

Chapter 2 **Affected Environment/Impacts, Thresholds of Significance, & Mitigation**

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Lake Tahoe Basin has been recognized by Presidential Executive Order, the Congress, the Department of Agriculture, and the States of California and Nevada as a unique and environmentally sensitive area. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) has adopted environmental thresholds required by public law 96-551. Projects that have California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) involvement intend to sustain or improve many of those thresholds. The TRPA is the responsible transportation-planning agency for the Tahoe Basin in that it carefully reviews and evaluates each project for environmental impacts. One of the main tasks that TRPA is responsible for is the implementation of the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). The objective of the Tahoe EIP is to achieve the Environmental Standards Carrying Capacity (ESCC) thresholds required by Public Law 96-551 and adopted for the Tahoe Region in 1982 by TRPA. The aforementioned thresholds are contained in the TRPA Code of Ordinances (Code). There are nine categories of thresholds programs and they are: 1) Water Quality Program, 2) Scenic Resources Program, 3) Soil Conservation/SEZ Program, 4) Recreation Program, 5) Noise Program, 6) Air Quality/Transportation Program, 7) Fisheries Program, 8) Vegetation Program, and 9) Wildlife Program. Specific TRPA thresholds are included in this chapter.

2.1 Aesthetics

2.1.1 Affected Environment/Impacts

State Route 89, which is the primary route around the western shore of Lake Tahoe, is on the eligible list for State Scenic Highway designation and warrants special attention. This region is considered to have extremely high scenic resource values, which is based on its eligibility for the State Scenic Highway designation and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) exceptionally high (3+) rating for scenic quality.

The existing Roadside Access and Viewing Area is currently an unimproved off-shoulder pullout area with bollard type vehicle barriers separating it from the existing bicycle trail.

Due to the sites intense and undesignated use patterns (approximately 120,000 people use this segment of the bicycle trail annually (Per. Comm TCPUD)) many large trees and other vegetation are in decline. In addition to pressures from the pedestrian and cycling public, the bollard parking barriers are in disrepair and do not exclude automobiles from beach and vegetated areas. The lack of signage and trash receptacles has led to trash disposal problems during heavy use weekends.

2.1.1.1 Impacts

There will be minor physical changes to the project site, which will be a visual enhancement. These modifications include:

- Replace and relocate auto barriers (bollards) between designated parking pullout area and bicycle path. Delineate parking pullout areas to meet safety requirements.
- Stabilize selected pedestrian high use areas along bicycle trail with interlocking pervious pavers.
- Enhance existing bicycle path with pullouts that contain bike racks at designated locations.
- Develop area for future interpretive plaques along existing bicycle path with informal seating (arranged boulders).
- Incorporate trash receptacles and signage to better manage and deter litter.
- Provide protective split-rail fencing around existing stands of vegetation currently in decline.
- Revegetate denuded areas to improve water quality.

It is not anticipated that there would be any negative visual impacts associated with this project. It is anticipated that the visual quality of the project site would be improved by the delineation of use areas and protection of existing vegetation.

Therefore, this project will have a less than significant impact on the project site and surrounding area.

2.1.2 Mitigation

The project has been found not to have a significant affect on visual resources, therefore no mitigation is necessary.

2.2 Air Quality

The proposed project is located in Placer County, which is governed by the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD). Due to the geography of the region, the PCAPCD is split into three different air basins, The Lake Tahoe Air Basin, The Mountain Counties Air Basin, and the Sacramento Valley Air Basin. This project is located in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin. The Lake Tahoe Basin is in attainment for all federal ambient air quality standards and non-attainment for the state PM₁₀ (airborne particulate less than 10 microns in diameter) standard.

2.2.1 Affected Environment/Impacts

Air quality impacts were determined by the flowcharts in the “Caltrans Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol.” This project is located in a federal attainment area for ozone, and particulate matter. Therefore this project is exempt from a regional conformity analysis. A local carbon monoxide analysis is required for projects that are likely to worsen air quality. To determine if a project is likely to worsen air quality, the criteria in the “Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol” needs to be examined. If the project passes the criteria, then the project will not worsen air quality and no further analysis is necessary. In summary, this project passes the criteria and will not worsen air quality, therefore it will not have an air quality impact.

Construction of the project will result in the generation of suspended particulate matter. Although the amount of dust generated will result in an impact, the impacts

will be temporary, local, and limited to the areas of construction. To minimize the amount of construction dust generated, and because the project is in a state PM10 non-attainment area dust control practices must be incorporated into the project to mitigate this potential impact. The dust control practices must comply with the current Caltrans' Standard Specifications and Placer County Air Pollution Control District Rule 228 – Fugitive Dust.

Within the State of California, naturally occurring asbestos is known to exist in serpentine rock. Serpentine, the “state rock” of California, is a greenish, greasy-looking rock that is common in the Coast Ranges, Klamath Mountains, and Sierra foothills. Asbestos is a potent carcinogen, particularly when inhaled. It is therefore regulated as an airborne toxic material, and strict limits are placed on its use and handling in working environments.

Placer County is known to contain ultramafic rock, which is known to consist of serpentine. Most of the area in this county that contains this rock is located west of the project area. Therefore, construction of this project would not release any asbestos in to the air. If asbestos is found, the Placer County Air Pollution Control District Rule 905 – Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Asbestos, must be adhered to when handling this material.

2.2.2 TRPA Thresholds

The following thresholds were extracted from the TRPA air quality threshold program (please visit the TRPA website for additional information at <http://www.trpa.org/>) or contact TRPA at (775)588-4547:

- AQ1-Carbon Monoxide levels shall not exceed the TRPA 8-hour 6.0 ppm standard.
- AQ2-Ozone levels shall not exceed the TRPA 1-hour standard of 0.08 ppm.
- AQ3-Particulate Matter concentrations shall not exceed the California and Federal standards for 24-hour concentrations and the annual average.

2.2.3 Mitigation

There are no impacts to air quality as a result of this project, therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary.

2.3 Biological Resources

Field surveys were conducted by Caltrans biologists on 05/07/02, 06/18/02 and 8/13/02. Emphasis was placed on special status species that may occur in the project area. The project sites were field reviewed to identify: 1. habitat types; 2. potential wetlands; 3. factors indicating the potential for rare species; 4. rare species present; and 5. potential problems for the study.

2.3.1 Affected Environment/Impacts

The Natural Environmental Study concluded that no listed endangered or threatened species or critical habitat is expected to be present in the project area, and the project will not have a significant negative impact on biological resources.

Impacts that may substantially affect sensitive biological resources are not expected to occur during the course of this project. The limited scope of the project combined with timing constraints will result in no effects to listed species, aquatic habitat or riparian vegetation.

Sensitive Species

The project has the potential to harass individual species that are nesting or foraging within the project area. During 2002 surveys, a Hairy woodpecker was found nesting within the cavity of a cottonwood snag adjacent to the bike trail. This species is protected from disturbance by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (See Appendix A of NESR for list of laws and policies). Mitigation measures have been incorporated to minimize the effects of construction.

There is the potential for bald eagles to occur within the vicinity of the proposed project. Surveys were conducted within a mile of the project in an effort to locate a nest. There were no nests found within that radius. Aerial photos show that the surrounding areas are significantly altered with residential and commercial development making it unlikely that a nest would occur along this stretch of the lake. Literature searches of known occurrences do not support a finding within the area. It is unlikely that bald eagles use the project area. The project area may provide

incidental foraging opportunities during seasonal movements. Seasonal movements would occur outside of the proposed construction period.

The project will not be affecting the foraging quality of the lake and work will not occur along the lakes margins or within the lake. There will be no bald eagle habitat removal or alteration as a result of this project. The proposed project is not expected to affect bald eagles.

2.3.2 TRPA Thresholds

The following thresholds were extracted from the TRPA Fisheries, Vegetation, and Wildlife threshold program. For additional information regarding TRPA thresholds, please visit the following website <http://www.trpa.org/> or contact TRPA at (775)588-4547.

Fisheries

- F1-Maintain 75 miles of habitat rated excellent, 105 miles of good, and 38 miles of marginal stream habitat.
- F2-A nondegradation standard shall apply to fish habitat in Lake Tahoe.
- F3-Achieve the equivalent of 5,948 total acres of excellent habitat in Lake Tahoe.
- F4-Until instream flow standards are established in the Regional Plan to protect fishery values, a nondegradation standard shall apply to instream flows.
- F5-It shall be a policy of the TRPA governing board to seek transfers of existing points of water diversion from streams to Lake Tahoe.
- F6-It shall be the policy of the TRPA governing board to support, in response to justifiable evidence, state and federal efforts to reintroduce Lahontan cutthroat trout.

Vegetation

- V1-Increase plant and structural diversity of forest communities through appropriate management practices as measured by diversity indices of species richness, relative abundance, and pattern. Provide for promotion and

perpetuation of late successional/old growth forests. The goal is to increase late successional/old growth conditions across elevational ranges of the Lake Tahoe Basin forest cover types. Individual trees greater than 30-inches dbh shall also be favored for retention because of their late seral attributes.

- V2-Provide for the nondegradation of the natural qualities of any plant community that is uncommon to the region or of exceptional scientific, ecological, or scenic values. This threshold shall apply but not be limited to 1) deep-water plants of Lake Tahoe; 2) Grass Lake (sphagnum bog); 3) Osgood swamp; and 4) the Freel Peak Cushion Plant community.
- V3- Maintain a minimum number of population sites for each of five sensitive plant species: 1) *Carex paucifructus*; 2) *Lewisia pygmaea logipetala*; 3) *Draba asterophora v. macrocarpa*; 4) *Draba asterophora v. asterophora*; and 5) *Rorippa subumbellata*.

Wildlife

- W1-Wildlife protection and maintenance of special interest species viability in the Lake Tahoe region. Provide a minimum number of population sites and disturbance zones for the following species: 1) Northern Goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*); 2) Osprey (*Pandion Haliaeetus*); 3) Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*); 4) Golden Eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*); 5) Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*); 6) Waterfowl (all open water associated species); and 7) Deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*).
- W2-A non-degradation standard shall apply to wildlife habitat consisting of deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations.

2.3.3 Mitigation

Although no significant impacts have been identified, the following measures shall be implemented to assure that there are not any impacts to avian species, sensitive plant species, or other biological resources during construction activities.

- The nesting season in the Tahoe region ranges from March 15th-July 30th. Removal of vegetation or other construction activities between that period will require pre-construction bird/nesting surveys by a qualified biologist. However, no bird/nesting survey's will be required for vegetation removal outside of that time. If nesting birds, most notably osprey, bald eagle, goshawk, or coopers hawk are not present, then there will be no impact. However, if a sensitive avian species is detected then no construction activities that will interfere with the nesting activities will be permitted until a qualified biologist determines the nest is no longer in use. In addition a .8km (.5mi) "buffer zone" shall be established around nest/roost trees of the aforementioned species while the particular bird(s) are nesting.
- For other avian species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act that are nesting within the project area, most notably the Hairy Woodpecker that was located during field surveys, measures will be implemented to avoid disturbance to the species that may cause them to abandon the nest or be otherwise disturbed. The proposed construction activities are not expected to exceed the existing level of disturbance caused by pedestrians, bicyclists, and beach users.
- Construction is not proposed until June of 2004. The project area will continue to be monitored to establish that no changes have occurred such as the presence of a nesting bird that was not at the site in 2002.
- Erosion control measures shall be implemented at any sites requiring vegetation removal or ground breaking. The measures may include the use of organic mulch and/or seeding or plantings.

2.4 Cultural Resources

2.4.1 Affected Environment/Impacts

A Negative Historic Resource Compliance Report (HRCR) was prepared in November 2002 for this project. The HRCR documented that there no archaeological sites or California Historic Landmarks; however, a portion of an historic road is shown in the vicinity of the project area on the 1884 GLO Plat map (T15N/R16E). No evidence of the historic road was located and it is very likely that this road no longer exists in the project area.

No cultural resources have been identified within the project area. However, mitigation measures shall be adhered to in order to ensure that there will not be a significant effect on cultural resources.

2.4.2 Mitigation

The following measure shall be implemented to assure that there are not any impacts to cultural resources during construction activities.

- If buried, or otherwise unknown cultural material such as bones, arrowheads, bottles, foundations or other historic or prehistoric remains are discovered during work associated with project, it is Caltrans' policy and state law that work temporarily cease in the area of the find. A qualified Caltrans archaeologist will evaluate the nature and significance of the find and coordinate with the State Historic Preservation Officer.

2.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

2.5.1 Affected Environment/Impacts

There are no potential sources of hazardous waste expected to be encountered within the project limits. The proposed project will not significantly impact the environment through the release of hazards or hazardous materials resources, or result in any of the conditions listed in the Threshold of Significance (TOS).

2.5.2 Mitigation

There are no potential sources of hazardous waste expected within the project limits, therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary.

2.6 Hydrology and Water Quality

A water quality assessment was prepared by a Caltrans Water Quality specialist as part of the environmental review of this project.

Federal water quality objectives are dictated by section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act and EPA water quality planning and management regulations, which require States to identify waters that do not meet, or are not expected to meet water quality standards even after technology-based or other controls are in place. These water bodies are

considered water quality limited and are reported by States in their section 303(d) list. Lake Tahoe is a section 303(d) listed body of water and the pollutants of concern are nutrients and sedimentation/siltation. Known sources of nutrients include: silviculture, construction/land development, urban runoff/storm sewers, wastewater, drainage/filling of wetlands, marinas, atmospheric deposition, highway maintenance and runoff, and other non point sources. All of the sources of sedimentation/siltation are unknown at this time.

2.6.1 Affected Environment/Impacts

The proposed project will not increase the amount of impervious surface for highway use: therefore, it does not seem probable that any water quality parameters administered by Federal, State, or local agencies will be adversely affected by the proposed project.

2.6.2 TRPA Thresholds

The following thresholds were extracted from the TRPA water quality threshold program:

- WQ1-Decrease sediment load as required to attain turbidity values not to exceed 3 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU) in littoral Lake Tahoe. In addition, turbidity shall not exceed 1 NTU in shallow waters of Lake Tahoe not directly influenced by stream discharges.
- WQ2-Average Secchi depth, December-March, shall not be less than 33.4 meters.
- WQ3-Annual mean phytoplankton primary productivity shall not exceed 52 gC/m²/yr. California: algal productivity shall not be increased beyond levels recorded in 1967-1971, based on a statistical comparison of seasonal and annual mean values.
- WQ4-attain a 90th percentile value for suspended sediment of 60mg/L.
- WQ5-Dissolved inorganic nitrogen, 0.5 mg/L; dissolved phosphorous, 0.1 mg/L; dissolved iron, 0.5 mg/L; suspended sediment, 250 mg/L.
- WQ6-Surface water infiltration into the groundwater shall comply with the Uniform Regional Runoff guidelines. For total nitrogen, 5 mg/L; total

phosphorous, 1 mg/L; total iron, 4 mg/L; turbidity, 200 NTU; and grease and oil, 40 mg/L.

- WQ7-For other lakes in California-Nevada, the standards are the same as the tributary standards.

2.6.3 Mitigation

These Best Management Practises (BMP) will be followed to adequately mitigate any potential effects that uncontrolled erosion from snowmelt and storm water runoff could have on the project site during construction.

- The contractor shall implement storm water controls as specified in section 7-1.01 G of the Caltrans Standard Specifications Handbook. Furthermore, the contractor must prepare a SWPPP in accordance with the guidelines in the Caltrans Storm Water Pollution Prevent Plan. The SWPPP must identify BMPs that shall be implemented during construction to minimize or reduce the potential for pollutant stormwater and non-stormwater discharges. At a minimum, the following BMPs shall be addressed in the SWPPP: temporary soil stabilization; temporary sediment control; wind erosion control; non-storm water management; waste management and materials pollution control. The BMPs identified and subsequently implemented shall comply with the requirements in the Caltrans Construction Site Best Management Practices manual.

Project features such as restoring vegetation and reducing foot traffic within vegetated zones will improve soil stability and serve as a biostrip. These features by definition are considered positive permanent BMPs.

2.7 Land Use and Planning

2.7.1 Affected Environment/Impacts

The current project will not impact any current land use plans.

2.7.2 Mitigation

There are no impacts to the current land use or plans of the project area; therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary.

2.8 Noise

This project is not a Type I project as defined by the Caltrans Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects, therefore, no further analysis is required. A Type 1 project is defined in 23 CFR 772 as follows:

A proposed Federal or Federal-aid highway project for the construction of a highway on a new location, or the physical alteration of an existing highway which significantly changes either the horizontal or vertical alignment, or increases the number of through traffic lanes.

2.8.1 Affected Environment/Impacts

The current project will not impact any sensitive noise receptors.

2.8.2 Mitigation

There are no impacts to sensitive noise receptors; therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary.

2.9 Recreation

2.9.1 Affected Environment/Impacts

The Alice Richardson project site is one of the few remaining shoreline locations on the west shore which is easily accessible by the public without fees. Over the years the site has become popular with local and traveling public, who enjoy the view, beach area and can access the bicycle trail quite easily. The project will enhance the accessibility potential of Alice Richardson Roadside and View Area by improving the auto parking area, enhancing the bicycle path, revegetating the areas which have been denuded by overuse, and installing trash receptors to reduce the amount of litter in the area.

2.9.2 TRPA Thresholds

The following thresholds were extracted from the TRPA Recreation threshold program:

- R1-It shall be the policy of the TRPA governing body in development of the Regional Plan to preserve and enhance the high quality recreational experience, including preservation of high quality undeveloped shorezone and other natural areas. In developing the Regional Plan, the staff and governing

body shall consider provisions for additional access, where lawful and feasible, to the shorezone and high quality undeveloped areas for low density recreational uses.

- R2-It shall be the policy of the TRPA governing body in development of the regional plan to establish and ensure a fair share of the total basin capacity for outdoor recreation is available to the general public.

2.9.3 Mitigation

Due to the potential beneficial impact from the project, no mitigation would be required.

Chapter 3 **Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts are those that are produced by the aggregation of individual environmental impacts resulting from a single project or from two or more projects in conjunction. Analysis of cumulative impacts is required under the California Resources Agency Guidelines, Title 14, Sections (§) 15130 and 15355. The following is an excerpt from § 15355 and explains what cumulative impacts are:

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

CEQA details two ways in which to evaluate cumulative impacts. One of these is to summarize growth projections in an adopted general plan or in a prior certified environmental document. The second method, that will be utilized for this IS, involves the compilation of a list of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts [please see section 15130 (b)1(A) of the CEQA Guidelines].

3.1 Cumulative Effects Area

For the proposed project, the area for evaluation of cumulative effects is the SR 89 corridor between Tahoe City wye south to the Placer County line. The cumulative effects area includes Tahoe Pines, Homewood, Chambers Lodge, and Tahoma.

3.2 Projects Considered in Cumulative Effects Evaluation

The cumulative effects analysis includes the projects listed below:

Cumulative Projects

Number	Project	Type	Location	Status/Schedule
1 EA 414501	SR 89 Landscape Project	Restore and improve degraded roadside access area along the shoreline of Lake Tahoe.	SR 89 in Placer Co. from KP 7.6/8.9 (4.7/5.2)	This is the proposed project discussed in this IS. It is planned for the 2003 construction year.
2 EA 2A9200	SR 89 Rehabilitation and drainage improvement project.	Improvement of traffic circulation, improve quality of storm water runoff and to implement elements of the Lake Tahoe Basin Environmental Improvement Project (EIP)	SR 89 in Placer Co. from KP 0.0/25.4 (PM 0.0/13.7)	This project is still in the early planning stages and is planned for the 2006 construction year.
3 EA 3C700	SR 89 Pedestrian Signal Project.	Installation of a pedestrian signal south of Fanny Bridge	SR 89 in Placer Co. KP8.57 (13.79)	This project is still in the early planning stages and is planned for the 2004 construction year.
4 TCPUD Project	Lakeside bicycle and trail project	Improvement of trail system along SR 89 on the lakeside	SR 89 in Placer Co	This project is schedule to begin work in 2003.
5 Placer County	SR 89 Timberland	Erosion Control/Water Quality Project	SR 89 Timberland Rd. to Sugarpine Rd.	This project is schedule to begin work in 2003.
6 Placer County	SR 89 Lake Tahoe Park	Erosion Control/Water Quality Project	SR 89 Cedar Crest Rd.to Fountain Ave.	Currently being designed and construction projected in 2004
7 Placer County	SR 89 Tahoe Pines	Erosion Control/Water Quality Project	SR 89 .1 miles north of Elizabeth Dr. to Vanessa Way	This project is schedule to begin work in 2009.

Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor, but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time. Cumulative impacts of the proposed project, in addition to the others listed in the table above, are analyzed for each subject area.

3.3 Potential Cumulative Effects

3.3.1 Aesthetics

The proposed project will make minor physical changes, which will have a beneficial effect on the aesthetic and scenic resources adjacent to SR 89 the project will not contribute to the adverse effects, which may be attributed the other projects in the cumulative effects study area.

3.3.2 Biological Resources

Potential cumulative biological impacts could result from activities that temporarily or permanently remove existing vegetation, disturb listed and non-listed species or affect water quality.

Many of the aforementioned projects, including Alice Richardson will incorporate measures to minimize the loss of vegetation. In most cases, erosion control measures will be part of the project scope. There is not expected to be a loss of vegetation on projects within the basin that when combined will be a substantial effect.

As with Alice Richardson, projects in the cumulative effects area will be coordinating with resource agencies and including measures that will avoid and minimize effects to listed and non-listed species. Timing constraints, avoidance of habitat removal and project modifications are expected to be included in each and every project. It is expected that if habitat removal must be done the project proponents will include replacement at a ratio suitable to avoid significant effects to species. If work must be done outside the work window then it is expected that the project proponent will include minimization measures to reduce construction impacts. It is expected that when the impacts of the projects in the cumulative affects area are combined that the effects will be less than substantial.

Many of the projects in the basin have been initiated to reduce the effects of human activity on the water quality of Lake Tahoe. Projects may include one or more of the following components: traffic management, erosion control, shoulder improvements, safety, stormwater improvements, bike trail improvements, roadside repair. Alice Richardson will be improving roadside access, limiting access to riparian vegetation, planting additional vegetation between the bike trail and the lake and providing trash receptacles. Although not all projects include stormwater collection units or other infiltration methods, the combined effort of better managing traffic, reducing traffic where possible, implementing erosion control etc. is expected, when combined with the larger more complex stormwater projects, to have a beneficial effect on the water quality of the Lake Tahoe area. Furthermore it is important to note that with the implementation of standard BMPs expected to occur on most of these projects there should be no net loss of water quality temporarily or permanently in the study area.

3.3.3 Hydrology and Water Quality

Six of the projects listed in the cumulative effects study area are either designed specifically for the purpose of improving storm-water runoff or have integrated mitigation which will improve the quality of storm-water runoff from the highway and/or the adjacent properties. As a specific part of this picture, the project will be including measures that reduce vegetation removal, includes additional plantings and manages, foot, bicycle and vehicular traffic also expected to reduce erosion. Should the goals be met for the various projects within the cumulative study area then the result is expected to be a beneficial net gain in the water quality of the area.

Chapter 4 List of Preparers

The North Region of the California Department of Transportation prepared this Negative Declaration/Initial Study (ND/IS). The following Caltrans staff prepared this IS/ND:

Alicia Beyer, Hazardous Waste Coordinator. MS Civil Engineering (Hazardous Waste), University of Texas; BS Civil Engineering, Chihuahua State University. Ten years in Hazardous Waste studies. **Contribution: Initial Site Assessment.**

Jeffrey M. Loudon, Senior Environmental Planner. MA Environmental Planning, CSU, Chico, BS Business Administration, CSU, Chico. 32 years experience in environmental planning. **Contribution: Branch Chief.**

Suzanne Melim. Associate Environmental Planner (Biology), B.S. Natural Resource Management, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. Five years experience in biology and environmental planning. **Contribution: Natural Environmental Study, Water Quality.**

Steve Nawrath, Landscape Architect CA. Lic. # 4562, Masters of Landscape Architecture, California Polytechnic State University Pomona; B.S. Ornamental Horticulture, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. Seven years of experience in environmental design, ecological restoration and erosion control. **Contribution: Project Landscape Architect, Visual Impact Assessment Technical Report.**

Keith Pommerenck, Civil Engineer, C.T. B.S. Environmental Resources, California State University, Sacramento. 18 years of experience preparing air, noise and energy studies. **Contribution: Noise and Air Quality Analysis.**

Sandra Rosas, Associate Environmental Planner. M.A. in Anthropology (Ethnobotany), Northern Arizona University; B.S./B.A. Biology/Anthropology, CSU, Chico. 11 years of experience in Environmental Studies. **Contribution: Project Coordinator & Document Writer.**

Scott Williams, Associate Environmental Planner (Archaeology). M.A. in Anthropology, CSU, Sacramento; B.A. in Anthropology, CSU; Sacramento, 20 years experience in Archaeology. **Contribution: Historic Resources Clearance Report/Archaeological Survey Report.**