

DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Canyon Springs Subdivision
SCH #2004052060

April 2007



Quad Knopf

DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Canyon Springs Subdivision
SCH #2004052060

Submitted to:

Town of Truckee
Community Development Department
10183 Truckee Airport Road
Truckee, California 96161

Prepared by:



Quad Knopf

One Sierragate Plaza, Suite 270C
Roseville, California 95678

(916) 784-7823

April 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Introduction.....	ES-1
Project Description	ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	ES-2
Potential Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved.....	ES-3
Alternatives to this Project	ES-3

Chapter One – Introduction

1.1 Procedures and Purpose	1-1
1.2 Organization of the EIR.....	1-3
1.3 Methodology	1-4

Chapter Two – Project Description

2.1 Project Location	2-1
2.2 Proposed Action	2-1
2.3 Project Description.....	2-5
2.4 Project Goals and Objectives.....	2-6
2.5 Uses of the EIR and Required Agency Actions and Permits.....	2-6

Chapter Three – Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures

3.1 Aesthetics	3-1
3.2 Air Quality	3-37
3.3 Biological Resources	3-51
3.4 Cultural Resources	3-105
3.5 Geology and Soils.....	3-119
3.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	3-133
3.7 Hydrology and Water Quality	3-145
3.8 Land Use, Planning and Recreation	3-161
3.9 Noise.....	3-187
3.10 Population and Housing.....	3-205
3.11 Public Services and Utilities.....	3-213
3.12 Transportation/Traffic.....	3-227

Chapter Four – Project Alternatives

4.1 Introduction	4-1
4.2 Project Objectives	4-5
4.3 Alternatives Rejected.....	4-5
4.4 Project Alternatives.....	4-5

4.5	Analysis of Project Alternatives.....	4-7
4.6	Environmentally Superior Alternative	4-16

Chapter Five – Mandatory CEQA Sections

5.1	Effects Not Found To Be Significant In The EIR	5-1
5.2	Significant Environmental Effects Requiring Mitigation	5-5
5.3	Significant Environmental Effects That Cannot Be Avoided.....	5-8
5.4	Irreversible Impacts	5-9
5.5	Cumulative Impacts	5-10
5.6	Growth Inducing Impacts	5-14

Appendices

Appendix A	Notice of Preparation and Comment Letters
Appendix B	Air Quality Impact Analysis
Appendix C	Biological Resource Analysis California Natural Diversity Database Report
Appendix D	Peer Review of Cultural Resource Studies Heritage Resource Inventory Update Archaeological Reconnaissance
Appendix E	Geologic, Geohazards and Environmental Hazards Evaluation Report Update
Appendix F	Preliminary Hydrology & Hydraulics Report and Exhibits
Appendix G	Acoustical Terminology FHWA Noise Prediction Model Inputs
Appendix H	Transportation Analysis Technical Appendices
Appendix I	List of References and Persons Consulted
Appendix J	List of Preparers

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page No.
S-1	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	ES-5
2-1	Subsequent Permits, Approvals, Review and Consultation Requirements.....	2-11
3.1-1	Landscape Visual Quality Scale Used In Rating Proposed Project Area Viewsheds.....	3-13
3.2-1	Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards.....	3-41
3.2-2	Construction Emissions (Pounds Per Day)	3-44
3.2-3	Project Direct/Indirect Emissions in Pounds Per Day.....	3-47
3.3-1	Plant and Wildlife Species Observed or Known to Occur on the Site or in the Vicinity.....	3-53
3.3-2	Listed and Special-Status Species Potentially Occurring on the Site or in the Vicinity.....	3-64
3.8-1	Project Consistency with General Plan Land Use Element.....	3-169
3.9-1	Summary of Measured Background Noise Levels May 23-24, 2006.....	3-193
3.9-2	Existing No Project Traffic Noise Levels.....	3-193
3.9-3	General Plan Standards for Land Use Compatibility with Noise.....	3-196
3.9-4	Noise Standards by Receiving Land Use.....	3-197
3.9-5	Significance of Changes in Cumulative Noise Exposure.....	3-198
3.9-6	Existing Plus Project Traffic Noise Levels	3-199
3.9-7	Year 2025 No Project Traffic Noise Levels.....	3-199
3.9-8	Year 2025 Plus Project Traffic Noise Levels	3-199
3.9-9	Construction Equipment Noise.....	3-200

3.10-1	Nevada County Historical Population Estimates 1970-1990	3-205
3.10-2	Nevada County Population Estimates 1996-2006	3-206
3.10-3	2000 Population by Age	3-207
3.10-4	General Household Demographic Data for Truckee	3-208
3.11-1	Truckee Donner Public Utility District, Project Water System Demand	3-216
3.12-1	2006 No Project Intersection LOS	3-235
3.12-2	Roadway Peak-Hour and Average Daily Traffic Volumes	3-236
3.12-3	Applicable LOS Standards	3-247
3.12-4	Canyon Springs Trip Generation	3-249
3.12-5	Canyon Springs Trip Distribution	3-250
3.12-6	Canyon Springs Development – Existing (2006) Distribution by Route....	3-254
3.12-7	2006 No Project and Plus Project Intersection LOS	3-257
3.12-8	2006 No Project and Plus Project Roadway Traffic Volumes	3-258
3.12-9	Estimation of Traffic Generated by Worst Case Construction Phase	3-267
3.12-10	Canyon Springs One Access Alternative – Existing (2006) Distribution by Route	3-269
3.12-11	One Access Alternative Impact on 2006 PM Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	3-271
3.12-12	One Access Alternative Impact on 2006 PM Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes With Proposed Project	3-271
3.12-13	2006 No Project and Plus Project Intersection LOS	3-272
3.12-14	2025 Intersection LOS	2-284
3.12-15	2025 Roadway Peak Hour and Average Daily Traffic Volumes	2-291
3.12-16	2025 One Access Alternative Generation PM Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	3-293

3.12-17	2025 Plus One Access Alternative PM Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	3-294
3.12-18	2025 Plus One Access Alternative Intersection LOS	3-294
3.12-19	2025 Plus One Access Alternative Roadway Peak Hour and Average Daily Traffic Volumes	3-296
4-1	Summary of Impact Comparison Between Proposed Project and Alternatives	4-16

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Title	Page
2-1	Location Map	2-3
2-2	Proposed Site Plan	2-7
2-3	USGS 7.5' Topographic Quadrangle	2-9
3.1-1	Key Observation Point Locations.....	3-11
3.1-2	KOP #1 Site Photos.....	3-15
3.1-3	KOP #2 Site Photos.....	3-17
3.1-4	KOP #3 Site Photos.....	3-19
3.1-5	KOP #4 Site Photos.....	3-21
3.1-6	KOP #5 Site Photos.....	3-23
3.1-7	KOP #6 Site Photos.....	3-25
3.1-8	KOP #7 Site Photos.....	3-29
3.3-1	Sensitive Habitat & Species Locations.....	3-57
3.3-2	CNDDDB Occurrences.....	3-73
3.5-1	Geologic Map.....	3-121
3.5-2	NRCS Soil Survey	3-123
3.6-1	Community Areas at Risk From Wildland Fire	3-143
3.7-1	FEMA Flood Zones	3-147
3.7-2	Project Flood Zones With Buffer	3-149
3.8-1	Current Town of Truckee & County of Nevada General Plan	3-165
3.8-2	Current Town of Truckee & County of Nevada Zoning	3-167
3.8-3	Annexation Area	3-173

3.9-1	Noise Measurement Site Locations	3-189
3.9-2	Continuous Measured Hourly Noise Levels	3-191
3.12-1	Intersection Lane Configuration and Traffic Control.....	3-229
3.12-2	Existing PM Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes Without Project.....	3-233
3.12-3	Project Net Impact on Existing 2006 PM Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes.....	3-259
3.12-4	Existing 2006 PM Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes With Project.....	3-261
3.12-5	Future (2025) PM Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes Without Project.....	3-285
3.12-6	Future (2025) Project Net Impact PM Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	3-287
3.12-7	Future (2025) PM Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes with Project	3-289

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The proposed Canyon Springs Subdivision will be located on approximately 289 acres, at the far eastern end of the Town of Truckee adjacent to the Glenshire, Cambridge Estates, and Elkhorn Ridge subdivisions. Figure 2-1 provides an illustration of the proposed project location. The project site is identified by the Nevada County Assessor's office as Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 49-020-17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22. Access to the site is proposed via a new road within Nevada County (APN 48-090-28), which is proposed to be annexed to the Town of Truckee. The proposed project is requesting approval of a tentative map and planned development applications to subdivide six parcels comprising 289 acres into 213 residential lots in the Town of Truckee. This 213 lot project includes 181 market rate lots and 32 "restricted-affordable" lots, along with eight open space lots (see Figure 2-2). This Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared for the following discretionary actions:

- Approval of a Tentative Subdivision Map Street Easement Abandonment (Doc. #97-019126, #88-15517, #84-31417)
- Approval of a Planned Development Application
- Annexation of Five Acres in Nevada County to Town of Truckee

This Draft EIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) statutes and guidelines and is an informational document intended to inform public decision-makers, responsible or interested agencies and the general public of the potential environmental effects of the proposed project, and where applicable, mitigation measures that can be implemented to reduce or avoid the potential adverse environmental effects.

Project Description

The applicant is requesting approval of a tentative map and planned development application to subdivide six parcels comprising 289 acres into 213 residential lots. The proposed project would consist of the following phases:

- Phase I: 51 for-sale market rate single family lots and 20 affordable lots (18 single family and two duplex);
- Phase II: 50 for-sale market rate single family lots and the remaining 12 affordable duplex lots;
- Phase III: The remaining 80 for-sale, market rate, single family lots.

The proposed project also requires abandonment of street and public utility easements created by a previous parcel map which will occur as part of tentative map approval. Future

development on the site will have two access points. The accesses propose to connect to Martis Peak Road and Edinburgh Drive. Martis Peak Road is a narrow paved roadway that connects directly to Glenshire Drive across from Whitehorse Road on the eastern end of the Glenshire area. All of Martis Peak Road is located within the jurisdiction of Nevada County. Edinburgh Drive is a short residential roadway that connects to a network of other local residential roads that weave through a neighborhood and exit onto Glenshire Drive near the Glenshire Clubhouse.

Located in the eastern Sierra Nevada Mountains at elevations ranging from 5,929 to 6,080 feet, the 289-acre project site is characterized by fairly gently sloping terrain with some relatively flat areas and three drainages. Biological communities consist primarily of Jeffrey pine, riverine, sagebrush, various low-growing ground cover species, ephemeral drainages, and seasonal wetlands. A Sierra Pacific Power-Glenshire electrical substation is located approximately 100 feet from the western edge of the site and a 60-KV transmission line traverses the northwestern portion of the project site. Land use surrounding the site includes recreational, forested open space, and rural/medium density residential.

The proposed project site is undeveloped; however, a well-developed network of unpaved roads and trails is distributed throughout the site. This network extends into adjacent lands on all sides of the study area. The study area is accessed from the Glenshire/Devonshire subdivision, and experiences unauthorized use year-round by nearby residents. In the winter, the predominant use is for cross-country and backcountry skiers, snowshoers, and snowmobile users. After the snow has melted, hikers, mountain bikers/dirt bikers/off-road vehicles and equestrians use the area frequently.

The Truckee General Plan designates the project site as RC/OS (Resource Conservation/Open Space) and RES 0.5-1 (Residential 0.5-1 unit per acre). The allowable density based on current zoning standards is 214 lots and consists of:

- 213 acres in RS-1 Zoning District (Single Family Residential, density of one dwelling unit per acre) that would allow a total of 213 lots.
- 71 acres in OS Zoning District (Open Space) allowing no housing units.
- Approximately five acres in Nevada County would allow one lot.

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Section 15123(b)(1) of the Guidelines for the California Environmental Quality Act (State CEQA Guidelines) provides that the summary shall identify each significant effect with proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect. This information is summarized in Table S-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Potential Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved

The following issues could produce controversy in reviewing and considering the proposed project:

- Aesthetics: Affects on the visual character and quality of the surrounding area including impacts from light and glare on the night sky.
- Air Quality: Increase in air pollution, particularly in winter.
- Biology: Impacts to the Loyaltton-Truckee deer herd as well as impacts to sensitive habitats and species.
- Hazards: Effect on emergency services, increased exposure to fire hazards.
- Recreation: Loss of recreation opportunities.
- Noise: Exposure to and creation of excessive noise levels.
- Public Services: School capacity.
- Transportation/Traffic: Project and cumulative increase in area traffic, as well as safety related issues.

Alternatives to the Project

Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the EIR to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or to the location of the project which would reduce or avoid significant impacts, and which could feasibly accomplish the basic objectives of the proposed project, and to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. Alternatives that would reduce or avoid significant impacts represent an environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project. However, if the environmentally superior alternative is the “No Project” alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

The alternatives identified for consideration are as follows:

ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

This alternative is required under CEQA, and will consist of describing the effects of taking no action or not receiving project approval. This alternative entails a general discussion of what can reasonably be expected to occur in the plan area in the foreseeable future if the proposed project is not approved, based on the existing general plan land use designation, zoning, and available infrastructure and services.

As of the date of publication of this EIR, the plan area is zoned Residential (RS-1) and Open Space (OS). RS-1 allows the construction of one single family dwelling unit per one acre. In accordance with Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines, this “No Project” alternative assumes a continuation of the existing Town of Truckee General Plan designations and policies currently governing the plan area. This alternative identifies the practical result of the project’s non-approval. In this case, the “No Project Alternative” is not a “No Build” Alternative since the Town of Truckee has designated this area for residential development. Additionally, this area is adjacent to existing neighborhoods, has infrastructure available and is located in a highly desirable area. It is highly unlikely that this site would remain undeveloped if this project is not approved.

ALTERNATIVE 2: ONE ACCESS ALTERNATIVE

This alternative is the same as the proposed project, except that access to the site would be provided via Martis Peak Road to the north of the site, not via Edinburgh Drive. Under this alternative Edinburgh Drive would be used for emergency access only. Although this alternative is conceptual in nature, a reduction of vehicular access would not change the site plan design. It is assumed that the project density will be the same, and the entire site developed in a similar manner to the proposed project.

ALTERNATIVE 3: REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE

This alternative is a reduced density development project design in which there would be a 25% reduction in the number of residential units from the proposed 213 units to approximately 160 units. This alternative would develop in areas of the project site where the environmental impacts would be minimized and leave the remaining sensitive areas undeveloped. It is assumed that parcel sizes would be similar or slightly greater than the proposed project.

ALTERNATIVE 4: CLUSTERED ALTERNATIVE

This alternative is a development project design which would be the same as the proposed project except that the residential units would be clustered, allowing for more open space on site between the residential unit clusters. Overall, the project density would remain the same as and the entire site developed in a similar manner to the proposed project.

**Table S-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
3.1 Aesthetics					
3.1-1	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	No Impact		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.1-2	Potential to damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.	No Impact		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.1-3	Alteration of views of the proposed project site from roadways along and through the site, and from Key Observation Points.	Potentially Significant	3.1-3a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The area of soil and vegetation disturbance on each homesite must be limited to that required for necessary construction, access and landscaping purposes. Except where required by access, there must be no disturbance in setbacks and areas that are otherwise designated to be left in a natural state. b. Tree, brush, and rock removal must be limited to that reasonably necessary for the construction of a home and its protection from fire. No clear-cutting of trees within any building envelope will be permitted; however, it is understood that some selective pruning or removal of trees and shrubs will be necessary for the development of any homesite. 	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		Potentially Significant	3.1-3b	<p>Land alterations for the proposed project shall comply with the following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Limit cuts and fills; b. Limit grading to the smallest practical area of land; c. Limit land exposure to the shortest practical amount of time; d. Replant graded areas with native or non-invasive exotic species to ensure establishment of plant cover before the next rainy season; and e. Create grading contours that blend with the natural contours on site or with contours on property immediately adjacent to the area of development. 	Less Than Significant
		Potentially Significant	3.1-3c	<p>New roads, parking and utilities shall be designed to minimize visual impacts. Unless limited by other mitigation measures, geological or engineering constraints, utilities shall be installed underground, and roadways and parking areas shall be designed to fit the natural terrain.</p>	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
3.1-4	Potential to create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.2 Air Quality					
3.2-1	Construction activities such as excavation and grading operations, construction vehicle traffic and wind blowing over exposed earth would generate exhaust emissions and fugitive particulate matter emissions that would affect local and regional air quality in the summer months during the buildout period of the proposed project.	Potentially Significant	3.2-1a	<p>The project proponent shall include the following dust control mitigation requirements in all construction contracts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All construction activities would be subject to the requirements of the NSAQMD's Regulation 2, Rule 226 regarding dust control. • Alternatives to open burning of vegetative material on the proposed project site shall be used unless deemed infeasible by the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District. Suitable alternatives are chipping, mulching, or conversion to biomass fuel. • Contractors shall be responsible for ensuring that adequate dust control measures are implemented in a timely manner during all phases of project development and construction. 	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All material excavated, stockpiled, or graded shall be sufficiently watered, treated, or covered to prevent fugitive dust from leaving the property boundaries and causing a public nuisance or violation of an ambient air standard. Watering should occur at least twice daily, with complete site coverage. • All areas (including unpaved roads) with vehicle traffic shall be watered or have a dust palliative applied as necessary for stabilization of dust emissions. • All on-site vehicle traffic shall be limited to a speed of 15 mph on unpaved roads. • All land clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation activities shall be suspended as necessary to prevent excessive windblown dust when winds are expected to exceed 20 mph. • All inactive portions of the construction site shall be covered, seeded, or watered until a suitable cover is established. Alternatively, apply 	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>county-approved non-toxic soil stabilizers (according to manufacturers specifications) to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas which remain inactive for 96 hours) in accordance with the local grading ordinance. Acceptable materials that may be used for chemical soil stabilization include petroleum resins, asphaltic emulsions, acrylics, and adhesives which do not violate Regional Water Quality Control Board or California Air Resources Board standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paved streets adjacent construction sites shall be swept or washed at the end of each day, or as required to remove excess accumulations of silt and/or mud which may have resulted from activities at the construction site. • All material transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent public nuisance. • Re-establish ground cover on the site through seeding and watering in accordance with the local grading ordinance. 	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		Potentially Significant	3.2-1b	<p>Place equipment and vehicle mitigation requirements in all construction contracts. All construction contracts will require the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contactors shall provide a plan for approval by the NSAQMD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20% NOx reduction and 45% particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average at time of construction. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. • Properly maintain all mobile and stationary equipment. 	Less Than Significant
3.2-2	Project traffic would increase carbon monoxide concentrations at intersections affected by project traffic.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
3.2-3	Project-related summertime emissions of ozone precursors would exceed the NSAQMD's thresholds of significance.	Potentially Significant		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No open burning of any material within the project site. • Landscape with native drought-resistant species to reduce the demand for gas powered landscape maintenance equipment. • Improve the thermal integrity of buildings, and reduce the thermal load with automated time clocks or occupants sensors. • Incorporate appropriate passive solar design and solar heaters. • Use devices that minimize the combustion of fossil fuels. • Require that landscape maintenance vehicles and equipment be electric. • Install electrical outlets on exterior walls to promote the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment. • Install gas outlets for gas burning barbeques. • Install low-NOx hot water heaters. 	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
3.2-4	Project-associated emissions of wintertime PM ₁₀ would exceed the NSAQMD significance threshold.	Potentially Significant	3.2-4a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to Final Map recordation, the project proponent shall either prohibit woodstoves on all single-family lots by placing a deed restriction on the title or pay an air quality mitigation fee per lot to the Air Quality Mitigation Fund to allow for EPA-Certified Phase II wood-burning devices. The amount of the fee shall be the fee established by Town Council resolution and in effect at the time of Final Map recordation. • No open burning of trash, leaves, vegetation or other material will be allowed within the proposed project. 	Less Than Significant
		Potentially Significant	3.2-4b	Prior to Final Map recordation, the project proponent shall pay an air quality mitigation fee to the Air Quality Mitigation Fund to offset PM ₁₀ emissions from vehicle tail pipes and re-entrained road dust to a level of zero from these sources. The amount of the mitigation fee shall be based on 50% of the total PM ₁₀ emissions estimated by Town Council resolution and in effect at the time of Final Map recordation. The fees collected will be used to reduce particulate matter emissions from existing sources within the Truckee Air Basin including improvements to street	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				sanding and sweeping operations to reduce re-entrained road dust emissions.	
3.3 Biological Resources					
3.3-1	Disturbance to common plant communities including Jeffrey pine and sagebrush.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.3-2	Removal of habitat for common wildlife currently utilizing the communities on the site.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.3-3	Potential disturbance to special-status plant species.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.3-4	Potential loss of wildlife movement and migration corridors.	Potentially Significant	3.3-4a	Prior to construction activities, the applicant shall prepare an open space preserve management plan for review and approval by CDFG. The open space preserve and wildlife corridor shall be managed under the guidance of an open space preserve management plan. The plan shall be prepared in consultation with the CDFG and shall include additional measures minimizing impacts to deer movement on the project site which may include restoring meadows and burned areas on- and off-site by planting bitterbrush, etc., creating guzzlers (perennial water sources) for deer and other	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				wildlife in areas that are otherwise suitable, including the presence of browse and cover, planting of additional willows and trees such as alders in the corridor to create cover and purchasing timber rights off-site to preserve cover. At a minimum, the plan shall include detailed strategies for the long term maintenance, monitoring, and funding of the preserve. The plan shall include a 600-foot setback area dedicated as open space within which may be used by deer as a deer movement corridor; the setback will be located along the eastern boundary of the project site as shown on Figure 3.3-1. The open space preserve management plan will be enforced and monitored by the CDFG and Town of Truckee. The management plan shall be reviewed annually by the CDFG. The open space preserve management plan shall explicitly prohibit off-road motorized vehicles.	
		Potentially Significant	3.3-4b	Prior to the onset of construction activities, the applicant shall delineate the boundaries of the setback buffers around all tributaries, ephemeral drainages, streams and the 182.34-acre open space area in a way that clearly designates these areas as no-work zones (e.g. signage, flagging etc.). Signage	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>shall be posted every 100-feet which clearly states that these no-work zones contain sensitive biological resources; this verbage shall be readable from a distance of 100-feet. In addition, the 600' eastern setback will be clearly designated as a as no-work zone using signage which clearly states that the area is a migratory setback. Exclusionary or any other type of construction fencing will not be used as it may inhibit the movement of deer herds and other larger wildlife. Delineation methods and signage shall be approved by a qualified biologist to ensure that these areas are adequately marked to prevent construction crews and equipment from disturbing these areas.</p>	
3.3-5	Potential disturbance of nesting migratory birds and raptors.	Potentially Significant	3.3-5a	<p>If development is proposed during the breeding season (April-August), a focused survey for migratory bird and raptor nests shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify active nests on the site.</p> <p>If no active nests are identified during the survey or if development is proposed to occur during the non-breeding season (September-March), no further mitigation would be required.</p>	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				If active nests are identified on the site, no construction activities shall take place within 100 feet of migratory bird nests and 500 feet of raptor nests until the young have fledged as determined by a qualified biologist.	
		Potentially Significant	3.3-5b	Trees containing nests that must be removed as a result of implementation of the proposed development shall be removed during the non-breeding season (September-March) under the supervision of a qualified biologist.	Less Than Significant
3.3-6	Potential disturbance to Sierra Nevada Fox.	Potentially Significant	3.3-6	Prior to the onset of construction activities, a preconstruction survey will be conducted as outlined by the CDFG draft recommendations for protection of fox species prior to or during ground disturbance to determine whether Sierra Nevada red fox species are present at the project site. This survey shall be conducted no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before beginning ground disturbance and/or construction activities or any project activity likely to affect Sierra Nevada red fox species. If no evidence of this species is found during field surveys, no further measures are required.	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>However, if active Sierra Nevada red fox dens are determined to occur on the site, technical assistance shall be requested from CDFG to determine further actions. At a minimum, construction activities shall not occur within 500 feet of an active den.</p> <p>If Sierra Nevada red fox dens are located on the site, further study may be required to determine the extent of the species range on the site and formal consultation with the CDFG shall be required to determine appropriate survey techniques. To the maximum extent possible, the project shall be re-designed to avoid the species range (PCGP Policy 6.C.6). If avoidance is not feasible, a CESA 2081 Take Permit shall be obtained from the CDFG.</p>	
3.3-7	Potential disturbance to special-status bat species.	Potentially Significant	3.3-7	If trees must be removed during the maternity season (March 1 to September 30), a qualified bat specialist (i.e., a person holding a CDFG collection permit and a memorandum of understanding with CDFG allowing the handling and collection of bats) will conduct a pre-construction survey to identify those trees proposed for disturbance that could potentially provide hibernacula or nursery colony roosting habitat for bats. Each tree identified as	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>potentially supporting an active maternity roost will be closely inspected by the bat specialist a maximum of seven days prior to tree disturbance to more precisely determine the presence or absence of roosting bats.</p> <p>If bats are not detected, but the bat specialist determines that roosting bats may be present, it is preferable to push the tree down using heavy machinery rather than felling it with a chainsaw. Maternity season lasts from March 1 to September 30. Trees determined to be maternity roosts must be left in place until the end of the maternity season. A 250-foot buffer, in which no construction activities are permitted, will be established around any tree, rock outcrop, or other occupied roost habitat until the end of the maternity season (September 30).</p> <p>The bat specialist will document all monitoring activities, and will prepare a summary report upon completion of tree disturbance activities. Reports will cover at the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the number and type of affected trees determined to support or potentially 	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>support roosting bats prior to disturbance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any actions undertaken to safely exclude roosting bats prior to disturbance and the results of those actions; • trees temporarily avoided to protect roosting bats; and • roosting bats found (alive or dead) after trees were removed or relocated. <p>This report will be provided to the Town of Truckee within 30 days following completion of tree removals.</p>	
3.3-8	Potential to result in the fill of potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. or disturb riparian areas.	Potentially Significant	3.3-8a	<p>If any impacts to wetlands are proposed, then the appropriate Section 404 permit shall be acquired as well as a Section 401 Water Quality certification or waiver shall also be acquired.</p> <p>Any jurisdictional waters that would be lost or disturbed due to implementation of the proposed project shall be replaced or rehabilitated on a “no-net-loss” basis in accordance with the USACEs’ mitigation guidelines, the RWQCB guidelines, and the</p>	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>Town of Truckee General Plan (Policy 1.3 and 1.4). Habitat restoration, rehabilitation, and/or replacement shall be at a location and by methods agreeable to the USACE, the RWQCB, and the Town of Truckee.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be obtained from CDFG, pursuant to Section 1600 et al of the CDFG Code, for each stream crossing and any other activities affecting the bed, bank, or associated riparian vegetation of the stream. The project applicant shall abide by the conditions of any executed permits.</p> <p>The Town of Truckee will also require a Minor Use Permit for any disturbance within 200 feet of a wetland. This permit shall be acquired prior to any grading or ground disturbance activities.</p>	
		Potentially Significant	3.3-8b	Prior to the onset of construction activities, the applicant shall submit grading plans to the Town of Truckee for review and approval. Plans shall incorporate measures as identified in the Town of Truckee's Grading Ordinance which are designed to assure that downstream wetland and	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				riparian areas are adequately protected from sedimentation, deposition and other adverse impacts resulting from upstream ground disturbance.	
		Potentially Significant	3.3-8c	Installation of utility lines (including sewer) that are required to cross drainage ways shall utilize a jack and bore method of installation in order to avoid any encroachment or damage to the drainage way.	Less Than Significant
3.4 Cultural Resources					
3.4-1	Disruption of known and unknown cultural resources.	Potentially Significant	3.4-1	<p>Because only surface remains may be potentially impacted by project activities, no archaeological test excavations are necessary. However, all surface remains shall be collected, analyzed, and reported upon, leaving potential subsurface archaeological deposits in tact and undisturbed. In addition, all surface site indicators shall be removed to prevent threats to site integrity from vandalism.</p> <p>Additional study at both sites shall be conducted, including the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • field artifact technical analysis prior to project ground disturbance activities 	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% collection of all surface artifacts • submittal of a small representative sample of collected artifacts for basalt sourcing analysis • completion of a catalog of items collected and preparation of a brief report presenting findings of lithics analysis. <p>Native American sites TB-1 and TB-2 shall remain within open-space areas that are free from ground disturbance activities. During project construction, a protective buffer shall be maintained by installing temporary fencing around each site. Fencing shall be removed after project ground disturbance activities cease.</p> <p>Although the project area has been subject to systematic surface archaeological investigations, it is possible that buried or concealed heritage resources could be present and detected during project ground disturbance activities. In the event of fortuitous discoveries of additional heritage resources, which have not previously been inventoried, project activities shall cease in the area of the find and the project sponsor</p>	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				shall consult a qualified archaeologist for recommended procedures.	
3.5 Geology and Soils					
3.5-1	Residential development could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving rupture or a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, ground failure, inundation, or landslides.	Potentially Significant	3.5-1	Prior to approval of the final map, the project proponent shall obtain a qualified geologist to perform trenching in the vicinity of the concealed fault trace on the project site to determine whether an active or potentially active fault is present.	Less Than Significant
3.5-2	The proposed project could result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	Potentially Significant	3.5-2a	<p>The project proponent shall prepare a grading plan that specifies the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project site should be graded and maintained such that surface drainage is directed away from the structures. 2. All homes shall utilize gravel infiltration trenches under the drip line of all building eaves and along all driveways. This requirement shall be included in the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R) and shown on building plans for individual residences. 	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		Potentially Significant	3.5-2b	<p>The project proponent shall be responsible for preparing a site-specific erosion control plan. The erosion control plan is subject to review and approval by the Town of Truckee and shall be implemented during all phases of construction. The erosion control plan shall utilize Best Management Practices in accordance with the California Stormwater Quality Association <i>Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbook</i>, and shall include one or more of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Directing some of the flow to sheet discharge onto grassy areas or open space. 2. The placement of water quality interceptor devices. 3. Use of rock-lined ditches below pipe outlets. 4. Vegetated grass lined swales. 5. Minimizing drainage concentration from impervious surfaces. 6. Construction management techniques. 	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>7. Erosion protection at culvert outfall locations.</p> <p>Implementation of the above BMPs shall ensure that pre-project flows are equal to or less than post-project flows.</p>	
3.5-3	The proposed project could expose people and property to geologic hazards, including liquefaction, landslides, slope instability, expansive soils, and subsidence on the proposed project site.	Potentially Significant	3.5-3	Building areas shall be set back from sloping areas adjacent to drainages. Existing landslides shall be repaired to prevent further landslides. Surface water should be diverted away from slopes to prevent erosion, the acceleration of creep, and landslides. All drainage areas and existing and potential landslide areas should be maintained in an open space easement to allow future access by geologists as necessary.	Less Than Significant
3.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
3.6-1	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, or disposal, emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
3.6-2	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.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.6-3	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.6-4	Project located within an airport land use plan or, within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip, resulting in the safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.	No Impact		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.6-5	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.	Potentially Significant	3.6-5a	The project applicant shall submit a fire safety plan and fuel modification plan that provides for (1) increased safety for emergency fire equipment and evacuating residents and visitors; (2) a point of attack or defense from a wildfire; and (3) strategic siting of fuel breaks, fire breaks, and greenbelts. The plan shall be reviewed by the Truckee Fire Protection District.	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		Potentially Significant	3.6-5b	The project applicant shall complete the project site's secondary access point via Edinburgh Drive during Phase I of the construction.	Less Than Significant
		Potentially Significant	3.6-5c	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project applicant shall install and provide proof of a serviceable water system prior to construction of the first residence. 2. All hydrants shall be space a maximum distance of 500 feet apart in residential areas. 3. The project applicant shall ensure that fire flow be provided to each hydrant at a rate of no less than 1,000 gallons per minute for a duration of 2 minutes in residential areas, with the provision that any residential dwelling exceeding 3,600 square feet shall be required to have no less than a fire flow rate of 1,500 gallons per minute. 	Less Than Significant
		Potentially Significant	3.6-5d	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to approval of final maps and the issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall provide verification that all fire safety standards and conditions have been met as required by Truckee Fire Protection District. 	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				2. Underbrush, dead and dying branches from trees shall be removed up to a minimum of 100-feet from the perimeter of all structures. 3. All flammable vegetation within 10 feet from the edge of road and driveway pavement shall be removed. 4. All flammable vegetation within 30 feet of all structures shall be removed.	
3.7 Hydrology and Water Quality					
3.7-1	Water quality degradation due to erosion, sedimentation and urban runoff due to implementation of the proposed project.	Potentially Significant	3.7-1	A. Prior to approval of improvement plans, a grading plan shall be prepared for the project site that contains the following provisions: 1. Incorporate sound soil conservation practices and minimize land alterations. 2. Limit cuts and fills and balance cut and fill on-site. 3. Limit grading to the smallest practical area of land. 4. Limit land exposure to the shortest practical amount of time.	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Replant graded areas with native or non-invasive exotic species to ensure establishment of plant cover before the next rainy season. If early rains occur, construction must cease and all unpaved areas be covered with straw or similar material. 6. Create grading contours that blend with the natural contours on-site or with contours on property immediately adjacent to the area of development. 7. Roadways, parking areas, trails and paths shall be designed to fit the natural terrain and minimize erosion. 8. Development near or on portions of hillsides shall not cause or worsen natural hazards such as erosion, sedimentation, or water quality concerns. 9. Erosion and sediment control measures including temporary vegetation (native or non-invasive exotic species) sufficient to stabilize disturbed areas. 	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>10. Incorporate the use of natural stormwater drainage systems to preserve and enhance natural features whenever possible.</p> <p>11. Indicate that proper control of erosion, sedimentation, siltation and other pollutants will be implemented per NPDES permit requirements and Town standards.</p> <p>12. Use landscaping, re-vegetation, the use of rice straw or other weed-free vegetative material for erosion control measures, or similar stabilization techniques.</p> <p>13. The site should be graded such that surface drainage is directed away from the structures. Final grade should slope a minimum of 2% away from the structures.</p> <p>B. Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be applied during construction to minimize erosion and sedimentation. An erosion control plan shall be submitted prior to ground disturbing activities that reduces erosion and water quality degradation. BMP's selected</p>	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>shall be in accordance with the California Stormwater Quality Association “Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbook,” and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board “Project Guidelines for Erosion Control.” These guidelines include the following the following temporary construction BMPs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Surplus or waste materials shall not be placed in drainage ways or within the 100-year flood plain of surface waters. 2. All loose piles of soil, silt, clay, sand, debris, or earthen materials shall be protected in a reasonable manner to prevent discharge of pollutants to waters of the State. Material stockpiles should be placed on the upgradient side of excavation whenever possible. Stockpiles may also be protected by covering to prevent contact with precipitation and by placing sediment barriers around the stockpiles. 3. Dewatering shall be done in a manner so as to prevent the 	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>discharge of pollutants, including earthen materials, from the site. The first option is to discharge dewatering waste to land. A separate permit may be required if, due to site constraints, dewatering waste must be discharged to surface waters. Contact the Regional Board for information on discharging to surface waters.</p> <p>4. All disturbed areas shall be stabilized by appropriate erosion and/or sediment control measures by October 15 of each year.</p> <p>5. All work performed between October 15 and May 1 of each year shall be conducted in such a manner that the project can winterized within 48 hours. Winterized means implementing erosion and/or sediment controls that will prevent the discharge of earthen materials from the site and the controls will remain effective throughout the rainy/snow season without requiring maintenance. In general, this requires stabilizing bare disturbed soils with mulch, erosion protection</p>	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>blankets, or other suitable materials, and installing perimeter sediment controls such as fiber logs or other similar materials that will remain effective during significant rain and snow events.</p> <p>6. After completion of a construction project, all surplus or waste earthen material shall be removed from the site and deposited at a legal point of disposal.</p> <p>7. All non-construction areas (areas outside of the construction zone that will remain undisturbed) shall be protected by fencing or other means to prevent necessary encroachment outside the active construction zone.</p> <p>8. During construction, temporary erosion control facilities (e.g., impermeable dikes, filter fences, weed-free straw bales, etc.) shall be used as necessary to prevent discharge of earthen materials from the site during periods of precipitation or runoff.</p>	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>9. Control of run-on water from offsite areas shall be managed (protected, diverted, treated, etc.) to prevent such water from degrading before it discharged from the site.</p> <p>10. Where construction activities involve the crossing and/or alteration of a stream channel, such activities require a prior written agreement with the California Department of Fish and Game and shall be timed whenever possible to occur during the period in which streamflow is expected to be lowest for the year. Other control measures may be used as necessary to prevent adverse effects from work in surface waters.</p> <p>The following Permanent Construction BMP's shall be applied during construction:</p> <p>1. Impervious surfaces should be constructed with infiltration trenches or comparable infiltration structures along downgradient sides to infiltrate the increase in runoff resulting from the new impervious</p>	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>surfaces. Infiltration structures should also be constructed to accept runoff from structural (roof top) drip lines. Other control measures may be considered if design and/or site constraints are such that construction of infiltration devices is infeasible. Additional specific design specifications are required for the Truckee, Little Truckee and Long Hydrologic Units/Areas (see specific requirements below).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Where possible, existing drainage patterns shall not be significantly modified. 3. Drainage swales disturbed by construction activities shall be stabilized by the addition of crushed rock or riprap, as necessary, or other appropriate stabilization methods. 4. Revegetated areas shall be regularly and continually maintained in order to assure adequate growth and root development. Physical erosion control measures (controls other than live vegetation) shall be placed on a routine maintenance and 	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>inspection program to provide continued erosion control integrity.</p> <p>C. Additional Requirements for Specific Watersheds - Truckee River Hydrologic Area and Little Truckee Hydrologic Unit:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Runoff from impervious surfaces shall be treated or contained onsite. For purposes of this requirement, the volume of water to be contained or treated is the 20-year, one-hour storm, which is equal to 0.7 inches of rain. 2. Except in the event of emergencies, land disturbance associated with project construction is prohibited between October 15th and May 1st of the following year. Exemptions may be granted by the Executive Officer on a case by case basis. 3. The erosion control plan shall indicate that proper control of erosion, sedimentation, siltation and other pollutants will be implemented per NPDES permit requirements and Town standards. 	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>The plan shall address storm drainage during construction and propose BMP's to reduce erosion and water quality degradation. All drainage facilities shall be constructed to Town of Truckee specifications. The plan shall also specify restoration measures for graded areas including but not limited to landscaping, re-vegetation, the use of rice straw or other weed free vegetative material for erosion control measures. Low Impact Development (LID) techniques should be utilized. Zero discharge areas may be utilized to minimize runoff including wet ponds, detention ponds, infiltration areas, grassy swales, and/or rain gardens between the road surfaces and other paved areas. Roof downspouts should be directed into conduits carrying water away from the building.</p> <p>4. Drainage facilities shall be protected as necessary to prevent erosion of the onsite soils immediately following grading activities. In addition, cut slopes</p>	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>and drainage ways within native material shall be protected from direct exposure to water runoff immediately following grading activities. The design for collected run-off shall dissipate the energy. Cut and fill embankment slopes shall be protected from sheet, rill, and gully erosion and shall not exceed 2:1, horizontal to vertical.</p> <p>5. Design, construction, and maintenance techniques shall ensure development near a creek will not cause or worsen natural hazards (such as erosion, sedimentation, flooding, or pollution) and will include erosion and sediment control practices such as: 1) turbidity screens and other management practices, which shall be used as necessary to minimize siltation, sedimentation, and erosion, and shall be left in place until disturbed areas are stabilized with permanent vegetation that will prevent the transport of sediment off site; and 2) temporary vegetation sufficient to stabilize disturbed areas.</p>	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>6. Pre-project stormwater flows shall equal post project flows for the design year event.</p> <p>7. Prior to submittal of improvement plans, the project applicant shall complete a final design hydrology and hydraulics report. This report shall include the volumes for a 10-year, 1-hour event and shall identify all existing drainage on the property and adjacent property that may affect this project in accordance with Town Engineering Standards. The report shall address recommendations made by Geocon in their peer review of "Preliminary Hydrology & Hydraulics Report for Tahoe Boca," October 3, 2003, prepared by CFA of Reno, Nevada, as follows:</p> <p>The methods reportedly used to perform the hydrologic analysis conform to the general standards of practice for the area at the time the analysis was performed. However, the data presented in Table 2 of the Preliminary</p>	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				<p>Hydrology & Hydraulics Report do not appear to provide a valid comparison for the 10-year and 20-year events. Specifically, the volumes for the 20-year event are based on 1-hour totals, whereas the volumes for the 10-year event are based on 24-hour totals. Both volumes should be based on the same time increment, either 1-hour or 24-hour totals. The Preliminary Hydrology & Hydraulics Report text also does not provide infiltration/percolation rates for soils on the Site.</p>	
3.7-2	<p>Place housing or other structures 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 or impede or redirect flood flows.</p>	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
3.8 Land Use, Planning and Recreation					
3.8-1	Potential for the proposed project to physically divide an established community.	No Impact		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.8-2	Consistency of the proposed Canyon Springs Subdivision with the land use policies of the 1996 Truckee General Plan and 2003 Truckee Development Code.	No Impact		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.8-3	Create land use conflicts with adjacent properties.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.8-4	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	No Impact		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.8-5	Increased use of parks and other recreational facilities as a result of increased population from the proposed project.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.9 Noise					
3.9-1	Development within the project area will be exposed to exterior traffic noise levels which may exceed the Town of Truckee General Plan Noise Element exterior noise level criteria.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
3.9-2	Development within the project area could be exposed to interior traffic noise levels which exceed the Town of Truckee General Plan Noise Element criterion of 45 dB Ldn.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.9-3	Development of the project area could result in a significant increase in traffic noise levels along area roadways.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.9-4	Development of the project would result in a substantial temporary or period increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	Potentially Significant	3.9-4	Construction activities shall adhere to the requirements of the Town of Truckee with respect to hours of operation, muffling of internal combustion engines, and other factors which affect construction noise generation and its effects on noise-sensitive land uses. Construction activities shall be restricted to between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, and between the hours of 8 a.m. and 7 p.m. on Saturdays. No construction activities will occur on Sundays and holidays.	Less Than Significant
3.9-5	Would the project be located within an airport land use plan or, within two miles of a public	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
	airport or private airstrip, resulting in the exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.				
3.10 Population and Housing					
3.10-1	Development of the proposed project would increase the population in the vicinity (growth-inducing impact) beyond that which is anticipated in the General Plan.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.10-2	Impact of the proposed project on compliance with the Housing Element of Town of Truckee General Plan and meeting the housing needs in the Town.	No Impact		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.11 Public Services and Utilities					
3.11-1	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	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
	times or other performance objectives for any of the public services.				
3.11-2	Result in the construction of new water or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	Potentially Significant	3.11-2a	Prior to the upgrade of the off-site water line, the applicant shall submit a construction traffic control plan to the Town that demonstrates that traffic delays will be minimized and advance notice directly to property owners will be provided at least 2 weeks prior to construction as well as informational signage and appropriate detours if necessary.	Less Than Significant
		Potentially Significant	3.11-2b	Construction activities shall adhere to the requirements of the Town of Truckee with respect to hours of operation, muffling of internal combustion engines, and other factors which affect construction noise generation and its effects on noise-sensitive land uses. Construction activities for the off-site water lines shall be restricted to between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. Monday through Friday. No construction activities will occur on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays.	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
3.11-3	Result in inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.11-4	Exceed the capacity of the landfill.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.12 Transportation/Traffic					
Proposed Project					
3.12-1	Exceedence of LOS thresholds	Significant	3.12-1	Without the proposed project, the Glenshire Drive/Donner Pass Road intersection is estimated to degrade to LOS F in the Year 2012. However, with construction of Phase One only (currently proposed as 71 residential units), this intersection is expected to maintain an acceptable LOS (LOS E or better) until the Year 2010, at which time it is expected to degrade to LOS F. Potential alternatives to improve LOS at the Glenshire Drive/Donner Pass Road intersection are presented under Impact #3.12-29. The Donner Pass Road Extension/Glenshire Drive realignment will likely be constructed in the near future, thereby eliminating the failing left-turn movement and providing an acceptable intersection LOS with full buildout of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project shall not commence Phase 2 or	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				Phase 3 until the construction of the Donner Pass Road Extension/Glenshire Drive realignment is complete. With this condition, the Glenshire Drive/Donner Pass Road intersection is expected to maintain an acceptable LOS.	
3.12-2	Project implementation conflicts with existing goals and policies.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.12-3	Project provides inadequate emergency access.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.12-4	Project implementation results in pedestrian/bicycle conflicts.	Potentially Significant	3.12-4	The project applicant shall work with the Town to determine the appropriate size and extent of the bicycle facilities that are required through the site. This would include a determination as to whether a full Class I bicycle facility should be constructed or whether a pedestrian trail is adequate. The proposed project's contribution towards constructing these facilities will also be determined and the applicant will at a minimum be required to reserve right of way for a future facility.	Less Than Significant
3.12-5	Project implementation exacerbates an existing traffic safety deficiency.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
3.12-6	Project implementation results in exceeding the capacity of an existing transit service or results in ridership levels adequate to meet the Transportation Development Act 10 Percent Minimum Fare Box Ratio.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.12-7	Project implementation results in exceedance of LOS thresholds during the construction phases.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
One Access Alternative					
3.12-8	Exceedence of LOS Thresholds	Significant	3.12-8	Without the proposed project, the Glenshire Drive/Donner Pass Road intersection is estimated to degrade to LOS F in the Year 2012. However, with construction of Phase One only (currently proposed as 71 residential units), this intersection is expected to maintain an acceptable LOS (LOS E or better) until the Year 2010, at which time it is expected to degrade to LOS F. Potential alternatives to improve LOS at the Glenshire Drive/Donner Pass Road intersection are presented under Impact #3.12-29. The Donner Pass Road Extension/Glenshire Drive realignment will likely be constructed in the near future, thereby eliminating the failing left-turn movement	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				and providing an acceptable intersection LOS with full buildout of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project shall not commence Phase 2 or Phase 3 until the construction of the Donner Pass Road Extension/Glenshire Drive realignment is complete. With this condition, the Glenshire Drive/Donner Pass Road intersection is expected to maintain an acceptable LOS.	
3.12-9	Project Implementation Conflicts with Existing Goals and Policies	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.12-10	Project Provides Inadequate Emergency Access	Potentially Significant	3.12-10	The proposed project shall provide a gated emergency access via Edinburgh Drive.	Less Than Significant
3.12-11	Project Implementation Results in Pedestrian/Bicycle Conflicts	Potentially Significant	3.12-4	Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.12-4 will mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level.	Less Than Significant
3.12-12	Project Implementation Exacerbates an Existing Traffic Safety Deficiency	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.12-13	Project Implementation Results in Exceeding the Capacity of an Existing Transit Service or Results in Ridership Levels Adequate to Meet the	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
	Transportation Development Act 10 Percent Minimum Fare Box Ratio.				
3.12-14	Project Implementation Results in Exceedance of LOS Thresholds during the Construction Phases	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
Reduced Density Alternative					
3.12-15	Exceedance of LOS Thresholds	Significant	3.12-15	Without the proposed project, the Glenshire Drive/Donner Pass Road intersection is estimated to degrade to LOS F in the Year 2012. However, with construction of Phase One only (currently proposed as 71 residential units), this intersection is expected to maintain an acceptable LOS (LOS E or better) until the Year 2010, at which time it is expected to degrade to LOS F. Potential alternatives to improve LOS at the Glenshire Drive/Donner Pass Road intersection are presented under Impact #3.12-29. The Donner Pass Road Extension/Glenshire Drive realignment will likely be constructed in the near future, thereby eliminating the failing left-turn movement and providing an acceptable intersection LOS with full buildout of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project shall not commence Phase 2 or Phase 3	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				until the construction of the Donner Pass Road Extension/Glenshire Drive realignment is complete. With this condition, the Glenshire Drive/Donner Pass Road intersection is expected to maintain an acceptable LOS.	
3.12-16	Project Implementation Conflicts with Existing Goals and Policies	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.12-17	Project Provides Inadequate Emergency Access	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.12-18	Project Implementation Results in Pedestrian/Bicycle Conflicts	Potentially Significant	3.12-4	Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.12-4 will mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level.	Less Than Significant
3.12-19	Project Implementation Exacerbates an Existing Traffic Safety Deficiency	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.12-20	Project Implementation Results in Exceeding the Capacity of an Existing Transit Service or Results in Ridership Levels Adequate to Meet the Transportation Development Act 10 Percent Minimum Fare Box Ratio.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
3.12-21	Project Implementation Results in Exceedance of LOS Thresholds during the Construction Phases	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
Clustered Alternative					
3.12-22	Exceedance of LOS Thresholds	Significant	3.12-22	Without the proposed project, the Glenshire Drive/Donner Pass Road intersection is estimated to degrade to LOS F in the Year 2012. However, with construction of Phase One only (currently proposed as 71 residential units), this intersection is expected to maintain an acceptable LOS (LOS E or better) until the Year 2010, at which time it is expected to degrade to LOS F. Potential alternatives to improve LOS at the Glenshire Drive/Donner Pass Road intersection are presented under Impact #3.12-29. The Donner Pass Road Extension/Glenshire Drive realignment will likely be constructed in the near future, thereby eliminating the failing left-turn movement and providing an acceptable intersection LOS with full buildout of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project shall not commence Phase 2 or Phase 3 until the construction of the Donner Pass Road Extension/Glenshire Drive realignment is complete. With this condition, the Glenshire Drive/Donner Pass	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
				Road intersection is expected to maintain an acceptable LOS.	
3.12-23	Project Implementation Conflicts with Existing Goals and Policies	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.12-24	Project Provides Inadequate Emergency Access	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.12-25	Project Implementation Results in Pedestrian/Bicycle Conflicts.	Potentially Significant	3.12-4	Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.12-4 will mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level.	Less Than Significant
3.12-26	Project Implementation Exacerbates an Existing Traffic Safety Deficiency	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.12-27	Project Implementation Results in Exceeding the Capacity of an Existing Transit Service or Results in Ridership Levels Adequate to Meet the Transportation Development Act 10 Percent Minimum Fare Box Ratio.	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	
3.12-28	Project Implementation Results in Exceedance of LOS Thresholds during the Construction Phases	Less Than Significant		No mitigation measures are required.	

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Cumulative Impacts – Proposed Project					
3.12-29	Cumulative Impact of Project Results in Exceedence of LOS Thresholds	Potentially Significant	3.12-29	As improvements to the Donner Pass Road/Glenshire Drive intersection and the Eastern Railroad Undercrossing (which would include the realignment of Donner Pass Road) are included in the Town of Truckee Impact fee, the proposed project's payment of Traffic Impact Fees would mitigate the impacts to the Donner Pass Road/Glenshire Drive intersection. The Town's traffic mitigation fees are calculated based upon a methodology provided in the Town of Truckee Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Report (AB 1600 Fee Analysis) (Town of Truckee, May 17, 1999), which currently requires a fee of \$2,450.00 per Dwelling Unit Equivalent (DUE). Multiplying this fee by the 213 units indicates a fee of roughly \$507,153 would be paid by the proposed project, based upon the current fee. As these fees are due upon issuance of building permit, they may differ depending upon the unit fee in place at the time of building permit issuance.	Less Than Significant
Cumulative Impacts – One Access Alternative					
3.12-30	Cumulative Impact of Project Results in Exceedence of LOS Thresholds	Potentially Significant	3.12-29	Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.12-29 will mitigate the impact to a less-than-significant level	Less Than Significant

Impact #	Impact	Significance	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Cumulative Impacts – Reduced Density Alternative					
3.12-31	Cumulative Impact of Project Results in Exceedence of LOS Thresholds	Potentially Significant	3.12-29	Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.12-29 will mitigate the impact to a less-than-significant level.	Less Than Significant
Cumulative Impacts – Clustered Alternative					
3.12-32	Cumulative Impact of Project Results in Exceedence of LOS Thresholds	Potentially Significant	3.12-29	Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.12-29 will mitigate the impact to a less-than-significant level.	Less Than Significant

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This Draft EIR is an informational document prepared for the Town of Truckee (herein referred to as “Town”) to evaluate potential environmental impacts of the proposed Canyon Springs Subdivision project (previously known as “Tahoe Boca”). This Draft EIR evaluates the potential environmental effects that might result from the proposed project and has been prepared in accordance with the CEQA Statutes and Guidelines.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines, this Draft EIR is a document intended to inform public decision makers, responsible or interested agencies, and the general public of the potential environmental effects of the proposed Canyon Springs Subdivision. The environmental review process has been established to enable interested parties to evaluate a proposed project in terms of its environmental consequences, to examine and implement methods to eliminate or reduce potential adverse impacts, and to consider a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project. While CEQA requires that major consideration be given to avoiding adverse environmental effects, the Lead Agency and other responsible public agencies must balance adverse environmental effects against other public objectives, including the economic and social benefits of a proposed project, in determining whether a proposed project should be approved. This document is also intended to serve for CEQA compliance purposes for Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) in review of annexation into the Truckee Donner Public Utility District and the proposed 5-acre road annexation and SOI amendment (if this road annexation is pursued).

1.1 Procedures and Purpose

As prescribed by CEQA, the Town, in its role as Lead Agency, has determined that an EIR shall be prepared for the proposed project. On April 12, 2006, the Town prepared and circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to responsible, trustee, and local agencies for review and comment. A copy of the NOP and copies of written responses to the NOP are included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR. Appendix A will also include comments received during the NOP for the Tahoe Boca project which was circulated from May 11, 2004 to June 11, 2004, since the Tahoe Boca project was proposed on the same site by the same applicant. A public scoping meeting was held for the proposed Canyon Springs project at the Town’s City Hall on April 4, 2006.

The Draft EIR will consider all potential environmental effects of the proposed project to determine the level of significance of the environmental effect, and will analyze these potential effects to the detail necessary to make a determination of significance. The EIR discussion of less-than-significant environmental effects will be limited to a brief explanation of why those effects are not considered potentially significant.

Section 15121(a) of the CEQA Guidelines define an EIR as an informational document that will:

...inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.

As defined by Section 15378 of the CEQA Guidelines, a "project" is any action that "...has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment..." Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines requires decision-makers to balance the benefits of a proposed project against any unavoidable adverse environmental effects of the proposed project. If the benefits of the proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, then the decision-makers may adopt a statement of overriding considerations, finding that the environmental effects are acceptable in light of the proposed project's benefits to the public.

The CEQA process requires that the Lead Agency seriously consider input from other interested agencies, citizen groups, and individuals. CEQA provides for a public process requiring full public disclosure of the expected environmental consequences of the proposed action. The public must be given a meaningful opportunity to comment on the environmental document. CEQA also requires monitoring of the mitigation measures to ensure that they are in fact carried out.

CEQA requires a public review period, normally 45 days, for commenting on the Draft EIR. During the review period, any agency, group, or individual may comment in writing on the Draft EIR, and the Lead Agency must respond to each comment on environmental issues in the Final EIR. According to Section 15202 of the CEQA Guidelines, CEQA does not require formal hearings at any stage of the environmental review process; however, it is typical to consider the EIR and its findings during public hearings required for the proposed project.

If the Town finds that the Final EIR is "adequate and complete," the Town may certify the Final EIR in writing in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, and if applicable, Section 15093. CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 specifies that the lead agency shall state findings, in writing, of any environmental impacts and the changes made to lessen the impact or the reason why such mitigation is infeasible. CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 requires a statement of overriding considerations in cases where the lead agency deems the proposed project's benefits outweigh unavoidable environmental impacts. The rule of adequacy generally holds that the EIR can be certified if:

- 1) The EIR shows a good faith effort at full disclosure of environmental information; and
- 2) The EIR provides sufficient analysis to allow decisions to be made regarding the proposed project in contemplation of environmental considerations.

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 require lead agencies to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to describe measures that have been adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or

avoid significant effects on the environment. Any mitigation measures adopted by the Town as conditions of project approval will be included in this report to verify compliance. This MMRP is adopted by Resolution at the time of project approval.

All comments or questions regarding this DEIR should be addressed to:

Denyelle Nishimori, Associate Planner
Truckee Community Development Department
10183 Truckee Airport Road
Truckee, CA 96161
(530) 582-7820

1.2 Organization of the EIR

CHAPTER ONE

Chapter One briefly describes the procedures and purpose for environmental evaluation of the proposed project, the contents and organization of the Draft EIR, and a brief methodology discussions.

CHAPTER TWO

Chapter Two provides the proposed project location, proposed action, project description, the project objectives, the uses of the EIR, and agency actions and permit requirements.

CHAPTER THREE

Chapter Three provides an environmental analysis evaluating each topical area. Each topical area is organized as follows:

Introduction. Each environmental topic is preceded by a description of the topic and a brief statement of the rationale for addressing the topic.

Environmental Setting. Description of the existing environment in and around the proposed project area.

Regulatory Setting. A discussion of the regulatory environment that may be applicable to the proposed project.

Thresholds of Significance. The thresholds of significance are the standards or thresholds by which impacts are measured, with the objective being the determination of whether an impact will be significant or less than significant. The purpose is to establish the level at which an environmental impact will be considered significant.

Impacts. Each impact associated with an environmental topic is described and listed by number for reference.

Discussion/Conclusion. This is an analysis and concluding statement identifying whether the impact is significant or less-than-significant. If found to be significant, the conclusion states whether the impact can be avoided or reduced to an acceptable level through implementation of mitigation measures, or whether the impact is significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures. Each feasible mitigation measure is described and listed by number. Existing regulations are described, but are not treated as mitigation measures that must be repeated in the EIR. Rather, they are assumed to be existing law with which the proposed project must comply.

CHAPTER FOUR

Chapter Four describes and evaluates alternatives to the proposed project. The proposed project is compared to each alternative, and the environmental ramifications of each are analyzed. Per requirements of CEQA Guidelines §15126.6[e][1], the “no project” alternative must be considered to compare the environmental consequences of the project as proposed to the consequences of taking no action.

CHAPTER FIVE

Chapter Five evaluates and describes the following CEQA required topics: impacts considered less-than-significant, significant and irreversible impacts, growth inducing effects, and significant and unavoidable environmental effects.

APPENDICES

References to published literature or technical reports cited in the text have been included at the end of this Draft EIR to facilitate full environmental review of the proposed project. Also included are the names and agencies of individuals contacted for information during EIR preparation.

1.3 Methodology

The Town has determined that a project level EIR shall be prepared for the Canyon Springs Subdivision project. An Initial Study was not prepared for the proposed project and the Town has not made any determinations regarding less than significant environmental effects of the project. A project level EIR is described in Section 15161 of the State CEQA Guidelines as one that examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project. A project level EIR must examine all phases of the proposed project, including planning, construction, and operation.

The Canyon Springs Subdivision is evaluated at a project level of detail in this EIR. This EIR is intended to provide the information and environmental analysis necessary to assist public agency decision-makers in considering all of the approvals necessary to build the proposed Canyon Springs Subdivision. Based upon the comments received on the NOP prepared by the Town, it has been determined that the EIR should focus on the environmental aspects outlined below:

AESTHETICS

The EIR will include an analysis of the proposed project's visibility from nearby viewing points. The EIR will also analyze any undesirable aesthetic impacts created within the proposed development. Light and glare impacts to residential properties and roadways from light sources and impacts to the night sky will also be evaluated.

AIR QUALITY

The EIR will identify sensitive receptors for air pollutants in the vicinity of the proposed project; identify construction emissions, operational emissions and indirect source emissions. Particulate matter emissions from the project will be identified and analyzed for consistency with the objectives and control strategies of the Town Particulate Matter Air Quality Management Plan.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

This section provides a discussion of the biological resources on the proposed project site and within the region, using the results of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), the California Native Plant Society Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants, a list of special-status plant and wildlife species from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for the Martis Peak 7.5-minute quadrangle search, and field investigations. This section then provides an impact analysis and recommendations for mitigating potentially significant impacts. The EIR identifies and evaluates potential habitats for special-status species and other biological resources within and near the proposed project site. Analysis in this section focuses on impacts to listed species and unique habitat types as well as deer migration corridors.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section discusses the cultural resources known to occur in the area, the results of the archeological studies conducted on the proposed project site, an impact analysis, and recommendations for mitigating potentially significant impacts.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The EIR will identify significant geological and soil impacts associated with development of the proposed project site (e.g., grading, soil erosion, drainage alterations, geologic stability, seismic hazards).

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The EIR will review potential sources of hazards or safety considerations that may affect the proposed project site, including the presence of hazardous materials, flooding and airport related impacts.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The EIR will identify significant impacts associated with drainage flows and water quality arising from development of the proposed project site. Includes will be construction as well as operational water quality impacts. Watersheds will be mapped and characterized and all waters under the authority of the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board will be identified.

LAND USE, PLANNING AND RECREATION

The EIR will identify the proposed project's consistency with the applicable plans, programs, and ordinances of the Town including the General Plan and Development Code. A land use survey will be conducted and the proposed project's compatibility with surrounding land uses will be evaluated.

NOISE

This section discusses the existing noise standards, ambient noise, construction-related noise, and impacts that are likely to result from proposed project implementation. This noise analysis provides a determination of whether there are nearby noise sources that may affect future residents. Noise is assessed based on consistency with applicable state, regional and local policies and plans, as well as the proposed project's generated traffic levels.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

The EIR will identify the proposed project's consistency with the applicable housing plans, programs, and ordinances of the Town and any significant environmental issues associated with direct and indirect population growth, such as an increased demand for affordable housing, jobs/housing balance and live/work units.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

The EIR will identify existing service levels of public service and utility providers and any significant public service impact that may result from implementation of the proposed project. This will include an evaluation of service capacity/availability of public services/utilities under existing and future (cumulative) conditions and will also consider short-term peak demands for services during construction.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

The EIR will identify transportation related impacts associated with the proposed project, including impacts to surrounding roadways and intersections, and the regional network. Traffic generation will be estimated and a traffic distribution pattern will be identified. Site access plans and existing roadway geometrics will be evaluated. Construction traffic will also be estimated and its impacts identified. Programs to encourage alternative modes of transportation will be reviewed for project applicability, including transit, bicycle and pedestrian access.

CHAPTER TWO

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

CHAPTER TWO

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Project Location

The proposed Canyon Springs Subdivision project would be located on approximately 289 acres, at the far eastern end of the Town of Truckee adjacent to the Devonshire, Glenshire, Cambridge Estates, and Elkhorn Ridge subdivisions. Figure 2-1 provides an illustration of the proposed project location.

The proposed project site is identified by the Nevada County Assessor's office as Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 49-020-17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22, and APN 48-090-28 in Nevada County. The majority of the proposed project site is located in Section 3 Township 17 North, Range 17 East, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian. A small portion of the site is located in the southwest ¼ of Section 34, Township 18 North, Range 17 East. The site is located on the U.S.G.S. 7.5-minute Martis Peak, CA-NV quadrangle.

2.2 Proposed Action

PROJECT HISTORY

The original project (known as Tahoe Boca) submittal in October 2003 consisted of a tentative map (with easement abandonment), and planned development application to create 250 single-family lots, including 19 affordable lots. In response to the recently adopted Town Housing Element, ongoing dialogue with Town staff and community members, as well as initial environmental findings, the project has been modified to decrease the total number of lots from 250 to 213 lots. Included in the project modification is the increase in the number of affordable lots from 19 to 32 which equates to a 50-lot reduction in the number of market rate lots and a 17 lot increase in the number of affordable lots.

Although the proposed number of lots has changed since the original submittal, the overall subdivision design has not changed considerably. The basic lot layout and road alignment are similar to the design discussed in the May 11, 2004 NOP and include access points from Martis Peak Road and Edinburgh Drive. Other project changes include:

- **Deer Corridor.** The easterly 600' is proposed to be reserved and protected as open space (800' in the area of the main drainage). A segment of the trail system is proposed within this corridor.
- **Mailbox Clustering.** Two mailbox clusters have been added along Silver Pass Road, both north of the main central drainage area. One of the two mailbox clusters has been incorporated into the design of the recreational area to allow shared parking and use;
- **On-site Amenities.** A primary multi-use recreational area is proposed adjacent to Silver Pass Road, integrated with one of the mail box clusters as illustrated on the tentative map and site layout. This recreational area includes a tot lot, swing set and play structure, picnic shelter

and multi-use play court. A second, smaller recreational area is proposed within proposed Open Space Lot E with the same shelter and children's play facilities, but no multi-use court. Both recreational areas are proposed for public use and would be linked by the proposed public trail system;

- **Edinburgh Buffer.** A 100' setback has been provided along the westerly property boundary in the area of Edinburgh Drive;
- **Watershed Setbacks.** A 100' setback from the main drainage corridor and 50' setback from all secondary/smaller drainage channels is proposed. Both setbacks are measured from the edge of the 100' year flood plain. All lots are proposed outside of these setback areas and would maintain an additional 20' setback to any structure;
- **Wetland Verification.** The previously mapped wetland limits have now been verified by the US Army Corps of Engineers (verification letter dated June 7, 2005);
- **Public Open Space.** A total of 182.34 acres is proposed to be created as public open space, representing 64.3% of the 283.75 acre project site (in-town acreage), 40 acres beyond the 50% required by Town standard. The public open space is proposed to be permanently reserved by protective conservation easement or dedication to the Town of Truckee/Truckee Donner Land Trust;
- **Trail and Trail Bridges.** The proposed public trail system has been slightly reconfigured in response to the new layout and to minimize drainage crossings through better utilization of the vehicular bridges;
- **Phasing.** Three phases continue to be proposed; however, slightly modified to reflect the 213 lot proposal;
- **PIES Consistency.** Minor modifications to the project roadways have been made in response to comments by the Town Engineering Department;
- **Cut/fill Volumes.** Revised estimates for this project include 71,500 cubic yards of cut and 79,500 cubic yards of fill;
- **Raley Road.** Sheet C1 of the plan package now includes the off-site (Nevada County) primary project access road (known as Raley Road) and associated five-acre parcel configured for this purpose. The single residential lot originally proposed within this five-acre parcel has been removed. A 3' tall split rail fence is proposed along the eastern boundary of this access road terminating in the location of the proposed project monument sign. LAFCO annexation of the road is proposed;
- **Affordable Housing.** Thirty-two lots are now proposed (as compared with the 19 lots previously proposed) to be restricted for sale to families and individuals with moderate-level incomes.

Insert Figure 2-1

PROJECT SUMMARY

The applicant is requesting approval of a tentative map and planned development application to subdivide six parcels comprising 289 acres into 213 residential lots. The 289-acre proposed project site is located at the far eastern end of the Town in the Glenshire area, immediately east of the Glenshire subdivision. This 213 lot proposed project includes 181 market rate lots and 32 “restricted-affordable” lots, along with eight open space lots (see Figure 2-2).

The proposed project would consist of the following phases:

- Phase I: 51 for-sale market rate single family lots and 20 affordable lots (18 single family and two duplex);
- Phase II: 50 for-sale market rate single family lots and the remaining 12 affordable duplex lots;
- Phase III: The remaining 80 for-sale, market rate, single family lots.

The proposed project also requires abandonment of street and public utility easements created by a previous parcel map. This will be accomplished through the approval of the tentative subdivision map. Future development on the site will have two access points. The accesses propose to connect to Martis Peak Road and Edinburgh Drive. Martis Peak Road is a narrow paved roadway that connects directly to Glenshire Drive across from Whitehorse Road on the eastern end of the Glenshire area. All of Martis Peak Road is located within the jurisdiction of Nevada County. Edinburgh Drive is a short residential roadway that connects to a network of other local residential roads that weave through a neighborhood and exit onto Glenshire Drive near the Glenshire Clubhouse.

2.3 Project Description

Located in the eastern Sierra Nevada Mountains at elevations ranging from 5,929 to 6,080 feet, the 289-acre proposed project site is characterized by fairly gently sloping terrain with some relatively flat areas and three drainages (ephemeral), two of which show as blue-line features on a USGS topographic map. The site topography generally slopes gently downward to the northwest along two ridges and varies in elevation from approximately 6,120 feet in the southeast to about 5,920 feet in the northwest (see Figure 2-3). Biological communities consist primarily of Jeffrey pine, riverine, sagebrush, various low-growing ground cover species, ephemeral drainages, and seasonal wetlands. A Sierra Pacific Power-Glenshire electrical substation is located approximately 100 feet from the western edge of the site and a 60- KV transmission line traverses the northwestern portion of the proposed project site. Land use surrounding the site includes recreational, forested open space, and rural/medium density residential.

The proposed project site is undeveloped; however, a well-developed network of unpaved roads and trails is distributed throughout the site. This network extends into adjacent lands on all sides of the study area. The study area is accessed from the Glenshire/Devonshire

subdivision, and experiences unauthorized use year-round by nearby residents. In the winter, the predominant use is for cross-country and backcountry skiers, snowshoers, and snowmobile users. After the snow has melted, hikers, mountain bikers/dirt bikers/off-road vehicles, and equestrians use the area frequently.

The Truckee General Plan (1996) designates the proposed project site as RC/OS (Resource Conservation/Open Space) and RES 0.5-1 (Residential 0.5-1 unit per acre). The allowable density based on current zoning standards is 214 lots and consists of:

- 213 acres in RS-1 Zoning District (Single Family Residential, density of one dwelling unit per acre) that would allow a total of 213 lots.
- 71 acres in OS Zoning District (Open Space) allowing no housing units.
- Approximately five acres in Nevada County would allow one lot.

2.4 Project Goals and Objectives

The applicant is requesting approval of a tentative map, planned development application and easement abandonment to subdivide six parcels comprising 289 acres into 213 residential lots. Goals and objectives of the project include the following:

- Create a residential community compatible with adjacent neighborhoods
- Provide low impact recreational opportunities for the public
- Provide open space areas that serve as wildlife migration corridors
- Cluster development to avoid environmentally sensitive areas
- Provide affordable housing opportunities

2.5 Uses of the EIR and Required Agency Actions and Permits

Agencies using this EIR in their decision-making will include the Town of Truckee, Nevada County LAFCO, Truckee Donner Public Utility District (TDPUD), California Department of Forestry, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, Truckee Sanitary District, and the County of Nevada.

The Town is not aware of any other environmental review or consultation requirements for the proposed project. Permits specifically required to implement the proposed project include those listed in Table 2-1.

Insert Figure 2-2

Insert Figure 2-3

**Table 2-1
Subsequent Permits, Approvals, Review and Consultation Requirements**

Agency	Approval
Town of Truckee Community Development Department	Tentative Subdivision Map approval including Street/Easement Abandonment (Doc. #97-019126, #88-15517, #84-31417); Planned Development (adjustment of open space zoning boundaries); and Minor Use Permit (MUP) for disturbance within 200-feet off a wetland
Nevada County	Approval of access outside the Town of Truckee
Nevada County LAFCO	Approval of annexation of the site into the TDPUD; and Approval of Sphere of Influence amendment and annexation of the 5-acre parcel (referred to as the “Raley Road” parcel) into the Town of Truckee. Note: The annexation of the 5 acres is not necessary for the project, but is the preferred option
California Department of Forestry	Approval of a Timberland Conversion Permit (TCP)
Truckee Donner Public Utility District (TDPUD)	Approval of annexation of the site into the TDPUD; and Approval for water service
Truckee Sanitary District	Sewer service
Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board	Water quality control standards (Statewide NPDES General Permit; Low Impact Development; Wetland and flood plain delineation)

Source: Quad Knopf, Inc. 2007.

CHAPTER THREE

SETTING, IMPACTS & MITIGATION MEASURES

CHAPTER FOUR

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

CHAPTER FOUR PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

4.1 Introduction

The California Environmental Quality Act and the implementing CEQA Guidelines require that alternatives to the proposed project be discussed in the EIR. The value of such discussion is to inform public decision-makers of the differential environmental impacts which may be associated with each potential alternative, and to enable a reasoned judgment to be made as to which alternative to the proposed project may be environmentally superior. Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines provides the following description of what should be included in the alternatives discussion in an EIR:

- (a) Alternatives to the Proposed Project. An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The Lead Agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.
- (b) Purpose. Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.
- (c) Selection of a range of reasonable alternatives. The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. Among the factors that may be

used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

- (d) Evaluation of Alternatives. The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. A matrix displaying the major characteristics and significant environmental effects of each alternative may be used to summarize the comparison. If an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the significant effects of the alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.
- (e) “No Project” alternative.
 - (1) The specific alternative of “no project” shall also be evaluated along with its impact. The purpose of describing and analyzing a no project alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. The no project alternative analysis is not the baseline for determining whether the proposed project’s environmental impacts may be significant, unless it is identical to the existing environmental setting analysis which does establish that baseline (see Section 15125).
 - (2) The “no project” analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. If the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.
 - (3) A discussion of the “no project” alternative will usually proceed along one of two lines:
 - (A) When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy or ongoing operation, the “no project” alternative will be the continuation of the plan, policy or operation into the future. Typically this is a situation where other projects initiated under the existing plan will continue while the new plan is developed. Thus, the projected impacts of the proposed plan or alternative

plans would be compared to the impacts that would occur under the existing plan.

- (B) If the project is other than a land use or regulatory plan, for example a development project on identifiable property, the “no project” alternative is the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Here the discussion would compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state against environmental effects which would occur if the project is approved. If disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as the proposal of some other project, this “no project” consequence should be discussed. In certain instances, the no project alternative means “no build” wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained. However, where failure to proceed with the project will not result in preservation of existing environmental conditions, the analysis should identify the practical result of the project’s non-approval and not create and analyze a set of artificial assumptions that would be required to preserve the existing physical environment.
 - (C) After defining the no project alternative using one of these approaches, the lead agency should proceed to analyze the impacts of the no project alternative by projecting what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.
- (f) Rule of reason. The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making.
- (1) Feasibility. Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can

reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent). No one of these factors establishes a fixed limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives.

- (2) Alternative locations.
 - (A) Key question. The key question and first step in analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR.
 - (B) None feasible. If the lead agency concludes that no feasible alternative locations exist, it must disclose the reasons for this conclusion, and should include the reasons in the EIR. For example, in some cases there may be no feasible alternative locations for a geothermal plant or mining project which must be in close proximity to natural resources at a given location.
 - (C) Limited new analysis required. Where a previous document has sufficiently analyzed a range of reasonable alternative locations and environmental impacts for projects with the same basic purpose, the lead agency should review the previous document. The EIR may rely on the previous document to help it assess the feasibility of the potential project alternatives to the extent the circumstances remain substantially the same as they relate to the alternative.
- (3) An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.

The sections of the chapter that follow present a description of the alternatives considered and an analysis of the alternatives in the context of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The range of alternatives addressed includes an evaluation of the no project alternative (which is required to be addressed), a one access alternative, and a reduced project size alternative. Finally, this chapter presents an analysis of the comparative environmental superiority of the various alternatives, as required by CEQA.

4.2 Project Objectives

As stated in Section Two of the DEIR, the objective of the project is to develop a residential subdivision with a variety of lot sizes and values including 213 units on 289 acres. The project will create additional affordable housing, cluster development to minimize environmentally sensitive areas, provide a network of trail systems for public use, and open space corridors for wildlife migration. Objectives of the project include the following:

- Create a residential community compatible with adjacent neighborhoods
- Provide low impact recreational opportunities for the public
- Provide open space areas that serve as wildlife migration corridors
- Cluster development to avoid environmentally sensitive areas
- Provide affordable housing opportunities

4.3 Alternatives Rejected

According to the CEQA Guidelines, two major provisions are necessary for an adequate alternative site analysis – feasibility and location. The EIR should consider alternate project locations if a significant project impact could be avoided or substantially lessened by moving the project to an alternate site. An alternative site for the proposed project would not be feasible for two reasons:

1. The act of moving the proposed project to an alternate site would not necessarily avoid or substantially lessen many of the significant environmental impacts. Many of the same significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project site would occur at an alternate site (e.g., increased traffic, air quality, and noise impacts).
2. The project proponent does not own or have access to a site in the vicinity of the proposed project site of similar size that would meet the project objectives.

Therefore, a discussion of an alternative site would not be feasible, nor would it meet the “rule of reason” under CEQA. This alternative was eliminated from further consideration in this EIR.

4.4 Project Alternatives

The alternatives to be evaluated should include those that offer substantial environmental advantages over the proposed project and that may feasibly be accomplished considering the various economic, environmental, technological, social and legal factors. Two such alternatives to the proposed project and the no project alternative were evaluated, as follows:

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2: One Access Alternative
- Alternative 3: Reduced Density Alternative
- Alternative 4: Clustered Development

4.4.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

This alternative is required under CEQA, and will consist of describing the effects of taking no action or not receiving project approval. This alternative entails a general discussion of what can reasonably be expected to occur in the plan area in the foreseeable future if the proposed project is not approved, based on the existing general plan land use designation, zoning, and available infrastructure and services.

As of the date of publication of this EIR, the plan area is zoned Residential (RS-1) and Open Space (OS). RS-1 allows the construction of one single family dwelling unit per one acre. In accordance with Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines, this “No Project” alternative assumes a continuation of the existing Town of Truckee General Plan designations and policies currently governing the plan area. This alternative identifies the practical result of the project’s non-approval. In this case, the “No Project Alternative” is not a “No Build” Alternative since the Town of Truckee has designated this area for residential development. Additionally, this area is adjacent to existing neighborhoods, has infrastructure available and is located in a highly desirable area. It is highly unlikely that this site would remain undeveloped if this project is not approved.

Under the Town of Truckee General Plan, the project site is designated as RS-0.5-1.0 (Residential- 0.5-1.0 dwelling unit per acre) and RC/OS (Resource Conservation/Open Space) (Figure 3.8-1). The allowable density based on current RS zoning standards is 214 lots.

The Resource Conservation/Open Space (RC/OS) land use designation is applied to lands containing significant natural resources such as forest land, rangeland, mineral resources, and open space uses such as bikeways, trails, and access to the Truckee River and other public areas; and to lands with environmentally sensitive features such as important wildlife habitat, wildlife movement corridors, and significant vistas.

4.4.2 ONE ACCESS ALTERNATIVE

This alternative is the same as the proposed project, except that access to the site would be provided via Martis Peak Road to the north of the site, not via Edinburgh Drive. Under this alternative Edinburgh Drive would be used for emergency access only. Although this alternative is conceptual in nature, a reduction of vehicular access would not change the site plan design. It is assumed that the project density will be the same, and the entire site developed in a similar manner to the proposed project.

4.4.3 REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE

This alternative is a reduced density development project design in which there would be a 25% reduction in the number of residential units from the proposed 213 units to approximately 160 units. This alternative would develop in areas of the project site where the environmental impacts would be minimized and leave the remaining sensitive areas undeveloped. It is assumed that parcel sizes would be similar or slightly greater than the proposed project.

4.4.4 CLUSTERED ALTERNATIVE

This alternative is a development project design which would be the same as the proposed project except that the residential units would be clustered, allowing for more open space on site between the residential unit clusters. Overall, the project density would remain the same as and the entire site developed in a similar manner to the proposed project.

4.5 Analysis of Project Alternatives

The discussion below presents an analysis of each alternative. The discussion focuses on a comparison of the environmental impacts of the alternatives. CEQA does not require the alternatives to be analyzed at the same level of detail as the proposed project; rather, the alternatives discussion can be based on a qualitative analysis and comparative methodology to identify the environmentally superior alternative.

4.5.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Aesthetics

In the worst case under the No Project Alternative, the site would be developed as residential (RS-1). Under current zoning in the Town of Truckee, RS-1 would allow the construction of one single family dwelling unit per one acre which would allow 214 units. Additional zoning at the project site is for open space, which under this alternative would not be built out. Both the proposed project and no project alternative would result in the construction of residential housing units, the existing visual character of the site would change. Neither the proposed project nor this alternative would result in impacts to views or visual resources within a scenic highway. Under this alternative, aesthetic impacts are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

Air Quality

Under this alternative the site would be developed as residential and would generate similar vehicle trips compared to the proposed project. Construction activities and wintertime operation emission similar the proposed project would require mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts. Since a similar amount of development would be allowed, the alternative would likely have the same emissions of PM₁₀ and ozone precursors. Under this alternative, air quality impacts are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Since the property could still be developed under the existing zoning, the No Project Alternative would have similar impacts in terms of biological resources. There would be no impact to designated open spaces; however, due to the potential biological impacts with the introduction of additional housing units in the area, mitigation measures would be required to protect potential nesting sites and sensitive habitat. Under this alternative, biological impacts are ***unchanged*** as compared to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Under this alternative the project site would be disturbed during development, similarly to the proposed project. This alternative would be similar in terms of cultural resources. Identical mitigation measures would be required to protect unknown cultural resources during construction, since disturbance of vegetation and soil surfaces could result in the discovery of unidentified cultural and historical resources. Under this alternative, cultural impacts are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

The alternative and proposed project will result in site improvements, which are likely to cause soil erosion and instability during the construction phase. Exposure of structures and people residing or working the project area are at risk of earthquakes and ground shaking that would require identical mitigation measures. Under this alternative, geological impacts are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, the project site would be developed with residential housing. The project site conditions would be similar to the proposed project. The entire Town of Truckee is located in a high fire severity zone, therefore, identical mitigation measures would be required. Under this alternative, impacts from fire hazards are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this alternative, similar effects on water quality would occur as a result of grading, excavation and potential cut and fill activity similar to the proposed project. Identical mitigation measures would be required. Under this alternative, impacts to hydrology and water quality are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

Land Use, Planning and Recreation

Under this alternative the project site would be developed similar to the proposed project. Since the alternative would be developed as low density residential under the alternative, this alternative, similar to the proposed project would result in no land use conflicts. Under this alternative, land use impacts are ***unchanged*** as compared to the proposed project.

Noise

This alternative would generate the same traffic than the proposed project and correspondingly similar noise levels. However, similar to the proposed project, the alternative would result in increases in temporary ambient noise levels during development, requiring identical mitigation measures. Under this alternative, noise impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

Population and Housing

Under this alternative the project site would be developed similar to the proposed project. Therefore, sewer and water lines would not be extended from the town, reducing growth-inducing impacts. The current zoning would allow 214 units as compared to the 213 units, which is virtually the same. Under this alternative, population and housing impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

Public Services and Utilities

Both the alternative and the proposed project will result in similar impacts to public services and utilities. Impacts to school services would require identical mitigation measures as the proposed project. Under this alternative, public services/utilities impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

Transportation/Traffic

Under this alternative the project site would be developed under the Town of Truckee General Plan designations of residential (RS-1, one residential unit per acre) and open space. The alternative would develop low density residential compared to the proposed project; however, the total number of units would be similar and result in the same or a similar number of vehicle trips. There would be increased traffic on similar roadways and intersections of the proposed project requiring similar mitigation measures. Under this alternative, impacts from transportation/traffic are *unchanged* as compared to the proposed project.

4.5.2 ONE ACCESS ALTERNATIVE

Aesthetics

Under this alternative the project site would have the same visual impacts as the proposed project. There would be less visual impacts to the south of the project site with the absence of vehicle traffic on Edinburgh Drive as this would be used for emergency purposes only. Under this alternative, aesthetic impacts are *lesser* compared to the proposed project.

Air Quality

Implementation of the alternative would be similar to the proposed project resulting in similar construction and operation emissions; however, there would be an increase the length of trips to and from the project site as a result of reduced site access. Residents would either elect to use

Highway 80 and access from the north to Martis Valley Road or drive all the way on Glenshire Drive. This would result in many residents having to travel back to the southern areas of the project site, increasing the vehicle miles traveled. Mitigation measures would be required to reduce potential impacts as a result of limited access. Under this alternative, air quality impacts are *greater* as compared to the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Implementation of the alternative would result in the same impacts as the proposed project. Assuming that Edinburgh Drive would be used exclusively for emergency purposes, there would be lesser impacts to wildlife from traffic and noise from that area of the project site. An emergency access road would still need to be constructed and the overall development would be very similar to the proposed project. Similar impacts would still result due to development of the site requiring similar mitigation measures as the proposed project. Under this alternative, biological impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Both the alternative and the proposed project will disturb the same amount of land. Both the alternative and the proposed project have the potential to disturb prehistoric cultural deposits in the project area. Under this alternative, cultural impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

Both the alternative and the proposed project will remove surface vegetation and disturb soil by grading. Construction activities will result in the disturbance of soils, which could cause soil erosion and instability. Under this alternative, geological impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, the project site would be developed with residential housing. The project site conditions would be similar to the proposed project. Due to the limited site access of the alternative, there may be a potential for increased risk from hazardous materials transport; however, this would be minimal since neither the proposed project nor alternative are expected to transport hazardous materials that would result in impacts to the environment or human health. The entire Town of Truckee is located in a high fire severity zone, therefore, identical mitigation measures, with additional mitigation addressing the limited site access would be required. Only having one primary access point would expose more people to wildland fire risk and it would be more difficult to evacuate the area under this alternative. Under this alternative, impacts from fire hazards are *greater* compared to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this alternative, similar effects on water quality would occur as a result of grading, excavation and potential cut and fill activity similar to the proposed project. Identical mitigation

measures would be required. Under this alternative, impacts to hydrology and water quality are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

Land Use, Planning and Recreation

Under this alternative the project site would develop the same amount of land as the proposed project. Under this alternative, land use impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

Noise

Implementation of the alternative would possibly result in lower noise levels to the south at Edinburgh Drive as a result of limiting access to the project site primary access route, Martis Peak Road. However, the alternative would still result in increase noise levels as a result of the development requiring the same mitigation measures as the proposed project. Under this alternative, noise impacts are generally *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

Population and Housing

This alternative would develop the same area as the proposed project and involve the same expansion of public infrastructure, which could be growth-inducing. Population and housing impacts are *unchanged* under this alternative.

Public Services and Utilities

Both the proposed project and alternative would develop the same amount of land, requiring expansion of public infrastructure. Public services and utility systems impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

Transportation/Traffic

Under the alternative 2006 LOS would not exceed Town of Truckee standards. However, 2025 LOS would exceed town standards with or without the alternative requiring similar mitigation measures as the proposed project. This alternative could result in greater through traffic on Glenshire Drive for residents to reach the north end of the project site. There would likely be more vehicle miles traveled as well since residents coming from the Town of Truckee and other locations would have to pass the site and many would have to drive back south to their residences. Under this alternative, transportation/traffic impacts are *greater* as compared to the proposed project.

4.5.3 REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE

Aesthetics

Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would have a lesser impact on aesthetics by leaving more of the project site and its natural features undisturbed. However, the project site would still be converted from an undeveloped natural setting to a residential development

permanently degrading the visual character and quality of the project site and its surroundings. The project site is not viewable from any scenic highways. This alternative would result in reduced number of residential units producing less glare and nighttime light. These impacts can be fully mitigated under both scenarios. Under this alternative, aesthetic impacts are *lesser* compared to the proposed project.

Air Quality

Implementation of the alternative would develop as low density residential, thereby reducing the number of vehicle trips to and from the site compared to the proposed project. There would be a reduction of construction and operation related emissions as a result of a 25 percent reduction in residential units proposed under this alternative. Under this alternative, air quality impacts are *lesser* as compared to the proposed project.

Biological Resources

This alternative would result in a smaller area of the project site being developed resulting in lesser impacts to biological resources. In particular, the preservation of the deer migratory corridor and natural buffers as well as the creation of additional open space would reduce the amount of habitat converted to residential dwellings. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans; however, there are local policies protecting biological resources in the Town of Truckee. In terms of biological resources, this alternative would have a *lesser* impact than the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

This alternative would require less grading and other construction activities that have the potential to disturb unknown cultural resources. There are no structures on the project site and there are no cultural resources that are eligible for preservation. Under this alternative, cultural resources impacts are *lesser* compared to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

Both the alternative and the proposed project will remove surface vegetation and disturb soil by grading. Construction activities will result in the disturbance of soils, which could cause soil erosion and instability. Under this alternative, geological impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Both the alternative and the proposed project would result in the same hazards from wildland fires, and require the same mitigations measures. In terms of hazards/hazardous materials, this alternative is *unchanged* in comparison to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

This alternative would develop the fewer number of residential units compared to the proposed project. However, the alternative would still result in impacts from construction related activities requiring similar mitigation measures as the proposed project. Under this alternative, impacts would be *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

Land Use, Planning and Recreation

This alternative will occupy a smaller amount of land as compared to the proposed project and involve similar land use designations and zoning. The project would remain consistent with General Plan policies and would have less impact on surrounding land uses due to the reduced density. Under this alternative, land-use impacts are *lesser* compared to the proposed project.

Noise

Implementation of the alternative would reduce the number of residential units compared to the proposed project. The reduced density development may result in fewer vehicle trips, thereby reducing the impact of noise on surrounding land uses. Under this alternative noise impacts would be *lesser* compared to the proposed project.

Population and Housing

This alternative would develop the same area as the proposed project and involve the same expansion of public infrastructure, which could be growth-inducing. The increase in population would be less under this alternative. With 160 units, it would be expected that there would be approximately 430 additional residents as compared with approximately 560 under the proposed project. Population and housing impacts are *lesser* under this alternative.

Public Services and Utilities

Both the proposed project and alternative would require expansion of public infrastructure. Public services and utility systems impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

Transportation/Traffic

Both the alternative and proposed project would have the similar impacts on transportation/traffic; although this alternative would generate slightly fewer trips due to the reduction in the number of residents. Traffic mitigation measures similar to the proposed project would be required, including improvements to local roadways to accommodate the projected level of service. Traffic impacts are *lesser* under this alternative.

4.5.4 CLUSTERED ALTERNATIVE

Aesthetics

Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would have a lesser impact on aesthetics by leaving more of the project site as open space. However, the project site would still be converted

from an undeveloped natural setting to a residential development permanently degrading the visual character and quality of the project site and its surroundings. The project site is not viewable from any scenic highways. This alternative would result in consolidating the location of residential units producing larger areas of open space between each clustered development. The clustered development would reduce the visual appearance of a larger scale development. These impacts can be fully mitigated under both scenarios. Under this alternative, aesthetic impacts are *lesser* as compared to the proposed project.

Air Quality

Implementation of the alternative would produce the same traffic trip generation rates, distributions and assignments thereby not changing the overall project net impact on air quality. The number of vehicle trips to and from the site compared to the proposed project would not change. The operation related emissions would be the same as the proposed project under this alternative. Under this alternative, air quality impacts are *unchanged* as compared to the proposed project.

Biological Resources

This alternative would result in an overall smaller area of the project site proposed for development resulting in lesser impacts to biological resources. In particular, the clustered development would provide for the creation of additional open space resulting in the reduction of the amount of habitat converted to residential dwellings. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans; however, there are local policies protecting biological resources in the Town of Truckee. In terms of biological resources, this alternative would have a *lesser* impact than the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

This alternative would require grading of an overall smaller area and other construction activities that have the potential to disturb unknown cultural resources. Although there are no structures on the project site or cultural resources that are eligible for preservation located on the site, the potential does exist for the discovery of unknown artifacts during ground disturbing activities. Under this alternative, cultural resources impacts are *lesser* compared to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

Both the alternative and the proposed project will remove surface vegetation and disturb soil by grading. Construction activities will result in the disturbance of soils, which could cause soil erosion and instability. Under this alternative, geological impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Both the alternative and the proposed project would result in the same hazards from wildland fires, and require the same mitigations measures. In terms of hazards/hazardous materials, this alternative is *unchanged* in comparison to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

This alternative would develop the same number of residential units as compared to the proposed project. In light of this, the alternative would also result in impacts from construction related activities requiring the same mitigation measures as the proposed project. Under this alternative, impacts would be ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

Land Use, Planning and Recreation

This alternative proposes the same land uses as the proposed project and involves the same land use designations and zoning. The proposed project and this alternative would not remain consistent with General Plan policies as a Class I bicycle facility, consistent with the *Truckee Trails and Bikeway Master Plan*, would not be constructed. However, the same mitigation measure identified for the proposed project would be applicable to this alternative thereby obtaining consistency with the General Plan through implementation of the proposed mitigation. Under this alternative, land-use impacts are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

Noise

Implementation of the alternative would not reduce the number of residential units as compared to the proposed project. The clustered development would result in the same vehicle trips thereby producing the same impact of noise on surrounding land use as the proposed project. Under this alternative noise impacts would be ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

Population and Housing

Although this alternative would develop the same area as the proposed project in a different configuration, it would involve the same expansion of public infrastructure. This alternative would also be considered growth-inducing as the resulting increase in population would be the same as the proposed project under this alternative. Population and housing impacts are ***unchanged*** under this alternative.

Public Services and Utilities

Both the proposed project and alternative would require expansion of public infrastructure. Public services and utility systems impacts are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

Transportation/Traffic

The clustered alternative proposes the same land uses as the proposed project and the trip generation, trip distribution, traffic assignment, its impact to traffic volumes as well as impacts to the Donner Pass Road/Glenshire Drive intersection are the same as under the proposed project. Traffic mitigation measures similar to the proposed project would be required, including improvements to local roadways to accommodate the projected level of service. Traffic impacts are ***unchanged*** under this alternative.

4.6 Environmentally Superior Alternative

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(d), this section compares the impacts of the three alternatives under consideration to those of the proposed project. Table 4-1 shows whether each of the thirteen impact areas are unchanged, lesser, or greater, compared to the proposed project.

Table 4-1
Summary of Impact Comparison Between Proposed Project and Alternatives

Issue	No Project Alternative	One Access Alternative	Reduced Density Alternative	Clustered Alternative
Aesthetics	Unchanged	Lesser	Lesser	Unchanged
Air Quality	Unchanged	Greater	Lesser	Unchanged
Biological Resources	Unchanged	Unchanged	Lesser	Unchanged
Cultural Resources	Unchanged	Unchanged	Lesser	Unchanged
Geology and Soils	Unchanged	Unchanged	Unchanged	Unchanged
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Unchanged	Greater	Unchanged	Unchanged
Hydrology and Water Quality	Unchanged	Unchanged	Unchanged	Unchanged
Land Use , Planning and Recreation	Unchanged	Unchanged	Lesser	Unchanged
Noise	Unchanged	Unchanged	Lesser	Unchanged
Population and Housing	Unchanged	Unchanged	Lesser	Unchanged
Public Services and Utilities	Unchanged	Unchanged	Unchanged	Unchanged
Transportation/Traffic	Unchanged	Greater	Lesser	Unchanged
Number of Impacts Reduced	0	1	8	0
Number of Impacts Increased	0	3	0	0
Number of Impacts Unchanged	12	8	4	12

Source: Quad Knopf, Inc.

The Reduced Density alternative is the environmentally superior alternative because it would reduce impacts in Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Land Use/Planning, Noise, Population and Housing and Transportation.

CHAPTER FIVE

MANDATORY CEQA SECTIONS

CHAPTER FIVE MANDATORY CEQA SECTIONS

5.1 Effects Not Found To Be Significant In The EIR

CEQA Guidelines §15128 require that an EIR contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various effects of a project were determined not to be significant, and were not discussed in detail in the EIR. An Initial Study was not conducted for this project, therefore a description of the issues are discussed below.

Based on the analysis contained in Chapter Three of this DEIR, the following impacts were found to have no impact or were determined to be less than significant.

AESTHETICS

- Impact 3.1-1: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- Impact 3.1-2: Potential to damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highways.
- Impact 3.1-4: Potential to create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

AIR QUALITY

- Impact 3.2-2: Project traffic would increase carbon monoxide concentrations at intersections affected by project traffic.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- Impact 3.4-1: Disturbance to common plant communities including Jeffrey pine and sagebrush.
- Impact 3.4-2: Removal of habitat for common wildlife currently utilizing the communities on the site.
- Impact 3.4-3: Potential disturbance to special-status plant species.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

None

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

None

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- Impact 3.6-1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, or disposal, emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- Impact 3.6-2: 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.
- Impact 3.6-3: Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- Impact 3.6-4: Project located within an airport land use plan or, within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip, resulting in the safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- Impact 3.7-2: Place housing or other structures 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 or impede or redirect flood flows.

LAND USE, PLANNING AND RECREATION

- Impact 3.8-1: Potential for the project to physically divide an established community.
- Impact 3.8-2: Consistency of the proposed Canyon Springs Subdivision with the land use policies of the 1996 Truckee General Plan and 2003 Truckee Development Code.
- Impact 3.8-3: Create land use conflicts with adjacent properties.
- Impact 3.8-4: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.
- Impact 3.8-5: Increased use of parks and other recreational facilities as a result of increased population from the proposed project.

NOISE

- Impact 3.9-1: Development within the project area will be exposed to exterior traffic noise levels which may exceed the Town of Truckee General Plan Noise Element exterior noise level criteria.

- Impact 3.9-2: Development within the project area could be exposed to interior traffic noise levels which exceed the Town of Truckee General Plan Noise Element criterion of 45 dB Ldn.
- Impact 3.9-3: Development of the project area could result in a significant increase in traffic noise levels along area roadways.
- Impact 3.9-5: Would the project be located within an airport land use plan or, within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip, resulting in the exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

- Impact 3.10-1: Development of the proposed project would increase the population in the vicinity (growth-inducing impact) beyond that that is anticipated in the General Plan.
- Impact 3.10-2: Impact of the proposed project on compliance with the Housing Element of Town of Truckee General Plan and meeting the housing needs in the Town.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

- Impact 3.11-1: 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.
- Impact 3.11-3: Result in inadequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.
- Impact 3.11-4: Exceed the capacity of the landfill.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Proposed Project

- Impact 3.12-2: Project implementation conflicts with existing goals and policies
- Impact 3.12-3: Project provides inadequate emergency access
- Impact 3.12-5: Project implementation exacerbates an existing traffic safety deficiency

Impact 3.12-6: Project implementation results in exceeding the capacity of an existing transit service or results in ridership levels adequate to meet the Transportation Development Act 10 Percent Minimum Fare Box Ratio.

Impact 3.12-7: Project implementation results in exceedance of LOS thresholds during the construction phases.

One Access Alternative

Impact 3.12-9: Project Implementation Conflicts with Existing Goals and Policies

Impact 3.12-12: Project Implementation Exacerbates an Existing Traffic Safety Deficiency

Impact 3.12-13: Project Implementation Results in Exceeding the Capacity of an Existing Transit Service or Results in Ridership Levels Adequate to Meet the Transportation Development Act 10 Percent Minimum Fare Box Ratio

Impact 3.12-14: Project Implementation Results in Exceedance of LOS Thresholds during the Construction Phases

Reduced Density Alternative

Impact 3.12-16: Project Implementation Conflicts with Existing Goals and Policies

Impact 3.12-17: Project Provides Inadequate Emergency Access

Impact 3.12-19: Project Implementation Exacerbates an Existing Traffic Safety Deficiency

Impact 3.12-20: Project Implementation Results in Exceeding the Capacity of an Existing Transit Service or Results in Ridership Levels Adequate to Meet the Transportation Development Act 10 Percent Minimum Fare Box Ratio

Impact 3.12-21: Project Implementation Results in Exceedance of LOS Thresholds during the Construction Phases

Clustered Alternative

Impact 3.12-23: Project Implementation Conflicts with Existing Goals and Policies

Impact 3.12-24: Project Provides Inadequate Emergency Access

Impact 3.12-26: Project Implementation Exacerbates an Existing Traffic Safety Deficiency

Impact 3.12-27: Project Implementation Results in Exceeding the Capacity of an Existing Transit Service or Results in Ridership Levels Adequate to Meet the Transportation Development Act 10 Percent Minimum Fare Box Ratio

Impact 3.12-28: Project Implementation Results in Exceedance of LOS Thresholds during the Construction Phases

5.2 Significant Environmental Effects Requiring Mitigation

Multiple environmental impacts have been identified which can be reduced to a level of less than significant upon incorporation of mitigation measures. These impacts are listed below. Refer to Chapter Three of this EIR for a full analysis of impacts and mitigation measures.

AESTHETICS

Impact 3.1-3: Alteration of views of the project site from roadways along and through the site, and from Key Observation Points (KOP).

AIR QUALITY

Impact 3.2-1: Construction activities such as excavation and grading operations, construction vehicle traffic and wind blowing over exposed earth would generate exhaust emissions and fugitive particulate matter emissions that would affect local and regional air quality in the summer months during the buildout period of the project.

Impact #3.2-3: Project-related summertime emissions of ozone precursors would exceed the NSAQMD's thresholds of significance.

Impact 3.2-4: Project-associated emissions of wintertime PM₁₀ would exceed the NSAQMD significance threshold.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact 3.3-4: Potential loss of wildlife movement and migration corridors.

Impact 3.3-5: Potential disturbance of nesting migratory birds and raptors.

Impact 3.3-6: Potential disturbance to Sierra Nevada Fox.

Impact 3.3-7: Potential disturbance to special-status bat species.

Impact 3.3-8: Potential to result in the fill of potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. or disturb riparian areas.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact 3.4-1: Disruption of known and unknown Cultural Resources.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Impact 3.5-1: Residential development could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving rupture or a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, ground failure, inundation, or landslides.

Impact 3.5-2: The proposed project could result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

Impact 3.5-3: The proposed project could expose people and property to geologic hazards, including liquefaction, landslides, slope instability, expansive soils, and subsidence on the project site.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Impact #3.6-5: 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.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Impact 3.7-1: Water quality degradation due to erosion, sedimentation and urban runoff due to implementation of the proposed project.

LAND USE, PLANNING AND RECREATION

None

NOISE

Impact 3.9-4: Development of the project would result in a substantial temporary or period increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

None

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Impact #3.11-2: Result in the construction of new water or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Proposed Project

Impact 3.12-1: Exceedance of LOS thresholds.

Impact 3.12-4: Project Implementation Results in Pedestrian/Bicycle Conflicts.

One Access Alternative

Impact 3.12-8: Exceedance of LOS Thresholds

Impact 3.12-10: Project Provides Inadequate Emergency Access

Impact 3.12-11: Project Implementation Results in Pedestrian/Bicycle Conflicts

Reduced Density Alternative

Impact 3.12-15: Exceedance of LOS Thresholds

Impact 3.12-18: Project Implementation Results in Pedestrian/Bicycle Conflicts

Clustered Alternative

Impact 3.12-22: Exceedance of LOS Thresholds

Impact 3.12-25: Project Implementation Results in Pedestrian/Bicycle Conflicts.

Cumulative Impacts – Proposed Project

Impact 3.12-29: Cumulative impact of project results in exceedance of LOS thresholds

Cumulative Impacts – One Access Alternative

Impact 3.12-30: Cumulative Impact of Project Results in Exceedance of LOS Thresholds

Cumulative Impacts – Reduced Density Alternative

Impact 3.12-31: Cumulative Impact of Project Results in Exceedance of LOS Thresholds

Cumulative Impacts – Clustered Alternative

Impact 3.12-32: Cumulative Impact of Project Results in Exceedance of LOS Thresholds

5.3 Significant Environmental Effects That Cannot Be Avoided

CEQA Guidelines §15126.2(b) requires that the EIR describe any significant impacts, including those that cannot be reduced to a level of insignificance. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated with the implementation of feasible mitigation measure(s), their implications and the reasons why the project is being proposed notwithstanding their effect, should be described.

The environmental impacts that would result from the proposed project are discussed in detail in Chapter Three of this EIR. The following is a brief review of the impacts that have been found to be significant and unavoidable.

AESTHETICS

None

AIR QUALITY

None

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

None

CULTURAL RESOURCES

None

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

None

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

None

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

None

LAND USE, PLANNING AND RECREATION

None

NOISE

None

POPULATION AND HOUSING

None

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

None

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

None

5.4 Irreversible Impacts

CEQA Guidelines §15126.2(c) requires a discussion of significant and irreversible changes that would be caused by the proposed project if implemented. The use of non-renewable resources during a project is irreversible when a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary and secondary impacts must also be considered, as well as the possibility of environmental accidents and commitments incurred by future generations.

AESTHETICS

None

AIR QUALITY

None

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

None

CULTURAL RESOURCES

None

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

None

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

None

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

None

LAND USE, PLANNING AND RECREATION

None

NOISE

None

POPULATION AND HOUSING

None

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

None

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

None

5.5 Cumulative Impacts

Section 15130 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. Section 15064(h) defines a cumulative impact as "cumulatively considerable" if "the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects."

The projects considered for cumulative impacts analysis include the following:

TOWN OF TRUCKEE

- TDPUD Glenshire Tentative Map and Rezoning – Requesting approvals of a General Plan amendment to modify the land use designation on the property from RC/OS (Resource Conservation/Open Space) to RES-0.5 (Residential – 0.5 dwelling units per acre); a zoning map amendment to modify the zoning district from RC to RR-0.25 (Rural Residential, 1 dwelling per 4 acres); and a tentative map to subdivide the 8.4 acre parcel into two parcels –

Located in the Glenshire Drive approximately ¼ mile west of Berkshire Circle (APN 49-011-29 and 49-011-31).

- Pioneer East Business Park – Request for a development permit, tentative map, and planned development for the division of the existing parcel into 17 individual lots for sale and development – Located on the north side of Pioneer Trail, west of Donner Pass Road (APN 19-410-28).
- Gateway Vista Centre – Request for a development permit, and land use permit for the construction of three commercial buildings with six residential units – Located on the south side of Donner Pass Road across adjacent to the Gateway Shopping Center.
- Truckee Trails Condominiums – Request a tentative map to convert an eight-unit multi family residential development into condominiums – Located in the Tahoe Donner Subdivision, on the east side of Northwoods Blvd., approx. 500 feet south of Muhleback Way (APN 45-070-10).
- Gregory Creek Subdivision – Request approval of a tentative map to subdivide a 32.1 acre site into 28 parcels and a lot line adjustment with two adjacent parcels – Located in the Donner Lake area, approx. ¼ mile northwest of the intersection of Donner Pass Road and Donner Lake Road (APN 17-150-30 and 17-150-49)
- Soaring Way Professional Center – Request approval of a development permit for two commercial office buildings of approx. 22,000 square feet of floor space – Located in the Martis Valley area, at the southeast corner of the intersection of Soaring Way and Business Park Drive (APN 19-620-42)
- Knight’s Crossing Commercial Center – Request approval of a development permit for 38,197 square feet of commercial retail / office floor space; a use permit for 12 residential units; and a tentative map to subdivide a 9.76 acre parcel into four parcels – Located in the Glenshire area, on the west side of Dorchester Drive approx. 200 feet north of Glenshire Drive (APN 40-430-01)
- Joerger Ranch Specific Plan (Planned Community – 3) – Request for approval of a specific plan for a mixed use project consisting of multi family residential units and commercial, service commercial, and industrial floor space. Request for a development permit for Phase I consisting of 174 multi family residential complex and 150,000 square feet commercial center – Located in the Martis Valley area, surrounding the intersection of State Highway 267, Brockway Road, and Joerger Drive.
- Ericksson Ranch II Subdivision – Request approval of a lot line adjustment to common property line with parcel to the east and approval of tentative map to divide a 40 acre parcel into four parcels 5, 6, 6, and 23 acres each – Located in the Airport Flats area, on the north side of Union Mills Road approx. ½ mile east of the Prosser Village Road interchange (APN 48-210-08).

- Gray's Crossing Amenities – Request for a development permit to construct the golf clubhouse, fitness facility, and golf barn for the Gray's Crossing Specific Plan development – Located on the south side of Prosser Dam Road, within the revised Phase 3 and 4 of the Gray's Crossing Development.
- Gray's Crossing Village – Request for a development permit for the construction of the mixed use 47,500 square feet of commercial Gray's Crossing Village component as identified in the Gray's Crossing Specific Plan – Located on the south side of Prosser Dam Road, within the revised Phase 3 and 4 of the Gray's Crossing Development.
- Hilltop Master Plan – Submit preliminary master plan for mixed use development consisting of 286 dwelling units and 50,000 to 75,000 square feet of commercial retail/office/lodging floor space – Located in the Downtown area, on the south side of Brockway Road approx. 500 feet west of Palisades Road.
- Coldstream Planned Community (PC-1) – Submit applications for approval. The property is allocated 150,000 s.f. of hotel/commercial/office/industrial development and 50 units of affordable housing.

AESTHETICS

Implementation of the proposed project will result in degrading the visual character of the site and its surroundings since the existing visual quality of the site is high; however, mitigation measures listed above will help to lessen visual impacts to a level of insignificance. In addition, the General Plan designated the subject parcels for residential development. According to the General Plan and Development Code Standards, specific measures will ensure that potential impacts to adjacent properties and surrounding areas are less than significant. The proposed project does contribute to a cumulative impact, but it is not cumulatively considerable.

AIR QUALITY

Implementation of the proposed project will result in the addition of ozone precursors and PM10 that would exceed the NSAQMD threshold of significance, which would contribute to the regional air pollution in the Truckee sub-Air Basin. Therefore the proposed project will result in cumulatively considerable impacts to regional air quality.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Implementation of the proposed project will result in the restriction of wildlife movement and will remove habitat for wildlife and decrease the acreage of remaining movement corridors available to wildlife in the region, limiting wildlife dispersal. Cumulatively, development within the surrounding area will contribute to the continuing fragmentation of the wildlife habitat of the vicinity. Loss of buffers, cover, snags, forage, and other habitat features will contribute to the cumulative loss of wildlife habitat in the region. Therefore, the proposed project will result in cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Implementation of the proposed project may result in surface remains being at risk of vandalism and unauthorized artifact collection due to increased public accessibility to the project area. In addition, buried or concealed heritage resources could be disturbed during construction. However, implementation of mitigation measures will reduce these potential impacts to a level of insignificant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project will not result in a cumulatively considerable impact on cultural resources.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Implementation of the proposed project has the potential to expose people or structures to fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, and seismic-related ground failure. Additionally, implementation has the potential to result in substantial soil erosion and soil instability. However, implementation of mitigation measures provided in this EIR will reduce these potential impacts to a level of insignificant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project will not result in a cumulatively considerable impact on geology and soils.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Implementation of the proposed project may result in exposure of 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. However, implementation of mitigation measure will reduce the potential risks to a level of insignificance. Implementation of the proposed project will result in a cumulatively considerable impact on exposure of people to wildland fire hazards.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Implementation of the proposed project would result in water quality degradation due to erosion, sedimentation and urban runoff due to implementation of the proposed project. However, implementation of mitigation measures in this EIR will reduce these potential impacts to a level of insignificance. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project will not result in a cumulatively considerable impact on hydrology and water quality.

LAND USE, PLANNING AND RECREATION

Implementation of the proposed project will not result in any significant impacts and will therefore not have a cumulatively considerable impact on land use, planning, and recreation.

NOISE

Implementation of the proposed project will not result in any significant impacts and will therefore not have a cumulatively considerable impact on noise.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Implementation of the proposed project will not result in any significant impacts and will therefore not have a cumulatively considerable impact on population and housing.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Implementation of the proposed project will result in a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios for education and school services. However, implementation of mitigation measures will reduce the potential impacts to a level of insignificance. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project will not result in a cumulatively considerable impact on public services and utility systems.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Implementation of the proposed project will result in exceedence of the LOS threshold. As indicated in Chapter 3 of this EIR, the Donner Pass/Glenshire Drive intersection is forecast to exceed LOS standards under AM and PM peak-hour 2025 conditions with or without the project. However implementation of mitigation measures will reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project will not result in a cumulatively considerable impact on area circulation.

5.6 Growth Inducing Impacts

CEQA Guidelines §15126.2(d) requires a discussion of growth-inducing impacts of a proposed project. Growth inducement occurs when a project would, either directly or indirectly, foster economic or population growth, construct additional housing, remove obstacles to population growth, increase burdens on existing community service facilities to the extent that new facilities would be needed, or encourage other activities that cause significant environmental effects. Note that it must not be assumed that growth is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

DIRECT GROWTH INDUCEMENT

Direct population growth occurs when a project would result in the construction of a substantial amount of new housing or otherwise directly cause a substantial increase in the city's population.

The proposed project will directly induce population growth by constructing up to 213 new residential units with approximately 15 percent (32 lots) is designated Restricted Affordable and the remaining 85 percent will be marketable units. According to the Towns General Plan, the proposed residential units will house approximately 2.7 individuals. These averages result in a total population increase of approximately 575 at build out of the proposed project. These averages result in a total population increase of approximately 575 at build out of the proposed project which is anticipated to occur by 2010. This population increase represents a 2.71 percent increase to the Town's 2010 population as projected in the General Plan. This direct growth

inducement cannot be mitigated; however, the proposed project will not result in significant direct growth-inducing impacts since the growth has been planned for and is in accordance with the General Plan.

INDIRECT GROWTH INDUCEMENT

Indirect growth inducement occurs when a project would extend infrastructure to undeveloped areas or otherwise remove obstacles to population growth.

Implementation of the proposed project will result in public infrastructure being extended to undeveloped land located to the east and southeast of the project site. There is not currently any indication that these properties would be developed in the immediate future, as they are currently not located within the Town of Truckee boundary. The undeveloped land to the southeast and east are currently located in Nevada County and are zoned general agriculture (AG-X), and to the east zoned Interim Development Reserve (IDR), which is intended to be used as an interim zoning district to reflect and reserve the development potential of property designated as Planned Development and Special Development Area in the Nevada County General Plan.

Since there is the potential for implementation of the proposed project to indirectly induce unplanned growth in the vicinity of the project site the project is considered to be significantly growth-inducing.