

New growth is restricted in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The TRPA has implemented strict growth and development guidelines that limit the amount of new development that can be added in the area. Since 1987, residential construction has been limited to the addition of 300 units per year in the region. As a result, the region is expected to remain relatively stable in terms of growth and development (TRPA 2002).

The proposed Program would implement NPDES requirements and elements of the Lake Tahoe EIP that relate to US 50 and SR 89. In addition, the Program would improve highway safety where practicable by implementing current design standards. These actions would not require or create additional infrastructure or improve highway level of service such that it would induce growth or development. None of the improvements proposed would remove any existing barriers to growth. While cumulative construction-related impacts sustained over an extended period of time—such as those resulting from the EIP—could lead to a temporary slowdown of growth, the proposed Program would have no permanent impact on growth.

This page intentionally left blank.

According to the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15355), *cumulative impacts* refer to two or more individual effects, that, when considered together, are considerable or compound or increase other environmental impacts. The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental impact of a project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

This section discusses the potential for cumulative effects that could result from the proposed Program and other projects approved or proposed for the study area and vicinity. The area considered for cumulative effects includes the watersheds of the southern Tahoe Basin, from approximately Tahoe Pines on the west shore of Lake Tahoe to Zephyr Cove on the east shore of Lake Tahoe, and the Upper Truckee Watershed.

The following describes other projects that have been approved or proposed within the study area or vicinity.

3.12.1 Proposed Projects in the Study Area and Vicinity

3.12.1.1 *El Dorado and Placer County Projects*

Sawmill Bicycle Path Project

The County of El Dorado is scheduled to construct and maintain the Sawmill bicycle path and bridge over the Upper Truckee River adjacent to the US 50 corridor as part of the TRPA's Tahoe Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

Dead Tree Removal – US 50 and Sawmill Road

This project would remove dead trees and reduce hazardous fuels on 20.2 ha (50 acres) in Washoe Meadows State Park. The project will create a defensible fuel profile zone to reduce the threat of a catastrophic wildfire and improve native forest composition and structure. Trees will be designated for removal under the supervision of a California Registered Professional Forester.

Angora 3 Erosion Control Project and Angora Creek Fisheries Enhancement Project

El Dorado County proposes to construct and maintain conveyance and stormwater treatment facilities to address water quality and erosion issues in the project area. The Angora wildfire of the summer of 2007 has prompted the County to revise their implementation schedule of 10-1-07 to 12-31-07 to include additional funds for hazard tree removal and emergency stabilization measures for the South Lake Tahoe road drainage structures in advance of the summer fire season of 2008. In addition, the proposed project includes the improvement of culverts under Lake Tahoe Boulevard to enhance fish habitat within Angora Creek. Both projects are considered environmental improvements as documented in the Lake Tahoe EIP.

Tahoe Pines Erosion Control Project

This project is proposed to reduce erosion, sediments, and nutrients from entering Lake Tahoe at the Tahoe Pines subdivision.

Villas at Harborside

This project consists of the construction of nine residential units at 5120–5140 West Lake Boulevard, Homewood, California.

3.12.1.2 City of South Lake Tahoe Projects

The South Lake Tahoe Planning Department was contacted regarding planned and proposed projects within the city limits. Table 3.12-1 lists all approved and proposed projects in South Lake Tahoe.

**Table 3.12-1
Approved and Proposed Projects in South Lake Tahoe**

Project	Location	Units (Approximate)	Construction Time Frame	Type
Triangle Project	Bordered by Pioneer Trail, US 50, and Midway Road	6 acres	Dates not available	Commercial, residential, hotels
Redevelopment Project 3	Northwest corner of Lake Tahoe Blvd. and Stateline Ave.	180 units w/ 180 lockouts, 8,681 m ² (93,448 ft ²) convention center, 4,322 m ² (46,526 ft ²) of retail, 30,142 ft ² nightclub/restaurant/bar	May 2007–May 2009	Hotel condos, convention center, retail, restaurant
Ski Run Shopping Center	1001 Ski Run Blvd.	1,498 m ² (16,129 ft ²) of floor area existing, 1,980 m ² (21,310 ft ²) after rebuild	Fall 2006–Summer 2008	Demo existing shopping center and rebuild larger center with retail and restaurant
Name not available	Southwest corner of US 50 and Ski Run Blvd.	13,000 square feet of commercial space and 24 tourist accommodation units	Dates not available	Hotel/retail
Fantasy Inn Project	3696 Lake Tahoe Blvd.	Unspecified development	Dates not available	Not available

3.12.1.3 Tahoe City Public Utility District Projects

The Tahoe City Public Utility District was contacted regarding known projects within the Program project vicinity (Beckman 2006). The boundaries of the district extend from Emerald Bay to Dollar Hill, and along the Truckee River to the Nevada County line. The following are all approved and proposed Tahoe City Public Utility District projects within the cumulative effects study area.

Westshore Trail

During the next several years, the Tahoe City Public Utility District will complete the Westshore Trail and finalize planning and begin construction on trail extensions from Sugar Pine State Park to the Meeks Bay campground. The project includes the construction of a 1.1 km (0.6 mile) Class 1 bicycle lane that will parallel SR 89. An additional extension of the Westshore Trail is proposed for Homewood, consisting of a 1.5 km (0.9 mile) Class 1 bicycle lane from Cherry Street to Fawn Street. An additional 1.5 meter (4.9 foot) extension to the exiting pedestrian path is also proposed.

3.12.1.4 South Tahoe Public Utility District Projects

The South Tahoe Public Utility District was contacted regarding known projects within the Program project vicinity (Donovan 2006). The service area of the district includes portions of El Dorado County in the Tahoe Basin, SR 89 north to Cascade Lake, SR 89 south to Luther Pass, US 50 east to the Nevada state line, and US 50 west to Echo Lake. The following project is within this service area in South Lake Tahoe.

Al-Tahoe Waterline

This approved project includes the upsizing of approximately 2,880 meters (9,293 feet) of new waterline in the Al-Tahoe neighborhood of South Lake Tahoe.

3.12.1.5 TRPA EIP Projects

Table 3.12-2 summarizes EIP projects and programs identified for the Program project vicinity. Details about each proposed EIP project are available in the TRPA's most recent 5-year EIP Update (TRPA 2001).

**Table 3.12-2
TRPA EIP Projects in the Cumulative Impacts Study Area**

Threshold Program	Project Name	EIP Project No.
Air Quality/ Transportation	Class Two: SR 89/US 50 to Basin Boundary	749
	Lakeside Bike Trail	763
	Class Three: SR 89 Cascade to Emerald Bay (North End)	765
	Class One: SR 89 Spring Creek to Cascade Properties	766
	Class One: SR 89 15th Street to Current Forest Service Trail	767
	Intersection Improvements – South Y	795
	Intersection Signalization along US 50	809
	US 50 Transitway Easement Acquisition	822
	Emerald Bay Trolley Service Improvements	831
	Class One: D.L. Bliss State Park to Meeks Bay	10039
	West Shore Bike Trail Extension and Improvements	10042
Fisheries	Stabilize Meeks Creek Phase I – Stream Habitat Restoration	147
	Rubicon Creek Mouth – Stream Habitat Restoration	402
	Meeks Creek Phase II – Stream Habitat Restoration	700
	Blackwood Creek Barrier Removal Phase I – Stream Habitat Restoration	883
	Habitat Restoration – General Creek Improvements	899
	Habitat Restoration – Eagle Creek Migratory 0.48 km (.3 mile)	900
	Habitat Restoration – Lonely Gulch Creek Improvements	901
	Habitat Restoration – Tallac Creek Improvements	902
	Habitat Restoration – Taylor Creek Improvements	903
	Lake Habitat Restoration – CSLT/El Dorado County	973
Recreation	Forest Service Taylor Creek Stream Profile Chamber Enhancement	510
	Sugar Pine Point State Park Day Use Improvements	861
	Marina/Site Master Plan – Camp Richardson	984
	Forest Service Campground Bearproof Retrofit	10043
	Vikingsholm Rehabilitation	10089
	New Taylor Creek Visitor Center	10094

Table 3.12-2 (Continued)
TRPA EIP Projects in the Cumulative Impacts Study Area

Threshold Program	Project Name	EIP Project No.
Scenic Resources	Scenic Road Unit #1: Tahoe Valley Improvement	82
	Scenic Road Unit #7: Meeks Bay Improvement	83
	Scenic Road Unit #9: Tahoma Improvement	84
	Scenic Shore Unit #9: Rubicon Bay Improvement	105
	Scenic Road Unit #2: Camp Richardson Improvement	503
	Emerald Bay Viaduct Scenic Restoration	608
	SR 89 Cascade Creek Area Retaining Walls	873
	Roadway Unit # 2: Camp Richardson	10001
	Shoreline Unit # 4: Taylor Creek Meadow Parking Lot Improvement Shoreline Unit	10013
	Shoreline Unit #5: Ebright-Minimize Visibility of Trail Between Eagle Pt. & Cascade Props.	10014
	Shoreline Unit # 6: Emerald Bay Roadscar Treatment	10015
	Shoreline Unit # 8: Redesign Rubicon Point Parking Area	10016
	Shoreline Unit # 12: Improve Marina Facilities At McKinney Bay	10017
Soil Conservation/ SEZ	Restore 16.2 ha (40 acres) of SEZ – El Dorado County	650
	General Creek Stream Bank Stabilization Project	936
	Meeks Bay Marina SEZ Fill Removal and Bank Stabilization	953
	Lonely Gulch	10128
Vegetation	Habitat Protection – Tahoe Yellow Cress Blackwood/County Park	976
	Tahoe Yellow Cress Habitat Protection – Baldwin Beach	977
	Habitat Protection – Tahoe Yellow Cress Meeks Bay	978
	Habitat Protection – Tahoe Yellow Cress D.L. Bliss State Park	979
	Habitat Protection – Tahoe Yellow Cress: Mouth of Edgewood Creek	980

Table 3.12-2 (Concluded)
TRPA EIP Projects in the Cumulative Impacts Study Area

Threshold Program	Project Name	EIP Project No.
Water Quality	Hwy 50 Echo summit to SR 89 Water Treatment	9
	Cascade Creek Watershed Bmp Retrofit	12
	Fallen Leaf Lake	704
	Christmas Valley Water Quality	708
	Meeks Bay Campground BMP Retrofit	711
	Rubicon/Meeks Bay Residential BMP	713
	Chambers Lodge	731
	Paradise Flat BMP Retrofit	739
	US 50 from Meyers to the South Y Water Quality Improvement	993
	SR 89 South Y to Placer County line Water Quality Treatment	995
	SR 89 Luther Pass to US 50 Junction Water Quality	1012
	Eagle Falls	10049
	Wildlife	General Creek Riparian Habitat Enhancement
Meeks Creek Riparian Habitat Improvement		605
Tallac Creek/Marsh Restoration		10044
Wildlife Habitat Restoration at Tahoe Basin State Parks		10083

The Caltrans *Lake Tahoe Basin Environmental Improvement Program Delivery Plan* (Caltrans 2005b) has scheduled a number of Lake Tahoe EIP projects to be constructed over the next five to seven years, as shown in Table 3.12-3. Other safety and operational projects are also planned within this time frame, including rock retaining wall and slope erosion control projects near Emerald Bay on SR 89 and at Echo Summit on US 50.

3.12.2 Assessment of Cumulative Impacts

Quantifiable environmental impacts were generally not yet reported for the majority of the proposed projects located in the south to southwest areas of Lake Tahoe; however, many TRPA EIP project descriptions provided estimates of beneficial impacts. Because of this limitation, the following analysis relies on information about the known landowners, growth pressures, and projects in the area and the known plans and policies of the local jurisdictions to make a qualitative assessment regarding the significance of the proposed Program's contribution of impacts to those of other actions in the south Lake Tahoe area.

The proposed Program is designed to collect and treat the roadway stormwater runoff and rehabilitate the existing roadway and drainage system. The Program does not include features that will increase the level of service, operating speed, or capacity of the facility. The Route Concept Report for these highways indicates no plans exist for new facilities or capacity-increasing operational improvement projects for US 50 or SR 89 in the study area vicinity. In the

future, US 50 and SR 89 will be rehabilitated as necessary to repair storm damage and to achieve minor operational and safety improvements as necessary. Substantial portions of the project area, along the highways, have been disturbed with homes, public facilities, and roads. These urban developments are likely to be retained in the future.

**Table 3.12-3
Planned Highway-Related EIP Projects, 2005–2012**

Project Location	County	Highway
Echo Summit to 1.8 km (1.1 miles) east of Echo Summit	El Dorado	50
0.3 km (0.2 mile) east of Echo Summit to Meyers Road	El Dorado	50
Meyers Road to Incline Road	El Dorado	50
Airport Road to SR 89 North “Y”	El Dorado	50
SR 89 North “Y” to Trout Creek	El Dorado	50
Trout Creek to Ski Run Boulevard	El Dorado	50
Ski Run Boulevard to State Line	El Dorado	50
Alpine County Line to US 50	El Dorado	89
US 50 to Cascade Road	El Dorado	89
Cascade Road to north of Eagle Falls Viaduct	El Dorado	89
North of Eagle Falls Viaduct to Meeks Creek	El Dorado	89
Meeks Creek to Placer County Line	El Dorado	89
Tahoe State Park to SR 267	Placer	28
SR 267 to Chipmunk Street	Placer	28
Chipmunk Street to State Line	Placer	28
El Dorado County Line to SR 28	Placer	28
Elizabeth Drive to Sugar Pine Road	Placer	28
SR 28 to Squaw Valley Road	Placer	28
Brockway Summit to 1 km (0.6 mile) south of Brockway Summit	Placer	267
1 km (0.6 mile) south of Brockway Summit to Stewart Way	Placer	267
Stewart Way to SR 28	Placer	267

Source: Caltrans 2005b

The TRPA has designated the proposed Program as a water quality EIP project. To qualify as an EIP project, the proposed Program must directly relate to a respective threshold program and contribute to the attainment of that threshold. Typically, EIP projects are intended to result in an environmental benefit. Considering the current Program within this context and the nature of the improvements, contribution to long-term (post-construction) cumulative impacts is not expected. Once Program construction is completed along or within any one segment, the Program would contribute to improved water quality runoff conditions and would not change existing traffic flow or circulation. The Program would not contribute to long-term cumulative impacts with respect to air quality or noise. Except for occasional maintenance of the proposed drainage basins and runoff drainage facilities, no further ground disturbance would take place after construction is completed. Therefore, the Program is not expected to result in long-term

contributions to any cumulative effects to the physical or biological environment or to community resources.

The projects identified in Section 3.12.1 generally consist of bicycle and pedestrian paths, water quality improvement and erosion control projects, utility district improvements, and proposed residential construction at various locations, including in the Homewood and South Lake Tahoe areas. The following discusses the potential cumulative impacts from the proposed Program and the other projects identified in Section 3.12.1.

Vegetation

All of the projects identified for this cumulative impact assessment will likely require some level of vegetation removal for site preparation. The proposed Program would require some vegetation removal as result of shoulder widening and drainage improvement activities. However, the removal of woody vegetation (trees and shrubs) would be the minimum required for construction and would occur only where trees or vegetation alongside the roadway or basin location cannot be avoided. The number, size, and location of trees to be removed as a result of Program implementation will be determined as design details are developed. The number of trees identified within the preliminary basin locations could be considered substantial for the overall Program (all eight segments). In some cases, individual basins may have to be redesigned, relocated, or eliminated to minimize or avoid removal of trees. Any proposed loss of trees should be in conformance with TRPA goals and policies (e.g., large trees may be removed for large public utilities projects if the TRPA finds there is no reasonable alternative). Overall, neither the proposed Program nor the other projects identified in Section 3.12.1 would be expected to substantially alter the species richness, relative abundance, and pattern of vegetation adjacent to US 50 and SR 89 or within the context of the larger south Lake Tahoe area.

Wildlife

The proposed Program would not cause an increase in urban growth, result in additional habitat fragmentation, alter existing connectivity between wildlife habitats along US 50 and SR 89, or cumulatively contribute to these types of impacts from other developments. The two highways already exist and are well traveled, and the Program would not change their locations or use. Potential movement of wildlife across the highways may be temporarily affected by construction activities. Considering that US 50 and SR 89 and associated development currently act as a barrier to wildlife movement, additional permanent structures that may adversely impact wildlife movement along or across US 50 and SR 89 (new roadways or highway access, right-of-way fencing, guardrails, median barriers, etc.) are not proposed as part of the Program. Although infrequent noises louder than background traffic noise may occur, it is expected that construction noise impacts would be comparable to traffic noise and should not result in significant noise-related disturbance to nesting birds, roosting bats, or other wildlife species, if present.

Similarly, the removal of vegetation adjacent to US 50 and SR 89 is unlikely to significantly contribute to adverse cumulative impacts to wildlife species, including migratory birds and special-status or management indicator species. The cumulative loss of woody vegetation caused by the Program, in combination with the losses incurred from other past, present, and potential future projects, is unlikely to result in the nonattainment of TRPA environmental threshold carrying capacities for managed wildlife species in the south Lake Tahoe area. Therefore, the removal of vegetation is not expected to result in a significant cumulative impact to wildlife.

The Program is not expected to permanently adversely impact the movement of fish and other aquatic organisms along or across US 50 and SR 89. Potential movement of aquatic organisms may be temporarily affected by construction activities such as dewatering, which may be necessary for the rehabilitation or replacement of culvert and drainage systems within the project area. No new barriers to aquatic migration are expected to occur as a result of the proposed Program.

As previously mentioned, the proposed Program and other projects that qualify for the TRPA’s EIP are intended to result in an environmental benefit and directly relate to a respective threshold program and attainment of that threshold. A number of EIP projects proposed in the south Lake Tahoe area are expected to have direct beneficial impacts to wildlife and fisheries resources. Cumulative adverse impacts to biological resources in the south Lake Tahoe area as a result of the proposed Program would be potentially offset by the cumulative beneficial impacts to biological resources from the proposed Program (water quality improvements), associated project-specific mitigation, and proposed and completed EIP projects in the south Lake Tahoe area. Table 3.12-4 summarizes EIP projects proposed in the south Lake Tahoe region that are expected to result in direct beneficial impacts to wildlife and fisheries.

**Table 3.12-4
EIP Projects Beneficial to Wildlife and Fisheries Resources in the South Lake Tahoe Area**

EIP Program	Project Name	EIP Project No.	Expected Environmental Benefit
Fisheries	Meeks Creek Phase II – Stream Habitat Restoration	700	10.5 km (6.5 miles) stream improved to excellent
	Habitat Restoration – General Creek Improvements	899	4.6 km (2.9 miles) stream improved to good
	Habitat Restoration – Eagle Creek Migratory	900	0.5 km (0.3 miles) stream improved to excellent
	Habitat Restoration – Lonely Gulch Creek Improvements	901	3.2 km (2.0 miles) stream improved to good
	Habitat Restoration – Tallac Creek Improvements	902	6.6 km (4.1 miles) stream improved to good
	Habitat Restoration – Taylor Creek Improvements	903	3.2 km (2.0 miles) stream improved to excellent
	Lake Habitat Restoration – CSLT/El Dorado County	973	19.4 ha (48 acres) of in-lake fish habitat restored.
	Habitat Restoration – General Creek Improvements	899	4.6 km (2.9 miles) stream improved to good
Soil Conservation/ SEZ	Restore SEZ – El Dorado County	650	16 ha (40 acres) restored
	General Creek Stream Bank Stabilization Project	936	0.4 ha (1 acres) restored
	Meeks Bay Marina SEZ Fill Removal and Bank Stabilization	953	0.2 ha (0.45 acres) restored

Table 3.12-4 (Concluded)
EIP Projects Beneficial to Wildlife and Fisheries Resources in the South Lake Tahoe Area

EIP Program	Project Name	EIP Project No.	Expected Environmental Benefit
Vegetation	Habitat Protection – Tahoe Yellow Cress, Blackwood/County Park	976	0.04 ha (0.10 acres) protected
	Habitat Protection – Tahoe Yellow Cress, Meeks Bay	978	Not identified
	Habitat Protection – Tahoe Yellow Cress, D.L. Bliss State Park	979	Not identified
	Habitat Protection – Tahoe Yellow Cress, Mouth of Edgewood Creek	980	Not identified
Water Quality	Lower Ward Valley/Pineland Ecp	219	5.1 km (3.2 miles) stream improved
	McKinney Tract	558	Not identified
	Fallen Leaf Lake	704	Not identified
	Meeks Bay Campground BMP Retrofit	711	Not identified
	McKinney II	727	1.3 ha (3.3 acres) improved
	Chambers Lodge	731	10.6 ha (4.3 acres) improved
	Paradise Flat BMP Retrofit	739	Not identified
	SR 89 South Lake Tahoe “Y” to Placer County Line	995	Not identified
	Ward Gullies	10048	Not identified
	Eagle Falls	10049	Not identified
Wildlife	General Creek Riparian Habitat Enhancement	604	161.9 ha (400 acres) improved
	Meeks Creek Riparian Habitat Improvement	605	0.6 km (1 mile) stream improved to excellent
	Tallac Creek/Marsh Restoration	10044	1.2 ha (3 acres) improved
	Wildlife Habitat Restoration at Tahoe Basin State Parks	10083	20 ha (50 acres) improved

SEZs and Jurisdictional Waters of the United States, Including Wetlands

The disturbance of SEZs and areas of jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands, due to Program implementation shall be the minimum required for construction. Most Program features (infiltration basins, sand traps, etc.) were designed to avoid impacts to SEZ areas.

Although the TRPA restricts activities that disturb SEZ areas, public service facilities (including highways and their associated facilities) are permissible uses in SEZs under certain conditions; however, mitigation must be provided for adverse impacts to lower land classifications, including SEZs. By implementing the required mitigation, the Program would result in a net gain in restored or improved naturally functioning SEZ coverage. This gain in SEZ coverage shall also be considered cumulative to other EIP stream and meadow restoration and improvement projects listed in Table 3.12-4. Furthermore, the quality of waters entering SEZ and jurisdictional water systems in the south Lake Tahoe area would be improved as a result of the proposed Program.

Traffic-Related Cumulative Impacts

The US 50 and SR 89 EIP projects would require temporary construction activities that will affect traffic flow and patterns. Other projects proposed for construction along the highways, such as the Tahoe City Public Utility District's Westshore Trail bike lane (along SR 89), South Lake Tahoe Public Utility District's waterline replacement (US 50), and the Sawmill Bike Path, have the potential to overlap in time and place with the proposed Caltrans EIP projects. Caltrans also plans a number of other safety and operational projects during this time frame, including rock retaining wall and slope erosion control projects near Emerald Bay on SR 89 and at Echo Summit on US 50.

In addition to the projects listed in Table 3.12-3, several other EIP agency projects in California and Nevada are expected to occur in conjunction with this project. For example, the Incline Village Improvement District and the Nevada Department of Transportation have scheduled sewer line and road rehabilitation projects during the same time frame as major Caltrans construction projects.

Cumulative community impacts related to these projects could include temporary road closures and traffic delays, acquisition of rights-of-way and adjacent property parcels, and land use changes. These impacts may impair traffic circulation and access to local businesses, commercial and tourist destinations, public recreational areas, and private residences.

As discussed previously, the Lake Tahoe regional economy relies heavily on tourism and recreational users. Cumulatively, the EIP and other construction projects may have a significant adverse impact on local and regional economies if primary transportation routes are closed or impaired for a substantial amount of time, restricting visitors' access to local businesses, resorts, and recreational areas. However, these impacts could be avoided through coordination and scheduling with the local utility districts and public works agencies responsible for these projects.

Caltrans has developed a draft Lake Tahoe Basin Regional Traffic Management Plan (TMP) that outlines time frames for construction of its road projects to minimize cumulative construction-related impacts. Implementation of the Regional TMP (Section 3.12.3) would reduce the cumulative impacts of the Program to less than significant.

3.12.3 Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures

The following measures will be applied to each segment or project when it is advanced for design.

Lake Tahoe Basin Regional Traffic Management Plan

A draft Lake Tahoe Basin Regional TMP was developed as part of the overall EIP project. The Regional TMP addresses cumulative construction-related impacts from the multiple Caltrans projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin as well as those from the Nevada Department of Transportation and other EIP agencies. In addition, project-specific TMPs will be developed during the final design phase of each project.

TMPs outline construction requirements and restrictions to minimize traffic delays and maximize safety within the construction areas. In general, TMPs develop strategies for public and motorist information, incident management, construction, demand management, and alternate routes. For

example, a construction season map will be published each year to inform the public, local businesses, and local agencies of project locations and activities.

Other requirements may include the following, as appropriate:

- During the peak summer travel season between July 1 and Labor Day, no lane closures will be allowed after noon on Fridays, or on weekends or holidays during this period. Work planned off of the highway travel lanes that does not impede normal traffic flow would not be subject to this restriction.
- Lane closure charts will be developed for each segment or area of work to address any planned temporary lane changes or closures. These charts and schedules will be made available for public notification and information.
- Lane closures will be limited to 1 km (0.6 mile) in length or less.
- Maximum delays caused by a single closure will be limited to 10 minutes for construction projects and 15 minutes for maintenance work. The cumulative delay for a given corridor will be limited to 30 minutes.
- Bicycle and pedestrian access will be maintained through the construction zone whenever possible and as appropriate.

Recreational Land Use

Construction activities may disturb some recreation users at sensitive land uses such as parks, trails, beaches, campgrounds, and similar publicly accessible facilities. The following measures may be applied as appropriate:

- Prior to construction, information on the activities, location, type of potential disturbance, and how it might affect recreation access or use should be noticed, advertised, or otherwise made publicly available so that users of the sites are aware and can plan accordingly.
- Construction activities in the vicinity of noise-sensitive uses such as campgrounds shall be restricted to daytime hours.

Public and Private Property Access

Access to a property, driveway, or access road along the highways shall not be blocked unless the occupant of the property (or responsible party) has been notified. Where access during the day may be impracticable during active construction, it will be provided by the end of each working day. Notification shall be made prior to commencing any construction work that could affect property access.

Public Involvement Plan

The Lake Tahoe Basin has a unique and complex socioeconomic environment. Due to the potential cumulative construction-related impacts of the EIP, it will be necessary to inform the public of construction activities and to involve them in Caltrans planning efforts to ensure that project impacts will be minimized.

Caltrans will develop a Public Involvement Plan based on the draft Tahoe Basin Public Communications and Outreach Guidelines. These guidelines outline ways to coordinate public

involvement with other agencies, identify interested stakeholders, and suggest strategies for public outreach and communication.

The guidelines describe several different strategies for public communication and outreach, including coordination with local agencies, public meetings and events, membership on boards, outreach at schools, and one-to-one meetings with stakeholders. Caltrans media communication may involve television and radio service announcements, newspaper articles, local newsletters, a website, and direct mailings.

This page intentionally left blank.

This section briefly discusses greenhouse gases and climate change, and the State's goals and actions to address potentially contributing emissions. As noted in previous sections in this EIR, and the conclusion to this section, this project would not increase or change long-term traffic capacity, and should have no or minimal effects related to this issue.

Climate change has been a concern since at least 1988, as evidenced by the establishment of the United Nations and World Meteorological Organization's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) reduction and climate change research and policy have increased dramatically in recent years. In 2002, with the passage of Assembly Bill 1493 (AB 1493), California launched an innovative and proactive approach to dealing with GHG emissions and climate change at the state level. AB 1493 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop and implement regulations to reduce automobile and light truck GHG emissions; these regulations will apply to automobiles and light trucks beginning with the 2009 model year.

On June 1, 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-3-05. The goal of this Executive Order is to reduce California's GHG emissions to: 1) 2000 levels by 2010, 2) 1990 levels by the 2020 and 3) 80 percent below the 1990 levels by the year 2050. In 2006, this goal was further reinforced with the passage of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 sets the same overall GHG emissions reduction goals while further mandating that ARB create a plan, which includes market mechanisms, and implement rules to achieve "real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases." Executive Order S-17-06 further directs state agencies to begin implementing AB 32, including the recommendations made by the state's Climate Action Team.

According to a recent white paper by the Association of Environmental Professionals,⁹ "an individual project does not generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to significantly influence global climate change. Global climate change is a cumulative impact; a project participates in this potential impact through its incremental contribution combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of greenhouse gases."

Caltrans and its parent agency, the Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency, have taken an active role in addressing GHG emission reduction and climate change. Recognizing that 98 percent of California's GHG emissions are from the burning of fossil fuels and 40 percent of all human-made GHG emissions are from transportation, the Department has created and is implementing the Climate Action Program at Caltrans (December 2006). One of the main strategies in the Climate Action Program to reduce GHG emissions is to make California's transportation system more efficient. The highest levels of carbon dioxide from mobile sources, such as automobiles, occur at stop-and-go speeds (0 to 25 miles per hour [mph]) and speeds over 55 mph.

Caltrans recognizes the concern that carbon dioxide emissions raise for climate change. However, modeling and gauging the impacts associated with an increase in GHG emissions levels, including carbon dioxide, at the project level is not currently possible. No federal, state, or regional regulatory agency has provided methodology or criteria for GHG emission and climate

⁹ Hendrix, Michael and Wilson, Cori. Recommendations by the Association of Environmental Professionals (AEP) on How to Analyze Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents (March 5, 2007), p. 2

change impact analysis. Therefore, Caltrans is unable to provide a scientific or regulatory based conclusion regarding whether the project's contribution to climate change is cumulatively considerable.

Caltrans continues to be actively involved on the Governor's Climate Action Team as CARB works to implement AB 1493 and AB 32. As part of the Climate Action Program at Caltrans (December 2006), the Department is supporting efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled by planning and implementing smart land use strategies: job/housing proximity, developing transit-oriented communities, and high-density housing along transit corridors. Caltrans is working closely with local jurisdictions on planning activities; however, Caltrans does not have local land use planning authority. Caltrans is also supporting efforts to improve the energy efficiency of the transportation sector by increasing vehicle fuel economy in new cars and light- and heavy-duty trucks. However, it is important to note that the control of the fuel economy standards is held by the United States Environmental Protection Agency and CARB. Lastly, the use of alternative fuels is also being considered; Caltrans is participating in funding for alternative fuel research at the University of California, Davis. The projects for this EIR are all water quality projects and will have no effect on greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, no minimization or mitigation measures are required.

In 1963, El Dorado County formed a service area governed by the Board of Supervisors in response to community complaints about pest mosquitoes. El Dorado County's Tahoe District became a Vector Control District in 1980. The District has a service area of 195 square miles from the crest of the Sierra Nevada mountain range near Echo Summit to the shore of Lake Tahoe in both the City of South Lake Tahoe and unincorporated El Dorado County.

The climate, topography, and plant communities of the Tahoe Basin provide an abundance and variety of larval mosquito habitats. The restoration of SEZs has created additional mosquito habitat. The mosquito population in the Tahoe Basin is most active in the spring and early summer. Each mosquito species has a season when it is most active and a range of preferred hosts. All mosquito species are potential sources of organisms that can cause disease to pets, domestic animals, wildlife, or humans.

Vector control is not addressed in the El Dorado County Ordinance Code; however, the Vector Control District Web site recommends identifying and eliminating all sources of standing water that can support mosquito breeding (El Dorado County Environmental Management 2007).

The proposed Program includes infiltration basins that will hold storm water runoff so it can infiltrate into the ground below. These facilities will temporarily hold standing water. Caltrans design requirements impose a 3-day (72-hour) limit on how long a drainage facility can hold standing water (Caltrans 2007a). This criterion will be implemented in the design of each project segment to avoid the potential for the basins to provide breeding habitat for mosquitoes.

This page intentionally left blank.