

Attachment A.1
Environmental Checklist



OFFICE
128 Market St.
Stateline, NV

Phone: (775) 588-4547
Fax: (775) 588-4527

MAIL
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

trpa@trpa.org
www.trpa.org

HOURS
Mon. Wed. Thurs. Fri
9 am-12 pm/1 pm-4 pm
Closed Tuesday

New Applications Until 3:00 pm

INITIAL DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST

Project Name: California Tahoe Conservancy revised Memorandum of Understanding

Project Description:

As part of the Development Rights Strategic Initiative (DRSI), the DRSI Working Group (including members of the California Tahoe Conservancy and Nevada Division of State Lands) proposed a revised Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between TRPA and the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) and a resolution. The revised MOU and resolution are intended to reaffirm local land bank authority, facilitate land acquisitions, increase the inventory of development rights held by the land banks, and accelerate the movement of existing development into the Town Centers by the local land banks. The revised MOU would replace the existing MOU between TRPA and CTC adopted by the TRPA Governing Board on March 17, 2016, Resolution 16-03-05.

Under the existing TRPA and CTC MOU, CTC has the authority to provide mitigation on behalf of project applicants on the California side of the Lake Tahoe Basin and sell and transfer coverage. They do so by acquiring and maintaining an inventory of hard, soft, and potential coverage; restoring hard and soft coverage on disturbed or sensitive lands; and retiring potential coverage. In exchange, TRPA transfers all excess coverage mitigation fees paid to TRPA for project approvals in California.

The revised MOU would expand the CTC's local authority to acquire, sell, and transfer all forms of development rights (i.e. CFA, TAU, existing and potential RUU, and land coverage) and align with the authority granted to the CTC by the State of California. The revised MOU would be consistent with the provisions of the TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 2: *Applicability of the Code of Ordinance* and would require that all activities be reviewed and approved in accordance with the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan and TRPA Code of Ordinances.

The resolution is intended to support state legislative proposals of the land banks as needed to help accelerate the goals and policies of the Regional Plan. For example, California legislative proposals by CTC to use alternative transfer or disbursement strategies in cases where the goals of the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan and State of California planning and environmental preservation objectives can better be achieved.

The following questionnaire will be completed by the applicant based on evidence submitted with the application. All "Yes" and "No, With Mitigation" answers will require further written comments.

I. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. 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)?

- Yes
- No
- No, With Mitigation
- Data Insufficient

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

- Yes
- No
- No, With Mitigation
- Data Insufficient

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

- Yes
- No
- No, With Mitigation
- Data Insufficient

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

- Yes
- No
- No, With Mitigation
- Data Insufficient

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

- Yes
- No
- No, With Mitigation
- Data Insufficient

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?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

2. Air Quality

Will the proposal result in:

a. Substantial air pollutant emissions?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

b. Deterioration of ambient (existing) air quality?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

c. The creation of objectionable odors?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No

No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

e. Increased use of diesel fuel?

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

3. Water Quality

Will the proposal result in:

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

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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?

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

c. Alterations to the course or flow of 100-yearflood waters?

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

Yes No

No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground water?

Yes No

No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

Yes No

No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

Yes No

No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

Yes No

No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

Yes No

No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

4. 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?

- Yes
- No
- No, With Mitigation
- Data Insufficient

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

- Yes
- No
- No, With Mitigation
- Data Insufficient

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

- Yes
- No
- No, With Mitigation
- Data Insufficient

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)?

- Yes
- No
- No, With Mitigation
- Data Insufficient

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

- Yes
- No
- No, With Mitigation
- Data Insufficient

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

- Yes
- No
- No, With Mitigation
- Data Insufficient

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"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

5. 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"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

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"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

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

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
|------------------------------|--|

No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

6. 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?

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

- b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

As required by Chapter 3: Environmental Documentation of the TRPA Code, Noise impacts will be analyzed for specific transfer of development projects during project permitting. The transfers of tourist lodging will be restricted to Centers in the Transfer of Development Program; though the exact area of tourist lodging placement is unknown. The 2011 threshold evaluation shows that the Region is at target or somewhat better for Cumulative Noise Events in Hotel/Motel and commercial areas.

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

7. Light and Glare

Will the proposal:

a. Include new or modified sources of exterior lighting?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

8. 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?

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

9. Natural Resources

Will the proposal result in:

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

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

10. Risk of Upset

Will the proposal:

- 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?

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

- b. Involve possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

11. Population

Will the proposal:

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

The implementation of the transfer of development program was analyzed in the 2012 Regional Plan Update. The Code amendments would allow the transfer program to operate consistent with the assumptions and analysis in the 2012 Regional Plan Update EIS, which found that the program would have beneficial effects on the location, distribution, density, and growth rate of human population in the Region. (2-2 to 2-3, 2-6 to 2-7 Regional Plan Update Final EIS http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/Volume_1_RPU_FEIS.pdf.)

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

12. Housing

Will the proposal:

- a. Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?

To determine if the proposal will affect existing housing or create a demand for additional housing, please answer the following questions:

- (1) Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

(2) Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region historically or currently being rented at rates affordable by lower and very-low-income households?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

Number of Existing Dwelling Units: _____

Number of Proposed Dwelling Units: _____

b. Will the proposal result in the loss of housing for lower-income and very-low-income households?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

13. Transportation/Circulation

Will the proposal result in:

a. Generation of 100 or more new Daily Vehicle Trip Ends (DVTE)?

As required by Chapter 3: Environmental Documentation of the TRPA Code, Transportation/Circulation impacts will be analyzed for specific transfer of development projects during project permitting. VMT impacts and the associated mitigation will be detected through regional modeling, regularly occurring every 4 years. In addition, potential regional VMT impacts are mitigated at the project level through localized trip generation calculations as an Air Quality Mitigation fee.

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

The proposed Code amendments will facilitate transfers of development to designated Centers, which will promote circulation patterns consistent with Regional Transportation Plan, Regional Plan, and supporting environmental analysis.

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

14. 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?

As required by Chapter 3: Environmental Documentation of the TRPA Code, Public Service impacts will be analyzed for specific transfer of development projects during project permitting.

a. Fire protection?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

b. Police protection?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

c. Schools?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

d. Parks or other recreational facilities?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

f. Other governmental services?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

15. Energy

Will the proposal result in:

a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No

No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

16. 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?

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

b. Communication systems?

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

e. Storm water drainage?

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

f. Solid waste and disposal?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

17. Human Health

Will the proposal result in:

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

18. Scenic Resources/Community Design

Will the proposal:

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No

No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

19. Recreation

Does the proposal:

a. Create additional demand for recreation facilities?

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

b. Create additional recreation capacity?

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

20. Archaeological/Historical

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?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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?

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

- Yes No
- No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

21. 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?

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

- 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.)

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

- 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?)

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

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

Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

Determination:

On the basis of this evaluation:

- a. The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment and a finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules of Procedure.

Yes No

- b. The proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but due to the listed mitigation measures which have been added to the project, could have no significant effect on the environment and a mitigated finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules and Procedures.

Yes No

- c. The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment and an environmental impact statement shall be prepared in accordance with this chapter and TRPA's Rules of Procedure

Yes No



Signature of Evaluator

Date August 9, 2018

TRPA Senior Planner, Long Range and Transportation Division
Title of Evaluator