2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Executive Summary section is provided in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15123. As stated in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(a), "[a]n EIR shall contain a brief summary of the proposed actions and its consequences. The language of the summary should be as clear and simple as reasonably practical." State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b) states, "[t]he summary shall identify: (1) each significant effect with proposed mitigation measures and alternatives that would reduce or avoid that effect; (2) areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public; and (3) issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects." Accordingly, this summary includes a brief synopsis of the proposed project and project alternatives, environmental impacts and mitigation, areas of known controversy, and issues to be resolved during environmental review. Table 2-1 (at the end of this section) presents the summary of potential environmental impacts, their level of significance without mitigation measures, the recommended mitigation measures, and the levels of significance following the implementation of mitigation measures.

2.1 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Placer County is proposing to construct a two-megawatt (MW) wood-to-energy biomass facility at the Eastern Regional Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) and Transfer Station that would use a gasification technology. Gasification systems generate electricity through transformation of the solid woody biomass into a "syngas" (i.e., synthetic gas) and combustion of the syngas in an internal combustion (IC) engine or turbine. Gasification is the thermochemical conversion of woody biomass into a syngas under controlled temperature and oxygen conditions; woody biomass materials are not "burned" in a gasification system. Gasification also produces a solid carbon char (also known as biochar).

The entire Eastern Regional MRF and Transfer Station site is approximately 292 acres and includes four County-owned parcels (APNs: 080-010-031, 080-010-033, 080-070-017, and 080-070-016). The proposed project would be located on a 3.7-acre site in the southernmost area of the property. The site is located within the unincorporated portion of Placer County, California, approximately 2 miles south of Interstate 80 (I-80) at 900 Cabin Creek Road, west of State Route (SR) 89.

The proposed project would include construction of an approximately 11,000 square-foot, two-story structure that would house the power generating and emissions control equipment, two, 400 square-foot pads to potentially accommodate transformer and phase-shifting equipment (if final design deemed necessary), and an approximately one-acre material storage area. The storage area would include a 7,000 square-foot open air pole barn structure to allow materials to dry before use in the energy generation process. Additional onsite improvements would include eight parking spaces, a paved vehicle circulation area that includes new driveways on Cabin Creek Road and the access road to Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART) and County Department of Public Works (DPW) facilities located on the site, a paved haul road south of the material storage area, stormwater treatment facilities (including an infiltration trench and detention basin), retaining walls, and utility improvements/extensions.

Biomass materials (fuel for the plant) would be processed (ground and screened) at the locations from which they are removed (such as U.S. Forest Service [USFS] fuels reduction sites) and delivered via haul truck to the project site. No additional wood material processing would occur at the project site beyond that which is already occurring in association with current Eastern Regional MRF and Transfer Station wood waste handling activities at their site. As needed, additional fuel for the plant (potentially during extended winters) could include wood waste materials (forest waste biomass) already being processed at the Eastern Regional MRF and Transfer Station.

2.2 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The following provides a summary description of the alternatives evaluated in Chapter 17 of this EIR.

2.2.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The 3.7-acre project site contains one temporary existing caretaker's residence and an existing cell tower. The site is otherwise undeveloped and contains undeveloped and forested land. There are no plans to expand existing Eastern Regional MRF and Transfer Station operations, County DPW and TART facilities, or any other uses at this site if the project were not implemented. Therefore, this alternative assumes that the site would remain in its current state with no changes to the existing environment. This alternative would not meet any of the project's objectives.

2.2.2 DIRECT COMBUSTION TECHNOLOGY ALTERNATIVE

The Direct Combustion Technology Alternative would include construction of a two-MW biomass energy facility at the proposed 3.7-acre project site that would utilize a direct combustion technology for wood-to-energy production. Similar to project, this alternative would require approval of a Conditional Use Permit by Placer County. The buildings and site improvements would be the same as the project, except that a direct combustion system would require that a baghouse, ash container, and cooling tower be located outside of the building.

Except for the increases in water demands, other utility improvements and connections would be the same as the project. As with the project, water service to the site with a direct combustion system would be provided by onsite water storage tanks. A direct combustion system requires a greater amount of water than a gasification system, because water is required for condensing steam and supplying the boiler and cooling tower. Depending on the manufacturer, a direct combustion system would require water at a continuous flow between 15 and 20 gallons per minute (gpm), or 21,600 to 28,800 gallons per day (gpd). Under this alternative, outgoing wastewater flows would be between 7.5 and 10 gpm, which equates to approximately 10,800 to 14,400 gpd.

Hazardous materials use and storage during construction would be the same as the project. The sources of fuel for this alternative would be the same as the project (solely renewable woody biomass). Direct combustion systems are not typically as efficient as gasification systems. To generate two MW of power using a direct combustion system, the plant would consume between 15,000 and 20,000 bone dry tons (BDT) of woody biomass fuel annually, as compared to the 14,000 to 17,000 BDT of fuel required for the project.

Assuming 235 delivery days, an estimated 64 to 85 BDT of biomass material would be delivered to the site on a typical weekday. Based on the volume of material required to fuel the facility on a yearly basis and the number of days that material could be delivered, it is estimated that up to 1,600 truck trips would occur annually under this alternative. All other fuel sourcing, processing, handling, storage, and recordkeeping details would be the same as the project.

With forest-sourced woody biomass, generally there would be approximately three to five percent ash produced per volume of woody biomass input (similar to the amount of biochar produced in a gasification system) associated with this alternative. Therefore, the 15,000 to 20,000 BDT of woody biomass used in power generation under the Direct Combustion Technology Alternative would yield an estimated 450 to 1,000 tons of ash per year, or between about 8 and 19 tons per week.

2.2.3 ALTERNATIVE SITE WITH GASIFICATION TECHNOLOGY ALTERNATIVE

This alternative includes the development of a two MW biomass energy facility at an alternative location within the study area (i.e., Eastern Regional MRF and Transfer Station site) that would distance the plant from existing residences and would eliminate the need to remove a temporary existing caretaker's residence. The alternative site is located nearly 0.5 mile northwest of the project site and adjacent to the haul road that provides access to site operations in the northern part of the site. Access to the site would be via Cabin Creek Road, and vehicles traveling to and from the site would be required to pass through the Eastern Regional MRF and Transfer Station scale house.

This alternative would occupy the same area (i.e., 3.7 acres) as the proposed project.

Improvements at the alternative site would include a paved access road extending from the haul road to the site, and improvements to the haul road (e.g., paving a portion of roadway that is currently unpaved). This alternative would include longer connections (i.e., for water, wastewater, and electricity) than the project. The utility lines would be placed underground and would be approximately 2,000 linear feet. Because the alternative site is located uphill (an elevation approximately 50 feet higher) from the existing well and water storage tanks, new pumping facilities would be required to bring water to the alternative site.

2.2.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The No Project Alternative would avoid the adverse environmental impacts at and adjacent to the project site associated with project construction and operations; however, it could result in potentially significant impacts associated with criteria air pollutant emissions from open burning of woody biomass material. Therefore, it would result in environmental tradeoffs compared to the project and would not be considered environmentally superior to the project. The Alternative Site with Gasification Technology Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative because it would result in slightly less toxic air contaminants (TAC) impacts because of the increase in distance from the plant to nearby residences and no temporary caretaker residences would be removed under this alternative. All other impacts under this alternative would be similar. The Direct Combustion Technology Alternative would not be environmentally superior to the project because it would result in three new potentially significant impacts (i.e., criteria air pollutants, GHG emissions, and groundwater) that would not occur under the project.

2.3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15382, a significant effect on the environment is defined as "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance." Chapter 4 through 16 of this Draft EIR describes in detail the significant environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project. Chapter 17 provides a discussion of cumulative and growth-inducing impacts as well as a description of alternatives and their comparative impacts. Table 2-1 summarizes the environmental impacts and mitigation measures discussed in these chapters.

2.3.1 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Detailed mitigation measures have been identified throughout Chapters 4 and 5 of this report that are intended to mitigate project effects to the extent feasible. All of these mitigation measures are identified in Table 2-1. After implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, all of the adverse effects associated with the proposed project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

2.3.2 SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The geographic area that could be affected by the project varies depending on the type of environmental resource being considered. As discussed in Section 18.9 of this Draft EIR, several projects are operational, being constructed, approved, or under review in the vicinity of the project site. These cumulative projects could potentially have some relation to the environmental impacts of the proposed project. The County has determined that the project's contribution of trips to the roadway system would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to an existing significant cumulative impact. However, implementation of a mitigation measure requiring payment of traffic fees, would reduce this impact such that the project's contribution to the significant cumulative impact would not be considerable. A discussion of impacts associated with cumulative development is provided in Section 18.9, Cumulative Impacts, of this Draft EIR.

2.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Section 15123 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the summary section of a Draft EIR to identify areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. The following provides a summary of the areas of controversy raised by agencies and the public in comment letters received on the Notice of Preparation. The comment letters on the Notice of Preparation are included in Appendix A of this document.

The EIR must evaluate direct and indirect impacts stemming from changes in landscapes and land management strategies in response to the availability of a local market for biomass fuels; impacts associated with the production, processing, and transportation of fuels; changes in behavior and management strategy on the part of waste disposal organizations (including government agencies), agricultural landowners, and forest managers; and changes in landfill operations.

- Use of gasification versus direct combustion technology.
- Direct and indirect impacts associated with the delivering of biomass fuels and operation of a new biomass facility.
- Net versus mass greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) calculations.
- Short-term versus long-term GHG emissions.

All of the substantive environmental issues raised in the Notice of Preparation comment letters have been addressed in this Draft EIR.

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4 Land Use and Forestry Resources			
Impact 4-1. Conflict with Relevant Plans, Policies, and Zoning. The project is in unincorporated Placer County and is not located within an existing community or community plan. As described in Table 4-1 of the Draft EIR, the project would be consistent with relevant Placer County General Plan goals and policies. Further, the Applicant would apply for a Conditional Use Permit for the project, which would provide for public input and additional discussion, ensuring project development in accordance with zoning regulations. No conflicts with relevant plans and policies would occur and this impact would be **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
Impact 4-2. Impacts to Forestry Resources. In the larger context of region-wide and statewide forestry resources, the project would not result in substantial impacts to forestry resources because the project site is small and contains minimal forestry resources and substantial forestry resources are and would continue to be available surrounding the site. In addition, the project would not directly or indirectly affect the use or management of surrounding forestry resources, and the project would continue the purpose and intent of the County's designation for the site to provide facilities that are important to maintain the County's health and welfare. In addition, the project will comply with the requirement to obtain a Timberland Conversion Permit (if required). For these reasons, the project would have a **less-than-significant** impact on forestry resources. For a discussion of impacts to off-site forested lands resulting from the removal of woody biomass material for use at the project site, please see Chapter 5, Biological Resources (5.3.4 – Impact Analysis).	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
5 Biological Resources			
Impact 5-1. Disturbance to Nesting Birds and Potential Loss of Individuals. Tree removal and ground-disturbing activities related to construction of the project would result in removal of potential nesting habitat for common and special-status birds. Habitat destruction and disturbance could result in the abandonment of nest sites and loss of eggs or young. This is considered a **significant** impact**.**	S	**Mitigation Measure 5-1.** To avoid impacts to nesting birds, trees and other vegetation shall be removed from the project site during the non-breeding season (September 1 to March 30) to the extent feasible. If vegetation removal is scheduled to occur during the nesting season (April 1 to August 31), the Applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys in suitable habitat on the project site. The surveys shall be conducted no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before the beginning of construction. Survey results shall be sent immediately to Placer County Planning Services Division and to the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). If active nests are present on or immediately adjacent to the project site, Planning Services Division staff shall initiate consultation with CDFG to determine appropriate avoidance measures. If no nests are found, no further mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 5-2. Conflict with Placer County Tree Ordinance. Implementation of the project would result in the disturbance and/or loss of approximately 1.87 acres of Jeffrey pine forest (approximately 44 trees). Placer County trees are protected under the *Placer County General Plan* and the County's Tree Ordinance. While the removal of these trees would not represent a substantial reduction of habitat, and the surrounding area provides similar and abundant habitat, their removal would represent a conflict with the County's Tree Ordinance. As such, this impact would be **potentially significant**.	PS	**Mitigation Measure 5-2.** a. To reduce the loss of Jeffrey pine forest and protect individual trees on the project site, the Applicant shall conduct a tree survey to determine the number and size of trees to be removed. The number of trees to be removed shall be minimized to the extent feasible. b. The Applicant shall obtain a tree permit from the County, as per the County's Tree Ordinance. As stated in the Tree Ordinance (12.16.080 Replacement program and penalties), the County may condition any tree permit or discretionary approval involving removal of a protected tree upon (a) the replacement of trees in kind, (b) implementation of a revegetation plan, or (c) payment into the County's Tree Preservation Fund. Because the project site would not support replacement trees or the implementation of a	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		revegetation plan, the Applicant shall either replace trees at an offsite location or contribute to the County's Tree Preservation Fund; this will be determined by the County. The replacement requirement may be calculated based upon an inch for an inch replacement of the removed tree(s) and may require minimum 15 gallon size trees. The total of replacement trees may be required to have a combined diameter of the tree(s) removed. A minimum of 50% of replacement trees will be of a similar native tree. Replacement trees may be planted onsite or in other areas to the satisfaction of the County Planning Services Division. Such replanting must not result in the over-planting of a site such that an unsafe fire condition is created. The County may decide that if the project site is not capable of supporting all of the replacement trees, the Applicant shall pay the County the current market value, as established by an arborist, forester, or registered landscape architect, of the replacement trees, including cost of installation, to go into a Tree Preservation Fund. Before Improvement Plans are approved, the Applicant shall provide proof to the County that one, or a combination, of the mitigation options described above has been completed and/or funded. Proof of mitigation fulfillment will also be provided to DFG.	
Impact 5-3. Modification of Forest Habitat Through Use of Woody Biomass. The fuel source for the proposed biomass facility would be woody biomass acquired primarily from hazardous fuel removal, forest thinning, and other forest management activities. Removal of woody biomass from the surrounding forests could modify habitat for common and special-status species, degrade sensitive habitats, and/or result in fill of jurisdictional waters of the U.S. However, forest projects that would generate the woody biomass are separate	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
projects independent from the proposed project, and are subject to separate environmental review and permitting. The generation of woody biomass would occur regardless of the proposed biomass project. Disposal of the woody biomass at the proposed facility in lieu of other disposal methods such pile burning would not have a substantial affect on biological resources. Therefore, the use of the forest residuals as a fuel source for the project is considered to have a **less-than-significant** impact on biological resources.			
Impact 5-4. Operational Effects on Wildlife. Operation of the proposed project would generate low levels of persistent noise and other disturbances that could adversely affect wildlife. Because wildlife have likely acclimated to the existing noise and disturbances in the study area, including operation of the Eastern Regional MRF and Transfer Station, and because the project would generate only low levels of noise, disturbance to wildlife would not be substantial. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
6 Cultural Resources			
Impact 6-1. Impacts to Historical Resources. The project site is located in a historic transportation corridor. A segment of the LTR&T Co Railroad and the 1860 Tahoe-Truckee Toll Road were located in this corridor. A field reconnaissance conducted on the site did not discover any evidence of historic resources. Nevertheless, it is possible that buried or concealed historic resources could be present and detected during ground disturbing activities at the project site. This impact would be **potentially significant.**	PS	**Mitigation Measure 6-1.** If an inadvertent discovery of cultural materials (e.g., unusual amounts of shell, animal bone, glass, ceramics, structure/building remains) is made during construction activities at the project site, ground disturbances in the area of the find shall be halted and a qualified professional archaeologist shall be notified regarding the discovery. The archaeologist shall determine whether the resource is potentially significant per the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and will develop appropriate mitigation to protect the integrity of the resource and ensure that no additional resources are affected. Mitigation could include but would not necessarily be limited to preservation in place, archival research, subsurface testing, or contiguous block unit excavation and data recovery.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Impact 6-2. Impacts to Archaeological Resources. The project area falls within the center of Washoe territory. The archaeological field reconnaissance conducted on the project site did not discover any evidence of archaeological resources. Nevertheless, it is possible that buried or concealed resources could be present and detected during ground disturbing activities. Disturbance of previously undiscovered archaeological resources would result in **potentially significant** impacts.	PS	The Applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 6-1 and 6-4.	LTS
Impact 6-3. Impacts to Paleontological Resources or Unique Geologic Features. No paleontological resources have been recorded from the project site; however, it is possible that buried or concealed paleontological resources could be present and detected as a result of ground disturbing activities. Disturbance of previously undiscovered paleontological resources would result in **potentially significant** impacts.	PS	**Mitigation Measure 6-3.** Before the start of grading and/or excavation, the Applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist or archaeologist to train all construction personnel involved with earthmoving activities, regarding the possibility of encountering paleontological resources at the site, the appearance and types of paleontological resources likely to be seen during project construction, and proper notification procedures should such resources be encountered. In the event that paleontological resources are discovered during ground disturbing activities, grading and construction work within 100 feet of the find shall be suspended until the significance of the features can be determined by a qualified professional paleontologist as appropriate. A qualified professional paleontologist shall then make recommendations for measures necessary to protect the find, or to undertake data recovery, excavation, analysis, and curation of paleontological materials as appropriate.	LTS
Impact 6-4. Disturbance to Human Remains. No known burials are present on the project site. Nevertheless, it is possible that buried remains could be present and detected as a result of ground disturbance. Disturbance of previously undiscovered burials would result in **potentially significant** impacts.	PS	**Mitigation Measure 6-4**. In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, potentially damaging excavation in the area of the burial shall be halted and the Applicant shall contact the Placer County Coroner and a professional archaeologist to determine the nature and extent of the remains. The coroner is required to examine	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or state lands (Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5[b]). If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by phone within 24 hours of making that determination (Health and Safety Code, Section 7050[c]). If the remains are determined to be those of a Native American, then the following shall occur: (a) The (State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Applicant, an archaeologist, and the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendant (MLD) shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments are not disturbed. The responsibilities for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in Section 5097.9 of the California Public Resources Code. (b) The SHPO shall ensure that the immediate vicinity (according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards and practices) is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD has taken place. The MLD shall have 48 hours to complete a site inspection and make recommendations after being granted access to the site. A range of possible treatments for the remains, including nondestructive removal and analysis, preservation in place, relinquishment of the remains and associated items to the descendants, or other culturally appropriate treatment may be discussed. Assembly Bill (AB) 2641 suggests that the concerned parties may extend discussions beyond the initial 48 hours to allow for the discovery of additional remains. AB 2641(e) includes a list of site protection measures and states that the Applicant shall implement one or more of the following measures:	

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		i. record the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center, ii. utilize an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement, and/or iii. record a document with the county in which the property is located. (c) The County or its authorized representative will rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance if the NAHC is unable to identify a MLD, or if the MLD fails to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being granted access to the site. The County may also reinter the remains in a location not subject to further disturbance if the County rejects the recommendation of the MLD, and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the County.	
7 Visual Resources			
Impact 7-1. Visual Character Impacts. While removal of onsite trees and construction of industrial structures could be perceived to have an adverse effect on the appearance of the project site in relation to other more pristine and natural areas, construction activities at the site would not result in physical characteristics that are substantially different from the developed conditions at the adjacent Eastern Regional MRF and Transfer Station and TART facilities. Therefore, the project would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site. This impact would be **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Impact 7-2. Scenic Resources Impacts. The project site does not possess any unique scenic resources for the area, including, rock outcroppings, trees, or historic buildings. State Route 89 is an Eligible route under the State Scenic Highway Program; however project buildings would not visible from State Route 89 and would have no effect on views experienced by travelers on that route. This impact would be **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
Impact 7-3. Light and Glare Impacts. The existing Eastern Regional MRF and Transfer Station and TART facilities currently use night lighting for operations and security purposes. Because of the 24-hour operations at the proposed biomass facility, additional nighttime lighting would be required and would be installed on the perimeter of the proposed building and mounted under the roof of the pole-barn structure. While the project site is located in a remote area, and night time lighting would not affect significant numbers of people, the additional night lighting would potentially increase sky glow effects that could adversely affect nighttime views of the sky outside of the immediate project area. This would be considered a **potentially significant** impact.	PS	**Mitigation Measure 7-3.** The Applicant shall ensure that exterior lighting installed at the facility will conform to an approved lighting plan. The exterior lighting plan shall be prepared prior to the issuance of a building permit, and submitted to the County with the project Improvement Plans for approval. Exterior lighting shall be limited to lighting required for safe operations and security purposes. The exterior lighting plan will require at a minimum the following: 〉 Identification of location of lighting, height, and positioning of all light fixtures, and type and style of light fixtures; 〉 Lighting shall be directed downward using fully shielded fixtures or fixtures otherwise designed to prevent light trespass or projection of light above the horizontal, except as needed for safe operations and security; 〉 The height of light poles shall be limited to 20 feet except as needed for operational and safety purposes. Light fixtures are not to exceed the height of adjacent structures. 〉 Ground level illumination levels shall not exceed two foot candles at the project property line.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
8 Transportation and Traffic			
Impact 8-1. Intersection Level of Service. The project's study intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS A with implementation of the project. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
Impact 8-2. Traffic Signal Warrants. The study intersection would not meet criteria for installing a traffic signal. This impact would be **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
Impact 8-3. Parking Impacts. The project site plan includes adequate parking supply onsite to serve the demand generated by the project. This project would result in **less-than-significant** impacts.	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
Impact 8-4. Transit Impacts. Implementation of the proposed project would not affect transit facilities or transit service in the project vicinity because the project would not change existing transit service or facilities and would not significantly increase traffic delay on existing transit routes. This project's transit impacts would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
Impact 8-5. Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Impacts. Because of limited employment opportunities and because the project is an industrial facility, it would not result in substantial demands for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Further, the project would not result in any changes to existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the area. This impact would be **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Impact 8-6. Construction Traffic Impacts. Construction activities and associated traffic would not cause the substantial deterioration of the LOS of surrounding roadways. The project's study intersection would continue to operate at an acceptable level at LOS A. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
Impact 8-7. Access and Circulation Impacts. The project would have adequately designed driveways and internal circulation roadways and would not affect circulation in the project vicinity. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
Impact 8-8. Safety Impacts. The proposed project would not affect safety in the project vicinity because the traffic volume generated by the project would be low and the LOS would not change; therefore, the existing lane configuration could adequately accommodate project-related traffic volumes. This impact would be **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
9 Air Quality			
Impact 9-1. Short-Term, Construction-Generated Emissions of ROG, NO_X, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Short-term, construction-generated emissions would not exceed PCAPCD's significance threshold for ROG, NO_X, or PM_{10}. Thus, short-term operational emissions of criteria area pollutants and precursors would not violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and/or conflict with air quality planning efforts. This impact would be **less than significant**.	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Impact 9-2. Long-Term, Operation-Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursor Emissions. Operation of the project would not result in mass emissions of criteria air pollutants or precursors in the Mountain Counties Air Basin or the Lake Tahoe Air Basin that exceed applicable mass emission thresholds. Thus, long-term operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors would not violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and/or conflict with air quality planning efforts. This impact would be **less than significant**.	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
Impact 9-3. Mobile-Source CO Concentrations. Short-term, construction-generated emissions would not exceed PCAPCD's significance threshold for ROG, NO_X, or PM_{10}, and thus, would not be expected to contribute to pollutant concentrations that exceed the NAAQS or CAAQS. This would be a **less-than-significant** impact.	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
Impact 9-4. Toxic Air Contaminant Concentrations. Construction and operation of the project would result in increased health risk levels associated with short-and long-term emissions of diesel PM and other TACs. However, the incremental increase in health risk levels, including cancer risk and noncancer chronic risk, would not exceed applicable thresholds at affected sensitive receptors. As a result, this impact would be **less than significant**.	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
Impact 9-5. Odorous Emissions. The project would introduce new odor sources into the area (e.g., diesel exhaust emissions, storage piles of biomass). However, these odor sources would not be expected to adversely affect adjacent land uses because project operations would include provisions that would guard against anaerobic activity in biomass storage piles and because	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
the nearest sensitive receptor to odors is located over 1,000 feet to the west, beyond the MRF site. Therefore, this impact would be considered **less than significant**.			
10 Climate Change			
Impact 10-1. Generation of GHG Emissions. Implementation of the proposed biomass power plant would result in a net increase in GHG emissions. However, the efficiency at which the power plant would produce electricity would be consistent with the state-wide efficiency of electricity generation needed to achieve the level GHG reductions identified for the electric power sector and would be consistent with AB 32's GHG emission reduction target and applicable provisions of the AB 32 Scoping Plan. Thus, the project's contribution of GHG emissions **would not be cumulatively considerable.**	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
Impact 10-2. Impacts of Climate Change on the Project. Climate change is expected to result in a variety of effects on the project area including changes to water supply and increased frequency and intensity of wildfire. Increased risks to the proposed facility could result. However, the proposed project includes design features that would minimize vulnerabilities to climate change impacts including appropriate types of infrastructure to prepare for wildland fire (e.g., reliable water source, water storage, non-vegetated setbacks, and fire-fighting infrastructure), and management practices to minimize risk of wildland fire on surrounding property (e.g., forest fuel management activity). Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
11 Noise			
Impact 11-1. Short-Term Construction Noise Impacts. Existing noise-sensitive receptors are located in close proximity to proposed construction areas. However, as stated in the project description, construction activities would be limited to the less noise-sensitive hours of the day (e.g., 6:00 A.M. and 8:00 P.M. Monday through Friday and 8:00 A.M. and 8:00 P.M. Saturday and Sunday) and, therefore, would be exempt from the Placer County noise standards. Thus, short-term onsite construction source noise would not result in the exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of applicable standards, or a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. This impact would be **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
Impact 11-2. Ground Vibration Impacts. Construction- and operational-related project activities would not result in vibration levels at the nearest sensitive land use that exceed Caltrans's recommended level of 0.2 in/sec PPV with respect to the prevention of structural damage for normal buildings or FTA's maximum acceptable level of 80 VdB with respect to human response for residential uses (i.e., annoyance). Thus, implementation of the project would not result in the exposure of existing sensitive receptors to excessive ground vibration or noise levels. Therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
Impact 11-3. Operational Stationary Source Noise Impacts. Project-generated stationary source noise levels would not exceed applicable noise standards and; therefore, would not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels at nearby existing noise-sensitive receptors. As a result, this impact is considered **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Impact 11-4. Operational Traffic Noise Impacts. Implementation of the project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project with regard to the long-term exposure of existing sensitive receptors to project-generated operational-related increases in traffic source noise levels. Therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
12 Geology, Soils and Paleontology			
Impact 12-1. Seismic Hazard Impacts. Previous soil sampling on the adjacent Eastern Regional MRF and Transfer Station site indicated the potential for liquefaction. A site-specific geotechnical study has not been prepared for the project. Because soils near the project site exhibit liquefaction properties, it is possible that similar soils exist on the project site. Therefore, this impact is considered **potentially significant.**	PS	**Mitigation Measure 12-1.** The Improvement Plan submittal shall include a geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following: A) Road, pavement, and parking area design; B) Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable); C) Grading practices; D) Erosion/winterization; E) Special problems discovered on-site, (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, etc.); and F) Slope stability. If the soils report indicates the presence of critically expansive or other soils problems that, if not corrected, could lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the requirements of the soils report shall be required prior to approval of the Improvement Plans. It is the responsibility of the Applicant to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Impact 12-2. Impacts Associated with Landslide, Lateral Spreading, Subsidence, or Collapse. Because the site is sloping and grading would involve cut and fill, there is a potential for grading activities to create slope instability. A site-specific geotechnical study and the final grading plan have not been prepared for the project; therefore, the potential exists for unstable slopes or other soil hazards to occur. This is considered a **potentially significant** impact.	PS	The Applicant will implement Mitigation Measure 12-1.	LTS
Impact 12-3. Risks to People and Structures from Seismic Hazards. Foundations and structures of the biomass facility would be designed based on site-specific conditions in accordance with seismic standards of the CBC, which includes specific minimum seismic safety and structural design requirements. This impact is considered **less than significant**.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
Impact 12-4. Risks to People and Structures from Avalanche Hazards. Slopes to the immediate west of the project site are between 14 and 20 percent. The project site is not located in a Potential Avalanche Hazard Area, as defined by Placer County, and the avalanche hazard is identified as low for the project site. This impact is considered **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
13 Hydrology and Water Quality			
Impact 13-1. Construction-Related Erosion and Sedimentation Impacts. Implementation of the project would result in slope and soil disturbance associated with construction activities that could cause accelerated soil erosion and sedimentation or the release of other pollutants to nearby water bodies. This impact would be considered **potentially significant.**	PS	**Mitigation Measure 13-1.** Final design of the detention facilities shall be included in the Final Drainage Report submitted with the Improvement Plans for the project. The final improvement plans shall contain the following information regarding stormwater drainage. a) The Applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the County for review and approval. The plans shall show all physical improvements as	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		required by the conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on and off site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, onsite and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The Applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees with the first Improvement Plan submittal. (NOTE: Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction costs shall be paid). The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the Applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or Development Review Committee (DRC) review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the Applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the County in both hard copy and electronic versions in a format to be approved by the County prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements. Conceptual landscape plans submitted prior to project approval may require modification during the Improvement Plan process to resolve issues of drainage and traffic safety. b) The Improvement Plans shall show all proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree	

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by the County. All cut/fill slopes shall be at a maximum of 2:1 (horizontal: vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the County concurs with said recommendation. Fill slopes shall not exceed 1.5:1 (horizontal: vertical) The Applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation, undertaken from April 1 to October 1, shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. It is the Applicant's responsibility to ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas, shall have proper erosion control measures applied for the duration of the construction as specified in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the County. The Applicant shall submit to the County a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110 percent of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work prior to Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon the County's acceptance of improvements, and satisfactory completion of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the Applicant or authorized agent. If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans	

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		shall be reviewed by the County for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the County to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body. c) The Improvement Plan submittal shall include a drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the County for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. “Best Management Practice” measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent contamination. d) Water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs), shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the County. Storm drainage from on- and offsite impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, infiltration basins, water quality basins, filters, etc. for entrapment of	

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the County. BMPs shall be designed at a minimum in accordance with the Placer County Guidance Document for Volume and Flow-Based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality Protection. No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals. All BMPs shall be maintained as required to insure effectiveness. The Applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation. Proof of on-going maintenance, such as contractual evidence, shall be provided to County upon request. e) Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the Applicant shall obtain a State Regional Water Quality Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction stormwater quality permit and shall provide to the County evidence of a state-issued Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees.	
Impact 13-2. Groundwater Depletion and Groundwater Recharge Impacts. Implementation of the proposed project would increase impervious surfaces on the project site by approximately two acres. However, this increase in impervious surfaces would not be expected to substantially alter the existing stormwater discharge from the project site and substantial areas of impervious surfaces are available surrounding the site. Therefore, the project would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. The project is located in a relatively rural area where groundwater is typically pumped by individual users. The project would result in the pumping of up to 16 acre-feet per	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
year (afy), and would increase pumping onsite by approximately 24%. It is not anticipated that this would be a substantial increase in groundwater pumping such that adverse groundwater depletion impacts in the local area would occur, because limited groundwater pumping occurs within the surrounding area and there is no evidence available to suggest that groundwater conditions are constrained. Overall, the project's groundwater depletion and groundwater recharge impacts would be **less than significant.**			
Impact 13-3. Potential Long-Term Degradation of Water Quality. Operation of the project would increase the intensity of use on the site, which could introduce new storm water pollutant sources. These pollutant sources could include oils and greases, petroleum hydrocarbons (gas and diesel fuels), nitrogen, phosphorus, and heavy metals. Pesticides, herbicides, and other landscape maintenance products could also be present and could adversely affect the quality of the site's storm water discharges. Additionally, there may be need for pretreatment of gasification-created wastewater prior to discharge to the regional sewer system. The potential water quality degradation associated with site operations would be considered **potentially significant.**	PS	The Applicant shall implement Mitigation Measures 13-1a through e.	LTS
Impact 13-4. Stormwater System Impacts. The project includes facilities that would ensure that the quantity of post-development peak stormwater flows from the project are, at a minimum, no more than the pre-development peak flow (e.g., detention facilities). These facilities would be designed in accordance with California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Lahontan Region) and Placer County's Stormwater Management Manual requirements. This impact would be **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
14 Population, Employment, Housing			
Impact 14-1. Induce Substantial Population Growth during Construction. The project would create up to 23 jobs during the construction phase, which would last from May to November over two construction seasons (2013 and 2014). Because of the limited number of construction positions and the shorter duration of construction 14 total months, the project would not be expected to result in substantial growth in the area. This impact would be considered **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
Impact 14-2. Displace Large Numbers of People or Housing. One temporary caretaker's residence owned by the County is currently located on the project site. This temporary house would be removed in order to construct the project. This would not constitute displacement of large numbers of people or housing. Therefore, this impact would be considered **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
Impact 14-3. Induce Substantial Population Growth During Operations. The estimated maximum number of employees required for the operational phase of the project is 13. A significant labor pool (approximately 8 percent of the labor force, with an 8.5 percent unemployment rate) of personnel is available in the surrounding Placer County, Nevada County, and Reno, Nevada areas to meet the needs of the project and an influx of new residents would not be expected as a result of the project. This impact would be considered **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
15 Public Services and Utilities			
Impact 15-1. Water Supply Impacts. Water supply on the site is limited to the capacity of the existing well and pump. The Applicant would select a vendor whose gasification technology could conform to water supply capabilities of the well and water supply system serving the site. Additionally, the project includes construction of a second well to provide redundant supply and reliability in the remote event the existing well would fail. The new well would be required to meet water quality and quantity criteria of the Placer County Environmental Health Department. Because adequate well capacity and redundant water supply would be provided with implementation of the project, the project's water supply impacts would be **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
Impact 15-2. Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment Capacity Impacts. The T-TSA advanced water reclamation plant has a permitted capacity of approximately 3.2 mgd. At maximum peak use flow, the biomass facility would discharge 14,400 gpd, which would be less than 0.5 percent of the T-TSA's available capacity. Therefore, adequate treatment capacity is available to serve the proposed biomass facility and no new facilities would be required. This impact would be **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
Impact 15-3. Increased Generation of Solid Waste. The project would generate solid waste during construction and operational activities. Construction activities could produce debris and operation activities would produce biochar, and municipal solid waste. Adequate long-term landfill disposal capacity (200 years permitted capacity) is available at the Lockwood Landfill in Storey, Nevada, to meet the project's solid waste generation needs. Therefore, the project's impacts on solid waste disposal would be **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Impact 15-4. Increased Demand for Electricity. The project would produce two MW of electricity for distribution through Calpeco's electrical grid that would also satisfy onsite electrical needs during plant operation. Overall, the project would result in a net surplus of electricity. Therefore, the project would have a **beneficial** electricity impact.	B	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	B
Impact 15-5. Increased Demand for Natural Gas. There would be some increase for demand of natural gas because the project would use a minimal amount of natural gas during start-up for boiler warm-up before biomass fuels are introduced, and for controlled cool down of the boiler during shut down. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant.**	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
Impact 15-6. Fire Protection, Emergency Medical Services, and Police Protection Impacts. While construction and operation of the biomass facility would increase the demand for police and emergency medical services compared to existing service requirements of adjacent facilities, this demand would be minor and would not change the daily operational needs (e.g., staffing or equipment) for the fire, emergency medical response, and police protection agencies. Further, adequate fire protection measures and setbacks would be in place to appropriately minimize fire hazard risks at the site and would not result in the need for expanded fire protection services. Therefore, this would be a **less-than-significant** impact.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
16 Hazardous Materials and Hazards			
Impact 16-1. Impacts from Exposure to Unknown Hazardous Materials. Volatile organic compounds have been identified in the groundwater underlying the Eastern Regional Landfill (closed) adjacent to the project site. Although not expected to be encountered during facility construction, excavation and construction activities in the area could result in the exposure of construction workers and the general public to previously undiscovered hazardous materials contamination. This impact is considered **significant.**	S	**Mitigation Measure 16-1.** If during site preparation and construction activities, previously undiscovered or unknown evidence of hazardous materials contamination is observed or suspected through either obvious or implied measures (e.g., stained or odorous soil, unknown storage tanks, etc.), construction activities in the area of the find shall immediately cease. County staff shall be immediately consulted and a qualified consultant registered in DTSC's Registered Environmental Assessor Program shall be contracted to assess the situation. Based on the assessment, the Applicant shall implement necessary remediation activities including but not limited to removal of soil and debris, treatment of contaminated groundwater, and capping the site prior to development. All required remediation shall include a DTSC Remedial Action Work Plan or equivalent. Based on consultation between the Registered Environmental Assessor and DTSC, remediation of the site shall be conducted consistent with all applicable regulations.	LTS
Impact 16-2. Impacts from Exposure to Hazardous Materials During Project Construction. Use of various paints, solvents, cements, glues, and fuels is expected during construction of the project. Construction workers and the general public could be exposed to hazardous materials as a result of improper handling or use; accident; environmentally unsound disposal methods; or fire, explosion, or other emergencies, resulting in adverse health effects. However, all allowable uses would be subject to compliance with federal, state, and local hazardous materials regulations, and would be monitored by the state (e.g., Cal/OSHA, DTSC, and CHP) and/or local jurisdictions. Therefore, the potential for human exposure to hazardous materials during construction would be considered a **less-than-significant** impact.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Impact 16-3. Impacts from Exposure to Hazardous Materials During Project Operations. The project facility would use many materials, some of which are considered hazardous, during the course of its daily operations. Compliance with federal, State, and local hazardous materials regulations, which would be monitored by the State and/or local jurisdictions, would avoid significant impacts associated with the use, transport, and storage of hazardous materials during operation of the project. Therefore, impacts related to creation of significant hazards to the public or the environment would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
Impact 16-4. Impacts from Exposure of People or Structures to Wildland Fires. Because the proposed facility would store potentially combustible woody biomass fuels, the facility operator would be required to incorporate applicable fire protection measures into the project design and operation procedures consistent with North Tahoe Fire Protection District, Truckee Fire Protection District, and CAL FIRE requirements and the fire and life safety regulations identified in Placer County Code Chapter 9, Article 9.32 including provisions for the prevention of wildland fires. However, as a result of the extensive storage of woody biomass fuel on the site, there is an increased risk for wildfire and exposure of people or structures to fire from this source. Therefore, this impact would be **potentially significant**.	PS	**Mitigation Measure 16-4.** The Applicant shall regularly compact the fuel piles to minimize fire risk in storage piles. The Applicant shall also prepare detailed written procedures for the management of biomass piles to prevent inadvertent combustion and fires, and that minimize vectors, odors, litter, and human contact with, inhalation, ingestion, and transportation of dust, particulates, and pathogenic organisms. The written procedures shall outline the specific measures that would be implemented to reduce the total pile storage area, and to prevent potential pile fires due to spontaneous combustion. The written procedures shall be subject to review and input by the County LEA that oversees the SWFP for the site and the Truckee Fire Protection District prior to initiating operations at the site. These measures shall include at a minimum the following: a) A schedule for periodic and random load checks of incoming biomass truckloads; b) Restricted public access to the facility (e.g., fencing); c) Fire prevention, protection, and control measures, including, but not limited to temperature monitoring of piles at least weekly, adequate water supply for fire suppression, and the isolation of potential ignition source from the biomass piles;	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		d) Fire lanes between piles shall be provided to allow fire control equipment access to all operational areas; e) Daily visual inspections of the storage piles to observe whether temperature-related effects are occurring (e.g., steam); and f) Leachate shall be controlled to prevent contact with the public. As necessary, measures such as moisture management (e.g., wetting), pile aeration, tarping, among others could be implemented to optimally manage the storage piles.	
18 Other CEQA Sections			
Cumulative Traffic Impact. On a long-term cumulative basis, the County requires that any project that contributes traffic trips would be required to pay the County's traffic impact fees. Therefore, County has determined that the project's contribution of trips to the roadway system would be a cumulatively considerable impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure, which requires payment of traffic fees would reduce this impact such that the project's impact would not be cumulatively considerable.	Cumulatively Considerable	**Mitigation Measure 18-1.** Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Applicant shall pay County traffic impact fees that are in effect for the Tahoe Resorts area pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. Fees shall be paid to Placer County DPW. Final determination of the fees will be made once the final site plans are submitted and approved by DPW.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant impact B = Beneficial impact PS = Potentially significant impact S = Significant impact