Appendix G

Environmental Findings



P.O. Box 5310 128 Market Street Stateline, Nevada 89449 (775) 588-4547 ◆ Fax (775) 588-4527

December 21, 2015

Documentation of Categorical Exclusion for the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization Linking Tahoe: Active Transportation Plan under the National Environmental Policy Act

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Regulations give federal agencies the authority and discretion to determine which of their own activities should be categorically excluded from NEPA depending on circumstances and valid justification. Furthermore, if a proposed activity falls under this section of the CFR, no further NEPA approvals are required by the Federal Highway Administration.

Under 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 771.117(c) "the following actions meet the criteria for Categorical Exclusions (CE's) in the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulation (section 1508.4) and 771.117 (a) of this regulation and normally do not require any further NEPA approvals by the Administration:

(1) Activities which do not involve or lead directly to construction, such as planning and technical studies.

The Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) Active Transportation Plan identifies numerous goals and policies as they relate to the creation of a region-wide bicycle and pedestrian system. The Plan identifies conceptual projects such as shared use paths, on-street infrastructure, priority intersections and support facilities. While these projects are included in the Plan, it is the understanding of the TMPO that each individual project will undergo environmental review and documentation as the project proceeds from the planning phase to the design and construction phases. For this reason, the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization has declared Linking Tahoe: Active Transportation Plan as categorically excluded from the National Environmental Policy Act.

Nick Haven

Principal Transportation Planner

lik Haver

Morgan Bery

Associate Transportation Planner

Notice of Exemption

Appendix E

To: Office of Planning and Research P.O. Box 3044, Room 113	From: (Public Agency): (RTPA for CA)	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency			
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044	P.O. Box 5310 Stateline, NV 89449				
County Clerk County of: Douglas County		(Address)			
Project Title: Linking Tahoe: Active Transpor	tation Plan				
Project Applicant: Tahoe Regional Planning	Agency	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Project Location - Specific: The Lake Tahoe Region encompasses part of tw jurisdictional boundaries of the Tahoe Regional					
Project Location - City: N/A	Project Location -	County: N/A			
Description of Nature, Purpose and Beneficiarie The project is a regional plan which lists goals a pedestrian network. The Plan identifies concept environmental analysis prior to construction. T	nd policies that encourage tual potential projects, whic	h will undergo individual			
Name of Public Agency Approving Project: Tah	noe Regional Planning Ago	ency as the RTPA for California			
Name of Person or Agency Carrying Out Project	ct: Tahoe Metropolitan Pla	nning Organization/ Tahoe Regier			
Exempt Status: (check one): Ministerial (Sec. 21080(b)(1); 15268); Declared Emergency (Sec. 21080(b)(3) Emergency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); Categorical Exemption. State type and Statutory Exemptions. State code num	15269(b)(c));	ibility and Planning studies			
Reasons why project is exempt: The project involves adoption of a plan which ic action. The Plan is exempt because the RTPA ha actions. The Plan is for planning purposes only a	s not approved, adopted, o	r funded these possible future			
Lead Agency Contact Person: Morgan Beryl	Area Code/Teleph	one/Extension: 775.589.5208			
If filed by applicant: 1. Attach certified document of exemption f 2. Has a Notice of Exemption been filed by		ng the project?. □ Yes □ No			
Signature: Morgan Beryl	Date: December 21, 2	Title: Transportation Planner			
■ Signed by Lead Agency □ Signed	by Applicant				
Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21110, Public Resour Reference: Sections 21108, 21152, and 21152.1, Public F		eeived for filing at OPR:			



OFFICE 128 Market St. Stateline,NV

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

MAIL PO Box 5310 Stateline, NV 89449-5310

www.trpa.org trpa@trpa.org

HOURS

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

New Applications Until 3:00 pm

Print Form

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

ssessor's Par	cel Number (APN)/Project Location		N/A	
Project Name	Linking Tahoe: Active Transp	ortation Plan	County/City N/A	
of Docorintion	of Projects			
ef Description This project	ect is an Active Transportation Plan	which lists potenti	al projects and policie	es necessary to
complete and	encourage use of a comprehensive	bicycle and pedestr	ian network. The plar	acts as a toolkit
	ting agencies, advocacy groups, and ortation projects. Any project that m			
	vironmental and public review.	ioves for ward to war	do imprementation w	in unuoigo

The following questionnaire will be completed by the applicant based on evidence submitted with the application. All "Yes" and "No, With Mitigation" answers will require further written comments. Use the blank boxes to add any additional information. If more space is required for additional information, please attach separate sheets and reference the question number and letter.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. Land

Will the proposal result in: a. Compaction or covering of the soil beyond the limits allowed in the land capability or Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES)? $\overline{\times}$ No ☐ Yes No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient b. A change in the topography or ground surface relief features of site inconsistent with the natural surrounding conditions? ☐ Yes $\overline{\times}$ No No, With Data Insufficient Mitigation c. Unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the proposal? Yes No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient d. Changes in the undisturbed soil or native geologic substructures or grading in excess of 5 feet? $\overline{\times}$ No ☐ Yes No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient e. The continuation of or increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? $\overline{\times}$ No ☐ Yes No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient

f. Changes in deposition or erosion of be siltation, deposition or erosion, includi which may modify the channel of a riv lake?	ng natural littoral processes,	
	Yes	⊠ No
	□ No, No Mitig	With Data Jation
g. Exposure of people or property to geo earthquakes, landslides, backshore e ground failure, or similar hazards?		5,
	Yes	⊠ No
	□ No, \	With Data Insuff
Quality		
Will the proposal result in: a. Substantial air pollutant emissions?		
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, V	With Data Insuff
b. Deterioration of ambient (existing) air of	quality?	
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, No Mitig	With Data pation Insuff
c. The creation of objectionable odors?		
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	□ No, \	With Data Insuff
d. Alteration of air movement, moisture of in climate, either locally or regionally?		
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, \	With Data

e. Increased use of diesel fuel?		
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insuffici
r Quality		
Will the proposal result in:		
a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction	on of water movements?	
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insuffic
 b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patter amount of surface water runoff so that a 20 y (approximately 1 inch per hour) cannot be con 	yr. 1 hr. storm runoff	
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insuffic
c. Alterations to the course or flow of 100-yearf	lood waters?	
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insuffic
d. Change in the amount of surface water in an	y water body?	
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insuffic
 e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alter quality, including but not limited to temperatu turbidity? 		
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insuffic

	_	
	Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
g. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through did or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by or or excavations?		
	Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise aver public water supplies?	ailable for	
	Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards of flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occurred seiches?		
	Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
j. The potential discharge of contaminants to the groundwa alteration of groundwater quality?	ter or any	
	Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
k. Is the project located within 600 feet of a drinking water so	ource?	
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient

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

4. Vegetation

Will the proposal result in:

a.	a. Removal of native vegetation in excess of the area utilized for the actual development permitted by the land capability/IPES system?				
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
b.	Removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation association critical wildlife habitat, either through direct removal or inclowering of the groundwater table?		vith		
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
C.	Introduction of new vegetation that will require excessive to water, or will provide a barrier to the normal replenishment species?				
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
d.	Change in the diversity or distribution of species, or numb species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, m and aquatic plants)?				
Г			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
e.	Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endange of plants?	red sp	ecies		
Г			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

f.	Removal of stream bank and/or backshore vegetation, incl woody vegetation such as willows?	uding			
Γ			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
g.	Removal of any native live, dead or dying trees30 inches on diameter at breast height (dbh) within TRPA's Conserva Recreation land use classifications?				
Γ			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
h.	A change in the natural functioning of an old growth ecosy	rstem'	?		
Γ			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
5. Wildlife					
W	ill the proposal result in:				
a.	Change in the diversity or distribution of species, or numb- species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, shellfish, benthic organisms, insects, mammals, amphibia microfauna)?	fish a			
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
b.	Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangere of animals?	ed spe	ecies		
Γ			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

(barrier to the migration or movement of animals?	esuit	ша		
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or	quality	?		
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
6. Noise					
,	Vill the proposal result in:				
;	Increases in existing Community Noise Equivalency Level beyond those permitted in the applicable Plan Area State Community Plan or Master Plan?		EL)		
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
1	Exposure of people to severe noise levels?				
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	Single event noise levels greater than those set forth in th Noise Environmental Threshold?	e TRF	PA		
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

a.	where the existing CNEL exceeds 60 dBA or is otherwise incompatible?		areas		
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
e.	The placement of uses that would generate an incompatible level in close proximity to existing residential or tourist accommodation uses?	ole no	ise		
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
f.	Exposure of existing structures to levels of ground vibratio could result in structural damage?	n that			
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

7. Light and Glare

Will the proposal: a. Include new or modified sources of exterior lighting? $\overline{\times}$ No No, With Data Insufficient Mitigation b. Create new illumination which is more substantial than other lighting, if any, within the surrounding area? ☐ Yes $\overline{\times}$ No No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient c. Cause light from exterior sources to be cast off -site or onto public lands? $\overline{\times}$ No ☐ Yes No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient d. Create new sources of glare through the siting of the improvements or through the use of reflective materials? $\overline{\times}$ No No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient

8. Land Use

Will the proposal:

a. Include uses which are not listed as permissible uses in the applicable Plan Area Statement, adopted Community Plan, or Master Plan?

	Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
	No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

	b. Expand or intensity an existing non-conforming use?				
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
9. Natu	ral Resources				
	Will the proposal result in:				
	a. A substantial increase in the rate of use of any natural res	ource	s?		
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	b. Substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resour	ce?			
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
10. Risl	c of Upset				
	Will the proposal:				
	a. Involve a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, che radiation in the event of an accident or upset conditions?	emica	ls, or		
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	b. Involve possible interference with an emergency evacuation	on pla	n?		
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

11. Population

Will the proposal: a. Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region? $\overline{\times}$ No Yes No, With Data Mitigation Insufficient b. Include or result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents? $\overline{\times}$ No Yes No, With Data Insufficient Mitigation 12. Housing Will the proposal: a. Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing? To determine if the proposal will affect existing housing or create a demand for additional housing, please answer the following questions: (1) Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe (

Region?					
	☐ Yes	⊠ No			
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient			
(2) Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the T Region historically or currently being rented at rates afford lower and very-low-income households?					
	☐ Yes	⊠ No			
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient			
Number of Existing Dwelling	g Units:				
Number of Proposed Dwelling Units:					
Number of Floposed Dwell	g Offics				

b. Will the proposal result in the loss of housing f very-low-income households?	or lower-income and	
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insuffic
nsportation/Circulation		
Will the proposal result in:	Frin Endo (DV/TE)2	
a. Generation of 100 or more new Daily Vehicle 1	mp Ends (DVTE)?	
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insuffi
b. Changes to existing parking facilities, or demar	nd for new parking?	
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insuffi
c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation highway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities		
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insuffi
 d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or and/or goods? 	movement of people	
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insuffi
e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?		
	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insuffic

f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?				
		Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
Public Services				
Will the proposal have an unplanned effect upon, or result in new or altered governmental services in any of the following	a nee areas	d for ?		
a. Fire protection?				
		Yes	X	No
		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
b. Police protection?				
		Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
c. Schools?				
		Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
d. Parks or other recreational facilities?				
		Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?				
		Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
		No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

f	Other governmental services?				
			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
15. Ener	ду				
V	Vill the proposal result in:				
a	a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?				
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
k	 Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of erequire the development of new sources of energy? 	nergy	, or		
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
16. Utilit	ies				
	Except for planned improvements, will the proposal result in a new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities		d for		
a	a. Power or natural gas?				
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
k	o. Communication systems?				
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
C	Utilize additional water which amount will exceed the maximetrial permitted capacity of the service provider?	imum			
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

C	I. Utilize additional sewage treatment capacity which amoun exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the sewage tre provider?		nt		
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
ϵ	e. Storm water drainage?				
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
f	. Solid waste and disposal?				
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
17. Hum	an Health				
V	Vill the proposal result in:				
a	Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (emental health)?	exclud	ling		
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
b	Exposure of people to potential health hazards?				
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

18. Scenic Resources/Community Design

Will the proposal:

a.	a. Be visible from any state or federal highway, Pioneer Trail or from Lake Tahoe?				
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
b.	Be visible from any public recreation area or TRPA design bicycle trail?	nated			
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
C.	Block or modify an existing view of Lake Tahoe or other seeen from a public road or other public area?	cenic ^v	vista		
Г			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
d.	Be inconsistent with the height and design standards requapplicable ordinance or Community Plan?	uired b	y the		
Γ			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
e.	Be inconsistent with the TRPA Scenic Quality Improveme (SQIP) or Design Review Guidelines?	nt Pro	gram		
Г			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

19. Recreation

Does the proposal:

	a.	Create additional demand for recreation facilities?				
				Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	b.	Create additional recreation capacity?				
				Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	C.	Have the potential to create conflicts between recreation usexisting or proposed?	ıses, €	either		
				Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	d.	Result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, or public lands?	water	way,		
				Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
0. Arcl	nae	eological/Historical				
	a.	Will the proposal result in an alteration of or adverse physaesthetic effect to a significant archaeological or historical structure, object or building?				
	Г			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

	b.	Is the proposed project located on a property with any knocultural, historical, and/or archaeological resources, include resources on TRPA or other regulatory official maps or re	ding	?		
	Г			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	C.	Is the property associated with any historically significant and/or sites or persons?	events	6		
	Г			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	d.	Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	chang	е		
	Г			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
	e.	Will the proposal restrict historic or pre-historic religious o uses within the potential impact area?	r sacr	ed		
				Yes		No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
21. Find	lin	gs of Significance.				
	a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish population below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a panimal community, reduce the number or restrict the range endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examp major periods of California or Nevada history or prehistory	oulation plant of e of a les of	n to or rare or		
	Г			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
				No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

b.	Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relative definitive period of time, while long-term impacts will endut the future.)	:-term vely br	rief,		
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
C.	Does the project have impacts which are individually limite cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two separate resources where the impact on each resource is small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on environmental is significant?)	or mo	re		
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
d.	Does the project have environmental impacts which will casubstantial adverse effects on human being, either directly indirectly?				
			Yes	$\overline{\times}$	No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

DECLARATION:

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

Signature: (Original signature required.)		
Morgan Beryl Digitally signed by Morgan Beryl DN: cn-Morgan Beryl, 0-TRPATIMPO, ou-Transportation, email-metryleting ar, c-US Date: 2015.12.21 15:10.51 -0800'		
IVIUI Gall Dely email-mbey/@tpa.org.c-US Dele-2015.12.21 15:105-1-0800	AtDate:	
Person Preparing Application	County	
Applicant Written Comments, (Attach additional cheets if no	occeptably	
Applicant Written Comments: (Attach additional sheets if no	ecessaly)	٦
		_

Print Form

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY Date Received: _______ By: ______ Determination: On the basis of this evaluation: a. The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment and a finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules of Procedure. Yes ☐ No b. The proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but due to the listed mitigation measures which have been added to the project, could have no significant effect on the environment and a mitigated finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules and Procedures. ☐ No ☐ Yes c. The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment and an environmental impact statement shall be prepared in accordance with Chapter 3 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and the Rules of Procedure. ☐ Yes ☐ No Signature of Evaluator

Title of Evaluator

ADDENDUM FOR TRANSFERS/CONVERSIONS OF USE

The following is to be used as a supplemental checklist for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC). It is to be used when reviewing any development right transfer pursuant to Chapter 34 of the Code of Ordinances or Conversion of Use pursuant to Chapter 33 of the Code of Ordinances. Any question answered in the affirmative will require written documentation showing that the impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level. Otherwise, an environmental impact statement will be required.

The asterisk (*) notes threshold subjects.

a) <u>Land</u> * Does the proposal result in any additional land coverage?		
	Yes	☐ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
b) Air Quality* Does the proposal result in any additional emission?		
	☐ Yes	No
	☐ No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
c) Water* Does the proposal result in any additional discharge that violation of TRPA discharge standards?	is in	
	☐ Yes	☐ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
d) Does the proposal result in an increase in the volume of	discharge?	
	☐ Yes	☐ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient
e) Noise* Does the proposal result in an increase in Community No Equivalency Level (CNEL)?	oise	
	☐ Yes	☐ No
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient

f) Aesthetics Does the proposal result in blockage of significant views to Lake Tahoe or an identified visual resource?					
Г			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
g)	Recreation* Does the proposal result in a reduction of public access to recreation areas or public recreation opportunities?	o publi	С		
Г			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
h)	h) Land Use Does the converted or transferred use result in a use that is not consistent with the goals and policies of the Community Plan or Plan Area Statement?				
			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
i)	Population Does the proposal result in an increase in the existing or population of the Region?	olanne	ed		
			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient
j)	Housing Does the proposal result in the loss of affordable housing	?			
			Yes		No
			No, With Mitigation		Data Insufficient

k) <u>Transportation</u> Does the proposal result in the increase of 100 Daily Vehicle Trip Ends (DVTE)?				
	☐ Yes	☐ No		
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient		
Does the proposal result in a project that does standards?	es not meet the parking			
	☐ Yes	☐ No		
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient		
m) <u>Utilities</u> Does the proposal result in additional water	use?			
	☐ Yes	☐ No		
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient		
n) Does the proposal result in the need for addi	itional sewer treatment?			
	☐ Yes	☐ No		
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient		
O) <u>Historical</u> Does the proposal result in the modification historic structure or site?	or elimination of a			
	☐ Yes	☐ No		
	No, With Mitigation	Data Insufficient		

and belief. Signature: (Original signature required.) Nick Haven Date: Person Preparing Application County Applicant Written Comments: (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

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

DECLARATION:

Print Form