1 INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

PROJECT INFORMATION	
1. **Project Title:**	Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**	Placer County, Planning Services Division, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**	Placer County, Stacy Wydra, Senior Planner, (530) 581-6288
4. **Project Location:**	Approximately 7,428 acres within the Martis Valley Community Plan area in Placer County on either side of SR 267.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**	CREW Tahoe, LLC, c/o Mountainside Partners, PO Box 2537, Truckee, CA 96161
6. **General Plan Land Use Designation:**	West Parcel: Forest; majority of East Parcel: Forest with approximately 670 acres designated Low Density Residential and General Commercial.
7. **Zoning:**	West Parcel: Timberland Production; majority of East Parcel: Timberland Production with approximately 670 acres zoned Single-Family Residential and Neighborhood Commercial out of TPZ.
8. **Description of Project:**	See Notice of Preparation 1.0, "Project Description"
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings)**	See Notice of Preparation 1.0, "Project Description"
10: **Other public agencies whose approval is required: (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement)**	See Notice of Preparation 1.0, "Project Description"

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 Forest Resources	☒ Air Quality
☒ Biological Resources	☒ 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	☒ Utilities / Service Systems	☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance
		☐ None With Mitigation

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project COULD have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

☒ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature	Date
Printed Name	Title
Placer County, Planning Services Division	
Agency	

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 onsite as well as onsite, 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 "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering 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.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ARB	California Air Resources Board
BMP	best management practice
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Cal-OSHA	California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CGS	California Geological Survey
CHP	California Highway Patrol
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CO	carbon monoxide
CO_2	carbon dioxide
dB	decibel
dbh	diameter at breast height
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
Du	dwelling units
EIR	environmental impact report
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EVA	emergency vehicle access
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
GHG	greenhouse gas
Lahontan RWQCB	Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
L_{dn}	day-night noise level
L_{eq}	equivalent noise level
LID	low impact development
L_{max}	maximum sound level
L_{min}	minimum noise level
L_x	percentile-exceeded sound level

MCAB	Mountain Counties Air Basin
NCSD	Northstar Community Services District
NFD	Northstar Fire Department
NO_2	nitrogen dioxide
NO_X	oxides of nitrogen
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
PCAPCD	Placer County Air Pollution Control District
PCCP	Placer County Conservation Plan
plan area	Specific Plan area
PM	particulate matter
PM_{10}	inhalable particulate matter
$PM_{2.5}$	fine particulate matter
project applicant	CREW Tahoe, LLC
RNAV	area navigation (pertaining to aircraft equipment)
ROG	reactive organic gases
SFHA	Special Flood Hazard Area
SO_2	sulfur dioxide
Specific Plan or proposed project	Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan Project
SR	State Route
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TPZ	Timberland Production Zone
TRPA	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
TTSA	Tahoe Truckee Sanitation Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
WSA	Water Supply Assessment

1.1 AESTHETICS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
I. Aesthetics. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☒	☐	☐	☐

1.1.1 Discussion

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

The following discussion addresses items a) and c):

Potentially Significant Impact. A scenic vista is defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. As described in the *Placer County General Plan* (Policy 1.K.1), Placer County considers resources such as river canyons, lake watersheds, scenic highway corridors, ridgelines, and steep slopes to be valuable scenic resources (Placer County 2013). The broader region in which the project site is located generally includes the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada in Placer and Nevada counties, south of Sierra Valley, and includes the northern portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin. This region is sparsely populated outside of established communities and resorts, and the landscape character is defined by its dominant natural features: striking geologic formations, varied terrain, lakes, streams, and diverse natural vegetation communities. The terrain consists of gently sloping to moderately steep plateaus and mountain valleys (Martis Valley, Sierra Valley) with some steep mountainous areas. Natural water features in the region include Lake Tahoe to the south of the project site, Donner Lake to the northwest of the project area, and the Lower Truckee River, which drains from Lake Tahoe to the west and north of the project area. Development of the proposed project would change the existing visual character of a portion of the West Parcel from undeveloped coniferous forest to a built environment with residential and neighborhood commercial buildings, roadways, and associated infrastructure and landscaping. The Specific Plan would include development standards and design guidelines to ensure the aesthetic quality of the project development. However, changes to the visual character of the project site could be considered potentially significant, and this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. No designated state scenic highways are located within or adjacent to the project site, and the project site is not visible from an existing scenic highway (California) or byway (Nevada). State Route (SR) 28, located approximately 3 miles south of the project site along SR 267 from the proposed entrance into the project, is an eligible California state scenic highway (Caltrans 2014), but the project site is not visible from SR 28. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in damage to scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and no impact would occur.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Potentially Significant Impact. New sources of light and glare would be created by lighting of portions of the project roadways and residential and neighborhood commercial areas within the project site. The new roadways would not include lighting along the entire alignments, but main intersections at primary roads and portions of the roads would include street lighting. Glare could also be created if reflective exterior building materials are used. This could increase the amount of light and glare on the project site relative to current conditions, and could adversely affect nighttime views, potentially increasing “sky-glow.” Therefore, this impact could be considered potentially significant and this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

1.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
II. Agriculture and Forest Resources.				
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997, as updated) prepared by the California Department 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 provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.				
Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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))?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐

1.2.1 Discussion

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?

No Impact. The project site has not been mapped by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (DOC 2010) and therefore does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance. No agricultural activities occur within either parcel. In addition, the project would not be located on or adjacent to farmland; therefore, the project would not convert farmland to non-agricultural use. No impact would occur.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. The project would not be located on or adjacent to farmland or land under a Williamson Act contract (DOC 2013); therefore, the project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

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))?

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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?

The following discussion addresses items c), d), and e):

Potentially Significant Impact. The West Parcel portion of the project site is currently zoned Timberland Production; however, the site is not intensively harvested by the land owner at present. Under the proposed project, 662 acres of the West Parcel would be rezoned from Timberland Production to Residential. The remaining 390 acres would remain designated Forest. If the Specific Plan and immediate rezone of the West Parcel from TPZ are approved by both the Placer County Board of Supervisors and the Board of Forestry, the 670 acres of the East Parcel currently zoned for development would be redesignated Forest and rezoned Timberland Production. The California State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection [through California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE)] must approve the immediate withdrawal from the TPZ before rezoning of the West Parcel can take place. The Placer County Board of Supervisors would tentatively approve the withdrawal of the West Parcel from the TPZ. The withdrawal would then be considered by CAL FIRE. A Timberland Conversion Permit would be required as part of the withdrawal. After the withdrawal is approved by CAL FIRE, the rezoning of the West Parcel would be effective. If the West Parcel is rezoned, the East Parcel would be rezoned Timberland Production. While the withdrawal of the West Parcel from TPZ may be offset by the rezoning of the East Parcel as TPZ and the preservation of the entire 6,376 acres as Forest/TPZ, the changes to the zoning and subsequent allowable operations on both the East and West Parcels would affect existing timberland zoning and could result in the loss of some forest, which could be considered potentially significant. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

1.3 AIR QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
III. Air Quality.				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied on to make the following determinations.				
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☒	☐	☐	☐

1.3.1 Discussion

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

The following discussion addresses items a) and b)):

Potentially Significant Impact. The project site is located in Placer County, within the Mountain Counties Air Basin (MCAB). The MCAB also includes all of Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa, Nevada, Plumas, Sierra, and Tuolumne counties, and the western portion of El Dorado County. Air quality within Placer County is regulated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Air Resources Board (ARB), and the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD). Each agency develops rules, regulations, and/or policies to comply with applicable legislation.

Concentrations of ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), respirable particulate matter (PM_{10}), fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$), and lead are used as indicators of ambient air quality conditions. Because these are the most prevalent air pollutants, often called criteria air pollutants, known to be deleterious to human health and extensive health-effects criteria documents are available, they are commonly referred to as “criteria air pollutants.” During construction of the proposed project, criteria air

pollutant emissions would be temporarily and intermittently generated from a variety of sources. Project-related excavation and site grading activities would generate fugitive particulate matter (PM) dust emissions. Fugitive PM dust emissions are primarily associated with ground disturbance and material transport. Exhaust emissions from diesel equipment, material transport trips, and construction worker-commute trips also contribute to short-term increases in PM emissions, but to a lesser extent. Exhaust emissions from these construction-related mobile sources would also include reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_X). In addition, the application of architectural coatings (i.e., interior and exterior surface painting) would result in off-gas emissions of ROG. Buildout of the proposed project is anticipated to occur over 20 years. Residents living onsite during the early phases of development could be exposed to exhaust emissions from construction equipment during later phases of development. Sensitive receptors located in the vicinity, including recreational users, may be exposed to concentrations of criteria air pollutants. Operation of the proposed project would result in air pollutant emissions from project-generated motor vehicle trips, landscaping equipment, area sources such as propane gas for outdoor barbeques (residences would be served by natural gas), and stationary sources such as boilers for building heating. The proposed project has the potential to result in criteria air pollutants that exceed applicable air quality standards, and project operation could potentially conflict with PCAPCD's air quality attainment plan. These impacts could be considered potentially significant, and these issues will be analyzed further in the EIR.

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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Potentially Significant Impact. Placer County is currently designated as a nonattainment area for the state and national ambient air quality ozone standards, and the state PM_{10} standards (ARB 2012). As discussed above, long-term operation of the proposed project would result in additional sources of criteria air pollutants. Therefore, the proposed project could contribute to the nonattainment status of the region, and the proposed project could contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. As a result, project operation-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors could be cumulatively considerable. This impact could be considered potentially significant and will be further analyzed in the EIR.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Potentially Significant Impact. Buildout of the proposed project is anticipated to occur over 20 years. Residents living onsite during the early phases of development could be exposed to pollutants and/or odors from diesel exhausts from construction equipment during later phases of development. Sensitive receptors located in the vicinity, including recreational users, may be exposed to substantial concentrations of criteria air pollutants. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be further analyzed in the EIR.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Potentially Significant Impact. The occurrence and severity of odor impacts depend on numerous factors, including the nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; wind speed and direction; and the presence of sensitive receptors. Although offensive odors rarely cause any physical harm, they still can be unpleasant, leading to considerable distress and often generating citizen complaints to local governments and regulatory agencies. Odors from the use of on-site equipment during construction activities could affect sensitive receptors if construction activities occur after residential and other sensitive receptors are construction onsite. During project operation, use of diesel backup generators could emit odors. This issue will be further analyzed in the EIR.

1.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. Biological Resources. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☒	☐	☐	☐
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

1.4.1 Discussion

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 Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Potentially Significant Impact. Special-status plant and wildlife habitats occur on the project site. Suitable late seral nesting/denning habitat within the project area was defined as Sierran mixed conifer, red fir, white fir, and subalpine conifer forest stands with old-growth characteristics. Forest stands with these characteristics provide potential breeding habitat for some special-status wildlife species, including California spotted owl, northern goshawk, and American marten. In the project area, solely within the East Parcel where no development is proposed, approximately 275 acres of suitable late seral forest

nesting/denning habitat were identified and mapped. California spotted owl and northern goshawk were identified as present on the project site in the Background Biological Resources Report prepared for the project. The preliminary biological resources assessment for the project also lists the potential presence of Olive-sided flycatcher, Yellow warbler, Mule deer, and Davy's sedge. Several other special-status plant and wildlife species have a moderate or high likelihood of occurring on the project site. Several of the species that are known to occur, or have the potential to occur, are located on the East Parcel where no development is proposed. However, the proposed project would result in development on the West Parcel, with up to 300 acres of disturbance and grading. Because implementation of the proposed project could result in disturbance or take of special-status species or disturbance or removal of suitable habitat for these species, this impact could be considered potentially significant, and this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Potentially Significant Impact. Seventeen upland and wetland land cover and habitat types occupy the project site. Noxious weeds are particularly invasive or detrimental plant species that have been so designated by the federal or state government in an effort to control their spread. At the federal level, noxious weeks are designated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In California, the state designation is made by the California Department of Food and Agriculture. Infestations of two noxious weed species (Bullthistle (*Cirsium vulgare*) and Cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*) were documented on the project site.

Sensitive natural communities and habitats are those of special concern to resource agencies because of their rarity and/or value as wildlife habitat, or those that are afforded specific consideration under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Sensitive habitats in the project area include wetland and riparian areas, and late seral forests. Development of the proposed project would change a portion of the West Parcel from undeveloped coniferous forest to a built environment with residential and neighborhood commercial buildings, roadways, and associated infrastructure. The sensitive natural communities identified on the project site could be affected by project implementation, and the project could disturb or remove riparian or other sensitive habitat. Therefore, this impact could be considered potentially significant, and this issue will be further analyzed in the EIR.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. Reconnaissance-level surveys and remote sensing data indicate the presence of jurisdictional wetlands within the portions of the project area proposed for development. Additionally, some riparian habitat within these portions of the project site may contain jurisdictional wetlands. Disturbance of any riparian or wetland area would require a wetland delineation and jurisdictional determination in compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. This impact could be considered potentially significant, and this issue will be further analyzed in the EIR.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. Wildlife corridors are features that provide connections between two or more areas of habitat that would otherwise be isolated and unusable. Often drainages, creeks, or riparian areas are used by wildlife as movement corridors as these features can provide cover and access across a

landscape. Martis Creek may be used by wildlife as a movement corridor. The Martis Valley area and the western shore of Lake Tahoe form the southernmost part of the Loyalton-Truckee Deer herd's summer range and support fawning areas. While SR 267 bisects migration paths, deer have the potential to migrate through the East Parcel to the West Parcel as they move into the Lake Tahoe Basin along Martis Creek and West Martis Creek. Project-related impacts to the movement of wildlife through this corridor could be considered potentially significant and will be further analyzed in the EIR.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Placer County General Plan and the MVCP contain policies related to the protection of biological resources. Placer County's tree ordinance addresses preservation of trees in the area east of the Sierra Summit (Placer County Code, Article 12.20). The ordinance is applicable to all trees east of the Sierra summit that are 6 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) or over, excluding lands devoted to the growing and harvesting of timber for commercial purposes. As stated above, suitable late seral nesting/denning habitat within the project area was defined as Sierran mixed conifer, red fir, white fir, and subalpine conifer forest stands with old-growth characteristics. The proposed project would result in development on the West Parcel, with up to 300 acres of disturbance and grading. Much of this disturbance would require removal of existing trees. A Timber Harvest Plan must be prepared and considered by CAL FIRE prior to the removal of timberland, and a tree permit must be obtained prior to removal of trees over 6-inches dbh. The majority of the area proposed for development is coniferous forest, which is common throughout the area. However, the removal of trees could be considered potentially significant, and the EIR will analyze the proposed project's consistency with local plans and policies related to biological resources.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. Placer County is preparing the *Placer County Conservation Plan* (PCCP) for the western portion of the County. This is the only HCP in, or proposed, for Placer County. The project site is not located within the boundary of the PCCP (Placer County 2011) and therefore, would not conflict with this plan. No other habitat conservation plans, NCCPs, or similar plans are being considered in the project site. No impact would occur.

1.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
V. Cultural Resources. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☒	☐	☐	☐

1.5.1 Discussion

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

The following discussion addresses items a) and b):

Potentially Significant Impact. In compliance with guidelines established by Placer County (CEQA Section 5024, Public Resource Code), the project applicant is required to consider potential project impacts on heritage resources. Heritage resource studies are customarily performed in a series of phases (1, 2 and 3), each one building upon information gained from the prior study. The *Phase 1A* preliminary prefield research report was submitted to the project sponsor on March 27, 2013. As part of the *Phase 1A* study, prefield research at the North Central Information Center, California State University, Sacramento disclosed that portions of the proposed project have been included in prior archaeological investigations and three heritage resources have been inventoried (Lindstrom 2013).

During the Phase 1B study (August 2013) and the Offsite Utilities Connection and Fire Road study (January 2015), the entire project area was subject to a surface survey using a mixed reconnaissance strategy of intensive systematic and general coverage techniques. The *Phase 1B* field reconnaissance disclosed a total of 45 heritage resources within the East and West Parcels. These resources represent prehistory and historical themes associated with logging, transportation, grazing, recreation, and public forest management. Resource types include archaeological sites and site complexes, linear features, and isolated finds (Lindstrom 2013). Construction-related ground disturbing activities could damage or destroy these and/or previously undiscovered resources. Therefore, the impact to historic and archaeological resources could be considered potentially significant, and this issue will be further analyzed in the EIR.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant Impact. There have been no recent discoveries of paleontological resources in the project region and there is no evidence identifying any sensitivity for paleontological resources in the project site. Geologic and soil conditions in the region were created by geologic uplift resulting in deep granitic bedrock with typically shallow surface soils. The project site is not underlain with sedimentary rock formations of a type that could contain fossils. In addition, past glacial movement in the area has resulted in significant movement and disturbance of rock and soil, further minimizing the potential for fossils to be present. Significant paleontological resources are not expected to occur, and this issue would be less than significant.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Potentially Significant Impact. No human remains have been found previously on the project site. However, the potential for human remains to occur below the ground surface in the project area is currently unknown. Implementation of the proposed project would involve soil disturbance during construction, which could result in impacts to any interred on-site human remains. This could be considered a potentially significant impact and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

1.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Geology and Soils. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.)	☒	☐	☐	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☒	☐	☐	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☒	☐	☐	☐
iv) Landslides?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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 onsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

1.6.1 Discussion

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.)

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

iv) Landslides and Avalanches

Potentially Significant Impact. Development of the proposed project could result in the exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards. A preliminary Avalanche Hazard Report was prepared in August 2013. Based on this site-specific study there are no slopes within the proposed development that meet the criteria of Potential Avalanche Hazard Areas as defined in the Placer County Avalanche Ordinance. While East Parcel slopes are not steep enough to produce avalanches, some of those of the West Parcel are steep enough to have avalanche potential. They are located in a thin band to the northeast of the northwest – southeast trending ridgeline that runs diagonally across the West Parcel. These steep slopes are heavily forested with a tree density that would likely prevent avalanche slab formation and propagation, so they are not considered Potential Avalanche Hazard Areas (Heywood 2013). However, if the project removed a contiguous portion of the heavily forested trees in this area, it could create an avalanche path. Therefore this issue could be considered potentially significant and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

Similar to nearly all of California, the project site is located in a potentially active seismic area. The site has experienced moderate ground shaking from historic earthquakes. The California Geological Survey (CGS) Open File Report 96- 08, Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Assessment for the State of California and the 2002 Fault Parameters classifies the project site as being located within the Western Nevada Seismic Zone, a poorly defined system of strike slip and dip slip faults. The fault system is designated as Type C, defined as having a low rate of slip, low rate of recurrence, and not capable of producing large magnitude earthquakes (Holdrege & Kull 2013a:10). However, while the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo zone, the CGS earthquake catalog identified other potential seismic sources in the vicinity of the project site, including: Dog Valley Fault, Mohawk Valley Fault Zone, Genoa Fault, Antelope Valley, Honey Lake Fault, West Tahoe – Dollar Point Fault, Polaris Fault, Agate Bay Fault, Incline Village Fault, and the North Tahoe Fault. Earthquakes associated with these faults may cause strong ground shaking at the project site (Holdrege & Kull 2013a:14). These faults could potentially rupture and expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects. The northern portion of the West Parcel contains moderately steep to steep slopes that may be subject to slope instability such as landslides, debris flows, and rock fall. In the event of a significant forest fire, the risk of rockfall, avalanche, and debris flow may increase. This impact could be potentially significant and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Potentially Significant Impact. Depending on wind and rain conditions, grading activities and improvements could result in the potential for erosion and sedimentation of site soils both on- and offsite. During construction activities, graded, excavated, and stockpiled soil could be exposed to erosion via wind and surface water runoff. However, potential soil erosion or the loss of top soil could be potentially significant, and this issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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 onsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Potentially Significant Impact. Potential seismic hazards resulting from a nearby moderate to major earthquake can generally be classified as primary and secondary. The primary effect is fault ground rupture, also called surface rupture. Secondary seismic hazards include liquefaction, lateral spreading, and

seismically induced slope instability and rock fall. Liquefaction is a phenomenon where loose, saturated, granular soil deposits lose a significant portion of their shear strength due to excess pore water pressure buildup. Cyclic loading, such as an earthquake, typically causes the increase in pore water pressure and subsequent liquefaction. Based on the results of the Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering and Geologic Review, it is anticipated that near-surface soil throughout the project site consists of loose to dense granular soil types overlying near-surface volcanic rock. This soil profile has a low potential for liquefaction.

Lateral spreading is the lateral movement of fractured rock or soil resulting from liquefaction of subadjacent materials. Because liquefaction potential at the site is anticipated to be low, the potential for lateral spreading to occur is also considered low to moderate. The potential for failure from subsidence and lateral spreading is highest in areas where there is a high groundwater table, where there are relatively soft and recent alluvial deposits, and where creek banks are relatively high. Based on site topography and characteristics of underlying materials, high groundwater levels are not anticipated on the project site (Holdrege & Kull 2013a).

Evidence of an ancient landslide, anticipated to be 70,000 to 120,000 years old, includes a steep eroded scarp below the ridgeline, benches, and hummocky topography within the sloping northern portion of the West Parcel. The ancient landslide appears to be stable and not continuing to creep or move at this time. Rock fall is a very localized potential hazard limited to immediately on or adjacent to rock outcrops throughout the project area (Holdrege & Kull 2013a:6). The landslide area could pose constraints to development, which could be considered potentially significant. The issues of secondary seismic hazards will be evaluated further in the EIR.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Soil throughout most of the project areas is mapped as Jorge-Tahoma complex, 2 to 30 and 30 to 50 percent slopes. Actual slopes mapped on the West Parcel range from zero to 10 percent up to 30 to 67 percent. The Jorge-Tahoma complex soil unit is described as forming on weathered andesite, basalt and latite volcanic flows and generally consists of a stony sandy loam. The Jorge-Tahoma soil series is well-drained, has a moderate subsoil permeability rate, an average depth of 48 inches, and has a moderate to severe erosion hazard when bare of vegetation. The Fugawee soil series is mapped along a portion of the gentle to moderately sloping terrain in the project areas. The Fugawee soil is well-drained, has a moderate subsoil permeability rate, and a slight to moderate erosion hazard when bare of vegetation (Holdrege & Kull 2013a:4).

The Jorge-Tahoma and Fugawee soil types are generally well-drained and form in upland areas underlain by near-surface volcanic rock. They typically have a moderate permeability and form on slopes ranging from two to fifty percent. These soil types generally have a slow to medium surface runoff and slight to moderate erosion hazard. Because the site soil is expected to be granular, future structures built on the West Parcel could likely be supported on conventional shallow spread foundations bearing on compacted structural fill, previously undisturbed native soil, and/or rock. No highly plastic or potentially compressible soil is anticipated. No expansive soil is anticipated on the project site; therefore this impact would be less than significant.

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?

No Impact. NCSD maintains sewer lines in the project area and wastewater would ultimately be conveyed to the TTSA for treatment. The proposed project would connect to NCSD transmission lines. The project would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems that could be affected by poor soils. Therefore, no impact would occur related to the adequate support of such facilities.

1.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				
i.) Short-Term Construction Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☒	☐	☐	☐
ii.) Long-Term Operational Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				
i.) Short-Term Construction Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☒	☐	☐	☐
ii.) Long-Term Operational Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☒	☐	☐	☐

1.7.1 Discussion

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Potentially Significant Impact. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions generated by the proposed project during construction would predominantly be in the form of carbon dioxide (CO_2). Emissions would be associated with mobile-source exhaust from construction worker commute trips, truck trips, and equipment used in the project site (e.g., excavators, graders). Depending on the size of the project footprint and duration of construction activities, project construction would generate GHG emissions that result in significant contributions to this cumulative impact. Operation of the proposed project would add mobile sources of GHGs associated with residents and employees. In addition, the removal of trees for development on the West Parcel would result in the loss of existing sources of carbon storage/sequestration. This impact could be considered potentially significant and, therefore, will be analyzed further in the EIR.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction activities have the potential to result in GHG emissions that could exceed applicable thresholds and, therefore, construction-related activities from the proposed project could conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The removal of trees on the project site could also decrease the amount of carbon sequestration provided by the existing forested area. Operation-related GHG emissions would not be great enough to directly alter climate or cause other changes. However, in combination with other development and GHG sources in the region and beyond, the project contribution to cumulative generation of GHG could be considerable. Therefore, the proposed project could potentially conflict with the goals of AB 32 and other applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. This could be considered a potentially significant impact and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

1.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐

1.8.1 Discussion

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Potentially Significant Impact. Hazardous materials would be stored, used, and transported in varying amounts during construction and long-term operation of the proposed project. Construction activities would primarily involve the storage, use, and transport of various household products such as paints, solvents,

glues, and cements. Petroleum hydrocarbon products such as gasoline, diesel, and lubricants would be used in heavy equipment and construction vehicles. Operation of the proposed project would involve residential, neighborhood commercial, and recreational uses. Hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and transported to the project site to support those long-term uses would include commercial and household-type maintenance products such as cleaning agents and degreasers, paints, and pesticides and herbicides; propane for heating; and diesel for emergency backup generators. In addition, commercial uses associated with project operation could include facilities and/or activities that could use and routinely transport hazardous materials on and off the project site.

Transport of hazardous materials on area roadways is regulated by the California Highway Patrol (CHP) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The project applicant, builders, contractors, business owners, and others would be required to use, store, and transport hazardous materials in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations, including the California Occupational Health and Safety Administration (Cal-OSHA) and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) requirements and manufacturer's instructions, during project construction and operation. Facilities that would use hazardous materials onsite would be required to obtain permits and comply with appropriate regulatory agency standards designed to avoid hazardous waste releases. Although the proposed project would be required to implement and comply with existing hazardous material regulations, impacts related to the creation of significant hazards to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials could be considered potentially significant and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Potentially Significant Impact. Hazardous materials can present a risk to people or the environment through improper handling or use of hazardous materials or hazardous wastes, particularly by untrained personnel; environmentally unsound disposal methods; or fire, explosion, or other emergencies. Implementation of applicable local, state, and federal regulations and standards would help ensure that potential public health and environmental hazards would be minimized; however, if the project resulted in upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, a significant hazard to the public or environment could occur. Therefore, this impact could be potentially significant. This issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No Impact. Construction and operation of the proposed project would include the use of common hazardous materials, such as diesel fuel, lubricants, and detergents. These materials would be handled consistent with local, state, and federal regulations and standards. There are no existing or proposed schools located within 0.25 mile of the project. The nearest school to the project site is Kings Beach Elementary (8125 Steelhead Avenue), located approximately 3 miles to the southeast from the West Parcel. No handling of hazardous materials would occur within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Less-than-Significant Impact. A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (Holdrege & Kull 2013b:5) was completed for the developable portions of the East and West parcels (subject property). The Phase 1 included research and review of records, interviews with a representative of Sierra Pacific Industries, and a

site reconnaissance. The records review included a search of the GeoTracker website, which is maintained by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), for potential releases within a ½ to one mile radius of the subject parcels. No record of releases were found within a ½ to one mile radius of the subject property location on the GeoTracker website. The site assessment also researched specific environmental databases to identify recorded release sites within the immediate vicinity of the subject property. No sites were identified within a ½ mile radius and upslope direction of the subject property. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact.

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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The nearest public airport within an airport land use plan is the Truckee-Tahoe Airport, located approximately 1.5 miles from the northwest portion of the East Parcel to the eastern edge of the Airport. The Airport is located approximately 4 miles northwest of the northern portion of the West Parcel. The West Parcel is not located within the Compatibility Map prepared for the Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Foothill Airport Land Use Commission 2004:2-16), but the East Parcel is within Zone E, which is defined as "Other Airport Environs." This zone has no maximum residential density limit, and development conditions include airspace review for objects greater than 100 feet tall, and major spectator-oriented sports stadiums, amphitheaters, and concert halls are discouraged beneath principal flight tracks. No development is proposed on the East Parcel. A proposed voluntary Area Navigation (RNAV) Visual Arrival Procedure is currently under review by the Federal Aviation Administration. However, this would not change the Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Plan, and the West Parcel would remain outside of the Compatibility Map and the East Parcel would remain in Zone E. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant. As discussed below under Item 1.12(e) (Noise), potential noise impacts related to exposure of people residing or working in the project area from operations of the Truckee-Tahoe Airport will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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?

No Impact. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. As discussed above under Item 1.8(f) (Hazards and Hazardous Materials), portions of the project site are located within the compatibility map for the Truckee Tahoe Airport, an airport with an adopted Land Use Plan. No other airports (including private airstrips) are located nearby. Therefore, no impacts related to safety hazards at private airstrips would occur.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Potentially Significant Impact. Project construction may result in traffic delays and possibly road closures that could affect emergency access to the project site and surrounding areas. While a construction management plan and traffic control plan would be required and would detail measures to ensure adequate emergency access during construction, it is unknown at this time what specific emergency access measures would be implemented.

A year-round paved EVA road would be constructed through the 325-acre forest land, connecting to SR 267 at Brockway Summit. In addition, a secondary seasonal EVA is proposed to be provided by connection to the Fibreboard Freeway, a paved road which runs adjacent to the southeastern corner of the project site and connects to SR 267. Both EVAs would provide access for emergency vehicles only, unless needed to also evacuate residents. The seasonal EVA via Fibreboard would be unimproved, not maintained, and used only

in non-winter months for catastrophic events. The adequacy of the EVAs to serve project development has not been analyzed at this time. Therefore, this impact could be considered potentially significant and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. The California State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection identifies those lands where CAL FIRE has the primary duty for wildland fire prevention and suppression; these lands are commonly known as state responsibility areas. California law requires CAL FIRE to identify areas based on the severity of fire hazard that is expected to prevail there. These areas, or "zones," are based on factors such as fuel (material that can burn), slope and fire weather. The three zones, based on increasing fire hazard, are medium, high, and very high. The project site is located primarily within a "very high" area (CAL FIRE 2007). Because the project would result in the placement of housing and other structures that would contain substantial numbers of people in a very high area, thereby exposing people and structures to a risk of wildland fires, this impact could be potentially significant. This issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

1.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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 on- or onsite erosion or siltation?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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 on- or onsite flooding?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

1.9.1 Discussion

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

The following discussion addresses items a) and f):

Potentially Significant Impact. Project-related construction activities would involve grading, earth moving, excavation, infrastructure development, and building construction. During project construction, disturbed portions of the project site would be subject to wind erosion, rainfall, and winter stormwater runoff events. Construction activities could result in soil erosion, siltation, or flooding. Specifically, construction activities such as grading could result in disturbance of soils and sediment that could be carried into the County's drainage conveyances or natural water bodies during storm events. Further, accidental discharges of construction-related fuels, oils, hydraulic fluid, and other hazardous substances could contaminate stormwater flows or increase siltation in nearby water bodies, resulting in a reduction in stormwater quality on or downstream of the project site. New impervious surfaces that would be constructed as part of the project could increase the volume of runoff coming from the project site. Runoff could contain oils, grease, fuel, sediments, brake dust, and other potential water pollutants. During storm events, these pollutants could be carried to downstream receiving waters. Therefore, this could be considered a potentially significant impact and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

Potentially Significant Impact. The project site is not located within a mapped groundwater basin. However, it is directly adjacent and south of the Martis (Truckee) Valley Groundwater Basin, which is within Nevada and Placer Counties, California. Water supply in the Martis Valley comes primarily from groundwater. The MVWPSP area would be annexed into, and water service would be provided by, NCSD. A water supply assessment (WSA) will be prepared under the direction of the NCSD to determine the proposed project's total water demand and whether available supplies are sufficient to meet this demand. Although the project is not expected to interfere with groundwater recharge because it is not located in a recharge area, the WSA will evaluate groundwater as a water source and the project's potential effects on groundwater. This impact could be considered potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

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 on- or onsite erosion or siltation?

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 on- or onsite flooding?

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?

The following discussion addresses items c), d), and e):

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would result in a maximum of 760 residential units and 6.6 acres of commercial uses and would increase the amount of impervious surface area in the project area by constructing new buildings, roadways, and walkways. This would increase the volume of surface runoff, thereby altering the existing site drainage pattern and potentially resulting in erosion and siltation.

The project site drainage flows into the Martis Valley. Onsite drainage facilities would be designed to ensure that there are no substantial changes to the hydrology of the existing watershed. Project runoff would be collected, treated, and infiltrated onsite to the greatest extent possible via basins, curb and gutter, swales, roc- lined channels, infiltration systems, retention/detention basins, BMPs, and other LID Measures. LID measures use a land planning and engineering design approach to managing storm water runoff that emphasizes conservation and use of on-site natural features to protect water quality. Post-development peak flows exiting the project site would ultimately be less than or equal to the pre-development or existing peak flows because flows would be conveyed to retention/infiltration facilities (either above- or below-ground) that would take peak runoff of storm events. The project's storm water would follow existing hydrological courses, either ultimately to the NCSD reservoir or Middle Martis Creek. No off-site drainage improvements are anticipated. However, a relatively large area of land would be disturbed during construction, resulting in the potential for on-site soil erosion and a short-term increase of surface runoff. Thus, these impacts could be considered potentially significant and these issues will be analyzed further in the EIR.

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?

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

The following discussion addresses items g) and h):

Potentially Significant Impact. Flood hazard areas identified on the Flood Insurance Rate Map are identified as a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA). SFHAs are defined as the area that will be inundated by the flood event having a 1-percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year, known as the base flood or 100-year flood. Per the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Map Number 06061C000 F, the entire Martis Valley West Parcel is within the Zone-X FEMA flood hazard area. Zone-X describes areas of 0.2 percent annual chance (or 500-year) flood; areas of 1 percent annual chance flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile.

The project site may include local 100-year floodplains that are not mapped by FEMA. A local 100-year flood hazard area is generally defined by Placer County as any drainageway that has a watershed tributary area of 20 or more acres. Any watersheds meeting this definition within the site would be identified and evaluated in the Preliminary Drainage Report prepared for the project. Localized 100-year flood hazard areas would then be identified along with the locations of proposed developments. This impact could be considered potentially significant, and this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

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?

No Impact. Lake Tahoe Dam is located in Tahoe City, at the outlet of the Lake on the Truckee River, approximately 6 miles southwest of the southwestern portion of the West Parcel. Any failure of the Lake Tahoe Dam is expected to be contained generally within the Truckee River floodway, which is outside of the project area. Martis Creek Dam is located approximately 4 miles north of the West Parcel. Any failure of this facility would result in flows toward the north in Martis Creek and into the Truckee River. No impact to the project site would occur.

j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact. Because of the elevation of the project's proposed development area and distance from the nearest large body of water—Lake Tahoe (approximately 3 miles south of the project site along SR 267 from the proposed entrance into the project)—it is unlikely that the proposed project would be affected by inundation as a result of seiche or tsunami. Soils capable of generating damaging mudflows are not present in the project area. There would be no impact.

1.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
X. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	☒	☐	☐	☐

1.10.1 Discussion

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The project area is currently undeveloped and consists of coniferous forest. There are no permanent structures on the project site and the only roads are paved and unpaved logging and fire roads. Therefore, the proposed project would not disrupt or divide an established community and would not cause physical changes such as urban decay or deterioration. There would be no impact.

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

d) Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts?

e) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?

The following discussion addresses items b), d), and e):

Potentially Significant Impact. The West Parcel is designated Forest in the MVCP. The majority of the East Parcel is designated Forest with approximately 670 acres designated Low Density Residential and General Commercial. The project proposes to redesignate the entire East Parcel as Forest, with a conservation easement or fee simple transaction to a conservation group. The West Parcel would be redesignated for residential, commercial and forest uses.

The West Parcel acreage is currently zoned TPZ and the East Parcel is zoned TPZ, Single-Family Residential and Neighborhood Commercial with a combining Use Permit and combining Design Sierra. The proposed project would rezone the East Parcel TPZ and the West Parcel would be zoned Residential, which would allow for single and multi-family residential uses, small commercial uses to serve the development, and homeowner amenities.

The proposed project would result in a maximum of 760 residential units and 6.6 acres of commercial uses on the West Parcel and would amend the MVCP land use plan. Because the project would result in a substantial alteration of present and planned land uses, these issues will be further analyzed in the EIR.

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

No Impact: As described above in "Biological Resources," the project site is not located within an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan; therefore, the project would not conflict with such plans. No impact would occur.

1.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. Mineral Resources. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

1.11.1 Discussion

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?

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?

The following discussion addresses items a) and b):

No Impact. According to the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the proposed project, mining of quartz was common along Middle Martis Creek and Martis Valley in the early 1860s. The Elizabethtown Mine, located near the entrance to the present day Northstar California Resort, was established in the early 1860s and mined for silver. The town contained at least thirteen buildings, including a blacksmith shop, store, saloons, butcher, barber, eating house, and miner's cabins. A small mining town was located within and near the northeast corner of the East Parcel. However, the mining era in the project vicinity was brief and mining towns were abandoned within one year (Holdrege & Kull 2013b:9).

The *Placer County General Plan Background Report* (Placer County 1994) indicates that the project site does not contain any natural economic mineral resources. Plates 3 through 6 of the *Mineral Land Classification of Placer County, California* do not depict known economic mineral deposits at the project site (Holdrege & Kull 2013b:12). Because the proposed project is not located within a mapped mineral resource zone and there would be no loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region, no impacts would occur.

1.12 NOISE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. Noise. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?				
i. Short-Term Construction Source Noise	☒	☐	☐	☐
ii. Long-Term Operational Source Stationary Noise	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Several different descriptors of time-averaged noise levels are used to characterize environmental noise. The noise descriptors used in this memo are below.

- **Decibel (dB):** A sound level expressed in decibels is the logarithmic ratio of two like pressure quantities, with one pressure quantity being a reference sound pressure
- **Equivalent Noise Level (L_{eq}):** The equivalent steady-state noise level in a stated period of time that would contain the same acoustic energy as the time-varying noise level during the same period (i.e., average noise level).
- **Maximum Noise Level (L_{max}):** The highest instantaneous noise level during a specified time period.
- **Minimum Noise Level (L_{min}):** The lowest instantaneous noise level during a specified time period.
- **Day-Night Noise Level (L_{dn}):** The 24-hour Leq with a 10-dB penalty applied during the noise-sensitive hours from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m., which are typically when sleeping occurs.

- **L_X (e.g., L_{10}, L_{50}, L_{90}):** Statistical descriptors where the number represents the percentage of time the measured sound level is exceeded during the measurement period (e.g., a 60 dB L_{50} would indicate that 60 dB was exceeded 50% of the time during the measurement period).
- **Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL):** Similar to the L_{dn} described above with an additional 5-dB penalty applied during the noise-sensitive hours from 7 p.m. to 10 p.m., which is typically the time when people relax, converse, read, and watch television.

1.12.1 Discussion

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

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

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

The following discussion addresses items a), c), and d):

Short-Term Construction Source Noise

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction-related noise sources could include both mobile and stationary on-site equipment (e.g., bulldozers, backhoes, front end loaders, graders, pavers, generators, and compressors), as well as impact tools. Construction may include limited blasting on the project site. Construction would generate truck trips associated with the delivery of building supplies and hauling away of construction debris. Article 9.36 of the County Code establishes a maximum daytime hourly average sound level standard of 55 dBA (L_{eq}) and a maximum single event noise level of 70 dBA (L_{max}) as measured at the receiving property line. Due to increased noise sensitivity at night, maximum sound levels are decreased to 45 dBA and 65dBA, respectively, during the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

Article 9.36 of the County Code exempts construction-related noise, provided that construction activities do not take place before 6:00 a.m. or after 8:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday, and before 8:00 a.m. and after 8:00 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday. However, even if construction activities were limited to these days and times, short-term onsite construction noise could result in the generation of excessive noise and could result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. This impact could be potentially significant and this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

Long-Term Operational Source Noise

Potentially Significant Impact. The project site is currently undeveloped and consists of coniferous forest. The proposed project would result in a maximum of 760 residential units and 6.6 acres of commercial uses. Residential units would be a mix of single-family homes, townhomes, cabins, multi-family residents, and condominiums. Commercial uses could include small restaurants or cafes, a sundries shop, equipment rentals, concierge services, and similar uses. Other sources of noise could include the homeowner amenities, such as recreational facilities and family entertainment services.

These land uses would introduce noise-generating sources as operation of the proposed project would result in residents, employees, and associated daily vehicle trips. Therefore, the project's long-term operations

could result in the substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. In addition, future residential uses on the project site could be exposed to existing noise sources from SR 267 and the Truckee-Tahoe Airport. Therefore, this impact could be considered potentially significant, and this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project may result in varying degrees of temporary groundborne vibration and noise, depending on the specific construction equipment used and activities involved. Project construction could result in the exposure of existing offsite sensitive receptors to excessive groundborne vibration levels, as well as future onsite receptors during later phases of development. This impact could be potentially significant, and this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. The nearest public airport is the Truckee-Tahoe Airport, located approximately 1.5 miles from the northwest portion of the East Parcel to the eastern edge of the Airport. The Airport is located approximately 4 miles northwest of the northern portion of the West Parcel. While the project site is not located within the Noise Contours figure prepared for the Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Foothill Airport Land Use Commission 2004:2-25), future property owners in the West Parcel may be affected by aircraft noise near or above the 65 L_{dn} noise contour. Therefore, this impact could be considered potentially significant, and it will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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?

No Impact. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. As discussed above under Item 1.12(e), the EIR will discuss potential noise exposure from an airport with an adopted airport land use plan. No other airports (including private airstrips) are located nearby. Therefore, no impacts related to excessive noise levels within the vicinity of a private airstrip would occur.

1.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. Population and Housing. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing homes, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

1.13.1 Discussion

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)?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would result in a maximum of 760 residential units. Residential units would be a mix of single-family homes, townhomes, cabins, multi-family residents, and condominiums. While the ultimate mix of units would be based on site characteristics and market conditions, the total number of units would not exceed 760. The anticipated residential unit mix is shown in Table 1. As shown in the table, the number of single family lots may range from 300 to 500; the range of townhomes/multiplexes would be 125 to 350 units; the range of cabins would be 40 to 200 units; and the number of condominiums would be zero to 170 units. Homeowner amenities, such as recreational facilities, registration desks, concierge services, and HOA meeting rooms would be developed. Commercial and community supporting retail, such as small restaurants or cafes, a sundries shop, and family entertainment would also be developed. Commercial uses would be designed and developed for project residents and guests rather than attracting an outside population.

Table 1 Residential Unit Range

Unit Type	Probable Mix	Possible Unit Mix Range			
Single Family Lots	375	300	375	360	500
Townhomes/multiplexes	265	250	125	350	200
Cabins	120	40	200	50	60
Condominiums	0	170	60	0	0
Total Units	**760**	**760**	**760**	**760**	**760**

Possible low unit types

Possible high unit types

Note: Any combination of unit type may occur up to 760 units. Unit type will be determined by market demand and project terrain.

These proposed uses could directly induce population growth in the area. In addition, the proposed project would extend water, sewer and dry utility lines. If the project population and/or extension of infrastructure induced growth, it could result in a potentially significant impact. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

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

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

The following discussion addresses items b) and c):

No Impact. The proposed project is currently undeveloped and would therefore provide new housing rather than displacing existing housing. There are no existing residences on the project site, and there would be no impact.

1.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. Public Services. Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
Police protection?	☒	☐	☐	☐
Schools?	☒	☐	☐	☐
Parks?	☒	☐	☐	☐
Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	☒	☐	☐	☐

1.14.1 Discussion

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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?

Police protection?

Schools?

Parks?

Potentially Significant Impact. Fire protection services for the proposed project would be provided by NCSD along with CAL FIRE. It is anticipated that fire response would be provided primarily by the Northstar Fire Department, with additional fire response and ambulance service provided by North Tahoe Fire. The entire West Parcel development area is located within 5 miles of the Northstar Drive Fire Station #31 the Northstar Highlands Fire Station #32 and/or the North Tahoe Fire Protection District Station #52. Law enforcement would be provided by the Placer County Sheriff's Department. The Tahoe-Truckee Unified School District would provide elementary, middle, and high school education. Sierra Pacific Power Company and Southwest

Gas Company would provide electrical and natural gas services, respectively. AT&T would provide telephone service to the project.

The proposed project would result in additional demand for public services, and this could be a potentially significant impact. These issues will be addressed in the EIR.

Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

Potentially Significant Impact. Project construction would involve the use of heavy trucks for materials delivery and hauling. The weight of these trucks may exceed the load capacity of local roadways and could contribute to the deterioration of these roads. Additionally, the proposed project would involve the construction of new public facilities such as utility infrastructure, trails, and roads that would require maintenance. This impact could be considered potentially significant and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

1.15 RECREATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. Recreation. Would the project:				
a) 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☒	☐	☐	☐

1.15.1 Discussion

a) 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?

b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The following discussion addresses items a) and b):

Potentially Significant Impact. The project site is located within the extensive recreation area of the Martis Valley and adjacent to the Tahoe Basin. The Northstar California Resort facility is located nearby to the northwest. Numerous unpaved access roads and logging landings are located on both the West and East parcels. The West Parcel is used for unauthorized sledding and snowmobiling and authorized snowshoeing, and cross country skiing during the winter season. Hiking and mountain biking trails traverse both the West and East parcels and unauthorized mountain biking and hiking occurs through the site. No public parks are in the immediate vicinity of the project site.

The proposed project would support active and passive recreation. Open space or a neighborhood park would be proposed within the project site for passive recreation. Residents would also have access to recreational amenities, which could include a fitness center. Trails, including biking, hiking, cross-country skiing, and snowshoeing, would connect to existing and planned trails in Martis Valley and the Tahoe Basin.

The EIR will analyze the proposed project's projected demand for recreational facilities, proposed public recreation improvements (including trail connections through the project site) and their physical impacts, and will describe to what level the proposed improvements meet or exceed General Plan requirements. This impact could be potentially significant and this issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

1.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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 the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐

1.16.1 Discussion

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures 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?

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 the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

The following discussion addresses items a) and b):

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would result in increased traffic, both during construction and operation. Project construction would result in construction worker commute trips and haul truck trips (for delivery and transport of materials and equipment) to and from the project area, resulting in increased traffic levels on local roadways. Operation of the proposed project would result in the approval of land use designations that would allow for a maximum of 760 residential units and neighborhood commercial development. The introduction of these new uses would increase the number of vehicle trips in the project area.

These increases in traffic levels on local roadways could exceed a level of service standard established by the County General Plan, the MVCP, and/or the California Department of Transportation. This impact could be considered potentially significant and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. The nearest public airport is the Truckee-Tahoe Airport, located approximately 1.5 miles from the northwest portion of the East Parcel to the eastern edge of the Airport. The Airport is located approximately 4 miles northwest of the northern portion of the West Parcel. The West Parcel is not located within the Compatibility Map prepared for the Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Foothill Airport Land Use Commission 2004:2-16), but the East Parcel is within Zone E, which is defined as "Other Airport Environs." This zone, on the East Parcel, has no maximum residential density limit, and development conditions include airspace review for objects greater than 100 feet tall, and major spectator-oriented sports stadiums, amphitheaters, and concert halls are discouraged beneath principal flight tracks. Development of the West Parcel and potential trail connections on the East Parcel would not result in a change in air traffic patterns or interfere with existing air traffic. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant. As discussed above under Item 1.12(e) (Noise), potential noise impacts related to exposure of people residing or working in the project area from operations of the Truckee-Tahoe Airport will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Access to and within the project site would be provided and designed consistent with County and California Department of Transportation standards. A detailed traffic analysis will be performed for the project; however, because potential traffic impacts are currently unknown, this impact could be considered potentially significant and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Potentially Significant Impact. Project construction may result in traffic delays and possibly road closures that could affect emergency access to the project site and surrounding areas. While a construction management plan and traffic control plan would be required and would detail measures to ensure adequate emergency access during construction, it is unknown at this time what specific emergency access measures would be implemented.

A year-round paved EVA road would be constructed through the 325-acre forest land, connecting to SR 267 at Brockway Summit. In addition, a secondary seasonal EVA is proposed to be provided by connection to the Fibreboard Freeway, a paved road which runs adjacent to the southeastern corner of the project site and connects to SR 267. Both EVAs would provide access for emergency vehicles only, unless needed to also evacuate residents. The seasonal EVA via Fibreboard would be unimproved, not maintained, and used only in non-winter months for catastrophic events. The adequacy of the EVAs to serve project development has

not been analyzed at this time. Therefore, this impact could be considered potentially significant and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. The potential construction-related and long-term project operations-related impacts to the roadway system described above could create hazards for bicyclists and pedestrians and contribute to the decreased performance of alternative transportation. As part of the proposed project, a bus stop is proposed to be constructed at the entrance of the project. The bus stop could service both west and eastbound transit routes, and keep riders from crossing SR 267. Hiking and bike trails would be provided throughout the project site and would connect to the existing and planned trail system. The EIR will evaluate the adequacy of proposed facilities to meet pedestrian, biking and transit demand. This impact could be considered potentially significant and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

1.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☒	☐	☐	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

1.17.1 Discussion

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

Potentially Significant Impact.NCSD maintains sewer lines in the project area and wastewater would ultimately be conveyed to TTSA for treatment. TTSA's Water Reclamation Plant is subject to permits issued by the Lahontan RWQCB. A NPDES permit allows the effluent from the plant to be discharged indirectly into the Truckee River. The Lahontan RWQCB has waste discharge requirements, and regulates the waste discharged into the leach field and the Truckee River. The Lahontan RWQCB also has effluent requirements for the plant.

The proposed project would result in an increase in the amount of wastewater that would require treatment at TTSA's Water Reclamation Plant. This impact could be potentially significant and this issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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?

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?

The following discussion addresses items b) and e):

Potentially Significant Impact. Water service would be provided by NCSD. It is anticipated that one of two options would be used to serve the project site. The first option is to connect to the NCSD water system in Highlands View Road. This option would require installation of water lines within the SR 267 and Highlands View Road rights of way and NCSD utility easements. The second option is to construct a new well or wells on the project site near SR 267. The well(s) would likely be owned and operated by NCSD and would serve the proposed development.

Sewer service and wastewater treatment would be provided by NCSD and ultimately conveyed to TTSA. It is anticipated that wastewater would be collected with 6-inch to 8-inch sewer lines located within project streets and NCSD utility easements. Multiple options are under consideration for the connection to existing NCSD conveyance facilities. One option would include a gravity flow collection system to a new sewer lift station located just north of the project site near SR 267. A 4-inch force main would be constructed within the SR 267, Highlands View Road and Northstar rights-of-way and NCSD utility easements to convey wastewater to an existing 12-inch sewer main located on Northstar Drive. The second option would be to construct a gravity sewer main that conveys wastewater to the NCSD lift station located on SR 267, just south of Northstar Drive. Lastly, a third option, a combination gravity-inverted siphon sewer main would convey project flows which would be installed outside of the existing NCSD sewer system. This option would run parallel to the existing system and could serve as back-up for the existing NCSD users.

Development of the proposed project could require the construction of new or expansion of existing water or wastewater treatment facilities. This could be a potentially significant impact and this issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project could result in an increase in the amount of stormwater runoff generated in the project site and could adversely affect existing stormwater drainage facilities. Low Impact Development techniques would be used during the engineering design of the project. Temporary BMPs would be used extensively during construction, such as silt fencing and tree protection, and a SWPPP would be prepared and submitted to the Lahontan RWQCB. Permanent BMPs, such as storm water treatment and infiltration facilities, would be implemented to the greatest extent possible. The project applicant is preparing a detailed drainage analysis to determine pre- and post-project stormwater runoff conditions. This could be a potentially significant impact and this issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. It is unknown whether sufficient water supplies are available to serve the proposed project. A Water Supply Assessment will be prepared to evaluate the project's project water

demand the ability of the NCSD to provide adequate water to the project. If new or expanded water entitlements are required for the project, a significant impact could result. This issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Project construction activities, although temporary, would generate solid waste including excess construction materials and material removed during site clearing. Development of new residential and commercial uses at the project site would increase the demand for solid waste collection and disposal. This impact could be potentially significant and this issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. See item f). The project would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations as they relate to solid waste. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

1.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance.				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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 an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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.)	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083, 21083.5.

Reference: Government Code Sections 65088.4.
Public Resources Code Sections 21080, 21083.5, 21095; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

1.18.1 Discussion

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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 an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project has the potential to substantially affect biological and cultural resources on the project site. Therefore, this is a potentially significant impact and these issues will be analyzed further in the EIR.

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.)

Potentially Significant Impact. As described in this Initial Study, implementation of the proposed project could result in significant impacts to the following resources: aesthetics; forestry resources; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; geology and soils; GHG emissions; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; noise; population and housing; public services; recreation; transportation and traffic; and utilities and service systems. When taken together with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects, the project's potential impacts could be cumulatively considerable. This issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The EIR will evaluate environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, including exposure to air pollutants, potentially hazardous materials, increased noise, public services and utilities, and increased traffic. Aside from these issue areas, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse effects on human beings. However, the project could result in potentially significant impacts within the issue areas described above. These issue areas will be evaluated further in the EIR.

2 REFERENCES

ARB. *See* California Air Resources Board.

CAL FIRE. *See* California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

California Air Resources Board. 2012. *Area Designations Maps / State and National.* Placer County, CA. Available: http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm. Last updated April 22, 2013. Accessed February 26, 2014.

California Department of Conservation. 2010. *Placer County Important Farmland 2010*. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/. Accessed February 26, 2014.

_____. 2013. *Placer County Williamson Act Lands 2013*. Williamson Act Program. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/. Accessed February 26, 2014.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2007 (November). Placer County Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map. Available: http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fhsz_maps_placer.php. Accessed January 21, 2014.

California Department of Transportation. 2011. California Scenic Highway Mapping System. Placer County. Available: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm. Last updated September 7, 2011. Accessed February 26, 2014.

California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). 2013. California Department of Fish and Game, Habitat Conservation Division, Wildlife and Habitat Data Analysis Branch.

Caltrans. *See* California Department of Transportation.

DOC. *See* California Department of Conservation.

Foothill Airport Land Use Commission. 2004 (December). *Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*. Prepared by Mead & Hunt. Santa Rosa, CA

Holdrege & Kull. 2013a (August). *Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering and Geologic Review for Martis Valley Opportunity*. Truckee, CA.

_____. 2013b (August). *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for Martis Valley Opportunity.* Truckee, CA.

Heywood, Larry. 2013 (August). *Preliminary Avalanche Hazard Report for Martis Valley West Parcel Project*. Homewood, CA.

Lindström, Susan, Ph.D. 2013 (August). *Martis Valley West Parcel Phase 1B: Heritage Resource Preliminary Field Inventory Report*. Truckee, CA.

Lindström, Susan, Ph.D. 2015 (January). *Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan Offsite Utilities Connection and Fire Road Heritage Resource Inventory Phase 1A and Phase 1B Preliminary Report, Revised*. Truckee, CA.

Placer County. 1994 (August 16). *Placer County General Plan Background Report*. Auburn, CA.

_____. 2011. *Placer County Conservation Plan Western Placer County.* Agency Review Draft Document February 1, 2011. Auburn, CA. Available: http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/PCCP.aspx. Accessed January 21, 2014.

_____. 2013. *Placer County General Plan*. Adopted August 16, 1994; update approved by Board of Supervisors May 21, 2013. Auburn, CA. Available: http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/planning/documentlibrary/commplans/pcgp. Accessed January 21, 2014.