Attachment C

Initial Environmental Checklist

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

TRPA--IEC 1 of 24

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:				itigation	icient
	 Impervious Cover Stream Environment Zone 	S	0	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
Wi	ll the proposal result in:	Yes	No	ž	Ds
a.	Compaction or covering of the soil beyond the limits allowed in the land capability or Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES)?		\boxtimes		
b.	A change in the topography or ground surface relief features of site inconsistent with the natural surrounding conditions?		\boxtimes		
c.	Unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the proposal?		\boxtimes		
d.	Changes in the undisturbed soil or native geologic substructures or grading in excess of 5 feet?		\boxtimes		
e.	The continuation of or increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?		\boxtimes		
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?		\boxtimes		
g.	Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, backshore erosion, avalanches, mud slides, ground failure, or similar hazards?		\boxtimes		

TRPA--IEC 2 of 24

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.

Ge	eology/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)				\boxtimes
	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?				
2.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (CEQA VIIb)				\boxtimes
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)				\boxtimes
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)				\boxtimes
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)				\boxtimes
6.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (CEQA VIIf)				\boxtimes

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.

TRPA--IEC 3 of 24

2. Air Quality (TRPA Checklist Questions)

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

Wi	 Carbon Monoxide (CO) Nitrate Deposition Ozone (O3) Regional Visibility Respirable and Fine Particulate Matter Sub-Regional Visibility Il the proposal result in: 	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a.	Substantial air pollutant emissions?	≻	\boxtimes		
b.	Deterioration of ambient (existing) air quality?				
c.	The creation of objectionable odors?		\boxtimes		
d.	Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?		\boxtimes		
e.	Increased use of diesel fuel?		\boxtimes		
Ai	r 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)				\boxtimes
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)				\boxtimes
3.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (CEQA IIIc)				\boxtimes
4.	Result in other emissions, such as objectionable odors, adversely affecting a substantial number of people? (CEQA IIId)				\boxtimes
Gr	reenhouse 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 VIIIa)				\boxtimes

TRPA--IEC 4 of 24

Gr	eenhouse 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)				\boxtimes
Dis	cussion:				
Th	e proposed modifications do not include modification of the air quality standards.				
3.	Water Quality (TRPA Checklist Questions)				
Cu	rrent 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 	S		No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
Wi	Il the proposal result in:	Yes	S S	S	Da
a.	Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?		\boxtimes		
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?		\boxtimes		
c.	Alterations to the course or flow of 100-year flood waters?		\boxtimes		
d.	Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?		\boxtimes		
e.	Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?		\boxtimes		
f.	Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground water?		\boxtimes		
g.	Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?		\boxtimes		
h.	Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?		\boxtimes		
i.	Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occurrence or seiches?		\boxtimes		

TRPA--IEC 5 of 24

3. Water Quality (TRPA Checklist Questions)

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

Wi	 Aquatic Invasive Species Deep Water (Pelagic) Lake Tahoe Groundwater Nearshore (Littoral) Lake Tahoe Other Lakes Surface Runoff Tributaries Load Reductions Il 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?		\boxtimes		
k.	Is the project located within 600 feet of a drinking water source?		\boxtimes		
Ну	drology/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)				\boxtimes
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)				\boxtimes
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)				\boxtimes
	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)				\boxtimes
5.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? (CEQA Xe)				\boxtimes

TRPA--IEC 6 of 24

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 			No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
Wi	ll the proposal result in:	Yes	N _o	No, v	Data
а.	Removal of native vegetation in excess of the area utilized for the actual development permitted by the land capability/IPES system?		\boxtimes		
b.	Removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat, either through direct removal or indirect lowering of the groundwater table?				
С.	Introduction of new vegetation that will require excessive fertilizer or water, or will provide a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?		\boxtimes		
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)?		\boxtimes		
e.	Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare, or endangered species of plants?		\boxtimes		
f.	Removal of stream bank and/or backshore vegetation, including woody vegetation such as willows?		\boxtimes		
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?		\boxtimes		
h.	A change in the natural functioning of an old growth ecosystem?		\boxtimes		

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.

TRPA--IEC 7 of 24

5. Wildlife (TRPA Checklist Questions)

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

• Special Interest Species

	<u></u>			<u>_</u>	
	 Instream Flow Lake Habitat Stream Habitat Il 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)?		\boxtimes		
b.	Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?		\boxtimes		
C.	Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?		\boxtimes		
d.	Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality?		\boxtimes		
Bi	ological 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)				\boxtimes
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)				\boxtimes
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)				\boxtimes
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)				\boxtimes
5.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance? (CEQA IVe)				\boxtimes

TRPA--IEC 8 of 24

Bi	ological 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)				\boxtimes
Dis	scussion:				
siz mo Lal	e proposed modification to the SEZ restoration standard utilizes the SEZ condition in the and condition, addressing the deficiency in the current standards' sole focus on an odification to the AIS threshold standards provide measurable targets for removal of ke. Better accounting for the benefits of enhancement of SEZ and removal of invasicentives to implement enhancement projects.	ea of SE f invasive	Z. The p	ropose from th	d ne
6.	Noise (TRPA Checklist Questions)			_	
Cu	rrent and historic status of the noise standards can be found at the links below:			gation	ent
	 Cumulative Noise Events Single Noise Events 	10		No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
Wi	ill the proposal result in:	Yes	S S	N	Dat
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?				
b.	Exposure of people to severe noise levels?		\boxtimes		
c.	Single event noise levels greater than those set forth in the TRPA Noise Environmental Threshold?				
d.	The placement of residential or tourist accommodation uses in areas where the existing CNEL exceeds 60 dBA or is otherwise incompatible?		\boxtimes		
e.	The placement of uses that would generate an incompatible noise level in close proximity to existing residential or tourist accommodation uses?				
f.	Exposure of existing structures to levels of ground vibration that could result in structural damage?				
No	oise (CEQA Checklist Questions)	ally Int	uo	act	act
		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				\boxtimes

TRPA--IEC 9 of 24

No	oise (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)				\boxtimes
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)				\boxtimes
Dis	cussion:				
The	e proposed modifications do not include modification of the air quality standards.				
7.	Light and Glare (TRPA Checklist Questions)			ر on	ent
Wi	II the proposal:	Yes	N _O	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a.	Include new or modified sources of exterior lighting?		\boxtimes		
b.	Create new illumination which is more substantial than other lighting, if any, within the surrounding area?				
c.	Cause light from exterior sources to be cast off -site or onto public lands?		\boxtimes		
d.	Create new sources of glare through the siting of the improvements or through the use of reflective materials?				
Ae	esthetics – 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)				\boxtimes
Dis	scussion:				

TRPA--IEC 10 of 24

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

8.	Land Use (TRPA Checklist Questions)			c U	Pnt
Wi	Il the proposal:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data
a.	Include uses which are not listed as permissible uses in the applicable Area Plan, Plan Area Statement, adopted Community Plan, or Master Plan?		\boxtimes		
b.	Expand or intensify an existing non-conforming use?		\boxtimes		
La	nd Use/Planning (CEQA Checklist Questions)	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1.	Physically divide an established community? (CEQA XIa)				\boxtimes
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)				\boxtimes
Dis	scussion:				
No	modifications to the land use in the Regional Plan are required to promote attainme	nt of th	ne stand	dards.	
9.	Natural Resources (TRPA Checklist Questions)			h ion	- - - -
Wi	Il the proposal result in:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a.	A substantial increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?		\boxtimes		
b.	Substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resource?		\boxtimes		
M	ineral 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)				\boxtimes
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)				\boxtimes
Dis	scussion:				

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

TRPA--IEC 11 of 24

10. Risk of Upset (TRPA Checklist Questions) No, with mitigation Will the proposal: Yes a. Involve a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances including, but Xnot limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation in the event of an accident or upset conditions? b. Involve possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan? X П П Hazards & Hazardous Materials (CEQA Checklist Questions) Potentially Significant LTS Impact No Impact 1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine XП transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (CEQA IXa) 2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably \boxtimes foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (CEQA IXb) 3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, Xsubstances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (CEQA IXc) 4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled X 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) 5. For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not Xbeen 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) 6. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency П X

TRPA--IEC 12 of 24

response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (CEQA VIIIf)

injury or death involving wildland fires? (CEQA IXg)

7. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss,

П

X

W	ldfire (CEQA Checklist Questions)	≥≠	_	ಕ	#
	ocated in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire ard 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)				\boxtimes
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)				\boxtimes
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)				
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)				\boxtimes
Dis	cussion:				
	modifications to the land use in the Regional Plan are required to promote attainmer o expected impact on the risk of upset in the region.	nt of th	e stanc	dards, so	o there
11	. Population (TRPA Checklist Questions)			uc	ent
Wi	I the proposal:	Yes	N O	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a.	Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?		\boxtimes		
b.	Include or result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents?		\boxtimes		
Po	pulation (CEQA Checklist Questions)				
. 0	palation (otal checking 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)				\boxtimes

TRPA--IEC 13 of 24

12	. Housing (TRPA Checklist Questions)				ent
Wi	ll the proposal:	Yes	N _O	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a.	Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?				
	To determine if the proposal will affect existing housing or create a demand for additional housing, please answer the following questions:				
	1. Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region?		\boxtimes		
	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?				
Ho	ousing (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)				\boxtimes
Dis	cussion:				
	modifications to the land use in the Regional Plan are required to promote attainment of expected impact on housing.	nt of th	ne stand	dards, s	o there
13	. Transportation / Circulation (TRPA Checklist Questions)			ر on	ent
Wi	Il the proposal result in:	Yes	No No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a.	Generation of 650 or more new average daily Vehicle Miles Travelled?		\boxtimes		
b.	Changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?		\boxtimes		
c.	Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, including highway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities?		\boxtimes		
d.	Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?		\boxtimes		
e.	Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?		\boxtimes		
f	Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, hicyclists, or nedestrians?				

TRPA--IEC 14 of 24

Tr	ansportation (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)				\boxtimes		
2.	Conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) VMT Threshold – Land Use Projects? (CEQA XVIIb)				\boxtimes		
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)				\boxtimes		
4.	Result in inadequate emergency access? (CEQA XVIId)				\boxtimes		
No rec	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.						
	. Public Services (TRPA Checklist Questions)			h ion	ient		
	Il the proposal have an unplanned effect upon, or result in a need for new or ered governmental services in any of the following areas?:	Yes	o N	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient		
a.	Fire protection?		\boxtimes				
b.	Police protection?		\boxtimes				
c.	Schools?		\boxtimes				
d.	Parks or other recreational facilities?		\boxtimes				
e.	Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?		\boxtimes				
f.	Other governmental services?		\boxtimes				
Pu	ablic Services (CEQA Checklist Questions)						
pro pho sig	ould the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the exision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or ysically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause nificant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, sponse times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: EQA XVa)	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact		
1.	Fire protection?		\boxtimes				

TRPA--IEC 15 of 24

2.	Police protection?		\boxtimes								
3.	Schools?		\boxtimes								
4.	Parks?		\boxtimes								
5.	Other public facilities?		\boxtimes								
Dis	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)			Ľ	ent						
Wi	ll the proposal result in:	Yes	o N	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient						
a.	Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?		\boxtimes								
b.	Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?		\boxtimes								
En	ergy (CEQA Checklist Questions)	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact						
	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? (CEQA VIa)		\boxtimes								
	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? (CEQA VIb)		\boxtimes								
Dis	cussion:										
	modifications to the land use in the Regional Plan are required to promote attainment of expected impact on energy.	nt of th	ne stand	dards, s	o there						
16	. Utilities (TRPA Checklist Questions)			<u></u>	ent						
	cept for planned improvements, will the proposal result in a need for new systems, substantial alterations to the following utilities:	Yes	No No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient						
a.	Power or natural gas?		\boxtimes								
b.	Communication systems?		\boxtimes								

TRPA--IEC 16 of 24

C.	Utilize additional water which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the service provider?		\boxtimes					
d.	Utilize additional sewage treatment capacity which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the sewage treatment provider?		\boxtimes					
e.	Storm water drainage?		\boxtimes					
f.	Solid waste and disposal?		\boxtimes					
Ut	ilities/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)							
2.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years? (CEQA XIXb)				\boxtimes			
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)				\boxtimes			
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)				\boxtimes			
5.	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (CEQA XIXe)				\boxtimes			
Dis	cussion:							
	modifications to the land use in the Regional Plan are required to promote attainment of expected impact on utilities.	nt of th	e stand	dards, so	o there			
17	. Human Health (TRPA Checklist Questions)			- u	ent			
Wi	Il the proposal result in:	Yes	N 0	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient			
a.	Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?		\boxtimes					
b.	Exposure of people to potential health hazards?		\boxtimes					
Dis	Discussion:							

TRPA--IEC 17 of 24

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)

	rent and historic status of the scenic resources standards can be found at the links ow: Built Environment Other Areas Roadway and Shoreline Units			No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
Wi	I the proposal:	Yes	No	No,	Data
a.	Be visible from any state or federal highway, Pioneer Trail or from Lake Tahoe?		\boxtimes		
b.	Be visible from any public recreation area or TRPA designated bicycle trail?		\boxtimes		
c.	Block or modify an existing view of Lake Tahoe or other scenic vista seen from a public road or other public area?		\boxtimes		
d.	Be inconsistent with the height and design standards required by the applicable ordinance, Community Plan, or Area Plan?		\boxtimes		
e.	Be inconsistent with the TRPA Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) or Design Review Guidelines?				
Ae	sthetics (CEQA Checklist Questions)	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
1.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (CEQA Ia)			\boxtimes	
2.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (CEQA Ib)			\boxtimes	
3.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (CEQA Ic)			\boxtimes	

Discussion:

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

TRPA--IEC 18 of 24

A	esthetics (CEQA Checklist Questions)	Potentially Significant	LTS with Mitigation	LTS Impact	No Impact
19	Recreation (TRPA Checklist Questions)			tion	4
Cu	rrent and historic status of the recreation standards can be found at the links below:			ıitigal	icien
	 <u>Fair Share Distribution of Recreation Capacity</u> <u>Quality of Recreation Experience and Access to Recreational Opportunities</u> 			No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
Wi	Il the proposal:	Yes	8	No,	Dat
a.	Create additional demand for recreation facilities?		\boxtimes		
b.	Create additional recreation capacity?		\boxtimes		
C.	Have the potential to create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed?		\boxtimes		
d.	Result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway, or public lands?		\boxtimes		
Re	ecreation (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)				\boxtimes
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)				\boxtimes
Dis	scussion:				
Th	e proposed modifications do not include modification of the recreation standards.				
20	. Archaeological / Historical (TRPA Checklist Questions)			h ion	ient
Wi	Il the proposal result in:	Yes	o N	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?		\boxtimes		

TRPA--IEC 19 of 24

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?		\boxtimes		
c.	Is the property associated with any historically significant events and/or sites or persons?		\boxtimes		
d.	Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?		\boxtimes		
e.	Will the proposal restrict historic or pre-historic religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?		\boxtimes		
Tri	ibal Cultural Resources (CEQA Checklist Questions)				
res cul· lan	ould the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural ource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, tural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the dscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, 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)				
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)				
Cu	Iltural 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)				\boxtimes
4. (Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (CEQA Vb)				\boxtimes
5. [Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (CEQA Vc)				\boxtimes
Dis	cussion:				
The	e proposed modifications do not include modification of cultural resources.				

TRPA--IEC 20 of 24

21	. Agriculture and Forestry Resources (CEQA Checklist Questions)	ally ant	ر ion	act	act
Wo	uld 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)		\boxtimes		
2.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (CEQA IIb)		\boxtimes		
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)		\boxtimes		
4.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (CEQA IId)		\boxtimes		
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)		\boxtimes		
Dis	cussion:				
The	e proposed modifications will not agriculture and forestry resources in the region.				
22	. Cumulative/Synergistic Impacts				
	e proposed amendments do not include any changes to regional growth restrictions. To promote additional restoration work in the region.	Γhe ch	anges a	re desig	gned
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?				
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.)		\boxtimes		

TRPA--IEC 21 of 24

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?	\boxtimes	
The	e changes are designed to promote additional restoration work in the region.		

TRPA--IEC 22 of 24

DECLARATION:

Person preparing application

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:

4/1/24

Dan Segan at Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Date

County

Applicant Written Comments: (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

TRPA--IEC 23 of 24

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	\boxtimes	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	\boxtimes	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	\boxtimes	NO

SA

Signature of Evaluator

Dan Segan, Chief Science and Policy Advisor

Title of Evaluator

Date <u>4/1/24</u>

TRPA--IEC 24 of 24