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TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
NOTICE OF MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, November 8, 1995, at the Horizon Casino Resort, U.S. Highway 50, Stateline, Nevada. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

October 30, 1995

By: [signature]
James W. Baetge
Executive Director

This agenda has been posted at the TRPA office and at the following post offices: Zephyr Cove and Stateline, Nevada, and Tahoe Valley and Al Tahoe, California. The agenda has also been posted at the North Tahoe Conference Center in Kings Beach, the Incline Village GID office, and the North Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce.
All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted.

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS (No Action)

Any member of the public wishing to address the Advisory Planning Commission on an agenda item not listed as a Public Hearing or a Planning Matter item, or on any other issue, may do so at this time. However, public comment on Public Hearing and Planning Matter items will be taken at the time those agenda items are heard.

NOTE: THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION IS PROHIBITED BY LAW FROM TAKING IMMEDIATE ACTION ON, OR DISCUSSING ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC THAT ARE NOT LISTED ON THIS AGENDA.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

V. PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

A. Amendment of Regional Plan, Man-Modified Determination for Douglas County APN 05-181-05

B. Bijou/Al Tahoe Community Plan and Draft BIR/EIS, Notice of Circulation

C. Draft EIS for the Lake Tahoe Shorezone Development Cumulative Impact Analysis

D. Notice of Circulation and Hearing, U.S. Forest Service North Shore Project Draft EIS

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Report on Traffic and Circulation Issues at National Avenue in Kings Beach

B. Notice of Preparation and Tentative Scope of Work, Paiute Gas Main Reinforcement Project EIS
VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director
   1. Notice of Circulation, Placer County and Washoe County Community Plans and Draft EIR/EIS
   2. Other

B. Legal Counsel

C. APC Members

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
October 30, 1995

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Regional Plan Land Capability Overlay Map Pursuant to Man-Modified Determination, Hock; APN 05-181-05, 629 Don Drive, Douglas County, Nevada

Proposed Action: To amend the Land Capability Overlay Map (H-15) to indicate a determination of man-modified on Douglas County APN 05-181-05, Zephyr Heights.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission recommend approval of the plan amendment which changes the land capability of the parcel from land capability class 1a to land capability class 8, with the following conditions:

1. A schedule for the installation of standard BMPs be completed by the owner and a security deposit be posted prior to the acknowledgement of any permits on this parcel. All BMPs must be installed prior to October 15, 1995. Implementation of BMP's relating to, but not limited to, ripping of compacted areas, revegetation, and stabilization of fill sideslopes, shall be required as part of onsite mitigation. The owner shall post a security equal to $8,300.00 or 110 percent of the project cost as determined by a licensed Civil Engineer or equivalent, to ensure completion of the necessary BMPs on the parcel.

2. Prior to the acknowledgement of a permit for a new project on this parcel which relies on the increase in the allowable land coverage associated with this man-modified determination, the owner shall retire 1,518 square feet of land coverage in the same hydrologically related area as the parcel in accordance with Subsection 20.3.C (2) or pay a mitigation fee of $7590.00 to the TRPA excess coverage mitigation fund. The fee is based on a per square foot value of land coverage at $5.00 per square foot. Either option would result in retirement of potential or existing coverage and shall be required as onsite mitigation.

BACKGROUND

The Hock property is a 10,100 square foot parcel located off in Zephyr Heights near Zephyr Cove, Nevada. There is an existing paved area and a small storage building on the parcel.
A field verification conducted on July 21, 1992 verified the parcel as land capability class 1a associated with the RtF (Rockoutcrop-Toem complex, 30 to 50 percent slopes) map unit. A subsequent IPES evaluation was conducted on May 2, 1994. This field work identified a large graded paved area in the center of the parcel, with slope gradients ranging from 2 to 9 percent. The side slope areas have slope gradients ranging from 38 to 45 percent. Based on evidence of grading, the land capability of the disturbed areas could not be verified without a detailed soils investigation.

An agent for the owner filed a land capability challenge on February 14, 1995. A TRPA team of experts conducted the field investigations in early September, 1995. The soils investigation were conducted by Joseph Pepi, Certified Professional Soil Scientist. A soils report was prepared and concluded the soils were modified by grading to the extent the land capability of the parcel had been significantly altered from its natural state.

Chapter 20, Subsection 20.2.F of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, sets forth the policy for processing man-modified determinations. A man-modified determination is appropriate when land has been altered such that it no longer exhibits the characteristics of the original mapped land capability.

REPORT

The following analyses are provided to complete the man-modified report:

(a) Geomorphic Characteristics - The Geomorphic Analysis of the Lake Tahoe Basin (Bailey, 1974) maps this area as geomorphic unit C-2 (Steep Strongly Dissected Lands). This geomorphic unit is classified as high hazard land. The soils identified on the parcel (see item c) are consistent with the mapped geomorphic hazard rating.

(b) Surface and Subsurface Hydrology - The parcel has no surface water drainages and there is no evidence of near surface groundwater. Some of the over-steepened areas and the disturbed areas have evidence of rill erosion resulting from uncontrolled runoff.

(c) Physical/Chemical Soil Characteristics - The parcel is mapped as RtF (Rock outcrop - Toem complex, 30 to 50 percent slopes) on TRPA Land Capability Map H-14.

The soils report prepared by Joseph Pepi, TRPA Soil Scientist, is attached. This report found a portion of parcel 05-181-05 to have been modified by grading. The graded areas now have soils which are deep loamy coarse sands over 50 inches in depth to granitic bedrock. These soils are most similar to the Elmira soil series and have slopes which are consistent with the range of slopes of the EbC (Elmira gravelly loamy coarse sand, 0 to 9 slopes) map unit, recognized in the SCS Tahoe Basin Soil Survey (Rodgers, 1974).

(d) The steep side slope areas on the parcel are characterized by shallow light brownish gray loamy coarse sand surface layer over a gray loamy coarse underlying layer with weathered granitic bedrock at 10 to 20 inches. These soils are best identified by the Toem soil series and the RtF soil map unit.
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(e) Erosion Hazard - The altered soils have been graded, are deep and would have a low runoff potential. Because of the coarse texture of the surface soils, they have a slight relative erosion hazard.

(f) Vegetation - The vegetative cover of the unpaved portion of the parcel consists of Jeffrey pine, bitterbrush, whitethorn and manzanita. The vegetation on the disturbed areas is sparse, since much of it was destroyed as a result of the grading. Natural revegetation of the unpaved disturbed areas has been slow; this may be due to the soil conditions or the unrestricted vehicular use of these areas.

(g) Land Capability District - The graded areas are best classified as land capability class 6, associated with the Ebc soil map unit. There is approximately 5,235 square feet (52%) of area on the parcel identified as class 6 and allowed 30 percent land coverage.

The steeper side slopes are classified as land capability class 1a associated with the RCF soil map unit and are allowed 1% land coverage. A topographic survey site plan of the parcel is on file at TRPA which depicts the boundaries of the different land capability units.

REQUIRED FINDINGS

The following is a list of required findings as set forth in Chapters 6 and 20 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, TRPA staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the required finding may be made.

A. Chapter 6 Findings

1. The project is consistent with and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements, the Code and other TRPA Plans and programs.

Rationale and Evidence: The proposed amendment of the Regional Plan to amend TRPA Land Capability Overlay Map H-14 is consistent with the procedures set forth in Chapter 20 of the Code. No significant impacts on the Regional Plan, Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements, the Code or other TRPA plans and programs are anticipated.

2. The project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.

Rationale and Evidence: The basis on which this finding can be made is provided in the checklist entitled, "Checklist: Article V (g) Findings", in accordance with Chapter 6, Subsection 6.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All responses contained in said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. A copy of the completed checklist is available at TRPA.
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All responses contained in said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. A copy of the completed checklist is available at the Advisory Planning Commission hearing and on file at TRPA.

3. Wherever Federal, State or local air and water quality standards applicable for the Region, whichever are strictest, must be attained and maintained, pursuant to Article V (d) of the TRPA Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

Rationale and Evidence: The basis on which this finding can be made is provided in the checklist entitled, “Checklist: Article V (g) Findings”, in accordance with Chapter 6, Subsection 6.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All responses contained in said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. A copy of the completed checklist is available at TRPA.

4. The Regional Plan, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

Rationale and Evidence: For the reasons stated in support of Findings 1, 2, and 3 above, the proposed amendment will result in the Regional Plan Package continuing to achieve and maintain thresholds.

B. Section 20.2.F. Findings

Finding (a): The land was modified prior to February 10, 1972.

A house was built on the property in 1963 and there is evidence the property was graded prior to the 1972 cutoff date.

Finding (b): Further development will not exacerbate the problems resulting from the modification of the land and will not adversely impact sensitive lands adjacent to or nearby the man-modified area.

Development of the graded area will not increase runoff or erosion provided all new development is completed with properly conceived and designed BMP’s which are properly maintained. Revegetation of the graded areas not utilized for development would enhance nutrient uptake and minimize surface erosion potential. There is no evidence of near surface groundwater and further development would not interfere with groundwater.

Finding (c): The land no longer exhibits the characteristics of land bearing the same original land capability classification.

The original land capability of the parcel was mapped class 1a. The graded area now has a slope gradient of 2 to 9 percent which is flatter than the natural slope gradients of the surrounding lands. Due to the change in slope, the graded area now exhibits the characteristics of a land capability class 6.

Finding (d): Restoration of the land in question is infeasible because of factors such as the cost thereof, a more positive cost-benefit ratio would be
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achieved by offsite restoration, onsite restoration would cause environmental harm. Restoration onsite would interfere with an existing legal use and the land is not identified for restoration by any TRPA program.

Onsite restoration of the graded area to the original land form and corresponding slope gradient would require importation of fill material to reshape the slope contours. Placement of fill material reshaped to the natural contours of 30 percent or greater would increase erosion potential and create large areas of unvegetated, erodible soil. The cost to reestablish the original contours or reshape the graded areas would exceed the costs to revegetate the graded areas to a natural vegetative community. Restoration of the graded areas would severely impact the existing use of the parcel. There are no current TRPA plans for restoration of this parcel.

Finding (e): Further development can be mitigated offsite.

The major impact related to the change in land capability of this parcel would be related to increased allowed land coverage. This increase in allowed land coverage could be mitigated by offsite retirement of potential or existing land coverage within the hydrologic region of the parcel. All new land coverage would be subject to the standard TRPA water quality mitigation.

Finding (f): Mitigation to offset the losses caused by the modification of the land and pertinent land capability district shall be as follows: (i) onsite and offsite mitigation, (ii) a maintenance program, including a schedule of maintenance proposed by the owner and approved by TRPA and; (iii) collection of a security, if deemed necessary by TRPA, to guarantee mitigation.

The man-modification of this parcel has resulted in an increased benefit to the owner in that there is an increase in allowed land coverage. The onsite mitigation for development of land coverage would entail runoff control of storm water by infiltration. Revegetation of disturbed areas would reduce runoff and erosion potential onsite. Onsite mitigation measures shall be in compliance with the TRPA BMP Handbook. The owner of the property shall include appropriate onsite mitigation measures with any project proposal submitted to TRPA, as a result of the change in land capability from the man-modified determination, for review and approval.

There will be an increase of 1,518 square feet of allowable land coverage over the allowed land coverage associated with the previous mapped land capability, as a result of the man-modified determination. This increase in allowed coverage would not have been available to the property owner had the parcel remained in its natural state. This increase in land coverage can be mitigated offsite by retirement of either potential land coverage or existing land coverage. The retirement of land coverage in the hydrologic region of the parcel could be accomplished by the owner acquiring other lands offsite and retiring land coverage; or the owner could pay, on a per foot basis, an appropriate mitigation fee to TRPA to be passed through to another entity for retirement of potential land coverage.
The owner of the property shall include a program and schedule for maintenance of the required BMPs as a condition of approval by TRPA. The owner shall post $8,300.00 or 110 percent of the project cost as determined by a licensed Civil Engineer as security for completion of the necessary BMPs. The security shall be posted within 90 days of the Governing Board approval of the man-modified determination.

CONCLUSIONS

Agency staff has found the graded areas of the parcel to exhibit different land capability than what was originally mapped, as a result of the man-modifications to the parcel. The impacts of the man-modified determination are predominately associated with increased allowable land coverage. The erosion and runoff impacts associated with the grading of the parcel can be mitigated through implementation of BMPs onsite and land coverage retirement offsite.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The approval of the man-modified determination requires a Regional Plan amendment to the Land Capability Overlay Map H-14. Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission recommend approval of the plan amendment which changes the land capability of the parcel to land capability class 6, and 1a, as depicted on the topographic survey map dated 10/10/95, which is on file with TRPA as a result of the man-modified determination with the following conditions:

1. The implementation of standard BMP’s shall be completed by the owner on the parcel within one year of the Governing Board approval of the change in land capability. Implementation of BMP’s relating to, but not limited to, revegetation, paving of the existing dirt driveway and stabilization of the driveway cutbank shall be required as part of the onsite mitigation. The owner shall post $8,300.00 or 110 percent of the project cost as determined by a licensed Civil Engineer as security for completion of the necessary BMPs. The security shall be posted within 90 days of the Governing Board approval of the man-modified determination.

2. Prior to acknowledgement of a permit for a new project on this parcel which relies on the increase in land coverage associated with this man-modified determination, the owner shall retire 1,518 square feet of land coverage in the same hydrologically related area as the parcel in accordance with Section 20.3.C. (2), or pay a mitigation fee of $7,590.00 to the TRPA excess coverage mitigation fund. The mitigation fee is based on a per square foot value of land coverage calculated at $5.00 per square foot. Either option would result in retirement of potential or existing land coverage as offsite mitigation.

Please contact Joe Pepi at (702) 588-4547 for questions relating to this action.
MEMORANDUM

October 27, 1995

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Notice of Circulation, Bijou/Al Tahoe Community Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

Copies of the above-referenced document were previously mailed to you under separate cover. The 60-day public comment period began on October 4, 1994, and concludes on December 4, 1995. This item has been placed on the agenda to solicit public and Advisory Planning Commission comments during the circulation period. No action is requested at this time.

A presentation regarding the contents of the DEIS will be made at the APC by TRPA staff. If you have any questions or comments regarding this matter, please contact Gabby Barrett at (702) 588-4547.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
308 Dorla Court
Elks Point, Nevada
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448-1038
(702) 588-4547
Fax (702) 588-4527

MEMORANDUM

October 27, 1995

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Lake Tahoe Shorezone Development Cumulative Impact Analysis and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

Proposed Action: The public hearing on this item was continued to November by the APC on October 11, 1995. The Governing Board had a public hearing at its October 25 meeting and continued the comment period until December 4, 1995. No further action is required at this time.

Background: In September 1995 copies of the Lake Tahoe Shorezone Development Cumulative Impact Analysis and DEIS were sent to the members of the APC. This document has been prepared in accordance with TRPA’s environmental document requirements as stated in Article VII of the bi-state Compact, Article VI of TRPA’s Rules and Procedures, and Chapter 5 of TRPA’s Code of Ordinances. The Lake Tahoe Shorezone Development Cumulative Impact Analysis and DEIS is presently being circulated for public comment. The public comment period began on September 6, 1995, and has been extended to December 4, 1995. Following the close of the comment period, a Final EIS will be prepared.

The purpose of this document is to analyze the existing situation in the shorezone of Lake Tahoe and provide an analysis of the proposed action (the reconsideration of the fish habitat and spawning stream location standards, as they pertain to new and existing piers, mooring buoys, boat ramps, floating docks or platforms, and other related shorezone structures) by looking at four different build-out alternatives. The scope of this document is limited to the shorezone area around Lake Tahoe. The analysis of potential impacts of the various alternatives focuses on the nine threshold categories (water quality, air quality/transportation, noise, soil conservation-littoral processes, vegetation preservation, wildlife, fisheries, scenic quality, and recreation/public access). In addition, historical and cultural considerations, public health and safety, land use, and economics were also analyzed.

Please contact Colleen Shade at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this matter.

CS/jf
10/27/95
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Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
October 25, 1995

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Staff

Subject: Notice of Circulation and Hearing, U.S. Forest Service North Shore Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

Copies of the above-referenced document were previously mailed to you under separate cover. The 60-day public comment period began on October 20, 1995 and concludes on December 19, 1995. This item has been placed on the agenda to solicit public and Advisory Planning Commission comments during the circulation period. No action is requested at this time.

This document examines the potential environmental impacts of four alternatives, including a no project alternative, to manage approximately 8,000 acres on the north side of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The proposed management objectives include:

1. Decreasing the amount and extent of tree mortality and risk of catastrophic fire in the short-term;

2. Improving wildlife habitat and aquatic habitat;

3. Re-introducing fire to the ecosystem; and

4. Restoring forest health and re-establishing a functioning, sustainable ecosystem.

A presentation regarding the contents of the DEIS will be made at the November Advisory Planning Commission meeting by TRPA and the U.S. Forest Service. If you have any questions or comments regarding this matter please contact Paul Nielsen in the Project Review Division at (702) 588-4547.
MEMORANDUM

October 27, 1995

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Report on Traffic and Circulation Issues at National Avenue in Kings Beach

At the October 10 APC meeting, a member of the public raised concerns regarding traffic circulation at the National Avenue and Highway 28 intersection in Kings Beach. Staff will provide information on this at the November 8 APC meeting.

If you have any questions or comments on this item, please contact Richard Wiggins at (702) 588-4547.
October 27, 1995

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Notice of Preparation and Tentative Scope of Work: Environmental Impact Statement for the Paiute Gas Main Reinforcement Project

Requested Action: There is no action requested for this item. This item is for discussion and direction only.

Discussion: As provided for in Article 6.11 of the TRPA Rules of Procedure, TRPA staff is seeking your input on the scope of work for preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Paiute Gas Main Reinforcement project.

Attached you will find a Notice of Preparation (NOP), which includes a project description, the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist, and an EIS work plan, which outlines the specific tasks to be performed by the consultant, Summit Envirosolutions.

If you have any questions concerning this item, please contact Jim Allison of the TRPA staff at (702) 588-4547.

AGENDA ITEM NO. VI B:

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
DRAFT NOTICE OF PREPARATION

To: ____________________________

From: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Post Office Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448-1038

This is a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that will address the environmental consequences of constructing three natural gas pipeline loops located in both the Lake Tahoe Basin and in the Carson Valley area. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) will be the lead for the portions of the pipeline loops located in the Lake Tahoe Basin while the State of Nevada State Lands Division will act as the co-lead agency for portions of the pipeline loops traversing Nevada state lands. Portions of the pipeline loop located in Placer County, California have already received environmental review and approval pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Public Resources Code 21000 et seq as amended.

Project Description

The proposed project consists of construction, operation, and maintenance of three natural gas pipelines; the North Tahoe Loop, Incline Loop, and South Tahoe Loop. The Incline Loop is located entirely within the Lake Tahoe basin while 3.3 miles of the North Tahoe Loop is situated within TRPA’s jurisdiction. The South Tahoe Loop is situated outside of the Lake Tahoe basin down in the Carson Valley.

Project Location

The proposed project can be described by three distinct pipeline loop systems. Furthermore, each loop traverses a variety of TRPA, federal, state, and local jurisdiction. The North Tahoe Loop is approximately 11.1 miles in length, of which 3.3 miles are located within the Lake Tahoe Basin and 7.8 miles are situated outside of the Lake Tahoe basin. This pipeline traverses a variety of Nevada state lands, private lands, and Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) right-of-way situated in Washoe County, Nevada.

The Incline Loop is approximately 3.2 miles long and is located in the Incline Village area of Lake Tahoe. The entire portion of this pipeline is located within the Lake Tahoe basin. This loop is located along portions of State Highway 28, in residential streets, and under a Sierra Pacific Power Company (SPPCo) right-of-way traversing the USDA Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU) in Washoe County, Nevada and Placer County, California.

The South Tahoe Loop is approximately 5.8 miles long and is located in the Carson Valley area of Nevada. The entire portion of this pipeline is situated outside of the Lake Tahoe basin. This loop is located entirely on local and NDOT road rights-of-ways including Highway 395, Muller Lane, and Foothill Road.
Additional information regarding environmental issues and a further discussion of the proposed project including a project location map, is included within the attached Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC).

We are soliciting your comments regarding this project as part of a formal scoping process and ask that you send your response to Mr. Jim Allison at the above address.

**Project Title**

The proposed project is referred to as the Paiute Pipeline Project.

**Project Applicant**

Paiute Pipeline Company

**Date**

November 1, 1995

**Signature**

Jim Allison, Associate Planner
INITIAL STUDY

I. Background

1. Name of Proponent: Paiute Pipeline Company

2. Address of Proponent: Post Office Box 94197
   Las Vegas, Nevada 89193-4187
   (702)876-7178

3. Phone Number:

4. Date Checklist Submitted: October 26, 1995

5. Name of proposal: Paiute Pipeline Project

II. Project Location

The proposed project consists of construction, operation, and maintenance of a total of 20.1 miles of 12 and 16-inch natural gas pipelines to transport natural gas to Lake Tahoe, Nevada and Truckee, California. These three pipeline segments are referred to as the North Tahoe Loop, Incline Village Loop, and the South Tahoe Loop as shown on Figure 1. Each pipeline loop is further described below.

North Tahoe Loop

The North Tahoe Loop would be approximately 11.1 miles long, 16-inches in diameter, and buried to a depth of approximately 3 to 5-feet. Approximately 3.3 miles of the pipeline are located within the Lake Tahoe basin which would be under the jurisdiction of TRPA while 7.8-miles would be constructed outside of the basin within the jurisdiction of the State of Nevada. The natural gas pipeline would begin at an existing 8-inch pipeline in the vicinity of the Ponderosa Ranch and would terminate at an existing 8-inch pipeline in Eastlake Boulevard as shown on Figures 2 and 3.

Lake Tahoe Basin

Within the Lake Tahoe basin, approximately 3.3-miles of the pipeline would be constructed along an existing 8-inch natural gas pipeline. A construction width of 25 to 50-feet would be required along this 3.3-mile segment. In environmentally sensitive areas and where the right-of-way might be visible from the lake or along roadways, the pipeline corridor will be reduced to 25 feet. The natural gas pipeline would begin at an existing 8-inch pipeline in the vicinity of the Ponderosa Ranch and would terminate at the easterly portion of the Lake Tahoe basin. Approximately 20-acres of land would be disturbed for construction of the pipeline right-of-way while approximately 5-acres would be disturbed to accommodate 4 staging areas which will house construction equipment and materials. All of the impacted acreage would be reclaimed and revegetated immediately after construction, with the exception of a 10-foot wide maintenance and access road which is
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already existing. In addition, the State of Nevada Division of State Parks (DSP) is requesting that existing access be maintained.

The time required to construct portions of the North Tahoe Loop located in the Lake Tahoe basin is estimated to be approximately 6-weeks assuming 60 construction employees are proceeding at a rate of 800-feet per day. Implementation of the proposed pipeline facility and construction staging areas within the Lake Tahoe basin would traverse land managed by the USDA Forest Service (Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit [LTBMU]), Nevada State Lands (Tahoe Lake State Park), NDOT (road right-of-way), and private property owners.

Outside the Lake Tahoe Basin

Approximately 7.8-miles of the North Tahoe Loop are located outside of the Lake Tahoe basin which would be under the jurisdiction of the State of Nevada. Outside of the Lake Tahoe basin, approximately 5-miles of the pipeline would be constructed along the existing Marklet water pipeline right-of-way while the remainder of the pipeline is proposed to traverse private property and road rights-of-way. Approximately one mile of disturbance on undeveloped natural open space would be required to accommodate this segment of the proposed project. A construction width from 25 to 50-feet would be required along this 7.8-mile segment. Portions of this pipeline outside the Lake Tahoe basin would begin at an existing 8-inch pipeline in Eastlake Boulevard, east of Highway 395 and would terminate at the easterly portion of the Lake Tahoe basin where the pipeline would continue into the Lake Tahoe basin. Approximately 47-acres of land would be disturbed for construction of the pipeline right-of-way while approximately 12-acres would be disturbed to accommodate 11 staging areas which will house construction equipment and materials. All of the impacted acreage would be reclaimed and revegetated immediately after construction, with the exception of a 10-foot wide maintenance and access road which is already existing. In addition, the State of Nevada Division of Building and Grounds (DBG) is requesting that existing access be maintained.

The time required to construct the portion of the North Tahoe Loop outside of the Lake Tahoe basin is estimated to be approximately 6 to 8 weeks assuming 60 construction employees are proceeding at a rate of 1000-feet per day. Implementation of the proposed pipeline facility and construction staging areas would traverse land managed by the USDA Forest Service (Toiyabe National Forest), Nevada State Lands (Washoe Lake State Park), Washoe County (road right-of-way), and private property owners.

Incline Loop

*Lake Tahoe Basin*

The Incline Loop would be approximately 3.2 miles long, 16-inches in diameter, and buried to a depth of approximately 3 to 5-feet. The entire portion of this pipeline is
located within the Lake Tahoe basin. Approximately 2.2-miles of the pipeline would be constructed along an existing 8-inch natural gas pipeline while approximately one mile would be constructed along the existing SPPCo power line. The entire portion of this pipeline would be constructed on land previously disturbed to accommodate development of a utility. A construction width from 25 to 50-feet would be required along this 3.2-mile segment. The natural gas pipeline would begin at an existing 8-inch pipeline in Highway 28 in Incline Village and would terminate at an existing 8-inch pipeline north of Kings Beach, California as shown on Figure 4. Approximately 19.4 acres of land would be disturbed for construction of the pipeline right-of-way while an existing construction yard would be utilized to house construction equipment and materials for this project. All of the impacted acreage along the pipeline facility would be reclaimed and revegetated immediately after construction.

The time required to construct this portion of the pipeline is estimated to be approximately 4 weeks (one month) assuming 60 construction employees are proceeding at a rate of 1000-feet per day. Implementation of the proposed pipeline facility and construction staging areas would traverse land managed by the USDA Forest Service (LTBMU), NDOT right-of-way, Washoe County (road right-of-way), and private owners.

South Tahoe Loop

Outside the Lake Tahoe Basin

The South Tahoe Loop would be approximately 5.8 miles long, 16-inches in diameter, and buried to a depth of approximately 3 to 5-feet. The entire segment of the pipeline would be constructed outside of the Lake Tahoe basin along existing NDOT and Douglas County road right-of-way, with the exception of one small parcel of privately owned land where the tie-in will occur. This will occur at the existing meter station on Foothill Road. Additionally, the entire portion of this pipeline would be constructed on land previously disturbed to accommodate development of a State Highway, two county roads, and a private parcel of land. A construction width of 25-feet on existing roadways and shoulders would be required along this segment. The natural gas pipeline would begin at an existing 8-inch pipeline near the intersection of Highway 395 and Airport Road and would terminate at the existing South Tahoe Meter Station located approximately one half mile south of the intersection of Muller Lane and Foothill Road, as shown on Figure 5. Approximately one acre of land would be disturbed for construction of the pipeline right-of-way while an existing construction yard would be utilized to house construction equipment and materials for this project. All disturbed acreage would be reclaimed and revegetated immediately after construction.

The time required to construct this portion of the pipeline is estimated to be approximately one week assuming 60 construction employees are proceeding at a rate of a little over one mile per day. Implementation of the proposed pipeline facility would traverse land owned and maintained by NDOT, Douglas County, and a private property owner.
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Notes:
1. Map adapted from 7.5 minute topographic quadrangles:
   - Mount Rose, NV
   - Martel, Lake, NV
   - Martel Peak, CA-NV
   - Kings Beach, CA-NV
2. Location: Washoe County, NV
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III. Alternatives

TRPA, in coordination with the State of Nevada, have recently identified the alternatives to be analyzed in the Draft EIS as shown on Figure 6. Nine alternatives will be analyzed, in addition to a “no project” alternative. The alternatives analyzed will potentially address alternative locations and right-of-ways for the various projects. An equal level of impact analysis will be conducted for several alternatives as well as the proposed project. The proposed alternatives will include the following:

No-Action/No Project Alternative
Mt. Rose Highway Alternative
Sporner Summit Alternative
Power Line Alternative
Marlette Lake Alternative
Ski Incline Alternative
Little Valley Alternative
Highway 28 Alternative
Four-Wheel Drive Alternative
Genoa Lane Alternative

In addition, the EIS will provide a discussion of the development alternatives, alternatives considered and eliminated from detailed analysis in the EIS, as well as a comparison of the alternatives in both matrix and textural form.

IV. Environmental Review

The environmental review for the proposed project will be thoroughly addressed in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to be prepared under the guidance and supervision of TRPA. This EIS will address the environmental consequences of the proposed project pursuant to the TRPA Planning Compact, Article VII; the TRPA Rules of Procedure, Article VI; the TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 5; and the USDA Forest Service Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations 40 CFR 1500 et seq.

This environmental document should also satisfy the State of Nevada (Divisions of State Lands and State Parks) who have requested environmental documentation on land managed by the State. The State of Nevada does not have a state environmental policy act or regulations requiring the preparation of an EIS for projects located on state or private lands within Nevada. However, this EIS will address environmental issues pertaining to impacts occurring on Nevada state lands and will respond to comments generated by federal, state and local agency staff members who manage lands along the proposed pipeline.
V. Compliance with Existing Regulations and Plan Consistency

Prior to project approval, environmental documentation associated with the proposed project must demonstrate that it is in compliance and/or consistent with all applicable TRPA, federal, state, and county laws, ordinances, regulations, and codes. Additionally, the project's consistency with applicable plans and policies must also be evaluated. As required under TRPA and NEPA regulations, the EIS will address these issues. A list of required governmental actions that will likely be required for approval of the proposed project include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Certification of an EIS by the TRPA Governing Board;
2. Approval of the project by the TRPA Governing Board;
3. Clearances pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act (and related acts);
4. Clearances pursuant to the Endangered Species Act;
5. Permits to construct and operate certain construction equipment, pursuant to the Clean Air Act;
6. Compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act;
7. Compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act;
8. Compliance with the Toxic Substances Control Act;
9. Issuance of a Permit to encroach onto a State Highway;
10. Issuance of a Permit to encroach onto a County road;
11. Compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (Nationwide permit for stream/drainage crossings) and Nevada 401 water quality certification;
12. Issuance of a Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board Waste Discharge Permit; and
VI. DRAFT TRPA INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST (IEC)

I. PAIUTE PIPELINE PROJECT

II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS - The follow 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. See Section III of this questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes, With Mitigation</th>
<th>No Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LAND. Will the proposal result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Compaction or covering of the soil beyond the limits prescribed in the land capability system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) A change in the topography or ground surface relief features of the site inconsistent with the natural surrounding conditions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Unstable earth conditions during or after completion of the proposal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Changes in the soil or geologic substructures?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) The continuation of or increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sand, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. AIR. Will the proposal result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Creation of objectionable odors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Water.** *Will the proposal result in:*

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

   b) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff so that a 2-year 6-hour storm runoff cannot be contained on the site?

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

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

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

   f) Alteration of the direction or fate of flow of ground waters?

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

4. **Plant Life.** *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 system?

   b) Removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat?

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

   d) Changes in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, microflora and aquatic plants)?

   e) Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?
5. **Animal Life.** Would the proposal result in:
   a) Change in the diversity of species or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms, insects or microfauna)?
   b) Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?
   c) Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?
   d) Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?

6. **Noise.** Will the proposal result in:
   a) Increases in existing noise levels?
   b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?

7. **Light and Glare.** Will the proposal produce new light or glare inconsistent with the surrounding area?

8. **Land Use.** Will the proposal result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?

9. **Natural Resources.** Will the proposal result in:
   a) Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?
   b) Substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resource?

10. **Risk of Upset.** Does the proposal 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 condition?
11. Population. *Will the proposal alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, With Mitigation</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Housing. *Will the proposal affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, With Mitigation</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Transportation/Circulation. *Will the proposal result in:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Generation of 100 or more vehicle trips or in excess of 1 percent of the remaining road capacity?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, With Mitigation</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, With Mitigation</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, With Mitigation</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, With Mitigation</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, With Mitigation</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, With Mitigation</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fire protection?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, With Mitigation</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Police protection?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, With Mitigation</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Schools?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, With Mitigation</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parks or other recreational facilities?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, With Mitigation</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, With Mitigation</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other governmental services?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, With Mitigation</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. **Energy.** Will the proposal result in:

- a) Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [X] No  
  - [ ] Yes, with mitigation  
  - [ ] Denial

- b) Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [X] No  
  - [ ] Yes, with mitigation  
  - [ ] Denial

16. **Utilities.** Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

- a) Power or natural gas?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [X] No  
  - [ ] Yes, with mitigation  
  - [ ] Denial

- b) Communications systems?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [X] No  
  - [ ] Yes, with mitigation  
  - [ ] Denial

- c) Water?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [X] No  
  - [ ] Yes, with mitigation  
  - [ ] Denial

- d) Sewer or septic tanks?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [X] No  
  - [ ] Yes, with mitigation  
  - [ ] Denial

- e) Storm water drainage?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [X] No  
  - [ ] Yes, with mitigation  
  - [ ] Denial

- f) Solid waste and disposal?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [X] No  
  - [ ] Yes, with mitigation  
  - [ ] Denial

17. **Human Health.** Will the proposal result in:

- a) Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No  
  - [X] Yes, with mitigation  
  - [ ] Denial

- b) Exposure of people to potential health hazards?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No  
  - [X] Yes, with mitigation  
  - [ ] Denial

18. **Aesthetics.** Will the proposal result in the obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public, or will the proposal result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to the public view?

19. **Recreation.** Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?
20. **Archaeological/Historical.** Will the proposal result in an alteration of an significant archeological or historical site, structure, object or building?

21. **Mandatory 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?

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.)

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.)

d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
III. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

All impacts identified with “yes” answers under Section II should be described below and evaluated as to their significance. All “no, with mitigation” responses require a description of the identified impact and the mitigation measure(s) proposed to mitigate the impact so that there is no significant impact.

1. **LAND.** Will the proposal result in:

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

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

   d) Changes in the soil or geologic substructures?

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

   f) Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sand, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?

   g) Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?

Proposed changes in the development of the site may present a change in the topography or ground relief features, increased erosion, changes in the soil or geologic substructures, and expose people to landslides during construction activities. Mitigation of potential erosion, landslide, and soil impacts must be achieved to a less-than-significant level in order to comply with existing TRPA laws and ordinances and State regulations. This issue will be fully analyzed and addressed in the environmental documentation.

2. **Air.**

The Tahoe Basin is a non-attainment area for State ozone standards, federal and State CO standards, and State PM<sub>10</sub> requirements. The proposed project could result in a short-term temporary increase in emissions related to construction which might only slightly add to the existing non-attainment conditions in the project area. However, providing natural gas to customers currently using wood to heat their homes might offset the effects to air quality. The proposed project would not include any component that could generate substantial odors, however, the use of odorizers will be discussed. In addition, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, or alter temperature, moisture or climate. The issues related to air quality will be discussed in the environmental documentation.
3. **Water. Will the proposal result:**

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

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

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

Within the Lake Tahoe Basin, the project will traverse several streamcourses. Outside of the Basin the project will traverse streams as well as the Carson River. Streams and rivers will be identified and the environmental documentation will examine potential project impacts on water resources. While the project would temporarily increase runoff slightly, the amount of runoff would not be great enough to substantially increase the amount of water in receiving bodies. Portions of the project are located within a designated 100-year floodplain and will therefore be thoroughly addressed. After revegetation takes place, a temporary water source will be needed to supply water to the plant material used to stabilize graded areas.

The environmental documentation will examine potential water supplies and will document measures to reduce significant impacts to levels that meet existing TRPA and State standards. An analysis of the project's potential effects on groundwater movement will also be presented in the environmental documentation. Potentially significant impacts to water supplies or movement will be identified. Mitigation measures for any significant impacts will be developed and presented in the environmental documentation.

4. **Plant Life. 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 system?

   b) Removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat?

   d) Changes in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, microflora and aquatic plants)?

The proposed project will require the alteration of vegetative communities and resources along the pipeline route both within and outside the Lake Tahoe Basin. The environmental documentation will include a full analysis and evaluation of the potential impacts to vegetative resources. If it is found that the proposed project changes area vegetation resources, or removes native vegetation in excess of the area utilized for actual development permitted by the land capability system, mitigation measures will be recommended to meet TRPA, state, and federal standards.

Implementation of the proposed project may require the reconfiguration of wetland areas to be constructed as part of the project. The reconfiguration may affect the long-term viability of wetland vegetation in these areas. Potential effects of the project on future wetland vegetation
viability will be assessed in the environmental documentation and mitigation measures recommended to meet TRPA, state and federal standards.

5. **Animal Life. Would the proposal result in:**
   
   c) Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?
   
   d) Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?

The proposed project may indirectly reduce species along the pipeline route. This may also cause a temporary barrier to the migration or movement of animals during construction. The environmental documentation will include a full analysis and evaluation of the potential impacts to rare, endangered, sensitive, and local wildlife species. If it is found that the proposed project impacts wildlife, mitigation measures will be recommended to meet TRPA, state, and federal standards. Implementation of the proposed project may also require the reconfiguration of habitat used by wildlife. The reconfiguration may affect the viability of wildlife in these areas. The potential effects of the project on wildlife viability will be assessed in the environmental documentation.

6. **Noise. Will the proposal result in:**
   
   a) Increases in existing noise levels?

Development of the pipeline project will result in short-term temporary increases in ambient noise levels. The noise effects of the projects’ construction activities will be documented. The environmental documentation will provide a general discussion of potential noise sources and measures to ensure that exterior and interior noise levels are consistent with TRPA and State noise standards.

8. **Land Use. Will the proposal result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?**

The proposed project will represent a temporary short-term change in use of the land during construction activities. The significance of this construction will be evaluated in the environmental documentation, as well as the potential conflicts with applicable TRPA plans or policies for the portion of the project located within the Lake Tahoe Basin and State plans or policies for portions of the project located outside the Basin. If significant impacts to land use are identified, the environmental documentation will recommend mitigation measures to alleviate these impacts to less than significant levels.

10. **Risk of Upset. Does the proposal 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 condition?**

Potential impacts will be evaluated in the environmental documentation document including the potential to create an accidental explosion or a release of hazardous substances. In addition, the
issue of the project increasing fire hazards in the area will be addressed in the environmental documentation.

13. **Transportation/Circulation.** *Will the proposal result in:*

   a) Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians?
   d) Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?
   f) Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians?

The environmental documentation will present an evaluation of local traffic conditions and how the proposed construction traffic or construction equipment could affect traffic and circulation, including mountain bicyclists and hikers along roadways and designated mountain bike trails. If a potential exists to interfere with bicyclists and pedestrians, the extent of the impacts will be analyzed and appropriate mitigation measures developed to reduce any significant impacts to a level considered less than significant.

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:*

   d) Parks or other recreational facilities?

Implementation of the proposed project will not have an unplanned effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services. Impacts to this governmental services will be identified and mitigation to reduce impacts to less than significant levels will be recommended.

17. **Human Health.** *Will the proposal result in:*

   a) Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?
   b) Exposure of people to potential health hazards?

Potential impacts will be evaluated in the environmental documentation document, including the potential to create a potential health hazard. In addition, the issue of the project increasing fire hazards in the area will be addressed in the environmental documentation.

18. **Aesthetics.** *Will the proposal result in the obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public, or will the proposal result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to the public view?*

The proposed project may result in significant impacts to visual resources in the Lake Tahoe Basin due to construction of an easement (varying in width from 25-50 feet) to accommodate a pipeline facility. A detailed visual analysis and visual simulation will be conducted and incorporated in the environmental documentation. The analysis will include locating important viewpoints and determining computer generated photo-simulation in conjunction with TRPA and USDA staff. Scenic quality threshold numbers will be adopted for each unit within the Lake Tahoe Basin. TRPA threshold carrying capacities, policies and goals and other information contained in the *USDA Forest Service Resource Management Plan* will be referenced.
Mitigation in the form of route modifications, specific revegetation efforts, and other techniques will be documented to meet existing design standards established by TRPA and the USFS.

19. **Recreation.** *Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?*

Implementation of the project will be expected to affect recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Flume Trail for approximately 4 to 6 weeks while construction takes place. The short-term impacts to existing recreational facilities will be analyzed and mitigation measures to achieve a less-than-significant level to comply with existing TRPA and State environmental laws and ordinances will be documented.

20. **Archaeological/Historical.** *Will the proposal result in an alteration of an significant archaeological or historical site, structure, object or building?*

There are cultural and historic resources located within and adjacent to the pipeline right-of-way. Cultural and historic resources will be discussed in the environmental documentation along with policies and measures that would ensure protection of this resources. The State Historical Preservation Office will also be consulted.
IV. CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the statements furnished above and in the attached exhibits present that 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.

26 October 1995 ___________________ Colleen Rathke, Summit Envirosolutions, Inc.
Date (name of person completing this form)

______________________________
Colleen Rathke
(signature of person completing this form)

V. DETERMINATION (to be completed by TRPA)

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 and Procedure.

__________
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.

__________
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.

______________________________
Date Signature of Evaluator

______________________________
Title
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Introduction

Summit Envirosolutions, Inc. (Summit) will serve as the prime contractor to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) to accomplish all work necessary to prepare a complete, comprehensive, and legally adequate environmental impact statement (EIS). This EIS will meet the requirements of Article VII of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, Article VI of the TRPA Rules and Procedures, Chapter 5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The Scope of Work to be undertaken by the Summit team during this EIS effort consists of the tasks described below. The team will primarily use available information and data sources, existing baseline environmental baseline studies, and will conduct specialized studies to prepare this EIS. This will be accomplished for each of the potential impact items identified in the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and supporting Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC).

This Scope of Work contains descriptions of the objectives, methods of analysis, and products for each of the following tasks:

Task 1: Project Management
Task 2: Project Initiation/Data Collection
Task 3: Project Scoping
Task 4: First Administrative Draft EIS Supplement
Task 5: Second Draft EIS
Task 6: Draft EIS/Public Review
Task 7: Response to Comments/Final EIS
Task 8: Public Hearings on the Draft and Final EIS
Task 9: Construction Monitoring Program
Task 10: Meetings

Task 1: Project Management

Objective

The objective of this task is to ensure complete coordination during preparation of the EIS with the lead agency TRPA and the State of Nevada. The project proponent and their representatives will also be involved in this process to ensure the project description is adequate and complete.
Methods

Greg Oothoudt and Colleen Bathker from Summit will be responsible for coordination of all team members with appropriate Agency staff and the project proponent. Summit will be submitting monthly invoices to TRPA for payment.

Products

Monthly invoices to be submitted to TRPA.

Task 2: Project Initiation/Environmental Data Collection/Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Environmental Checklist

Objective

Preparation of the EIS and to lay the groundwork for an efficient and thorough process. To prepare a NOP and Initial Environmental Checklist that meets the requirements of TRPA and NEPA.

Methods

Summit will meet with the project applicant and TRPA to be briefed on the nature of the project. Summit and the project team will collect and review all relevant available documentation on the project. We will prepare a Scope of Work, Cost Estimate, and a Schedule for preparation of the EIS. We will prepare a NOP and IEC for a review and circulation by TRPA.

Products

NOP, one camera-ready and one disk copy
Draft and Final Scope of Work, Cost Estimate, and Schedule
Draft and Final, Environmental Checklist Form (IEC)

Task 3: Project Scoping

Objective

To conduct a thorough review of the issues relevant to the environmental review process.

Methods

Summit will meet with representative of various agencies and other entities to discuss issues that need to be addressed in the EIS and appropriate methods of analysis. In addition, Summit will attend and present the proposed project at the November 8, 1995 TRPA Advisory Planning Commission meeting and will record opinions and comments expressed about the proposed project.
Products

Attend TRPA APC meetings and record opinions and comments. Refine project description and scope of work, if necessary.

Task 4: Preparation of an Administrative Draft EIS

Objective

The objective of this task is to prepare an accurate, thorough, and complete ADEIS.

Methods

An Administrative Draft EIS will be prepared for the proposed project. The EIS will address the environmental consequences of the proposed pipeline loops pursuant to requirements of (1) the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, Article VII; (2) the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Rules of Procedure, Article VI; (3) the TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 5 and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations 40 CFR 1500 et seq.

The EIS will evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed project. These potential impacts are identified in the attached IEC which has been prepared and will be circulated with a NOP for public review and comment. The checklist will serve to focus the EIS evaluation and allow public review of the intended approach to the document.

In coordination with TRPA staff, the project description contained in the NOP will be refined to develop a clear and concise description of the proposed project to identify characteristics/components that have the potential to result in environmental impacts. Off-site improvements that are required as part of the proposed project will be described as well as the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project pipeline loops. Summit will work with the project applicant and agency staff in selecting figures to illustrate the regional context and project location within the adjacent study area.

Summit, in coordination with TRPA and State of Nevada staff, have recently defined the alternatives to be analyzed in the Draft EIS. Nine alternatives will be analyzed, in addition to a "no project" alternative. The alternatives analyzed will potentially address alternative locations and right-of-ways for the various projects. An equal level of impact analysis will be conducted for several of the alternatives as well as the proposed project. The proposed alternatives will include the following:

No-Action/No Project Alternative
Mt. Rose Highway Alternative
Spooner Summit Alternative
Power Line Alternative
Marlette Lake Alternative
Ski Incline Alternative
Little Valley Alternative
Highway 28 Alternative
Four-Wheel Drive Alternative
Genoa Lane Alternative

In addition, Summit will provide a discussion of the development alternatives, alternatives considered and eliminated from detailed analysis in the EIS, as well as a comparison of the alternatives in both matrix and textural form.

For each environmental issue to be addressed in the Draft EIS, the analysis will describe the relevant aspects of the project setting and delineate operational effects. Where adverse effects are predicted, the level of significance or non-significance of those effects will be characterized based on a list of clearly stated “significance criteria” that will be developed for each issue area.

Appropriate mitigation will be identified for each significant adverse impact. These mitigation measures will be feasible and clearly stated, including their relationship to contingent activities in the proposed project area. For each mitigation measure, the responsibility for implementation, timing, and phasing will be identified. The level of significance of adverse impacts, after the mitigation is applied, will also be described. The following environmental issues will be addressed in the EIS:

4.1 Earth Resources

Data on the general geology, faulting and seismic considerations will be gathered from existing published information. Identification of potential erosion, sedimentation, and runoff impacts are expected to be the primary concerns related to soil resources. Soil series will be obtained from the Soil Conservation Service’s published Soil Surveys. The surveys detail the water and wind erosion hazards of the soils. This information will be used in conjunction with the Land Capability Classifications provided by TRPA to determine areas particularly susceptible to disturbance. Site specific mitigation measures will be analyzed and recommended. It is anticipated that mitigation measures for these impacts will involve using a variety of revegetation techniques to stabilize erosive soils and to reestablish vegetative cover as quickly as possible.

4.2 Water Resources

Surface Hydrology

The primary water quality concerns associated with the proposed project include short and long term increases in nutrient and sediment loads in tributaries and from general surface runoff as a result of project construction. Summit will characterize the amount of surface clearing/disturbance which may be required for construction; and will document the number and specifications of necessary crossings of stream environmental zones (SEZs). Potential impacts from these project characteristics will be thoroughly addressed and adequate
construction and maintenance procedures and standards will be documented in the EIS to prevent degradation in the functioning of SEZs. All identified impacts will be mitigated to meet the goals, policies, and provisions of Chapter 20 (Land Coverage Standards) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Groundwater Resources

Summit will characterize the groundwater regime under portions of the proposed pipeline route and will identify potential conflicts with communication with the groundwater during construction and operation of the project. It is found that the groundwater table is high near the proposed right-of-way, mitigation measures will be recommended to be implemented during construction to minimize groundwater intrusion. The project’s impact to the quality of the groundwater will also be addressed a well as mitigation to avoid significant impacts.

4.3 Stream Environmental Zones and Jurisdictional Wetlands

The potential impact of the proposed pipeline loop on stream environmental zones (SEZs) and to wetlands in relation to applicable Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and TRPA standards will be evaluated. All impacted SEZs and wetlands will be delineated per TRPA federal guidelines and will be fully analyzed and documented in the EIS. In addition, mitigation measures will be recommended if significant impacts are implied.

4.4 Vegetation

The project applicant is preparing a revegetation plan to establish plant coverage along the pipeline route immediately after construction. This plan will cover issues such as plant materials (native and non-native species), techniques along the various sections of the pipeline, as well as the measures to obtain successful revegetation. This plan will be reviewed and approved by TRPA prior to certification of the EIS. The potential impact of the proposed project on vegetative communities in relation to applicable federal, state, and TRPA standards will be evaluated. Revegetation plans, along with drainage and other relevant plans, will be used to analyze any impacts to biological resources. In addition, the compliance of the project and several alternatives with TRPA and other regulatory agency requirements will be evaluated.

4.5 Wildlife and Fisheries

The potential impact of the proposed project on wildlife habitat and fisheries in relation to applicable federal, state, and TRPA standards will be evaluated. In addition, the compliance of the project and several alternatives with TRPA and other regulatory agency requirements will be evaluated. Threatened, endangered, and sensitive species will also be addressed if present in the vicinity of the pipeline project. If impacts to these species occurs, mitigation measures will be addressed including implementing revegetation techniques, timing of construction, and rerouting the pipeline around sensitive areas.
4.6 Cultural Resources

Database searches, background research, and route surveys will be conducted for the proposed project to describe the existing cultural and historic resources. An archive review will be conducted at the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in Carson City and findings will be documented in the analysis. Potential impacts and conflicts to existing cultural/historic sites and areas will be identified and mitigation (reroutes, avoidance, etc.) to avoid these resources will be documented. Property also found to be on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) list will be documented and thoroughly discussed. Actual locations of cultural and historical resources will not be identified in the EIS. TRPA and SHPO will receive full reports depicting these locations.

4.7 Scenic Resources

Brady and Associates conduct an initial field and data survey to establish a photographic inventory and overall familiarity with the visual character of the project area. The pipeline right-of-way and several alternatives will be walked, driven, and photographed to establish this familiarity. Important viewpoints will be located and identified and computer generated photo-simulations will be determined in conjunction with TRPA and USDA Forest Service staff. Based on the photographic inventory, field notes, analysis of available aerial photographs, and review of collected data, project area visual resources will be identified and documented in map and textual form.

A description will be included in the EIS including a general analysis of the project from roadways and from the lake as well as from recreation and public gathering areas. The EIS will also include a description of the scenic quality threshold numbers adopted for each unit. These ratings represent the quality of the scenic resources within the region. Roadway and shoreline units within the project area that may be potentially affected will also be described and mapped. This section of the EIS will include discussions about TRPA threshold carrying capacities, Policies and Goals, Code of Ordinances, Design Review Guidelines, and information contained in the USDA Forest Service Resource Management Plan. The environmental consequences and recommended mitigation section of the EIS will include a discussion of the scenic elements of the project which represent significant impacts, the extent of view alterations, location and significance of scenic resource viewpoints most affected by these adverse impacts, potential changes in TRPA’s unit ratings, and the relationship of the project to policies, regulations, standards, and guidelines. TRPA’s Scenic Quality and Travel Route rating sheets will be used for rating effects on roadways and shorelines. Brady and Associates will then be instrumental in identifying important route modifications and mitigation measures (vegetative screening, rerouting the pipeline, off-site mitigation, etc.) which could meet existing design standards established by TRPA and the USFS.

4.8 Recreation

Impacts of the proposed pipeline loops to recreational users along the various corridors remains a major issue. The proposed North Tahoe Loop traverses along a popular hiking and biking
trail (flume trail) through Lake Tahoe State Park. In addition, the proposed project will traverse lands in Washoe Lake State Park. Impacts during and after construction will be addressed as well as the long term operation and maintenance requirements. It is anticipated that pipeline construction will proceed in steep terrain at approximately 500 to 800 feet per day depending on construction methods and ROW width restrictions. Construction activities will span 30 days on the North Tahoe Loop depending on timing restrictions for construction activities. This issue will also be addressed. Mitigation measures may include road improvements through installation of road erosion control devices, revegetation efforts, and the use of signage and escorts through the construction area. The project team also anticipates coordination between all recreational users including TRPA, Nevada State Parks, USDA Forest Service, and the Tahoe Area Mountain Biking Association (TAMBA).

4.9 Air Quality

A description of the climate of the proposed project area, historical air quality data, and current efforts to attain and maintain identified TRPA air quality thresholds will be prepared. Using existing data, the proposed project will be analyzed regarding its consistency with federal, state, and TRPA standards. An air quality analysis of construction equipment will be based on in-house information and public data sources. No new data collection or major air quality analysis is envisioned.

Elements to be incorporated in the proposed project to reduce potential construction related air quality impacts will be identified and their potential effectiveness discussed. Sensitive receptors within the proposed project vicinity will also be identified. Adverse impacts will be identified where the proposed project would result in violations of Federal, state, or TRPA standards or increase pollutants for which the Tahoe Basin is already in nonattainment. A similar discussion will also be prepared for several of the alternatives.

4.10 Traffic and Access

The proposed project will involve short-term increases in local traffic along various State Highways (28, 431, and 395) and residential streets in Kings Beach, Incline Village, Lakeview Estates, and in the Carson Valley. Field observations indicated that these highways may be typified as having a least a Level of Service C and often a Levels of Service B. This may decrease by approximately one level of service during peak commuter hours and tourist days on weekends, holidays and the summer tourist season. Summit will quantify the expected number and source of construction vehicle trips by type per day as well as the overall rate and duration of construction along alternative routes. Mitigation measures to address identified impacts will be documented in the EIS, including advising area visitor bureaus and authorities of the construction. Access to these areas will also be discussed.

4.11 Noise

The potential for noise associated with construction and operation of the proposed pipeline will be evaluated based on construction plans and schedules. The short-term construction related
noise environment will be based on the information from traffic and circulation discussion and other data available from existing documents, plans, and publications and from regulatory agencies. A discussion of the existing noise environment and the potential short-term impacts resulting directly from proposed project construction activity will be provided. The noise discussion will also address acoustic fundamentals and provide a detailed description of the regulatory environment within the Tahoe Basin as it pertains to noise. Existing noise sources will be described using information provided by TRPA and the State of Nevada.

4.12 Socioeconomic Issues

The proposed project will not divide or disrupt present population patterns or alter migration trends, including migration trends of different socioeconomic groups into or out of the area. Neighborhood character, stability, property values, and local tax bases should remain unaffected. Expansion of the gas system will allow for future conversion from propane, fuel oil, coal and wood to natural gas. The EIS will discuss the socioeconomic issues pertaining to the number of employment opportunities generated by this project as well as the need for housing for these employees. In addition, population, housing and other data relevant to this discussion will be documented.

4.13 Public Health and Safety Hazards

The potential exists for hazardous or dangerous materials to be encountered during the execution of this project which require subsurface activities. The majority of the proposed corridor is in relatively rural areas. A database search was completed for a portion of the proposed corridor using Vista Environmental Information, Inc. (Vista) to locate problem areas and sites. The remaining portions of the pipeline route will also be surveyed. This report will be included in the EIS as an Appendix.

Spill prevention and containment will also be addressed. These issues will be reviewed by TRPA and implemented by the pipeline contractor when construction takes place. This section will describe specific measures to be followed by properly stored regulated products and will document ways to reduce the potential for an accidental discharge during pipeline construction activities.

Based on information provided by the project applicant, public record information available from permits and records, and a review of previous land uses based on available aerial photographs, the potential impacts of the proposed project's construction and operation in regards to public safety will be described. Based on existing and future land uses in the proposed project area, the discussion will address safety issues related to construction and operation of the proposed pipeline. This section of the document will also include a discussion pertaining to potential impacts of a wildland fire.
Products

Twenty (20) bound copies of the ADEIS will be delivered to the lead agencies and other reviewers for their review and commend.

Task 5: Preparation of the Second Administrative Draft EIS

Objective

To revise the first administrative draft EIS to reflect comments by the reviewing agencies.

Methods

After the lead agencies have reviewed the Administrative Draft EIS, the Summit team will incorporate needed revisions and submit a second administrative draft to TRPA and the State for final review and comment prior to public circulation of the Draft EIS.

Product

Twenty (20) copies of the Second Administrative Draft EIS.

Task 6: Revise and Circulate Draft EIS

Objective

To prepare document for public circulation and review.

Methods:

Incorporate final revisions to second Administrative Draft. Provide copies of the Draft EIS to the lead agencies for their distribution.

Products:

One loose-leaf, camera ready unbound copy of the Draft EIS and Appendices
One Hundred (100) bound copies of the Draft EIS
One disk copy of the Draft EIS

Task 7: Preparation of the Final EIS

Objective:

To prepare a legally adequate Final EIS.
Methods:

The objective of this task is to prepare a draft document containing written responses to all substantive comments received during the public review period. Upon review of the administrative draft by the lead agencies, a Final EIS will be prepared and submitted.

Products:

Ten (10) bound copies of the administrative draft of the Final EIS
One (1) loose-leaf camera-ready copy of the Final EIS
Fifty (50) bound copies of the Final EIS
One disk copy of the Final EIS

Task 8: Public Hearings on the Draft and Final EIS

Objective:

The objective of this task is to participate in public hearing(s) on the Draft and Final EIS.

Methods

Greg Oothoudt and Colleen Bethker will attend, make presentations, and answer questions at up to four public hearing in the Tahoe area on the Draft and Final EIS. It is assumed that Summit will not be primarily responsible for preparation of findings for the project, but will be available for consultation during their preparation.

Products

Presentation materials and handouts for up to four public hearings

Task 9: Prepare Construction Monitoring Program

Objective

The objective of this task is to prepare a Construction Monitoring Program consisting of the approved mitigation measures, best management practices (BMP), TRPA codes and regulations, and methods to implement the mitigation.

Methods

Summit will prepare a Construction Monitoring Program for the EIS and incorporate this plan in the Draft EIS using the information from the environmental analysis. The program will include the specific mitigation measures presented in the EIS, assignments of responsibility, relationships of project phasing, and time frames for implementation identified in the impact analyses.
Product

Construction Monitoring Program to be included in Draft EIS

Task 10. Meetings

Greg Oothoudt and Colleen Bethker will be available for as many as 36 meetings with agency staff over the next year. Staff has agreed to meet twice a month to review the project and we have also included additional meetings with federal and state agencies. Most of these would be held in Lake Tahoe or in Carson City.
MEMORANDUM

October 27, 1995

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Notice of Circulation, Placer County and Washoe County Community Plans and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

Copies of the above-referenced document will be presented to you at the November APC meeting. The 60-day public comment period is scheduled to begin on November 1, 1995, and to conclude on January 2, 1996. No action is requested at this time.

A presentation regarding the contents of the Community Plans and DEIS will be made at the November APC by TRPA staff. If you have any questions or comments regarding this matter, please contact Gabby Barrett at (702) 588-4547.