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## CCUP21-0001 Exhibit C: Aerial Map
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Note:
The meridian of this survey is identical to that of
TAHOE PARADISE UNIT № 18 .
All Distances on curved lines are chord measurement.
All 10 corners and curve points hove capped iron pipes
least $3 / 4$ " diameter stamped "R. C. E. 7400 ".
This map is filed for the purpose of amending the Map
of TAHOE PARADISE, UNIT № I8A, filed in the office of
the Recorder of EI Dorado County in Book D of Maps,
Map $\mathrm{N}^{\circ} 53$.
The leach field easement shown hereon is for the exclusive
benefit of TAHOE PARADISE PROPERTIES, INC., and will
cease to exist when public sewers are available in this
location.
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## JOHN D'AGOSTINI

SHERIFF - CORONER - PUBLIC ADMINISTRATOR $\operatorname{COII}$ APR | $\mid$ AM $11: 54$
COUNTY OF EL DORADO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

04/06/2022
Aaron Mount
EDC Planning and Building Dept.
2850 Fairlane Court, Building C
Placerville, CA 95667
The El Dorado Sheriff's Office has completed the interim background review for Embarc Myers LLC CCUP21-0001 for a Commercial Cannabis Use Permit. The Sheriff's Office has determined the applicant(s) meets the minimum requirements for this portion of the application process (Pending our ability to conduct Live Scans to confirm the applicant(s) criminal history). The El Dorado County Sheriff's Office currently recommends the El Dorado County Planning and Building Department to continue with Embarc Myers LLC CCUP21-0001 commercial cannabis permit application.

The following persons have met the minimum criteria for the position as set forth in County Code Section 130.41.100 (15)(G), 130.41.100(4)(G) and Section 26057 of the California Business and Professions Code.

## Lauren Carpenter - Owner 90\%, Dustin Moore - Spouse <br> Gregory Daum - Owner 10\%, Carol Daum - Spouse

If you have any questions, please contact the El Dorado County Sheriff's Office Cannabis unit at 530-642-4723.

Sincerely,
JOHN D'AGOSTINI
Sheriff-Coroner
Public Administrator
By:


Captain Tasha Thompson
El Dorado County Sheriff's Office Commercial Cannabis Background Unit 530-642-4723

Headquarters • 200 Industrial Drive • Placerville, CA 95667 • 530-621-5655 • Fax 530-626-8163 Jail Division • 300 Fomi Road • Placerville, CA 95667 • 530-621-6000 • Fax 530-626-9472
Tahoe Patrol - 1360 Johnson Blvd., Suite $100 \cdot$ South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150 - 530-573-3000 - Fax 530-544-6809
Tahoe Jail • 1051 Al Tahoe Blvd. • South Lake Tahoe, CA $96150 \cdot 530-573-3031 \cdot$ Fax 530-541-6721
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## CCUP21-0001 Exhibit L

130.41.100.4.F. 13 The security plan for the operation that includes adequate lighting, security video cameras with a minimum camera resolution of 1080 pixels and 360 degree coverage, alarm systems, and secure area for cannabis storage. The security plan shall include a requirement that there be at least 90 calendar days of surveillance video (that captures both inside and outside images) stored on an ongoing basis and made available to the County upon request. The County may require real-time access of the surveillance video for the Sheriff's Office. The video system for the security cameras must be located in a locked, tamper-proof compartment. The security plan shall remain confidential.

## CCUP21-0001 Exhibit M

## Memorandum

To: Lauren Silberman<br>Director of Operations - Embarc<br>From: Stephen Dillon, EIT<br>Matt Weir, P.E., T.E., PTOE, RSP 1<br>Re: Embarc Meyers - DRAFT Transportation Review<br>Date: October 15, 2021

This evaluation was performed in accordance with the Scopes of Services commonly required by El Dorado County, and in a manner consistent with El Dorado County Community Development Agency's Transportation Impact Study Guidelines ${ }^{1}$.

## Project Description

The project proposes to repurpose an existing commercial building located at 3008 US-50 in South Lake Tahoe, California as a marijuana dispensary. Access to the site is provided via one existing driveway along US-50 (see Exhibit 1).

## Trip Generation

The number of trips anticipated to be generated by the proposed project was approximated using data included in the Trip Generation Manual, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The County has specified ITE Retail Land Use Codes as appropriate for use in assessing the site, specifically Land Use Code 882 (Marijuana Dispensary). As this Land Use code was subject to small sample size variability, you also provided internal operational data from comparable Embarc business locations currently in operation in Northern California.

## On-Site Transportation Review

In accordance with the County's Guidelines, the following aspects of the proposed project were evaluated:

1. Existence of any current traffic problems in the local area such as a high-accident location, nonstandard intersection or roadway, or an intersection in need of a traffic signal
According to the County's 2018 Annual Accident Location Study ${ }^{2}$, there were no accidents in the vicinity of the site during a three-year period between January 1, 2016, and December 31, 2018.

Through review of the site driveway and surrounding area it was determined that there are no "non-standard intersection or roadway" facilities in the general project area.
2. Proximity of proposed site driveway(s) to other driveways or intersections

Access to the site is provided at one existing driveway along US-50. A detailed description of the site access point is as follows:

One full-movement driveway is existing along US-50, located approximately 500 feet northeast of the Meyers Work Center-Forest Service driveway and approximately 100 feet southwest of the

[^0]neighboring Chevron driveway. The site driveway is approximately 800 feet northeast of Apache Avenue and approximately 700 feet southwest of the Santa Fe Road/Apache Avenue intersection. The proximity of the existing driveway to both Apache Avenue and the Santa Fe Road/Apache Avenue intersections satisfies County spacing requirements for an arterial as defined in their design standards ${ }^{3}$ (250-feet minimum offset). The existing driveway also satisfies County driveway spacing requirements for adjacent properties per design standards. The existing fullmovement driveway is located directly across from a parking lot entrance for the Tahoe Paradise Golf Course.

## 3. Adequacy of vehicle parking relative to both the anticipated demand and zoning code requirements

According to the County's requirements ${ }^{4}$, the proposed project is required to have eight (8) total parking spaces assuming one story of the building is utilized at 1,893 SF active use area and 512 SF of storage. As noted in the Exhibit 2, ten (10) surface parking spaces are proposed to be provided (including one (1) handicap accessible space). For the purposes of this assessment, the handicap accessible space is ignored, and available parking is treated as nine (9) spaces, which satisfies County requirements. For a conservative assessment of the site, three (3) employees are assumed to park on-site during both the AM and PM peak-hour periods, effectively reducing available parking for customers during both peak-hours to six (6) spaces. Embarc company policy calls for employees to park off-site, an arrangement potentially achieved via coordination with the property owner who owns and operates properties adjacent to the Project site.

Preliminary correspondence with you assumed arriving vehicles to have an average transaction time of 12 minutes. Additional data provided for existing sites in operation shows average transaction times closer to 5 minutes. Parking operations were analyzed for three transaction time conditions: 5 minutes, 12 minutes, and 8.5 minutes (the average of both). Parking capacity findings are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 - Parking Capacity Summary

|  |  | Arrivals/Period |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Effective \# <br> Spaces* | Transaction <br> Time/Space <br> (min) | Transactions/ <br> Space/Hour | Space <br> Capacity/Hr | AM Peak <br> Hour | PM Peak <br> Hour |
| 6 | 5 | 12 | 72 | 18 | 34 |
| 6 | 8.5 | 7 | 42 | 18 | 34 |
| 6 | 12 | 5 | 30 | 18 | 34 |

*10 spaces provided on site less 1 handicap accessible, 3 assumed employee parking -Orange indicates Arrivals > Space Capacity

Table 1 shows that, over the course of an hour, assuming a uniform arrival of customers, each of the six available spaces conservatively assumed to be available are anticipated to accommodate between five to twelve transactions per hour depending on the transaction time. This finding is equivalent to the parking lot being able to handle between 30-72 customers over the course of an hour. The project is anticipated to generate 18 arrivals and 34 arrivals during the AM and PM peak-hour periods respectively per ITE Land Use 889. Taking the average transaction time of 8

[^1]minutes 30 seconds per customer shows that the parking lot can reasonably be expected to accommodate customer arrivals. Under the aforementioned parameters, the parking lot's 42customer effective capacity is sufficient to handle the maximum (PM) peak-hour customer demand.

## 4. Adequacy of the project site design to fully satisfy truck loading demand on-site, when the anticipated number of deliveries and service calls may exceed 10 per day

Ten or more deliveries to the project site are not anticipated based on the project land uses. As a result, the project site depicted in Exhibit 2 appears to be designed to satisfy the anticipated loading demand on-site. The largest vehicle anticipated to access the site in future conditions is a delivery van. Project vehicles should utilize available parking during loading/unloading operations and should avoid blocking parking spaces/drive aisles. Loading/unloading operations should occur during off-peak hour periods.

## 5. Adequacy of the project site design to provide at least a 25-feet minimum required throat depth (MRTD) at project driveways. Include calculation of the MRTD.

The proposed project site driveway has an existing throat depth distance of approximately 65feet. Queueing at the site driveway was assessed using Synchro 10 software and combining ITE generated project volumes with background volumes on US-50 from Caltrans. The results of this analysis for both AM and PM peak hour project volumes are provided in Appendix A. The available throat depth is considered adequate as analyzed trip arrival and departure patterns are not anticipated to generate queues beyond one vehicle length ( $25-\mathrm{ft}$ ). As queue lengths are not anticipated to exceed one vehicle length ( $25-\mathrm{ft}$ ), project operations are not anticipated to obstruct pedestrian operations proximate to the site.

## 6. Adequacy of the project site design to convey all vehicle types

The site is anticipated to accommodate the circulation needs of all vehicle types that will be accessing the facility. The largest vehicles anticipated to access the site will be delivery vans. In the absence of delivery vans, the largest anticipated vehicle will be passenger vehicles.

## 7. Adequacy of sight distance on-site

Existing sight distance was considered for the existing site access driveway intersection. These evaluations are performed in accordance with the guidelines presented in the Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, published by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), and the Highway Design Manual, published by Caltrans. The posted speed limit on US-50 immediately fronting the project site is 40 MPH . Per AASHTO, the required intersection site distances are 445-feet and 385-feet for left and right turns respectively from the site driveway, reflected in Exhibit 3. Driveway sight distance is considered to be adequate. In all cases, roadside vegetation should be maintained to preserve sight distance. In addition, according to the project site plan (Exhibit 2) there appears to be adequate sight distance on-site to facilitate safe and orderly circulation.

## 8. Emergency Vehicle Access

As the project involves repurposing an existing building, it is anticipated that the existing parking lot and site configurations are sufficient to handle emergency access should it prove necessary.

## 9. Deliveries of Goods and Services

Deliveries of product for sale to the site will occur 2 times per week. Trips for disposing of product will occur once per month. The Client is planning to operate up to two delivery vehicles to service approximately 20 in-home deliveries per day at full capacity. Deliveries are anticipated
to be executed using permitted employee vehicles under Opening Day/Near Term conditions with delivery vans potentially being utilized in the future.

## 10. Access to Public Transit Services

There are no public transit services that currently operate proximate to the proposed redevelopment site. There is a school bus stop in operation that has a scheduled stop across the street from the existing project driveway.

## 11. Accommodation of Non-Motorized Transportation

An existing shared use bike/pedestrian path runs in front of the proposed redevelopment site. The analysis (Appendix A) shows that as queue lengths are not anticipated to exceed one vehicle length ( $25-\mathrm{ft}$ ), project operations are not anticipated to obstruct pedestrian operations proximate to the site.

## CEQA/SB 743 Assessment

This section documents a SB 743 compliant analysis completed for the proposed project. The project is expected to consist of a 3,050 square-foot dispensary located along US-50 in Meyers. With the passage of SB 743, Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) has become an important indicator for determining if new development will result in a "significant transportation impact" under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This section summarizes the VMT analysis and resultant findings for the proposed cannabis dispensary.

## Methodology and Assumptions

Based on the land use information provided, for the purposes of the VMT analysis and the determination of transportation related significant impacts, the project was considered to be "retail."

The Project is located within the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's (TRPA) geographical boundaries rather than the geographical boundaries covered by the El Dorado County Travel Demand Model (EDC TDM). Therefore, the principal tool used to analyze the proposed Project was TRPA's VMT estimation tool ${ }^{5}$. TRPA's VMT estimation tool is a web-based tool that uses land use type, size of project, location of project, and whether the project is replacing an existing use to estimate the Project's transportation impact on the surrounding roadway network.

TRPA's VMT estimation tool uses the basic land use categories contained within the Trip Generation Manual, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). While the trip generation manual contains information on cannabis dispensaries, TRPA's VMT estimation tool does not include this category, but it does provide for the ability for the user to enter a unique land use and its respective trip generation rate. However, it was determined that the proposed Project should be considered as a retail land use rather than a cannabis dispensary due to the limited number of studies contained within the Trip Generation Manual, the limitation of these sites providing analogous data to the proposed Project (urban vs suburban context, proximity to legalization date, limited number of competing sites), and the data provided by the proposed Project's applicant showing trip rates that are analogous to general retail.

Trip generation data for two existing cannabis dispensaries operated by the proposed Project's applicant were used to compare their trip generation to a general retail of similar size. As shown in Table 2, both existing sites produce fewer trips overall than a similarly sized general retail store. In addition, as the existing dispensary in Alameda is a similar context to the proposed Project, a suburban location with most
${ }^{5}$ TRPA Project Impact Analysis Tool. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. https://trpa.shinyapps.io/PIA Tool/. Accessed October 14, 2021.
customers driving to the store, the Alameda location's trip rate was used to project the number of trips produced by the proposed Project. As shown in Table 2, the proposed project would still produce fewer daily trips than a similarly sized general retail store. Therefore, it was deemed appropriate to use general retail as the land use for the proposed Project when analyzing it using TRPA's VMT estimation tool.

Table 2 - Daily, AM peak-hour, and PM peak-hour Trip Generation of Operating Embarc Dispensaries

| Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | GFA (KSF) | Daily | AM | PM |
| South Lake Tahoe | 1.61 | 170.80 | 3.83 | 45.49 |
| Shopping Center (820) |  | 363.10 | 152.59 | 25.62 |
| Alameda | 1.34 | 225.50 | 4.60 | 61.07 |
| Shopping Center (820) |  | 320.22 | 152.45 | 22.34 |
| Meyers* | 3.05 | 513.26 | 10.47 | 139.00 |
| Shopping Center (820) |  | 560.20 | 153.31 | 41.07 |

*Trip Generation Rates applied from Alameda given anticipated comparable customer vehicle usage

## Quantitative Analysis

As noted in the previous section, TRPA's VMT estimation tool was used to estimate the VMT impact of the proposed project. The proposed Project is planning to utilize an existing building that as of January 2021 operated a CrossFit gym. The gym used all 6,000 square-feet (two floors) of the existing building while the proposed Project is only planning to use the ground floor of the building, or 3,050 square-feet. The location of the building, the proposed Project's details (retail land use and 3,050 square-feet), and the existing use's details (health and fitness club land use and 6,000 square-feet) were input into the tool and the tool was run.

The results of the analysis are shown are summarized in the output report provided here as Appendix $B$. The proposed Project is estimated to have gross VMT of 550 while the existing site is estimated to have a VMT of 1,117 . Therefore, the proposed Project is screened from having to mitigate any impact as it is shown to result in a net decrease in VMT compared to the existing use.

## Qualitative Analysis

Page 16 of the Technical Advisory specifically addresses some of the key issues surrounding how a local serving retail store, should be evaluated in terms of its VMT impact. As described, the threshold for significance is "a net increase." This means that if a proposed store produces one additional VMT, it would result in a finding of significance. However, the document further explains that local retail stores in can be determined to result in an overall VMT reduction by the lead agency. This is consistent with the desire to develop more sustainable communities that have fewer transportation impacts.

Local commercial uses primarily serve pre-existing needs (i.e. they do not generate new trips because they meet existing demand). Because of this, local commercial uses can be presumed to reduce trip lengths when a new store is proposed. Essentially, the assumption is that someone will travel to a newly constructed cannabis dispensary because of a its proximity, rather than the proposed dispensary fulfilling an unmet need (i.e. the person had an existing need that was met by a dispensary located further away and is now traveling to the new dispensary because it is closer to the person's origin location). This results in an existing trip on the roadway network becoming shorter, rather than a new trip being added to the roadway network which results in an impact to the overall transportation system. Conversely, residential and office land uses often drive new trips given that they introduce new participants to the transportation system. However, a cannabis dispensary does not truly generate new trips that are added
to the transportation system. As such, this means that the impact to the transportation system will be reduced by the introduction of a new cannabis dispensary that is primarily local in its service focus.

## Findings

Based on the results of this analysis, the following findings are made:

- Table 2 summarizes how the proposed Project should be considered a general retail use when analyzed using TRPA's VMT estimation tool.
- The qualitative analysis summarizes how the addition of the proposed Project results in a net decrease in VMT.
- The addition of the proposed Project results in a net decrease of Countywide VMT based on TRPA's VMT estimation tool. The addition of the proposed Project is determined to result in a finding of no significant impact.


## Conclusions

Significant findings of this study include:

- Existing site configuration and parking capacity are anticipated to be sufficient for effective Project operations. Project vehicle queueing is not anticipated to result in unsafe operations along either the bike path or US-50 proximate to the Project.
- After considering the Project as general retail for this study, qualitative and quantitative analyses both find that the addition of the proposed Project results in a net decrease in Countywide VMT based on the TRPA's VMT estimation tool. The addition of the proposed Project is determined to result in a finding of no significant impact.


## Attachments

Exhibit 1 - Project Vicinity Map
Exhibit 2 - Preliminary Site Plan
Exhibit 3 - Sight Distance Triangles
Appendix A - Analysis Worksheets
Appendix B - Unincorporated County Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Details
Appendix C - County Cannabis Operations Trip Generation Form
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Appendix A


| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 | 个 |  | * |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 3 | 1175 | 1175 | 15 | 12 | 2 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 3 | 1175 | 1175 | 15 | 12 | 2 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  |  | 0.998 |  | 0.982 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  | 0.958 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1863 | 1859 | 0 | 1752 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  | 0.958 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1863 | 1859 | 0 | 1752 | 0 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 40 | 40 |  | 10 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 820 | 724 |  | 115 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.0 | 12.3 |  | 7.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 3 | 1277 | 1277 | 16 | 13 | 2 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 1280 | 1293 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Left | Right | Left | Right |
| Median Width(ft) |  | 12 | 12 |  | 12 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) |  | 16 | 16 |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 |  |  | 9 | 15 | 9 |
| Sign Control | Free |  | Free |  | Stop |  |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type: Other

Control Type: Unsignalized
Intersection Capacity Utilization 74.2\% ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{\uparrow}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 3 | 1175 | 1175 | 15 | 12 | 2 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 3 | 1175 | 1175 | 15 | 12 | 2 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 3 | 1277 | 1277 | 16 | 13 | 2 |




| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  | * |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 7 | 1175 | 1175 | 27 | 27 | 6 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 7 | 1175 | 1175 | 27 | 27 | 6 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  |  | 0.997 |  | 0.974 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  | 0.961 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1863 | 1857 | 0 | 1744 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  | 0.961 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1863 | 1857 | 0 | 1744 | 0 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 40 | 40 |  | 10 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 820 | 724 |  | 115 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.0 | 12.3 |  | 7.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 8 | 1277 | 1277 | 29 | 29 | 7 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 1285 | 1306 | 0 | 36 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Left | Right | Left | Right |
| Median Width(ft) |  | 12 | 12 |  | 12 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) |  | 16 | 16 |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 |  |  | 9 | 15 | 9 |
| Sign Control | Free |  | Free |  | Stop |  |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type: Other
Control Type: Unsignalized
Intersection Capacity Utilization 77.4\% ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15



Appendix B

## Project Details

The tool provides initial screening for all project types and more detailed analysis for residential, tourist accommodation unit, and public service projects. All non-screened commercial, recreation, and other projects will need to complete a more detailed transportation analysis. For detailed information on the PIA framework, tool usage, and calculations see the User Guidelines. For detailed information on the PIA framework, tool usage, and calculations select the User Guidelines tab. For questions about the project impact assessment process contact Melanie Sloan (msloan@trpa.gov). For technical issues with the tool contact Reid Haefer (rhaefer@trpa.gov).

## Date Submitted

Thu Oct 14 20:29:36 2021

## Report Notes

None

## Analysis Type

TRPA

## Existing Land Use

Health and Fitness Club

## Proposed Project

Embarc
General retail
3,050.00 Square Feet
VMT
Proposed Project Gross VMT - 550
Existing VMT - 1,117
Mitigated VMT - 0
Project Total Net VMT - 0
Standard of Significance VMT - 0
Mitigation Needed - 0

## Screening

Screened - Yes

# Additional Analysis Required? 

Mitgation Info
Mitigations -
Percent - 0.00\%

## Other Project Details

Zone ID - Zone 32
Zone Average Trip Length - 4.78
ITE Trip Rate (if applicable) - 37.75
Zone VMT Per Capita Standard of Significance - 14.51
Located in Town/Regional Center - Yes
Located in Bonus Unit Eligible Area - No
Jurisdiction - El Dorado County
Parcel Number (APN) - 034-671-005

Appendix C

## CANNABIS OPERATIONS TRIP GENERATION FORM

## Date Submitted to DOT:

Permit Number:
Business Name: Embarc Meyers LLC

Location: 3008 US-50, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

## Type of Cannabis Operation and Square Footage:

Check all that apply

|  | Cannabis Operation Includes: | Square footage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Grower- Outdoor |  |
|  | Grower - Greenhouse |  |
|  | Drying Room/Processing |  |
|  | Distribution Center |  |
|  | Offices |  |
| $X$ | Other (describe) Storefront Retail | 0.41 Acre |

Number of Harvests Each Year: N/A

Hours of Operation: Monday - Sunday 8am to 8pm, with no deliveries after 7pm

Special Hours (harvest, rush processing due to climatic conditions, etc.) N/A

Is the operation planned to expand next year (yes or no)? No

Please note: ADT means Average Daily Trips. For purposes of this form, provide traffic generation information in one-way trips. This means that a single round trip is counted as two (2) trips (ADT) i.e., a vehicle driving to the property is counted as one trip. The same vehicle leaving the site is counted as a second trip. Gate data from a secure facility may be used to document trips.

Attach pages as necessary to more fully describe any of the items or circumstances found below.
Submit this form to El Dorado Department of Transportation annually as a part of permit renewal process.

## CANNABIS OPERATIONS TRIP GENERATION FORM

Employee Traffic Using Passenger vehicles in Average ADT Current Year: 2021
ADT = \# employees x 3 trips daily ITE Trip Generation Manual, $10^{\text {th }}$ Ed. General Lt. Industrial (110)

## Everyday Operations

|  | Data for Current Year |  | Proposed for Next Year |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Number of <br> Employees | Multiply by 3= <br> ADT | Number of <br> Employees | Multiply by 3= <br> ADT |
| Cannabis Production |  |  |  |  |
| Cannabis Storage |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative |  |  |  |  |
| Sales |  |  | 6 FTE, 8 PTE | $14 \times 3=42$ |
| Processing |  |  |  |  |
| Security |  |  | 2 PTE | $2 \times 3=6$ |
| Other (describe): |  |  |  | $42+6=48$ |
| TOTALS |  |  |  |  |

During Harvest and Processing N/A

|  | Data for Current Year |  | Proposed for Next Year |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of <br> Employees | Multiply by 3= <br> ADT | Number of <br> Employees | Multiply by 3= <br> ADT |
| Cannabis Production |  |  |  |  |
| Cannabis Storage |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative |  |  |  |  |
| Sales |  |  |  |  |
| Processing |  |  |  |  |
| Cultivation/Seasonal: |  |  |  |  |
| Cultivation/Maintenance: |  |  |  |  |
| Security |  |  |  |  |
| Other (describe): |  |  |  |  |
| TOTALS |  |  |  |  |

## CANNABIS OPERATIONS TRIP GENERATION FORM

Truck Traffic Associated with
Operation

|  |  | Data for Current Year | Proposed for Next Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deliveries - Includes Importation |  |  |  |
|  | Loads Per Year |  | 2 per week = 110 per year |
|  | Dates of activity |  | TBD |
|  | Vehicle Type |  | Delivery van |
| Cannabis Disposal |  |  |  |
|  | Loads Per Year |  | 1 per month = 12 per year |
|  | Dates of activity |  | TBD |
|  | Vehicle Type |  | Delivery van |
| Miscellaneous Deliveries |  |  |  |
|  | Loads Per Year |  | N/A |
|  | Dates of activity |  |  |
|  | Vehicle Type |  |  |
| Cannabis Transportation to Distributor or Sales |  |  |  |
|  | Loads Per Year |  | N/A |
|  | Dates of activity |  |  |
|  | Vehicle Type |  |  |
| Miscellaneous visitors (UPS, mail, trash) |  |  |  |
|  | Annually |  | N/A |
| TOTALS |  |  | 122 per year |

Summary (During Non-Harvest)

|  | Data for Current Year | Proposed for Next Year |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Employee Traffic |  | 48 ADT |
| Truck Traffic |  | N/A |
| Miscellaneous Other Traffic |  | 122 per year |

Variation in ADT during the course of a typical full production year

| Month | Jan | Feb | Mar. | Apr. | May | June | July | Aug. | Sept. | Oct. | Nov. | Dec. |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Totals | High | High | High | Low | Low | High | High | High | Low | Low | Low | High |

*Note: answer provided re: high/low tourist season in Tahoe area, which impacts customer traffic


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Transportation Impact Study Guidelines, El Dorado County Community Development Agency, November 2014.
    2 Annual Accident Location Study 2018, El Dorado County Transportation Division, April 10, 2019.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ El Dorado County Department of Transportation Design Standards, Standard Plan 109, March 14, 2019.
    ${ }^{4}$ El Dorado County Ordinance Code, Section 130.35.030, November 17, 2004.

