

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Amendments



OCTOBER 2023

PREPARED FOR:

Placer County
Community Development
Resource Agency
775 North Lake Boulevard
Tahoe City, CA 96145



Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449



Initial Environmental Checklist
for the
Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Amendments

Prepared for:
Placer County
Community Development Resource Agency
775 North Lake Boulevard, Tahoe City, CA 96145
530530-581-6200

Contact: Emily Setzer, Principal Planner
and

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
PO Box 5310, Stateline, NV 89449
775-589-5221

Contact: Jacob Stock, AICP, Senior Planner

Prepared By:
Ascent Environmental, Inc.
PO Box 5022, Stateline, NV
702-596-5957

Contact: Adam Lewandowski, AICP, Senior Project Manager

October 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	III
1 INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1 Introduction and Regulatory Guidance	1-1
1.2 Purpose of this Document	1-1
1.3 Document Organization	1-2
2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2-1
2.1 Project Location	2-1
2.2 Project Background and Need	2-1
2.3 Project Objectives	2-2
2.4 Proposed Area Plan Changes	2-2
2.5 Growth Potential	2-6
3 INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	3-7
3.1 Land	3-8
3.2 Air Quality	3-12
3.3 Water Quality	3-17
3.4 Vegetation	3-22
3.5 Wildlife	3-26
3.6 Noise	3-29
3.7 Light and Glare	3-33
3.8 Land Use	3-35
3.9 Natural Resources	3-36
3.10 Risk of Upset	3-38
3.11 Population	3-41
3.12 Housing	3-43
3.13 Transportation/Circulation	3-45
3.14 Public Services	3-50
3.15 Energy	3-53
3.16 Utilities	3-54
3.17 Human Health	3-57
3.18 Scenic Resources/Community Design	3-59
3.19 Recreation	3-63
3.20 Archaeological/Historical	3-66
3.21 Findings of Significance	3-69
4 REFERENCES	4-1
5 REPORT PREPARERS	5-1

Tables

Table 2-1.	Summary of Proposed Policy Document Changes.....	2-2
Table 2-2.	Summary of Proposed Implementing Regulations Changes	2-3
Table 2-3.	Updates to Building Length and Height in Town Centers	2-6
Table 3-1.	Land Capability and Existing Coverage within the Plan Area ¹	3-9
Table 3-2.	Status and Trends of TRPA Air Quality Threshold Standards	3-12
Table 3-3.	Scenic Travel Routes within the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan	3-60

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AADT	annual average daily traffic
ADT	average daily traffic
APC	Advisory Planning Commission
Area Plan	Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan
BMP	best management practice
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFA	commercial floor area
CFR	Code of Federal Regulation
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CO	carbon monoxide
CP	Community Plans
Dbh	diameter at breast height
EIP	Environmental Improvement Program
EIS	environmental impact statement
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
GHG	greenhouse gas
IEC	Initial Environmental Checklist
IPES	Individual Parcel Evaluation System
LCD	land capability districts
Lmax	Maximum Sound Level
LOS	level of service
LRWQCB	Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
LTGRP	Lake Tahoe Geographic Response Plan
MOA	Memoranda of Agreement
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRF	Materials Recovery Facility
MTCO ₂ e	metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent
NDEP	Nevada Department of Environmental Protection
NDOT	Nevada Department of Transportation
NEPA	National Environmental Protection Act
NLTFPD	North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District
NOX	nitrogen oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRS	Nevada Revised Statutes
NTFPD	North Tahoe Fire Protection District
NTPUD	North Tahoe Public Utility District

OES	Placer County Office of Emergency Preparedness
PAOT	persons-at-one-time
PAS	Plan Area Statements
PIA	Project Impact Assessment Guidelines
PM10	respirable particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less
PM2.5	fine particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less
RBU	Residential Bonus Units
Region	Tahoe Region
Regional Plan	TRPA Regional Plan
RPU	Regional Plan Update
RTTP	Resort Triangle Transportation Plan
RUU	residential unit of use
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
SB	Senate Bill
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
SEZ	Stream Environment Zone
SHPO	state historic preservation officer
SQIP	Scenic Quality Improvement Program
SR	State Route
State Parks	California State Parks
SWPPP	storm water pollution prevention plan
SWRCB	California State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	toxic air contaminant
TART	Tahoe Area Regional Transit
TAU	tourist accommodation units
TBAP	Tahoe Basin Area Plan
TCPUD	Tahoe City Public Utilities District
TDR	Transfer of Development Rights
TMDL	total maximum daily load
TMPO	Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization
TRPA Code	Code of Ordinances
TRPA	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
TTD	Tahoe Transportation District
T-TSA	Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency
TTSD	Tahoe Truckee Sierra Disposal
TTUSD	Tahoe Truckee Unified School District
USC	U.S. Code
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
VMT	vehicle miles traveled

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE

This Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of Article VI of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Rules of Procedure and Chapter 3 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (TRPA Code) to evaluate potential environmental effects resulting from implementation of the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan (Area Plan) Amendments. TRPA is the lead agency pursuant to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (Public Law 96-551), 1980 revision, TRPA Code, and TRPA Rules of Procedure. Chapter 2, "Project Description" presents project details.

TRPA has responsibility for implementation of the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan (Regional Plan), approval of area plans, and annual/quadrennial reviews of area plans to ensure that development within the geographic boundaries of an area plan meets adopted TRPA standards. Chapter 13 of the TRPA Code allows local governments to adopt a conforming area plan containing policies and development ordinances that are consistent with and that further the goals and policies of the Regional Plan. Chapter 13 also establishes the content requirements for area plans and defines development activities that will not have a substantial effect on the physical environment of the Tahoe Region (Region), and therefore allows TRPA to delegate limited permitting authority to local governments. The Area Plan amendments evaluated herein were prepared by Placer County pursuant to Chapter 13 of the TRPA Code.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This IEC evaluates the potential environmental effects associated with adoption and implementation of the proposed Area Plan amendments. Though more focused and site-specific than the Regional Plan, the Area Plan and the proposed amendments apply to a broad geography and are intended to guide planning decisions over a planning timeframe of 20 or more years. The policy-oriented nature of the Area Plan and the proposed amendments is such that this impact analysis is prepared at a programmatic level—that is, a more general analysis with a level of detail and degree of specificity commensurate with that of the plan itself. Future projects that would be implemented under the amended Area Plan, for which project details are developed to a sufficient degree that environmental effects can be identified and assessed with greater certainty, would be evaluated by TRPA and Placer County at a project-level.

Chapter 3 of this document contains the IEC analysis and discussion of potential environmental impacts of the Area Plan amendments. Based on the issues evaluated in that chapter, it was determined that the project would have either no impact or a less-than-significant impact related to all resource areas identified. Therefore, an IEC is the appropriate document for compliance with the requirements of TRPA.

1.2.1 Tiering Process

The concept of tiering refers to the environmental review of large-scale projects in a program Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and carrying out subsequent environmental review for smaller projects by referencing and summarizing applicable program-level impacts that were identified in a program EIS and concentrating on the issues specific to the project at hand. TRPA thus limits the analysis for a later project that is consistent with a certified program EIS. Subsequent review is required only for effects that were not examined as significant in the EIS, or for effects which are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by revisions in the project through conditions of approval or mitigation.

This IEC is tiered from the 2016 Placer County and TRPA Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge Project (TBAP) EIR/EIS and the TRPA 2012 Regional Plan Update (RPU) EIS and in accordance with Section 6.12 of the TRPA Rules of Procedure. The 2016 Area Plan EIR/EIS and the 2012 RPU EIS constitute a program EISs prepared pursuant to Article VI of TRPA Rules of Procedure (Environmental Impact Statements) and Chapter 3, Environmental Documentation, of the TRPA Code.

The Regional Plan is a comprehensive land use plan that guides physical development within the Tahoe Region. The 2012 RPU EIS analyzed full implementation of uses and physical development proposed in the Regional Plan and identified measures to mitigate the significant adverse program-level and cumulative impacts associated with that growth. The Tahoe Basin Area Plan and the development it would accommodate is an element of the growth that was anticipated in the 2012 RPU and evaluated in the 2012 RPU EIS. The 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS evaluated full buildout of the plan area and implementation of TBAP policies and regulations that apply within the plan area. It also included mitigation measures to avoid or reduce significant environmental effects. Those mitigation measures were incorporated into the adopted TBAP.

In tiering from the 2016 Area Plan EIR/EIS and 2012 RPU EIS, this IEC relies on those document for the following:

- ▶ Background and setting information for environmental topic areas.
- ▶ Regional growth-related issues.
- ▶ Issues that were evaluated in sufficient detail in the 2016 Area Plan EIR/EIS and/or 2012 RPU EIS for which there is no significant new information or change in circumstances that would require further analysis.
- ▶ Assessment of cumulative impacts.

TRPA's determination, based on the analysis contained in this IEC, finds that the proposed Area Plan amendments would not have significant effects on the environment. Therefore, a Finding of No Significant Effect will be prepared by TRPA.

This IEC concludes that many potentially significant impacts are addressed by mitigation measures that have been adopted as part of the approval of the RPU and TBAP. Therefore, the RPU EIS and TBAP EIR/EIS mitigation measures that are related to, and may reduce the impacts of, the proposed Area Plan amendments are identified in this IEC. Nothing in this IEC alters the obligations of Placer County or TRPA to continue to implement the mitigation measures adopted in the RPU EIS and TBAP EIR/EIS. Consequently, Placer County would adhere to all applicable adopted mitigation measures required by the RPU EIS and TBAP EIR/EIS as a part of the amended Area Plan amendments.

1.3 DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

This IEC is organized as follows:

- ▶ Chapter 1: Introduction. This chapter introduces the environmental review process. It describes the purpose and organization of this document.
- ▶ Chapter 2: Project Description. This chapter describes the objectives of the proposed Area Plan amendments and provides a detailed description of the proposed amendments.
- ▶ Chapter 3: Initial Environmental Checklist. This chapter presents an analysis of a range of environmental issues identified in the TRPA IEC and determines if the proposed Area Plan amendments would result in no impact, a less-than-significant impact, a less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated, or a potentially significant impact. If any impacts were determined to be potentially significant, an EIS would be required. For the proposed Area Plan Amendments, however, none of the impacts were determined to be significant.
- ▶ Chapter 4: References. This chapter lists the references used in preparation of this IEC.
- ▶ Chapter 5: List of Preparers. This chapter identifies report preparers.

2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The TBAP addresses that portion of Placer County that is also within the jurisdiction of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), encompassing an area of 46,162 acres (72.1 square miles) that includes the communities of Kings Beach/Stateline, Tahoe City, Carnelian Bay, Dollar Point, Sunnyside, Homewood, Tahoe Vista, and Tahoma. The plan area is bounded by El Dorado County to the south, the state of Nevada to the east, Martis and Olympic Valleys to the north, and the Sierra Nevada to the west.

2.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND NEED

The Placer County Board of Supervisors and TRPA Governing Board adopted the Area Plan on December 6, 2016 and January 25, 2017, respectively. The Area Plan replaced all previous community plans, general plans, land use regulations, development standards and guidelines, and plan area statements within the Tahoe Basin portion of Placer County. The Area Plan includes a policy document and implementing regulations which serve as the zoning code for the Tahoe Basin portion of Placer County. Area plans are a central part of the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan and an important strategy to accelerate attainment of TRPA environmental thresholds. The Area Plan sets forth the regulations that implement the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan in the Placer County portion of the Lake Tahoe region. The proposed project, the subject of this IEC, consists of targeted amendments to the adopted Area Plan.

Despite significant public infrastructure investment and community and governing body approval of robust plans and visions for the future, the North Tahoe Town Centers of Tahoe City and Kings Beach have yet to see major private investment that would result in implementation of the types of projects envisioned by the TBAP. A few sizable redevelopment projects in Town Centers have been proposed in the past year which are in the planning stages, but even these projects are struggling to meet some existing Area Plan development standards.

Because of the limited availability of quality lodging in the Town Centers, lodging has shifted to the neighborhoods in the form of short-term rentals. This, in combination with second homes, has drastically reduced the availability of housing, particularly workforce housing. The North Tahoe region has seen very few new multifamily workforce or “missing middle” housing projects, defined as house-scale buildings with multiple units in walkable environments, often targeted at those who earn above the typical 60 percent of median income limits deemed as “affordable” but who cannot afford to purchase homes in the region. Eastern Placer County currently has approximately 19,000 residential units, 12 percent of which are owner-occupied fulltime, 15 percent are used as long-term rentals, and the remaining 73 percent sit mostly vacant as private vacation homes or second homes, some of which are used as short-term rentals (Mountain Housing Council 2021). The North Tahoe-Truckee Regional Housing Implementation Plan estimated that about a third of North Tahoe and Truckee’s housing is used for workforce housing, which combines housing used as long-term rentals and housing owned and occupied by local workers. Meanwhile, the American Community Survey (ACS 2020) 5-year estimates predict that only 8 percent of the housing units within the Tahoe Truckee Unified School District geographical boundary (which covers North Tahoe and Truckee) are renter occupied (Mountain Housing Council 2021). The lack of housing options has led to a decrease in population. In the Placer County portion of the Tahoe Basin, the population decreased by 2,000 residents between 2000 and 2020. This lack of year-round economic stability and local workforce has made it challenging for businesses to thrive. The lack of redevelopment means that the area plan has not achieved its expected environmental improvements.

Numerous community groups have provided years of feedback to County staff about the need for quality hotels in Town Centers, ways to make the approval process for small business start-ups more streamlined, and the overwhelming demand for workforce housing. These groups have included the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association, the North Tahoe Business Association, the Tahoe City Downtown Association, and the Mountain Housing Council. The overall theme has centered around shifting lodging from short-term rentals in residential neighborhoods to quality hotels and workforce housing in Town Centers, creating vibrant Town Centers with a unique sense of place.

In addition to the above, new legislative and development conditions have created the need for plan updates. First, the State of California has passed housing legislation that limits the ability of local governments to obstruct housing development. New state housing laws reform and streamline permitting processes, moving toward a ministerial approval model for housing that complies with local zoning and planning rules to reduce barriers to housing production. The new California laws require that local governments update their housing plans to focus on growth. Second, since the area plan's adoption, multiple efforts have been underway to address the slower-than-anticipated pace of redevelopment and revitalization of the Town Centers and Village Centers due to barriers to development, including for example high construction material and labor costs, high cost of meeting regulatory requirements, and lack of available parcels. Similarly, through the September 2021 Baseline Report for the Tahoe Basin, the March 2022 Community Report for the Tahoe Region, and the June 2022 Envision Tahoe Prosperity Playbook, the Tahoe Prosperity Center has illustrated the population, economic, and housing challenges facing the region. New tools are necessary to encourage redevelopment.

2.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The proposed Tahoe Basin Area Plan amendments promote economic development and housing and aim to:

- encourage environmentally beneficial redevelopment in the area, particularly lodging, in Town Centers;
- make the development process more predictable, reducing barriers for new businesses to locate in the Town Centers; and
- provide additional opportunities for workforce housing development, including a greater variety of housing types.

2.4 PROPOSED AREA PLAN CHANGES

The proposed Area Plan amendments focus on process, policy, and code improvements to support appropriate lodging, mixed-use developments, and a variety of housing types, including workforce housing. The amendments also focus on diversifying land uses, with the intent of streamlining planning processes and increasing the diversity of business and housing types. Therefore, the proposed amendments are designed to implement recommendations outlined in the Economic Sustainability Needs Assessment, particularly those focused on process, policy, and code improvements that will facilitate and streamline revitalization projects in the Town Centers and workforce housing throughout North Tahoe.

2.4.1 Area Plan Policy Document Proposed Amendments

A strikethrough/underline version of the TBAP Policy document that shows proposed policy changes is available on the Placer County website here: www.placer.ca.gov/3342/Tahoe-Basin-Area-Plan

Table 2-1. Summary of Proposed Policy Document Changes

Area Plan Element	Proposed Change	Summary of Change
Scenic Resources	Changed policy language in policies SR-P-3, SR-P-4, and added policy SR-P-10.	The policy amendments are intended to support the evaluation or reevaluation of scenic requirements to facilitate private reinvestment in Town Centers targeted for redevelopment and/or new development under the Area Plan. The intent is to generate development that improves environmental conditions, creates a more efficient, sustainable, and less auto-dependent land use pattern, and provides for economic opportunities.
Vegetation	Changed policy language in policy VEG-P-6 and added policy VEG-P-7	A new policy was added to support implementation of new or expanded hardening, green waste, and defensible space incentive and/or rebate programs.
Socio-Economic	Removed policy SE-P-5 and added policies SE-P-6 and SE-P-7	Former Policy SE-P-5 was removed from the Area Plan, which related to addressing the job-housing imbalance and providing housing at various affordable levels. Policies were added to support high-speed broadband infrastructure capacity and to support childcare facilities to meet the needs of the local workforce.

Area Plan Element	Proposed Change	Summary of Change
Land Use	Added policies LU-P-19, LU-P-20, LU-P-21, LU-P-22, and LU-P-23.	New policies were added to help achieve the objectives of the Placer County North Lake Tahoe Economic Development Incentive Program, which prioritizes development rights to the most community-benefitting projects that align with the Area Plan and Regional Plan. Policies were added to support the allocation and conversion of TRPA development rights, and to address land uses in the Town Centers. Policies were also included to support funding sources for a frontage improvement implementation plan to achieve area plan infrastructure such as sidewalks, curbs, and gutters, as well as implementing parking management plans and developing a reservation and conversion manual for development rights.
Mixed Use	Added policies MU-P-7, MU-P-8, and MU-P-9.	Policies were added to ensure the availability and development of mixed use, business park, and light industrial space, and to encourage potential residential components in such development.
Town Centers	Changed policy language in policy TC-P-5, and added policies TC-P-10, TC-P-11, TC-P-12, TC-P-13, TC-P-14, TC-P-15, TC-P-16, TC-P-17, TC-P-18, and TC-P-19.	New policies were added that would allow groundwater interception for mixed-use projects in Town Centers, supporting streamlined permit processes for mixed use projects, encouraging active ground floor uses, facilitating mobile vendors and food trucks in Town Centers, supporting the retention and expansion of businesses from the North Tahoe-Truckee region, supporting relocations of industrial and public utility land uses in the Town Centers to free up Town Center sites, as well as supporting parking maximums and other parking solutions.
Community Design	Added policies CD-P-14, CD-P-15, CD-P-16, and CD-P-17.	Policies to support and promote local artists and public art in North Tahoe were included.
Redevelopment	Added policies DP-P-5, DP-P-6, DP-P-7, DP-P-8, DP-P-9, DP-P-10, and DP-P-11.	New policies support and encourage adaptive reuse of vacant or underutilized retail and office space, support redevelopment of aging lodging products and encourage revitalization and creation of new high-quality lodging, allow multipurpose and flexible gathering spaces in private and public parking areas where events could be held during off-peak hours, expedite building permit processes, and support the development of new business innovation space and flexible light industrial spaces to diversify the local economy.
Housing	Added policies HS-P-8, HS-P-9, HS-P-10, HS-P-11, HS-P-12,	Additional policies were included to support streamlining affordable, moderate, and achievable housing, require that 50 percent of units converted from multifamily to condominiums be deed restricted to affordable, moderate or achievable housing, address the job-housing imbalance in the region, monitor and track housing data in the region, and support adaptive management of the short-term rental inventory to balance housing availability with short-term rentals as new lodging products are added to the region.

2.4.2 Area Plan Implementing Regulations Proposed Amendments

A strikethrough/underline version of the TBAP Implementing Regulations that shows proposed policy changes is available on the Placer County website here: www.placer.ca.gov/3342/Tahoe-Basin-Area-Plan

Table 2-2. Summary of Proposed Implementing Regulations Changes

Proposed Change	Summary of Change
Global changes to the Implementing Regulations to adopt and incorporate the TRPA Shorezone Ordinances.	The proposed amendments to the area plan are intended to reflect the changes made to Placer County Code Chapter 12, Article 12.32, "Lake Tahoe Shorezone" adopted by the Board of Supervisors in February of 2021. In August 2019, TRPA amended its Code of Ordinances, including shorezone regulations contained in Chapters 80 through 85.
Additions have been made to Chapter 1.04 Administration, Design Review Required for Commercial, Tourist Accommodation, and Multi-Family	Tourist Accommodation development has been added and would therefore be subject to Design Review. Multi-Family Residential Development with 15 units or fewer and not in a designated scenic area is exempt from the Design Review requirements under this part. Additionally, the process for

Proposed Change	Summary of Change
Dwelling Residential Development, and All Development in Designated Scenic Areas. Tourist Accommodation was added to the review requirement and an exemption was added.	Design Review has been modified to provide for lesser environmental review if project is exempt per applicable CEQA Guidelines exemptions or other California streamlining exemptions.
Residential Subdistrict Development Standards revised to reduce or remove setbacks, articulation, massing requirements, minimum lot widths, and minimum lot area.	Setbacks and articulation and massing requirements limiting building capacity would be removed and/or reduced. The proposed amendments would also include reduced minimum lot widths for some zone districts. The minimum lot area per dwelling unit in all residential zone districts would also be removed to accommodate smaller dwelling units. In seven of the 21 residential zone districts listed as Preferred Affordable, Moderate and Achievable Areas, the minimum lot size was reduced to 2,904 square feet to accommodate existing densities of 15 dwelling units per acre, and minimum lot widths were reduced to 25 feet to accommodate smaller lots that can promote smaller and more affordable houses, and which match existing lot sizes. Street side setbacks for corner lots are introduced. Side setbacks were also reduced to 5 feet minimum, except when adjoining another unit on adjacent property, which would require 0 feet on one side and 10 feet on the other to accommodate duplex-style developments.
Residential Subdistrict Land Use Regulations revised to change multiple family and multi-person dwellings and employees housing to an Allowed Use.	In the 21 residential zone districts listed as Preferred Affordable, Moderate, and Achievable Areas, where not otherwise allowed by right, the proposed amendments would allow multifamily and employee housing by right with no use permit if 100 percent of units are deed restricted to affordable, moderate, or achievable housing per TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 90: Definitions, for achievable, moderate-income, or affordable housing. This is intended to encourage development of multifamily housing by reducing costs and time delays associated with use permits and provide clear standards and requirements that must be met.
Mixed-Use Districts Tables 2.04.A-1 for Greater Tahoe City Mixed Use and 2.04.B-1 and North Tahoe East Residential Uses	Multifamily, multi-person, and employee housing would be allowed by right if 100% of the units are deed restricted to affordable, moderate, or achievable housing per TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 90: Definitions, for achievable, moderate-income or affordable housing. New attached single-family residential units of more than one unit, would only be allowed if single family encompasses 25% or less of the entire project or if at least 50% of the units are deed restricted to affordable, moderate or achievable housing per TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 90: Definitions, for achievable, moderate-income or affordable housing.
Mixed-Use Districts Tables 2.04.A-3 for Greater Tahoe City Mixed Use and 2.04.B-3 and North Tahoe East	Side and rear setbacks were reduced to 0 ft to encourage mixed use development in the Town Centers.
Table 2.04.A-4, Building Form Guidelines for the Greater Tahoe City Mixed-Use Subdistricts has been revised.	Revisions refine maximum building lengths for proposed structures in the mixed-use Town Center zone districts in Tahoe City where there were no existing maximums. These changes are proposed to assist in guiding building design and massing. See Table 2-3, below.
Table 2.04.B-4, Building Form Guidelines for the North Tahoe East Mixed-Use Subdistricts has been revised.	Revisions refine maximum building lengths for proposed structures in the mixed-use Town Center zone districts in Kings Beach. These changes are proposed to assist in guiding building design and massing. See Table 2-3, below.
Section 2.09, Overlay Districts, has been revised to clarify building height standards.	The proposed changes below incorporate clarifications on maximum height allowances in Town Centers and transition areas. All projects would still be required to comply with TRPA scenic requirements.
Land Use Regulations for Mixed-Use Subdistricts have been revised.	Amendments would allow food trucks and mobile vendors in Town Centers as an allowed use in compliance with Senate Bill (SB) 946. SB 946 established requirements for local regulation of sidewalk vending, legalizing sidewalk vending across the state. The proposed amendments would also offer an avenue to some types of land uses that currently require use permits to be pursued as an allowed use if below a defined maximum square footage. The following land uses would be eligible: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ► Hotels, Motels, and other Transient Dwelling Units ► Eating and drinking facilities ► Building materials and hardware stores

Proposed Change	Summary of Change
	<p>► Repair services</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed amendments separate eating and drinking facilities into subcategories based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers Manual (Drinking Place, Fast Casual Restaurant, Quality Restaurant, High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant, and Fast-Food Restaurant without Drive Thru Window) to allow a specified maximum commercial floor area for each type of facility listed in the use table.</p> <p>The goal of these changes is to incentivize and streamline new lodging products, restaurants, retail, and local-serving land that would strengthen the year-round economic vitality of Town Centers and make the Implementing Regulations compatible with state law.</p>
Section 3.01, "Permissible Uses," has been amended to incorporate Moveable Tiny Houses.	The proposed amendments refer to the countywide housing code amendments that were adopted by the Board of Supervisors on June 14, 2022, to allow for tiny houses as primary or accessory dwelling units as well as employee housing and tiny house communities. Moveable tiny houses and moveable tiny house communities would comply with definitions and development standards in Placer County's Zoning Ordinance.
Section 3.06 "Streetscape and Roadway Design Standards" and Table 3.06.A "Future Streetscape and Roadway Design Characteristics" have been revised.	The proposed amendments are designed to provide consistency throughout the Area Plan in identifying the requirements of street frontage improvements and to provide reference to other applicable standards contained in the area plan. The proposed amendments would require street frontage improvements of all development. Minor changes were made to the text to eliminate redundancy and provide clarity and consistency.
Section 3.07, "Parking and Access," has been revised to permanently adopt the parking pilot program for North Lake Tahoe Town Centers.	<p>These changes support exemptions to parking and spur redevelopment in the Town Centers and support strategies identified in the Resort Triangle Transportation Plan (RTTP), which was approved by the TRPA Board of Supervisors in October 2020 and outlines strategies to increase mobility and reduce VMT in the Tahoe region. Changes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ► Expanding eligible applicants to include all development/redevelopment proposed in Town Centers. ► Allowing further collaboration with tourist accommodation and residential uses to be considered. ► Removing the existing limitation in the area plan that project sites eligible for the exemption shall be 25,000 square feet or less. ► Expanding financial mitigations beyond establishment of a transit County Service Area Zone of Benefit to include financial support for transit service enhancements or other alternative transportation projects that support multi-modal transportation and/or strategies noted in the RTTP. ► Revised single-family and multi-family dwelling parking requirements.
Section 3.09, "Design Standards and Guidelines," has been revised to include exceptions for groundwater interception.	<p>The proposed amendment exempts groundwater interception to projects proposing below-grade parking. When such exceptions are granted, the applicant must demonstrate that the project impacts have been mitigated to be equal to or better than the original impacts. This amendment is intended to facilitate the redevelopment desired in Town Centers and allow for below-grade parking, which reduces coverage.</p> <p>The proposed amendments would restrict new attached single family in Town Centers of over one unit, including townhomes and condominiums, if single family encompasses 25 percent or less of the entire project or if at least 50 percent of the single-family residential units are deed restricted to affordable, moderate, or achievable housing per TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 90: Definitions, for achievable, moderate-income, or affordable housing. The intent is to facilitate mixed use development and allow some single family to offset costs of workforce housing or commercial uses while still achieving the goals of the area plan and community.</p>
Section 3.11, "Signs," has been removed.	Updates refer to the TRPA Code of Ordinance Chapter 38 "Signs." This amendment is intended to streamline signage requirements and will make the Basin Area Plan consistent with the TRPA Code of Ordinances, thereby eliminating the need for future amendments to the area plan should TRPA modify Chapter 38 of the Code of Ordinance.

Table 2-3. Updates to Building Length and Height in Town Centers

Proposed Change	Summary of Change
Building Length – Kings Beach Town Center	Building length is reduced in MU-TOR from 350 ft to 200 ft. To ensure compatibility with residential zone districts, any buildings directly facing residential zone districts are proposed to be a maximum of 75 ft long.
Building Length – Tahoe City Town Center	Building length transitions have been incorporated where there were none before to ensure consistency between Kings Beach and Tahoe City mixed use zone districts. To ensure compatibility with residential zone districts, any buildings directly facing residential zone districts are proposed to be a maximum of 75 ft long.
Building Height – Town Centers	The maximum building height is currently measured in stories, which would change to feet (e.g., 56 feet instead of four stories). Maximum building heights have been incorporated for the special planning area overlay districts where there were none before.

2.5 GROWTH POTENTIAL

Pursuant to the TRPA growth management system (TRPA Code Chapters 50 – 53), development rights in the form of residential allocations or residential bonus units (RBUs), commercial floor area (CFA) and tourist accommodation units (TAUs) are required for any new residential, commercial, or tourist accommodation development. Thus, the number of available development rights limits the development potential within the plan area. The Area Plan Amendments would maintain the existing number of development rights and would make the development rights that were previously assigned to the Area Plan.

Residential allocations are distributed to Placer County by TRPA based on a two-year cycle. The number of allocations Placer County receives varies based on the performance review system described in TRPA Code Section 50.5.2.E. The Area Plan would make no changes to the number or distribution of residential allocations. Because the Area Plan Amendments would not alter the number of development rights or the process for distributing residential allocations, the amendments would not alter the existing growth potential within the plan area.

3 INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

This chapter evaluates the effects of adopting and implementing the proposed Area Plan amendments on each topic addressed in the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC). For each topic area, a brief environmental setting is provided to describe existing conditions and background information pertinent to the analysis. Following the description of the environmental setting is a discussion of each question in the IEC, which includes responses to each question included in the IEC. In addition, the discussion provides a determination as to the significance of the impact, consistent with significance determination approach used in the Area Plan EIR/EIS. This IEC uses the following terminology to describe the significance of each environmental impact:

Beneficial: An impact that would result in improved environmental conditions.

Less-than-Significant: An impact that would not result in a substantial and adverse change in the physical environment. This impact level does not require mitigation.

Significant Impact: An impact that would result in a substantial adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the Region. Potentially feasible mitigation measures or alternatives to the component(s) of the Area Plan resulting in the impact must be considered in an attempt to substantially reduce significant impacts.

Potentially Significant Impact: An impact that would be considered a significant impact as described above if it were to occur; however, the occurrence of the impact cannot be immediately determined or there is some uncertainty about its occurrence.

As described in Section 1.2.1, this IEC is tiered from the 2016 Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge Project EIR/EIS (Area Plan EIR/EIS or 2017 Area Plan EIR/EIS) in accordance with Section 6.12 of the TRPA Rules of Procedure. Because of the broad geography and long timeframe to which the proposed Area Plan amendments apply, environmental analysis is prepared at a program level: that is, it contains a general analysis of each resource area with a level of detail and degree of specificity commensurate with that of the proposed Area Plan itself. The analysis in this IEC is not intended to take the place of future project-level environmental analysis. For future projects that are not otherwise exempt or qualified exempt, TRPA or Placer County would review those site-specific projects to determine the appropriate level of environmental review: initial environmental checklist (IEC), environmental assessment, and/or environmental impact statement (EIS), as appropriate, consistent with TRPA Code Chapter 3. For future projects that have the potential to result in significant effects on the environment, TRPA or Placer County would develop feasible mitigation measures that must be implemented to minimize any such effects.

3.1 LAND

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
I. Land.				
Will the proposal result in:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.1.1 Environmental Setting

The plan area includes all portions of Placer County within the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Tahoe Basin was initially formed by glacial activity 2.5 million years ago and has since been shaped throughout the Pleistocene and Holocene, and Quaternary epochs by alluvial and glacial outwash. Because of its location within the Sierra Nevada mountains, the area is marked by mountainous, rugged terrain. The area addressed by the Area Plan is bounded by El Dorado County to the south, the state of Nevada to the east, Martis and Squaw Valleys to the north, and the Sierra Nevada to the west. Bedrock geology is characterized by granitic, metamorphic, and volcanic rocks.

Soils within the project area are derived from glacial till and alluvial deposits. Approximately 55 percent of the plan area are classified as sensitive lands (land capability districts [LCD] 1 – 3). The vast majority of the lands in the plan area with a high erosion hazard rating are associated with steep and rocky slopes outside of the developed communities, while the areas with lower erosion hazard ratings are located throughout the developed portions of Kings Beach and Tahoe City, closer to the shoreline, and up canyons where more development has occurred (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 14-15, 14-17). Table 3-1 shows the total portion of the plan area within each LCD district, as well as the allowable and existing coverage. As shown in Table 3-1, when the plan area is considered in its entirety, LCDs 1b and 2 currently exceed the base allowable coverage, while all other LCDs have less than the base allowable land coverage.

Table 3-1. Land Capability and Existing Coverage within the Plan Area¹

Land Capability District	Total Area (acres)	Base Allowable Coverage	Allowable Coverage (acres)	Existing Coverage (acres)	Acres Over (or Under) Threshold
1a	10,908	1%	109	172	(85)
1b	1,248	1%	12.5	125	112.5
1c	11,823	1%	118	160	(42)
2	1,375	1%	13.75	33	19.25
3	3,571	5%	178.5	158	(20.5)
4	3,204	20%	640.8	107	(533.8)
5	8,774	25%	2,193.5	973	(1,220.5)
6	5,091	30%	1,527	289	(1,238)
7	0	30%	0	0	0
Other	219	NA	0	4	4
Total	46,213		4,793.7	2017	(2,776.7)

¹ Total and exact acreage provided for comparison purposes may vary due to mapping discrepancies.

Source: TRPA Bailey Land Capability Classification, Aerial LiDAR data collected in summer 2010.

3.1.2 Discussion

a) Compaction or covering of the soil beyond the limits allowed in the land capability or Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES)?

Less than significant. The Area Plan amendments would not alter or revise existing regulations pertaining to land capability and the Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES) (see Chapter 30 of the TRPA Code). Outside of Town Centers, there would be no change in the location or amount of coverage that could be permitted. As described in the 2016 EIR/EIS, the changes in land coverage in Town Centers would be balanced by transfers of sensitive land cover outside of the Town Centers and result in an overall reduction in coverage (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 14-23). The Tahoe Basin Area Plan amendments propose developing a new allocation tracking system for the plan area that would streamline and clarify existing and future development projects coverage to stay within the development and coverage bounds set by TRPA.

Within Town Centers, the amended area plan would continue to implement the land coverage limitations authorized by the Regional Plan in TRPA Code Section 30.4.2.B.1. The addendum does not propose direct changes of the land coverage limits analyzed and approved in the 2016 EIR/EIS (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 14-23 through 14-26). The proposed changes to the Tahoe Basin Area Plan do not conflict with or invalidate the EIR/EIS analysis.

As described above, the coverage limits and policies in the proposed Area Plan would not be changed by the proposed amendments and the proposed developed allocation system would clarify allowable coverage for future projects. This would support attainment of TRPA Threshold Standards related to land coverage consistent with the limits allowed by the land capability and IPES systems. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

b) A change in the topography or ground surface relief features of site inconsistent with the natural surrounding conditions?

Less than significant. Future projects implemented under the amended Area Plan could include grading, excavations, cut and fill, and trenching, all of which would alter existing topography and ground surface. However, projects would be evaluated on a project-specific basis consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and TRPA environmental review requirements (TRPA Code Chapter 3) and would be required to adhere to numerous regional and local requirements and regulations relating to grading, soil stability, and erosion. These include adherence to

Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code, which identifies various standards and regulations related to grading to protect against significant adverse effects from development. These effects were previously analyzed in the 2016 EIR/EIS (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 14-28 through 14-36). The analysis found that because future projects would adhere to existing regulations, including Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code, the effect would be less than significant. Implementation of the proposed Area Plan would not include any provisions or changes that would alter such requirements or regulations for individual future projects. Therefore, impacts to topography or ground surface relief features within the plan area would be the same as previously analyzed in the 2016 EIR/EIS and would be less than significant.

c) Unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the proposal?

Less than significant. As stated above under 3.1.2(b), future projects within the plan area could include grading, excavations, cut and fill, and trenching, all of which would involve disturbance of surface soils. However, all projects would be evaluated on a project-specific basis and would be required to adhere to numerous regional and local requirements and regulations relating to grading, soil stability, and erosion. These include adherence to Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code, which identifies various standards and regulations related to grading to protect against significant adverse effects from development (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 14-28 through 14-36). The analysis found that because future projects would adhere to existing regulations, including Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code, the effect would be less than significant. Implementation of the Area Plan would not include any provisions or changes that would alter such requirements or regulations for individual projects, and therefore impacts related to soil stability within the plan area remain the same as those evaluated under the 2016 EIR/EIS and would be less than significant.

d) Changes in the undisturbed soil or native geologic substructures or grading in excess of 5 feet?

Less than significant. Future projects implemented under the proposed Area Plan could involve excavating to a depth deeper than 5 feet below ground surface. The proposed amendment to Section 3.09 "Design Standards and Guidelines," would revise regulations to allow for groundwater interception for specific project types that propose below-grade parking. Such a project would be evaluated on a project-specific basis and would be required to adhere to numerous regional and local requirements and regulations relating to grading. These include adherence to Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code, which identifies various standards and regulations related to grading to protect against significant adverse effects from development. Additionally, the applicant would be required to demonstrate that the project impacts have been mitigated to equal to or better than the original impacts that would occur without groundwater interception. Such mitigation would be reviewed by Placer County or TRPA to verify that the below-ground structures would not reduce the quantity or quality of groundwater or adversely affect adjacent groundwater hydrology. Mitigation could be achieved by rerouting groundwater flows around the below-ground structure, such as by the installation of buried pervious pipes around the structure. Project designs would consider the existing groundwater levels, soil permeability, and groundwater flow directions to ensure groundwater interception does not adversely affect groundwater quantity, quality, or hydrology. Groundwater interception would be limited to mixed use projects that would revitalize Town Centers. These projects would still comply with all mitigation measure identified and analyzed in the 2016 EIR/EIS and ensure that the projects would mitigate beyond or equal to the impacts described in the EIR/EIS (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 14-28 through 14-36). This analysis found that future mixed-use projects would adhere to existing regulations, including Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code, and mitigate beyond these measures if groundwater interception was planned. The requirement of additional mitigation measures would therefore create similar impacts to those evaluated in the 2016 EIR/EIS and would be less than significant.

e) The continuation of or increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?

Less than significant. As stated above under 3.1.2(b), future projects implemented under the proposed Area Plan could involve grading, excavations, cut and fill, and trenching, all of which would involve disturbance of surface soils. However, all projects would be evaluated on a project-specific basis and would be required to adhere to numerous regional and local requirements and regulations relating to grading, soil stability, and erosion. These include adherence to Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code, which identifies various standards and regulations related to grading to protect against significant adverse effects from development. Implementation of the amended Area Plan would not

include any provisions or changes that would alter such requirements or regulations for individual projects. For the same reasons described above, these effects would be less than significant.

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?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter existing regulations related to modifications of a river, stream or the bed of Lake Tahoe. The Area Plan identifies proposed environmental improvement projects and the proposed amendments do not identify additional environmental improvement projects nor do they modify the review or approval process. Each future project would be subject to a project-level planning, design, environmental review, and permitting process. This process would include compliance with the resource management and protection provision of TRPA Code Chapters 60 through 68, environmental review of the project consistent with Chapter 3 of the TRPA Code, and, if applicable, adherence to permit requirement including TRPA standard permit conditions and requirements of Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act. Additionally, since the EIR/EIS was approved, Placer County Code Chapter 12, Article 12.32, "Lake Tahoe Shorezone," and TRPA Code of Ordinances shorezone regulations in Chapter 80 through 85 were amended and must also be adhered to. The Area Plan amendments would not alter any of the procedural or substantive project planning, design, environmental review, or permitting process. Nor would the Area Plan amendments approve projects or require them to be implemented. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

g) Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, backshore erosion, avalanches, mud slides, ground failure, or similar hazards?

Less than significant. This impact was previously analyzed in the 2016 EIR/EIS. The analysis identified that development could expose people and property to hazards resulting from seismic activity (landslides, backshore erosion, avalanches, mud slides, ground failure, liquefaction, lateral spreading, or collapse), and non-seismic geologic hazards (lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse) (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 14-34). However, projects under the Regional Plan are subject to site-specific environmental review, and, if appropriate, geotechnical analysis (TRPA Code Section 33.4). Through this review, projects may be required to employ design standards that consider seismically active areas and determine the design, grading, and construction practices required to avoid or reduce geologic hazards. Moreover, all projects must comply with current building codes and geotechnical standards for local jurisdictions. The 2016 EIR/EIS analyzed the change in land use in town centers in the Area Plan and determined that with mitigation measures development projects would create less than significant levels of exposure to seismic, geological, erosion, or other hazardous events (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 14-28 through 14-36).

3.2 AIR QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
II. Air Quality.				
Will the Proposal result in:				
a) Substantial air pollutant emissions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Deterioration of ambient (existing) air quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) The creation of objectionable odors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Increased use of diesel fuel?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.2.1 Environmental Setting

Region-wide air quality trends are tracked as part of the threshold monitoring program. The primary sources of air pollution in the planning area are vehicle emissions, vehicle entrainment of road dust, wildfire, and residential wood smoke. TRPA threshold standards address carbon monoxide (CO), ozone, regional and sub-regional visibility, particulate matter, nitrate deposition, and odor. Numerical standards have been established for each of these parameters, and management standards have been developed that are intended to assist in attaining the threshold standards. The applicable management standards include reducing particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), maintaining levels of nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and reducing vehicle miles of travel (VMT). Attainment status and trends of each air quality indicator reporting categories from the 2019 Threshold Evaluation are summarized in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2. Status and Trends of TRPA Air Quality Threshold Standards

Threshold Indicator Reporting Category	Threshold Standards	2019 Attainment Status	Trend
Carbon Monoxide	Highest 8-hour Average Concentration of Carbon Monoxide	Considerably better than target	Moderate improvement
	Average Daily Winter Traffic Volume, Presidents Weekend	Considerably better than target	Little or no change
Ozone	Highest 1-hour Average Concentration of Ozone	At or somewhat better than target	Moderate improvement
	Oxides of Nitrogen Emissions	Considerably better than target	Moderate improvement
Visibility	Regional Visibility		
	Regional Visibility 50th Percentile ("Average Visibility Days")	Considerably better than target	Moderate improvement
	Regional Visibility 90th Percentile ("Worst Visibility Days")	At or somewhat better than target	Little or no change
	Subregional Visibility		
	Subregional Visibility 50th Percentile ("Average Visibility Days")	Considerably better than target	Insufficient data to determine trend
	Subregional Visibility 90th Percentile ("Worst Visibility Days")	Considerably better than target	Insufficient data to determine trend
Particulate Matter	Highest 24-hour PM ₁₀ Concentration	At or somewhat better than target	Moderate decline
	Annual Average PM ₁₀ Concentration	Considerably better than target	Moderate improvement

Threshold Indicator Reporting Category	Threshold Standards	2019 Attainment Status	Trend
	24-hour PM _{2.5} Concentration	Considerably better than target	Moderate decline
	Annual Average PM _{2.5} Concentration	Considerably better than target	Moderate improvement
Nitrate Deposition	Reduce generation and transport of nitrate to achieve water quality standards	Implemented ¹	Unknown
	Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	Insufficient data to determine status or no target established	Insufficient data to determine trend

Notes:

¹ "Implemented" refers to implementation of a management standard rather than monitoring the achievement of a numerical standard.

Source: TRPA 2023.

3.2.2 Discussion

a) Substantial air pollutant emissions?

Less than significant. Impacts related to air pollution emissions within the plan area are the same as those analyzed in both the 2012 RPU EIS and the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, and therefore the analysis is tiered from and consistent with the 2012 RPU EIS and the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not modify laws or regulations pertaining to air quality. Projects that could be implemented under the Area Plan amendments would be subject to subsequent environmental review and permitting and would be required to comply with Chapter 65 of the TRPA Code. Chapter 65 includes provisions that apply to direct sources of air pollution in the Tahoe Region, including certain motor vehicles registered in the region, combustion heaters installed in the region, open burning, stationary sources of air pollution, and idling combustion engines.

The Lake Tahoe Air Basin is in attainment for all national ambient air quality standards. Implementation of the Area Plan amendments would involve development of projects that have the potential to produce air pollutant emissions that could contribute to nonattainment during project construction and operation, as discussed below.

Construction Emissions

Development or redevelopment projects that could occur with implementation of the proposed Area Plan amendments would produce construction-related air emissions. Construction emissions are those that are short-term or temporary in nature. Gas and diesel equipment used for construction are the major construction-related sources of emissions of reactive organic gases, CO, and NO_x. Grading, site preparation, and off-road transport are the primary construction-related sources of fugitive dust emissions (particulate matter [PM] 10 and 2.5). While the specific projects that would be implemented under the amended Area Plan are not known, many such projects would involve the use of heavy, gas- and diesel-powered construction equipment, grading, and on-site materials transport. These projects may also involve other activities that produce air emissions such as commuting to the site by construction workers, paving asphalt surfaces, and making excavations for building foundations. Because specific projects and project implementation details are not currently known, this IEC does not include modeling of potential construction emissions. Nevertheless, development and redevelopment under the proposed Area Plan amendments would be anticipated to result in construction-related emissions.

The 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS considered construction-related emissions that could occur from implementation of individual projects and crafted mitigation measures in response. Also, the TRPA Code contains standard conditions of approval for both grading and residential projects. In Section 65.1.8.A. (Air Quality/Transportation, Idling Restrictions), for example, idling times are restricted for heavy duty construction equipment to no more than 15 minutes within the plan area. In addition, the TRPA Standard Conditions of Approval for Grading Projects and Standard Conditions of Approval for Residential Projects include requirements for the use of existing power sources (e.g. power grid) or clean-fuel generators rather than temporary diesel power generators wherever feasible, locating of construction staging areas as far as feasible from sensitive air pollution receptors (e.g.

schools or hospitals), and closure of engine doors during operation except for engine maintenance. Projects implemented under the Area Plan amendments would be subject to these and all other air quality standards in the TRPA Code. As a result, subsequent projects would not generate substantial air pollutant emissions such that they could violate or contribute substantially to an existing, or projected air quality violation, and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Operational Emissions

The long-term operation of development or redevelopment that could occur with implementation of the proposed Area Plan amendments would produce operational air emissions. Operational emissions could result from mobile, area, and natural gas sources. Mobile-source emissions are associated with motor vehicle use and are affected by the amount of VMT within a given area. Area-source emissions would include emissions from consumer products, landscaping and maintenance, wood-burning appliances, and snow removal equipment. Natural gas-related emissions would be associated with space and water heating. The proposed Area Plan amendments would result in operational emissions that are consistent with the operational emissions evaluated in the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS for the following reasons: 1) although the Area Plan amendments may modestly increase the pace of construction within the plan area, they would not increase the development potential within the area, which is limited by the availability of development rights (i.e. residential units, Tourist Accommodation Units, and Commercial Floor Area); 2) the Area Plan amendments would not increase VMT beyond the level analyzed in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS; and 3) the proposed Area Plan amendments do not include land use, design standard, or other changes that would result in uses or design practices that are more emissions intensive than those evaluated in the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS.

The 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS evaluated operational emissions of build-out of the plan area under Impact 11-3. The analysis found that emissions of ozone precursors and CO in the Tahoe Region would be expected to decrease substantially by 2035 compared to existing conditions. This can be explained by the fact that vehicle emissions standards are expected to continue to improve in the near future (ARB 2022), and limited new development would occur. Any additional population growth and associated increase in operational ozone precursor emissions would be more than offset by more stringent vehicle emissions standards. Although the analysis found that implementation of the Area Plan would result in a net increase in emissions of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, this increase would not exceed applicable PCAPCD significance criteria.

For the reasons described above, future projects implemented under the proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in substantial air pollutant emissions during project construction and operation.

b) Deterioration of ambient (existing) air quality?

Less than significant. See analyses for question a, above, which concludes that the proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in substantial air pollution emissions. Because the proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in substantial pollution emissions, it would not result in the deterioration of ambient air quality.

c) The creation of objectionable odors?

Less than significant. The occurrence and severity of odor impacts depend on numerous factors, including the nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; wind speed and direction; and the presence of sensitive receptors. Although offensive odors rarely cause physical harm, they can be unpleasant, leading to considerable distress and often generating citizen complaints to local governments and regulatory agencies. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in major sources of odor as the plan does not include or contemplate construction of any of the common types of facilities that are known to produce odors (e.g., landfills, wastewater treatment facilities). In addition, no known substantial sources of objectionable odors are located in the plan area. Diesel exhaust from the use of on-site construction equipment would be intermittent, temporary, and would dissipate rapidly from the source with an increase in distance. Finally, the proposed Area Plan amendments do not propose the siting of new sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, hospitals). Thus, neither project construction nor operation of the proposed Area Plan amendments would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, nor would the proposed Area Plan amendments result in the siting of sensitive receptors in proximity to an odor source. This impact would be less than significant.

d) Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?

Less than significant. Impacts related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions within the plan area are the same as those analyzed in the 2012 EPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, and therefore the analysis is tiered from and consistent with the 2012 EPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not modify existing laws or regulations that address GHG emissions. Future projects that could be implemented under the amended Area Plan would be subject to subsequent environmental review and permitting and would be required to comply with Chapter 65 of the TRPA Code. Chapter 65 includes provisions that apply to direct sources of air pollution in the Tahoe Region. Adherence to these air quality provisions would also reduce GHG emissions.

Implementation of the Area Plan amendments would result in some level of development and population growth anticipated during the plan horizon and would contribute some level of GHG to the regional output. As described above for air pollutant emissions, GHG emissions can occur from construction-related activity and from operations of structures within the plan area. The 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS evaluated these effects under Impact 12-1. It determined that the combination of increased building area and decreased vehicle activity under the Area Plan would result in a net decrease in long-term operational GHG emissions from 2015 baseline conditions by the year 2035. However, the analysis concluded that the overall reduction in GHG emissions would not be sufficient to meet California's GHG reduction goals and could be substantial when taken together over the buildout period of the Area Plan. Because the plan area includes a small proportion of the total development potential within the Tahoe Region, and because many of the sustainability- and conservation-oriented land use and transportation policies and strategies of the TRPA Regional Plan, County Master Plan, and current Area Plan effectively reduce VMT, increase transit and non-motor vehicle travel, and allow or encourage mixed-use redevelopment that improve energy efficiency, the combined influence of development and population growth allowed by the Area Plan amendments would, by themselves, result in a less-than-significant increase in overall GHG emissions, below the 25,000 MTO CO₂e/year TRPA significance threshold. However, when emissions generated by the Area Plan amendments are considered in combination with region wide GHG emission resulting from TRPA Regional Plan implementation, the emissions would be a significant contribution to global climate change as identified in the TBAP EIR/EIS and described below.

TRPA adopted several provisions intended to reduce GHG emissions in November 2013. The GHG reduction provisions include additional best construction practices policies, a requirement to include a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction strategy in Area Plans, a woodstove rebate program, and revisions to TRPA Code sections to remove unintended barriers to sustainable design. In Section 65.18.A. (Air Quality/Transportation, Idling Restrictions) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, idling times are limited for heavy construction equipment to no more than 15 minutes. In addition, the TRPA Standard Conditions of Approval for Grading Projects and Standard Conditions of Approval for Residential Projects include construction provisions that call for the use of existing power sources (e.g., power grid) or clean-fuel generators rather than temporary diesel power generators wherever feasible. Chapter 13 (Area Plans) of the TRPA Code requires a strategy in Area Plans to lower emissions of greenhouse gases from the operation or construction of buildings. The strategy must include elements in addition to those included to satisfy other state or TRPA requirements. The current Area Plan addresses this provision by requiring that all publicly funded buildings in the plan area be designed and constructed to an industry recognized standard for sustainability and greenhouse gas reduction. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not change any of these standards.

In addition, TRPA funds existing wood stove incentive programs in the Lake Tahoe Region as a GHG mitigation strategy. Numerous non-conforming woodstoves have been replaced with natural gas heaters, EPA compliant woodstoves, or other approved devices meeting EPA Phase II certification through these Woodstove Retrofit Programs in the Lake Tahoe Region. The continuing replacement of nonconforming woodstoves would result in direct GHG emission reductions. Lastly, several TRPA Code modifications have been added to remove barriers for incorporating alternative energy or emission reducing vegetated roofs into structures (see TRPA Code Section 36.6.1) and for allowing additional height for wind turbines and renewable power facilities (see TRPA Code Section 37.6.2).

Continued compliance with TRPA Code and Placer County regulations, as well as implementation of pedestrian and alternative transportation improvements, mixed-use design, infill, and energy efficient design and landscaping, and woodstove retrofit programs will continue to support ongoing reductions to regionwide GHG emissions. Furthermore, a

region-wide program of GHG reduction strategies, including those described above and strategies contained in the Lake Tahoe Sustainability Action Plan, is now in place. The current Area Plan is consistent with these programs. Provisions in the current Area Plan promote sustainable design, green building incentives, and energy efficiency improvements to support these strategies and remove unintended barriers to GHG-reducing projects in Chapter 36 of the TRPA Code. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not change any of these standards. Because the current Area Plan is consistent with the regional GHG reduction strategies included in the Regional Plan, and because the proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter these provisions, no further analysis is required for the Area Plan amendments.

e) Increased use of diesel fuel?

Less than significant. This potential effect is the same as those analyzed in both the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, and therefore this analysis is tiered from and consistent with the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS. As with existing conditions, construction and operation of future projects under the proposed Area Plan amendments would require the use of diesel fuel associated with construction equipment and ongoing vehicle use. One of the primary concerns related to diesel fuel consumption is the resultant exposure of sensitive receptors to emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) contained in emissions from diesel equipment. Future projects in the plan area could result in short-term diesel exhaust emissions, including diesel particulate matter (PM), from the use of heavy-duty diesel equipment required for construction activities.

Diesel PM is a TAC and the potential cancer risk from the inhalation of diesel PM is a more serious risk than the potential non-cancer health impacts (TRPA 2012a, page 3.4-39). Consistent with the findings in the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, the proximity of heavy-duty diesel-fueled construction equipment to existing sensitive receptors within or adjacent to the plan area during construction activities may result in exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs. However, the proposed Area Plan amendments do not include changes in land use or design standards that would increase exposure when compared to what could occur without adoption of the proposed Area Plan amendments.

TRPA has adopted additional best construction practices measures regarding the reduction of diesel fuel emissions. In Section 65.1.8.A of the TRPA Code, construction vehicle idling time is limited to 15 minutes in the plan area. In addition, the TRPA Standard Conditions of Approval for Grading Projects and Standard Conditions of Approval for Residential Projects include additional conditions that require the use of existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean-fuel generators rather than temporary diesel power generators wherever feasible, location of construction staging areas as far as feasible from sensitive air pollution receptors (e.g. schools or hospitals), and closure of engine doors during operation except for engine maintenance. Furthermore, the existing Area Plan includes policies that promote the establishment of idle-free zones. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter these standards.

Projects implemented under the Area Plan amendments would be subject to all air quality standards in the TRPA Code, including measures that were adopted to mitigate diesel PM emissions associated with buildout of the Regional Plan. Therefore, because the existing Area Plan includes measures that reduce construction-related TAC emission to the extent feasible, and the proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter these provisions, future projects in the plan area involving the use of heavy-duty diesel-fueled equipment would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs.

3.3 WATER QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
III. Water Quality.				
Will the proposal result in:				
a) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Alterations to the course or flow of 100-year flood waters?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) The potential discharge of contaminants to the groundwater or any alteration of groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k) Is the project located within 600 feet of a drinking water source?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.3.1 Environmental Setting

The plan area lies within two major drainage areas, the Lake Tahoe Basin, and the Truckee River Watershed. Other larger bodies of water in the plan area include the Lower Truckee River, Blackwood Creek, and Griff Creek. Lake Tahoe is located on the east side of the plan area and receives run-off from most of the water bodies and overland flow in the plan area, excluding the smaller creeks that flow into the Lower Truckee River, west of Tahoe City. The Lower Truckee River is also the one outflow of Lake Tahoe. Most of the water bodies in the plan area flow from the upper mountainous regions into Lake Tahoe.

Due to an increase in phosphorous, nitrogen, and fine sediment entering runoff into Lake Tahoe, lake clarity has severely declined in the past 40 years. The historic development of extensive hard land coverage within the plan area, and throughout Tahoe, has reduced the land's natural capacity to infiltrate and filtrate runoff before discharging into the lake. Historic degradation and development of Stream Environment Zones (SEZs) has also accelerated decline in lake clarity, as

these areas serve important functions in terms of water filtration, nutrient cycling, and sediment retention. As of the 2019 Threshold Evaluation, the Threshold standards related to secchi depth in Pelagic Lake Tahoe were somewhat worse than the target with little or no change (TRPA 2019a). Increased particulate matter, which can be caused by prolonged smoke, algae growth, and run off from overland areas are all events that can cause Lake Tahoe's clarity to decrease.

TRPA, Placer County, and other partners participate in numerous programs to improve and protect water quality in the plan area. A primary program is the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program (EIP), an inter-agency partnership created to protect and restore the natural and recreational resources of the Lake Tahoe Region. A total of 49 EIP water quality and watershed projects have been completed in the plan area to improve water quality, restore watersheds, and contribute to restoring clarity in Lake Tahoe (TRPA 2023).

Another primary water quality improvement program is the Lake Tahoe total maximum daily load (TMDL), which is a comprehensive strategy to achieve Lake Tahoe clarity standards. In the plan area, the TMDL is administered by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (LRWQCB), which works in close coordination with the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection (NDEP) on the Nevada side of the Tahoe Region. LRWQCB's stated plan for implementing the Lake Tahoe TMDL for Placer County is by gaining discharge permits through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), run by the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Implementing the TMDL occurs through the development of a stormwater load reduction plan, which identifies annual load reduction targets. Placer County's participation in the TMDL and stormwater load reduction programs is ongoing.

The Middle Truckee River also has a TMDL program. The TMDL focuses on sediment-related water quality objectives for the reach of the Truckee River from the outflow at Lake Tahoe to the California/Nevada state line, which is in the plan area. This reach drains roughly 428 square miles. The primary goal of the TMDL is to lower sediment inputs to protect instream aquatic life which has decreased in diversity and structure as it trended towards more sediment tolerant species. The TMDL emphasizes the continuation and improvement of existing erosion control and monitoring programs, NPDES stormwater permits and sediment controls for construction projects, highway operations and long-term operations such as ski resorts and industrial areas.

Another related water quality improvement strategy involves the retrofit of existing development with water quality best management practices (BMPs), which are described in TRPA Code Section 60.4 and the TRPA Best Management Practices Handbook (TRPA 2012c). As described in TRPA Code Section 60.4 all existing development is required to implement BMP retrofits, and all projects are required to comply with BMP requirements as a condition of approval.

3.3.2 Discussion

a) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?

Less than significant. Per Section 33.3.6 of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Code of Ordinances for mixed-use projects in Town Centers, the proposed amendments include a policy that would exempt groundwater interception for projects proposing below-grade parking. When such exceptions are granted, the applicant must demonstrate that the impacts to groundwater are no worse than under the original conditions. This amendment is intended to facilitate the redevelopment desired in Town Centers and allow for below-grade parking, which reduces coverage. The amendments to the Area Plan do not approve any projects. Projects would be evaluated individually by a qualified professional and need to prove that they will not degrade water quality or significantly alter the course or direction of water movement to cause degradation related to hydrology or the alternation of watercourses in the plan area.

The 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS identifies proposed and implemented projects that are intended to benefit watersheds, water quality, and habitat in the plan area (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 15-19). These projects could modify the currents, course, or direction of water movements and/or affect other hydrologic processes in Ward Creek, Blackwood Creek, Snow Creek, Griff Creek, and the Truckee River. However, the proposed Area Plan amendments do not alter or approve any of these projects and each project would be subject to a project-level planning, design, environmental review, and permitting process. This process would include compliance with the resource management and protection provisions of TRPA Code Chapters 60 through 68, environmental review of the project consistent with Chapter 3 of the TRPA Code

and NEPA, if applicable, and adherence to permit requirement including TRPA standard permit conditions and requirements of Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act. The impact would be less than significant.

b) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff so that a 20-year, 1-hour storm runoff (approximately 1 inch per hour) cannot be contained on the site?

Less than significant. Impacts related to changes in drainage patterns, absorption rates, and surface water runoff within the plan area are the same as those analyzed in the 2012 RPU EIS and the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS. Therefore, the analysis is tiered from and consistent with the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 YBAP EIR/EIS. The 2012 RPU EIS evaluated provisions that would increase the maximum allowable coverage in Town Centers for both developed and undeveloped parcels from 50 to 70 percent for high capability lands (LCDs 4-7). It determined that implementation of these Regional Plan policies, including mitigation measures that were incorporated into the Regional Plan, would result in a less than significant impact related to stormwater runoff (TRPA 2012a: 3.8-32 through 3.8-53). The 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS evaluated the impacts of potential increase in stormwater run-off and impacts to existing drainage systems and found that while development in the area will increase impervious coverage, mitigation measures and existing BMP standards would remain in place and create a less-than-significant impact to water quality due to storm water management. The proposed Area Plan amendments would continue to implement these Regional Plan and Area Plan standards, resulting in a potential increase in coverage within Town Centers. However, as discussed Section 3.1.2(a), this increase in coverage would require restoration and transfers of existing coverage from elsewhere, resulting in a net reduction in land coverage, including a reduction in land coverage in sensitive lands. Additionally, policies are being added to decrease overall coverage from mixed use buildings due to allowances for underground parking and higher build capacity options. This would result in a net improvement in absorption rates, where feasible, throughout the plan area.

All new coverage within the plan area would be required to implement stormwater BMPs as required by TRPA Code Section 60.4. The 2012 RPU EIS evaluated the performance of BMPs in Town Centers under the coverage provisions included in the proposed Area Plan and found that high capability land with up to 70 percent coverage could accommodate the design and construction of BMPs of sufficient size to mitigate the impacts of the impervious coverage (TRPA 2012a: 3.8-25). The results of Pollutant Load Reduction Modelling completed as part of the 2012 RPU EIS also confirmed that implementation of these BMPs would successfully reduce and/or treat surface runoff within Town Centers (TRPA 2012b: 3-32). Additionally, individual future projects within the plan area would undergo project-level environmental review and would be required to demonstrate compliance with BMP provisions, including the stormwater pollution prevention plans for each stage of construction, as applicable, and meet all other applicable water quality regulations and standards (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 15-21). For these reasons, this impact would be less than significant.

c) Alterations to the course or flow of 100-year flood waters?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter regulations related to floodplains or flooding. All development in the plan area that is subject to floods would continue to be required to meet the design and development standards established in the Placer County Code, Placer County General Plan, and Placer County River Basin Stormwater Management Plan. Additionally, TRPA Code Section 35.4., Floodplains, prohibits additional development, grading, and filling of lands within the 100-year floodplain, except under specific circumstances. The Area Plan amendments would not alter land use such that permissible uses within plan neighborhoods would result in a change to the course or flow of 100-year flood waters from what would be allowed under the existing Area Plan. See also the discussion in section 3.3.2(a).

d) Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter land use such that permissible uses within the plan area would change the amount of surface water in any water body from what would be allowed under the existing PASs and Community Plans. Any development that has the potential to increase impervious area could increase surface water runoff, which would result in changes to the amount of surface water in water bodies. Refer to Section 3.3.2(b), which addresses this issue. The proposed Area Plan identifies proposed watershed and water quality

projects that could affect the amount of surface water in water bodies. Refer to Section 3.3.2(a), which addresses this topic. See also Section 3.16.2(c), which addresses municipal water supplies.

e) Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter or revise the regulations pertaining to discharge into surface waters and surface water quality. Nor would they result in land use changes that could increase the risk of discharge into surface waters. As with existing conditions, all development, redevelopment, and infrastructure improvements within the plan area would be required to meet the discharge standards of the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, and where applicable comply with a Stormwater Discharge Permit. All projects that would create more than one acre of disturbance are required to prepare a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). Future projects implemented in the plan area would also be required to comply with the TRPA Code provisions in Section 60.1., Water Quality Control. This section identifies standards for discharge and surface water runoff from parcels and regulates domestic, municipal, and industrial wastewater. These requirements would continue to prevent projects from causing degradation to surface water in excess of the limits identified in the TRPA Code. Future projects would also continue to be required to adhere to TRPA Code Section 60.2., Water Quality Mitigation, which requires that all new development—that is, any development that generates new impervious coverage—completely offset any potential water quality impacts. The proposed Area Plan amendments would modify setback, articulation, and massing requirements that limit building capacities (Placer County 2017). Side setbacks are being modified to accommodate duplex style homes. The amendments would also reduce lot widths to accommodate smaller dwelling units in residential districts. These changes could allow certain buildings to be placed closer to the roadway. However, there is no evidence to suggest that this change would result in changes that could affect discharge into surface water, such as changed parking or circulation movements that would increase parking or travel on unpaved areas. Section 3.09 of the proposed amendments would exempt groundwater interception to projects proposing below-grade parking. When such exceptions are granted, the applicant must demonstrate that the project impacts have been mitigated to be equal to or better than the original impacts (See Section 3.2.1(d)). This amendment is intended to facilitate the redevelopment desired in Town Centers and allow for below-grade parking, which would potentially reduce coverage. Additionally, all projects implemented under the Area Plan would be evaluated on a project-specific basis and would therefore be required to undergo project-specific environmental review and establish that they would not result in a degradation of water quality. For these reasons, the impact would be less than significant.

f) Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of groundwater?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments would include possible exemptions that would allow certain mixed-use projects to intercept groundwater for below-grade parking, which is further evaluated in Section 3.3.2(d). Due to the requirements that projects that include groundwater interception mitigate all impacts to groundwater, the amendments would not increase the potential for future projects to alter the rate or flow of ground water. Future projects implemented in the plan area could involve excavating to a depth deeper than 5 feet below ground surface, or to depths that would intercept groundwater. However, all projects would continue to be evaluated on a project-specific basis and would be required to adhere to numerous regional and local requirements and regulations relating to grading. These include adherence to Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code, which identifies various standards and regulations related to grading to protect against significant adverse effects from development. Chapter 33 also specifically prohibits excavations greater than 5 feet below ground surface, or shallower in areas of known high groundwater, because of the potential for groundwater interception or interference, except in limited cases, which align with the amendments proposed for the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan. Thus, the impact would be less than significant.

g) Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?

Less than significant. As stated above under 3.3.2(a) and 3.3.2(f), the proposed Area Plan would not alter regulations relating to groundwater that are not allowable under the TRPA Code of Ordinances; and all future projects would be evaluated on a project-specific basis and would be required to adhere to numerous regional and local requirements

and regulations relating to grading and groundwater interception. Because of these regulations and required mitigation measures, the amendment change would not substantially affect groundwater.

h) Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter land use such that permissible uses within the plan area would result in a change in water use from what would be allowed under the existing Area Plan. Nor would it alter regulations related to public water supplies. See also Section 3.16.2(c), which addresses municipal water supplies.

i) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occurrence or seiches?

Less than significant. Within the plan area, there are locations exposed to 100-year flood risk, as well as areas with a known risk of seiche exposure (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 15-14 through 15-15). However, the proposed Area Plan amendments would not increase the overall growth potential within the plan area beyond that which could occur under the existing Area Plan. The proposed Area Plan amendments could accelerate redevelopment projects in established Core Areas, which could direct a greater proportion of future growth into existing Town Centers. These Town Centers are above elevation 6,260, which is generally susceptible to seiche. Refer to Section 3.3.2(c), which addresses the potential for future development within floodplains.

j) The potential discharge of contaminants to the groundwater or any alteration of groundwater quality?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter regulations related to the discharge of contaminants to groundwater. Nor would it include land use changes that would allow for new uses that would increase the risk of groundwater quality degradation, such as new uses that require substantial fertilizer. As with existing conditions, all development, redevelopment, and infrastructure improvements within the plan area would be required to meet the discharge standards of the NPDES, and where applicable comply with a stormwater discharge permit. All projects that would create more than one acre of disturbance are required to prepare a SWPPP, which would include applicable provisions to protect groundwater quality. Future projects implemented in the plan area would also be required to comply with the TRPA Code provisions in Section 60.1., Water Quality Control. This section identifies standards to prevent groundwater quality degradation, including limits on fertilizer use and discharges to groundwater. These requirements would continue to prevent projects from causing degradation to groundwater quality.

k) Is the project located within 600 feet of a drinking water source?

Less than significant. Drinking water sources are located within the plan area. However, the proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter regulations related to development near a drinking water source. Nor would it include land use changes that would allow for new uses that would increase the risk of drinking water contamination. All future projects under the amended Area Plan would be evaluated under applicable TRPA and CEQA environmental review requirements, which include the consideration of development within 600 feet of a drinking water source. In addition, future projects would continue to comply with drinking water protection regulations including Section 60.3, Source Water Protection, in the TRPA Code of Ordinances. For these reasons, the proposed Area Plan amendments would have a less-than-significant effect on drinking water sources.

3.4 VEGETATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
IV. Vegetation.				
Will the proposal result in:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare, or endangered species of plants?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Removal of stream bank and/or backshore vegetation, including woody vegetation such as willows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) A change in the natural functioning of an old growth ecosystem?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.4.1 Environmental Setting

The plan area is characterized by mountainous, rugged terrain, with a steep elevation gradient containing three vegetation zones: montane, upper montane, and subalpine. The dominant vegetation habitat types in the plan area include Sierran Mixed conifer, Jeffery pine (*Pinus jeffreyi*), white fir (*Abies concolor*), and perennial grasslands. The urban zones are along the shorelines and lower canyons surrounded by mixed conifer forests. The higher elevations zone has red fir, mountain chapparral, and subalpine conifer habitats. In addition, sensitive habitats in the plan area include a variety of wetland/riparian communities such as wet meadows, riparian zones along streams, seasonal wetlands, and drainages. Many of the Town Centers are in or adjacent to Stream Environment Zones (SEZs) in the plan area. Other sensitive habitats include TRPA-designated prime fish habitat and late seral/old growth forest. Data review identified 42 special status plant species that could occur in or near the plan area (Placer County and TRPA 2016: E-1 through E-8). These species are protected at different levels under federal and state regulations.

3.4.2 Discussion

a) Removal of native vegetation in excess of the area utilized for the actual development permitted by the land capability/IPES system?

Less than significant. Implementation of the proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter regulations pertaining to the preservation of native vegetation. As with existing conditions, vegetation surrounding the construction site of any project permitted in the plan area would be required to comply with TRPA Code Section 33.6, Vegetation Protection During Construction, and TRPA Standard Conditions of Approval for Grading Projects (TRPA Permit Attachment Q). Protective requirements include installation of temporary construction fencing, standards for tree removal and tree protection, standards for soil and vegetation protection, and revegetation of disturbed areas.

Furthermore, the proposed Area Plan amendments would not change land use classifications or allow new uses that would be more likely to require vegetation removal. The proposed Area Plan amendments would facilitate more concentrated redevelopment in existing Town Centers, which could reduce the potential for development on vacant lands containing native vegetation because a higher proportion of future growth would likely occur in already developed Core Areas.

b) Removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat, either through direct removal or indirect lowering of the groundwater table?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter the regulations relating to vegetation removal or groundwater management. Water supply within the plan area is provided by Tahoe City Public Utilities District (TCPUD) and North Tahoe Public Utility District (NTPUD) from Lake Tahoe and tributary surface waters. Consistent with existing conditions, future projects within the plan area would be required to meet TRPA requirements for water supply. TRPA regulations prohibit the approval of any development requiring water unless there is adequate water supply within an existing water right (TRPA Code Section 32.4.1). Additionally, TRPA Code Section 33.3.6, Excavation Limitations, prohibits excavation that intercepts or interferes with groundwater except under specific circumstances and with prior approval by TRPA. The policies propose an exception to this requirement for mixed use building projects that would minimize coverage impacts. To qualify for this exception, the applicant must demonstrate that the proposed project impacts have been mitigated to equal to or better than the original impacts. For these reasons, future projects approved under the proposed Area Plan would not directly or indirectly lower the groundwater table.

In addition, vegetation removal associated with projects that could occur under the Area Plan would be required to comply with existing TRPA, federal, and state regulations, permitting requirements, and environmental review procedures that protect habitat that supports riparian vegetation and critical wildlife. Specifically, riparian vegetation and wildlife habitat are protected by TRPA Code Sections 61.1.6, Management Standards for Tree Removal, 61.3.3, Protection of Stream Environment Zones, and 63.3, Fish Habitat Protection, and Chapter 62, Wildlife Resources. For these reasons, development associated with the Plan is not expected to result in the removal of riparian or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat.

c) Introduction of new vegetation that will require excessive fertilizer or water, or will provide a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan would not alter regulations relating to new vegetation, nor would it allow new land uses that are more likely to require fertilizer or water than existing uses allowed in the plan area. As with existing conditions, implementation of future development or redevelopment projects in the plan area would be required to comply with TRPA Code provisions (e.g., Section 61.4, Revegetation) and Goals and Policies that prohibit the release of non-native species in the Region. Generally, native species require less fertilizer and water than non-native species. Provisions for fertilizer management and preparation of fertilizer management plans that address the type, quantity, and frequency of use of fertilizers are included in Section 60.1.8 of the TRPA Code. Moreover, future projects associated with implementation of the amended Area Plan would be subject to project-level environmental review and permitting, and at that time they would be required to demonstrate that any proposed new vegetation would not require excessive fertilizer, or water, or provide a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species.

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)?

Less than significant. This impact is addressed in 3.4.2(a), (b), and (c), above, and in 3.4.2(e), (f), (g), and (h), below.

e) Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter or revise the regulations pertaining to unique, rare, or endangered species of plants. Nor would they alter land use regulations to allow new uses or structures that are more likely to affect unique, rare, or endangered species of plants. The natural resource protection provisions of TRPA Code Chapters 61, Vegetation and Forest Health, and 62, Wildlife Resources, would still apply to future projects within the plan area. As with existing conditions, construction activities associated with implementation of future projects in the plan area could affect special-status plant species and the presence of suitable habitat, depending on the type, timing, and specific nature of any proposed actions. However, projects implemented under the Area Plan would be subject to applicable TRPA and CEQA project-level environmental review and permitting. During such reviews, potential effects on plant species would be determined based on the species' distribution and known occurrences relative to the project area, the presence of suitable habitat for the species in or near the project area, and preconstruction surveys (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 7-15). TRPA's existing policies and code provisions address potential impacts to special-status species through site-specific environmental review, require development and implementation of project-specific measures to minimize or avoid impacts through the design process, and require compensatory or other mitigation for any adverse effects on special-status species as a condition of project approval (see TRPA Code Sections 61.3.6, Sensitive and Uncommon Plant Protection and Fire Hazard Reduction and 62.4, Special Interest, Threatened, Endangered, and Rare Species). Project-level planning and environmental analysis would identify potentially significant effects, minimize or avoid those impacts through the design process, and require mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval.

f) Removal of stream bank and/or backshore vegetation, including woody vegetation such as willows?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter the regulations pertaining to removal of stream bank or backshore vegetation. Refer to Section 3.4.2(b), above, for more detail on impacts to stream bank and backshore vegetation in SEZs.

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?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments would make no changes to regulations regarding the removal of native trees 30 inches or greater diameter at breast height (dbh). Nor would the proposed Area Plan amendments include land use or regulatory changes that would be more likely to result in the cutting of trees greater than 30 inches dbh. Nearly 78 percent of the plan area is preserved as conservation/backcountry land classifications. Recreation areas accounts for approximately 9 percent of the plan area. Forested areas within the plan area are defined as a "westside forest type" (TRPA Code Chapter 90, Definitions). TRPA Code Section 61.1.4, Old Growth Enhancement and Protection, includes TRPA's old growth enhancement and protection provisions, which prohibits cutting any live dead, or dying tree larger than 30 inches dbh in westside forest types on conservation and recreation lands or within SEZ areas, except under certain defined conditions.

Future projects implemented in the plan area would be subject to applicable subsequent project-level environmental review and permitting by TRPA and Placer County. As with existing conditions, permit applicants would be required to demonstrate that tree removal would be conducted in accordance with Chapter 61, Vegetation and Forest Health, of the TRPA Code, including those provisions related to the removal of trees 30 inches dbh or greater set forth to protect the natural function of old growth ecosystems on recreation and SEZ lands.

h) A change in the natural functioning of an old growth ecosystem?

No impact. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter the regulations pertaining to old growth ecosystem management within the plan area, nor would it include land use changes within these areas. Refer to Section 3.4.2(g), above and the 2016 EIR/EIS for more detail on impacts to old growth ecosystems and old growth tree removal (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 7-12, 7-17, 19-8).

3.5 WILDLIFE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
V. Wildlife.				
Will the proposal result in:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Reduction of the number of any unique, rare, or endangered species of animals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.5.1 Environmental Setting

Terrestrial habitat types in the plan area are described in the 2016 Area Plan EIR/EIS in Section 7.1, Biological Resources. Elevation in the plan area range from 6,100 feet along the Truckee River to 8,740 feet at Ward and Ellis Peaks, with montane, upper montane, and subalpine habitats in the elevation gradient. Aquatic habitats in the plan area range from small glacial tarns and snowmelt ponds to very large lakes, such as Lake Tahoe. Streams range from small ephemeral drainages to large perennial rivers, such as the Truckee River. Riparian and wetland vegetation associated with these aquatic features provides important aquatic habitat functions. Major aquatic habitats in the plan area include Griff Creek, Lower Truckee River, Ward Creek, Blackwood Creek, Meeks Creek, and Lake Tahoe. Invasive species and special interest wildlife and plant species occur in the plan area. Data review identified 35 special status animal species that could occur in the plan area. These species are defined under state and federal protections (Placer County and TRPA 2016: E-9 through E-16)

3.5.2 Discussion

- 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)?**

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter the regulations pertaining to the protection of animal species. Nor would they alter land use regulations to allow new uses or structures that are more likely to affect the diversity or distribution of any species of animal than could currently occur within the plan area. The 2016 Area Plan EIR/EIS evaluated the potential for disturbance or loss of sensitive habitat that would affect the diversity or distribution of animal species and determined that the area plan would create a less than significant impact (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 7-12). The resource management provisions contained in Chapters 60 through 68 of the TRPA Code would continue to apply to future projects within the plan area. Future projects within the plan area would be subject to subsequent project-level environmental review and permitting. As with existing conditions, permit applicants would be required to demonstrate that any proposed project would be consistent with TRPA Code provisions related to resource management, including the provisions of Chapters 62 and 63 that address protection of wildlife and fish resources,

respectively. For these reasons, adoption of the proposed Area Plan would not result in substantial adverse changes in the diversity or distribution of species, or numbers of any species or animals.

b) Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter or revise the regulations pertaining to special-status or listed species of animals. Nor would they alter land use regulations to allow new uses or structures that are more likely to affect the diversity or distribution of any species of animal than could currently occur within the plan area. The 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS evaluated the potential for disturbance or loss of sensitive habitat that would affect the diversity or distribution of animal species and determined that the area plan would create a less than significant impact (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 7-15). As with existing conditions, future development or redevelopment projects in the plan area could affect unique, rare, or endangered species depending on the type, timing, and specific nature of future proposed projects. However, any such projects would be subject to subsequent project-level environmental review and permitting at which time they would be required to demonstrate compliance with all federal, state, and TRPA regulations pertaining to the protection of animal species. The protections for rare and special-status species contained in Sections 61.3.6 and 62.4 of the TRPA Code would continue to be applicable to all future projects within the plan area. At a project-level, potential effects on animal species would be determined based on the species' distribution and known occurrences relative to the project area, the presence of suitable habitat for the species in or near the project area, and preconstruction surveys. Existing policies and TRPA Code provisions address potential impacts to special-status species through site-specific environmental review, development, and implementation of project-specific measures to minimize or avoid impacts through the design process, and compensatory or other mitigation for any adverse effects on special-status species as a condition of project approval (TRPA Code Sections 61.3.6 and 62.4). Project-level planning and environmental analysis would identify potentially significant effects, minimize or avoid those impacts through the design process, and require mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in a reduction in the number of any unique, rare, or endangered species of animals.

c) Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter or revise the regulations pertaining to the introduction of new species migration or movement of animals. Nor would they alter land use regulations to allow new uses or structures that are more likely to result in the introduction of new species or barriers to wildlife movement than could currently occur within the plan area. As with existing conditions, future development or redevelopment projects in the plan area could result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals depending on the type, timing, and specific nature of proposed actions. Future projects located within the existing Town Center areas would have minimal impact to wildlife corridors because of existing development patterns, which limit the value of these areas as wildlife corridors. Because the proposed Area Plan amendments would include provisions to concentrate development in Core Areas, they would reduce the risk of creating additional isolated barriers to wildlife movement. Future projects proposed in the Recreation and Conservation land use districts would have low potential for impact to wildlife corridors because of the recreational or resource management nature of allowable uses in these areas (e.g., linear trails or trailheads on the edge of recreational areas). However, any such projects would be subject to subsequent project-level environmental review and permitting at which time they would be required to demonstrate compliance with all federal, state, and TRPA regulations including TRPA Code Chapters 62 and 63 (Wildlife Resources and Fish Resources, respectively). For these reasons, the proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in the introduction of new species of animals or result in a barrier to the movement of animal species.

d) Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter or revise the regulations pertaining to existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality. Nor would they alter land use regulations to allow new uses or structures that are more likely to result in the deterioration of existing habitat quantity or quality than could currently occur within the plan area. As with existing conditions, future development or redevelopment projects in the plan area

could affect fish and wildlife depending on the type, timing, and specific nature of future projects. However, future projects would be subject to applicable project-level environmental review, permitting, and would be required to demonstrate compliance with all federal, state, and TRPA regulations pertaining to the protection of fish and wildlife including those contained in Chapters 62, Wildlife Resources, and 63, Fish Resources, of the TRPA Code. Project-level planning and environmental analysis would identify potentially significant effects, minimize or avoid those impacts through the design process, and require mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in the deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity. Moreover, the TBAP specifically identifies priority areas for SEZ restoration that would directly benefit habitat quantity and quality, which the amendments would not alter (Placer County 2016: 164-169).

3.6 NOISE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
VI. Noise.				
Will the proposal result in:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.6.1 Environmental Setting

The TBAP applies Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) standards within each zoning district. Additionally, the existing Area Plan includes policies that direct the County and TRPA to continue to enforce noise standards that align with TRPA's thresholds. Article 9.36 of the Placer County Code codifies the maximum CNEL standards and is consistent with the TRPA Code of Ordinances for the Tahoe Planning Area.

Section 2.10 of the existing Area Plan is designed to improve and protect the scenic quality and tranquility of the planning area by, in part, ensuring that noise levels remain within the established thresholds. Policy N-P-1, Noise, emphasizes working collaboratively with TRPA, the California Department of Transportation, Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART), the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), and other partner agencies to minimize transportation-related noise impacts on residential and sensitive uses. Additionally, the policy would continue to limit hours for construction and demolition work to reduce construction-related noises.

3.6.2 Discussion

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?

Less than significant. This potential effect is the same as those analyzed in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, and therefore this analysis tiers from and is consistent with the 2016 EIR/EIS. The existing Area Plan carried forward and applies the CNEL standards set forth in the previous PASs and CPs. Additionally, Article 9.36 of the Placer County Development Code includes noise standards consistent with the TRPA Code of Ordinances. These standards are consistent with TRPA's noise threshold, which is established based on the characteristics of the area. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not change these standards.

The growth projections associated with the proposed Area Plan amendments are consistent with the analysis included in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, which evaluated complete buildout of the plan area. Therefore, noise associated with construction and operation of new development, including associated transportation noise, is the same as that which was analyzed in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS.

Implementation of the proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in the development of new major stationary noise sources. Future projects in the plan area would result in increases in vehicle travel and traffic volumes on roadways compared to existing conditions. As detailed in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, it is unknown at this time whether all individual proposed projects would be able to incorporate design and operational measures that would prevent an increase in traffic noise levels that exceed applicable CNEL standards. To mitigate this potential impact, TRPA Code Section 68.8.3 requires that all substantial transportation projects in transportation corridors that could exceed adopted CNEL standards incorporate mitigating design features to achieve adopted standards. This requirement would reduce any noise impacts to a less than significant level and would continue to apply with adoption of the proposed Area Plan amendments.

Further, future projects within the plan area would be evaluated at a project level and Placer County and/or TRPA would enforce CNEL standards on a project-by-project basis pursuant to the noise limitations in TRPA Code Chapter 68, Noise Limitations. Through the project level review, TRPA and/or Placer County would only approve projects that can demonstrate compliance with TRPA's threshold standards (i.e., CNEL standards). The current Area Plan CNEL standards are consistent with the TRPA's threshold standards; and thus, future projects within the plan area would only be approved by TRPA or Placer County if they can demonstrate compliance with these CNEL standards. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not change these standards. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?

Less than significant. This potential effect is the same as those analyzed in both the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, and therefore this analysis tiers from and is consistent with the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS.

Construction activities associated with new development and redevelopment within the plan area could include site preparation (e.g., demolition, clearing, excavation, grading), foundation work, paving, building construction, utility installation, finishing, and cleanup. These activities typically involve the use of noise generating equipment such as cranes, excavators, dozers, graders, dump trucks, generators, backhoes, compactors, and loaders. Noise levels associated with these types of equipment are typically between 70 and 85 dBA L_{max} at 50 feet. In unique circumstances, specialized construction equipment (such as pile drivers) or techniques (such as blasting) that are inherently louder than typical construction equipment (typically between 94 and 101 dBA L_{max} at 50 feet) may be required. This construction activity could result in a significant impact if no noise reduction measures were incorporated.

TRPA has adopted best construction practices policies regarding noise generation designed to reduce construction related noise levels down to a less than significant level. In November 2013, TRPA formalized the best construction policies by including additional noise requirements in the TRPA Standard Conditions of Approval for Grading Projects and Standard Conditions of Approval for Residential Projects. These conditions require projects to utilize existing power sources instead of generators and where feasible keep engine doors closed during periods of operation, locate stationary equipment (e.g., generators or pumps) and staging areas as far as feasible from noise-sensitive receptors (e.g., residential areas), install temporary sound barriers around construction areas or stationary noise sources (e.g., pumps or generators) near noise sensitive receptors (e.g., residential areas), use sonic pile driving instead of impact pile driving where feasible, and pre-drill holes to minimize impacts of pile driving. The 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS emphasized that with continued implementation of the TRPA Best Construction Practices Policy, this impact would remain less than significant. In addition, the existing Area Plan seeks to improve and protect the scenic quality and tranquility of the planning area by, in part, continuing to limit hours for construction and demolition work to reduce construction-related noises.

TRPA and/or Placer County would continue to evaluate individual future projects within the plan area at a project level. Through the project level analysis, TRPA and/or Placer County would evaluate project-specific noise impacts and would require compliance with all applicable noise reducing measures identified in the standard condition of approval. Thus,

because the existing Area Plan is consistent with these criteria, and the proposed Area Plan amendments would not change existing noise provisions, future projects in the plan area would not expose noise-sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels.

c) Single event noise levels greater than those set forth in the TRPA Noise Environmental Threshold?

No impact. Single-event noise standards are set forth in Section 68.3.1 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances for aircraft, watercraft, motor vehicles, motorcycles, off-road vehicles, and over-snow vehicles. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter standards related to single-event noise, nor would it allow uses that are more likely to result in single-event noise exceedances than are already possible under the existing Area Plan. Future projects could involve uses that include these types of motorized vehicles. The potential for a vehicle to exceed single-event noise standards depends on the condition and operation of the specific vehicle, which would not be affected by the proposed Area Plan amendments. As is the case under existing conditions, new uses involving over-snow vehicles (e.g., snowmobile courses and cross-country ski facilities) would be required to meet the TRPA Code provisions pertaining to single-event noise.

d) The placement of residential or tourist accommodation uses in areas where the existing CNEL exceeds 60 dBA or is otherwise incompatible?

Less than significant. As detailed in 3.6.2(a) above, under the proposed Area Plan amendments, TRPA and/or Placer County would continue to evaluate individual projects within the plan area at a project level and would enforce CNEL standards on a project-by-project basis pursuant to the noise limitations in TRPA Code Chapter 68, Noise Limitations. Therefore, through the project level analysis, TRPA and/or Placer County would continue to evaluate the compatibility of new proposed projects and only approve projects that can demonstrate compliance with TRPA's threshold standards (i.e., CNEL standards). The existing Area Plan CNEL standards are consistent with the TRPA's threshold standards, and the proposed Area Plan amendments would not change these standards. Thus, any project under the proposed Area Plan amendments would only be approved by TRPA and/or Placer County if they can demonstrate compliance with these CNEL standards. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

e) The placement of uses that would generate an incompatible noise level in close proximity to existing residential or tourist accommodation uses?

Less than significant. As detailed in 3.6.2(a) above, TRPA and/or Placer County would continue to evaluate individual future projects within the plan area at a project level and would enforce CNEL standards on a project-by-project basis pursuant to the noise limitations in TRPA Code Chapter 68, Noise Limitations. Therefore, through the project level analysis, TRPA and/or Placer County would evaluate the compatibility of proposed projects and would only approve projects that can demonstrate compliance with TRPA's threshold standards (i.e., CNEL standards). The existing Area Plan CNEL standards are consistent with the TRPA's threshold standards, and the proposed Area Plan amendments would not change these standards. Thus, any project under the proposed Area Plan amendments would only be approved by TRPA and/or Placer County if they can demonstrate compliance with these CNEL standards. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

f) Exposure of existing structures to levels of ground vibration that could result in structural damage?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments do not contemplate any new major stationary sources of ground vibration; therefore, operation of projects that would result in ground vibration is not evaluated. Future construction activities that could occur in the plan area could generate varying degrees of temporary ground vibration, depending on the specific construction equipment used and activities involved. Ground vibration generated by construction equipment spreads through the ground and diminishes in magnitude with increases in distance. Construction-related ground vibration is normally associated with impact equipment such as pile drivers, jackhammers, and the operation of some heavy-duty construction equipment, such as dozers and trucks. Blasting activities also

generate high levels of ground vibration. Ground vibration generated during construction of projects could result in damage to nearby buildings and structures and/or result in a negative human response to vibration-sensitive land uses.

To reduce this potential effect, TRPA has adopted best construction practices policies regarding construction-generated noise and ground vibration designed to reduce construction related vibration levels down to a less than significant level (see Section 3.6.2(b), above). In addition, the current Area Plan seeks to improve and protect the scenic quality and tranquility of the planning area by, in part, continuing to limit hours for construction and demolition work to reduce construction-related noise and vibration.

As detailed in section 3.6.2(b) above, TRPA and/or Placer County would continue to evaluate individual future projects at a project level. Through the project level analysis, TRPA and/or Placer County would assess the potential for a future project to cause ground vibration that would result in structural damage, and where necessary require mitigation measures to prevent this impact. In addition, TRPA and/or Placer County would only approve projects with construction activity that complies with all applicable measures identified by the Best Construction Practices Policy. Thus, because the current Area Plan is consistent with ground vibration mitigation measures identified in both the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, and because future projects would be evaluated and ground vibration mitigated, future projects under the proposed Area Plan amendments would not expose receptors to vibration levels that could result in structural damage.

3.7 LIGHT AND GLARE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
VII. Light and Glare.				
Will the proposal:				
a) Include new or modified sources of exterior lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Cause light from exterior sources to be cast off-site or onto public lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.7.1 Environmental Setting

The plan area has dark skies with little light pollution from urban areas, such as Sacramento, which is shielded by the surrounding mountains. Views from lakeside beaches and from watercraft on the Lake are expansive and free of substantial nighttime light interference. Lighting associated with urban development and human presence can result in light pollution and spillover, which can adversely affect the dark night skies that contribute to the natural scenic character of the plan area.

The primary sources of night lighting in the plan area are from commercial centers, residential neighborhoods, and small commercial nodes that serve the residential neighborhoods. These areas are mainly located in and around Tahoe City, Kings Beach, and Stateline. Also, rural transition areas, which are a combination of human-made development and natural landscape features, create some night lighting that affects the plan area. Otherwise, there is little light pollution generated in the plan area, apart from the lighting required for public safety and from private residences.

3.7.2 Discussion

a) Include new or modified sources of exterior lighting?

Less than significant. Although they could modestly increase the pace of construction, the proposed Area Plan amendments would not increase the potential for growth in the plan area beyond that which could occur under the existing Area Plan. As with existing conditions, future projects could result in new sources of light from exterior lighting.

The TRPA design standards for exterior lighting (TRPA Code Chapter 36, Design Standards) are designed to reduce light pollution and reduce the display of light on adjoining parcels and adjacent residential uses (TRPA 2012a). The TBAP implements design standards and guidelines for the plan area which meet, and in some cases surpass, the requirements of the TRPA design standards. The lighting standards are included in Chapter 3, Area-Wide Standards and Guidelines, of the TBAP Implementing Regulations, which include but are not limited to the following requirements:

- ▶ Exterior lights shall not blink, flash, or change intensity except for temporary public safety signs. String lights, building or roofline tube lighting, reflective, or luminescent wall surfaces are prohibited.
- ▶ Exterior lighting shall not be attached to trees except for the winter holiday season.
- ▶ Parking lot, walkway, and building lights shall be directed downward.

- ▶ Fixture mounting height shall be appropriate to the purpose. The height shall not exceed the limitations set forth in Chapter 37 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.
- ▶ Outdoor lighting shall be used for purposes of illumination only, and shall not be designed for, or used as, an advertising display. Illumination for aesthetic or dramatic purposes of any building or surrounding landscape utilizing exterior light fixtures projected above the horizontal is prohibited.
- ▶ The commercial operation of searchlights for advertising or any other purpose is prohibited.
- ▶ Seasonal lighting displays and lighting for special events may be permitted on a temporary basis pursuant to Chapter 22 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

The TBAP Design Standards and Guidelines also require that exterior light sources be shielded and downward facing, and prohibit the use of flood lighting, reflective materials, and lighting strips (including neon/fluorescent tubing) to minimize reflectivity and glare. As the applicable lighting standards would not change with adoption of the proposed Area Plan amendments, glare and reflectivity from future projects proposed in the plan area would not change compared to projects developed under the existing Area Plan, and would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

The TBAP Design Standards and Guidelines incorporate protections for natural features with the goal to encourage projects to create a context-sensitive design of the built environment that reflects differences in the character of unique communities consistent with recommendations in the Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) (TRPA 1989). These standards would not be changed by the proposed amendments. They reduce the potential for future projects to result in substantial light or glare, new sources of light or glare that are more substantial than other light or glare in the area, or exterior light that is cast off-site.

Future projects within the plan area would be evaluated on a project-specific basis consistent with TRPA environmental review requirements (TRPA Code Chapter 3) and CEQA, where applicable. This analysis would consider the project-specific effects on light and glare at the time that project characteristics are known. This analysis would review the proposed project for consistency with applicable standards and would consider unique project aspects, such as the location, height, and design of a proposed structure to determine if it would result in significant impacts related to light and glare. If necessary, the environmental review would require mitigation measures, such as revised lighting designs, to reduce significant impacts related to light and glare.

Because all existing lighting design standards and guidelines would remain in effect and all future projects would be evaluated considering the project-specific characteristics related to light and glare, the proposed Area Plan amendments would have a less than significant effect on light and glare conditions.

b) Create new illumination which is more substantial than other lighting, if any, within the surrounding area?

Less than significant. See discussion in Section 3.7.2(a), above.

c) Cause light from exterior sources to be cast off-site or onto public lands?

Less than significant. See discussion in Section 3.7.2(a), above.

d) Create new sources of glare through the siting of the improvements or through the use of reflective materials?

Less than significant. See discussion in Section 3.7.2(a), above.

3.8 LAND USE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
VIII. Land Use.				
Will the proposal:				
a) Include uses which are not listed as permissible uses in the applicable Plan Area Statement, adopted Community Plan, or Master Plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Expand or intensify an existing non-conforming use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.8.1 Environmental Setting

The 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS summarizes existing land use classifications and development within the Lake Tahoe Basin is controlled by land use mapping and zoning and by TRPA regulated commodities (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 5-8). Chapter 50 of the TRPA Code sets forth the requirements for regulating the rate and timing of growth in the Lake Tahoe Basin in a manner intended to award and distribute allocations for growth and development in an orderly fashion to meet and maintain environmental thresholds (TRPA 2012b: 50-1). The 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS summarizes the existing commodities within Placer County as of December 2012 (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 5-11). Chapter 21 of the TRPA Code defines permissible uses. To permit a special use, the findings in TRPA Code Section 21.2.2 must be made.

3.8.2 Discussion

a) Include uses which are not listed as permissible uses in the applicable Plan Area Statement, adopted Community Plan, or Master Plan?

Less than significant. The TBAP amendments would not approve or result in new land uses that are not already permissible uses. The proposed amendments include new policies to help achieve the objectives of the Placer County North Lake Tahoe Economic Development Incentive Program, which prioritizes development rights to the most community-benefitting projects that align with the Area Plan and Regional Plan. Policies are proposed to support the allocation and conversion of TRPA development rights, and to encourage redevelopment in the Town Centers. The amendments would also include targeted revisions to permit requirements for specific permissible uses. These proposed changes are in line with Placer County's intended direction with their development goals and are guided by the TRPA Threshold Standards and Regional Plan and align with the Goal DP-3, LU-4.9.3, and LU-4.9.4 (TRPA 2021: 7-6, 2-18). For these reasons, the proposed amendments would result in a less than significant impact.

b) Expand or intensify an existing non-conforming use?

No impact. The proposed Area Plan would make limited changes to permissible uses that are guided by Placer County, TRPA, and California State policies about affordable housing and which promote redevelopment of Town Centers. The proposed amendments would support affordable housing projects and streamline the permitting and approval process. The amendments would not add a new use to the plan area or expand or intensify any non-conforming uses. The proposed housing policies comply with the overall goals set by TRPA, the State of California, and Placer County to increase affordable housing options in the area to support the local workforce. Future projects would still be reviewed at a project scale and would comply with Placer County's Zoning Ordinance and TRPA's Development Code. Because the proposed amendments would not introduce new non-conforming uses or affect existing non-conforming uses, it would they would have no impact on non-conforming uses.

3.9 NATURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
IX. Natural Resources.				
Will the proposal result in:				
a) A substantial increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resource?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.9.1 Environmental Setting

Natural resources such as lumber, water, and minerals/metals are used in the construction of structures and infrastructure. Non-renewable resources, such as gasoline, diesel fuel, and other petroleum products are used during construction activities to fuel equipment and vehicles. Non-renewable resources are also used during the operation and use of development within the plan area to heat buildings, provide electricity and water supplies, and support transportation within the plan area. There are no mining operations, privately held timber land, or other commercial resource extraction activities within the plan area.

3.9.2 Discussion

a) A substantial increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?

Less than significant. This potential effect is the same as those analyzed in both the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, and therefore this analysis tiers from and is consistent with the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not increase the potential for growth in the plan area beyond that which could occur under the existing Area Plan. Both the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS evaluated the effects of build-out of the plan area on natural resources. As with existing conditions, the use of natural resources, such as construction wood or metals, or gasoline would increase incrementally as future commercial, tourist, recreational, and residential projects are constructed in the plan area. The 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS both acknowledged the potential increase in the use of natural resources resulting from increased development within the plan area; however, projects implemented under the proposed Area Plan amendments would be subject to subsequent project-level environmental review, permitting by TRPA and Placer County, and site-specific mitigation measures if necessary. Because the proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in an increase in the use of natural resources beyond the levels analyzed in the 2012 RPU EIS and the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS and future projects would be evaluated to ensure there are not substantial project-level increases in the rate of use of natural resources, this impact would be less than significant.

b) Substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resource?

Less than significant. This potential effect is the same as those analyzed in both the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, and therefore this analysis tiers from and is consistent with the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not increase the potential for growth in the plan area beyond that which could occur under the existing Area Plan. The 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS both evaluated the effects of build-out of the plan area on natural resources. As with existing conditions, nonrenewable natural resources, such as gasoline and diesel, would be consumed during the construction and operation of future projects in the plan area. However, the potential for growth in the plan area would be limited through limitation on development rights, such as commercial floor area (CFA), residential units of use (RUUs), and tourist accommodation units (TAUs). The proposed Area Plan amendments do not proposed new uses that would require substantial amounts of non-renewable resources, such as heavy industrial or manufacturing uses. Furthermore, the existing Area Plan includes a GHG reduction strategy which reduces the long-

term use of non-renewable resources below acceptable TRPA and Placer County thresholds, which would remain in place. As described above, future projects would be evaluated at a project-level to ensure they do not result in a substantial depletion of non-renewable resources. For these reasons, the proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resource.

3.10 RISK OF UPSET

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
X. Risk of Upset.				
Will the proposal result in:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Involve possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.10.1 Environmental Setting

Hazardous Materials

Federal law requires projects to ensure that hazardous materials are properly handled, used, stored, and disposed of, and if such materials are accidentally released, to prevent or mitigate injury to health or the environment. EPA is the agency primarily responsible for enforcement and implementation of federal laws and regulations pertaining to hazardous materials. Applicable federal regulations pertaining to hazardous materials are primarily contained in Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) Titles 29, 40, and 49. Hazardous materials, as defined in the CFR, are listed in 49 CFR 172.101. Management of hazardous materials is governed by the following laws, among others: The Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976 (15 U.S. Code [USC] Section 2601 et seq.), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (42 USC 6901 et seq.), The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (also called the Superfund Act or CERCLA) (42 USC 9601 et seq.), and the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986 (Public Law 99-499; USC Title 42, Chapter 116. The Federal Hazardous Materials Transportation Law, 49 USC 5101 et seq. (formerly the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act 49 USC 1801 et seq.) is the basic statute regulating transport of hazardous materials in the United States. Hazardous materials regulations are enforced by the Federal Highway Administration, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Federal Railroad Administration, and the Federal Aviation Administration.

The Lake Tahoe Geographic Response Plan (LTGRP) is a principal guide for agencies within the Lake Tahoe watershed, its incorporated cities, and other local government entities in mitigating hazardous materials emergencies. It establishes policies and procedures to protect life, the environment, and property from hazardous material incidents. It is primarily intended to be used for oil spills or chemical releases that impact the Lake Tahoe and Truckee River drainages.

Hazardous materials exist in the Plan Area and were identified and analyzed for the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 18-10). Updated information is on the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) website (SWRCB 2023).

Emergency Response and Evacuations

Placer County Office of Emergency Preparedness (OES) coordinates inventories hazardous materials, used by businesses and administers the Placer County emergency management program on a day-to-day basis and during disasters. It is a focal point during disasters for planning and logistics. Evacuation centers have been identified in the Kings Beach and Tahoe City area in Placer County (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 18-9). The LTGRP establishes the emergency response organization for hazardous materials incidents occurring within the Lake Tahoe watershed (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 18-6).

The Placer County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan is to reduce the long-term risk to people and property from natural hazards and their effects in Placer County. The plan was updated and approved in 2021 by the Board of Supervisors to also avoid costly disaster recovery expenses (Placer County 2021). The 2021 updates include refined risk

assessments for disasters such as fires and floods, enhanced programs to reduce the cost of flood insurance, expanded federal grant opportunities, streamlined response operations after emergencies, as well as updated and prioritized the county's mitigation project list (Placer County 2021).

The North Tahoe Fire Protection District's (NTFPD's) Emergency Preparedness Guide includes advice for what to do in case of an emergency event, such as fires or avalanches, and identifies evacuation routes for Kings Beach, Tahoe Vista, Tahoe City,Tahoma, and Meeks Bay (NTFPD n.d.). SR 28 is identified in both directions as an evacuation route, and Hwy 267, and 89 are also evacuation routes out of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

3.10.2 Discussion

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?

Less than significant. This potential effect is the same as those analyzed in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, and therefore this analysis tiers from and is consistent with the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS. Construction activities related to future projects implemented under the proposed Area Plan could involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials. However, use of hazardous materials would be of typical urban development projects in the Tahoe Region and would occur in compliance with all local, state, and federal regulations. Further, the types of uses that would be permissible within the area are not of the nature that would involve storage, use, and transport of large quantities of hazardous substances that would increase the risk of incident. The types of uses (e.g., commercial and light industrial) are consistent with the types of uses already allowed under existing conditions, such that implementation of the proposed Area Plan amendments would not be expected to create a new risk of accident or upset conditions.

These effects were previously analyzed in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS. This analysis found that because future projects would adhere to existing regulations, including various federal, state, and local regulations address the handling, transporting, and disposing of hazardous materials, and because there would be no proposed policies or changes to existing policies that would affect the transport or use of hazardous materials in the region, no impact would occur (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 18-1). Implementation of the proposed area plan amendments would not include any provisions or changes that would alter such requirements or regulations for individual future projects. Therefore, impacts to risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances within the plan area would be the same as previously analyzed in the 2016 EIR/EIS and would have a less than significant impact.

b) Involve possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan?

Less than significant. The 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS determined that implementation of the proposed Area Plan would not alter the existing Placer Operation Area East Side Emergency Response Evacuation Plan (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 18-23). The amendments to the TBAP would not make changes to the total number or distribution of residential allocations or other development rights (e.g., CFA, TAUs). As such, the potential growth that could occur within the plan area would not change from the potential growth allowed by the existing Area Plan.

Due to the existing land use pattern and growth controls, most new development would be in the form of redevelopment of existing development. It is the intent of both the proposed Area Plan and Regional Plan that redevelopment be concentrated in the Town Centers, with a focus on, among other things, support for a comprehensive transportation network that considers transit, pedestrian, and non-motorized transportation opportunities. Added policies for redevelopment, land use, and mixed use for the proposed Area Plan support development of land use patterns that reduce private automobile use, increase concentration of development in urban centers, and develop active transportation opportunities and community spaces which would reduce automobile dependency and increase walkability, bikeability, connectivity, and safety in the community.

Buildout of the amended Area Plan could result in the same amount of additional development in the plan area that could occur under the existing Area Plan. The potential traffic associated with buildout of the plan area would not be substantial and would be consistent with that anticipated under the Regional Plan and evaluated in the 2016 TBAP

EIR/EIS. Roadways in the region currently experience congested conditions during peak periods throughout the year. With the focus on walkability, alternative transportation, and transit improvements emphasized in the Area Plan consistent with the Regional Plan and 2017 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, and growth limitations from TRPA allocations, the addition of residents and visitors generated by the amended Area Plan would not substantially increase long-term congestion such that interference with emergency response or evacuation plans would occur. As with existing conditions, construction of residential, commercial, utility, roadway improvements, community revitalization, and bicycle and pedestrian trails projects in accordance with amended Area Plan may temporarily increase construction-related traffic within the plan area, potentially causing intermittent congestion on SR 28, SR 89, and SR 267. Additionally, some construction projects could result in temporary lane or shoulder closures. Because the potential development associated with the proposed Area Plan amendments would be the same as what could occur with existing conditions, potential construction effects on emergency vehicle response time and evacuation would not change from what could occur under the development potential allowed by the existing Area Plan. In addition, future projects would be reviewed pursuant to applicable CEQA and TRPA environmental review requirements. This project-level review would evaluate the site-specific characteristics of each proposed project to determine if it would interfere with an emergency evacuation plan. If a future project would interfere with an emergency evacuation plan, then project-specific mitigation measures, such as a traffic control plan, or changes to project design or construction operations, would be required.

Buildout of the amended Area Plan would result in the same level of development previously assessed for the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS and Regional Plan, and would include efforts to reduce use of automobiles and increase travel connections in the plan area. Additionally, projects would be required to reduce potential construction-related traffic impacts. Therefore, implementation of the Area Plan amendments would not interfere with implementation of existing regulations or plans pertaining to emergency response or evacuation. This impact would be less than significant.

3.11 POPULATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
XIV. Population				
Will the proposal result in:				
a) Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Include or result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.11.1 Environmental Setting

The area under the jurisdiction of the Tahoe Basin Area Plan has a total population of approximately 10,835 people and 4,140 households (U.S. Census 2020). Development in the Tahoe Region is guided by the TRPA growth control system, which allows new development and redevelopment through authorization of residential allocations, commercial floor area, tourist accommodation units, and residential bonus units. As a result, development is capped in the Region.

3.11.2 Discussion

a) Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?

Beneficial. This potential effect is the same as those analyzed in both the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, and therefore this analysis tiers from and is consistent with the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS and 2012 RPU EIS. The proposed Area Plan amendments would include several policy additions to the existing Area Plan that are designed to promote the development of affordable housing in the plan area. These include policies to support streamlining affordable, moderate, and achievable housing; require that 50 percent of housing units converted from multifamily units to condominiums be deed restricted to affordable, moderate or achievable housing; address the job-housing imbalance in the region; monitor and track housing data in the region; and support adaptive management of the short-term rental inventory to balance housing availability with short-term rentals as new lodging products are added to the region. Although the pace of construction in the plan area may modestly increase under the proposed amendments, the total number of residential units would remain capped and the total development potential in the plan area would not be affected.

The existing Area Plan implements mixed-use zoning concepts envisioned by the TRPA Regional Plan and analyzed in the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS. The TRPA Regional Plan guides changes to the overall density and distribution of the region's population, gradually increasing the density of the population within Town Centers, such as Tahoe City and Kings Beach, and simultaneously reducing density outside these centers. This trend would continue under the proposed Area Plan amendments. Although this pattern results in changes to the density and distribution of the region's population, to date such changes have not and would continue to not result in environmental degradation. Transitioning to higher-density, compact, transit-oriented development has reduced and would continue to reduce environmental impacts associated with traffic (VMT), air quality, land disturbance, infrastructure expansion, and other environmental issue areas. Also, this transition pattern has provided and would continue to provide opportunities for stream environment restoration and improved water quality control facilities. Such changes would continue to be beneficial.

The proposed changes to land use zoning and development patterns associated with the proposed Area Plan amendments would bring the plan area into alignment with the location, distribution and growth rate of the human population planned for the region in the TRPA Regional Plan. Growth within the plan area would continue to be limited to that which is allowed by the growth management system set forth in Chapter 50, Allocation of Development, of the TRPA Code and redirected to more appropriate locations. Thus, this impact would be beneficial.

b) Include or result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents?

Beneficial. See discussion in Section 3.11.2(a), above. The proposed Area Plan amendments do not propose any specific projects that would result in the loss of very-low, lower-, or moderate-income housing or that would displace substantial numbers of people necessitating construction of replacement housing elsewhere. All future projects in the plan area would be required to undergo project-level environmental review during which potential impacts on residences or businesses would be assessed and mitigated to the extent feasible. Future projects would be subject to TRPA requirements for in-kind replacement housing equal to the number of displaced or removed residential units for the loss of moderate-income housing (TRPA Code Section 39.2.3.B); consequently, there would be no net loss of housing.

3.12 HOUSING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
XIV. Housing				
Will the proposal result in:				
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:				
i) Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.12.1 Environmental Setting

There are 14,115 existing residential units within the plan area. This includes 6,087 single family residences, 7,146 condominiums, and 882 other multi-family residential units (U.S. Census 2020). The median sale price of homes sold in 2022 in the plan area was \$970,000 (Zillow 2023). Between 2016 and 2020, 67 percent of all households were housing cost burdened meaning 30 percent or more of the household monthly income is spent on housing and associated costs (HUD 2023). The high cost of housing is caused in part by the limited availability of housing in the plan area.

3.12.2 Discussion

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:

i) Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region?

No impact. The amount of housing in the Tahoe Region is limited by the number of available RUUs available through the TRPA growth management system described in TRPA Code Chapters 50 – 53. The proposed amendments would not affect the current or potential future number of housing units.

ii) 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?

Beneficial. This potential effect is similar to those analyzed in the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, and therefore this analysis tiers from and is consistent with the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS and 2012 RPU EIS. The existing Area Plan implements Regional Plan strategies that allow for increased residential height and density within existing Town Centers (which can improve the feasibility of affordable housing projects) and encourage the replacement of single-family homes in outlying areas with multi-family units in Town Centers (which are typically less expensive than single-family homes). The 2012 RPU EIS evaluated the effects of the Regional Plan strategies that would be implemented

with the existing Area Plan and found that they would have the potential to improve housing opportunities for lower income residents over the planning period of the Regional Plan (TRPA 2012a: 3.12-17).

The proposed Area Plan amendments would include several policy additions to the existing Area Plan that are designed to promote the development of affordable housing in the plan area. These include policies to support streamlining affordable, moderate, and achievable housing; require that 50 percent of housing units converted from multifamily units to condominiums be deed restricted to affordable, moderate or achievable housing; address the job-housing imbalance in the region; monitor and track housing data in the region; and support adaptive management of the short-term rental inventory to balance housing availability with short-term rentals as new lodging products are added to the region. Although the pace of construction in the plan area may modestly increase under the proposed amendments, the total number of residential units would remain capped and the total development potential in the plan area would not be affected. The amendments would also encourage a greater proportion of the available residential units to be developed as more affordable workforce housing. To the extent that the proposed housing policies are successfully implemented, they could reduce the number of existing residents that are housing cost burdened and/or increase the availability of housing for lower and very low-income households.

The proposed Area Plan amendments would not prohibit residential uses in any location where they are currently allowed. Future projects within the plan area would be subject to TRPA requirements for in-kind replacement housing equal to the number of displaced or removed residential units for the loss of low- or moderate-income housing (TRPA Code Section 39.2.3.B).

As described above, the proposed Area Plan amendments would implement additional Regional Plan strategies that would benefit affordable housing, would not reduce the amount of existing affordable housing, and would implement additional strategies to provide workforce housing. Therefore, this impact would be beneficial.

3.13 TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
XIII. Transportation/Circulation.				
Will the proposal result in:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, including highway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.13.1 Environmental Setting

The plan area is served by a network of state, Placer County, Forest Service, State Parks and private roadways. Due to topographical constraints, the overall network is very limited with few alternate routes.

State Highways

The primary through roadways in the area consists of the three state highways, as described below.

State Route (SR) 28 is the major roadway serving Lake Tahoe's North Shore. It provides a link between Incline Village, Nevada and Tahoe City. SR 28 is typically a two-lane facility with one lane of travel in each direction. A center two-way left-turn lane is provided in Tahoe City, Tahoe Vista, and Kings Beach. The posted speed limit along SR 28 varies from 25 to 45 miles per hour through the Plan area.

SR 267 is a two-lane highway running in a general northwest-southeast alignment between Interstate 80 in Truckee and SR 28 in Kings Beach. This highway consists of two travel lanes, with a speed limit of 55 miles per hour in the rural sections outside of Kings Beach. It climbs almost 1,000 feet in elevation from Lake Tahoe to Brockway Summit.

SR 89 serves the Truckee River Canyon and West Shore, as part of the overall route connecting Alpine County on the south with I-5 in Siskiyou County on the north. As the most direct all-weather road connecting the Tahoe area to I-80 and the Sacramento and San Francisco Bay areas, it carries the greatest traffic volumes into the North and West Shores of Lake Tahoe. It also provides access to Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows. SR 89 is generally two lanes in width, with additional turn lanes at major intersections. Within the Plan area, the speed limit varies from 25 to 45 miles per hour.

Traffic control on State Highways in the Plan area includes stop signs and three traffic signals along SR 28 (at SR 89 in Tahoe City, at National Avenue in Tahoe Vista, and at SR 267 in Kings Beach), as well as two roundabouts in Kings Beach (at Bear Street and at Coon Street). In addition, a winter traffic management program is operated in Tahoe City during afternoons on peak winter ski days, coning two east-bound through lanes and an eastbound right-turn lane to increase capacity and reduce congestion.

County Roadways

The majority of roadways in the Plan Area are owned and maintained by Placer County. Snow removal is an important element of county roadway activities. With the highest average snowfall of any county in the lower 48 states, Placer County's snow removal program ranks among the largest four in California.

Transit Network

As a tourist destination with a limited roadway network, public transit services are an important component of the transportation system in the Plan area. As discussed below, the region is served by a mix of public and private transit services.

TAHOE-TRUCKEE AREA REGIONAL TRANSIT

The Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART) system is operated by the Placer County Department of Public Works and Facilities. Services are as follows:

- TART's "Main Line" route operates on SRs 28 and 89 along the northern and western shores of Lake Tahoe from Sugar Pine Point State Park in El Dorado County on the southwest to Incline Village, Nevada on the northeast. During the summer, more frequent service is scheduled, while less frequent service is provided during the winter and off-season.
- The SR 89 Route provides hourly service between Tahoe City and Truckee, via Squaw Valley, year-round.
- The SR 267 Route operates hourly between Truckee, Northstar Village, Kings Beach and Crystal Bay year-round.
- The Subsidized Taxi Service is provided to persons eligible under the Americans with Disability Act that cannot access the fixed route service. It is provided for all portions of eastern Placer County, through a contractor.
- TART Connect provides free on-demand service within the plan area and into Washoe County and Truckee.

Throughout the year, TART service operates approximately from 6:00 a.m. to 6:45 p.m., seven days a week and 364 days per year (the exception being Christmas).

Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure

The Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD) operates a series of multipurpose recreational trails along the Truckee River between Tahoe City and Olympic Valley, along the West Shore between Tahoe City and Sugar Pine Point State Park, and along the North Shore from Tahoe City to Dollar Hill. These facilities total 16.2 miles in length. TCPUD also operates a 0.9-mile lakefront trail through the core of Tahoe City from Commons Beach to the State Park Campground.

The Pinedrop Trail is a 1.5 mile shared use path connecting Pinedrop Drive (near SR 267) with the North Tahoe Regional Park in Tahoe Vista, operated by the North Tahoe Public Utility District. In addition, the National Avenue Bike Path consists of a separated shared use Class I facility along National Avenue from SR 28 to Donner Road (the road providing access to the Regional Park).

SR 28 between Tahoe City and Kings Beach includes Class II (striped) bike lanes. Sidewalks are provided in Tahoe City along both sides of a 0.7-mile-long section of SR 28. In addition, sidewalks are present along SR 28 and numerous side streets in Kings Beach. Additional information on

The region also encompasses an extensive network of unpaved trails, including USFS trails, California State Park trails, and 36 miles of the Tahoe Rim Trail. Portions of the Tahoe Rim Trail are also part of the Pacific Crest Trail.

3.13.2 Discussion

a) Generation of 650 or more new average daily Vehicle Miles Travelled?

Less than significant.

At the time the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS was completed, the TRPA's Initial Environmental Checklist criteria as it related to VMT, stated that the Area Plan would result in a significant impact to transportation and circulation if it would cause total VMT within the Tahoe Region to exceed the TRPA Air Quality Threshold value of 2,030,938. However, since certification of the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, TRPA has revised the VMT criteria and metrics. Therefore, the average VMT (new TRPA IEC metric) associated with implementation of the Area Plan was not analyzed in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS. Since the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS was adopted, TRPA has an updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP includes travel demand management strategies to decrease use of personal automobiles and increase transportation via walking, bicycling, transit, and carpooling. The RTP also includes transportation system management projects, which increase infrastructure with an emphasis on transit, trails, and technologies that can further reduce personal automobile use. Taken together, these RTP strategies have the potential to reduce VMT beyond the measures identified in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS.

The TRPA Project Impact Assessment Guidelines (PIA) (2022) describes the VMT requirements for development projects and Regional Plan, Code, or local plan amendments in the Tahoe Region. The PIA describes the process and requirements for conducting a VMT assessment and reflects the 2021 updates to the TRPA Environmental Thresholds, which involved replacement of a VMT-based nitrate deposition threshold with a new transportation and sustainable communities threshold, also based on VMT. The PIA provides a basis for preparing a VMT analysis in compliance with Chapter 65 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. As detailed in Section 4.1, Screening Criteria, of the PIA, the policy effect of plans, ordinances, and amendments must be considered in relation to trip generation and trip length. The PIA notes that in many cases a policy proposal may have no effect on vehicle trips or lengths. In this case, the amendments would not directly affect trip generation and future projects within the plan area will assess project generated VMT that exceeds 650 VMT outside of Town Centers or 1,300 VMT in Town Centers

As detailed in Section 2.4, Proposed Area Plan Changes, the proposed Area Plan amendments focus on process, policy, and code improvements to support appropriate lodging, mixed use, and workforce housing. The amendments also focus on diversifying land uses across a variety of sectors, with the intent of streamlining and diversifying the business sector and a variety of housing types. However, the proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter land use classifications or growth potential from that which was evaluated in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS. Because trip generation is generally estimated based on land use classification, the number of trips generated within the plan area would not change due to the implementation of the proposed Area Plan amendments. Additionally, trip distances are generally attributable to the land uses producing or attracting the new trips. Thus, similar to the discussion for trip generation above, because the land use classifications and development capacity of the Area Plan would not change with implementation of the proposed Area Plan amendments, trip lengths associated with implementation of the Area Plan would not increase. Because the Area Plan amendments would further promote concentration of development within Town Centers and improve pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and because VMT tends to be lower for projects in Town Centers, which include bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and residential, commercial, and other use in proximity, the amendments may contribute to a reduction in VMT.

Because the changes in the proposed Area Plan amendments are not expected to increase traffic generation or trip distances, the proposed Area Plan amendments' effect on VMT within the Tahoe Region would not be substantially different than that which could occur under the existing Area Plan. Therefore, the VMT effects of proposed Area Plan amendments are less than significant.

b) Changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?

Less than significant. As described above in Section 3.13.2(a), the proposed Area Plan amendments would not increase trip generation compared to that which could occur under the existing Area Plan. Nor would the proposed amendments alter land use classifications or growth potential beyond those evaluated in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS. Therefore, the Area Plan amendments are not expected to increase the demand for new parking.

The proposed Area Plan amendments include updates to parking standards and the creation of parking districts. The proposed Area Plan amendments include new policies in the Land Use element that would support funding sources for the implementation of parking management plans. The Area Plan would also be amended to support parking maximums and other parking solutions in Town Centers. Additionally, the proposed Area Plan amendments include

new policies that would allow multipurpose and flexible gathering spaces in private and public parking areas where events could be held during off-peak hours. Section 3.07, "Parking and Access," would also be revised to permanently adopt the parking pilot program for North Lake Tahoe Town Centers that support exemptions to parking and spur redevelopment in the town centers and support strategies identified in the Resort Triangle Transportation Plan (RTTP). Although these proposed amendments to the Area Plan would result in lower total parking supply in Town Centers, they are designed to, and would result in more efficient use of parking areas. Therefore, adequate parking would still be provided. Additionally, Section 3.09, "Design Standards and Guidelines," would be revised to include exceptions for groundwater interception to facilitate below-grade parking for mixed-use projects in Town Centers. Therefore, this amendment to the Area Plan would potentially increase parking supply within the plan area through the provision of below-grade parking, potentially offsetting parking reductions resulting from other provisions.

Finally, each future project would continue to be reviewed for consistency with parking standards and would be reviewed through a project-specific environmental review pursuant to TRPA Code Chapter 3 and CEQA to evaluate if the proposed project would degrade parking conditions. As with existing conditions, project specific mitigation measures would be required if a future project would significantly degrade parking conditions. Therefore, the proposed Area Plan amendments would have a less-than-significant impact on parking

c) Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, including highway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities?

Less than significant. As described above in Section 3.13.2(a), the proposed Area Plan amendments would not increase trip generation compared to that which could occur under the existing Area Plan. Additionally, the transportation policies in the Area Plan promote bicycle and pedestrian modes and call for improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The existing Area Plan policies specify improvements and management strategies to enhance bicycle and pedestrian conditions, such as T-P-30 and T-P-31. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter land use classifications or growth potential, and thus, the amendments would not result in an increase in transit demand beyond those evaluated in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS. Therefore, impacts to the transit system would be consistent with that which was analyzed in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS.

The proposed Area Plan amendments include revisions to Section 3.06 "Streetscape and Roadway Design Standards" and Table 3.06.A "Future Streetscape and Roadway Design Characteristics" to require street frontage improvements for all development and to provide reference to other applicable standards contained in the area plan. This change would improve transportation systems within the plan area by ensuring street frontage improvements are implemented as redevelopment under the Area Plan occurs. For these reasons, the proposed Area Plan would not substantially degrade existing transportation systems.

d) Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?

Beneficial. As described above in Section 3.13.2(a), impacts related vehicle trip and average daily VMT generation with the proposed Area Plan amendments are very similar to that which would be generated by the existing Area Plan. Additionally, the proposed Area Plan amendments would not include any new roadways or alter land use classifications or growth potential beyond those evaluated in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, and thus, would not result in any change to circulation patterns associated with vehicular transportation. The proposed Area Plan amendments also support bicycle and pedestrian circulation through the inclusion of policies (e.g., T-P-30 and T-P-31) that promote improvements to bicycle/pedestrian conditions and specific bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements.

As described above in Section 3.13.2(c), the proposed Area Plan amendments include revisions to Section 3.06 "Streetscape and Roadway Design Standards" and Table 3.06.A "Future Streetscape and Roadway Design Characteristics" to require street frontage improvements for all development and to provide reference to other applicable standards contained in the Area Plan. This change would improve transportation systems within the plan area by ensuring street frontage improvements are implemented as development and redevelopment under the Area Plan occurs.

The proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in any additional alterations to present or planned patterns of circulation or movement. All future projects that could alter circulation patterns would continue to be evaluated

through a project-level environmental review (e.g., TRPA Code Chapter 3), which would assess and, if necessary, mitigate negative impacts on circulation. For these reasons, the impact would be less than significant.

e) Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments do not involve any alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic; nor would they alter travel demand to the extent that they would result in changes to existing air, rail, or waterborne travel patterns. Because the proposed Area Plan amendments would not affect air, rail, or waterborne travel patterns, the effects on these transportation systems would be less than significant.

f) Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments do not include or approve specific transportation elements that inherently would increase the potential for hazards. Individual future projects would be subject to all applicable federal, state and local design standards. Additionally, the transportation policies in the Area Plan promote bicycle and pedestrian modes and call for improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities that specify improvements and management strategies to enhance bicycle and pedestrian conditions (e.g., T-P-30 and T-P-31).

The proposed Area Plan amendments include changes designed to provide consistency throughout the Area Plan in identifying the requirements of street frontage improvements and to provide reference to other applicable standards contained in the Area Plan. Additionally, the proposed Area Plan amendments include revised Residential Subdistrict Development Standards that would reduce or remove setbacks, articulation, massing requirements, minimum lot widths, and minimum lot area. This change could allow certain buildings to be placed closer to the roadway. However, it would not create traffic hazards because it would maintain safe setbacks from roadways and pedestrian areas, incorporate required streetscape improvements including bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and all future projects under the Area Plan would still be subject to all applicable federal, state and local design standards. There is no evidence to suggest that this change would result in unsafe parking or circulation movements. For these reasons, the proposed Area Plan amendments would have a less-than-significant impact on transportation hazards.

3.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
XIV. Public Services.				
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?				
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks or other recreational facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Other governmental services?				

3.14.1 Environmental Setting

Fire Protection

North Tahoe Fire Protection District (NTFPD) provides fire protection services within the plan area. Automatic aid agreements between Squaw Valley Fire Department and North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District allow neighboring districts to respond to emergencies that are within the service area of another service provider without having to get additional approval which augments fire protection coverage in the plan area (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 16-15).

Police Protection

Police protection in the plan area is provided by the Placer County Sheriff's Office. The Placer County Sheriff operates a substation in Tahoe City and assigns patrol units that cover the plan area (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 16-15). The average response for high priority calls in the area meets the county standards for calls in remote rural areas.

Schools

The Tahoe Truckee Unified School District (TTUSD) serves the plan area, and operates five schools: Kings Beach Elementary School, Tahoe Lake Elementary School, North Tahoe School, North Tahoe High School, and Cold Stream Alternative School. All schools have available enrollment capacity (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 16-15).

Libraries

The Tahoe City Library and Kings Beach Library serve the plan area. The library is a part of the Placer County library system and shares resources with nine partner branches (Placer County n.d.).

3.14.2 Discussion

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:

a) Fire protection?

Less than significant. Implementation of the proposed Area Plan amendments would not change the total number of residential allocations or other development rights that could be developed in the plan area. The Placer County area of the Tahoe Basin has steadily decreased full-time residential population since 2000. Long-term growth is predicted to be relatively limited and total growth and development is capped by the Regional Plan. The potential effects on

fire protection from additional development and population growth under the Regional Plan was evaluated in the 2012 RPU EIS, which found that any new construction could result in population increases that, depending upon location, could require improved or expanded facilities for fire protection, the construction of which could result in adverse environmental effects (TRPA 2012a: 3.13-21 through 3.13-22). However, individual projects would be required to undergo environmental review to ensure that impacts are identified and mitigated.

The proposed Area Plan amendments would continue to support achieving adequate fire protection service levels because of the limited growth potential and the type of housing that would be supported would be more concentrated mixed-use housing that is closer to Town Centers and easier to protect. While building setbacks could be reduced, all new buildings would continue to be required to comply with existing access requirements to provide safe and efficient access for emergency service vehicles. No major fire protection facility expansions or relocations are anticipated. Additionally, future projects would be required to undergo project-level environmental review to analyze potential impacts, such as effects on provision of fire protection services, and identify any necessary mitigation to reduce significant impacts. For these reasons and because of the limited amount of growth anticipated, impacts from the Area Plan amendments on fire protection services would be less than significant.

b) Police protection?

Less than significant. See discussion in Section 3.14.2(a), above. The potential effects on police protection from additional development and population growth under the Regional Plan were analyzed in the 2012 RPU EIS (TRPA 2012a: 3.13-21 through 3.13-22). This analysis found that any new construction could result in population increases that, depending upon location, could require improved or expanded facilities for police protection. However, individual projects would be required to undergo environmental review to ensure that impacts are identified and mitigated, including the provision of adequate funding for any necessary facility expansions.

The proposed Area Plan amendments would not change overall growth potential in the plan area. The proposed Area Plan amendments would continue to support achieving adequate police protection service levels because of the limited amount of growth possible. No major police protection facility expansions or relocations are anticipated. Additionally, future projects would be required to undergo project-level environmental review to analyze potential impacts, such as effects on provision of police protection services, and identify any necessary mitigation to reduce significant impacts. For these reasons, impacts from the proposed Area Plan amendments on police protection services would be less than significant.

c) Schools?

Less than significant. See discussion in Section 3.14.2(a), above. The potential effects on school services from additional development and population growth under the Regional Plan were analyzed (TRPA 2012: 3.13-21 through 3.13-22). This analysis found that any new construction could result in population increases that, depending upon location, could require improved or expanded facilities for school services and any associated construction activities could result in adverse environmental effects. However, individual projects would be required to undergo environmental review to ensure that impacts are identified and mitigated.

The limited potential growth that could occur within the plan area would not be changes by the proposed Area Plan amendments. TTUSD claims to have capacity for additional students (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 16-15). Projections for the area indicate that enrollment is expected to remain steady for the duration of the planning horizon.

Given the limited growth potential in the plan area, it is unlikely that the potential growth in student population that could occur in the plan area would result in the current schools exceeding capacity. Additionally, future projects are subject to a project-level environmental review of impacts on public facilities and government services, to analyze potential impacts and identify any necessary mitigation to reduce significant impacts. This impact would be less than significant.

d) Parks or other recreational facilities?

Less than significant. See discussion in Section 3.14.2(a), above. The potential effects on parks or other recreational facilities from additional development and population growth under the Regional Plan were analyzed in the 2012 RPU EIS (TRPA 2012a: 3.11-16 through 3.11-20). This analysis found that the increase in residents and visitors associated

with the Regional Plan could be accommodated by existing facilities in the Tahoe region, or with expanded facilities and new facilities that are developed consistent with the Recreation and Land Use Elements of the Regional Plan. Analysis of projects against the threshold standards would minimize any project-related adverse environmental effects associated with increased demand for or use of recreation facilities attributed to an increase in population. Additionally, the goals and policies in the Regional Plan and TBAP would ensure that demand for recreation facilities and opportunities in the Region are met. Ongoing improvements through various entities (e.g., USDA Forest Service, California State Parks, Public Utility Districts, and private property owners) and programs (such as the Environmental Improvement Program [EIP]) and persons-at-one-time (PAOT) allocations, as needed, by TRPA would continue to expand and maintain these opportunities and ensure that capacity is available. The 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS also analyzed the recreation capacity in the plan area and planned facilities that may be built in the plan area. The new amendments to the Area Plan would be within the scope of what was analyzed in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS and would not change the impacts analyzed in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS.

The current Area Plan includes transportation strategies that would implement pedestrian trails, mobility options other than single occupancy vehicles, and active transit, which would enhance recreational opportunities for residents and visitors (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 136 – 140). As with existing conditions, the proposed Area Plan amendments would allow for a gradual and limited increase in population, and therefore incrementally increasing the demand for recreation facilities and uses that would be consistent with recreation demand anticipated by the Regional Plan and existing Area Plan. However, continued implementation of recreation goals and policies and implementation of new recreation projects from other programs (e.g., EIP) would reserve adequate capacity for recreation, and implementation of the proposed Area Plan would not reduce capacity of existing recreation facilities or opportunities or result in adverse physical effects on recreation facilities. For the reasons described herein, the proposed Area Plan amendments would not have a substantial adverse physical impact on or result in the unanticipated need for parks and recreation facilities. This impact would be less than significant.

e) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

Less than significant. The proposed amendments to the Area Plan are designed to promote consistency and clarity and will require street frontage improvements and funding sources to be implemented for development projects. Any future projects within the plan area would be subject to subsequent project-level environmental review and permitting. As with existing conditions, permit applicants would be required to demonstrate that any proposed project would be consistent with TRPA Code provisions related to public facilities and transportation, including the provisions of Chapters 32 and 65 that address the standards of basic services and transportation, respectively. For these reasons, adoption of the proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in an unplanned effect upon maintenance of public facilities, including roads.

f) Other governmental facilities?

Less than significant. The plan area includes several governmental facilities including a community center, post offices, and libraries. The Area Plan amendments would not increase growth potential, which would be consistent with the growth allocated under the Regional Plan. This amount of growth would not result in a substantial adverse effect on existing governmental facilities. For these reasons, the proposed Area Plan would not have an unplanned effect upon other governmental facilities. This impact would be less than significant.

3.15 ENERGY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
VI. Energy.				
Will the proposal result in:				
a) Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.15.1 Environmental Setting

Energy sources including electricity and natural gas are used during the operation and use of development within the plan area to heat buildings, provide electricity and water supplies. Energy sources such as gasoline and diesel fuel are also used during construction activities to fuel equipment and vehicles, and support transportation within the plan area. Electricity and natural gas services in the plan area are provided by Liberty Utilities and Southwest Gas Company respectively.

3.15.2 Discussion

a) Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?

Less than significant. This potential effect is the same as those analyzed in the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, and therefore this analysis tiers from and is consistent with the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS and 2012 RPU EIS. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not increase the potential for growth in the plan area beyond that which could occur under the existing Area Plan. Therefore, potential effects on the use of energy or fuel would be the same as those analyzed in the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 EIR/EIS. As with existing conditions, energy and fuel would be consumed during the construction and operation of future projects in the plan area. However, the potential for growth in the plan area would not change due to the amendments and would continue to be limited by available development rights, such as CFA, RUUs, TAUs. While the proposed Area Plan amendments may modestly increase the pace of construction, they would not increase overall construction activity or development potential in the plan area. The proposed Area Plan amendments do not allow new uses that would require substantial amounts of energy or fuel, such as heavy industrial or manufacturing uses. While any new construction would require electric and natural gas service as part of the basic services (see TRPA Code Chapter 32, Basic Services) the entire plan area is located in proximity to existing electric and gas infrastructure. Future projects requiring new or modified connections would be subject to the requirements and fees of the applicable utility providers. As described in Section 3.13.2(a), the proposed Area Plan amendments would not increase VMT beyond the level analyzed in the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, thus the use of fuel and energy for transportation would be consistent with the analysis in the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS. In addition, future projects would be evaluated at a project-level to determine if the project would use substantial amounts of fuel or energy and mitigation measures would be required, if necessary, as a condition of approval. For these reasons, the proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in the substantial use of fuel or energy.

b) Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?

Less than significant. See discussion in Section 3.15.2(a), above, that concludes that the available capacity for energy supply would far exceed the demand generated at build-out of the Regional Plan. Therefore, demand created by implementation of the proposed Area Plan amendments would not exceed available capacity or require the development of new sources of energy.

3.16 UTILITIES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
XVI. Utilities.				
Except for planned improvements, will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:				
a) Power or natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Communication systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Solid waste and disposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.16.1 Environmental Setting

Power and Natural Gas

Electricity is provided by Liberty Utilities and natural gas services are provided by Southwest Gas Corporation within the plan area. Liberty Utilities is working on upgrading their infrastructure to be more wildfire resilient and reliably provide electricity to the region, which would also expand capacity. Southwest Gas Corporation provides over 14,000 connections in the plan area with high pressure and distribution lines located in the plan area (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 16-13).

Communication Systems

Charter Spectrum and AT&T provide telecommunications services, including telephone, internet, and television, in the plan area. These providers offer data, voice, and video services.

Water Service

Water service for the plan area is primarily provided by the North Tahoe Public Utility District (NTPUD) and Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD), most of NTPUD's water supply comes from surface water and TCPUD sources most of its water from groundwater resources. NTPUD has the combined surface and groundwater rights to 5,800-acre feet of water per year. TCPUD estimates that growth will be limited in the area due to restricted growth. The utilities anticipate that there is sufficient supply to meet future increase in water demand (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 16-11).

Sanitary Sewer Service

The plan area is serviced by NTPUD, TCPUD, and Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency (T-TSA). Water is pumped to treatment sites at NTPUD and TCPUD. T-TSA also has treatment facilities in the Martis Valley. No septic tanks or sewage treatment is permitted in the Tahoe Basin and all three services pump their water out of the Tahoe Basin to existing wastewater systems. All three services estimate that they have the capacity to meet future growth demand in both wet and dry years (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 16-12).

Stormwater

Storm water management infrastructure is of critical importance to protect and restore the water quality of Lake Tahoe. Storm water management systems (e.g., curbs and gutters, catch basins, storm drainpipes, culverts, ditches, and detention ponds) are the responsibility of all parties who have a right-of-way or drainage easement, or have graded development. The county, Caltrans, and utilities are responsible for stormwater infrastructure along their respective roads and drainage easements, while private property owners are responsible for infiltrating runoff on their properties. Combined, this network of storm water infrastructure connects to provide drainage to the entire planning area.

Solid Waste

Solid waste disposal in the plan area is provided by Tahoe Truckee Sierra Disposal (TTSD) and operates the Eastern Regional Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) and Transfer Station under contract with Placer County. TTSD collects residential recycling through their Blue Bag Program and takes it to the MRF, with all solid waste loads collected in eastern Placer County. After separation of recyclables, residual solid waste is transported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill in Storey County, Nevada. The MRF receives an average of 257 tons of material per day and sends 20 to 22 tons per day to Lockwood Landfill. As permitted, the remaining life of the landfill is 150 years. Currently, the landfill receives an average of 4,000 tons of solid waste each day, but this can vary depending on the season (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 16-13).

3.16.2 Discussion

a) Power or natural gas?

Less than significant. As described in Section 3.16.1, the service providers already cover the region and resilience projects are in place to expand capacities. This potential effect of the amendments is the same as those analyzed in the 2012 RPU EIS, and therefore this analysis tiers from and is consistent with the 2012 RPU EIS. Long term growth is regulated by the Regional Plan and therefore projects approved in the plan area would not allow the growth capacity to be exceeded. The long-term growth under the proposed Area Plan amendments would be relatively small and would not change from what is allowed under the existing Area Plan. The potential effects on power and natural gas from additional development and population growth under the Regional Plan were analyzed under the 2012 RPU EIS (TRPA 2012a: 3.13-5 through 13.3 -6). As described in the 2012 RPU EIS, Liberty and Southwest Gas project that, based on their forecasting and recent growth trends in the Region, their existing capacity will substantially exceed the future demand that could be generated by potential development and redevelopment authorized by the Regional Plan. The proposed Area Plan would not authorize or result in growth that would exceed that which was analyzed in the 2012 RPU EIS, and thus the impacts of the proposed Area Plan would be less than significant.

b) Communication systems?

Less than significant. As described in Section 3.16.1, multiple telecommunication providers offer services within the plan area. The long-term growth under the proposed Area Plan would be relatively small and consistent with what could occur under the existing Area Plan. Thus, it would be unlikely to exceed the capacity of existing service providers. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

c) Utilize additional water which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the service provider?

Less than significant. As described in Section 3.16.1, water service for the plan area is provided by NTPUD and TCPUD. The California side of the Tahoe Region has an allocation of 22,700 afy from Lake Tahoe and tributary surface waters. Additionally, there are ample groundwater sources that the water purveyors utilize. The long-term growth under the existing Area Plan would be relatively small and would not change due to the amendments. The water distributors do not use the entirety of their water allocation in a given year. The excess capacity of water supply and the limited future growth in the plan area would not exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the service providers. Additionally, future projects in the plan area would be required under the TRPA Code Section 32.4 to demonstrate sufficient supply, treatment capacity (as applicable), and conveyance capacity for clean water by the water purveyor.

d) Utilize additional sewage treatment capacity which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the sewage treatment provider?

Less than significant. As described in Section 3.16.1, the plan area is serviced by three separate sewage systems. The community sewer systems were designed and built such that it could be expanded to accommodate the community's future growth potentials. Because the proposed Area Plan amendments would not increase the growth potential within the plan area beyond what could already occur, it would not exceed the capacity of the sewage treatment provider. Additionally, future projects in the plan area would be required under the TRPA Code Section 32.4 to demonstrate sufficient conveyance and treatment capacity for wastewater. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

e) Storm water drainage?

Less than significant. Policy LU-P-21 is proposed to be included in the Area Plan and would support funding sources for frontage improvements for future projects, which would include planning for necessary stormwater drainage infrastructure. This new policy in combination with existing Area Plan and Regional Plan stormwater requirements would result in a less-than-significant impact.

f) Solid waste and disposal?

Less than significant. As described in Section 3.16.1, solid waste is disposed of at the Lockwood Regional Landfill. As permitted, the remaining life of the landfill is 150 years. Because the long-term growth under the proposed Area Plan would be relatively small, it would not exceed the permitted capacity for solid waste disposal.

3.17 HUMAN HEALTH

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
XVII. Human Health.				
Will the proposal result in:				
a) Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of people to potential health hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.17.1 Environmental Setting

A variety of natural hazards have the potential to occur throughout the plan area including floods, landslides, earthquakes, avalanches, wildfires, and seiches (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 14-12, 14-13, 14-34, 18-7). The adoption and implementation of building codes and development standards maintains a robust proactive stance regarding the potential for natural hazards. In addition, Placer County actively seeks to provide residents and visitors with information about the potential for these hazards to occur. See Section 3.14.1, "Fire Protection" for fire hazard planning and cross jurisdiction agreements in the plan area. Placer County has a Mosquito and Vector Control District to protect the public's health and well-being through the prevention of human disease by assessing environmental, regulatory, economic, and societal factors (PMVCD 2023). See "Emergency Response and Evacuations" under Section 3.10, Risk of Upset, for a discussion of applicable programs and management in Placer County related to emergency evacuation.

3.17.2 Discussion

a) Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?

Less than significant. This potential effect is the same as those analyzed in the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS and 2012 RPU EIS, and therefore this analysis tiers from and is consistent with the two documents. See discussion in Section 3.10.2(a), Risk of Upset, which addresses the potential for the proposed Area Plan amendments to result in release of hazardous substances to the environment. The proposed Area Plan amendments do not propose policies or changes to existing policies that would affect the transport or use of hazardous materials in the region.

As with existing conditions, infrastructure, restoration, or landscape projects could be implemented under the amended Area Plan that would have the potential to create conditions conducive to breeding mosquitoes, which are potential vectors for diseases. Health hazards from vector-borne diseases are evaluated in the 2012 RPU EIS. The analysis found that by maintaining regulations that allow for fogging and spraying to reduce adult mosquito populations, effects on public health associated with mosquito-borne illnesses would be less than significant (TRPA 2012a: 3.14-15 through 3.14-16). The proposed Area Plan does not propose policies or changes to existing policies or regulations that would affect vector control programs or efforts. Additionally, future projects would be evaluated on a project-specific basis consistent with TRPA environmental review requirements (TRPA Code Chapter 3) and by Placer County Environmental Health Services, as applicable, to identify potential environmental effects and implement mitigation measures, if necessary, to reduce those effects.

As with existing conditions, implementation of the proposed Area Plan amendments would result in new development and redevelopment in the plan area that would increase the number of residents and visitors in the Town Centers consistent with growth limitations in the Regional Plan. Development that would occur in the plan area would need approval from TRPA and/or Placer County. Development would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis and would consider hazards such as wildfire, flooding, seismic hazards (e.g., earthquakes, avalanches, and seiches), and landslides which have the potential to occur in the plan area. These potential risks would be analyzed, and the projects would require approval before any project implementation.

Effects related to wildfire hazards were previously analyzed in the 2012 RPU EIS and the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS (TRPA 2012a: 3.14-11 through 3.14-13; Placer County and TRPA 2016: 18-7). The analysis found that because future projects would be required to be consistent with Regional Plan requirements for fire safety as well as other applicable federal, state, regional, and local fire safety plans and future projects would be required to consider the fire hazards in the region and include measures to ensure that defensible space is maintained and excessive fuel is reduced, the effect would be less than significant. In addition, a new policy is proposed to support implementation of new or expanded hardening, green waste, and defensible space incentive and/or rebate programs. The redevelopment incentives in the Area Plan amendments could also result in the replacement of older developments with new buildings that comply with current fire safety standards. The building hardening, defensible space, and redevelopment incentives could result in a beneficial effect related to the risk of wildfire.

Effects related to flood hazards were previously analyzed in the 2012 RPU EIS and the 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS (TRPA 2012a: 3.14-13 through 3.14-14; Placer County and TRPA 2016: 15-14, 15-15). This analysis found that because the Regional Plan (Policy NH-1.2) does not allow for development activities that would result in new flooding issues or allow for the exacerbation of existing flooding issues that would expose occupants and/or structures to flood hazards, the effect would be less than significant. Flooding issues are also addressed in Section 3.3.2(b) and (c). Effects related to seismic hazards, such as landslides, earthquakes, avalanches, and seiches, were previously analyzed under Impact 3.7-3 in the 2012 RPU EIS (TRPA 2012a: 3.7-48 through 3.7-51). This analysis found that because construction projects in the Tahoe region must meet multiple requirements and regulations of TRPA, federal, state, and local agencies and development would be required to undergo site-specific geotechnical analysis (TRPA Code Section 33.4), and, if applicable, employ design standards that consider seismically active areas and comply with current building codes and local jurisdiction seismic standards, impacts related to seismic hazards would be less than significant.

The 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS includes maps showing areas of potential hazards, including flooding, seismic, avalanche, wildfire, landslide, and tsunami/seiche hazards, visually portraying potential hazard zones where additional design, construction, and review requirements may be required (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 14-8 through 14-18). All future projects in the plan area would be required to comply with Placer County codes and policies for development and building in areas prone to floods, earthquakes, avalanches, wildfire and other natural hazards. Development located in an identified potential hazard zone may be subject to additional design, construction, and review requirements. Additionally, future projects would be evaluated on a project-specific basis consistent with TRPA environmental review requirements (TRPA Code Chapter 3), and where applicable CEQA, to identify potential environmental effects, such as exposure to hazards, and be reviewed for consistency with county, state, federal, and TRPA regulations.

For the reasons described herein, the proposed Area Plan amendments would not create any health hazards. This impact would be less than significant.

b) Exposure of people to potential health hazards?

Less than significant. See discussion under item 3.17.2(a), above, which concludes that the proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in exposure of people to potential health hazards.

3.18 SCENIC RESOURCES/COMMUNITY DESIGN

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
XVIII. Scenic Resources/Community Design.				
Will the proposal:				
a) Be visible from any state or federal highway, Pioneer Trail or from Lake Tahoe?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be visible from any public recreation area or TRPA designated bicycle trail?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Be inconsistent with the TRPA Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) or Design Review Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.18.1 Environmental Setting

The plan area contains several travel routes and natural scenic features that are formally designated by TRPA as part of the Scenic Threshold Standards. The travel route threshold ratings track long-term, cumulative changes to two types of views: those seen from major roadways in the Region within urban, transitional, and natural landscapes (Roadway Travel Units); and those seen from Lake Tahoe looking landward (Shoreline Travel Units). Travel route ratings are used to assess the visual experience of traveling the Lake Tahoe Basin's major roads, including all state and federal highways. These roadways are separated into segments called travel units, each of which represents a continuous, two-directional viewshed of similar visual character. Travel route ratings consist of a numeric composite score that represents the relative scenic quality throughout the entire travel unit. Roadway travel unit ratings reflect six components: man-made features, physical distractions to driving along roadways, roadway characteristics, view of the Lake from the roadways, general landscape views from the roadways, and the variety of scenery from the roadways. Each component is rated from 1 (has a strong negative effect on scenic quality) to 5 (has a strong positive effect on scenic quality). A composite rating is obtained by summing the ratings of the six individual components. To be considered "in attainment" with the threshold standard, the current composite rating of each roadway travel unit must be at least 15.5 and equal to or greater than the original 1982 score. Shoreline travel units reach attainment at a score of 7.5 or higher and exceeds the original scenic score from 1982. Shoreline units are rated from 1 (has a strong negative effect on scenic quality) to 5 (has a strong positive effect on scenic quality) on three components: man-made features, background views, and variety of scenery from the shoreline travel unit. Numerical ratings are assigned for each characteristic every four years by a team of qualified scenic quality experts. The team also assesses the out of attainment travel routes for TRPA's SQIP and provides suggestions for improving the route's score. The plan area includes the following scenic travel units (Table 3-3).

Table 3-3. Scenic Travel Routes within the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan

Roadway Travel Unit (attainment status) ¹	Shoreline Travel Unit (attainment status) ¹
9 Tahoma (N)	12 McKinney Bay (A)
10 Quail Creek (A)	13 Eagle Rock (A)
11 Homewood (N)	14 Ward Creek (N)
12 Tahoe Pines (A)	15 Tahoe City (N)
13 Sunnyside (N)	16 Lake Forest (N)
14 Tahoe Tavern (A)	17 Dollar Point (A)
15 Tahoe City (A)	18 Cedar Flat (N)
16 Lake Forest (A)	19 Carnelian Bay (N)
17 Cedar Flat (N)	20 Flick Point (A)
18 Carnelian Bay (A)	21 Agate Bay (A)
19 Flick Point (A)	22 Brockway (N)
40 Brockway Cutoff (A)	
41 Brockway Summit (A)	
42 Outlet (N)	
43 Lower Truckee River (N)	
20A Tahoe Vista (N)	
20B Kings Beach (A)	
20C Brockway (A)	

¹ N = Nonattainment of Threshold Standards, A = Attainment of Threshold Standards

Source: TRPA n.d. 2019 scenic threshold monitoring data.

The 2019 TRPA scenic threshold monitoring found seven Roadway Travel Units and six Shoreline Travel Units in the plan area area to be out of attainment (Table 3-3). Several of the Roadway Travel units in the plan have improved over the past 10 years due to roadway improvements along the west shore, implementation of the Kings Beach commercial core project, and redevelopment of private properties consistent with design standards throughout the plan area (TRPA n.d.). No recent changes to scenic scores in Shoreline Travel Units have occurred in the plan area, although scenic threshold monitoring data indicates that redevelopment of structures along the shoreline consistent with current scenic requirements has led to incremental improvements within the plan area. (TRPA n.d.).

3.18.2 Discussion

a) Be visible from any state or federal highway, Pioneer Trail or from Lake Tahoe?

Less than significant. The 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS includes a detailed analysis of the Area Plan's effects on scenic quality in Impact 9-1 (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 9-15 through 9-40). This analysis found that future projects in the plan area would be required to comply with a series of existing requirements and Area Plan standards that would minimize adverse effects on the existing visual character or quality of the Plan area, the TRPA scenic threshold ratings, scenic vistas, scenic resources, and views of Lake Tahoe. The analysis found that one provision of the proposed Area Plan would allow for non-contiguous project areas (e.g., concentrating land coverage allowed on multiple parcels onto a single parcel), which could result in additional visual mass to be placed between major travel routes and Lake Tahoe and potentially block or degrade views of Lake Tahoe. However, that impact was addressed by a mitigation measure that restricts the placement of additional visual mass between the major highway and lake. This mitigation measure was incorporated into the existing TBAP, resulting in less than significant impacts to scenic quality.

Several proposed new or amended TBAP policies could affect scenic resources. Proposed policy amendments would clarify existing scenic requirements, and a new Policy SR-P-10 would support the reevaluation of scenic requirements to promote environmentally beneficial redevelopment of Town Centers. New policies CD-P-14, 15, 16, and 17 would support small public spaces and public art installations. These policy changes would not result in direct adverse changes to scenic resources. The new Policy SR-P-10 would promote a reevaluation of scenic requirements, but not alter any existing scenic requirements. If future changes to scenic requirements are proposed, they would be evaluated at the time the change is proposed and could only be approved if the change was demonstrated to support attainment and maintenance of TRPA Scenic Thresholds. New policies CD-14, 15, 16, and 17 could result in additional public art that highlights North Tahoe's character, landscape, and history. In general, additional public art that reflects the character of the region would be expected to add visual interest and enhance community character because the public art would be specifically designed to enhance the community character.

The proposed Area Plan amendments also include several revisions to implementing regulations that could affect scenic quality. These changes include:

- ▶ requiring design review for tourist accommodation projects and exempting multi-family projects with fewer than 15 units outside of TRPA scenic corridors from design review;
- ▶ Increasing maximum building length to 75 feet in the Kins Beach and Tahoe City Town Centers;
- ▶ promoting public art;
- ▶ removing or reducing minimum lot size requirements, clarifying that front setbacks along roadways proposed for streetscape improvements, and adding street-side setbacks in residential districts;
- ▶ waiving the requirement for a minor use permit for residential projects in specific zoning districts if all of the units are deed restricted as affordable, moderate or achievable housing;
- ▶ removing interior yard setback requirements for some mixed-use projects in Town Centers;
- ▶ allowing the placement of tiny homes as primary or accessory dwellings while maintaining overall caps on residential units;
- ▶ deferring to TRPA sign standards; and
- ▶ improving consistency and clarity regarding frontage improvements.

Taken together, these changes could have nominal effects on the appearance of the built environment. The changes could result in slightly more compact development within Town Centers, due to incentives for affordable housing, changes to setbacks, and allowances for tiny homes, as well as additional public art and streetscape improvements. All new buildings would need to comply with TRPA's scenic requirements and design standards. Redevelopment consistent with these standards has consistently been shown to improve Scenic Threshold scores (TRPA n.d.). Because the overall growth potential would not be changed, any increase in development in Town Centers (for example due to affordable housing incentives), would be offset with a corresponding decrease in development potential elsewhere. Most of the existing design standards would continue to apply, which have been demonstrated to result in improved scenic quality and community character as older, non-conforming development is replaced with new buildings consistent with current standards (TRPA n.d.). Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that redevelopment under the TBAP, as amended, would continue to result in incremental improvements in scenic quality and a built environment that is consistent with the community character.

Furthermore, future projects within the plan area would be evaluated for effects on scenic quality, including effects on roadway scenic thresholds and consistency with design standards, at the time a project is proposed. Only projects that would not degrade scenic thresholds and are consistent with design standards would be approved. For these reasons, the proposed Area Plan amendments would result in a less-than-significant impact.

b) Be visible from any public recreation area or TRPA designated bicycle trail?

Less than significant. See discussion in Section 3.18.2(a), above. Future projects within the plan area could be visible from public recreation facilities or TRPA designated bicycle trails. However, for the same reasons described above, they would not result in significant impacts to scenic resources.

c) Block or modify an existing view of Lake Tahoe or other scenic vista seen from a public road or other public area?

Less than significant. The plan area composes a portion of the scenic vistas visible from SR 89 and SR 28. The project area also comprises of scenic vistas visible from numerous recreation areas and public gathering places. See discussion in Section 3.18.2(a), above. For the same reasons described above, future projects within the plan area would not block or modify an existing view of Lake Tahoe or another scenic vista as seen from a public area.

d) Be inconsistent with the height and design standards required by the applicable ordinance or Community Plan?

Less than Significant. The 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS evaluated the effects of the proposed TBAP on community character, including applicable height and density standards (Placer County and TRPA 2016: 9-41 through 9-47). This analysis found that standards for site design, building form, and street frontage improvements would create visual interest and promote pedestrian activity within mixed-use areas. The 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS determined that the TBAP would be consistent with applicable TRPA height and design standards, design review guidelines, and the Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP), resulting in a less than significant impact. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter height standards, and changes to design standards would be limited to modifications to setbacks and lot sizes, as well as design review procedures for certain projects. These changes could result in slightly more compact development than could otherwise occur. However, these changes would only apply within Town Centers. Because Town Centers correspond to the areas that are most intensively developed under existing conditions, slightly more compact development would generally be consistent with the existing character of the developed Town Centers. There are very few undeveloped parcels within Town Centers. Thus, changes in Town Centers would be the result of redevelopment, which would often replace structures developed before current design standards were in place with new structures that comply with current standards, which has been demonstrated to improve scenic conditions in the Tahoe Region. For these reasons, the impact would be less than significant.

e) Be inconsistent with the TRPA Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) or Design Review Guidelines?

No impact. See discussion in Section 3.18.2(a), above. As described above, the proposed amended Area Plan would continue to include goals, policies, and implementation actions that are consistent with and would implement the SQIP.

3.19 RECREATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
XIX. Recreation.				
Does the proposal:				
a) Create additional demand for recreation facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create additional recreation capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have the potential to create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.19.1 Environmental Setting

Extensive outdoor recreation opportunities exist throughout the plan area. TCPUD and NTPUD manage recreation facilities throughout the plan area, including beaches, day-use areas, lakeside parks, hiking trails, and boat launch facilities. Other agencies who contribute to the development and management of recreational facilities within the plan area include the USFS, California State Lands Commission, California Department of Parks and Recreation, Tahoe Transportation Department, California Department of Transportation, Tahoe Area Mountain Biking Association, Tahoe Rim Trail Association, Tahoe Fund, and Placer County.

Outdoor activities, such as snow and water sports, beach activities, golfing, hiking, walking, and bicycling are all common in the plan area. The upper elevations of the planning area, located mostly on National Forest land, are accessible to the public on a non-fee basis for activities such as hiking and cross-country skiing.

The existing and planned recreation resources within the plan area include day use beaches, day use areas, community and sports recreation parks, community centers, golf courses, campgrounds, and open space areas that tend to be used for passive recreation. The plan area also contains a number of existing and proposed bike and pedestrian trails, including an extensive network of hiking trails. The plan area contains an almost continuous network of multi-use trails that connects areas near Sugar Pine Point State Park, south of Placer County, to Incline Village, east of Placer County.

TRPA has adopted two Recreation Thresholds as policy statements (i.e., qualitative standards). These thresholds address: 1) the quality of recreational experiences and access to recreational opportunities, and 2) the fair share distribution of recreation capacity. As of the 2019 Threshold Evaluation Report, both Recreation Threshold Standards were in attainment (TRPA 2019b).

3.19.2 Discussion

a) Create additional demand for recreation facilities?

Less than significant. The existing Area Plan implements Regional Plan strategies to restore sensitive lands and concentrate redevelopment within walkable and bikeable Town Centers. The proposed Area Plan amendments would continue these strategies with modifications to further promote redevelopment and affordable housing in Town Centers. As with existing conditions, some level of new growth could occur within the plan area. Any future growth would result in additional demand for recreation facilities. Although the proposed Area Plan amendments would modestly increase the pace of construction within the plan area, they would not increase the potential for growth in the plan area beyond that which could already occur under the existing Area Plan. Because potential future growth in the plan area is limited, the demand for recreation facilities would not substantially increase. However, the travel

mode used to access recreation sites and the location of recreation demand may shift somewhat (i.e., an potential increase in transit, bike, and pedestrian access to recreation near Town Centers).

The existing Area Plan includes an overall strategy to support high-quality recreation opportunities. The existing Area Plan *"seeks to enhance recreation opportunities, support Lake Tahoe as a four-season international destination and ensure that recreation facilities do not adversely impact environmental thresholds or disturb important habitats."* The Area Plan also specifies that *"outdoor recreational uses should be developed based on demand and be consistent with the environmental constraints and threshold standards"* (TBAP pg. 140). Thus, the current Area Plan seeks to provide additional recreation capacity consistent with increases in demand. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not affect these goals.

The existing Area Plan includes policies that provide additional recreation capacity consistent with demand. These include the following:

- ▶ Policy R-P-1: Continue to manage recreation facilities and uses in accordance with the Regional Plan.
- ▶ Policy R-P-2: Continue to enhance recreation facilities through coordinated interagency planning and funding programs.
- ▶ Policy R-P-3: Ensure that recreational opportunities are available and accessible to visitors of all income levels.
- ▶ Policy R-P-4: Support the funding, construction, and maintenance of the multi-use bike trails identified in the Plan area.
- ▶ Policy R-P-6: Protect and support existing public beach access as well as secure additional public access rights as opportunities arise.
- ▶ Policy R-P-7: Utilize all appropriate opportunities (land acquisition, obtaining easement rights, etc.) to increase opportunities for public access to the shoreline of Lake Tahoe.
- ▶ Policy R-P-8: Coordinate with State Parks and the California Tahoe Conservancy on management, operations, and maintenance of beaches within the plan area.
- ▶ Policy R-P-9: Enhance winter recreational opportunities and improve access for cross country and back country skiers.
- ▶ Policy R-P-11: Continue to protect and support the Public Trust as it relates to the shores of and access to Lake Tahoe, including various undeveloped public right-of-ways/easements for lake access.

The proposed Area Plan amendments would not add to, change or amend any of these policies.

The proposed Area Plan amendments do not authorize or approve any development, redevelopment, or recreation facility projects. Nor would they make any changes to the existing TRPA system of PAOTs, which regulates capacity for certain recreation facilities. As with existing conditions, future projects within the plan area would be reviewed through a project-level environmental review (TRPA Code Chapter 3), which would assess whether the project would increase demand for recreation facilities and/or provide additional recreational capacity. If applicable, mitigation measures would be required to address significant project-level effects on recreation demand or capacity.

As described above, the future demand for recreation facilities would not substantially change with adoption of the proposed Area Plan amendments and the existing Area Plan already includes appropriate strategies to provide additional recreation capacity consistent with demand. The proposed Area Plan amendments do not approve any projects that would affect recreation demand or capacity and all future projects would be assessed for their impacts on recreation. For these reasons, the proposed Area Plan amendments would not have a significant impact on demand for recreation facilities.

b) Create additional recreation capacity?

Less than significant. See the discussion in Section 3.19.2(a), above, which describes how the existing Area Plan balances recreation demand and capacity. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not affect this process. Therefore, for the same reasons described above, the proposed Area Plan amendments would have a less-than-significant impact on recreation capacity.

c) Have the potential to create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed?

Less than significant. The proposed Area Plan amendments do not approve changes to existing recreation facilities, which could create conflicts between existing recreation uses. The existing Area Plan is consistent with applicable plans that guide existing and proposed recreation uses in the plan area including the Sustainable Recreation Plan for the Tahoe Region, the NTPUD Parks Master Plan, the Truckee River Corridor Access Plan, and the Active Transportation Plan. It also provides policy direction to coordinate with federal and state agencies and TRPA to ensure that management plans for public lands consider the effects on residents of the plan area and the quality of recreation activities. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not affect any of these elements.

Furthermore, all future projects within the plan area would be evaluated through a project-level environmental review (TRPA Code Chapter 3), which would evaluate the potential for specific future projects to create conflicts between existing or planned recreation uses. If necessary, the project-level environmental review would identify mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential conflicts.

For the reasons described above, the proposed Area Plan amendments would not create conflicts between existing or proposed recreation uses.

d) Result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway, or public lands?

Less than significant. See discussion in Sections 3.19.2(a) and (c), above. The proposed Area Plan amendments would not rezone public lands or change any existing requirements for public access to any lake, waterway, or public lands. The existing Area Plan also includes policies to protect and improve access to Lake Tahoe and public lands including the following:

- ▶ Policy R-P-4: Support the funding, construction, and maintenance of the multi-use bike trails identified in the Plan area.
- ▶ Policy R-P-6: Protect and support existing public beach access as well as secure additional public access rights as opportunities arise.
- ▶ Policy R-P-7: Utilize all appropriate opportunities (land acquisition, obtaining easement rights, etc.) to increase opportunities for public access to the shoreline of Lake Tahoe.
- ▶ Policy R-P-8: Coordinate with State Parks and the California Tahoe Conservancy on management, operations, and maintenance of beaches within the Plan area.
- ▶ Policy R-P-11: Continue to protect and support the Public Trust as it relates to the shores of and access to Lake Tahoe, including various undeveloped public right-of-ways/easements for lake access.

The proposed Area Plan amendments would not change these policies.

For the reasons described above and in Sections 3.19.2(a) and (c), the proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway, or public land.

3.20 ARCHAEOLOGICAL/HISTORICAL

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
XX. Archaeological/Historical.				
Would the project:				
a) Will the proposal result in an alteration of or adverse physical or aesthetic effect to a significant archaeological or historical site, structure, object or building?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Is the property associated with any historically significant events and/or sites or persons?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.20.1 Environmental Setting

History of the Plan Area

The plan area falls within the center of Washoe homeland. Lake Tahoe was both the spiritual and physical center of the Washoe world. The ethnographic record suggests that during the mild season, small groups traveled through high mountain valleys of the Tahoe Region collecting resources including edible and medicinal roots, seeds and marsh plants. In the higher elevations, men hunted large game and trapped smaller mammals. Lake Tahoe and its tributaries were important fisheries year-round. Suitable toolstone was quarried at various locales. The Washoe have a tradition of making long treks across the Sierran passes for the purpose of hunting, trading, and gathering acorns. While some Washoe trekked to distant places for desired resources, most groups circulated in the vicinity of their traditional habitation sites.

By the 1850s Euroamericans had permanently occupied the Washoe territory and changed traditional lifeways. Mining, lumbering, grazing, commercial fishing, tourism, and the growth of settlements disrupted traditional Indian relationships to the land. As hunting and gathering wild foods were no longer possible, the Washoe were forced into dependency upon the Euroamerican settlers. Beginning in 1917, however, the Washoe Tribe began acquiring back a small part of their traditional lands. The Washoe Tribe of California and Nevada remain as a recognized tribe by the U.S. government and have maintained an established land base. Its approximate 1,200 tribal members are governed by a tribal council that consists of members of the Carson, Dresslerville, Woodfords, and Reno-Sparks Indian colonies, as well as members from non-reservation areas.

The Washoe have not been completely displaced from their traditional lands. The contemporary Washoe have developed a Comprehensive Land Use Plan that includes goals of reestablishing a presence within the Tahoe Sierra and re-vitalizing Washoe cultural knowledge, including the harvest and care of traditional plant resources and the protection of traditional properties within the cultural landscape (TRPA 2012a.)

In 1844, John C. Frémont and his companion Charles Preuss recorded the first sighting of Lake Tahoe by a Euro-American. Later that same year, members of the westward-bound Stevens-Murphy-Townsend party were likely the first Euro-Americans to venture onto the shore of the lake. The California gold rush centered mainly in the Sierra Nevada foothills, and the subsequent Comstock Lode silver rush that occurred a decade later in Nevada, drew thousands of miners and entrepreneurs through the Tahoe Sierra on their way to the mining locales. During this period, the lake was known by various names, including Mountain Lake and Lake Bigler. It was officially designated Lake Tahoe in 1945. The proximity of the Tahoe Basin to the Mother Lode in California and the Comstock Lode in Nevada promoted related development in lumbering, grazing, transportation, market hunting and fishing, tourism, and urban development in the region to provide materials to meet the demand of those areas. In the early 1900s the plan area served as a recreational destination with several small resorts, which increased in size over time. The 1960 Olympics created a development boom in the Tahoe Region.

Historic Resources

There are at least 25 TRPA-designated historic or eligible historic resources within the plan area (see Figure 2.13, Historic Resources, of the existing Area Plan). Four of these properties are listed on the National Register of Historic Places: Lake Tahoe Dam, Outlet Gates and Gatekeepers Cabin, Watson Log Cabin, and the Chapel of the Transfiguration (NPS 2023).

3.20.2 Discussion

a) Will the proposal result in an alteration of or adverse physical or aesthetic effect to a significant archaeological or historical site, structure, object or building?

Less than significant. This potential effect is the same as those analyzed in both the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, and therefore this analysis tiers from and is consistent with the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS. The 2012 RPU EIS evaluated the effects on historic resources from build-out of the entire Tahoe Region, including the plan area, consistent with the Regional Plan in Impact 3.15-1 on pages 3.15-13 through 3.15-15 (TRPA 2012a). This analysis determined that future projects could occur on properties that contain known historical resources, be associated with historically significant events or individuals, or result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a significant historical site, structure, object, or building. The 2016 EIR/EIS arrived at the same conclusion. However, federal and state, regulations and TRPA Code are in place to address protection of these resources.

The applicable TRPA protections include TRPA Code Section 33.3.7, requires cessation of grading and consultation with government agencies whenever historical, pre-historical, or paleontological materials appearing to be 50 years or older are discovered during grading activity. TRPA Code Chapter 67 includes standards which require evaluation by a qualified archaeologist of any potential archaeological, cultural, or historical resources discovered during project construction (TRPA Code Section 67.3.1). TRPA also requires that projects in areas with known or newly discovered sites of cultural or historic significance include a site survey (performed by a qualified archaeologist) before TRPA approval (TRPA Code Section 67.3.2). This standard also requires consultation with the Washoe Tribe on all site surveys to determine if tribally significant sites are present. If resources are discovered and deemed significant, then a resource protection plan is required. Such a plan shall be prepared by a qualified professional and may provide for surface or subsurface recovery of data and artifacts and recordation of structural and other data (Code Section 67.3.3). Additionally, grading, operation of equipment, or other soil disturbance is prohibited in areas where a designated historic resource is present, or could be damaged, except in accordance with a TRPA-approved resource protection plan (TRPA Code Section 67.3.4). Finally, upon discovery of a previously unknown site, object, district, structure or other resource, potentially meeting criteria designating it as a historic resource (as outlined in TRPA Code Section 67.6) TRPA shall consult with the applicable state historic preservation officer (SHPO), and with the Washoe Tribe if it is a Washoe site. In addition, the Washoe Tribe is a permanent member of the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC), where a Washoe Tribe representative has the opportunity to review all projects that come before the APC. These protections would continue to apply under the proposed Area Plan amendments.

The proposed Area Plan amendments would also not alter existing state and federal protections for historic or cultural resources. The California SHPO reviews projects for potential impacts to historic properties. The California

SHPO keeps an inventory of the state's cultural resources to assist federal, state, and local agencies in planning projects so as to avoid impacts to important cultural resources; the agency also acts as a clearinghouse for nominations of sites and features to the NRHP. Additionally, the California SHPO plays an advisory role to TRPA during project review of structures 50 years old or older. At the federal level, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act guides cultural resources investigations by federal agencies and requires considerations of effects on properties that are listed in, or may be eligible for listing in, the NRHP. USFS, a primary landowner within the plan area, adheres to the NHPA in managing the public land under its jurisdiction. The USDA Forest Service consults with the Washoe Tribe, TRPA, and the California SHPO, as appropriate. Additionally, the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit Forest Plan provides guidelines for historic and archaeological resource protection.

Additionally, the existing Area Plan includes policies for the protection of historic and cultural resources as follows:

GOAL C3: Provide for the preservation of cultural and historic resources in public and private development projects.

- ▶ Policy C-P-1: Encourage reuse and incorporate buildings or structures that are determined to be of historic significance into site plans.
- ▶ Policy C-P-2: Evaluate cultural and/or historic resources when evaluating project activities with the goal of avoiding impacts to such resources.
- ▶ Policy C-P-3: All TRPA policies, ordinances and programs related to cultural resources will remain in effect.

All future projects within the plan area would be evaluated through a project-level environmental review (TRPA Code Chapter 3) and, where applicable, CEQA, which would evaluate the potential for specific future projects to degrade historic, archeological, or cultural resources. If necessary, the project-level environmental review would identify mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential conflicts.

For the reasons described above, the proposed Area Plan amendments are consistent with the analysis in both the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 TBAP EIR/EIS, which both determined that impacts on historic resources would be less than significant.

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?

Less than significant. See discussion in Section 3.20.2(a), above. For the same reasons described above, this impact would be less than significant.

c) Is the property associated with any historically significant events and/or sites or persons?

Less than significant. See discussion in Section 3.20.2(a), above. For the same reasons described above, this impact would be less than significant.

d) Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?

Less than significant. See discussion in Section 3.20.2(a), above. For the same reasons described above, this impact would be less than significant.

e) Will the proposal restrict historic or pre-historic religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

Less than significant. See discussion in Section 3.20.2(a), above. For the same reasons described above, this impact would be less than significant.

3.21 FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES		Yes	No, With Mitigation	No	Data Insufficient
XXI.	Findings of Significance.				
a)	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human being, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.21.1 Discussion

- a) **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?**

Less than significant. See the discussion in Sections 3.1 through 3.20, above, including the discussions related to vegetation, wildlife, and historic resources in sections 3.4, 3.5, and 3.20, respectively. For the reasons described in those sections, this impact would be less than significant.

- b) **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.)**

Less than significant. This potential effect is the same as those analyzed in the 2012 RPU EIS, and therefore this analysis tiers from and is consistent with the 2012 RPU EIS. The 2012 RPU EIS evaluated the relationship between

short-term uses of the environment and the maintenance of long-term productivity on pages 5-3 through 5-5 (TRPA 2012a). This analysis found that the long-term implementation of the Regional Plan would result in future development and population growth that would have associated impacts to biological resources; traffic and circulation; air quality and climate change; noise; water quality; and public services and utilities. However, through redevelopment in urban areas and transfer of coverage and development rights from sensitive lands, the Regional Plan would refine the land use pattern of the Region in a manner intended to sustain natural resources and support social and economic health. Because the proposed Area Plan would implement the Regional Plan and would not increase the potential for future growth beyond the levels anticipated in the Regional Plan, the proposed Area Plan would be consistent with the analysis on pages 5-3 through 5-5 of the 2012 RPU EIS (TRPA 2012a).

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?)

Less than significant. This potential effect is the same as those analyzed in the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 Area Plan EIR/EIS, and therefore this analysis tiers from and is consistent with the 2012 RPU EIS. The 2012 RPU EIS evaluated the cumulative impacts of long-term implementation of the Regional Plan on pages 4-1 through 4-36 (TRPA 2012a). Because the proposed Area Plan would implement the Regional Plan and would not increase the potential for future growth beyond the levels anticipated in the Regional Plan, the proposed Area Plan would be consistent with the cumulative analysis in the 2012 RPU EIS and 2016 Area Plan EIR/EIS, as described below.

Cumulative Analysis in the 2016 Area Plan EIR/EIS

The Area Plan EIR/EIS analyzes the cumulative impacts of implementation of the TBAP in Chapter 19, "Cumulative Impacts", which provides a comprehensive cumulative impact assessment by using a combination of the plan and list methods identified in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130. The Area Plan EIR/EIS incorporates the cumulative analysis from the 2012 Regional Plan Update Environmental Impact Statement (RPU EIS) and the Regional Transportation Plan: Mobility 2035 and Sustainable Communities Strategy EIR/EIS (RTP/SCS EIR/EIS). The Regional Plan establishes policies, regulations, programs, and growth limits that apply to the entire Tahoe Region, including the TBAP plan area. The RPU EIS cumulative analysis evaluated the effects of total build-out of the Tahoe Region, including the TBAP plan area. Because the TBAP must be consistent with the Regional Plan, including the growth limits established in the Regional Plan, the RPU EIS cumulative analysis provided a cumulative analysis of full build-out of the TBAP. The Area Plan EIR/EIS cumulative analysis supplemented the RPU EIS cumulative analysis by evaluating complete build-out of the Tahoe Region in combination with build-out of reasonably foreseeable land use plans and projects within the Tahoe Basin and in surrounding areas outside of the Tahoe Basin (see Table 19-2, Cumulative Project List in the Area Plan EIR). This analysis found that implementation of the TBAP would make a considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to roadway level of service and impacts on local residential streets, and feasible mitigation measures were included. The Area Plan EIR/EIS found that implementation of the TBAP would not make a considerable contribution to other significant cumulative impacts. The Final Area Plan EIR/EIS also includes additional cumulative analysis of Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) in response to public comments (see Final Area Plan EIR/EIS Master Response 1 – VMT and LOS on pages 3.1-1 through 3.1-22). This analysis explicitly considers VMT within the plan area generated by full build-out of the Tahoe Region in combination with full build-out of reasonably foreseeable plans and projects within the Tahoe Basin and in nearby areas outside of the Tahoe Basin.

Changes to Cumulative Conditions in the Tahoe Region

Since the Area Plan EIR/EIS was adopted in 2016, some projects identified in the Area Plan EIR/EIS cumulative analysis have been implemented, others have been withdrawn, and new projects have been proposed. The changes in cumulative projects in the vicinity of the plan area since 2016 are described in the Village at Palisades Tahoe Specific Plan Partially Revised EIR in Table 18-2 (Village at Palisades REIR) (Placer County 2022). That analysis identified an additional 297 residential units and an additional 238 tourist accommodation units associated with proposed projects in the Tahoe Region that were not known in 2016, when the Area Plan EIR/EIS was certified. The units are associated with

the following newly proposed or modified projects: Tahoe Cedars Subdivision, Boatworks at Tahoe, 39 Degrees North, and Dollar Creek Crossing.

All projects within the Tahoe Region must comply with the policies and standards in the Regional Plan, and all projects within the plan area must also comply with the policies and regulations in the TBAP. Furthermore, the total capacity for development of residential, tourist accommodation, and commercial uses in the Tahoe Region is limited by the growth control system in the Regional Plan. Because the RPU EIS and Area Plan EIR/EIS already analyzed the cumulative effects of complete build-out of the Tahoe Region and TBAP plan area consistent with the policies and regulations in both the Regional Plan and TBAP, and because the proposed Area Plan amendments would not alter the growth limits or other assumptions incorporated into these cumulative analyses; the existing analysis in the Area Plan EIR/EIS already accounts for the cumulative effect of these projects (i.e., Tahoe Cedars Subdivision, Boatworks at Tahoe, 39 Degrees North, and Dollar Creek Crossing) even though the specific projects were not identified in the Area Plan EIR/EIS. For this reason, there are not changed conditions within the Tahoe Region that would cause the proposed Area Plan amendments to result in a new or more severe contribution to a significant cumulative impact than was previously disclosed in the Area Plan EIR/EIS.

Changes to Cumulative Conditions Outside the Tahoe Region

In surrounding areas outside of the Tahoe Region, the Village at Palisades REIR identified no net increase in the number of tourist accommodation rooms (e.g., hotel rooms) and an increase of 55 dwelling units (DU) that were not identified in 2016. Notably, the 2016 Area Plan EIR/EIS evaluated the cumulative effects of the Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan, which proposed 760 DUs and approximately 7 acres of commercial development off of SR 267 between the Town of Truckee and Brockway Summit. Since adoption of the Area Plan EIR/EIS, this project has been litigated and the project approvals have been invalidated by the court. Placer County has not received a new application for the project since the approvals were invalidated, and this cumulative project may not occur.

Other changes in surrounding areas outside of the Tahoe Region include the County-initiated housing needs rezone program. Because the Placer County General Plan Housing Element did not identify sufficient sites to accommodate the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) across all income levels, state law requires the County to implement a rezone program to allow higher density residential development. This program is considering the possible rezone of two candidate sites in proximity to the plan area: APN 095-050-042 a 1.7-acre parcel near the intersection of SR 89 and Alpine Meadows Road currently zoned as C1-Ds, and 3.9 acres on two adjacent parcels (APNs 080-020-014 and 080-020-013) near the intersection of SR 89 and West River Street, currently zoned RM-Ds. The existing zoning on all of these parcels would allow for up to 21 DU per acre. The proposed rezone would allow for up to 30 DU per acres or an increase of 9 DU per acre. If all three parcels are rezoned, it could result in an increase of up to approximately 50 additional DUs outside of the TBAP plan area that were not considered in the Area Plan EIR cumulative analysis.

Taken together, these changes are expected to result in 655 fewer DUs and 7 acres less commercial area in areas outside of the Tahoe Region than were evaluated in the Area Plan EIR/EIS. Thus, the Area Plan EIR provides a conservative analysis of the cumulative effects of future development in areas outside of plan area, and the cumulative effects of the proposed Area Plan amendments would be less than those disclosed in the Area Plan EIR/EIS. For the reasons described above, changes in the list of cumulative projects do not constitute significant new information and the proposed Area Plan amendments would not result in a new or more severe contribution to cumulative impact than was evaluated in the Area Plan EIR/EIS.

d) Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human being, either directly or indirectly?

Less than significant. See the discussion in Sections 3.1 through 3.20, above, including the discussions related to risk of upset and human health in sections 3.10 and 3.17, respectively. For the reasons described in those sections, this impact would be less than significant.

This page intentionally left blank.

4 REFERENCES

ARB. See California Air Resources Board.

California Air Resources Board. 2022. 2022 Scoping Plan Updates. Available: ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-12/2022-sp_1.pdf. Accessed July 26, 2023

HUD. See U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

National Park Service. 2023. National Register Database and Research. Available <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/database-research.htm#table> . Accessed July 26, 2023.

NDEP. See Nevada Division of Environmental Protection.

North Tahoe Fire Protection District. n.d. *Emergency Preparedness and Evacuation Guide*. Available: ntfire.net/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/NUBIZ-1004-NTFPD-Emergency-Prepared-Brochure.pdf. Accessed April 10, 2023.

NPS. See National Park Service.

NTFPD. See North Tahoe Fire Protection District.

NTPUD. See North Tahoe Public Utility District

Placer County. 2017 (January). Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Implementing Regulations. As amended. Available: <https://www.placer.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/55342/Tahoe-Basin-Area-Plan-Implementing-Regulations-Feb-2021>

———. 2021 (June). Placer County 2021 Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Update. Available: <https://www.placer.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/58056/Placer-County-LHMP-Update-Complete>. Accessed April 10, 2023.

———. n.d. Placer County Libraries. Available: www.placer.ca.gov/2093/Library. Accessed April 10, 2023.

Placer County and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. 2016 (June). Placer County and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge Project Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement. State Clearing House No. 2014072039. Auburn, CA. Prepared by Ascent Environmental, Inc. Stateline, NV. Available: www.placer.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/52376/Tahoe-Basin-Area-Plan-Draft-EIR. Accessed April 10, 2023.

Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District. 2023. What we do page. Available: placermosquito.org/what-we-do/#ivm. Accessed May 1, 2023.

PMVCD. See Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District.

TCPUD. See Tahoe City Public Utilities District.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. 1989. *Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin Design Review Guidelines*. Stateline, NV. Adopted September 27, 1989

———. 2012a (April). Regional Plan Update Environmental Impact Statement. State Clearinghouse No. 2007092027. Stateline, NV. Prepared by Ascent Environmental, Inc., Stateline, NV. Available: <http://www.trpa.org/regional-plan/goals-policies/>. Accessed January 23, 2020.

———. 2012b (October). Regional Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Statement. State Clearinghouse No. 2007092027. Stateline, NV. Prepared by Ascent Environmental, Inc., Stateline, NV. Available: <http://www.trpa.org/regional-plan/goals-policies/>. Accessed January 23, 2020.

———. 2012c. Best Management Practices Handbook. Available: www.tahoebmp.org/Documents/2012%20BMP%20Handbook.pdf. Accessed May 1, 2023.

- . 2019a. Average Secchi Disk Transparency 2019 Evaluation Threshold. Available: thresholds.laketahoeinfo.org/Indicator/ThresholdEvaluationDetail/454. Accessed May 1, 2023.
- . 2019b. Recreation 2019 Evaluation Threshold. Available: thresholds.laketahoeinfo.org/ThresholdCategory/Detail/Recreation. Accessed May 1, 2023.
- . 2021. Threshold Standards and Regional Plan. Adopted 1987, updated 2012, amended 2021. Stateline, NV.
- . 2023. EIP Project Tracker; Action Priorities. Available: eip.laketahoeinfo.org/EIPActionPriority/Index. Accessed May 8, 2023.
- . n.d. *2019 Scenic Threshold Monitoring Data*. Stateline, NV.
- TRPA. See Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.
- TTSD. See Tahoe Truckee Sierra Disposal.
- State Water Resources Control Board. 2023. GeoTracker. Available: geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?global_id=SL0600713863. Accessed May 1, 2023.
- SWRCB. See State Water Resources Control Board.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2023. Consolidated Planning/CHAS Data. Available: www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/cp.html#2006-2016_query. Accessed July 26, 2023.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2020. Lake Tahoe CCD Profile. Available: data.census.gov/profile/Lake_Tahoe_CCD,_Placer_County,_California. Accessed July 26, 2023.
- Zillow. 2023. Zestimates Placer County Tahoe Basin Area. Available: https://www.zillow.com/homes/for_sale/?searchQueryState. Accessed July 26, 2023.

This page intentionally left blank.

5 REPORT PREPARERS

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Jacob Stock, AICP	Senior Planner
Michelle Glickert.....	Principal Transportation Planner
Tiffany Good.....	Permitting Program Manager
Shay Navarro.....	Watersheds and Water Quality Program Manager
Devin Middlebrook	Government Affairs Manager
Jannifer Self.....	Principal Planner

Placer County

Emily Setzer	Principal Planner
Stacy Wydra.....	Principal Planner

Ascent Environmental, Inc.

Sydney Coatsworth, AICP	Principal
Adam Lewandowski, AICP	Project Manager
Jessica Mitchell	Environmental Planner
Zachary Miller, AICP.....	Transportation Planner
Tiffany Lunday.....	Environmental Planner
Eric Cohen	Environmental Planner
Molly Nagle.....	Environmental Planner
Brian Perry.....	Graphics Specialist
Lisa Merry	GIS Analyst
Gayiety Lane	Publishing Specialist
Riley Smith.....	Publishing Specialist

This page intentionally left blank.