

# SUBSTITUTE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT

## TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD FOR SEDIMENT MIDDLE TRUCKEE RIVER WATERSHED PLACER, NEVADA AND SIERRA COUNTIES

**May 2008**

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region  
**2501 Lake Tahoe Boulevard**  
**South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150**  
**530-542-5400**

*Prepared By:*

**Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board  
TMDL Unit**

*Contact Person:*

**Anne Holden**

**[aholden@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:aholden@waterboards.ca.gov)**

# SUBSTITUTE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT

## MIDDLE TRUCKEE RIVER WATERSHED TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD FOR SEDIMENT

### INTRODUCTION

The Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) is the California State agency responsible for water quality protection east of the Sierra Nevada crest. It is one of nine Water Boards that function as part of the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) system within the California Environmental Protection Agency. The Water Board implements both the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, which is part of the California Water Code. Water quality objectives along with beneficial uses (together defined as water quality standards by USEPA) and implementation measures to meet those objectives are contained in the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region* (Basin Plan).

The Water Board proposes to amend its Basin Plan to incorporate a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) and implementation plan to address sedimentation problems affecting water quality in the Truckee River watershed. The proposed Basin Plan amendment focuses on the Truckee River between the outlet of Lake Tahoe and the California/Nevada state line, also known as the middle Truckee River. Unless otherwise noted, references to the Truckee River in this document pertain to the segment of the Truckee River as described above.

This Basin Plan amendment is considered a "project" subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CWA section 303(e) requires states to implement TMDLs through their Continuing Planning Process. The Water Board's planning process has been certified by the Secretary for Resources under Public Resources Code section 21080.5. This certification allows the preparation of a "substitute environmental document" (SED) in lieu of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for proposed Basin Plan amendments. Like an EIR, the SED must include a discussion of project alternatives and mitigation measures.

While the Water Board would not directly undertake any actions that could physically change the environment, adoption of the proposed Basin Plan amendment would result in sediment control actions by landowners, municipalities and other agencies to comply with the requirements of the Basin Plan amendment. These actions may result in a physical change to the environment. The potential environmental impacts of such physical changes are evaluated below, to the extent that they are reasonably foreseeable. Changes that are speculative in nature do not require environmental review.

This document provides a general program level, or Tier One analysis (Public Resources Code [PRC] 21159(a) (1)-(3)) of reasonably foreseeable methods of

compliance, mitigation measures, and alternatives to the proposed TMDL. A subsequent project-specific review, or Tier Two analysis, must be done by project proponents for specific sediment control projects to comply with the TMDL (PRC 21159.2).

This SED includes the proposed Basin Plan Amendment language (Attachment 1) and the middle Truckee River Watershed TMDL for Sediment staff report (Attachment 2), which together provide the information used to evaluate potential physical environmental impacts. These documents are also available at the following website:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water\\_issues/programs/tmdl/truckee/index.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/tmdl/truckee/index.shtml)

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project is a proposed amendment to the Basin Plan, incorporating a TMDL for sediment for the middle Truckee River watershed. The TMDL amendment contains a problem statement that describes how excessive sediment is impairing beneficial uses in the river, an assessment of the sources of sediment, and a numeric target for in-stream suspended sediment concentrations that will be protective of aquatic life. The maximum amount of sediment that the river can assimilate while still attaining water quality standards is estimated, and the general actions needed to control excessive sediment are outlined.

To assess the river's response to sediment control actions, the TMDL monitoring plan relies on an existing program of suspended sediment monitoring in the Truckee River. Progress on implementation of control actions for major sediment sources will be tracked and assessed along with the results of the in-stream monitoring. It is estimated that the numeric target for in-stream sediment will be met within 20 years. This estimate takes into consideration time to identify, plan, fund, and construct sediment control measures, and allows time for the river to respond to decreased sediment loading.

## **PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION**

TMDLs are primarily implemented through the Water Board's existing regulatory tools authorized by the CWA and the California Water Code. Other implementation mechanisms include acknowledgement and reliance on actions by other agencies through agency agreements, memorandums of understanding, or water quality management programs undertaken by various responsible or cooperating entities, and include voluntary efforts.

Regulatory tools include Basin Plan waste discharge prohibitions, waste discharge requirements (WDRs), waivers of WDRs, and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) storm water and construction permits to control sediment discharges. Enforcement actions may be used to address water quality problems when Basin Plan provisions, WDRs or waivers are violated. These include Notices of Violation, Cleanup and Abatement Orders, Cease and Desist Orders, and monetary fines (administrative

civil liabilities). Although the Water Board cannot specify the design, location, type, or particular manner of compliance (Water Code section 13360), it can require dischargers to implement sediment controls such as best management practices (BMPs) necessary to attain the water quality standards through its regulatory authority.

While the Water Board must retain responsibility for regulating the quality of waters of the state, TMDL implementation plans may point to the water quality responsibilities and efforts of other agencies including local, state, federal, or nongovernmental organizations. Also, grant funds are available to assist the regulated community and nongovernmental organizations to implement both required and voluntary actions. Federal 319(h) nonpoint source grants and State Water Bond grants (e.g., Propositions 13, 40 and 50) are examples of these types of funding mechanisms. Several nonprofit watershed or land trust groups in the Truckee River watershed have successfully applied for and received funding from these programs to conduct watershed assessments, implement restoration projects or acquire land for conservancy in the Truckee River watershed. These types of actions will complement the Water Board's regulatory authorities to make progress in reducing sediment loading to the Truckee River and its tributaries.

Water Board staff analyses presented in the TMDL staff report indicates storm water runoff from urban areas, dirt roads, graded ski runs, and legacy sites (past land or surface water disturbances that have an ongoing impact) are the primary human-caused sediment contributors to the Truckee River. Reducing erosion from these sources may involve the following types of sediment controls:

- Revegetating bare soil areas
- Stabilizing or removing dirt roads
- Stabilizing road cuts
- Stabilizing runoff conveyances
- Installing sediment treatment basins
- Restoring infiltration capacity of upland soils
- Installing runoff relief structures
- Reducing and/or collecting traction sand from paved surfaces
- Installing temporary BMPs at construction sites
- Restoring stream channels and meadows

Implementation of these types of sediment control actions could result in physical changes to the environment. For example, installation of sediment treatment basins would involve minor construction or earthmoving (e.g., grading, installation of runoff conveyances and flow dissipation devices). Earthmoving to reduce road-related erosion may involve re-contouring the surface of some dirt roads to disperse concentrated runoff, terracing steep slopes and banks to reduce erosion rates, or reconstructing or relocating of road segments to avoid erosion-sensitive areas. Potential impacts from these types of construction activities are reasonably foreseeable as a result of the proposed Basin Plan amendment, and are discussed in the Environmental Analysis Section below.

## **PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROJECT**

The CWA requires states to identify waters that are not attaining water quality standards (i.e., impaired waters) and to develop and implement TMDLs to address the impairments. The middle Truckee River was identified as impaired based on information from the California Department of Fish and Game regarding degraded fish habitat in the river due to sediment. Water Board staff's analysis, presented in the TMDL staff report, indicate that suspended sediment levels in the river are above those recommended to protect aquatic life, and site-specific studies show that bottom-dwelling insects (benthic macroinvertebrates) are impacted in areas with increased deposited sediment. Therefore, to meet the requirements of the CWA, this TMDL establishes watershed-wide sediment load reductions that are protective of aquatic life beneficial uses in the Truckee River.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The project area for the Truckee River TMDL begins at the northern end of Lake Tahoe, where a dam controls the lake's outflow into the middle Truckee River at Tahoe City. From this outlet, the river flows generally north toward the Town of Truckee, and then northeasterly to the end of the project area at the California/Nevada state line. Elevations in the area range from about 5,050 feet at the California/Nevada state line to 10,778 feet at the summit of Mount Rose, Nevada. The river's elevation drops from 6,225 feet at the outlet at Tahoe City to 5,050 feet at the California/Nevada state line, a distance of 39 miles.

Major tributaries to the Truckee River in the project area include Bear, Squaw, Donner/Coldstream, Trout, Martis, Prosser, Gray and Bronco creeks, and the Little Truckee River. Dam-regulated impoundments include Lake Tahoe, Donner, Independence, and Webber Lakes, and Boca, Stampede, Prosser Creek, and Martis Creek Reservoirs.

Mountainous streams, reservoirs, natural lakes, and outstanding scenery characterize the Truckee River watershed. The area provides for year-round recreational opportunities, including fishing, hiking, horseback riding, biking, swimming, kayaking, skiing, golfing, and off-highway vehicle use. Recreation and tourism are key attributes of the economy of the mountain communities in the watershed. Several renowned ski resorts are located in the project area, including Alpine Meadows, Squaw Valley and Northstar-at-Tahoe. The watershed is home to approximately 20,000 year-round residents. Urban areas include the Town of Truckee, Tahoe City and the communities around the three major ski resorts. All of these areas are experiencing high growth and development related to primary and second home building and resort-related tourism.

State Highways 89 and US Interstate Highway 80 are the major transportation corridors, and generally run parallel to the Truckee River throughout the project area. Much of the watershed is within the Tahoe and Toiyabe National Forests, and approximately 54 percent of the land within the project area is owned by the US Forest Service (USFS).

## **ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS DISCUSSION**

Title 23, Section 3777 of the California Code of Regulations states that any standard, rule, regulation, or plan proposed for board approval or adoption must be accompanied by a discussion of reasonable alternatives to that activity. The Preferred Alternative (i.e., this proposed Total Maximum Daily Load amendment to the Basin Plan), a No Action Alternative, and other alternatives are discussed in this section.

### **Preferred Alternative**

The *Preferred Alternative* is the adoption of the Basin Plan amendment incorporating a TMDL for Sediment in the Truckee River. The Basin Plan amendment includes a discussion of the impacts of excessive sediment in the river, an assessment of sediment sources, and an implementation and monitoring plan. Current sediment loading should be reduced by approximately 20 percent, and the allowable load is allocated to existing sediment source categories, future growth and a margin of safety. A numeric target for suspended sediment concentration is proposed as an indicator of whether load reductions are being met. An adaptive management approach employs a monitoring plan to evaluate the numeric target, in combination with information on the completion of specific implementation actions identified in the implementation plan.

This project will not result in significant adverse environmental impacts (defined as adverse physical changes in the environment). However, if the proposed amendment is adopted, there may be environmental impacts from projects implemented to comply with this amendment. These projects would undergo CEQA review and include mitigation measures where significant impacts are identified. The impacts would be limited in duration (e.g., short-term impacts from installation of sediment control management practices), and the overall effect of the Preferred Alternative is to improve environmental conditions for aquatic life in the river.

The *Preferred Alternative* meets the requirements of the CWA, California Water Code, and the State Board's *Policy for Implementation and Enforcement of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program*.

### **Alternative - No Action**

The *No Action* alternative means that the Water Board would not adopt the Basin Plan amendment, including the TMDL, the numeric target, TMDL implementation plan, and monitoring program. Because the Water Board is required to regulate all nonpoint sources of pollution, many of the actions required by this Basin Plan Amendment (i.e., issuance and compliance with WDRs or waivers, including implementation of BMPs, monitoring and reporting) could occur regardless of TMDL adoption, but the time frame would be uncertain. Additionally, the numeric target needed to interpret the narrative water quality objectives related to sediment would not be established and methods to evaluate the success of sediment control efforts in the watershed could be inconsistently applied. The *No Action* alternative would eliminate an opportunity for increased public input on the watershed restoration plan and could circumvent focusing

implementation actions on the most problematic sources. The *No Action* alternative would also avoid establishing a schedule for assessing success and may result in less effective efforts to ensure protection of water quality. Finally, the *No Action* alternative would not fulfill the requirements of the CWA, Water Code, or the State Board's *Policy for Implementation and Enforcement of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program*.

#### **Alternative – Less Stringent Numeric Target**

The *Less Stringent Numeric Target* alternative would involve setting a target for suspended sediment in the Truckee River at a higher (less stringent) level than that proposed. However, this would result in less-than-adequate conditions for aquatic life that would not be protective of the SPWN (spawning, reproduction and development) beneficial use.

#### **Alternative – More Stringent Numeric Targets**

The *More Stringent Numeric Target* alternative would involve setting the target value for suspended sediment concentration at lower (more stringent) level than that proposed. However, according to the scientific literature review conducted to select the target, the proposed target is set at a level that will protect the most sensitive beneficial uses, and meet water quality standards; therefore, a more stringent target is unnecessary.

### **ECONOMIC CONSIDERATION**

The control actions required by the TMDL will be implemented through the existing WDRs for ski areas, construction projects or similar land disturbing activities. Storm water discharges containing sediment from other areas under the jurisdiction of Placer County and the Town of Truckee have also been identified as sediment sources and were assigned load reductions to meet the TMDL. These entities have been designated as regulated small municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) and will be developing storm water management programs as required under the State's Phase II general municipal NPDES permit.

As required by the State Board's *Policy for Implementation and Enforcement of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program*, sediment discharges from dirt roads, forest management, and other activities will be regulated under the authorities provided by the Water Code, which include WDRs (including National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System [NPDES] permits) and conditional waivers of WDRs. Sediment-generating activities due to timber harvesting or fuels reduction projects are regulated through the Water Board's timber harvest waiver policy (Resolution No. R6T-2007-0008). Under the policy, land owners and federal or state land managers must apply for and receive either a conditional waiver or WDRs from the Water Board before conducting timber harvest or vegetation management activities.

Although requirements to control the pollutant discharges described above exist irrespective of the TMDL, the TMDL provides the analysis needed to emphasize and prioritize the needed actions; therefore, costs associated with these actions are evaluated as part of this document. It is difficult to accurately estimate the cost of implementing the TMDL because the specific priorities and control measures need to

be determined by each individual discharger and may be addressed by an array of alternatives that will be determined iteratively as dischargers work to comply with their permit conditions. General cost estimates for a range of possible control measures that could be used are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Estimate of Possible TMDL Implementation Costs**

<b>Urban Areas (a)</b>	<b>Cost/Unit</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Source</b>
Storm Water Management Plan Development - lump sum per permittee	\$500,000	3	\$1,500,000	Staff Estimate
Storm Water Management Plan Administration - per permittee, per year, 20 years	\$100,000	60	\$6,000,000	Staff Estimate
Monitoring Plan Development - lump sum per permittee	\$100,000	3	\$300,000	Staff Estimate
Monitoring Plan Implementation and Reporting- per permittee, per year, 20 years	\$75,000	60	\$4,500,000	Staff Estimate
Storm Water Site Inspections - 40 sites/permittee, 2 hours/site, \$65/hour, 20 years	\$130	2,400	\$312,000	Staff Estimate
Storm Drain System Construction - per sq. ft. estimate	\$210	Variable	Not Applicable	(c)
Detention Basin Construction - per sq. ft. estimate	\$15	Variable	Not Applicable	(c)
Roadside Ditch Stabilization - per linear ft. estimate	\$120	Variable	Not Applicable	(c)
Road Shoulder Stabilization - per linear ft. estimate	\$70	Variable	Not Applicable	(c)
Revegetation and soil restoration - per sq. ft. estimate	\$2	Variable	Not Applicable	(c)
Street Sweeping - 20 years labor and equipment @ \$155/hour, appr. 20 days/year/permittee	\$155	10,000	\$1,550,000	(c)
Sediment Trap Vactoring - 20 years labor & equipment @ \$120/hour, appr. 20 days/year/permittee	\$120	10,000	\$1,200,000	(c)
Single-Family Housing BMPs - per parcel (b)	\$4,700	2,300	\$10,810,000	(c)
Multi-family Housing BMPs - per parcel @ 50 units per parcel (b)	\$13,100	80	\$1,048,000	(c)
Commercial/Industrial BMPs - per parcel (b)	\$57,000	20	\$1,140,000	(c)

(a) Includes Municipal NPDES Permittees (Caltrans, Placer County, and Town of Truckee)

(b) Estimate based on BMPs for new development

(c) Lake Tahoe TMDL Pollutant Reduction Opportunity Report, September 2007



**Table 1. (Cont.) Estimate of Possible TMDL Implementation Costs**

<b>Dirt Roads (a)</b>	<b>Cost/Mile</b>	<b>Miles</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Source</b>
BMP Retrofit - includes water bars, rolling dips, armored drainage ditches, stabilize ruts	\$24,900	450	\$11,205,000	(b)
BMP Retrofit - annual maintenance, assume 100 miles per year for 20 years	\$4,900	2,000	\$9,800,000	(b)
Full Obliteration - includes recontouring, soil restoration, seed, mulch, blocking vehicle access - assume 150 miles	\$171,100	150	\$25,665,000	(b)
Road Reclamation - includes blocking vehicle access and scarifying only - assume 150 miles	\$1,350	150	\$202,500	(c)

(a) Estimates based on 450 miles of dirt roads within 200 feet of waterways, assumes dirt road width of 12 feet (0.7 acres/mile)

(b) Lake Tahoe TMDL Pollutant Reduction Opportunity Report, September 2007

(c) USEPA, Polluted Runoff (Nonpoint Source Pollution) - <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/MMGI/Chapter3>.

**Costs adjusted for inflation using calculator - <http://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/cpicalc.pl>**

<b>Upland Legacy Sites (a)</b>	<b>Cost/Acre</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Source</b>
Surface Treatment - hydroseeding, tackifier	\$2,500	Variable	Not Applicable	(b)
Surface Treatment - annual maintenance	\$2,833	Variable	Not Applicable	(b)
Surface Treatment With Mulch Cover - hydroseeding, tackifier, pine needle mulch	\$8,000	Variable	Not Applicable	(b)
Surface Treatment With Mulch Cover - annual maintenance	\$3,000	Variable	Not Applicable	(b)

(a) Typically includes areas of soil and vegetation disturbance, eroding cut slopes, graded ski runs, etc.

(b) Lake Tahoe TMDL Pollutant Reduction Opportunity Report, September 2007

<b>Stream Restoration (a)</b>	<b>Small Streams 20-Year Cost (\$/meter)</b>	<b>Large Streams 20 Year Cost (\$/meter)</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Source</b>
Bank Toe Protection - stone	\$700	\$700	Not Applicable	(b)
Bank Protection - anchored shrub/brush revetment	\$342	\$1,495	Not Applicable	(b)
Bank Strengthening - wet meadow vegetation	\$336	\$336	Not Applicable	
Bank Strengthening - woody riparian vegetation	\$336	\$336	Not Applicable	(b)
Bank Lowering Plus Flood Plain excavation	\$1,601	\$6,997	Not Applicable	(b)
Bank Lowering Plus angle reduction	\$268	\$1,170	Not Applicable	(b)
Channel Reconstruction	\$2,718	\$11,882	Not Applicable	(b)

(a) Estimates based on projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin - tributary streams (small) and the Upper Truckee River (large)

(b) Lake Tahoe TMDL Pollutant Reduction Opportunity Report, September 2007

<b>Numeric Target Monitoring (a)</b>	<b>Cost/Month</b>	<b>Months</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Source</b>
Suspended Sediment Monitoring at Farad - 20 years	\$500 (one event/month)	240	\$120,000	(b)

(a) Monitoring costs, other than for suspended sediment, are covered under the Urbanized Areas

(b) Personal communication (October 2007) with A. Heyvaert, Desert Research Institute

## ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

1. **Project title:**  
Middle Truckee River Watershed Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Sediment, Basin Plan Amendment
2. **Lead agency name and address:**  
Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board  
2501 Lake Tahoe Blvd.  
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
3. **SED Preparer and phone number:**  
Anne Holden, (530) 542-5450
4. **Project location:**  
Middle Truckee River watershed, north of Lake Tahoe to the California/Nevada state line, Placer, Nevada and Sierra Counties, California
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**  
Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board  
2501 Lake Tahoe Blvd.  
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150  
Attn: Anne Holden
6. **General plan designation:**  
Not Applicable
7. **Zoning:**  
Not Applicable
8. **Description of project:**  
The Lahontan Regional Board intends to adopt a Basin Plan amendment incorporating the *Total Maximum Daily Load for Sediment in the Truckee River Watershed, Placer, Nevada and Sierra Counties* into the Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region (Basin Plan). The project would involve actions to reduce sediment loads in the watershed and protect beneficial uses.
9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:**  
The proposed Basin Plan amendment affects the high elevation mountainous environment within the Truckee River watershed. Land use is generally for commercial, residential, and recreational purposes.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)  
The California State Water Resources Control Board, California Office of Administrative Law, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency must approve the proposed Basin Plan amendment.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

The proposed Basin Plan amendment does not define the specific actions that entities would take to comply with requirements derived from the amendment. As discussed in previously, physical changes resulting from the Basin Plan amendment are foreseeable, but the specific implementation actions (e.g., design, location, extent, etc.) are not determined at this time and will be implemented iteratively. Therefore, this analysis considers the reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance with the Basin Plan amendment in general programmatic terms and concludes that the Basin Plan amendment will not have significant environmental impacts.

Specific compliance projects, when they are developed, will be subject to CEQA review and/or approval by the Water Board. As a result, the Water Board (or other lead agencies under CEQA) could either disapprove projects with significant and unacceptable environmental impacts, or require implementation of mitigation measures (e.g., best construction management practices) to ensure that environmental impacts are reduced to less than significant levels. Additionally, there are existing performance standards (e.g., air standards and noise ordinances) with which proposed projects must comply to keep impacts at less-than significant levels. In sum, CEQA requirements, existing regulatory programs, and performance standards currently in place provide adequate assurances that impacts from the Basin Plan amendment will be less than significant.

An explanation for each box checked on the environmental checklist is provided below.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X

a-d) The proposed Basin Plan amendment will not result in any adverse aesthetic changes to scenic vistas, resources or state scenic highways.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

a-c) The proposed Basin Plan amendment does not involve converting agricultural land to non-agricultural use. Implementation of sediment control activities as a result of the amendment would not impact farmland in the Truckee River watershed. No sediment control activities are proposed for existing farmlands.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>III. AIR QUALITY</b> -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		X		
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

a) The Basin Plan amendment does not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any air quality plans.

b) Construction of erosion control projects as a result of the amendment could involve dust-generating activities; however, these projects would be of short-term duration and of limited scale such that impacts would not be cumulatively considerable or substantial. Additionally, any dust-generating activities would be subject to dust control regulations implemented under applicable construction permits and by local air pollution control districts. For example, the Placer County Air Pollution Control District

has promulgated dust control requirements in its Rule 228 (Fugitive Dust, amended April 10, 2003). The following minimum dust control requirements are to be initiated at the start, and maintained throughout the duration of construction or grading activity, including any construction or grading for road construction or maintenance:

- Unpaved areas subject to vehicle traffic must be stabilized by being kept wet, treated with a chemical dust suppressant, or covered.
- Storage piles and disturbed areas not subject to vehicular traffic must be stabilized by being kept wet, treated with a chemical dust suppressant, or covered when material is not being added to or removed from the pile.
- Prior to any ground disturbance, including grading, excavating, and land clearing, sufficient water must be applied to the area to be disturbed to prevent emitting dust.
- Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt, from being released or tracked offsite.
- When wind speeds are high enough to result in dust emissions crossing the boundary line (as defined in the rule), despite the application of dust mitigation measures, grading and earthmoving operations shall be suspended.

Therefore, with required mitigation measures, dust generation from Basin Plan amendment-related projects would be less than significant.

c) No increase in criteria pollutants is expected from the amendment.

d-e) No substantial or considerable increases in pollutant concentration levels or objectionable odors are foreseeable.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES --</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		X		
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree				X



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
preservation policy or ordinance?				
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

a-b) The species shown in Table 2, below, were identified as rare, threatened, endangered, or special concern species in the project area. Temporary impacts to riparian or other sensitive habitat could occur if projects are proposed that involve construction and earthmoving activities to implement long-term soil stabilization or treatment measures. However, specific implementation project proposals subject to CEQA must undergo a project-specific analysis to identify potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures. For example, the Nevada County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance require that certain discretionary projects complete Biological Inventory Reports and/or Habitat Management Plans. The intent of these reports is to determine whether the habitat for special status species and/or the actual special status species itself may be affected by a proposed project. The information provided in the report should be at a level of detail sufficient for conducting a CEQA analysis of the project, including existing setting, impacts, mitigation measures, and monitoring.

Additionally, implementation projects, whether subject to CEQA or not, must comply with Basin Plan requirements and conditions from applicable local, state, and federal permitting authorities. No discharges are allowed that would cause a violation of water quality objectives. At a minimum, mitigation measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate any impacts to sensitive habitats for specific projects are required under the regulatory authority of the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and the Lahontan Water Board.

Mitigation measures required in operational and construction-related waste discharge requirements (WDRs) or National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits issued by the Water Board and those required by the CDFG under its stream alteration agreement program (CDFG Code §1603) include, but are not limited to:

- Developing written storm water pollution prevention plans (SWPPPs)
- Stabilizing disturbed areas to protect against adverse weather conditions
- Restricting vehicle use to roadways or existing disturbed areas
- Limiting the extent of land disturbance
- Prohibiting land disturbance during winter months (between October 15 and May 1)

- Installing temporary erosion control measures at active construction sites
- Revegetating disturbed land areas
- Properly managing earthen waste materials
- Diverting stream flows away from work areas
- Providing in-kind replacement of disturbed vegetation
- Prohibiting activities that would likely jeopardize the continued existence of a threatened or endangered species and activities that would likely destroy or adversely modify critical habitat of such species
- Prohibiting the “take” of a threatened or endangered species

Therefore, activities taken to comply with the Basin Plan amendment would not cause substantial adverse effects to habitats, special-status species, or sensitive communities, and the impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

**Table 2. Candidate, Threatened, Endangered, or Special Concern Species (SC) in the Project Area<sup>1</sup>**

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status	CDFG Status
American badger	Taxidea taxus	None	None	SC
Bald eagle	Haliaeetus leucocephalus	Delisted	Endangered	
Black swift	Cypseloides niger	None	None	SC
California wolverine	Gulo gulo	None	Threatened	
Cooper's hawk	Accipiter cooperii	None	None	SC
Great gray owl	Strix nebulosa	None	Endangered	
Greater sandhill crane	Grus canadensis tabida	None	Threatened	
Lahontan cutthroat trout	Oncorhynchus clarkii henshawi	Threatened	None	
Northern goshawk	Accipiter gentilis	None	None	SC
Osprey	Pandion haliaetus	None	None	SC
Pacific fisher	Martes pennanti (pacifica)	Candidate	None	SC
Sierra Nevada mountain beaver	Aplodontia rufa californica	None	None	SC
Sierra Nevada red fox	Vulpes vulpes necator	None	Threatened	
Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare	Lepus americanus tahoensis	None	None	SC
Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog	Rana sierrae	Candidate	None	SC
Silver-haired bat	Lasionycteris noctivagans	None	None	SC
Tahoe yellow cress	Rorippa subumbellata	Candidate	Endangered	
Webber's ivesia	Ivesia webberi	Candidate	None	
Western white-tailed jackrabbit	Lepus townsendii	None	None	SC
Willow flycatcher	Empidonax traillii	None	Endangered	
Yellow warbler	Dendroica petechia brewsteri	None	None	SC

<sup>1</sup> California Natural Diversity Database. California Department of Fish and Game, (CDFG) 2007 online *QuickViewer*. Search based on the following USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle maps in the project area: Webber Peak, Sattley, Sierraville, Sardine Peak, Dog Valley, Independence Lake, Hobart Mills, Boca, Martis Peak, Truckee, Norden, Tahoe City, and Granite Chief.

c) Temporary impacts to federally protected wetlands could occur if projects are proposed that involve construction and earthmoving activities to implement long-term soil stabilization or treatment measures. However, specific implementation project proposals subject to CEQA must undergo a project-specific analysis to identify potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures. Additionally, the Basin Plan includes a "no net loss" policy for wetland protection and requires that discharges to wetlands must be protected with respect to the same standards and minimum treatment as for surface waters. Policies to avoid, minimize, and mitigate wetland impacts are ensured under CWA Sections 401 (Water Quality Certification issued by the Water Board) and 404 (Permits for work in "waters of the U.S." issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). Measures required to prevent significant impacts to federally protected wetlands include, but are not limited to:

- Reviewing project plans to ensure that wetland disturbances are avoided and minimized to the extent practicable
- Installing temporary and permanent erosion controls to all disturbed land surfaces and areas below the high water mark
- Prohibiting activities that would substantially disrupt the movement of species migrating through the work area
- Using protective mats for heavy equipment working in wetlands
- Preventing use of unsuitable fill materials
- Removing all temporary fill and restoring affected areas to their preexisting elevation
- Providing in-kind replacement of wetlands at a ratio sufficient to compensate for temporal and spatial wetland impacts

Therefore, activities taken to comply with the Basin Plan amendment would not substantially affect federally protected wetlands, and the impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

d) Certain restoration activities (e.g., in-stream restoration work, temporary construction disturbance, etc.) have the potential to interfere with fish or wildlife movement, wildlife corridors, or wildlife nursery sites. However, specific implementation project proposals subject to CEQA must undergo a project-specific analysis to identify potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures. Projects that are determined to potentially affect fish and wildlife habitat or activities would be regulated under the state and federal authority described above. Mitigation measures required under the authority of the Water Board, CDFG, and/or U.S. Army Corps of Engineers would include those previously described under items IV. a,b, and c. Therefore, activities taken to comply with the Basin Plan Amendment would not substantially interfere with fish or wildlife movement, wildlife corridors, or wildlife nursery sites, and the impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

e-f) The proposed project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat

conservation plans. The proposed Basin Plan amendment is intended to protect biologic (aquatic) resources and habitats in the Truckee River.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES --</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?		X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?		X		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		

a-c) Impacts to historical, unique paleontological, geological, or archeological resources could occur as a result of projects that are proposed involving earthmoving activities to implement long-term soil stabilization or treatment measures. However, specific implementation project proposals subject to CEQA must undergo a project-specific analysis to identify potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures.

If, during the review and/or approval of specific implementation projects, it is found these resources or features may be present, the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the project area, and if so, to mitigate that effect. If areas are identified where potential impacts cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance, then these project areas may need to be avoided. Specific project proponents should contact the California Historic Resources Information Center through the State Office of Historic Preservation for information on whether the project area has been surveyed for cultural resources, or if the potential exists for cultural resources to be present. The Native American Heritage Commission should be contacted for a Sacred Lands File search. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plans provisions for identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, per CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, subdivision (f). Mitigation plans for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in

consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans, should also be included. In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American should monitor all ground-disturbing activities. Note that lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence.

If a specific implementation project affects state-owned historical resources, as described in Public Resources Code section 5024, and the lead agency is a state agency, the lead agency shall consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer as provided in Public Resources Code section 5024.5. Consultation should be coordinated in a timely fashion with the preparation of environmental documents.

d) When an initial study identifies the existence of, or the probable likelihood, of Native American human remains within the project, a lead agency shall work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission as provided in Public Resources Code section 5097.98. The applicant may develop an agreement for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS --</b> Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				

a) The Basin Plan amendment would not involve the construction of habitable structures; therefore, it would not involve any human safety risks related to fault rupture, seismic ground-shaking, ground failure, or landslides.

b) Projects involving earthmoving or construction activities to comply with the proposed Basin Plan amendment are reasonably foreseeable. Such activities would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The purpose of the Basin Plan amendment is to reduce erosion, not increase it.

c-d) Specific projects to comply with the Basin Plan amendment would be designed to minimize any potential for landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Therefore, the Basin Plan amendment would not create safety or property risks due to unstable or expansive soils.

e) The Basin Plan amendment would not require wastewater disposal systems; therefore, affected soils need not be capable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:</b> Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

a-c) The proposed project does not involve the transport, use, disposal, release, or transmission of hazardous materials.

d) Restoration projects implemented as a result of proposed Basin Plan amendment may be located on a site that is identified as a hazardous materials site compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. A search of the "Hazardous Wastes and Substances Site List" (Cortese List) ([http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/mandated\\_reports.asp](http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/mandated_reports.asp)) shows nine sites are included on the list in the project area. Of these, one is listed as "active", with confirmed contaminants detected. The site is currently undergoing cleanup under the oversight of the Department of Toxics Substances Control. Any proposed sediment-related restoration at this site would be coordinated with DTSC to ensure no significant hazards to the public or environment would occur.

e-f) The project does not involve activities near an airport or airstrip that would result in a safety hazard.

g) The project does not interfere with an emergency evacuation or response plan.

h) The project does not expose people or structures to wildland fires. The project does not preclude fuels reduction activities, and these activities should result in decreased risk of wildland fires.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		X		
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?		X		
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

a) Temporary land disturbing projects could be proposed that have the potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. However, the California Water Code (Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act) requires that any entity discharging waste, or proposing to discharge waste that could affect the quality of the waters of the state must submit a report of waste discharge to the Water Board. The Water Board regulates such discharges by issuing general and individual WDRs (including NPDES permits) and conditional waivers of WDRs. These WDRs and waivers of WDRs require written pollution prevention plans and implementation of mitigation measures to ensure that discharges do not cause a violation of water quality objectives. Mitigation measures associated with land disturbing activities include a variety of techniques to:

- retain soil and sediment on the construction site
- prevent non-storm water discharges that would discharge pollutants off site
- prevent the discharge of other pollutants associated with construction activities to land or surface waters
- permanently stabilize disturbed soils
- minimize the effects of increased storm water runoff from impervious surfaces

With required mitigation, activities taken to comply with the Basin Plan amendment would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

b) The proposed project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. Rather, groundwater recharge may be improved by increased infiltration capacity resulting from erosion control projects undertaken as a result of the Basin Plan amendment. This would be a beneficial, rather than a negative, impact.

c-d) Implementation activities may be undertaken which could alter the existing drainage or runoff patterns of a site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river. For example, stream or upland restoration to reduce erosion rates or increase infiltration capacity may be proposed. The net effect of these activities would be to reduce sediment loading or runoff rates to surface waters to improve conditions. This would be a beneficial, rather than a negative, impact.

e-f) Basin Plan amendment-related activities are intended to decrease peak runoff rates from upland land uses to reduce sediment input to channels and channel erosion. Therefore, the Basin Plan amendment would not increase the rate or amount of runoff, exceed the capacity of storm water drainage systems, or degrade water quality.

g-i) The Basin Plan amendment does not involve housing or structures that would pose, or be subject to, flood hazards.

j) Basin Plan amendment-related projects would not expose people or structures to substantial risks due to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -</b> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

a) The Basin Plan amendment does not involve projects that may physically divide an established community. It is not foreseeable that projects implemented as a result of the proposed amendment would be of such scale that they could physically divide an established community.

b-c) The Basin Plan amendment would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation, and would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

a-b) Basin Plan amendment-related projects would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resources.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XI. NOISE:</b> Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

a) Restoration activities involving earthmoving or construction may occur as a result of the Basin Plan amendment. These activities could temporarily generate noise. The Truckee River and its major tributaries that are the focus of this project are located

primarily in Placer and Nevada Counties, and the Town of Truckee; therefore, restoration projects would most likely occur in these areas (Sierra County is mostly rural, and only a small portion of the mainstem Truckee River is located in Sierra County). All three of these local governments have noise ordinances. Construction projects to comply with this Basin Plan amendment would be required to comply with these local ordinances.

Placer County's noise ordinance contains an exemption for construction or repair activities conducted weekdays between 6 am and 8 pm (weekends from 8 am and 8 pm), provided that all construction equipment is fitted with appropriate muffling devices and kept in good working order (Placer County Code, Section 9.36.030 Exemptions). It is reasonable to assume these daylight periods are when restoration actions would occur. Therefore, restoration construction projects in Placer County would not exceed standards.

Nevada County has promulgated noise standards in its General Plan (Policy 9.1, Nevada County General Plan). However, Policy 9.1 contains an exemption to those standards for construction of a project (Policy 9.1.f). Therefore, restoration construction projects in Nevada County would comply with the county's noise standards as exempted. Further, any construction projects within the Town of Truckee's jurisdiction (the Town is located in Nevada County), would be subject to the Town's more restrictive ordinance, below.

The Town of Truckee's Noise Ordinance contains an exemption for noise sources associated with non-single family residential construction, provided the activities do not take place before 7:00 a.m. or after 9:00 p.m. on any day except Sunday, or before 9:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on Sunday. The Town may impose further limitations on the hours and day of construction or other measures to mitigate significant noise impacts on sensitive uses.

b) Projects could be proposed that involve use of earthmoving or other heavy construction equipment, which would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels in excess of current noise levels. However, excessive noise is regulated by the Placer County Code (Chapter 9, Article 9.36), the Town of Truckee's Noise Ordinance, and the Noise Element of the Nevada County General Plan, which prevent unreasonable noise levels while allowing necessary construction activities. Therefore, activities taken to comply with the Basin Plan amendment will not result in substantial noise increase, and the impacts will be less than significant.

c) The Basin Plan amendment would not cause any permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Any noise would be short-term in nature.

d) Projects could be proposed that involve use of earthmoving or other heavy construction equipment, which would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels in excess of current noise levels. However, excessive noise is regulated by the Placer County Code (Chapter 9, Article 9.36), the Town of Truckee's Noise Ordinance, and the Noise Element of the Nevada County General Plan, which prevent



unreasonable noise levels while allowing necessary construction activities. Therefore, activities taken to comply with the Basin Plan amendment will not result in substantial noise increase, and the impacts will be less than significant.

e-f) The Basin Plan amendment would not cause any permanent increase in ambient noise levels, including aircraft noise. Therefore, it would not expose people living within an area subject to an airport land use plan or in the vicinity of a private airstrip to excessive noise.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING --</b> Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

a-c) The Basin Plan amendment would not affect the population of the Truckee River watershed. It would not induce growth through such means as constructing new housing or businesses, or by extending roads or infrastructure. The Basin Plan amendment would also not displace any existing housing or any people that would need replacement housing.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES</b>				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?				X
Police protection?				X
Schools?				X
Parks?				X
Other public facilities?				X

a) The Basin Plan amendment would not affect service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services, including fire protection, police protection, schools, or parks.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIV. RECREATION --</b>				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

a-b) The Basin Plan amendment would not increase the use of recreational facilities, or require construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC --</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				X
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

a-b) The Basin Plan amendment would not involve projects that substantially increase traffic or capacity of street systems, or affect the level of service standards. Any

construction activities related to erosion control or stream restoration projects would be temporary, and related traffic increases would be of short-term duration. Therefore, the Basin Plan amendment would not substantially increase traffic in relation to existing conditions. Levels of service would be unchanged.

c) The Basin Plan amendment would not affect air traffic.

d) Reductions in road-related erosion implemented as a result of the Basin Plan amendment would not require installation of hazardous design features or incompatible uses.

e-f) The Basin Plan amendment will not affect emergency access or parking capacity.

g) The Basin Plan amendment will not affect alternative transportation.

.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b> Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		X		
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				

a-b) The Basin Plan amendment does not involve projects which would affect wastewater treatment facilities.

c) New or expanded storm water drainage facilities are reasonably foreseeable as a result of the Basin Plan amendment. For example, entities may propose projects to install or expand storm water treatment vaults, retention basins, curb and gutter features or bio-filtration areas to comply with TMDL load reductions from urban areas. The construction or expansion of these facilities could result in environmental impacts if appropriate mitigation measures are not implemented. Any project subject to CEQA that proposes new or expanded storm water facilities must identify potential environmental impacts and feasible mitigation measures to ensure impacts are less than significant.

Further, projects to construct or expand storm water facilities would be subject to requirements contained in statewide and Lahontan region-specific general NPDES construction permits. These permits require written pollution prevention plans and implementation of mitigation measures to ensure that discharges do not cause a violation of water quality objectives. Mitigation measures associated with land disturbing activities include a variety of techniques to:

- retain soil and sediment on the construction site
- prevent non-storm water discharges that would discharge pollutants off site
- prevent the discharge of other pollutants associated with construction activities to land or surface waters
- permanently stabilize disturbed soils
- minimize the effects of increased storm water runoff from impervious surfaces

With required mitigation, either under CEQA or Water Board permitting authorities, activities taken to comply with the Basin Plan amendment would not result in significant environmental impacts that could not be mitigated to less-than-significant levels.

e) The Basin Plan amendment would not increase demand on any wastewater treatment provider.

f) Basin Plan amendment implementation would not affect solid waste generation or landfill capacities.



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife 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 history or prehistory?				X
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

a) The Basin Plan amendment is intended to improve, rather than degrade, the quality of the environment. The project will improve habitat for aquatic life species by reducing sediment loading to the Truckee River and its major tributaries.

b) Staff considered the potential for the Basin Plan amendment to cause cumulative impacts. The project is a watershed restoration plan, which does not have

growth inducing effects that could cause incremental effects or cumulatively cause considerable impacts. Although there could be temporary effects from the construction of sediment control mechanisms, the net long-term effect is beneficial and improves the natural functions of the watershed. Potential short-term impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels. As specific projects are proposed, they would be subject to review and/or approval by the Water Board, and responsible agencies under CEQA, and mitigation measures would be required to ensure that impacts remain less-than-significant. Therefore, the overall effect of adopting the proposed Basin Plan amendment is determined to have less than significant cumulative impacts to the environment.

c) The Basin Plan amendment does not have environmental effects which will cause adverse effects on human beings, neither directly or indirectly.

### **DETERMINATION**

On the basis of this evaluation:

I find the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment.

I find that the proposed project may have a significant adverse impact on the environment. However, there are feasible alternatives and/or feasible mitigation measures available that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impact. These alternatives and mitigation measures are discussed in the attached written report.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment. There are no feasible alternatives and/or feasible mitigation measures available that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts. See the attached written report for a discussion of this determination.

---

Signature

---

Date