

---

## STAFF REPORT

Date: April 3, 2024

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Updates to Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities (Threshold Standards)

---

### Summary and Staff Recommendation

The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) heard an informational item about proposed revisions to threshold standards in three focus areas; 1) Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) restoration, 2) Aquatic Invasive Species control, and 3) Tahoe Yellow Cress conservation at its October 2023 meeting. The APC requested that the Threshold Update Initiative Stakeholders Working Group (TUISWG) consider questions related to the proposed modification of the Aquatic Invasive Species that arose during the APC discussion. The TUISWG provided directions related to the APC-identified issues in February of 2024. In consultation with partners, staff have integrated the TUISWG direction and bring forward revised standards for APC review. Staff recommends that the APC recommend that the Governing Board revise the threshold standards as presented in attachment B.

### Required Motions:

In order to recommend approval of the requested action, the APC must make the following motions based on the staff summary:

- 1) A motion to recommend approval of the required findings (Attachment B) including a finding of no significant effect.
- 2) A motion to recommend adoption of Ordinance 2024-\_\_\_, amending Ordinance 2019-02 (Attachment A), updates to the threshold standards for 1) Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) restoration, 2) Aquatic Invasive Species control, and 3) Tahoe Yellow Cress conservation.

In order for the motion(s) to pass, a majority of the APC quorum present is required.

### Threshold Update Initiative Stakeholder Working Group Recommendation

The TUISWG recommended the adoption of the proposed threshold standards as presented in Attachment A on February 14, 2024. A summary of their discussion and recommendations is included in the background section of the staff summary below.

## Background

TRPA operates under the authority of the states of California and Nevada and the federal government through the Bi-State Compact, which was ratified by Congress and signed by the President of the United States. The revised Bi-State Compact, signed nearly forty years ago, wrote “the waters of Lake Tahoe and other resources of the region are threatened with deterioration or degeneration, which endangers the natural beauty and economic productivity of the region (96th Congress 1980)” To ensure the natural beauty and economic productivity of the region would persist for generations to come, the Bi-State Compact directs TRPA to establish “environmental threshold carrying capacities,” defined as “an environmental standard necessary to maintain a significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific or natural value of the region or to maintain public health and safety within the region.” These environmental threshold standards establish goals for environmental quality and express the shared aspiration for environmental restoration of the Tahoe Region. The standards shape the goals and policies of the Regional Plan and guide millions of dollars of public and private investment in the basin through the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). The initial threshold standards set the course for the Region 40 years ago but were never intended to be immutable. The multi-disciplinary team that authored the 1981 threshold study report outlined specific triggers for standard review, and set the expectation that the standards would be reassessed at least every five years, and wrote: “environmental thresholds are not static standards that once in place remain forever” (TRPA 1982a).

Proposed changes to the threshold standards were developed using the guidelines proposed by the Tahoe Science Advisory Council (Science Council) and direction from the Threshold Update Initiative Stakeholders Working Group appointed by the TRPA Governing Board and chaired by the Advisory Planning Commission (APC). The specific changes being presented to the APC were prepared in conjunction with the EIP working groups focused on each subject matter: Tahoe Watershed Improvement Group for SEZ, Tahoe Yellow Cress Adaptive Management Working Group for Tahoe Yellow Cress, and the Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinating Committee for Aquatic Invasive Species.

At the February 14, 2024 meeting, the Threshold Update Initiative Stakeholder Working Group considered the proposed threshold standards and the issues identified by the APC. The APC raised multiple questions related to the AIS thresholds and asked that the questions be considered by the TUISWG.

The first question raised in the discussion at APC related to the recommendation to establish two threshold standards related to the aquatic invasive plants, but not for other AIS. Further discussion teased out two subparts to the question, first why recommend standards for some AIS but not others? And second what happens to the AIS for which no threshold standard has been recommended?

The question is a derivative of a question the TUISWG and the Science Council have spent considerable time on in the past. The rationale for recommending and adopting standards for aquatic invasive plants, but not yet for other AIS is rooted in the Bi-State Compact definition and requirements for threshold standards, and the guidance of the Science Council for implementing best practices in the adoption of

the threshold standards. Building off that framework, staff recommended and TUISWG concurred that the goals (e.g., New Zealand mudsnails, Asian Clams) for which we are not yet ready to establish a threshold standard should be considered for goals and policies within the Regional Plan.

The second question the APC referred to the TUWISG related to the proposed target date for attainment of the AIS threshold standard in the Tahoe Keys. The TUISWG suggested that in the absence of plan to attain the desired end state it is appropriate to adopt a threshold standard without a specified attainment date. In accordance with that direction, the date has been removed from the proposed standard. The TUISWG also asked that standard attainment be assessed on as average abundance, and that the baseline year against which progress will be assessed be clearly defined in the standard. With the support of the AISCC the proposed modifications are now included in the proposal.

A summary of the proposed changes is included below. The text of the proposed standards is included in attachment A and additional detail on the proposals is available in the online resources identified below.

#### Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) restoration

The proposed update to the SEZ restoration renews the partnership's long-term commitment to restoring the resilience of SEZ, by establishing a new target for SEZ restoration. The proposed standard utilizes the SEZ condition index which integrates both size and condition, addressing the deficiency in the current standards' sole focus on area of SEZ.

#### Proposed Standard:

Enhance the quality and function of meadows and wetlands from 79% to 88% of the regional possible SEZ condition index score.

#### Aquatic Invasive Species Control

The proposed modifications to the AIS control threshold standards replace six aspirational statements with two quantifiable goals. The first standard establishes a goal of no active plant infestations outside the Tahoe Keys, and the second establishes the goal of minimum of a 75% reduction in annual average abundance of invasive aquatic plants within the Tahoe Keys.

#### Proposed Standards:

1. No active aquatic invasive plant infestations in Lake Tahoe, adjacent wetlands, and tributaries, not including the Tahoe Keys.
2. Reduce average AIS plant abundance in the Tahoe Keys by a minimum of 75% from the 2021 baseline year.

#### Tahoe Yellow Cress

The proposed modifications to the Tahoe yellow cress threshold standard incorporate the last thirty years of Tahoe yellow cress science and recognize the influence of lake level on the number of observed

population sites. The proposed standard aligns the threshold standard with the Tahoe yellow cress species conservation strategy.

**Proposed Standard:**

Maintain at least the number of occupied *Rorippa subumbellata* survey sites for each lake level as established in the Table below:

Lake Level (feet of elevation)	Occupied survey sites
Low (<6,225)	35
Transition (6,225- 6,227)	26
High (>6,227)	20

Additional detail on the proposals can be found in the attached memos from the individual working groups to the Tahoe Interagency Executive Steering Committee (TIE-SC). The attached memos will be presented to the TIE at the November 2023 meeting.

Review and Update Protocol

The APC also had several fundamental questions about the proposed updates including the distinction between Threshold Standards and Regional Plan goals and policies, when a threshold and/or an alternative (e.g., a Regional Plan goal or policy, standard in the Code of Ordinances, etc.) amendment is appropriate, and related questions. The APC asked that the proposal and these questions be referred to the Threshold Update Initiative Stakeholders Working Group (TUISWG) appointed by the Governing Board and delegated to the APC to lead. At their February 2024 meeting the TUISWG recommended approval of the proposed threshold standard updates above and suggested establishing a more formal protocol for review and update of threshold standards. Staff will be seeking input and developing a proposal to implement this component of the TUISWG recommendation.

Public Comment

To submit a written public comment, email [publiccomment@trpa.gov](mailto:publiccomment@trpa.gov) with the appropriate agenda item in the subject line. Written comments received by 4 p.m. the day before a scheduled public meeting will be distributed and posted to the TRPA website before the meeting begins. TRPA does not guarantee written comments received after 4 p.m. the day before a meeting will be distributed and posted in time for the meeting.

Contact Information

For questions regarding this item, please contact Dan Segan, Chief Science and Policy Advisor, at [dsegan@trpa.gov](mailto:dsegan@trpa.gov), (775) 589-5233.

Attachments:

- A. TRPA Adopting Ordinance  
Exhibit 1: Proposed new threshold standards
- B. Environmental Findings and Findings of No Significant Effect (FONSE)
- C. TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist

Online resources:

- A. [Threshold Update Initiative Stakeholders Working Group February 14, 2024 Draft Meeting Summary](#)
- B. [Staff Summary – Threshold Update Initiative Stakeholders Working Group Meeting February 14, 2024](#)
- C. [Staff Summary – Advisory Planning Commission October 11, 2023 - Threshold Standard Update](#)

Attachment A

TRPA Adopting Ordinance

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ORDINANCE 2024 – XX

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE 2019-03, AS AMENDED,  
TO AMEND THE THRESHOLD STANDARDS

The Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency does ordain as follows:

**Section 1.0**     **Findings**

- 1.10            The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (P. L. 96-551, 94 Stat. 3233, 1980) created the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and empowered it to set environmental threshold carrying capacities (“threshold standards”) for the Tahoe Region.
- 1.15            The Compact directs TRPA to adopt and enforce a Regional Plan that, as implemented through agency ordinances, rules, and regulations, will achieve and maintain such threshold standards while providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent with such thresholds.
- 1.20            Compact Art. V(c) states that the TRPA Governing Board and Advisory Planning Commission shall continuously review and maintain the Regional Plan.
- 1.25            In June 1987, the TRPA Governing Board adopted Ordinance 87-9, which established the Regional Plan and included, amongst other things, the Goals & Policies and the Code of Ordinances (“Code”).
- 1.30            In April 2019, the TRPA Governing Board adopted Ordinance 2019-03, superseding portions of Ordinance 87-9 by collocating the environmental threshold standards with the Regional Plan Goals and Policies.
- 1.35            It is necessary and desirable to amend the environmental threshold standards to reflect the best available science and guidance from the Tahoe Science Advisory Council.
- 1.40            Prior to the adoption of these amendments, the Governing Board made the findings required by TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 4.5, and Article V(g) of the Compact. TRPA has made the necessary findings required by Article V of the Compact, Chapter 4 of the Code, and all other applicable rules and regulations, and incorporates these findings fully herein.
- 1.45            The proposed amendments to the threshold standards were the subject of an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC), which was processed in accordance with Chapter 3: *Environmental Documentation* of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and Article VI of the Rules of Procedure. The Tahoe Basin Area Plan amendments have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and are therefore exempt from the requirement of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to Article VII of the Compact.
- 1.50            The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) and the Governing Board have each

conducted a noticed public hearing on the proposed amendments to the threshold standards. The APC has recommended Governing Board adoption of the necessary findings and adopting ordinance. At these hearings, oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and considered.

1.55 Each of the foregoing findings is supported by substantial evidence in the record.

**Section 2.0**      **Amendment of the TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies**

2.10 Ordinance 2019-03, as previously amended, is hereby amended as shown in Exhibit 1.

**Section 3.0**      **Interpretation and Severability**

3.10 The provisions of this ordinance amending the TRPA Code of Ordinances adopted hereby shall be liberally construed to affect their purposes. If any section, clause, provision or portion thereof is declared unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this ordinance and the amendments to the Regional Plan Package shall not be affected thereby. For this purpose, the provisions of this ordinance and the amendments to the Regional Plan Package are hereby declared respectively severable.

**Section 4.0**      **Effective Date**

4.10 This ordinance shall be effective after its adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held on May 22, 2024 by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Absent:

---

Cindy Gustafson, Chair  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
Governing Board



## Exhibit 1

### Proposed Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

#### THRESHOLD STANDARDS

Threshold standards establish the Environmental Improvement Program partners' shared goals for restoration and maintenance of the qualities of the Tahoe Region.

The adopted current threshold standards are stated below. The agency will maintain and update online inventories of the administrative status and disposition of each threshold standard.

#### WATER QUALITY

##### DEEP WATER (PELAGIC) LAKE TAHOE

###### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

- WQ1) The annual average deep water transparency as measured by Secchi disk shall not be decreased below 29.7 meters (97.4 feet), the average levels recorded between 1967 and 1971 by the University of California, Davis.
- WQ2) Maintain annual mean phytoplankton primary productivity at or below 52gmC/m<sup>2</sup>/yr.

##### LITTORAL LAKE TAHOE

###### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

- WQ3) Attain turbidity values not to exceed three NTU.
- WQ4) Turbidity shall not exceed one NTU in shallow waters of the Lake not directly influenced by stream discharges.
- WQ5) Attain 1967-71 mean values for phytoplankton primary productivity in the littoral zone.
- WQ6) Attain 1967-71 mean values for periphyton biomass in the littoral zone.

###### MANAGEMENT STANDARD

- WQ7) Support actions to reduce the extent and distribution of excessive periphyton (attached) algae in the nearshore (littoral zone) of Lake Tahoe.

##### AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES

###### MANAGEMENT STANDARDS

- WQ8) Prevent the introduction of new aquatic invasive species into the region's waters.
- ~~WQ9) Reduce the abundance of known aquatic invasive species.~~
- ~~WQ10) Reduce the distribution of known aquatic invasive species.~~
- ~~WQ11) Abate harmful ecological impacts resulting from aquatic invasive species.~~
- ~~WQ12) Abate harmful economic impacts resulting from aquatic invasive species.~~
- ~~WQ13) Abate harmful social impacts resulting from aquatic invasive species.~~
- ~~WQ14) Abate harmful public health impacts resulting from aquatic invasive species.~~
- WQ9) No active aquatic invasive plant infestations in Lake Tahoe, adjacent wetlands, and tributaries, not including the Tahoe Keys

[WQ10\) -Reduce average aquatic invasive plant abundance in the Tahoe Keys by a minimum of 75% from the 2020 baseline year.](#)

## **TRIBUTARIES**

### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

- WQ15) Attain applicable state standards for concentrations of dissolved inorganic nitrogen.
- WQ16) Attain applicable state standards for concentrations of dissolved phosphorus.
- WQ17) Attain applicable state standards for dissolved iron.
- WQ18) Attain a 90 percentile value for suspended sediment concentration of 60 mg/1.

## **SURFACE RUNOFF**

### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

- WQ19) Achieve a 90 percentile concentration value for dissolved inorganic nitrogen of 0.5 mg/1 in surface runoff directly discharged to a surface water body in the Basin.
- WQ20) Achieve a 90 percentile concentration value for dissolved phosphorus of 0.1 mg/1 in surface runoff directly discharged to a surface water body in the Basin.
- WQ21) Achieve a 90 percentile concentration value for dissolved iron of 0.5 mg/1 in surface runoff directly discharged to a surface water body in the Basin.
- WQ22) Achieve a 90 percentile concentration value for suspended sediment of 250 mg/1 in surface runoff directly discharged to a surface water body in the Basin.

## **GROUNDWATER**

### MANAGEMENT STANDARDS

- WQ23 - WQ32) Surface runoff infiltration into the groundwater shall comply with the uniform Regional Runoff Quality Guidelines as set forth in Table 4-12 of the Draft Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity Study Report, May, 1982. Where there is a direct and immediate hydraulic connection between ground and surface waters, discharges to groundwater shall meet the guidelines for surface discharges, and the Uniform Regional Runoff Quality Guide lines shall be amended accordingly.<sup>1</sup>

## **OTHER LAKES**

### NUMERICAL STANDARD

- WQ33) Attain existing water quality standards.

## **LOAD REDUCTIONS**

### MANAGEMENT STANDARDS

- WQ34) Reduce fine sediment particle (inorganic particle size < 16 micrometers in diameter) load to achieve long-term pelagic water quality standards (WQ1 and WQ2).
- WQ35) Reduce total annual phosphorus load to achieve long-term pelagic water quality standards (WQ1 and WQ2) and littoral quality standards (WQ5 and WQ6).
- WQ36) Reduce total annual nitrogen load to achieve long-term pelagic water quality standards (WQ1 and WQ2) and littoral quality standards (WQ5 and WQ6).
- WQ37) Decrease total annual suspended sediment load to achieve littoral turbidity standards (WQ3 and WQ4).

---

<sup>1</sup> See attachment A

- WQ38) Reduce the loading of dissolved phosphorus to achieve pelagic water standards (WQ1 and WQ2) and littoral quality standards (WQ5 and WQ6).
- WQ39) Reduce the loading of iron to achieve pelagic water standards (WQ1 and WQ2) and littoral quality standards (WQ5 and WQ6).
- WQ40) Reduce the loading of other algal nutrients to achieve pelagic water standards (WQ1 and WQ2) and littoral quality standards (WQ5 and WQ6).
- WQ41) The most stringent of the three dissolved inorganic nitrogen load reduction targets shall apply:
- i. Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loads to pelagic and littoral Lake Tahoe from<sup>2</sup>:
    - a) surface runoff by approximately 50 percent of the 1973-81 annual average,
    - b) groundwater approximately 30 percent of the 1973-81 annual average, and
    - c) atmospheric sources approximately 20 percent of the 1973-81 annual average.
  - ii. Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loading to Lake Tahoe from all sources by 25 percent of the 1973-81 annual average.
  - iii. To achieve littoral water quality standards (WQ5 and WQ6).

## SOIL CONSERVATION

### IMPERVIOUS COVER

#### MANAGEMENT STANDARDS

SC1-SC9) Impervious cover shall comply with the Land-Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin, California-Nevada, A Guide For Planning, Bailey, 1974<sup>3</sup>.

### STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONES

#### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

SC10) Preserve existing naturally functioning SEZ lands in their natural hydrologic condition.

SC11) Enhance the quality and function of meadows and wetlands from 79% to 88% of the regional possible SEZ condition index score. ~~Restore all disturbed SEZ lands in undeveloped, unsubdivided lands.~~

~~SC12) Restore 25 percent of the SEZ lands that have been identified as disturbed, developed or subdivided.~~

~~SC13) Attain a 5 percent total increase in the area of naturally functioning SEZ lands.~~

## AIR QUALITY

### CARBON MONOXIDE

#### NUMERICAL STANDARD

<sup>2</sup> This threshold relies on predicted reductions in pollutant loadings from out-of-basin sources as part of the total pollutant loading reduction necessary to attain environmental standards, even though the Agency has no direct control over out-of-basin sources. The cooperation of the states of California and Nevada will be required to control sources of air pollution which contribute nitrogen loadings to the Lake Tahoe Region

<sup>3</sup> See attachment B

- AQ1) Maintain carbon monoxide concentrations at or below 6 parts per million (7 mg/m<sup>3</sup>) averaged over 8 hours.

#### MANAGEMENT STANDARD

- AQ2) Reduce traffic volumes on the U.S. 50 Corridor by 7 percent during the winter from the 1981 base year between 4:00 p.m. and 12:00 midnight, provided that those traffic volumes shall be amended as necessary to meet the respective state standards.

### OZONE

#### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

- AQ3) Maintain ozone concentrations at or below 0.08 parts per million averaged over 1 hour.  
AQ4) Maintain oxides of nitrogen (NOx) emissions at or below the 1981 level.

### REGIONAL VISIBILITY<sup>4</sup>

#### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

- AQ5) Achieve an extinction coefficient of 25 Mm<sup>-1</sup> at least 50 percent of the time as calculated from aerosol species concentrations measured at the Bliss State Park monitoring site (visual range of 156 kilometers, 97 miles).  
AQ6) Achieve an extinction coefficient of 34 Mm<sup>-1</sup> at least 90 percent of the time as calculated from aerosol species concentrations measured at the Bliss State Park monitoring site (visual range of 115 kilometers, 71 miles).

### SUBREGIONAL VISIBILITY<sup>5</sup>

#### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

- AQ7) Achieve an extinction coefficient of 50 Mm<sup>-1</sup> at least 50 percent of the time as calculated from aerosol species concentrations measured at the South Lake Tahoe monitoring site (visual range of 78 kilometers, 48 miles).  
AQ8) Achieve an extinction coefficient of 125 Mm<sup>-1</sup> at least 90 percent of the time as calculated from aerosol species concentrations measured at the South Lake Tahoe monitoring site (visual range of 31 kilometers, 19 miles).

### RESPIRABLE AND FINE PARTICULATE MATTER

#### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

- AQ9) Particulate Matter<sub>10</sub> 24-hour Standard: Maintain Particulate Matter<sub>10</sub> at or below 50µg/m<sup>3</sup> measured over a 24-hour period in the portion of the Region within California, and maintain Particulate Matter<sub>10</sub> at or below 150 µg/m<sup>3</sup> measured over a 24-hour period in the portion of the Region within Nevada. Particulate Matter<sub>10</sub> measurements shall be made using gravimetric or beta attenuation methods or any equivalent procedure which can be shown to provide equivalent results at or near the level of air quality standard.  
AQ10) Particulate Matter<sub>10</sub> Annual Arithmetic Average - Maintain Particulate Matter<sub>10</sub> at or below annual arithmetic average of 20µg/m<sup>3</sup> in the portion of the Region within California, and maintain Particulate Matter<sub>10</sub> at or below annual arithmetic average of 50µg/m<sup>3</sup> in the

---

<sup>4</sup> Amended 03/22/00. Calculations will be made on three year running periods. Beginning with the existing 1991-93 monitoring data as the performance standards to be met or exceeded.

<sup>5</sup> Amended 03/22/00. Calculations will be made on three year running periods. Beginning with the existing 1991-93 monitoring data as the performance standards to be met or exceeded.

portion of the Region within Nevada. Particulate Matter<sub>10</sub> measurements shall be made using gravimetric or beta attenuation methods or any equivalent procedure which can be shown to provide equivalent results at or near the level of air quality standard.

AQ11) Particulate Matter<sub>2.5</sub> 24-hour Standard - Maintain Particulate Matter<sub>2.5</sub> at or below 35µg/m<sup>3</sup> measured over a 24-hour period using gravimetric or beta attenuation methods or any equivalent procedure which can be shown to provide equivalent results at or near the level of air quality standard.

AQ12) Particulate Matter<sub>2.5</sub> Annual Arithmetic Average - Maintain Particulate Matter<sub>2.5</sub> at or below annual arithmetic average of 12µg/m<sup>3</sup> in the portion of the Region within California and maintain Particulate Matter<sub>2.5</sub> at or below annual arithmetic average of 15µg/m<sup>3</sup> in the portion of the Region within Nevada. Particulate Matter<sub>2.5</sub> measurements shall be made using gravimetric or beta attenuation methods or any equivalent procedure which can be shown to provide equivalent results at or near the level of air quality standard.

## **NITRATE DEPOSITION**

### MANAGEMENT STANDARDS

AQ13) Reduce the transport of nitrates into the Basin and reduce oxides of nitrogen (NOx) produced in the Basin consistent with the water quality thresholds.

## **TRANSPORTATION AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES**

TSC1) Reduce Annual Daily Average VMT Per Capita by 6.8% from 12.48, the 2018 baseline, to 11.63 in 2045.

## **VEGETATION PRESERVATION**

### **COMMON VEGETATION**

#### MANAGEMENT STANDARDS

VP1) A non-degradation standard shall apply to native deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows to preserve plant communities and significant wildlife habitat, while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations to be consistent with the SEZ threshold.

VP2) Increase plant and structural diversity of forest communities through appropriate management practices as measured by diversity indices of species richness, relative abundance, and pattern.

VP3) Maintain the existing species richness of the Basin by providing for the perpetuation of the following plant associations:

Yellow Pine Forest: Jeffrey pine, White fir, Incense cedar, Sugar pine.

Red Fir Forest: Red fir, Jeffrey pine, Lodgepole pine, Western white pine, Mountain hemlock, Western juniper.

Subalpine Forest: Whitebark pine, Mountain hemlock, Mountain mahogany.

Shrub Association: Greenleaf and Pinemat manzanita, Tobacco brush, Sierra chinquapin, Huckleberry oak, Mountain whitethorn.

Sagebrush Scrub Vegetation: Basin sagebrush, Bitterbrush, Douglas chaenactis.

Deciduous Riparian: Quaking aspen, Mountain alder, Black cotton-wood, Willow.

Meadow Associations (Wet and Dry Meadow): Mountain squirrel tail, Alpine gentian, Whorled penstemon, Asters, Fescues, Mountain brome, Corn lilies, Mountain bentgrass, Hairgrass, Marsh marigold, Elephant heads, Tinker's penney, Mountain Timothy, Sedges, Rushes, Buttercups.

Wetland Associations (Marsh Vegetation): Pond lilies, Buckbean, Mare's tail, Pondweed, Common bladderwort, Bottle sedge, Common spikerush.

Cushion Plant Association (Alpine Scrub): Alpine phlox, Dwarf ragwort, Draba.

VP4) Relative Abundance - Of the total amount of undisturbed vegetation in the Tahoe Basin: Maintain at least four percent meadow and wetland vegetation.

VP5) Relative Abundance - Of the total amount of undisturbed vegetation in the Tahoe Basin: Maintain at least four percent deciduous riparian vegetation.

VP6) Relative Abundance - Of the total amount of undisturbed vegetation in the Tahoe Basin: Maintain no more than 25 percent dominant shrub association vegetation.

VP7) Relative Abundance - Of the total amount of undisturbed vegetation in the Tahoe Basin: Maintain 15-25 percent of the Yellow Pine Forest in seral stages other than mature.

VP8) Relative Abundance - Of the total amount of undisturbed vegetation in the Tahoe Basin: Maintain 15-25 percent of the Red Fir Forest in seral stages other than mature.

VP9) Pattern - Provide for the proper juxtaposition of vegetation communities and age classes by;  
1. Limiting acreage size of new forest openings to no more than eight acres

VP10) Pattern –Provide for the proper juxtaposition of vegetation communities and age classes by;  
2. Adjacent openings shall not be of the same relative age class or successional stage to avoid uniformity in stand composition and age.

VP11) Native vegetation shall be maintained at a maximum level to be consistent with the limits defined in the Land-Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin, California-Nevada, A Guide For Planning, Bailey, 1974<sup>6</sup>, for allowable impervious cover and permanent site disturbance.

## **LATE SERAL AND OLD GROWTH FOREST ECOSYSTEMS<sup>7</sup>**

### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

VP12) Attain and maintain a minimum percentage of 55 percent by area of forested lands within the Tahoe Region in a late seral or old growth condition, and distributed across elevation zones. Standards VP 13, VP14, and VP15 must be attained to achieve this threshold.

VP13) 61 percent of the Subalpine zone (greater than 8,500 feet elevation) must be in a late seral or old growth condition. The Subalpine zone will contribute 5 percent (7,600 acres) of forested lands towards VP13.

VP14) 60 percent of the Upper Montane zone (between 7,000 and 8,500 feet elevation) must be in a late seral or old growth condition. The Upper Montane zone will contribute 30 percent (45,900 acres) of forested lands towards VP13.

---

<sup>6</sup> See attachment B

<sup>7</sup> For standards VP13 - VP16: Forested lands within TRPA designated urban areas are excluded in the calculation for threshold attainment. Areas of the montane zone within 1,250 feet of urban areas may be included in the calculation for threshold attainment if the area is actively being managed for late seral and old growth conditions and has been mapped by TRPA. A maximum value of 40 percent of the lands within 1,250 feet of urban areas may be included in the calculation.

VP15) 48 percent of the Montane zone (lower than 7,000 feet elevation) must be in a late seral or old growth condition; the Montane zone will contribute 20 percent (30,600 acres) of forested lands towards VP13.

### UNCOMMON PLANT COMMUNITIES

#### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

VP16-VP17) Provide for the non-degradation of the natural qualities of any plant community that is uncommon to the Basin or of exceptional scientific, ecological, or scenic value. This threshold shall apply but not be limited to:

- VP16) The deep-water plants of Lake Tahoe.
- VP17) The Freel Peak Cushion Plant community.

### SENSITIVE PLANTS

#### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

Maintain a minimum number of population sites for each of five sensitive plant species.

- VP18) Maintain a minimum of 2 *Lewisia pygmaea longipetala* population sites.
- VP19) Maintain a minimum of 2 *Draba asterophora v. macrocarpa* population sites.
- VP20) Maintain a minimum of 5 *Draba asterophora v. asterophora macrocarpa* population sites.
- VP21) Maintain at least the number of occupied *Rorippa subumbellata* survey sites for each lake level as established in the Table below:

<u>Lake Level (feet of elevation)</u>	<u>Occupied survey sites</u>
<u>Low (&lt;6,225)</u>	<u>35</u>
<u>Transition (6,225- 6,227)</u>	<u>26</u>
<u>High (&gt;6,227)</u>	<u>20</u>

- VP22) Maintain a minimum of 7 *Arabis rigidissima v. demote* population sites.

## WILDLIFE

### SPECIAL INTEREST SPECIES

#### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

Provide a minimum number of population sites and disturbance zones for the following species:

Population sites:

- W1) Provide a minimum of 12 Goshawk population sites.
- W2) Provide a minimum of 4 Osprey population sites.
- W3) Provide a minimum of 2 Bald Eagle (Winter) population sites.
- W4) Provide a minimum of 1 Bald Eagle (Nesting) population sites.
- W5) Provide a minimum of 4 Golden Eagle population sites.
- W6) Provide a minimum of 2 Peregrine population sites.
- W7) Provide a minimum of 18 Waterfowl population sites.

Disturbance Zones:

- W8) Provide disturbance zones in the most suitable 500 acres surrounding nest site including a 0.25 mile buffer centered on nest sites, and influence zones in 3.5 mi for Goshawk.
- W9) Provide 0.25 mi disturbance zones and 0.6 mi influence zones for Osprey.
- W10) Provide disturbance zones in mapped areas and influence zones in mapped areas for Bald Eagle (Winter).
- W11) Provide 0.5 mi disturbance zones and variable influence zones for Bald Eagle (Nesting).
- W12) Provide 0.25 mi disturbance zones and 9.0 mi influence zones for Golden Eagle.
- W13) Provide 0.25 mi disturbance zones and 7.6 mi influence zones for Peregrine.
- W14) Provide disturbance zones in mapped areas and influence zones in mapped areas for Waterfowl.
- W15) Provide disturbance zones in meadows and influence zones in mapped areas for Deer.

## FISHERIES

### STREAM HABITAT

#### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

- F1 -F3) As indicated by the Stream Habitat Quality GIS data, amended May 1997, based upon the re-rated stream scores set forth in Appendix C-1 of the 1996 Evaluation Report, maintain:
- F1) 75 miles of excellent stream habitat.
  - F2) 105 miles of good stream habitat.
  - F3) 38 miles of marginal stream habitat.

### INSTREAM FLOWS

#### MANAGEMENT STANDARD

- F4) Until instream flow standards are established in the Regional Plan to protect fishery values, a non-degradation standard shall apply to instream flows.

### LAKE HABITAT

#### MANAGEMENT STANDARD

- F7) A non-degradation standard shall apply to fish habitat in Lake Tahoe. Achieve the equivalent of 5,948 total acres of excellent habitat as indicated by the Prime Fish Habitat GIS Layer as may be amended based on best available science.

## NOISE

### SINGLE NOISE EVENTS

#### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

The following maximum noise levels are allowed. All values are in decibels.

Aircraft measured 6,500 m-start of takeoff roll 2,000 m-runway threshold approach:

- N1) 80 dBA - between the hours of 8am and 8pm<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> The single event noise standard of 80 dBA  $L_{max}$  for aircraft departures at Lake Tahoe Airport shall be effective immediately. The single event noise standard of 80 dBA  $L_{max}$  for aircraft arrivals at Lake Tahoe Airport is not to be effective until ten years after the adoption of an airport master plan by TRPA. The schedule for phasing in the 80



N2) 77.1 dBA - between the hours of 8pm and 8am

Watercraft:

N3) Pass-By Test - 82  $L_{max}$  -measured 50ft from engine at 3,000rpm.

N4) Shoreline test - 75  $L_{max}$  - measured with microphone 5 ft. above water, 2 ft., above curve of shore, dock or platform. Watercraft in Lake, no minimum distance.

N5) Stationary Test - 88 dBA  $L_{max}$  for boats manufactured before January 1, 1993; Microphone 3.3 feet from exhaust outlet - 5 feet above water.

N6) Stationary Test - 90 dBA  $L_{max}$  for boats manufactured after January 1, 1993; Microphone 3.3 feet from exhaust outlet - 5 feet above water.

Motor Vehicles Less Than 6,000 GVW:

N7) 76 dBA – Travelling at speeds less than 35 MPH at a monitoring distance of 50ft

N8) 82 dBA – Travelling at speeds greater than 35 MPH at a monitoring distance of 50ft.

Motor Vehicles Greater Than 6,000 GVW:

N9) 82 dBA – Travelling at speeds less than 35 MPH at a monitoring distance of 50ft.

N10) 86 dBA – Travelling at speeds greater than 35 MPH at a monitoring distance of 50ft.

Motorcycles:

N11) 77 dBA – Travelling at speeds less than 35 MPH at a monitoring distance of 50ft.

N12) 86 dBA – Travelling at speeds greater than 35 MPH at a monitoring distance of 50ft.

Off-Road Vehicles:

N13) 72 dBA – Travelling at speeds less than 35 MPH at a monitoring distance of 50ft.

N14) 86 dBA – Travelling at speeds greater than 35 MPH at a monitoring distance of 50ft.

Snowmobiles:

N15) 82 dBA – Travelling at speeds less than 35 MPH at a monitoring distance of 50ft.

## CUMULATIVE NOISE EVENTS

### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

Background noise levels shall not exceed the following levels:

N16) 55 dBA CNEL (Average Noise Level) in the High Density Residential Areas Land Use Category.

N17) 50 dBA CNEL (Average Noise Level) in the Low Density Residential Areas Land Use Category.

N18) 60 dBA CNEL (Average Noise Level) in the Hotel/Motel Areas Land Use Category.

N19) 60 dBA CNEL (Average Noise Level) in the Commercial Areas Land Use Category.

N20) 65 dBA CNEL (Average Noise Level) in the Industrial Areas Land Use Category.

N21) 55 dBA CNEL (Average Noise Level) in the Urban Outdoor Recreation Areas Land Use Category.

N22) 50 dBA CNEL (Average Noise Level) in the Rural Outdoor Recreation Areas Land Use Category.

---

dBa arrival standard shall be based on a review and consideration of the relevant factors, including best available technology and environmental concerns, and shall maximize the reduction in noise impacts caused by aircraft arrivals while allowing for the continuation of general aviation and commercial service. The beginning arrival standard shall not exceed 84 dBA for general aviation and commuter aircraft, and 86 dBA for transport category aircraft.

- N23) 45 dBA CNEL (Average Noise Level) in the Wilderness and Roadless Areas Land Use Category.
- N24) 45 dBA CNEL (Average Noise Level) in the Critical Wildlife Habitat Areas Land Use Category.

## RECREATION

### POLICY STATEMENTS

- R1) It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Body in development of the Regional Plan to preserve and enhance the high quality recreational experience including preservation of high-quality undeveloped shorezone and other natural areas. In developing the Regional Plan, the staff and Governing Body shall consider provisions for additional access, where lawful and feasible, to the shorezone and high quality undeveloped areas for low density recreational uses.
- R2) It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Body in development of the Regional Plan to establish and ensure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation is available to the general public.

## SCENIC RESOURCES

### ROADWAY AND SHORELINE UNITS

#### NUMERICAL STANDARDS

SR1-SR4) Maintain or improve the numerical rating assigned each unit, including the scenic quality rating of the individual resources within each unit, as recorded in the Scenic Resources Inventory and shown in:

- SR1) Table 13-3 of the Draft Study Report<sup>9</sup>.
- SR2) Table 13-5 of the Draft Study Report<sup>10</sup>.
- SR3) Table 13-8 of the Draft Study Report<sup>11</sup>.
- SR4) Table 13-9 of the Draft Study Report<sup>12</sup>.

SR5-SR8) Maintain the 1982 ratings for all roadway and shoreline units as shown in:

- SR5) Table 13-6 of the Draft Study Report<sup>13</sup>.
- SR6) Table 13-7 of the Draft Study Report<sup>14</sup>.
- SR7) Restore scenic quality in roadway units rated 15 or below.
- SR8) Restore scenic quality in shoreline units rated 7 or below.

### OTHER AREAS

#### NUMERICAL STANDARD

- SR9) Maintain or improve the numerical rating assigned to each identified scenic resource, including individual subcomponent numerical ratings, for views from bike paths and other

---

<sup>9</sup> See attachment C

<sup>10</sup> See attachment D

<sup>11</sup> See attachment E

<sup>12</sup> See attachment F

<sup>13</sup> See attachment G

<sup>14</sup> See attachment H

recreation areas open to the general public as recorded in the 1993 Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Evaluation.

**BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

POLICY STATEMENT

- SR10) It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Body in development of the Regional Plan, in cooperation with local jurisdictions, to insure the height, bulk, texture, form, materials, colors, lighting, signing and other design elements of new, remodeled and redeveloped buildings be compatible with the natural, scenic, and recreational values of the region.

Attachment B

Environmental Findings and Findings of No Significant Effect (FONSE)

**Required Findings & Finding of No Significant Effect  
for the adoption of four new environmental threshold carrying capacities  
(threshold standards) and the removal of nine threshold standards**

This document contains required findings per Chapter 3 and 4 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances for amendments to the TRPA Threshold Standards and TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies.

**TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 3.3: Determination of need to prepare Environmental Impact Statement**

Finding: TRPA finds that the amendments to the threshold standards and Regional Plan will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Rationale: TRPA staff prepared an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) pursuant to Article VI of TRPA Rules of Procedure and Chapter 3: *Environmental Documentation* of the TRPA Code of Ordinances to evaluate potential environmental effects of the proposed action as presented seen in Attachment C. Based on the information contained within the IEC, the proposed amendments would not have a significant effect on the environment and TRPA staff prepared a finding of no significant effect in accordance to TRPA's Rules of Procedure Section 6.6 and Code of Ordinance Section 3.3.2.

**TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 4.4: Threshold Related Findings**

Finding: The project (ordinance) is consistent with and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, plan area statements and maps, the Code, and other TRPA plans and programs;

Rationale: The proposed amendments are consistent with and will not adversely affect the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies (as discussed below), plan area statements and local planning areas, the Code and other TRPA plans and programs.

Finding: The project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded; and

Rationale: The proposed amendments will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded. The Regional Plan Environmental Impact Statement prepared in 2012 for an amendment of the Regional Plan analyzed full development build out potential within the Tahoe

Region. The findings for adoption of the 2012 Regional Plan demonstrated that implementation of the Regional Plan would not cause Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities to be exceeded. The updating of the standards in three categories to reflect current science and best practice will not alter the policies or implementation of the Regional Plan.

Finding: Wherever federal, state, or local air and water quality standards apply for the region, the strictest standards shall be attained, maintained, or exceeded pursuant to Article V(d) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

Rationale: The proposed amendments will not affect any state, federal, or local standards. The amendments increase clarity and transparency in reporting on threshold standard progress.

**TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 4.5: Findings Necessary to Amend the Regional Plan, Including Goals and Policies and Plan Area Statements and Maps**

Finding: The Regional Plan, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

Rationale: The proposed amendments do not alter the substance of the Regional Plan.



**Mail**

PO Box 5310  
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

**Location**

128 Market Street  
Stateline, NV 89449

**Contact**

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

**STATEMENT OF NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT**

- Project Description:** The adoption of four new environmental threshold carrying capacities (threshold standards) and the removal of nine threshold standards.
- Staff Analysis:** In accordance with Article IV of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended, and Section 6.6 of the TRPA Rules of Procedure, TRPA staff reviewed the information submitted with the subject project.
- Determination:** Based on the Initial Environmental Checklist, Agency staff found that the subject project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. A.', written over a horizontal line.

TRPA Executive Director/Designee

April 2, 2024

Date

Attachment C

TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist



# **TRPA INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

---

## **Project Name:**

Updates to the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities (threshold standards) for 1) Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) restoration, 2) Aquatic Invasive Species control, and 3) Tahoe Yellow Cress conservation.

## **Expanded Initial Environmental Checklist:**

This document serves as the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist for the amendments, with an expanded analysis to include the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Initial Study Checklist. While not required for TRPA action, the expanded analysis and information will support CEQA lead agencies with their own future environmental review of the amendments.

## **Project Location:**

The Tahoe Region is within the planning area jurisdiction of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

## **Project Need:**

TRPA operates under the authority of the states of California and Nevada and the federal government through the Bi-State Compact, which was ratified by Congress and signed by the President of the United States. The revised Bi-State Compact, signed nearly forty years ago, wrote “the waters of Lake Tahoe and other resources of the region are threatened with deterioration or degeneration, which endangers the natural beauty and economic productivity of the region (96th Congress 1980)” To ensure the natural beauty and economic productivity of the region would persist for generations to come, the Bi-State Compact directs TRPA to establish “environmental threshold carrying capacities,” defined as “an environmental standard necessary to maintain a significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific or natural value of the region or to maintain public health and safety within the region.”

These environmental threshold standards establish goals for environmental quality and express the shared aspiration for environmental restoration of the Tahoe Region. The standards shape the goals and policies of the Regional Plan and guide millions of dollars of public and private investment in the basin through the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). The first set of threshold standards was adopted in 1982, The initial threshold standards set the course for the Region 40 years ago but were never intended to be immutable. The multi-disciplinary team that authored the 1981 threshold study report outlined specific triggers for standard review, and set the expectation that the standards would be reassessed at least every five years, and wrote: “environmental thresholds are not static standards that once in place remain forever” (TRPA 1982a).

There is a broad bi-state consensus and support for updating the Thresholds and monitoring systems. In 2015 the TRPA Governing Board identified the review and updating of the threshold standards as one of seven strategic initiatives for the agency. The goal of the initiative is to ensure a representative, relevant, and scientifically rigorous set of threshold standards, supported by a cost-efficient and feasible monitoring and evaluation plan, and the development of a robust and repeatable process for review of standards in the future.

## **Project Description:**

The proposed changes to the threshold standards were developed using the guidelines proposed by the Tahoe Science Advisory Council and direction from the Threshold Update Initiative Stakeholders Working Group appointed

by the TRPA Governing Board and chaired by the Advisory Planning Commission (APC). The proposed updates were prepared in conjunction with the EIP working groups focused on each subject matter: Tahoe Watershed Improvement Group for SEZ, Tahoe Yellow Cress Adaptive Management Working Group for Tahoe Yellow Cress, and the Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinating Committee for Aquatic Invasive Species.

## Tiering and References to Other Documents:

This Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) tiers from the 2012 Regional Plan Update (RPU) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). This document can be accessed at: <https://www.trpa.gov/regional-plan/2012-regional-plan-update/>.

The following questionnaire has been completed based on evidence submitted with the application. For the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist, all "Yes" and "No, With Mitigation" answers require written discussion. For the CEQA Initial Study checklist, all "Less Than Significant (LTS) with Mitigation" and "Less than Significant (LTS)" answers require written discussion. Written discussion is also provided by some "No" and "No Impact" answers where needed to support the conclusion. (Again, the CEQA checklist is complete here only as a future aid to California jurisdictions subsequent actions.)

For information on the status of TRPA environmental thresholds (<https://thresholds.laketahoeinfo.org>) click on the links below to the Threshold Dashboard.

## I. Environmental Impacts

### 1. Land (TRPA Checklist Questions)

Current and historic status of soil conservation standards can be found at the links below:

- [Impervious Cover](#)
- [Stream Environment Zone](#)

Will the proposal result in:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Compaction or covering of the soil beyond the limits allowed in the land capability or Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. A change in the topography or ground surface relief features of site inconsistent with the natural surrounding conditions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Changes in the undisturbed soil or native geologic substructures or grading in excess of 5 feet?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The continuation of or increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sand, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion, including natural littoral processes, which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, backshore erosion, avalanches, mud slides, ground failure, or similar hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The proposed modification to the SEZ restoration standard utilizes the SEZ condition index which integrates both size and condition, addressing the deficiency in the current standards' sole focus on area of SEZ. By accounting for the benefits of functional enhancement of SEZ that are not considered “restoration” provides additional incentives to implement enhancement projects.

**Geology/Soils (CEQA Checklist Questions)**

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: (CEQA VIIa) i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42? ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (CEQA VIIb)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (CEQA VIIc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (CEQA VIId)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. 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? (CEQA VIIe)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (CEQA VIIf)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The proposed modifications to the threshold standards establish specific and measurable targets and align the standards with the latest science. No modifications to the Regional Plan are required to promote attainment of the standards.

## 2. Air Quality (TRPA Checklist Questions)

Current and historic status of air quality standards can be found at the links below:

- [Carbon Monoxide \(CO\)](#)
- [Nitrate Deposition](#)
- [Ozone \(O3\)](#)
- [Regional Visibility](#)
- [Respirable and Fine Particulate Matter](#)
- [Sub-Regional Visibility](#)

Will the proposal result in:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Substantial air pollutant emissions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Deterioration of ambient (existing) air quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The creation of objectionable odors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Increased use of diesel fuel?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Air Quality (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (CEQA IIIa)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards? (CEQA IIIb)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (CEQA IIIc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Result in other emissions, such as objectionable odors, adversely affecting a substantial number of people? (CEQA IIId)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Greenhouse Gas Emissions (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
5. Greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (CEQA VIIa)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Greenhouse Gas Emissions (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
6. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (CEQA VIIIb)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion:

The proposed modifications do not include modification of the air quality standards.

## 3. Water Quality (TRPA Checklist Questions)

Current and historic status of water quality standards can be found at the links below:

- [Aquatic Invasive Species](#)
- [Deep Water \(Pelagic\) Lake Tahoe](#)
- [Groundwater](#)
- [Nearshore \(Littoral\) Lake Tahoe](#)
- [Other Lakes](#)
- [Surface Runoff](#)
- [Tributaries](#)
- [Load Reductions](#)

### Will the proposal result in:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff so that a 20 yr. 1 hr. storm runoff (approximately 1 inch per hour) cannot be contained on the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Alterations to the course or flow of 100-year flood waters?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occurrence or seiches?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 3. Water Quality (TRPA Checklist Questions)

Current and historic status of water quality standards can be found at the links below:

- [Aquatic Invasive Species](#)
- [Deep Water \(Pelagic\) Lake Tahoe](#)
- [Groundwater](#)
- [Nearshore \(Littoral\) Lake Tahoe](#)
- [Other Lakes](#)
- [Surface Runoff](#)
- [Tributaries](#)
- [Load Reductions](#)

Will the proposal result in:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
j. The potential discharge of contaminants to the groundwater or any alteration of groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Is the project located within 600 feet of a drinking water source?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Hydrology/Water Quality (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality? (CEQA Xa)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? (CEQA Xb)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: (CEQA Xc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;				
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;				
iii) 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; or				
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?				
4. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? (CEQA Xd)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? (CEQA Xe)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The proposed modifications to the threshold standards establish specific and measurable targets and align the standards with the latest science. No modifications to the Regional Plan are required to promote attainment of the standards.

#### 4. Vegetation (TRPA Checklist Questions)

Current and historic status of vegetation preservation standards can be found at the links below:

- [Common Vegetation](#)
- [Late Seral/Old Growth Ecosystems](#)
- [Sensitive Plants](#)
- [Uncommon Plant Communities](#)

<b>Will the proposal result in:</b>	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Removal of native vegetation in excess of the area utilized for the actual development permitted by the land capability/IPES system?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat, either through direct removal or indirect lowering of the groundwater table?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Introduction of new vegetation that will require excessive fertilizer or water, or will provide a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Change in the diversity or distribution of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, micro flora, and aquatic plants)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare, or endangered species of plants?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Removal of stream bank and/or backshore vegetation, including woody vegetation such as willows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Removal of any native live, dead or dying trees 30 inches or greater in diameter at breast height (dbh) within TRPA's Conservation or Recreation land use classifications?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. A change in the natural functioning of an old growth ecosystem?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The proposed modifications to the threshold standards establish specific and measurable targets and align the standards with the latest science. No modifications to the Regional Plan are required to promote attainment of the standards.

## 5. Wildlife (TRPA Checklist Questions)

Current and historic status of special interest species standards can be found at the links below:

- [Special Interest Species](#)

Current and historic status of the fisheries standards can be found at the links below:

- [Instream Flow](#)
- [Lake Habitat](#)
- [Stream Habitat](#)

Will the proposal result in:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Change in the diversity or distribution of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms, insects, mammals, amphibians or microfauna)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Biological Resources (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (CEQA IVa)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (CEQA IVb)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (CEQA IVc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. 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? (CEQA IVd)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance? (CEQA IVe)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



## Biological Resources (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (CEQA IVf)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion:

The proposed modification to the SEZ restoration standard utilizes the SEZ condition index which integrates both size and condition, addressing the deficiency in the current standards' sole focus on area of SEZ. The proposed modification to the AIS threshold standards provide measurable targets for removal of invasive plants from the Lake. Better accounting for the benefits of enhancement of SEZ and removal of invasive plants provides additional incentives to implement enhancement projects.

## 6. Noise (TRPA Checklist Questions)

Current and historic status of the noise standards can be found at the links below:

- [Cumulative Noise Events](#)
- [Single Noise Events](#)

### Will the proposal result in:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Increases in existing Community Noise Equivalency Levels (CNEL) beyond those permitted in the applicable Area Plan, Plan Area Statement, Community Plan or Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Single event noise levels greater than those set forth in the TRPA Noise Environmental Threshold?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The placement of residential or tourist accommodation uses in areas where the existing CNEL exceeds 60 dBA or is otherwise incompatible?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The placement of uses that would generate an incompatible noise level in close proximity to existing residential or tourist accommodation uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Exposure of existing structures to levels of ground vibration that could result in structural damage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Noise (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Noise (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
general plan or noise ordinance, or other applicable local, state, or federal standards? (CEQA XIIIa)				
2. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (CEQA XIIIb)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. For a Project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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? (CEQA XIIIc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion:

The proposed modifications do not include modification of the air quality standards.

## 7. Light and Glare (TRPA Checklist Questions)

### Will the proposal:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Include new or modified sources of exterior lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create new illumination which is more substantial than other lighting, if any, within the surrounding area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Cause light from exterior sources to be cast off -site or onto public lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create new sources of glare through the siting of the improvements or through the use of reflective materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Aesthetics – Light and Glare (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (CEQA Id)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion:

The proposed modifications will not impact light or glare in the region.

## 8. Land Use (TRPA Checklist Questions)

### Will the proposal:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Include uses which are not listed as permissible uses in the applicable Area Plan, Plan Area Statement, adopted Community Plan, or Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Expand or intensify an existing non-conforming use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Land Use/Planning (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (CEQA XIa)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (CEQA XIb)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion:

No modifications to the land use in the Regional Plan are required to promote attainment of the standards.

## 9. Natural Resources (TRPA Checklist Questions)

### Will the proposal result in:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. A substantial increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resource?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Mineral Resources (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. 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? (CEQA XIIa)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. 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? (CEQA XIIb)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion:

No modifications to the land use in the Regional Plan are required to promote attainment of the standards.

## 10. Risk of Upset (TRPA Checklist Questions)

### Will the proposal:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Involve a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation in the event of an accident or upset conditions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Involve possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Hazards & Hazardous Materials (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (CEQA IXa)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (CEQA IXb)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (CEQA IXc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. 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? (CEQA IXd)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? (CEQA IXe)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (CEQA VIII f)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? (CEQA IXg)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Wildfire (CEQA Checklist Questions)

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
8. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (CEQA XXa)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? (CEQA XXb)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Require the installation of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? (CEQA XXc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? (CEQA XXd)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion:

No modifications to the land use in the Regional Plan are required to promote attainment of the standards, so there is no expected impact on the risk of upset in the region.

## 11. Population (TRPA Checklist Questions)

Will the proposal:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Include or result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Population (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial unplanned 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)? (CEQA XIVa)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## 12. Housing (TRPA Checklist Questions)

### Will the proposal:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing? <i>To determine if the proposal will affect existing housing or create a demand for additional housing, please answer the following questions:</i>				
1. Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region historically or currently being rented at rates affordable by lower and very-low-income households?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Housing (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (CEQA XIVb)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion:

No modifications to the land use in the Regional Plan are required to promote attainment of the standards, so there is no expected impact on housing.

## 13. Transportation / Circulation (TRPA Checklist Questions)

### Will the proposal result in:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Generation of 650 or more new average daily Vehicle Miles Travelled?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, including highway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Transportation (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities? (CEQA XVIIa)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) VMT Threshold – Land Use Projects? (CEQA XVIIb)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (CEQA XVIIc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Result in inadequate emergency access? (CEQA XVIId)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion:

No modifications to the land use in the Regional Plan or Transportation Policy in the Regional Transportation Plan are required to promote attainment of the standards, so there is no expected impact on transportation in the region.

## 14. Public Services (TRPA Checklist Questions)

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

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks or other recreational facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Public Services (CEQA Checklist Questions)

Would the Project 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: (CEQA XVa)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- |                             |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. Police protection?       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Schools?                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Parks?                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

No modifications to the land use in the Regional Plan are required to promote attainment of the standards, so there is no expected impact on public services.

### 15. Energy (TRPA Checklist Questions)

**Will the proposal result in:**

- |   | Yes                      | No                                  | No, with mitigation      | Data insufficient        |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### Energy (CEQA Checklist Questions)

- |  | Potentially Significant  | LTS with Mitigation                 | LTS Impact               | No Impact                |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? (CEQA VIa) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? (CEQA VIb)   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

No modifications to the land use in the Regional Plan are required to promote attainment of the standards, so there is no expected impact on energy.

### 16. Utilities (TRPA Checklist Questions)

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

- |                           | Yes                      | No                                  | No, with mitigation      | Data insufficient        |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Power or natural gas?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Communication systems? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |



- |   |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c. Utilize additional water which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the service provider?                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Utilize additional sewage treatment capacity which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the sewage treatment provider? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Storm water drainage?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Solid waste and disposal?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### Utilities/Service Systems (CEQA Checklist Questions)

- |  | Potentially Significant  | LTS with Mitigation      | LTS Impact               | No Impact                           |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? (CEQA XIXa) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years? (CEQA XIXb)   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. 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? (CEQA XIXc)   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? (CEQA XIXd)  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (CEQA XIXe)   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

No modifications to the land use in the Regional Plan are required to promote attainment of the standards, so there is no expected impact on utilities.

### 17. Human Health (TRPA Checklist Questions)

**Will the proposal result in:**

- |  | Yes                      | No                                  | No, with mitigation      | Data insufficient        |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

The proposed threshold standard for removal of the invasive plants could have a beneficial impact on water quality with potential beneficial impacts on human health.

### 18. Scenic Resources/Community Design (TRPA Checklist Questions)

Current and historic status of the scenic resources standards can be found at the links below:

- [Built Environment](#)
- [Other Areas](#)
- [Roadway and Shoreline Units](#)

**Will the proposal:**

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Be visible from any state or federal highway, Pioneer Trail or from Lake Tahoe?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Be visible from any public recreation area or TRPA designated bicycle trail?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Block or modify an existing view of Lake Tahoe or other scenic vista seen from a public road or other public area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be inconsistent with the height and design standards required by the applicable ordinance, Community Plan, or Area Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Be inconsistent with the TRPA Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) or Design Review Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Aesthetics (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (CEQA Ia)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (CEQA Ib)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (CEQA Ic)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The proposed modifications do not include modification of the scenic standards.

## Aesthetics (CEQA Checklist Questions)

### 19. Recreation (TRPA Checklist Questions)

Current and historic status of the recreation standards can be found at the links below:

- [Fair Share Distribution of Recreation Capacity](#)
- [Quality of Recreation Experience and Access to Recreational Opportunities](#)

Will the proposal:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Create additional demand for recreation facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create additional recreation capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Have the potential to create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway, or public lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Recreation (CEQA Checklist Questions)

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. 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? (CEQA XVIa)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (CEQA XVIb)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Discussion:

The proposed modifications do not include modification of the recreation standards.

### 20. Archaeological / Historical (TRPA Checklist Questions)

Will the proposal result in:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. An alteration of or adverse physical or aesthetic effect to a significant archaeological or historical site, structure, object or building?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Is the proposed project located on a property with any known cultural, historical, and/or archaeological resources, including resources on TRPA or other regulatory official maps or records? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Is the property associated with any historically significant events and/or sites or persons?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Will the proposal restrict historic or pre-historic religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### Tribal Cultural Resources (CEQA Checklist Questions)

**Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:**

- |   | Potentially Significant  | LTS with Mitigation                 | LTS Impact               | No Impact                |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)? (CEQA XVIIIa.i)   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. (CEQA XVIIIa.ii) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### Cultural Resources (CEQA Checklist Questions)

- |   | Potentially Significant  | LTS with Mitigation      | LTS Impact               | No Impact                           |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? (CEQA Va)    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (CEQA Vb) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (CEQA Vc)                          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

The proposed modifications do not include modification of cultural resources.

## 21. Agriculture and Forestry Resources (CEQA Checklist Questions)

### Would the Project:

	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the CA Resources Agency, to a non-agricultural use? (CEQA IIa)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (CEQA IIb)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resource Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by Public Resource Code section 4526) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (CEQA IIc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (CEQA IId)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. 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? (CEQA IIe)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion:

The proposed modifications will not agriculture and forestry resources in the region.

## 22. Cumulative/Synergistic Impacts

The proposed amendments do not include any changes to regional growth restrictions. The changes are designed to promote additional restoration work in the region.

## 23. Findings of Significance


	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
f. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California or Nevada history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time, while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environmental is significant?)
- d. Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human being, either directly or indirectly?

The changes are designed to promote additional restoration work in the region.

**DECLARATION:**

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

Signature:  \_\_\_\_\_

Dan Segan at Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

4/1/24

Person preparing application

County

Date

**Applicant Written Comments:** (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

---

---

## Determination:

### On the basis of this evaluation:

- a. The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment and a finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules of Procedure  YES  NO
- b. The proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but due to the listed mitigation measures which have been added to the project, could have no significant effect on the environment and a mitigated finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules and Procedures.  YES  NO
- c. The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment and an environmental impact statement shall be prepared in accordance with this chapter and TRPA's Rules of Procedures.  YES  NO



---

Signature of Evaluator

Dan Segan, Chief Science and Policy Advisor

---

Title of Evaluator

Date 4/1/24