Section 5
TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist

This document is a joint CEQA/TRPA Environmental Document. TRPA made an environmental determination based on review of this IEC and considering that a NEPA Environmental Assessment will be prepared for the restoration portion of the project as a separate document and a CEQA Initial Study have been prepared to analyze and provide mitigation for potentially significant environmental impacts resulting from the project. The TRPA determined that the TRPA IEC was adequate for the TRPA portion of the environmental document. (Whitney, 2008)

The completed TRPA IEC is included on the following pages. Supplemental information including explanations of "Yes" and "No, with mitigation" answers follows the checklist. All questions were answered "No" for several resource areas including: Light and Glare, Land Use, Natural Resources, Population, Housing, Energy, Utilities, and Human Health. These questions on the checklist are used as significance criteria to determine if a resource issue would be significantly impacted by the project and during construction of the project.

The following pages include the TRPA IEC and supplemental information.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

SOUTH SHORE
128 Market St.
Stateline,NV

Monday-Friday
9:00 am-5:00 pm

NORTH SHORE
3080 North Lake Blvd.
Tahoe City,CA

Tuesday-Friday
9:00 am-4:00pm

MAIL
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

Accepting Applications
Until 4:00 pm at both offices

Phone:(775) 588-4547 Fax:(775)588-4527 www.trpa.org trpa@trpa.org

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

I. Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)/Project Location

Project Name County/City

Brief Description of Project:

The following questionnaire will be completed by the applicant based on evidence submitted with the application. All "Yes" and "No, With Mitigation" answers will require further written comments.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. Land

Will the proposal result in:

a. Compaction or covering of the soil beyond the limits allowed in the land capability or Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. A change in the topography or ground surface relief features of site inconsistent with the natural surrounding conditions?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

c. Unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the proposal?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

d. Changes in the undisturbed soil or native geologic substructures or grading in excess of 5 feet?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

e. The continuation of or increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sand, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion, including natural littoral processes, which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, backshore erosion, avalanches, mud slides, ground failure, or similar hazards?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

2. Air Quality

Will the proposal result in:

a. Substantial air pollutant emissions?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Deterioration of ambient (existing) air quality?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

c. The creation of objectionable odors?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

d. Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

e. Increased use of diesel fuel?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

3. Water Quality

Will the proposal result in:

a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff so that a 20 yr. 1 hr. storm runoff (approximately 1 inch per hour) cannot be contained on the site?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

c. Alterations to the course or flow of 100-yearflood waters?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground water?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

g. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occurrence or seiches?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

j. The potential discharge of contaminants to the groundwater or any alteration of groundwater quality?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

k. Is the project located within 600 feet of a drining water source?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

4. Vegetation

Will the proposal result in:

a. Removal of native vegetation in excess of the area utilized for the actual development permitted by the land capability/IPES system?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat, either through direct removal or indirect lowering of the groundwater table?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

c. Introduction of new vegetation that will require excessive fertilizer or water, or will provide a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

d. Change in the diversity or distribution of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, micro flora and aquatic plants)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

e. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

f. Removal of stream bank and/or backshore vegetation, including woody vegetation such as willows?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

g. Removal of any native live, dead or dying trees30 inches or greater in diameter at breast height (dbh) within TRPA's Conservation or Recreation land use classifications?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

h. A change in the natural functioning of an old growth ecosystem?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

5. Wildlife

Will the proposal result in:

a. Change in the diversity or distribution of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms, insects, mammals, amphibians or microfauna)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

d. Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

6. Noise

Will the proposal result in:

a. Increases in existing Community Noise Equivalency Levels (CNEL) beyond those permitted in the applicable Plan Area Statement, Community Plan or Master Plan?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

c. Single event noise levels greater than those set forth in the TRPA Noise Environmental Threshold?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

7. Light and Glare

Will the proposal:

a. Include new or modified sources of exterior lighting?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Create new illumination which is more substantial than other lighting, if any, within the surrounding area?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

c. Cause light from exterior sources to be cast off -site or onto public lands?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

d. Create new sources of glare through the siting of the improvements or through the use of reflective materials?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

8. Land Use

Will the proposal:

a. Include uses which are not listed as permissible uses in the applicable Plan Area Statement, adopted Community Plan, or Master Plan?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Expand or intensify an existing non-conforming use?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

9. Natural Resources

Will the proposal result in:

a. A substantial increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resource?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

10. Risk of Upset

Will the proposal:

a. Involve a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation in the event of an accident or upset conditions?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Involve possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

11. Population

Will the proposal:

a. Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Include or result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

12. Housing

Will the proposal:

a. Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?

To determine if the proposal will affect existing housing or create a demand for additional housing, please answer the following questions:

(1) Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

(2) Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region historically or currently being rented at rates affordable by lower and very-low-income households?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

Number of Existing Dwelling Units: _____

Number of Proposed Dwelling Units: _____

b. Will the proposal result in the loss of housing for lower-income and very-low-income households?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

13. Transportation/Circulation

Will the proposal result in:

a. Generation of 100 or more new Daily Vehicle Trip Ends (DVTE)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, including highway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

14. Public Services

Will the proposal have an unplanned effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas?

a. Fire protection?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Police protection?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

c. Schools?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

d. Parks or other recreational facilities?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

f. Other governmental services?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

15. Energy

Will the proposal result in:

a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

16. Utilities

Except for planned improvements, will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

a. Power or natural gas?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Communication systems?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

c. Utilize additional water which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the service provider?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

d. Utilize additional sewage treatment capacity which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the sewage treatment provider?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

e. Storm water drainage?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

f. Solid waste and disposal?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

17. Human Health

Will the proposal result in:

a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

18. Scenic Resources/Community Design

Will the proposal:

a. Be visible from any state or federal highway, Pioneer Trail or from Lake Tahoe?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Be visible from any public recreation area or TRPA designated bicycle trail?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

c. Block or modify an existing view of Lake Tahoe or other scenic vista seen from a public road or other public area?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

d. Be inconsistent with the height and design standards required by the applicable ordinance or Community Plan?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

e. Be inconsistent with the TRPA Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) or Design Review Guidelines?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

19. Recreation

Does the proposal:

a. Create additional demand for recreation facilities?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Create additional recreation capacity?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

c. Have the potential to create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

d. Result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway, or public lands?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

20. Archaeological/Historical

a. Will the proposal result in an alteration of or adverse physical or aesthetic effect to a significant archaeological or historical site, structure, object or building?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Is the proposed project located on a property with any known cultural, historical, and/or archaeological resources, including resources on TRPA or other regulatory official maps or records?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

c. Is the property associated with any historically significant events and/or sites or persons?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

d. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

e. Will the proposal restrict historic or pre-historic religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

21. Findings of Significance.

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish 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 or Nevada history or prehistory?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time, while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environmental is significant?)

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

d. Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human being, either directly or indirectly?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

DECLARATION:

I hereby certify that the statements furnished above and in the attached exhibits present the data and information required for this initial evaluation to the best ofmy ability, and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature: **(Original signature required.)**

_____ Person Preparing Application

At _____ County

Date: _____

Applicant Written Comments: (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Date Received: _____ By: _____

Determination:

On the basis of this evaluation:

a. The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment and a finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules of Procedure.

☐ Yes ☐ No

b. The proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but due to the listed mitigation measures which have been added to the project, could have no significant effect on the environment and a mitigated finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules and Procedures.

☐ Yes ☐ No

c. The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment and an environmental impact statement shall be prepared in accordance with this chapter and TRPA's Rules of Procedure

☐ Yes ☐ No

_____ Date: _____

Signature of Evaluator

_____

Title of Evaluator

ADDENDUM FOR TRANSFERS/CONVERSIONS OF USE

The following is to be used as a supplemental checklist for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC). It is to be used when reviewing any transfer pursuant to Chapter 34 of the Code of Ordinances or Conversion of Use pursuant to Chapter 33 of the Code of Ordinances. Any question answered in the affirmative will require written documentation showing that the impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level. Otherwise, an environmental impact statement will be required.

The asterisk (*) notes threshold subjects.

a) Land *
Does the proposal result in any additional land coverage?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

b) Air Quality *
Does the proposal result in any additional emission?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

c) Water *
Does the proposal result in any additional discharge that is in violation of TRPA discharge standards?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

d) Does the proposal result in an increase in the volume of discharge?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

e) Noise *
Does the proposal result in an increase in Community Noise Equivalency Level (CNEL)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

f) Aesthetics *
Does the proposal result in blockage of significant views to Lake Tahoe or an identified visual resource?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

g) Recreation *
Does the proposal result in a reduction of public access to public recreation areas or public recreation opportunities?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

h) Land Use
Does the converted or transferred use result in a use that is not consistent with the goals and policies of the Community Plan or Plan Area Statement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

i) Population
Does the proposal result in an increase in the existing or planned population of the Region?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

j) Housing
Does the proposal result in the loss of affordable housing?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

k) Transportation
Does the proposal result in the increase of100 Daily Vehicle Trip Ends (DVTE)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

l) Does the proposal result in a project that does not meet the parking standards?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

m) Utilities
Does the proposal result in additional water use?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

n) Does the proposal result in the need for additional sewer treatment?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

o) Historical
Does the proposal result in the modification or elimination of a historic structure or site?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ No, With Mitigation ☐ Data Insufficient

DECLARATION:

I hereby certify that the statements furnished above and in the attached exhibits present the data and information required for this initial evaluation to the best of my ability, and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature: **(Original signature required.)**

_____ At_____ Date:_____

Person Preparing Application — County

Applicant Written Comments: (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

5.1 Supplemental Information

5.1.1 Land

1b. Will the proposal result in a change in the topography or ground surface relief features of site inconsistent with the natural surrounding conditions?

No with mitigation. The project proposes the construction of a 0-4 foot vertical berm in Reaches 6W, 4W, and 3X. This modification is not deemed significant due to greater existing local topographic features. Localized existing high and low points within the Lake Forest Meadow exceed eight feet vertical over a horizontal distance of approximately 30 feet. The existing vertical drop across the Meadow is over 24 feet vertical along the berm's alignment. The proposed berm would follow existing topography. The berm is being constructed as a resource barrier to confine water in the meadow areas.

1c. Will the proposal result in unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the proposal?

No, with mitigation. The project would require some grading activities during construction. This may result in unstable soil conditions during construction. Temporary erosion control devices shall be constructed as required by the TRPA. These devices shall be maintained and left in a stable condition on site or later removed, as directed by the Engineer and as specified in the Construction Special Provisions. When no longer required, temporary erosion control devices and the retained silt and any trapped solids from runoff shall be removed and disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Standard Specifications.

- *Prior to plant establishment, Lake Forest Meadow and all other restoration reaches would have silt fencing installed perpendicular to the slope every 100 feet.*
- *A temporary sediment trap will be installed at Lake Forest Road (the downstream end of the Lake Forest Meadow) to catch excess sediment from the meadow.*
- *A turbidity curtain will be installed at the outlet of Lake Forest and Polaris Creeks (Bristlecone Street and Star Harbor).*
- *Sand bags will be placed around all existing DIs and sediment traps.*
- *All roadside ditches will have gravel bag check dams every 100 feet.*
- *All proposed drop inlets, once installed, will have drop inlet protection installed until construction is complete.*
- *All trees close to proposed improvements will be protected using orange fencing installed at the drip line.*
- *Construction staging areas will be equipped with concrete washout facilities.*

- *All access routes except for the proposed berm alignment will be protected from compaction and will be stabilized, if necessary.*
- *Silt fencing will be installed down gradient from all proposed basin sites.*
- *Dirt piles shall be covered during non working hours and during times of precipitation.*
- *All open trenches shall be covered during periods of precipitation.*
- *Vegetation protection fencing shall be placed around all vegetated areas near construction.*
- *Dirt shall not be tracked off site. Construction equipment shall be cleaned to remove any loose dirt or sediment prior to exiting the site.*
- *All construction equipment shall be parked on paved areas.*
- *All disturbed areas shall be stabilized with vegetation and heavy mulch until vegetation is established.*
- *All construction site waste including trash, debris and spoil piles shall be cleaned up and removed.*

1d. Will the proposal result in changes in the undisturbed soil or native geologic substructures or grading in excess of 5 feet?

Yes. The project would require installing subsurface structures below 5 feet and grading below 5 feet in the upper meadow. A Soils Hydrology Scoping Report has been submitted to TRPA. TRPA was present during the subsurface investigation to make a determination to approve with conditions grading below 5 feet.

1f. Will the proposal result in changes in deposition or erosion of beach sand, or changes in siltation, deposition of erosion, including natural littoral processes, which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?

Yes, the project would change deposition of erosion of beach sand and sediment, however this would be a benefit to water quality. These changes are part of the project design to restore the stream channels to historic configurations and rechannelize flows back into them. This would result in deposition of sediment onto the floodplain and into the revitalized meadow areas instead of Lake Tahoe. The project would also improve two outfalls to Lake Tahoe to reduce beach erosion at these locations including one near the public boat launch and one west of Bristlecone Street near Lake Forest Beach.

There would be no effect to littoral drift as changes to flow would be minor to Lake Tahoe.

5.1.2 Air Quality

2a. Will the proposal result in substantial air pollutant emissions?

No, with mitigation. During construction there would be a slight increase of vehicle emissions due to the presence of construction vehicles and modifications of traffic patterns during cross culvert replacement activities. This increase would be temporary. The peak impact would occur during removal of an estimated 3,000 cubic yards of fill from the Lake Forest Meadow to an approved disposal area, such as an approved location within the Tahoe basin in need of fill or Lockwood Landfill outside of the Lake Tahoe Basin in Lockwood, Nevada. Construction equipment will have proper emission reducing equipment in place as required by the State of California. These temporary increases in air pollution emissions will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures.

- *During construction, contractors shall comply with all local, regional, state and federal regulations regarding air pollution control. For Placer County please see the APCD Rules and Regulations including but not limited to: Rule 202- Visible Emissions, Rule 207- Particulate Matter, Rule 213- Gasoline Transfer into Storage Containers, Rule 214- Gasoline Transfer into Vehicle Fuel Tanks, Rule 217- Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials, Rule 228- Fugitive Dust, and Rule 240- Surface Preparation and Clean-up.*
- *Existing power sources (e.g. power poles) or clear fuel generators shall be utilized, rather than diesel powered generators.*
- *Low emission on-site stationary and mobile equipment shall be utilized.*
- *Diesel warm up and idling times shall be limited to 5 minutes.*
- *The site contractor shall have a regular maintenance program for all equipment to ensure that the equipment engines are properly tuned and maintained.*
- *Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed Federal and/or state Health and Safety Code visible emission limitations.*
- *Construction equipment idling shall be kept to a minimum when it is not in use.*

2b. Will the proposal result in deterioration of ambient (existing) air quality?

No, with mitigation. The project proposes some grading activities which may result in an increase in dust in the project area and exhaust emissions from heavy equipment. Construction control measures will be implemented during construction to bring potential impacts to air quality to a less than significant level. The measures will include the following as well as those listed in answer 2a above.

- *All disturbed areas shall be adequately restabilized to minimize exposure of soil to wind and water erosion.*

- *All exposed stockpiles shall be covered to reduce wind and water erosion. This information will be included in the plans and specifications.*
- *All grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour and dust impacts are occurring off-site.*
- *During clearing, demolition, earth moving, excavation operations, or grading, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust preventive measures (e.g. hydroseeding, dust control palliative, etc.), subject to the approval of Placer County.*
- *Construction vehicles shall be washed on a regular basis to eliminate dust and debris.*
- *All haul/dump truckloads shall be covered securely.*
- *All dirt and mud, which has been generated from or deposited by construction equipment going to and from the construction site shall be removed from all adjacent streets when needed.*
- *On-site vehicle speed shall be limited to 15 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces.*

5.1.3 Water Quality

3a. Will the proposal result in changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?

Yes. The project is for the purpose of erosion control and SEZ restoration. There would be some changes to the course or direction of storm water drainage throughout the project area in order to route drainage to containment and treatment areas. This would help to improve existing drainage problems in the area.

The project would also change the course of water movements from the restoration efforts; however, this would be a benefit. The project proposes to restore portions of Polaris Creek and Lake Forest Creek to more natural channels and create new floodplain in some locations to promote increased overbanking frequency and sediment deposition. New channels would be constructed in the restoration areas which would change the course of water movements. However, this approach is consistent with current Tahoe Basin restoration management approaches. One of the objectives of the project is to restore plant and wildlife habitat by creating new floodplain in some areas which could result in an overall improvement to the water quality of Lake Tahoe by reducing sediment load reaching the lake. It is anticipated that this action will improve the riparian habitat and ultimately improve water quality.

3c. Will the proposal result in alterations to the course or flow of 100-year flood waters?

Yes, the course of floodwaters would change. The proposed project would require revisions to the base flood elevations, flood hazard boundaries, and floodway boundaries within the project area. The proposed floodplain is designed to carry the 100-year peak flow without impacts to existing structures, and lessen negative impacts overall to the project area compared to existing conditions.

After restoration of the meadow, the storm drain that currently collects Lake Forest Creek flow downstream of SR 28 would no longer collect the creek flow. The proposed channelization through the upper meadow would more than compensate for the conveyance lost by the abandonment of the storm drain. In addition, the storm drain, which would be plugged at the inlet just downstream of SR 28 and north of the Lake Forest Glen Condominiums, would have more conveyance to collect runoff from the condominiums without the SR 28 Lake Forest flows. If a 100-year flood occurs with magnitudes close to those predicted with County SWMM methods, the Lake Forest Meadow channel system may be overwhelmed and flow may go south towards the condominiums. However, these flows would be at a much lower rate than in existing conditions due to the increase conveyance capacity of the meadow channel complex under proposed conditions.

Permitting requirements for the proposed project would require FEMA compliance and permitting due to the change in both base flood elevations and floodway boundaries. In general, accepted FEMA base flood elevations and regulatory floodway boundaries can be a complicated process, requiring more than a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) and/or the Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) process. However, it is unclear at this time how FEMA would actually view this project. Ultimately, close coordination with the Placer County Flood Control District and FEMA will be required for obtaining the necessary permits and completing the appropriate FEMA process for implementation of the proposed project. Overall, a net decrease of structures located within the regulatory floodplain and the mitigation for the floodplain modification is achieved through the proposed project design.

Work within the 100-year floodplain will also require permits from USACOE, CDFG, and Lahontan. All permits will be completed prior to beginning construction.

3d. Will the proposal result in a change in the amount of surface water in any water body?

Yes. Lake Forest Creek currently enters a storm drain pipe that conveys the flow underground form SR 28 under the meadow and the Lake Forest Glen Condominiums. The project proposes to abandon the portion of the storm drain through the meadow and to construct surface water channels through the meadow which would increase the amount of surface water for Lake Forest Creek. This would be an improvement to the meadow and the creek and is consistent with the water quality and SEZ improvement goals for the Tahoe Basin.

3e. Will the proposal result in discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?

No, with mitigation. Construction of the project includes excavation, new channel construction, restoration of a functional channel and floodplain, and installation of water quality improvements which would reduce downstream transport of sediment and nutrients. Construction activities may have the potential to temporarily impact water quality. However, use of appropriate mitigation measures would reduce any such impacts to a level of less than significant.

- *Construction activities will be implemented in full compliance with the Lahontan Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) and Section 401 of the Clean Water Act through consultation, with and permits issued by, the Lahontan Region of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.*

- *Construction activities will be implemented in full compliance with the TRPA permit, SWPPP and approved dewatering/diversion plan.*

- *Prior to the introduction of flow into the designed meadow, the newly constructed meadow will be flushed until the effluent collected in the downstream temporary sediment can meets the Lahontan 20 NTU turbidity standard. The effluent will be collected and disposed of off-site to an approved location*

- *Disturbed soils will be revegetated and stabilized. Disturbed areas will be seeded with native grasses and mulched. When construction sequencing allows certain areas to be completed prior to other project areas, these areas will be revegetated at that time and have any necessary irrigation systems installed to encourage rapid vegetation growth. Irrigation systems will be monitored regularly.*

- *BMPs for control of erosion will be implemented as part of the project including minimizing re-contouring of land surfaces, avoidance of sensitive areas, use of native mulch to cover disturbed areas, implementation of seeding and re-vegetation plans, and use of sediment berms and/or curtains to reduce storm water erosion.*

- *Prior to plant establishment, Lake Forest Meadow and all other restoration reaches will have silt fencing installed perpendicular to the slope every 100 feet.*

- *A temporary sediment trap will be installed at Lake Forest Road (the downstream end of the Lake Forest Meadow) to catch excess sediment from the meadow.*

- *A turbidity curtain will be installed at the outlet of Lake Forest and Polaris Creeks (Bristlecone Street and Star Harbor).*

- *Sand bags will be placed around all existing DIs and sediment traps.*

- *All roadside ditches will have gravel bag check dams every 100 feet.*

- *All proposed drop inlets, once installed, will have drop inlet protection installed until construction is complete.*

- *All trees close to proposed improvements to remain will be protected using orange fencing installed at the drip line.*

- *Construction staging areas will be equipped with concrete washout facilities.*

- *All access routes will be protected from compaction, and will be stabilized if necessary.*

- *Silt fencing will be installed down gradient from all proposed basin sites.*

- *During construction, daily inspections will be conducted on all existing BMPs in the project area. Should any deficiencies be noted, remedial action by Placer County staff and/or Contractor will be initiated immediately.*

- *Equipment will not be operated in the stream/spring channels of flowing live streams/springs, although it may be necessary to construct barriers and fills at channel changes.*

- *When work in a flowing stream/spring is unavoidable, the entire stream flow will be gradually diverted around the work area by a barrier, temporary culvert and/or a new bypass channel. Construction of the barrier and/or new bypass channel shall proceed in a manner that minimizes sediment discharges and facilitates wildlife escape from the work area.*

- *Monitoring of water turbidity will be conducted above (if possible) and below the Lake Forest Meadow construction site a minimum of every four hours during the workday, or as required by project permits. Should water turbidity levels be found to exceed permitted levels, construction activities will cease until turbidity and settleable materials decrease to acceptable levels. Also Placer County will prepare a Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) to be included as part of the SWPPP. The SAP will identify sampling locations and procedures to measure stormwater run-off and nearby surface waters during storm events to identify threats to water quality.*

- *Instream construction activities will be limited to the period from June 1 to October 15 of each year. Limiting construction activities to this period will reduce the potential of encountering groundwater and adverse impacts to amphibian resources.*

- *At a minimum of three times per week, all dirt and mud which has been generated from or deposited by construction equipment going to and from the construction site shall be removed from all adjacent streets. A stable construction access point will be constructed.*

3f. Does the proposal have the potential to result in alteration of the direction or rate of flow of groundwater?

Yes. As part of the project, the Lake Forest Meadow restoration may alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater with the abandonment of the existing storm drain and utilities. The dewatering and diversion plan would be outlined in the SWPPP and implemented during construction along with special conditions outlined in both the TRPA and the Lahontan permits. Utilities located during excavation will be removed and relocated, if necessary. Other utility trenches, to remain in place, will be located and a cut off wall will be installed to prevent the trench from acting as a conveyance structure. It is not expected that by diverting the groundwater upstream of the Lake Forest Glen Condominiums that the Aspen drainage downstream would be affected. Flows would be less in the Aspen drainage than existing conditions, however, there would continue to be some flow. Altering the direction or rate of flow of groundwater in the project area is a less than significant impact.

3g. Will the proposal result in a change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions or withdrawls, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?

No, with mitigation. The proposed project would involve relocation of Lake Forest Creek to the meadow surface and abandonment of the existing storm drain within the Lake Forest Meadow. This would potentially raise the groundwater levels within the meadow and possibly reduce the groundwater levels at the existing outlet of the storm drain system on Sierra View Avenue. It is expected that the groundwater at Sierra View Avenue would remain high enough to support the downstream SEZ (Aspen Drainage). The change in groundwater levels is a less than significant impact as it does not affect aquifer volume or groundwater supplies.

The potential exists for groundwater to be temporarily intercepted during construction. Groundwater may be encountered during construction of the proposed restoration features in all of the restoration reaches located south of SR 28, as well as Reaches 3Y and 4Z. Groundwater may also be encountered during construction activities in the Aspen Drive/Lake Forest Road area. Groundwater levels in the lower portion of the Lake Forest Meadow are expected to maintain the seasonal high water level (i.e., at ground surface) for a longer duration than under current conditions.

The following mitigation measure will be implemented if groundwater is intercepted during construction. The County will immediately notify the appropriate agencies. All activities in the vicinity of the intercepted groundwater shall cease and groundwater shall be allowed to re-infiltrate. If infiltration is not possible, well points shall be installed around the Lake Forest Meadow excavation and groundwater shall be pumped out of the excavation, treated, tested and discharged downstream. On all other SEZ restoration areas where groundwater is expected, sumps and diversions can be used to divert surface water and/or intercepted groundwater.

3i. Would the proposal result in exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occurrence or seiches?

No, with mitigation. See answer to 3c above. The proposed project would require revisions to the base flood elevations, flood hazard boundaries, and floodway boundaries within the project area. The proposed floodplain is designed to carry the 100-year peak flow without impacts to existing structures, and lessen negative impacts overall to the project area compared to existing conditions. The project would not expose people to wave action from 100-year storm occurrence or seiches.

3j. Does the proposal have the potential to discharge contaminants to the groundwater or any alteration of groundwater quality?

No with mitigation. During grading activities, the project does have the potential to discharge contaminants to the groundwater. These contaminants would be oil, grease and other lubricants used by heavy equipment. The following construction control measures will be taken to protect groundwater.

- *Earthwork shall be confined to areas of construction activities only. This information will be included in the contractor specifications.*
- *Standard temporary construction BMPs per the TRPA permit will be implemented during construction.*
- *Construction vehicles will be serviced in specific paved areas to prevent accidental spills of fluids, oils and lubricants into groundwater.*
- *All spills shall be reported to Lahontan and procedures and response protocols for immediate cleanup outlined in the SWPPP shall be implemented. These procedures shall include placement of sandbags, gravel, boards or other TRPA approved methods to prevent spilled material from entering groundwater.*

3k. Is the project within 600 feet of a drinking water source?

Yes. The project is located within 600 feet of a drinking water source. However, temporary erosion control measures and BMPs will be implemented during construction to bring potential impacts to the drinking water source to a less than significant level. The measures are described in answers to 1c, 3e and 3j above. Placer County shall notify the local water purveyor of the project and solicit comments about the project plans prior to preparing the final plans and specifications.

5.1.4 Vegetation

4b. Will the proposal result in removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat, either through direct removal or indirect lowering of the groundwater table?

No, with mitigation. The area of proposed disturbance has been previously distressed by human activities, primarily development, resulting in fragmented SEZ and riparian habitat. These features lack significant functional value and transport sediment to the receiving water, Lake Tahoe. The proposed improvements would restore 35 acres of SEZ (nearly two million square feet) and associated habitat connectivity, resulting in a positive impact. The proposed project would also restore SEZ/riparian habitats by removing approximately 6,400 square feet of coverage with the removal of a portion of the existing campground roadways and bike trail removal. . Approximately, 2,800 square feet of coverage would be relocated in the SEZ for construction of the new campground entrance from Lake Forest Road, the new footbridge from the campground to Pomin Park and new boardwalk trail through the meadow. The existing footpath in Skylandia Park is being replaced by a boardwalk. The proposed 3 to 4 parking spaces being added to the southern parking lot will be constructed over existing soft coverage. A TRPA coverage/disturbance verification has been requested and the coverage analysis will be revised once a determination is received from TRPA if needed.

Approximately 21 trees 14 inches dbh and over would be removed for construction of the restoration project including the new river channel and restoration of the riparian area and floodplain. Approximately 27 trees 14 inches dbh would be removed for construction of the erosion control improvements. Approximately 4 trees greater than 30 inches dbh would be cut as part of the restoration improvements and 4 trees greater than 30 inches dbh would be cut as

part of the erosion control improvements. All cut-trees would be re-used on site, either chipped for mulch or used to construct habitat structures in the meadow and stream areas.

According to TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 71 Tree Removal, trees over 30 inches dbh may not be cut in SEZ areas unless certain findings can be made. Subsection 71.2.A(5) grants an exception to this rule provided the tree removal is for "… ecosystem management goals consistent with TRPA goals and policies …" (TRPA 2004). The design calls for removal of these trees to complete restoration efforts. This is consistent with TRPA's goals and policies for restoration of this EIP project. A TRPA forester will be consulted with to mark the trees prior to construction.

All SEZ disturbance associated with the water quality improvement portion of the proposed project is in conjunction with improvements designed to disconnect untreated urban area runoff from Lake Tahoe. Water quality improvement features, primarily channels, are proposed along roadsides for surface runoff within developed neighborhoods in the Highlands and Panorama/Meadowbrook subdivisions. The proposed channels would provide additional opportunity for infiltration to reduce runoff velocities.

Disturbance of riparian habitat would occur during construction; however, such impact would be short-lived and overall the project would restore and enhance SEZ and riparian habitats. Restoration of these SEZ areas would include recontouring/grading, installation of rock armoring, revegetation, and sediment collection structures. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed below the project would have a less than significant impact.

- *The SEZ improvements are being proposed in conjunction with water quality improvements that help disconnect runoff from Lake Tahoe. Construction shall occur during the summer months, so work in the SEZ areas is conducted in dry conditions.*

- *Prior to construction, a TRPA forester will do a proposed tree removal survey and advise specific BMPs for implementation.*

- *BMPs shall be implemented by the Contractor to ensure that sediment is kept out of the SEZ during construction. Construction fencing shall be installed around improvements and tress (>6 inches dbh) to ensure no impacts are made outside of the proposed project area to existing riparian habitat.*

- *The amount of disturbance will be minimized by restricting the Contractors' access with equipment through the use of construction limit fencing. All disturbed areas will be stabilized and revegetated with native seed and compost. All revegetated areas will be irrigated for a minimum of two years following construction.*

- *On-site construction access/haul routes will be delineated at 15 feet wide to minimize impacts to existing riparian habitat. These routes will be constructed using standards established in the Basin: imported road base over geotextile fabric. Also, use of low ground pressure equipment or construction of road beds to meet maximum work area and access/haul route ground pressure standards will be required to minimize impacts to existing wet meadow areas. On-site access/haul routes will be delineated during*

construction with continuous flagging supported by stakes or by construction fencing to prevent equipment operators from deviating from established haul routes. All access/haul routes on existing wet meadow areas will be fully decommissioned to allow re-establishment of the meadow.

4c. Will the proposal result in introduction of new vegetation that will require excessive fertilizer or water, or will provide a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?

No, with mitigation. The project includes a large amount revegetation of native SEZ and riparian species of plants. Prior to use of the new channels, the vegetation would require a water and soil amendments to get established and while it is being stockpiled. Soil amendments would also be used to help with plant establishment. Once established, this vegetation would provide soil stabilization and help to reduce erosion. A temporary drainage system would be constructed to capture excess water and keep it from discharging into the creek. It is likely that most of the irrigation water would be taken up by the plants and infiltrate into the ground.

4d. Will the proposal result in a change in the diversity or distribution of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, micro flora and aquatic plants)?

No, with mitigation. However, this would be an improvement to the current situation. All natural habitats have been impacted by prior development activities. Revegetation of disturbed areas and bare shoulder areas are proposed as part of the project to help to stabilize erosion source areas. Revegetation of SEZ restoration areas is proposed to improve riparian habitat for vegetation and wildlife. This would include a seed mix of native upland and riparian plants. The number of plants including grasses would increase in the project area. The creation of wet/dry meadow habitats on restored floodplain surfaces within the project area would result in no net loss or elimination of unique natural communities, wetland, or riparian habitats. A revegetation plan will be submitted to TRPA and approved prior to issuance of the TRPA permit.

The project would remove approximately 58 trees over 14 inches dbh. See answer 4b above.

4e. Will the proposal result in the reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?

No, with mitigation. The goals of the project are to reduce ongoing erosion and to restore habitat using geomorphic stream restoration design. The project would restore riparian habitats, which would improve wildlife habitat and water quality. Information on potentially sensitive animal species in and surrounding the project was compiled from database searches, literature, and field data. The proposed project could potentially affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, special status species that might temporarily enter the project area.

There is potential for a significant impact to the Tahoe yellow cress (TYC), Rorippa subumbellata, because habitat has been identified within the project area, but the impact can be diminished to a level of insignificance with mitigation measures. There is suitable habitat for TYC at three existing locations (the three areas at which plants were identified in 2006). The EOR is defined as the Element Occurrence Record, which approximates the natural biological

population of TYC. Approximately one dozen plants were located within these areas in 2006. These locations would not be directly disturbed during construction with the proposed project. TYC is a candidate species for listing as part of the Endangered Species Act. TYC is a small low growing perennial plant with a rootstock that remains annually and stems lasting one growing season. TYC typically grows on open sandy beaches or dunes, especially near the lakeshore, stream mouths and back lagoons.

There are two potential types of impacts to TYC at the locations specified above, direct and indirect. Potential direct impacts to TYC at the project site include the earthwork associated with the proposed realignment of Lake Forest Creek and restoration of the picnic area at Lake Forest Beach (located at the end of Bristlecone Street). Both outlets have suitable habitat for TYC, however, TYC was not observed at either location. TYC has a tendency to thrive in disturbed areas; direct impacts from earthwork and construction activities may positively affect TYC populations in the project area.

Potential indirect impacts to TYC at the project site include the proposed reduction of flows to the Lake Tahoe Beach in the vicinity of Bristlecone Street. The proposed design reroutes Lake Forest Creek away from this area, potentially reducing flows near the lakeshore. Flows that are designed to still reach the area would be rerouted further west to create a small wetland prior to discharge to Lake Tahoe. TYC germination opportunities are a function of Lake Tahoe water levels. The higher the lake level, 6,225 feet above mean sea level (AMSL), the less likely TYC would propagate. Conversely, in below normal water years, TYC populations are more abundant when lake elevations are 6,224 feet AMSL and below. Thus, the reduction of storm water in the immediate vicinity of the lake shore may affect, but is not likely to have an adverse effect on, TYC populations in this location.

Mitigation measures are listed below.

- *In 2008, a Tahoe yellow cress field survey will be conducted between June 30 and September 30 by a qualified biologist. The results will be mapped on the working engineering plan set for proposed project improvements. In 2009 and all additional years during which construction would take place along the lake shore, Tahoe yellow cress populations within 200 feet of the proposed disturbance areas would be identified prior to commencement of construction. The Tahoe yellow cress populations will be delineated with orange construction fence to ensure that Tahoe yellow cress is not impacted by equipment. Equipment access routes will be identified and any Tahoe yellow cress populations along the access route will be delineated. The contractor will be instructed regarding current policy regarding Tahoe yellow cress. If any project activities are conducted during a low lake level period when plants may be present, all work activities will remain above 6,228 feet AMSL to avoid the low lying populations.*

- *Prior to project activities in undeveloped habitat, a survey for special status plants will be conducted. If special status species are found during the pre-project survey, mitigation or avoidance measures will be implemented.*

4f. Will the proposal result in removal of streambank and/or backshore vegetation, including woody vegetation such as willows?

No, with mitigation. The project is for the purpose of SEZ restoration and erosion control. There would be some willow removal in the Aspen drainage and probably at the Polaris Creek and Lake Forest Creek outlets. However, the riparian areas of the project would be revegetated and the streambank vegetation would improve once the project is completed due to restoration efforts. A revegetation plan will be prepared as part of the final plans and specifications by a qualified revegetation specialist in accordance with Chapter 77 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

4g. Will the proposal result in the removal of any native live, dead or dying trees 30 inches or greater in diameter at breast height (dbh) within TRPA's Conservation or Recreation land use classifications?

Yes. Approximately 8 trees over 30 inches dbh are proposed for removal. Approximately 4 of these trees are located within Recreation land use classifications in Plan Areas 006 – Fish Hatchery and 008 – Lake Forest in Skylandia Park. The other four trees are located within the erosion control portion of the project. A TRPA staff forester will visit the sites prior to construction to determine appropriate BMPs for tree removal. The removal of these trees is necessary for stream and riparian habitat restoration and may be allowed in accordance with TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 71, Subsection 71.2.A(5).

According to TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 71 Tree Removal, trees over 30 inches dbh may not be cut in SEZ areas unless certain findings can be made. Subsection 71.2.A(5) grants an exception to this rule provided the tree removal is for "… ecosystem management goals consistent with TRPA goals and policies …" (TRPA 2004). The design calls for removal of these trees to complete restoration efforts. This is consistent with TRPA's goals and policies for restoration of this EIP project. A TRPA forester will be consulted with to mark the trees prior to construction.

5.1.5 Wildlife

5a. Will the proposal result in a change in the diversity or distribution of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms, insects, mammals, amphibians or microfauna)?

No, with mitigation. The goals of the project are to reduce ongoing erosion and to restore habitat using geomorphic stream restoration design. The project would restore riparian habitats, which would improve wildlife habitat and water quality. The proposed project would benefit all wildlife that either inhabits or has the potential to inhabit the project area. Possible disturbance to wildlife species might occur during the construction phases of the project.

A wildlife survey was conducted in the summers of 2004 and 2005. Changes to the project area as a result of the proposed project would include establishment of wildlife habitat conducive to small mammals, waterfowl, butterflies, reptiles, and amphibians. This proposed project would result in a change that is considered a positive impact. Post project monitoring of wildlife will likely be conducted by California Tahoe Conservancy. Vegetation monitoring will be conducted for 2 years (post project) by a revegetation specialist.

5b. Will the proposal result in the reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species or animals?

No with mitigation. Several sensitive species have been identified as having suitable habitat in or near the project area by the CDFG/ Natural Diversity Database. These species include the Bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus), California spotted owl (Strix occidentalis occidentalis), Great grey owl (Strix nebulosa), Northern goshawk (Accipiter gentiles), Willow flycatcher (Empidonax traillii adustus), Lahontan cutthroat trout (Oncorhynchus clarkia henshawi), Lahontan Lake tui chub (Gila bicolor pectinifer), Mountain yellow legged frog (Rana muscosa), Northern leopard frog (Rana pipiens), Sierra Nevada red fox (Volpes volpes necator), American marten (Martes americana), and the Great Basin rams-horn (Helisoma Carninifex newberryi).

A BA/BE was prepared for the project by Wildlife Resource Consultants in 2007. Surveys were conducted in the project area in the summers of 2004 and 2005. It was determined that none of the species listed above would be affected by the project.

The mitigation measures listed below will bring any potential impacts to special status species to a less than significant level.

- *Any sighting of listed species, sensitive species, or location of nest or dens of these species will be reported to a LTBMU biologist. These nests, dens, or plant locations will be protected in accordance with the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (2000) and the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities for the Lake Tahoe Region guidelines (TRPA, 1982).*

- *The project proponent will consult with agency biologists (e.g., TRPA, LTBMU) to determine whether information on bald eagle and osprey nesting is available. If no agency*

surveys have been performed, pre-project surveys will be conducted to determine the location of any active nests.

- *If special status wildlife species with agency-mandated PACs and LOPs are found breeding in the project area, a protected activity center will be delineated by the LTBMU wildlife biologist and a LOP will be implemented.*

- *Any management activities that require removal of trees and shrubs should be conducted outside the avian nesting season (April 1 through August 15) unless a qualified biologist determines that no nesting is occurring. The chronology of each year's nesting could vary due to snow loads. If vegetation removal and ground disturbance occurs during the avian nesting season, a qualified biologist should conduct a nesting bird survey of the areas of vegetation and tree removal out to 150 feet to ensure that breeding birds are not adversely affected. To comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, any location containing an active nest will not be disturbed until the young have fledged or it is determined that the nest is inactive. The survey should be conducted no sooner than 30 days prior to construction activity.*

- *Some work is proposed within 300 feet of willow flycatcher habitat. Prior to project implementation, protocol-level surveys for willow flycatchers will be conducted in suitable riparian/meadow habitat (situated in the undeveloped western portions of the project area) if this habitat type occurs within 300 feet of the proposed project activity. If willow flycatchers are detected, a Limited Operating Period (LOP) between June 1 and August 31 will be imposed. The location of the LOP will be determined by the LTBMU wildlife biologist based on site conditions and the type of project activity. If no surveys are conducted, an LOP will automatically be implemented in suitable habitat within 300 feet of any project activities.*

- *All trash created during construction will be properly contained in wildlife-proof containers and removed at the end of each day.*

5d. Will the proposal result in deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality?

No, with mitigation. The proposed project would restore 35 acres of SEZ. The proposed project would not 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 wildlife community, substantially reduce the number of or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species. The project would result in an improvement to the wildlife habitat within the project area.

5.1.6 Noise

6a. Will the proposal result in increases in existing Community Noise Equivalency Levels (CNEL) beyond those permitted in the applicable Plan Area Statement?

No, with mitigation. During construction the project has the potential to increase noise levels beyond the CNEL. Construction controls will be implemented to bring potential impacts to a less than significant level. These controls will include the following:

- *Any normal construction activities shall be conducted between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, holidays excluded. Any construction activities conducted between the hours of 6:30 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., Saturday, Sunday and holidays, shall comply with the noise standards applicable to the corresponding TRPA Plan Area Statements.*

Temporary signage shall be located throughout the project (4′ x 4′), as determined by the DPW, at key intersections depicting the above construction hour limitations. Said signs shall include a toll free public information phone number where surrounding residents can report violations and the developer/builder will respond and resolve noise violations. This condition shall be included on the Improvement Plans and shown in the development notebook.

5.1.7 Risk of Upset

10a. Will the proposal involve a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances including, but not limited to oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation in the event of an accident or upset conditions?

No, with mitigation. During excavation activities underground utilities may be located in the area. This could be a potential risk of explosion if a gas or electrical line is hit or sewage spill if a sewer line is hit. The contractor will be directed to contact the Underground Service Alert (USA) to mark the location of underground utilities prior to excavation activities to avoid hitting underground utilities. The heavy equipment used during construction may need to be serviced onsite. This could cause a release of hazardous substances such as oil or other lubricants for maintenance of the equipment. The following construction controls will be implemented to bring this potential impact to a less than significant level.

- *The Contractor, under the direction of Placer County, shall implement BMPs during construction and develop a Hazardous Material Spill Prevention and Containment Plan in the SWPPP to minimize the risk of any contamination of toxic materials during project construction. All staging locations must be approved by TRPA prior to use.*

- *The construction areas shall be isolated during construction by turbidity curtains, gravel bags, and/or filter fabric where needed to minimizing the risk of contamination to surface waters from potential spill of hazardous materials.*

- *Staging areas for fueling and maintenance of heavy equipment during construction shall be away from the stream channels and Lake Tahoe in order to limit potential spills to*

designated areas where observation and clean-up can be readily accomplished. Should an oil or fuel spill occur during construction or maintenance activities, all work will cease immediately, Lahontan will be notified, and clean up procedures will begin immediately.

5.1.8 Transportation/Circulation

13b. Will the proposal result in changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?

No, with mitigation. Current formalized parking exists within Pomin Park and the Lake Forest Boat Launch area. The boat launch charges a parking fee managed by the TCPUD and boat launching is free. Several aspects of the project would impact traffic and parking on Lake Forest Road. From the western intersection with SR 28 to the access to Pomin Park, parking barriers would be added to Lake Forest Road shoulder. Parking barriers are being installed on the road sides near the U.S. Coast Guard entrance to eliminate this activity where new vegetation is planted for restoration and erosion control purposes as a resource protection measure.

A bike route would also be added along Lake Forest Road, as discussed in detail in Section 3, Project Description. From the western intersection of Lake Forest Road and SR 28, to Meadowbrook Drive, parking barriers would be implemented in some locations to eliminate shoulder widening from cars and disturbance to restored SEZ areas.

This would reduce shoulder parking in the area including vehicle trailer parking near the boat launch area. However, this parking is primarily used to avoid paying the fee required at the boat ramp parking area or when the boat ramp parking area is full. This situation occurs usually the week before and after July 4th, on weekends in July and August and Labor Day weekend. Additionally, there is adequate formalized parking available at other boat ramps within a few miles of the Lake Forest boat launch. Single vehicles, without trailers, may find parking at other locations along Lake Forest roadways or along improved shoulder areas along Lake Forest Road. Because there is sufficient parking through most of the year and there are nearby boat ramps with parking, the impact to parking in the area would be considered less than significant.

Parking capacity is being added to the Skylandia Park lot which would be an improvement to the existing parking situation. This would also be a resource protection measure discouraging people from parking on vegetated areas because of the lack of available parking during times when parents are picking up and dropping off kids at the summer camps.

Parking barriers are also proposed as a resource protection measure at the beach access at the end of Bristlecone Street. The Bristlecone Street parking barriers are designed to be permanent, but allow parking on existing hard coverage. This would be a less than significant impact as adequate parking would still be available for beach access along Bristlecone Street and Aqua Drive. Several other beach access locations within a few miles of Lake Forest Beach also provide adequate parking for beach access..

Construction of curb and gutter on Lake Forest Road, within the commercial district, would be coordinated with individual commercial tenants to ensure parking and circulation is not

impacted during construction. Post-construction, parking patterns would be altered throughout the project area, but the number of spaces is not expected to be reduced.

13f. Will the proposal result in an increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians?

No, with mitigation. A traffic study was conducted by Placer County to determine impacts associated with changing the entrance to the Lake Forest Campground from the boat parking lot to an entrance off of Lake Forest Road. This would reduce coverage within the SEZ. It was determined that the relocation of the entrance would have no adverse effects to the project area. This improvement is important in the restoration of SEZ, by removing approximately 4,232 square feet of coverage and restoring the SEZ to a more natural functioning SEZ. With mitigation this improvement would be less than significant.

- *At some locations, temporary lane closures will be necessary to facilitate construction. Appropriate signage and flaggers will direct traffic, as needed. Temporary detours may be employed where needed. However, at no time will access for local residents, emergency vehicles, or school buses be prohibited. Traffic controls will be implemented during work hours and only when it is necessary to perform work.*

- *During construction, single lane closures may be required and may have a minor impact on traffic circulation and access. The contractor will be required to prepare a traffic management/control plan for TRPA and Placer County review and approval. Elements of the plan will include appropriate use of signage, flaggers, traffic calming, and alternative routes to accommodate local and through traffic. In addition, Placer County will advise local residents regarding schedules for construction traffic detours through distribution of flyers in the area neighborhoods well in advance of construction initiation.*

  A traffic control plan shall be prepared by a California Licensed Civil Engineer or Traffic Engineer, or by an American Traffic Safety Services Association certified person for City approval. No lane closures shall take place until this plan has been approved by the City.

- *All guide signs shall be installed to maintain continuity of destination. In addition to the existing warning and directional signs, the Contractor shall erect, within or adjacent to the limits of the work, such supplemental warning and directional signs as ordered by the Engineer.*

- *Personal vehicles of the Contractor's employees shall not be parked on the traveled way or shoulders, including any section closed to public traffic.*

- *The Contractor shall notify local authorities of his intent to begin work at least 5 days before work is begun. The Contractor shall cooperate with local authorities relative to handling traffic through the area and shall make his own arrangements relative to keeping the working area clear of parked vehicles.*

- *Whenever vehicles or equipment are parked on the shoulder within 6 feet of a traffic lane, the shoulder area shall be closed with fluorescent traffic cones or portable delineators*

placed on a taper in advance of the parked vehicles or equipment and along the edge of the pavement at 25-foot intervals to a point not less than 25 feet past the last vehicle or piece of equipment. A minimum of 9 cones or portable delineators shall be used for the taper. A C23 (Road Work Ahead) or C24 (Shoulder Work Ahead) sign shall be mounted on a telescoping flag tree with flags.

- *For work within the County ROW, the contractor shall provide for a minimum of one 11-foot paved travel lane during construction hours. In the event the contractor chooses to reduce traffic to one lane the contractor must provide for traffic control to allow for travel in both directions along the street. The contractor shall employ a minimum of two "flaggers" that will be provided with radios so that they can coordinate the flow of traffic. The Engineer shall review all proposed detours. No detour can begin until approved by the Engineer, and must be appropriately signed. All detours and lane closures are to be suspended during non working hours and the roadways shall be reopened to vehicular traffic at the end of each working day. A minimum of two 11 foot travel lanes shall be provided with delineation provided between the two lanes, in accordance with the Standard Specifications and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control devices.*

- *When lane closures are made for work periods only, at the end of each work period, all components of the traffic control system, except portable delineators placed along open trenches of excavation adjacent to the traveled way, shall be removed from the traveled way. If the Contractor so elects, said components may be stored at selected central locations, approved by the Engineer, within the limits of the highway ROW.*

- *For work within the County ROW, the contractor shall additionally provide at minimum two 11-foot paved travel lanes during all non-construction hours. For work within Caltrans ROW, the contractor shall provide for a minimum of four 11-foot paved travel lanes during non-construction hours.*

- *The full width of the traveled way and all business/residence driveway accesses shall be open for use by public traffic on Saturdays, Sundays, designated legal holidays, after 12:00 noon on Fridays and the day preceding designated legal holidays. Designated legal holidays are: January 1, the third Monday in February, the last Monday in May, July 4, the first Monday in September, November 11, Thanksgiving Day, and December 25. When a designated legal holiday falls on a Sunday, the following Monday shall be a designated a legal holiday. When November 11 falls on a Saturday, the preceding Friday shall be a designated legal holiday.*

5.1.9 Public Services

14e. Will the proposal have an unplanned effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas?

Yes. Placer County would be building this project with a construction grant from the California Tahoe Conservancy. As part of the grant requirement, the County must commit to maintaining the project for 20 years. Therefore, there would be a need for new services for maintenance of the facilities constructed as part of this project.

5.1.10 Scenic Resources/Community Design

18a. Will the project be visible from any state or federal highway, Pioneer Trail or from Lake Tahoe?

Yes. The proposed project would ultimately enhance the visual quality as the SEZ and riparian areas are restored throughout the project area through restoration of natural floodplain processes and wet meadow habitats that are currently degraded by the fill in the Lake Forest Meadow. While construction activities may affect the scenic resources, it is a temporary effect that would not be substantial or long lasting. The erosion control facilities would be non-obtrusive, context sensitive, and not detract from scenic views from this area.

Visually, the aesthetic impact from the project would be noticeable from close range. The visual impact during construction would be minimal and diminish over time due to growth of vegetation in the Lake Forest Meadow. Re-established riparian features would screen proposed improvements, especially the berm in the Meadow, over the first decade after vegetation is established. The proposed project would restore degraded channels and bare and denuded soil areas and therefore would improve the visual character and quality of the site.

Some improvements are proposed along the lake shore including stormwater outfall improvements, one next to the Lake Forest Boat Launch and one next to Lake Forest Beach. These improvements may be visible from the lake; however they would be constructed of rock, a natural material that would blend with the surrounding environment. The outfall improvements would help prevent erosion along the beach from the outfall.

Resource enhancement improvements at the end of Bristlecone at Lake Forest Beach may also be visible. Improvements to the existing picnic area, where vegetation would be planted, would improve the view from the lake. The parking barriers would not be visible from the lake and would be used to help the revegetation of the SEZ be established and thrive since parking would be restricted in these areas. This would also be an improvement of the aesthetics of the area from the lake. Formalization of the parking at the end of Bristlecone would not effect the aesthetics of the areas as these improvements would be at grade or subsurface and would not be visible.

18b. Be visible from any public recreation area or TRPA designated bicycle trail?

Yes. The project area is visible from the Caltrans/TCPUD Bicycle Trail, Pomin Park and adjacent Lake Forest Campground and the Lake Forest Boat Launch area. See answer 18a above.

5.1.11 Recreation

19b. Will the project create additional recreation capacity?

Yes. The net impact of the project would increase recreational opportunities. The project would modify and augment existing regional recreational features, linkages, and opportunities while protecting/enhancing wildlife habitat. This would be achieved in several locations throughout the project area by the addition of pedestrian paths, approximately 5,000 feet of Class 3 bicycle route, and expanded parking facilities.

The road entrance to the Lake Forest Campground would be moved to Lake Forest Road and a kiosk would be added for campsite information and payment, to be maintained by TCPUD. Access to the restrooms and boat ramp from the campground would be along the new pedestrian bridge and hardened path from the campground to Pomin Park. Existing trails from Pomin Park will then access the boat launch area and restrooms.

All features are expected to enhance local and regional recreational opportunities and provide a safer environment for users. There would be a no net loss of recreation at any of the recreation sites including Lake Forest Beach where improvements are proposed for Bristlecone Street parking. On a regional scale, the existing parks and recreational features would be linked to the existing bicycle path, the proposed Burton Creek trail system, and the regional Lake Tahoe Basin trail network. Features that could generate negative impacts, such road crossings, have been mitigated within the project through the addition formalized crossings. There may be potential minor impacts to recreational use of recreational facilities in the project area due to construction. These impacts would be temporary and minor inconveniences. The overall impacts would have a net beneficial increase in recreational opportunities.

5.1.12 Archaeological/Historical

20a. Will the proposal result in an alteration of or adverse physical or aesthetic effect to a significant archaeological or historical site, structure, object or building?

No, with mitigation. An archaeological record search, archaeological survey, and an ethnographic report were completed for this project in September 2004. Seven cultural resources were identified in the project area boundary. These include 5 sites and 2 isolated finds. Within the boundaries of the isolated finds the proposed project would include excavation of the Lake Forest Meadow and construction of a detention basin at the corner of SR 28 and Old Mill Road. The sites and finds are detailed in the Cultural Resource Inventory Report. Standard Resource Protection Measures are needed to protect the historic values of these finds that may be affected by the project. Resources would be protected in accordance with Chapter 29 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. The isolated finds IF-1 and IF-2 may be disturbed during construction. These artifacts were evaluated in accordance with Section 29 of the TRPA's Code of Ordinances, and determined not to be a historic resource as defined therein.

It is possible that buried or concealed heritage resources could be discovered during grading activities. The following mitigation measures will be implemented during construction if heritage resources are discovered.

- *Known sites and finds shall be flagged by Heritage Resource specialists near construction activities.*
- *Should any human remains be uncovered during construction activities, all work shall stop in the immediate area of the remains. As required by California law, Placer County will contact the County Coroner, to inspect the findings and determine appropriate measures to take.*

- *Should any archaeological materials be uncovered during construction activities, all work shall stop in the immediate area of the cultural or archaeological resource and Placer County will contact a qualified archaeologist, at Placer County's expense, to inspect the finds and determine appropriate measures to take. Construction activities will restart after inspection of the find.*

- *A cultural resources expert shall be onsite to witness excavation in the Lake Forest Meadow.*

20b. Is the proposed project located on a property with any known cultural, historical, and/or archaeological resources, including resources on TRPA or other regulatory official maps or records?

Yes. However, no significant cultural resources would be affected by the project. See answer 20a above.

20c. Is the property associated with any historically significant events and/or sites or persons?

Yes. But none of these sites would be affected by the project. See answer 20a above.

5.1.13 Findings of Significance

21a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish 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 or Nevada history or prehistory?

No, with mitigation. The project would not reduce habitat of fish populations, however, it could potentially impact nesting Willow flycatchers during construction if they are present. However, protocol level surveys will be conducted prior to construction within 300 feet of the willows in the disturbance area. If birds are present, then LOPs will be enforced. See answer 5b above for more information.

Habitat for Tahoe Yellow Cress exists within the project area and could be potentially impacted by the project. However, the mitigation measure described in answer 5b would bring potential impacts to a less than significant level.

The project would be implementing grading activities in areas where heritage resources were discovered. However mitigation measures identified in answer 20a above should bring potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Grading activities could affect unknown cultural resources, however mitigation measures identified in answer 20a should bring potential impacts to a less than significant level.