project as described in Alternative 2 will provide additional recreational opportunities, enhanced awareness of the historic fabric of the area and numerous social and health benefits to the community.

Figure 1 (Alternative 1, no action)




Figure 2 (Alternative 2, replace Squaw lift with chairlift)




Figure 3 (Alternative 3, replace and realign Squaw lift with chairlift)




Figure 4 (Alternative 4, replace and extend Squaw lift with chairlift)





Figure 5 (Visual simulation of alternative 3)



Figure 6 (Map of Mohawk Valley)



Appendix 1 (Capital Improvements Plan)

Capital Improvements Plan (Plumas Eureka ski Bowl)					
RESORT		SPECS	COST/ UNIT	TOTAL COST	TOTAL Investment
Plumas Eureka					
Permits	Permit costs			\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
Lifts	New chairlift			\$ 942,000	\$ 942,000
	Installation			\$ 398,000	\$ 398,000
	Add 250 HP upgrade			\$ 6,200	\$ 6,200
	Add mid station			\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000
Groomer	Acquisition			\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000
Trails	Clear/grub terrain		sum	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000
Buildings	Upgrade existing lodge		sum	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
	New maintenance facility	2000 sf	125	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000
Infrastructure	Diesel Power generator CAT 3456 (500 KW)*		sum	\$ 87,000	\$ 87,000
	Utility corridor	1200 lf	sum	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000
	Water Supply upgrade		sum	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
	Communication upgrade		sum	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000
	Project management		sum	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
	New signs		sum	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
				\$ 1,970,200	\$ 1,970,200
Contingency		5%		\$ 99,000	\$ 99,000
Total				\$ 2,069,200	\$ 2,069,200

Appendix 3 (Generator Cost Estimate)



Power Solutions

3101 East Craig Road
North Las Vegas, Nevada 89030
702.649.8777 tel
702.639.5090 fax

TODAY'S DATE: **December 1, 2005**
QUOTE EXPIRES: **December 28, 2006**
TO:
FROM: **Rebel Hooper**
RE: **455 kw 3456 Electric Set**

Per our conversation, Cashman Power is pleased to offer this proposal to supply a new Caterpillar engine and controls for your genset.

Our package will include all items detailed bill of materials is attached.

Startup and initial building load testing are included. Standard 24-month warranty applies.

Lead times estimated 12-14 weeks ARO.

Thank you for the opportunity to supply this equipment. Please feel free to contact me at (775) 332-2526 if I may be of any further assistance with this project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'R. Hooper', with a stylized flourish at the end.

CASHMAN EQUIPMENT COMPANY
Rebel W Hooper
Power Solutions
775.332.2526

Quantity	Description
1	EMISSIONS
1	60HZ 480 VOLTS
1	STANDBY POWER APPLICATION
1	EMCP TWO PLUS
1	455 EKW W/FAN
1	3456 480/277V 60 HZ
1	CRITICAL SILENCER
1	110 ANNUNCIATOR
1	STANDBY POWER
1	GENSET ISOLATORS
1	FLEXABLE CONNECTOR FOR EXHAUST
1	WSW FUEL TNK BS-300
1	GENERATOR 6134G FRAME PREMIUM
1	6114F FRAME GENERATOR REMOVAL
1	PM GENERATOR
1	GENERATOR RUNNING RELAY
1	DUST-PROOF CONTROL PANEL
1	JACKET WATER HEATER 3KW-240VAC
1	ENGLISH LANGUAGE OPTION
1	SPACE HEATER - 230V
1	CONTROL GP-HEATERS 240V
1	400 AMP 3-POLE FLR STNDG C/B
1	CIR BRKR CABLING KIT-400 AMPS
1	CIR BRKR AUX CONTACTS
1	CURCIT BREAKER 300 AMPS
1	CONTROL PANEL MOUNTING - REAR
1	OVERSIZE BATTERY
1	BATTERY CHARGER-10AMP DUALRATE
1	PAPER PARTS BOOK-IN ENGLISH
1	GENERATOR TEST REPORT

FOB Jobsite for total Quote: \$86,889.00

Quote based upon one line diagram dated and specifications dated.

Cashman Power is a supplier of equipment not a sub-contractor. We do not supply fuel oil piping, offloading, wire conduit installation, installation hardware, insulation or foundation pads **unless listed in our bom**. No other equipment is provided except as listed in the bill of material whether implied or specified.

Fuel for initial fill and startup by others.

Startup and commissioning will commence upon pre-startup checklist completion and inspection of site by Cashman representative to confirm installation is complete.

This unit is Tier 1 EPA/Carb non-road emissions certified. You will have to consult the air board in the county that this unit is to be installed in for possible emissions equipment required. Custom lugs for transfer switches or circuit breakers may incur additional charges.

Restocking charges may apply for cancelled orders.


Appendix 4 (Estimated additional public works contract costs)

Estimated additional public works contract cost	
Direct Cost- Labor, Materials, Contract Bid Prices	100%
Additional costs that should be considered in a public works contract as a percentage of the initial direct costs	
Design Costs	13%
Design Support- Check if subcontractors are required	5%
Contract set up	2%
CEQA Review	5%
Accessibility Review	1%
Cultural Resource Review	5%
Permits Required	3%
Inspection	5%
Service Center Coordination	5%
Admin Overhead	15%
Total cost above contract bid price (percentage)	59%

Appendix 5 (Non-Profit Ski Areas)

Non profit ski areas (US)
Alpenglow Ski Area, Anchorage, AK. Operated by Anchorage Ski Club (non profit).
Black Mt. of Maine, Rumford, ME. Operated by Maine Winter Sports Center (non-profit)
Camden Snow Bowl, Camden, ME. Operated by a concessionaire (profit)
Ski Cooper, Leadville, CO. Operated by a local community (non profit)
Dartmouth Skiway, Hanover, NH Operated by Dartmouth College (profit)
Hickory Hills, Traverse City, MI. Operated by the City of Traverse City
Hilltop Ski Area, Anchorage, AK. Operated by local non profit
Hogadon Ski Area, Casper, WY. Operated by the City of Casper
Howelsen Hill, Steamboat Springs, CO. Operated by the City of Steamboat Springs
Leavenworth Ski Hill, Leavenworth, WA. Operated by the community (non-profit)
McIntyre Ski Area, Manchester, NH Operated by the City of Manchester
Mt Ashland Ski Area, Ashland, OR. Operated by a non-profit
Mt. Eyak Ski Area, Cordova, AK. Operated by local group of community volunteers
Mt. Spokane Ski Area, Spokane, WA. Operated by a non-profit.
Porcupine Mountain Ski Area. Operated by Michigan State Parks

Appendix 6 (Organizational Chart)



Appendix 7 (Job Duties & Responsibilities)

General Manager

Job Duties & Responsibilities

- Oversee all operations
- Work directly under the supervision of the Board of Directors
- Set rules and policies. Working closely with the Board of Directors
- Implement rules and policies for employees and ensure that all employees and management are adhering to rules and policies
- Utilize and manage funds & resources in their best interest
- Give staffing authorization to Senior Managers
- Directly supervise all senior managers
- Conduct meetings with senior managers and staff
- Keep website up to date
- Be official spokesperson
- Put together monthly budgets for fiscal year
- Final responsibility of financial statements

Food & Beverage Manager

Job Duties & Responsibilities

- Supervise all operations of cafeteria
- Work directly under the supervision of the General Manager
- Directly supervise & motivate kitchen and cafeteria staff
- Train staff in customer service, cleanliness, delivery of food and drink to the customer, proper handling of food, cash register use, and balancing of sales
- Supervise proper balancing of Coin Safe
- Ensure that front-end employees are following proper inventory procedures
- Manage, co-ordinate and execute catering and other events
- Work closely with Marketing Manager to organize and conduct entertainment at the mountain
- Accept applications or resumes for prospective employees and conduct interviews
- Ensure all training is arranged and completed with new employees
- Keep track of and submit hours of all employees to Financial Administrator/ Office Manager
- Work closely with the General Manager to ensure cash controls & systems are working efficiently and accurately
- Ensure all equipment is maintained and cleaned when needed
- Make sure food and bar standards & duties are clearly outlined and maintained
- Listen to customer concerns and deal with them appropriately
- Perform all ordering and receiving functions dealing with cafeteria
- Make sure adequate resources and supplies are kept up (dealing with food)
- Maintain contact and dealings with suppliers (dealing with food)

- Maintain contact and dealings with maintenance companies (dealing with food)
- Submit all invoices to Financial Administrator/Office Manager for payment
- Perform all paperwork necessary for food & bar
- Perform all other duties as kitchen and cafeteria staff

Cook

Job Responsibilities & Duties

- Work directly under the supervision of the Food and Beverage Manager
- Cook/Prepare food for purchase by customers
- Keep the back end of the kitchen neat & tidy at all times
- Adhere to all food sanitation requirements as set out by manager
- Clean all equipment, counters, floors, etc. and ensure all food is put away before the end of shift
- When not busy, clean equipment and complete any possible food preparation in advance
- Ensure coolers and freezers are well stocked with product that is needed for the day at the beginning of shift
- Inform supervisor of any food or supplies that need to be ordered or are running low
- Follow proper inventory procedures as outlined by supervisor
- Follow proper recording policies of wastage, spillage and breakage as outlined by supervisor

Assistant Manager (Lifts/Operations)

Job Duties & Responsibilities

- Work directly under the supervision of the General Manager
- Directly supervise Groomer/Mechanic, lift supervisor, Parking Lot & Janitorial Staff.
- Ensure that Road and parking is maintained as needed (ie: snowplowing, sanding, gravel, ditching, etc.)
- Keep General Manager informed of any major activities on the hill
- Maintain water and wastewater systems
- Accept applications or resumes for prospective employees and conduct interviews
- Pass applications or resumes of supervisory staff to GM (with recommendations) for final approval. Ensure all training is arranged and completed
- Make sure adequate supplies and resources needed for operations are kept up
- Maintain contact and dealings with suppliers (related to Operations)
- Maintain contact and dealings with maintenance companies (related to Operations)
- Forward all invoices to Financial Administrator/Office Manager for payment

Groomer/Mechanic

Job Duties & Responsibilities

- Work directly under the supervision of the Assistant Manager (lift operations)
- Perform all maintenance and necessary repairs on all lifts and log

- Perform all maintenance and necessary repairs on all mountain motor vehicles and log
- Be available during shift at any time for lift problems
- Keep communication with Assistant Manager
- Make sure that all snowmobiles are in proper working order and ready to go
- Inform lift supervisor of any problems with lift they should know about
- Follow all snowmobile safety policies of the mountain
- Ensure that all safety rules are adhered to while operating groomer
- Work with Assistant Manager and other grooming staff to ensure that grooming is done with the most efficiency and safety
- Make sure you follow all checks with equipment at beginning and end of shift
- Complete grooming log at end of shift
- Make sure any riders are approved with the Assistant Manager
- Make sure that ski patrollers keep trails closed while grooming when hill is open

Lift Supervisor

Job Responsibilities & Duties

- Work directly under the supervision of the Assistant Manager (lifts/operations)
- Directly supervise all lift operators
- Schedule and track all hours worked by lift operators
- Submit all hours worked by lift operators to the Assistant Manager
- Work closely with the Risk Manager to ensure safety standards are met and maintained within department
- Ensure that a proper training program is in place for lift operators
- All other duties as a lift operator

Lift Operator

Job Responsibilities & Duties

- Work directly under the supervision of the lift supervisor
- Assist customers in getting on lift
- Keep lift loading area clean of excess snow
- Ensure customers can see stop line
- Make sure all lanes and ropes are in place before opening and monitor throughout the day
- Check every lift ticket and season pass for validity
- Make sure skis and boards have a safety strap or brakes
- Know and properly administer shut down procedures when people are working in or around the lift
- Slow down lift when small children or beginners need it slower
- Inform lift supervisor of any apparent problems with lift
- Make sure lift-loading area is kept neat and clean
- Inform supervisor of any problems or situations (with equipment, products or

Parking Lot Staff

Job Responsibilities & Duties

- Work directly under the supervision of the Assistant Manager (lifts/operations)
- Clean up all debris and garbage from parking lot at the beginning of shift
- Ensure that all customers entering our parking lot are guided to a parking spot
- Make sure barriers and signs are placed properly at beginning of day
- Assist customers with equipment, stuck vehicles, etc. whenever possible
- Point customers in the right direction
- Be available for other duties around the lodge when time permits

Janitorial Services

Job Responsibilities & Duties

- Work directly under the supervision of the Assistant Manager (lifts/operations)
- Keep lodge vacuumed and garbage free
- Ensure floors are kept clean by sweeping and mopping daily
- Keep windows clean and streak free
- Empty trash receptacles when bag 2/3 full
- Keep grounds surrounding lodge garbage free
- Ensure bathrooms are kept clean and tidy at all times checking toilet paper, paper towels, soap, air fresheners, and insect controls so that they always have ample supply
- Perform all dusting as necessary
- Ensure that entrances are safe and salted
- Must be available for other cleaning duties around the lodge when needed

Assistant Manager (On Snow)

Job Responsibilities & Duties

- Work directly under the supervision of the General Manager
- Supervise and organize all staff that relates to activities on the mountain i.e.: Ski/Board instructors, Ski patrol, Groups, Rental and Repair shop employees
- Co-ordinate all activities on the mountain pertaining to these departments
- Set up and maintain all programs, activities, & sessions pertaining to ski school
- Update programs and camps every season working under the supervision and direction of the Assistant Manager (lift/operations)
- Accept applications or resumes for prospective employees and conduct interviews
- Pass applications or resumes for supervisor positions to GM
- Ensure all training is arranged and completed with new employees
- Ensure that all pertinent staff is aware and trained of ski school operations
- Keep track of and submit hours of all employees to Financial Administrator/Office Manager
- Make sure that there is sufficient equipment and supplies for operation of ski school i.e.: rental equipment, helmets, lesson tools, etc.
- Maintain close relationship with Plumas Eureka ski club and racing programs to ensure that there are no conflicts of interest dealing with items such as trail usage

- Acquire and organize any instructor courses

Snow School Supervisor

Job Responsibilities & Duties

- Work directly under the supervision of the Assistant Manager (On Snow)
- Supervise & organize all ski and snowboard instructors
- Interview, hire and provide orientation for instructors
- Co-ordinate full time instructor schedules with Risk Manager to ensure the full time instructors are kept busy during slow times
- Provide a detailed yearly staff schedule to director
- Co-ordinate with guest services for lesson times and instructors
- Provide a yearly detailed Professional Development schedule for all snow school staff
- Have instructor assignments pre-arranged before program, camps, etc. begin
- Schedule and keep track of instructor hours and submit them to supervisor
- Hold instructor meetings

Ski/Board Instructor

Job Responsibilities & Duties

- Work directly under the supervision of the Snow School Supervisor
- Ensure that you are a valid instructor for any lessons that you give
- Make sure instructor's license is up to date
- Provide lessons for new skiers/boarders or skiers/boarders that want to improve their skill level
- Ensure communication with supervisor for lesson times
- Know the proper procedures for school groups and programs
- Know proper procedures for injured customers
- Ensure that customer's equipment is working properly before the lesson
- Instruct customers of proper lift loading and unloading

Risk Manager/Head Ski Patroller

Job Responsibilities & Duties

- Work directly under the supervision of the Assistant Manager (On Snow)
- Directly supervise all paid and volunteer ski patrollers
- Schedule, track and submit hours of paid patrollers to the Assistant Manager (on Snow)
- Take initiative to ensure that our customers are as safe as possible with regard to trail, lodge and grounds safety
- Ensure that proper signage, bamboos, ribbon, safety equipment etc. is available and put up on trails where needed
- Ensure that you are properly qualified to be a patroller
- Know all radio codes and procedures
- Make sure that the hill and lifts are safe before opening
- Work closely with Assistant Manager to ensure risk management standards are met

- Complete daily logs in all departments
- Implement and maintain/update a risk management plan
- Document concerns of the insurance carrier and address all these concerns
- Report all accidents of a serious nature to the insurance carrier without delay
- All other duties as ski patroller

Ski Patroller

Job Responsibilities & Duties

- Work directly under the supervision of the Head Ski Patroller
- Ensure that you are properly qualified to be a patroller
- Make sure that the hill and lifts are safe before opening
- Work closely with Risk Manager to ensure risk management standards are met
- Ensure all trails swept at the end of the day
- Make sure that hill is covered while on break
- Ensure that skiers/boarders on the large hill have skill enough to be there
- Discipline any skier/boarder who are endangering other skiers/boarders
- Put bamboo sticks, signage etc. in front of danger areas
- Make sure lift towers; power poles, etc. have mats in place
- Ensure all warning signs are visible, free of snow and legible
- Inform Risk Manager of any danger area you cannot deal with
- Make sure helmet, safety strap, and binding brake rules are enforced
- Do not allow skiers/boarders to ski/board on unmarked or closed trails
- Ensure closed trail signs are clearly visible
- Know the exact procedures for lift evacuations

Financial Administrator/Office Manager

Job Duties & Responsibilities

- Perform all accounting and financial duties as they pertain to the business
- Work directly under the supervision of the General Manager
- Directly supervise sales staff
- Place coin orders and manage safe floats
- Complete all deposits and perform all other banking functions such as the management of cash and liquid assets, balancing bank statements etc.
- Ensure financials are complete and up to date
- Maintain contact & relationships with creditors and credit customers
- Keep collections kept up to date
- Perform all necessary payroll functions
- Maintain working relationship with General Manager
- Maintain non-disclosure of company financial information
- Ensure that staff members adhere to rules and policies
- Work directly under the supervision of the Office Manager
- Answer all incoming phone calls
- Answer questions and provide information to customers on all areas of the ski resort

- Process day tickets and season passes.
- Perform other general office duties including: opening and sorting mail, filing, mailing out documents, ensure the correct person receives the proper documents or messages you receive over the phone, in the mail or from drop in customers
- Perform daily deposits and cash management.
- Assist the office manager in various aspects of office duties as required

Marketing Manager

Job Responsibilities & Duties

- Acquire business and visitors through appropriate marketing and advertising venues
- Identify creative and new activities and events to attract new and repeat business from families, corporations, school groups, organizations.
- Work directly under the supervision of the General Manager
- Ensure the Marketing Assistant keeps the website information, including events calendar and daily picture, up to date
- Work closely with all other managers in organizing events and activities
- Coordinate with all necessary departments on any events/activities that pertain to them
- Co-ordinate on site entertainment including live bands and other special events
- Sell Chair Signs, Tower Banners, and other on site advertising
- Stay within advertising and marketing budgets as outlined by the General Manager
- Ensure all advertising is maintained and as per contract
- Maintain working relationship with media outlets
- Create and maintain partnerships with Sports Stores and Hotels/Motels
- Create partnerships with sport and wellness groups to promote Plumas Eureka as a venue for healthy, active living

Guest Services

Job Responsibilities & Duties

- Work directly under the supervision of Marketing Manager
- Sell Lift Tickets, Ski & Board Lessons, Rentals, and other products and services
- Be well informed of all ski & board programs to serve the customer better
- Work closely with the Snow School Supervisor
- Conduct cash outs at end of shift
- Balance cash at beginning and end of shift
- Replenish cash at beginning of shift
- Keep work area clean and tidy at all times

Appendix 8 (Jobs and Salaries)

See appendix 11 for total hours and wages.

Administration:

General Manager	F/T	1	\$30,000 per year + up to 10% bonus
Food & Beverage Manager	F/T	1	\$10,000 per year (from Dec. 15-Apr 15)
Assistant Mgr (Lifts/Op)	F/T	1	\$15,000 per year (from Aug. 1-July 1)
Assistant Mgr (On Snow)	F/T	1	Paid per hour from Dec. 15 Apr. 15
Financial Adm/Office Mgr	P/T	1	Paid per hour from Dec. 15 Apr. 15
Marketing Manager	P/T	1	Paid per hour from Dec. 15 Apr. 15

General Mountain Operations:

Groomer/Mechanic	F/T	1	Paid per hour from Dec. 15 Apr. 15
Lift Supervisor	F/T	1	Paid per hour from Dec. 15 Apr. 15
Lift Operators	P/T	3	Paid per hour from Dec. 15 Apr. 15
Parking Lot Staff	P/T	1	Paid per hour from Dec. 15 Apr. 15
Janitors	P/T	1	Paid per hour from Dec. 15 Apr. 15
Snow School Supervisor	F/T	1	Paid per hour from Dec. 15 Apr. 15
Ski/board instructors	P/T	1	Paid per hour from Dec. 15 Apr. 15
Risk Manager/ Head ski	F/T	1	Paid per hour from Dec. 15 Apr. 15
Paid Patrollers	P/T	1	Paid per hour from Dec. 15 Apr. 15
Volunteer Patrollers	P/T	10	\$0
Guest Services Staff	P/T	3	Paid per hour from Dec. 15 Apr. 15
Cooks	F/T	1	Paid per hour from Dec. 15 Apr. 15

Appendix 9 (Mountain Rules & Policies)

The following rules and policies have been established for the PESB. Every employee and manager must read, sign and date this document as a condition of hiring.

Chain of Command

Any employee must report directly to their supervisor as stated in their job duties. Any questions/concerns should be directed to supervisor, then a senior manager

Shift trades must be approved by supervisor or a senior manager

Grievances are handled through the following levels: 1) immediate supervisor 2) senior manager 3) General Manager.

Overtime must be pre-approved by supervisor

Supervisors must be informed of any information from an employee that would affect his or her job duties or responsibilities

Employees must notify their supervisor immediately if they will be late or absent from work

No employee can discuss Mountain issues with any media unless previously approved by the General Manager

Pay & Benefits

Employees will be paid every 2 weeks on the following Friday.

Overtime is paid at a rate of 150 percent normal wage per hour

Employees must punch in and out for their shifts. Any employee who forgets to punch in or out must get their supervisor or manager on duty to write in their time and initial it.

Employees are eligible for 50% discount on food and coffee

Employees should leave the best parking for our customers.

Health & Safety

No smoking inside lodge, groomer or other facilities

Sexual harassment of any kind will not be tolerated

Employees working in food areas are not permitted to eat while working.

Employees must conduct themselves safely in accordance with safety standards

Employees must represent the mountain in a respectful and mature manner

Helmets must be worn at all times when operating ATVs or Snowmobiles

Termination

Management reserves the right to dismiss an employee within 90 days of hiring without notice if they do not meet the required job requirements

An employee may be terminated without notice for the following violations:

- Being absent for a shift without just cause
- Being under the influence of illegal drugs or alcohol while working
- Stealing from the company
- Gross misconduct with customers, supervisors, or other employees

Appendix 10 (Operating Pro Forma Statement)

Operating Proforma Statement (Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl)									
Visits				Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	
1	Skier Visits			6,480	7,560	8,100	8,640	8,640	
2	Mountain Capacity			600	600	600	600	600	
3	Base Area Capacity			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4	Utilization*			12%	14%	15%	16%	16%	
5	Days of Operation**			90	90	90	90	90	
6	Previous Season Skier Visits				6,480	7,560	8,100	8,640	
7	Ticket Price		25	25.00	26.00	26.00	27.00	27.00	
Revenues		Rev/skier visit***	Estimate						
8	Tickets	24.51	90%	\$ 150,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 210,000	\$ 210,000	
9	Snowplay and other winter op	1.18		\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	
10	Lessons	3.06		\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	
11	Food and beverage	21.52	18	\$ 120,000	\$ 140,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 160,000	\$ 160,000	
12	Retail stores	2.99							
13	Rental Shops	5.54							
14	Accommodations lodging	24.09							
15	Other gross	10.01							
16	Total	92.90	46	\$ 300,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 370,000	\$ 410,000	\$ 410,000	
	Fraction of industry rev/skier	0.50							
Expenses		Exp/skier visit***	Estimate						
17	Cost of goods	8.38							
18	Direct labor	25.34							
19	Other direct	15.71							
20	Payroll taxes	0.59							
21	Property operation	2.96							
22	General and administrative	10.73							
23	Marketing/advertisement	4.89							
24	Insurance	2.77							
25	Land use fees	3.24							
26	Property/other taxes	1.43							
27	Total Expenses	76.04	38	\$ 250,000	\$ 290,000	\$ 310,000	\$ 330,000	\$ 330,000	
28	Operating Margin	16.86	8.40	\$ 50,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	
29		0.18	0.18						
30	NSAA dep (incl leases and in	11.41	9.26						
31	Depreciation (30)			\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	
32	Interest Exp %			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
33	Operating income (before taxes)			\$ (10,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	
34	Add depreciation and interest			\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	
35	Operating cash flow			\$ 50,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	
* Industry utilization by size = 25.4%. Industry utilization by region by Size = 32.6%									
** December 15 to april 15 = 4 months (120 days)									
*** Industry averages (Pacific West) NSAA Economic Analysis (Table 2C and 10C)									

Appendix 11 (Total Hours and Wages)

Total Hours and Wages (Plumas Eureka Ski Bowl)						
Administration						
	Position	#	Hours*	Salary/hour	Total	Description of work schedule
General Manager	F/T	1	1800	17	30600	Full time. More hours during season
Food & Beverage Manager	F/T	1	640	13	8320	Five days/week for four months
Assistant Mgr (Lifts/Op)	F/T	1	960	15	14400	Five days/ week for 5 months
Assistant Mgr (On Snow)	F/T	1	640	13	8320	Five days/week for four months
Financial Adm/Office Mgr	P/T	1	480	13	6240	Part time as needed for four months
Marketing Manager	P/T	1	480	13	6240	Part time as needed for four months
General Mountain Operations						
Groomer/Mechanic	F/T	1	640	13	8320	Five days/week for four months
Lift Supervisor	F/T	1	640	10	6400	Five days/week for four months
Lift Operators**	P/T	2	640	8	10240	5 positions part time.
Parking Lot Staff	P/T	1	128	5	640	One person for weekends and holidays
Janitors	P/T	1	128	8	1024	One person for weekends/week
Snow School Supervisor	F/T	1	640	7	4480	Part time as needed for four months
Ski/board instructors	P/T	2	480	6	5760	Part time as needed for four months
Risk Manager/ Head ski	F/T	1	640	14	8960	Part time as needed for four months
Paid Patrollers	P/T	1	320	8	2560	Part time as needed for four months
Volunteer Patrollers	P/T	5			0	Part time as needed for four months
Guest Services Staff	P/T	3	192	7	4032	Part time as needed for four months
Cooks	F/T	1	640	8	5120	Part time as needed for four months
Base salary wage estimate					130000	
Workers comp/health insurance						
Employee cost increase (State pr	25%				30000	
Total estimated employment compensation					160000	
*Approximate (full time =2080 hours/year)						
**Two lift operators needed to run lifts with supervisor.						