

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

The USDA Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU or USDA Forest Service), Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), and Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (Lahontan RWQCB) have prepared this joint environmental document for the proposed Meeks Bay Restoration Project (project). The joint document consists of an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S. Code [USC] Section 4321-4347), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations Implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulation [CFR] Section 1500-1508), and USDA Forest Service NEPA Regulations (36 CFR Part 220); an environmental impact statement (EIS) for TRPA pursuant to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (Public Law 96-551) and 1980 revision (Compact), Code of Ordinances, and Rules of Procedure; and an environmental impact report (EIR) for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 15000 et seq.). This EIS/EIS/EIR evaluates the environmental consequences of implementing the project. USDA Forest Service, TRPA, and Lahontan RWQCB are the lead agencies.

ES.2 BACKGROUND

The proposed Meeks Bay Restoration Project area (project area) includes approximately 74 acres of National Forest System lands along the shore of Lake Tahoe, which historically included a stream channel, wetland, lagoon, and barrier beach. Historic development along Meeks Bay, including construction of Meeks Bay Marina, displaced wetland and lagoon habitat, modified the stream channel, created conditions conducive to aquatic invasive species (AIS), and accelerated sediment delivery into Lake Tahoe. The LTBMU acquired the project area in 1974 and manages it through concession agreements. The project area has heavy summer recreation activity, including camping, boating, and beach use. The site is within the homeland of the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, which manages the Meeks Bay Resort and is participating in the restoration of Meeks Meadow upstream of the project area. Management actions are necessary to protect resources and move the project area toward desired conditions while continuing to support sustainable recreation opportunities.

The USDA Forest Service, TRPA, and Lahontan RWQCB released a scoping notice for the project in September 2018. During the scoping period, the LTBMU received over 100 comments on the project, the majority of which were supportive of restoration but opposed to a new pier or boat ramp at Meeks Bay. Others questioned the need to remove the existing marina to achieve restoration objectives. Based on feedback received during the scoping period, the lead agencies initiated a stakeholder planning process to address issues and concerns. The lead agencies brought in a neutral, third-party facilitator to interview stakeholders and invited stakeholder representatives to participate in a Stakeholder Forum. Participants included representatives from the Washoe Tribe, Friends of the West Shore, Lake Tahoe Marina Association, Tahoe Lakefront Owners Association, Meeks Bay Yacht Club, League to Save Lake Tahoe, Lake Tahoe Water Trail, and the Meeks Bay Fire District. The lead agencies hosted five stakeholder forum meetings and two public workshops to understand concerns, get input on project alternatives and design features, and compile the best available information for the environmental analysis.

This EIS/EIS/EIR evaluates the environmental effects of five alternatives (including the No Action Alternative) that were developed through the stakeholder planning process, consistent with NEPA, Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, TRPA Code of Ordinances, TRPA Rules of Procedure, and State CEQA Guidelines. Alternative 4 reflects the “proposed action” for purposes of NEPA and the “project” for purposes of CEQA and TRPA. It involves removal of Meeks Bay Marina; restoration of Meeks Creek and associated wetland/lagoon habitat; eradication of AIS; reconfiguration or construction of pedestrian and vehicle circulation and parking areas, and reconfiguration of the campgrounds; installation of utility infrastructure and best management practices (BMPs), shoreline stabilization, habitat enhancement, and resource protection features; and other associated improvements.

ES.3 PURPOSE, NEED, AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the project is to move the Meeks Creek stream channel and wetland/lagoon below the State Route (SR) 89 to a more natural condition where geomorphic and hydrologic processes support a functioning ecosystem while continuing to support sustainable recreation opportunities. The proposed action and alternatives include strategies to meet the following needs and project objectives:

- ▶ Improve hydrologic function and processes of Meeks Creek, Meeks lagoon, and associated floodplain.
- ▶ Restore degraded aquatic, riparian, and wetland habitats and barrier beaches to provide high quality habitat that is resilient to a changing climate.
- ▶ Improve fish passage and flood flow conveyance through the SR 89 stream crossing, and control or eradicate current populations of terrestrial and aquatic invasive plant and animal species.
- ▶ Promote the Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, Candidate, and Sensitive species Tahoe yellowcress (*Rorippa subumbellata*) and Lahontan cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki henshawi*).
- ▶ Replace the SR 89 Caltrans bridge to allow for aquatic organism passage and flood flow conveyance.
- ▶ Maintain and enhance access to Lake Tahoe and National Forest System lands.
- ▶ Provide sustainable recreation opportunities consistent with a functioning ecosystem.
- ▶ Enhance educational and interpretive opportunities.
- ▶ Enhance species of value to the Washoe Tribe.

ES.4 PROJECT LOCATION

The Meeks Bay Restoration Project area (project area) is located on the west shore of Lake Tahoe in El Dorado County, California. The project area is approximately 74 acres and extends from approximately 50 feet upstream of SR 89 in the east to the Lake Tahoe shorezone in the west (see Figure 2-1 in Chapter 2, "Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives"). The project area encompasses recreation facilities including Meeks Bay Marina, Meeks Bay Resort, and Meeks Bay Campground.

ES.5 SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

The lead agencies, in collaboration with stakeholders and interested members of the public, developed four action alternatives, which are evaluated along with a no action alternative in this EIS/EIS/EIR. Each of the action alternatives includes different combinations of design features intended to achieve the project purpose, needs, and objectives while minimizing adverse effects. The alternatives listed below are evaluated in this EIS/EIS/EIR. Alternative 4 is the preferred alternative that is proposed for adoption by the lead agencies. It constitutes the "proposed action" for purposes of NEPA, and the "project" that is evaluated pursuant to CEQA and TRPA.

- ▶ Alternative 1 – Restoration with Boating Pier. This alternative includes restoration of the creek and lagoon and installation of a pier to provide motorized boat access. It includes replacement of the SR 89 bridge, relocation of two motel-style cabins, and other changes to facilities while not substantially changing the extent of any existing land uses.
- ▶ Alternative 2 – Restoration with Pedestrian Pier. This alternative includes restoration of the creek and lagoon and installation of a shorter pier to provide pedestrian access. It includes replacement of the SR 89 bridge and changes to upland facilities while not substantially changing the extent of any existing land uses.
- ▶ Alternative 3 – Restoration with No Pier. This alternative includes restoration of the creek and lagoon with no pier. It includes replacement of the SR 89 bridge, non-motorized lake access features, and changes to upland facilities including expanded campgrounds and parking.

- ▶ Alternative 4 – Preferred Alternative. This alternative is proposed for adoption by the lead agencies. It includes full restoration of the creek and lagoon with no pier. It includes replacement of the SR 89 bridge, non-motorized lake access features, and changes to upland facilities including expanded parking and the relocation of two motel-style cabins.
- ▶ No Action Alternative. This alternative reflects future conditions with the current marina, boat launch, and upland recreation facilities and management approaches if the proposed action is not adopted.

ES.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

ES.6.1 Project Impacts

This EIS/EIS/EIR has been prepared to evaluate the physical environmental effects of the proposed Meeks Bay Restoration Project. Table ES-1, presented at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental impacts for the project. The table provides the level of significance of the impact before mitigation, recommended mitigation measures, and the level of significance of the impact after implementation of the mitigation measures.

ES.6.2 Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

As documented throughout Chapter 3 of this Draft EIS/EIS/EIR, after implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, most of the impacts associated with the proposed Meeks Bay Restoration Project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The following impacts are considered significant and unavoidable; that is, no feasible mitigation is available to reduce the project's impacts to a less-than-significant level.

- ▶ Impact 3.1-4: Affect Local Access or Opportunities for Motorized Watercraft is potentially significant and unavoidable for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.
- ▶ Impact 3.2-2: Alter Views of Lake Tahoe from Meeks Bay is significant and unavoidable for Alternative 1.
- ▶ Impact 3.11-1: Short-Term Project-Related Construction Noise Levels is significant and unavoidable for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.

The significant and unavoidable impacts of the project related to Impacts 3.1-4 and 3.2-2 are taken into consideration with tradeoffs resulting from the benefits of the Meeks Creek restoration and removal of the marina. The significant and unavoidable impact related to Impact 3.11-1 is taken into consideration with the tradeoff of reducing overall construction duration associated with construction of the SR 89 bridge.

ES.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Throughout the public scoping period, five stakeholder forum meetings, and two public workshops, numerous comments and concerns were raised. Many of the concerns were addressed through the stakeholder planning process that resulted in the alternatives evaluated in this EIS/EIS/EIR. Key concerns and issues that were raised by multiple individuals and which were not completely resolved through the stakeholder planning process include the following:

- ▶ Opposition to a pier or motorized boating facilities in Meeks Bay due to concerns over traffic, noise, crowding, and user conflicts;
- ▶ Concerns over the loss of moorings and motorized/sailing boat launch opportunities with the removal of the marina; and
- ▶ A desire for improved public safety access with a pier or other structure that provides public safety boat access at Meeks Bay.

The Draft EIS/EIS/EIR evaluates the potential environmental effects (e.g., transportation, noise, crowding, user conflicts) from four alternatives that were developed to provide a range of improvements related to recreation opportunities in the project area. The alternatives provide several options that offset the loss of the marina, boat ramp, and mooring opportunities. As further described under Section 2.12, "Alternatives Considered but Not Evaluated," alternatives were considered that maintained boat access in the project area; however, these alternatives were eliminated due to not achieving the project objectives and potential effects on beach recreation, proximity to residences, and tree removal, scenic, and traffic and circulation impacts.

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.1 Recreation			
Impact 3.1-1: Affect the Quality of Recreational Opportunities	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.1-2: Create Recreational User Conflicts	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.1-3: Affect Regional Access or Opportunities for Motorized Watercraft	Alt. 1-4 = PS NAA = NI	Mitigation Measure 3.1-3: Maintain Capacity for Public Moorings <i>This mitigation measure will apply to Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.</i>	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.1-4: Affect Local Access or Opportunities for Motorized Watercraft	Alt. 1-4 = PS NAA = NI	Mitigation Measure 3.1-4: Maintain Capacity for Public Moorings <i>This mitigation measure will apply to Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.</i>	Alt. 1-4 = PSU NAA = NI
Impact 3.1-5: Affect Recreational User Access to Lake Tahoe and the Project Area	Alt. 1-4 = B NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alt. 1-4 = B NAA = NI
3.2 Scenic Resources			
Impact 3.2-1: Substantially Degrade Views of Meeks Bay from Lake Tahoe	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.2-2: Alter Views of Lake Tahoe from the Project Area	Alt. 1 = S Alt. 2-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for Alternatives 2, 3, and 4. There is no additional feasible mitigation that would reduce the impact of the proposed pier in Alternative 1, while still achieving the intent of Alternative 1.	Alt. 1 = SU Alt. 2-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.2-3: Substantially Degrade Views from SR 89	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.2-4: Degrade the Visual Character of the Project Area	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
3.3 Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources			
Impact 3.3-1: Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Historical Resource	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI

B = Beneficial NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant PSU = Potentially significant and unavoidable SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact 3.3-2: Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of Unique Archaeological Resources	Alt. 1-4 = PS NAA = N	Mitigation Measure 3.3-2a: Develop and implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program <i>This mitigation measure will apply to Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.</i> Mitigation Measure 3.3-2b: Establish an Archaeological Buffer for P-09-003861 <i>This mitigation measure will apply to Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.</i> Mitigation Measure 3.3-2c: Retain an Archaeological Monitor and Native American Monitor, and Halt Ground-Disturbing Activity Upon Discovery of Subsurface Archaeological Features <i>This mitigation measure will apply to Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.</i>	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.3-3: Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource or Affect Unique Ethnic Cultural Values or Restrict Sacred Uses	Alt. 1-4 = PS NAA = N	Mitigation Measure 3.3-3: Avoid Degradation of Tribal Cultural Resources, Ethnic, and Cultural Values <i>This mitigation measure will apply to Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.</i>	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.3-4: Disturb Human Remains	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
3.4 Terrestrial Biological Resources			
Impact 3.4-1: Result in Disturbance, Loss, or Reduced Abundance of Tahoe Yellow Cress and Other Special-Status Plants	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = PS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = PS
Impact 3.4-2: Result in Disturbance, Loss, or Reduced Abundance of Special-Status Wildlife from Construction and Recreational Uses	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NII = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NII = LTS
Impact 3.4-3: Result in Disturbance or Loss of Common Terrestrial Vegetation Communities and Wildlife Habitats, Trees, Sensitive Natural Communities, and Riparian Habitat	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS
Impact 3.4-4: Result in Disturbance or Loss of State or Federally Protected Wetlands	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = PS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alt. 1-4 = LTS NAA = PS
Impact 3.4-5: Interfere with Wildlife Movement Corridors or Impede the Use of Wildlife Nurseries	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS
Impact 3.4-6: Conflict with Local Policies and Ordinances	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS

B = Beneficial NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant PSU = Potentially significant and unavoidable SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.5 Aquatic Biological Resources			
Impact 3.5-1: Short-Term Aquatic Habitat Degradation	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS
Impact 3.5-2: Stranding of Aquatic Biota from Dewatering Worksites	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.5-3: Short-Term Disruption of Fish Passage/Migration	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.5-4: Long-Term Disruption of Fish Passage/Migration	Alts. 1-4 = B NAA = PS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = B NAA = PS
Impact 3.5-5: Introduction and Spread of Aquatic Invasive Species by Construction Activities	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS
Impact 3.5-6: Long-Term Disruption of Nearshore Aquatic Habitat	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS
Impact 3.5-7: Long-Term Change in in Habitat Conditions Associated with Restoration and Enhancement	Alts. 1-4 = B NNA = PS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = B NNA = PS
3.6 Hydrology and Water Quality			
Impact 3.6-1: Degradation of Lake Tahoe and Meeks Creek Water Quality from Restoration Activities and Facility Construction and Maintenance	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = PS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = PS
Impact 3.6-2: Alteration of Lake Currents, Littoral Processes, and Shoreline Erosion	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.6-3: Water Quality Effects of Motorized Boating	Alt. 1 = LTS Alts. 2-4 = B NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alt. 1 = LTS Alts. 2-4 = B NAA = NI
Impact 3.6-4: Potential for Increase in Stormwater Runoff, Impacts to Existing Drainage Systems, or Alteration of Drainage Patterns	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS
Impact 3.6-5: Groundwater Impacts	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI

B = Beneficial NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant PSU = Potentially significant and unavoidable SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.7 Geology and Soils			
Impact 3.7-1: Compact or Cover Soil with Impervious Surfaces Beyond the Limits Allowed by the Land Capability Districts	Alts. 1-4 = B NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = B NAA = NI
Impact 3.7-2: Result in Substantial Soil Erosion or Loss of Topsoil	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS
Impact 3.7-3: Substantially Increase Exposure of People or Property to Geologic Hazards Such as Earthquakes, Landslides, Backshore Erosion, Avalanches, Mud Slides, Ground Failure, Seiche, or Similar Hazards	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.7-4: Substantially Disturb Native Soils and Geologic Structures or Change Topography in a Manner Inconsistent with the Natural Surroundings	Alts. 1-4 = B NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = B NAA = NI
3.8 Air Quality			
Impact 3.8-1: Short-Term Impacts From Construction-Generated Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors	Alts. 1-4 = S NAA = NI	Mitigation Measure 3.8-1: Implement an El Dorado County Air Quality Management District-Approved Fugitive Dust Control Plan During Construction <i>This mitigation measure will apply to Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.</i>	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.8-2: Long-Term Impacts From Operational-Related Emissions of Regional Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.8-3: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
3.9 Climate Change and Energy			
Impact 3.9-1: Project-Generated GHG Emissions	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS
Impact 3.9-2: Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy during Project Construction or Operation	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS
Impact 3.9-3: Conflict with or Obstruct a State or Local Plan for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS

B = Beneficial NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant PSU = Potentially significant and unavoidable SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.10 Public Safety and Hazards			
Impact 3.10-1: Interfere with Implementation of an Adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS
Impact 3.10-2: Emergency Access to and from Lake Tahoe	Alt. 1 = B Alts. 2-4 = LTS NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alt. 1 = B Alts. 2-4 = LTS NAA = LTS
Impact 3.10-3: Increased Demand for Emergency Response Resources	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.10-4: Navigational Hazards to Motorized and Nonmotorized Recreation	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS
Impact 3.10-5: Accidental Release of Hazardous Substances	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.10-6: Potential Changes in Wildfire Risk	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = LTS
3.11 Noise			
Impact 3.11-1: Short-Term Project-Related Construction Noise Levels	Alts. 1-4 = S NAA = NI	Mitigation Measure 3.11-1 Construction Noise Reduction <i>This mitigation measure will apply to Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.</i>	Alts. 1-4 = SU NAA = NI
Impact 3.11-2: Short-Term Vibration Impact from Project Construction	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.11-3: Long-Term Changes in Boat Noise	Alt. 1 = LTS Alts. 2-4 = B NAA = LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alt. 1 = LTS Alts. 2-4 = B NAA = LTS
Impact 3.11-4: Long-Term Traffic Noise Levels	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
3.12 Transportation and Circulation			
Impact 3.12-1: Conflict with a Program, Plan, Ordinance or Policy Addressing the Circulation System, Including Transit, Roadway, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities	Alts. 1-4 = B NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = B NAA = NI

B = Beneficial NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant PSU = Potentially significant and unavoidable SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact 3.12-2: Conflict or Be Inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) Regarding Vehicle Miles Traveled	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.12-3: Substantially Increase Transportation Hazards due to a Design Feature or Incompatible Uses	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
Impact 3.12-4: Result in Inadequate Emergency Access	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = LTS NAA = NI
3.13 Land Use			
Impact 3.13-1: Consistency with Adopted Plans and Policies	Alts. 1-4 = B NAA = NI	No mitigation is required for this impact.	Alts. 1-4 = B NAA = NI

B = Beneficial NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant PSU = Potentially significant and unavoidable SU = Significant and unavoidable