

Appendix C TRPA Checklist



INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

I. Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)/ Various APNs/State Route 89 between Eagle Falls
Project Location: Viaduct and Meeks Creek

Project Name ED-89 PM 18.0–24.9 Water Quality Improvements **County/City** El Dorado County

Brief Description of Project

The Project proposes to improve the quality of stormwater runoff by collecting and treating the stormwater runoff from State Route (SR) 89 by implementing the following improvements where feasible and warranted: rehabilitating existing drainage systems and installing new drainage systems, including infiltration basins and water conveyance systems; deploying treatment best management practices (BMPs); providing rock slope protection; constructing rock energy dissipaters for erosion control; regrading driveways; revegetating bare or erodible areas; where permitted by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), allowing sheet flow off of roadways to allow the spreading and subsequent infiltration of runoff water prior to reaching any identified water of the United States or stream environment zone areas; placing asphalt-concrete overlay (1.8 inches); digging out failed pavement sections; and lining or replacing culverts in poor condition. To allow for construction, temporary access to or use of lands outside the Caltrans right-of-way would be required. This access or use is typical of most major roadway projects and would allow for the temporary staging of equipment and construction, and access to and from the construction areas. Construction easements would be defined during the preparation of plans, specifications, and estimates for the Project. Construction activities would require the clearing of vegetation where facilities would be installed. Tree removal would be necessary in some locations but would be minimized through further refinement of basin and facility design. State, regional, and local vegetation and tree removal requirements and permitting would be followed. During construction, the contractor would be required to develop and implement erosion control measures and plans and to follow seasonal restrictions applicable to projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The removal and replacement of existing pavement and the installation of new paved areas along the highways would occur during construction. New vehicle pullouts might require earthwork and disturbance of existing slopes. New cut slopes would be stabilized with rock-slope protection or vegetation. TRPA scenic threshold criteria would be considered in the design of slope protection systems. Excavation and earthwork would be necessary for the installation of pavement, runoff basins, water collection and control devices, and similar facilities. Excavated earth and materials not reused at the Project site or elsewhere would be disposed of by the contractors at appropriate disposal facilities. The contractors may need to use controlled blasting, involving a single blast with a small charge, at locations where existing rock prevents or substantially impairs excavation. Permanent, long-term BMPs, including asphalt dikes and new drainage systems, would be implemented for controlling potential impacts on existing waterways or storm drainage facilities.

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.

II. 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

Explanation:

- c. Pavement resurfacing would create temporary odors. This effect would be very limited in duration.
 e. The use of diesel fuel by construction equipment would be temporary.

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-year flood 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?
 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
- k. Is the project located within 600 feet of a drinking water source?
 Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

Explanation:

- a. The Project would only slightly increase the amount of impervious surface resulting in concentrating and possibly redirecting flows to specified water quality treatment facilities. The flow rates associated

with the water quality improvements along the Project segment would not be altered substantially that would affect the quantity of surface runoff or groundwater downstream of the construction areas.

- e. Impacts on drainage patterns would be minor and consist only of directing runoff into new drainage facilities. The Project proposes to implement improvements, such as infiltration basins and culverts, along SR 89 that would collect and treat the surface water runoff to remove sediments and pollutants. These facilities would increase the amount of sediments and pollutants that would be filtered out of the surface water, thereby improving the surface water quality leaving the right-of-way.
- g. The Project would increase the infiltration of stormwater runoff into groundwater.

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?

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

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |
- e. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?

| | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |
- f. Removal of stream bank and/or backshore vegetation, including woody vegetation such as willows?

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

Explanation:

- b. Some removal of riparian vegetation may be required. Removal of riparian vegetation would be kept to a minimum. Efforts to restore previously disturbed areas would be attempted where possible. Some trees and vegetation may be removed where basin and other drainage facilities are proposed. Impacts on trees and existing vegetation would be minimized during the design of the drainage facilities.
- f. Construction at streambanks and creeks would be minimized, as would the removal of woody vegetation.
- g. The proper permits will be obtained before the removal of any native live, dead, or dying trees that measure 30 inches in dbh or more within land classified for conservation or recreation uses.

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)?
- Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient
- b. Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?
- Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient
- c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?
- Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient
- d. Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality?
- Yes No
 No, With Mitigation Data Insufficient

Explanation:

- a. Some common species of animals could be killed during tree removal and other construction activities. Because of the limited scope of the Project, the number of common animals lost is expected to be low. Environmental Commitments for the Project would reduce or avoid the loss of sensitive animal species.
- b. Environmental Commitments for the Project would reduce or avoid the loss of any sensitive animal species.
- d. Small amounts of habitat would be converted to infiltration basins and small areas of habitat would be temporarily affected during construction. Environmental commitments for the Project would minimize impacts on habitat and would restore habitat temporarily affected by the Project. In addition, because the Project components would collect, treat, and transport runoff from SR 89, the Project would reduce the potential for contaminants to enter water bodies in the Project area, potentially improving water quality and aquatic habitat.

6. Noise

Will the proposal result in:

- a. Increases in existing Community Noise Equivalency Levels (CNEL) beyond those permitted in the applicable 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

Explanation:

- a. The Project would not contribute any new traffic and therefore would not change traffic-related noise levels with respect to the TRPA CNEL noise thresholds. The noise thresholds could be exceeded temporarily during heavy or sustained construction activities. TRPA-approved construction projects are exempt from the TRPA Noise Ordinance if the construction activities occur between 8:00 a.m. and 6:30 p.m.

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?
 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

- 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

Number of Existing Dwelling Units:

N/A

Number of Proposed Dwelling Units:

N/A

13. Transportation/Circulation

Will the proposal result in:

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

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?

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?

- 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 increases 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

Explanation:

- a. The Project is located on and immediately adjacent to SR 89.
- b. D. L. Bliss State Park and Meeks Bay Campground are adjacent to SR 89 and visible from the Project.

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

Explanation:

- b. A total of five cultural resources are located in the Project area. All are located on maps at the North Central Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System and the Forest Service's Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit. None of these resources were identified during the current cultural resources inventory and would not be affected by the Project.

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

Declaration

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

Signature **(Original signature required.)**

_____ At _____ Date _____
Person Preparing Application County

Applicant Written Comments: (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Date Received _____

By: _____

Determination:

On the basis of this evaluation

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

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

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: _____

Title of Evaluator