

*Appendix A*  
CEQA Environmental Checklist

# Appendix A

## CEQA Environmental Checklist

1.	Project title: <i>Snow Creek Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) Restoration Project</i>		
2.	Lead agency name and address: <i>Placer County Department of Public Works Tahoe Engineering Division P.O. Box 336, Kings Beach, CA 96143</i>		
3.	Contact person and phone number: <i>Kansas MaGahan, P.E., Senior Civil Engineer (530) 581-6217</i>		
4.	Project location: <i>450/500 National Avenue, Tahoe Vista, California</i>		
5.	Project sponsor's name and address: <i>Placer County Department of Public Works Tahoe Engineering Division P.O. Box 336, Kings Beach, CA 96143</i>		
6.	General plan designation: <i>Tahoe Vista Community Plan – Public Service/Industrial Special Area 5</i>	7.	Zoning: <i>Tahoe Vista Community Plan, Special Area #5 (Public Service/Industrial Area) and TRPA Plan Area Statement 24B</i>
8.	Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.) <i>See attached Draft Snow Creek SEZ Restoration Project CEQA Initial Study and TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist.</i>		
9.	Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings: <i>Undeveloped open space to the east, public service and industrial to the north and west, multi-family residential to the west and residential to the south.</i>		
10.	Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.) <i>Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Resources Agency, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Fish and Game, and California Tahoe Conservancy</i>		

### Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forestry Resources		Air Quality
X	Biological Resources	X	Cultural Resources		Geology /Soils
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality
	Land Use / Planning		Mineral Resources		Noise
	Population / Housing		Public Services		Recreation
	Transportation/Traffic		Utility / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance

### Determination (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<b>X</b>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.
_____ Signature	_____ Date

### Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

## Issues

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? <i>The Project would have no adverse impacts on any scenic vista. The Project area is not an existing scenic vista and was used as an industrial property.</i>				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? <i>The Project area is not within a state scenic highway.</i>				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? <i>See Section 3.1.</i>			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? <i>No new lighting or sources of glare are proposed.</i>				X
<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES</b> -- In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology	<b>Not applicable to Project.</b>			

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
<p>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p> <p><i>The Project area is not shown on any maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p> <p><i>The Project area is not zoned for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</p> <p><i>The Project does not propose to change existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land, or timberland.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p> <p><i>The Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non forest use. The existing uses are industrial and recreation. The industrial use would be discontinued and recreation use would continue.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p> <p><i>The Project proposes to restore wetland and SEZ in the current industrial use area and to</i></p>				<b>X</b>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>create recreation use in existing open space. The open space area is located between existing industrial use land and existing forest recreation use land. No farmland is located in the Project area. The forest land would remain forest land after the Project is completed.</p>				
<p><b>III. AIR QUALITY</b> – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</p> <p><i>The Project would not conflict with the implementation of any applicable air quality plans. Applicable air quality plans include the TRPA Regional Plan, TRPA Regional Transportation Plan, Federal Clean Air Act, and Placer County APCD Air Quality Attainment Plan. A dust control plan is described in Section 2 Project Description which would reduce potential impacts from fugitive dust to a less than significant impact as explained in Section 3.2.5. Emissions from the use of heavy equipment and traffic to and from the site are shown to be minimal and not significant in Section 3.2.5.</i></p>				X
<p>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</p> <p>See Section 3.2</p>			X	
<p>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (AAQS) (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</p> <p>See Section 3.2.</p>			X	
<p>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p> <p>See Section 3.2.</p>			X	
<p>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</p> <p><i>The Project would not create objectionable odors.</i></p>				X

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b> -- Would the project:				
<p>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.3.</i></p>		<b>X</b>		
<p>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.3.</i></p>		<b>X</b>		
<p>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.3</i></p>			<b>X</b>	
<p>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</p> <p><i>The Project area is not located in a migratory corridor for mule deer or any other species. In addition, no major nursery sites exist within the Project area.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.3.</i></p>			<b>X</b>	
<p>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation</p>				<b>X</b>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p>Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</p> <p><i>The Project area is not within a Habitat Conservation Plan area or Natural Community Conservation Plan area or any other local, regional or state habitat conservation plan area.</i></p>				
<p><b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b> -- Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?</p> <p><i>Resources discovered within the Project area have been determined to not be significant. Many of the found resources would not be disturbed.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?</p> <p><i>Resources discovered within the Project area have been determined to not be significant. Many of the found resources would not be disturbed.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.4.</i></p>		<b>X</b>		
<p>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.4.</i></p>		<b>X</b>		

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
<p>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</p> <p><i>The Project area is within an active area for faulting and seismic activity. The Project does not propose any new housing that would be occupied by people. The Project would not add to the population of the Project area. Public recreation is already provided at locations surrounding and within the Project area and the Project would not increase the amount of people recreating within the surrounding area that would be affected by rupture of an earthquake fault.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</p> <p><i>Same as VI.a)i) above</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</p> <p><i>Same as VI.a)i) above</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>iv) Landslides?</p> <p><i>The Project area is not within an area subject to landslides.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.5.</i></p>			<b>X</b>	
<p>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</p> <p><i>The Project area does not contain a geologic unit or soil type that is unstable.</i></p>				<b>X</b>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</p> <p><i>Any expansive soils within the Project area are considered to be low or very low for expansion potential. There are no residents within the Project area.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</p> <p><i>The Project would not create a need for septic tanks because a sewer system is available and already existing.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<b>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS --</b> Would the project:				
<p>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.6.</i></p>			<b>X</b>	
<p>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs)?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.6.</i></p>			<b>X</b>	
<b>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS --</b> Would the project:				
<p>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.7.</i></p>			<b>X</b>	
<p>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.7.</i></p>			<b>X</b>	
<p>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.7.</i></p>			<b>X</b>	

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</p> <p><i>The Project site is not contained on the Cortese list or the EnviroStor databases compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</p> <p><i>The Project area is not located within an airport land use plan area. The Project area is not within two miles of an airport.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</p> <p><i>The Project area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p> <p><i>The Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.7.</i></p>			<b>X</b>	

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY --</b> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? <i>See Section 3.8.</i>			<b>X</b>	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? <i>The Project proposes to raise the groundwater table by removing existing fill and restoring SEZ and wetland area which would result in no adverse impacts to groundwater recharge.</i>				<b>X</b>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? <i>See Section 3.8.</i>			<b>X</b>	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? <i>See Section 3.8.</i>			<b>X</b>	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? <i>The Project would provide improvements to existing facilities for stormwater drainage.</i>				<b>X</b>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? <i>See Section 3.8.</i>			<b>X</b>	

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</p> <p><i>The Project does not propose new housing and is not located nor would it impact the 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on the federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</p> <p><i>See answer IX(g) above.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</p> <p><i>The Project would not increase the risk of flooding. All drainage entering the site would be contained and treated prior to being conveyed to the adjacent wetlands and SEZ. Drainage improvements proposed on the site would preclude causing new flood risk.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</p> <p><i>The Project does not contain any components that would increase the risk of mudflows, seiches, or tsunamis, nor would it introduce any risks to people from these hazards.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p><b>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:</b></p>				
<p>a) Physically divide an established community?</p> <p><i>The Project would not physically divide an established community. It would provide a direct connection from the residential uses to recreation and restoration uses.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</p>			<b>X</b>	

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
See Section 3.9.				
<p>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</p> <p><i>The Project area is not located within any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<b>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES</b> -- Would the project:	<b>Not applicable to Project.</b>			
<p>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</p> <p><i>The Project area does not contain any known mineral resources of value to the region and the residents of the state.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</p> <p><i>The Project area is not located within an important mineral resource recovery site.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<b>XII. NOISE</b> -- Would the project result in:				
<p>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</p> <p><i>The applicable noise standards are described in the Tahoe Vista Community Plan and in PAS 24B. While construction noise would likely exceed these limits during construction, TRPA exempts construction noise from the noise standards between 8:00 AM and 6:30 PM, Monday through Friday. Use of the area as a bicycle and pedestrian trail would not exceed standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance. The proposed trail would connect to existing trails nearby and also located within the same general area.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</p> <p>See Section 3.10.</p>			<b>X</b>	

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p> <p><i>The Project area is currently being used for industrial purposes and would be used for recreational purposes once the Project is completed. Therefore, there would be a permanent decrease in the amount of noise that could be generated from the Project area.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.10.</i></p>			<b>X</b>	
<p>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</p> <p><i>The Project area is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</p> <p><i>The Project area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p><b>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING --</b> Would the project:</p>	<b>Not applicable to Project.</b>			
<p>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</p> <p><i>The Project is not proposing new homes or businesses. It is converting the property from an industrial use to public open space and recreational uses.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing</p>				<b>X</b>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
elsewhere? <i>The Project does not affect existing housing.</i>				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? <i>The Project does not affect existing housing and would therefore, not displace any people.</i>				<b>X</b>
<b>XIV.PUBLIC SERVICES</b>	<b>Not applicable to Project.</b>			
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection? <i>The Project area is already served by the North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District.</i>				<b>X</b>
Police protection? <i>The Project area is already served by the Placer County Sheriff's Office.</i>				<b>X</b>
Schools? <i>The Project would not increase population requiring changes to schools.</i>				<b>X</b>
Parks? <i>The Project would construct recreational facilities accessible via a proposed bicycle and pedestrian trail but would not require construction of additional park facilities than what is already proposed as part of the Project.</i>				<b>X</b>
Other public facilities? <i>The Project would not result in the construction of additional public facilities other than what is currently being planned.</i>				<b>X</b>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XV. RECREATION</b>				
<p>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</p> <p><i>The Project proposes to construct a bicycle and pedestrian trail segment that would connect to a proposed trail along National Avenue and an existing dirt trail that is part of the North Tahoe Regional Park trail system. No parking is being provided at the site. This short segment of trail would provide additional trail access to what is already being used and is not expected to increase use of these existing facilities.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.11.</i></p>			<b>X</b>	
<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:</b>				
<p>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</p> <p><i>The Project is listed as the National Ave. Eastside Trail on the Proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Project List in the Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, 2010. It is in accordance with applicable planning ordinances and policies for transportation planning.</i></p>				<b>X</b>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? <i>See Section 3.12.</i></p>			<b>X</b>	
<p>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks? <i>The Project would have no impact to air traffic.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? <i>The Project would not increase hazards to design features or incompatible uses. No traffic design features are proposed with the exception of a new bicycle and pedestrian Class 1 trail which would provide for safe access along a portion of National Avenue and to the east.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>e) Result in inadequate emergency access? <i>Some traffic control measures would be implemented when needed, however emergency access would be provided when necessary.</i></p>				<b>X</b>
<p>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? <i>The Project would comply with the Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan which is a component of the Tahoe Area Regional Transportation Plan. The proposed bicycle and pedestrian trail segment is listed within the Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and would help to meet goals for increasing bicycle and pedestrian trails around Lake Tahoe.</i></p>				<b>X</b>

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>XVII. UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?  <i>The Project does not propose any wastewater facilities.</i>				<b>X</b>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?  <i>The Project would not increase water use or the amount of wastewater currently provided for under existing service infrastructure.</i>				<b>X</b>
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?  <i>See Section 3.13.</i>			<b>X</b>	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  <i>Existing water supply is sufficient to provide irrigation for the Project while plants are being established. No additional water facilities are needed.</i>				<b>X</b>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?  <i>A will serve letter is not required to approve the Project.</i>				<b>X</b>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</p> <p><i>The Project would haul non-contaminated soil to Teichert Materials in Truckee and contaminated material to Lockwood Landfill in Lockwood, Nevada. Both of these facilities have adequate capacity to serve the Project. Solid waste from construction of the Project would be disposed of at the Eastern Regional Landfill in the Tahoe area. The Eastern Regional Landfill serves as a transfer station where waste is gathered then hauled to a landfill or recycling facilities in California.</i></p>				X
<p>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</p> <p><i>All solid waste will be disposed of according to federal, state and local statutes and regulations.</i></p>				X
<b>XVIII.MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
<p>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.14.</i></p>		X		
<p>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</p> <p><i>All cumulative impacts are less than significant.</i></p>				X
<p>c) Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p> <p><i>See Section 3.14.</i></p>			X	