

California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Lahontan Region

CEQA Environmental Checklist

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

Project Title:	Angora Fire Trails and Stream Environment Zone Restoration Project
Lead agency name and address:	Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board 2501 Lake Tahoe Blvd. South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
Contact person and phone number:	Laurie Scribe, (530) 542-5465 LScribe@waterboards.ca.gov
Project Location:	Angora Fire area near City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County
Project sponsor's name and address:	US Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU) 35 College Drive South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.)	<p>The U.S. Forest Service – Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU) has undertaken a multi-phase effort to restore the area burned by the 2007 Angora Fire. The Angora Fire began on lands managed by the LTBMU and burned over 3,100 acres, including approximately 2,700 acres of National Forest land, destroying more than 250 residential structures in the South Shore area of Lake Tahoe.</p> <p>The LTBMU began rehabilitation and restoration activities immediately following the fire, including slope stabilization and erosion control, hazard tree removal and reforestation. In 2010, the LTBMU prepared an Environmental Assessment for the Angora Fire Restoration Project (Angora EA) and Decision Notice/Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act</p>

(NEPA). The Angora Fire Restoration Project is the final stage of long-term restoration and includes: silviculture activities, aquatic habitat and stream restoration, roads and trails, and noxious weed removal.

Remaining components of the federal Angora Fire Restoration Project require discretionary approvals from the Water Board. The Angora Fire Trails and Stream Environment Zone Restoration Project (Project), a subset of the larger Angora Fire Restoration Project, includes:

- 1) **Aquatic habitat and stream channel restoration:**
Restore 1,200 feet of Angora Creek channel by excavating a new channel to reflect historic channel pattern of greater sinuosity and shallower depth. Restore the man-made 0.5-acre Seneca Pond to a wetland complex. Place large woody debris on 2 miles of Angora Creek and tributaries to promote riparian habitat diversity. Stabilize a 1,500 foot gully in the Gardner Mountain Meadow. Work will be completed primarily through the use of heavy equipment.
- 2) **Trails:** Restore/decommission 16.7 miles of trail by recontouring, subsoiling, and camouflaging. Construct 8.9 miles of new trail. Remove 15,130 square feet of trail from Stream Environment Zones (SEZ). Install a footbridge over Angora Creek. Construction and decommissioning will be completed with hand tools and small mechanized equipment.

In planning for summer 2013 implementation of the trails and Gardner Mountain Meadow restoration work, the LTBMU has prepared a draft Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), describing Best Management Practices (BMPs) that it will implement to control discharges of sediment and protect water quality. The SWPPP also contains:

- Maps of staging and access areas
- Updated trail maps
- Angora Creek footbridge construction details
- Erosion and sediment control BMPs
- BMP inspection, maintenance, and monitoring plans
- Construction schedule and phasing

The LTBMU has also prepared the Angora Creek Meadow-Channel Restoration Design Plans (Design Plans) for implementation and permitting of the restoration work within Angora Creek. The Design Plans

	<p>contain BMPs, revegetation specifications, and preliminary diversion and dewatering specifications.</p> <p>The LTBMU's Angora EA, FONSI, SWPPP, and Design Plans, together describe measures the LTBMU will use to avoid or substantially lessen and mitigate potential adverse environmental impacts associated with the Project.</p> <p>The Water Board will regulate discharges from the Project by: (1) granting coverage under the Water Board's General Waste Discharge Requirements and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity in the Lake Tahoe Basin; (2) issuing Clean Water Act 401 Water Quality Certification; and (3) granting Basin Plan Prohibition Exemptions. The Water Board is the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).</p>
<p>Surrounding land uses and setting; briefly describe the project's surroundings:</p>	<p>Forested settings with adjacent recreational land uses and residential development surround the Project area. The lands within the Angora Fire burn area are managed by the LTBMU for resources, recreation, and transportation routes. Residential communities border some of the Angora Fire Trail and Stream Environment Zone Restoration Project area.</p>
<p>Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):</p>	<p>Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, United States Army Corps of Engineers</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture and Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise
<input type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation/Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required

Signature:	Date:
Printed Name: PATTY Z. KOUYOUMDJIAN, EXECUTIVE OFFICER	

CEQA Environmental Checklist

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the Project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the project indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included either following the applicable section of the checklist or referenced to the appropriate section of the Angora EA. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

The Project is subject to the requirements of both the federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The LTBMU is the NEPA Lead Agency. In 2010 the LTBMU developed the Angora EA and signed a FONSI for the Angora Fire Restoration Project, pursuant to NEPA.

Section 15221 of the CEQA Guidelines directs that when a project requires compliance with both NEPA and CEQA, state Lead Agencies should use the EA and FONSI rather than preparing a separate Negative Declaration, as long as the EA and FONSI comply with the requirements of CEQA. This Mitigated Negative Declaration and CEQA Environmental Checklists incorporate by reference the Angora EA and FONSI pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15150, and rely on that analysis. However, the Water Board staff has also determined that additional mitigation measures, which are described in the LTBMU's SWPPP and Design Plans and set forth here, are needed to comply with CEQA requirements.

Therefore, the Water Board is circulating a CEQA checklist, along with the Angora EA, FONSI, SWPPP, and Design Plans to support a Mitigated Negative Declaration in compliance with CEQA guidelines. This CEQA checklist was developed by Water Board staff to inform the public and interested agencies of the Project and describe the additional mitigation measures identified as necessary by the Water Board, which are contained in the SWPPP and Design Plans. A discussion of growth inducing impacts and mandatory findings of significance, as required by CEQA, is also included in the CEQA checklist.

The federal Angora Fire Restoration Project was designed to prevent negative environmental impacts by incorporating "Design Features" (DFs) into the project design to minimize or prevent negative environmental effects. For each resource category, the CEQA Environmental Checklist identifies the DFs that have been incorporated into the federal project design to reduce impacts. The DFs are further described in the Angora EA, Section 2.3.2, and FONSI, Appendix A. In addition, water quality BMPs that are part of the federal project are included in the Angora EA, Appendix A. Project area maps are located in the Angora EA and SWPPP.

I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:

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

Potential impacts to scenic resources are analyzed in the Angora EA Section 3.4 (Recreation and Scenic Resources). Section 3.4 describes the current scenic quality of the Project area as degraded due to 80-percent of the area being burned by moderate to high intensity fire. The Project will have some short term construction related impacts however these are offset by the long term improvement in scenic quality. The scenic character would be more resilient in the long term due to management activities that re-establish forest and riparian systems. The Water Board concurs with that analysis and considers it to sufficiently describe how the Project, including its DFs, will have a less than significant impact to scenic resources. The following Project DFs and BMPs described in the FONSI will reduce impacts to aesthetic values of the area:

- DF 3 (construction timing, staging, and camping restrictions)
- DF 59-60 (temporary road design and restoration)
- DF 63 (dust abatement)
- DFs 61, 64, and 65 (revegetation of stream channels)
- BMP 5-4 (revegetation of disturbed areas)
- BMP 5-5 (disposal of organic debris)
- BMP 7-1 (watershed restoration)

a-b) The visual character of the Project area has been degraded by the Angora Fire. There are no scenic vistas or scenic highways in the Project area, therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

c) The visual character and quality of the Project area have been degraded by the Angora Fire. The proposed Project accelerates restoration and natural recovery processes through management intervention. Restoring Seneca Pond, a man-made feature, to a functional wetland will change the scenic character of

the area. However the wetland will continue to provide a natural scenic quality to the area.

Construction activities will cause short-term impacts to aesthetics, especially to the adjacent property owners. These impacts will occur for one to five years but will allow for long term restoration of scenic quality to the fire area.

d) The project does not include the development of new sources of light or glare, therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-b) The Angora EA does not analyze potential agricultural impacts. There is no farmland or agricultural resources in or adjacent to the Project area, therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

c-e) The Project does not involve the conversion of forest land, therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potential impacts to air quality are analyzed in the Angora EA Section 3.8 (Air Quality). Section 3.8 states that the potential impacts on air quality are associated primarily with temporary dust from equipment, dust from road usage, and smoke emissions from prescribed burning. Dust abatement measures and adherence to a smoke management plan will reduce negative effects on air quality. The Project will not exceed state and local air quality standards. The Water Board concurs with that analysis and considers it to sufficiently describe how the Project, including its DFs, will have a less than significant impact to air quality. Project DFs to reduce air quality impacts are described in Appendix A of the FONSI, including:

- DFs 34 and 35 (stabilization of roads)
- DFs 39 and 63 (dust abatement)
- DF 66 (dust abatement and irrigation)

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region (Water Board) previously permitted and regulated the silviculture and road activities that were analyzed in the Angora EA under the Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Timber Harvest and Vegetation Management Activities (Board

Order No. R6T-2009-002). Silviculture activities, including pile burning, are not part of this current Project for aquatic habitat and stream channel restoration and trail work, and so are not analyzed in this CEQA checklist.

a-e) Construction activities, as described for the Project in the attached documents are most likely to affect air quality by generating short-term and minor amounts of vehicle exhaust and fugitive dust. Project DFs minimize the production and transport of fugitive dust on permanent and temporary roads by providing dust abatement through such measures such as regular watering, rocking of the road surface, or providing surface chipping to neighborhood entry and exit points.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Angora EA discusses potential biological impacts in Section 3.5 (Botanical Resources) and Section 3.6 (Wildlife and Aquatic Species). The Angora EA discloses potential effects on species (and/or their habitats) listed as endangered, threatened, candidate or proposed under the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 as amended (ESA); species designated as sensitive by the Regional Forester in Region 5; species designated as special-interest by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency; habitats designated for management indicator species (MIS) for the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (MIS report); and wildlife and fisheries threshold standards as designated by the TRPA report.

Information found in Sections 3.5 and 3.6 is based upon the *Biological Assessment/Biological Evaluation Aquatic and Terrestrial Species for the Angora Fire Restoration Project*.

There are potential direct and indirect impacts to individual species; however negative effects are not expected due to implementation of Project DFs. The Project may affect individuals of a species but is not likely to result in a trend toward federal listing or loss of viability. The Project is designed to improve geomorphic and hydrologic conditions, which should improve habitat for sensitive plant species. The Water Board concurs with that analysis, however requires that additional mitigation be added to reduce Project impacts to less than significant.

DFs listed in the FONSI to protect biological resources include:

- DF 2 (Limit grading and soil disturbance to dry season)
- DFs 57 – 65 (Stream channel and aquatic habitat restoration)
- DFs 67-69 (Flagging and protection for unique plant populations and habitat)
- DFs 70-74 (Flagging, buffer zones, and protection for Messia and Sphagnum sites)
- DFs 75-81 (Invasive weeds management)

a-d) Construction activities and temporary stream flow diversions may cause short term impacts to biological resources, including indirect impacts on sensitive species and habitat. Overall, the Project will enhance biological resources within the Angora Fire area by improving riparian and floodplain habitat, decommissioning redundant trails, and removing trails in SEZs.

The Design Plans and SWPPP provide additional measures necessary to mitigate potential impacts to biological resources. The Design Plans contain specifications that mitigate potential impacts to riparian habitat and wetlands on the following pages:

- C11 (Imported material and earthwork)
- C12 (Revegetation)
- C13 (Access and temporary roads)
- C17 (Dewater, diversion, and channel flushing)

BMPs in the SWPPP (Section III) which mitigate impacts to riparian habitat and wetlands include:

- NS-1 (Water Control and Conservation)
- NS-2 (Dewatering Operations)
- NS-5 (Clear Water Diversion)
- NS-6 (Illicit Connection and Illegal Discharge)

These measures are adequate to mitigate impacts to biological resources in the Project area to less than significant.

In addition, all stream restoration work would comply with requirements of permits issued by the Water Board, including NPDES construction stormwater permit requirements and requirements set forth in a Clean Water Act section 401 State Water Quality Certification. The mitigation identified herein and in the attached Project documents will be incorporated into the terms of the permits.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Angora EA Section 3.9 discusses impacts to cultural resources. Forest Service policy requires that projects with the potential to affect cultural resources be surveyed for such resources in order to comply with applicable federal laws and regulations. These include 36 CFR 800, the NHPA of 1966, as amended, the Antiquity Act of 1906, the Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, Executive Order 11593, the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974, and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978. The LTBMU and the Forest Service currently operate under two major Programmatic Agreements with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (CA-SHPO). Direct SHPO consultation is not required.

Archaeological inventories have been conducted in the recent past within the project area. Additional pedestrian surveys were conducted over 95-percent of the Project area specifically for the proposed project to identify, record, and assess potential effects on cultural resources.

There were 15 previously recorded sites within the Angora Fire area. There were nine new sites discovered during the survey work associated with the proposed action. Eight of these new sites are historic in nature and are generally associated with trash sites or old roadbeds. One site is prehistoric. Management recommendations have been developed for each site in order to ensure appropriate protection of the sites and their setting. These recommendations will be implemented during the project.

The Water Board concurs with that analysis and considers it to sufficiently describe how the Project, including its DFs, will have a less than significant impact to cultural resources.

The FONSI, DFs 82 and 83, describe Standard Resource Protection Measures to protect heritage resources, including requirements to delineate, avoid, and buffer (if needed) any identified cultural resources.

a-d) The Project area has been thoroughly evaluated for the presence of historic and archeological resources, and includes protection for catalogued sites. It is possible that buried or concealed cultural resources, including human remains, could be present and detected during project ground disturbance activities. In the event of additional discoveries of heritage resources that have not previously been inventoried, project activities would cease in the area of the find and the project operator would consult the LTBMU archaeologist for recommended procedures. This requirement is described in the EA at page 3.9-2, and contained in DF 83. In the event that human remains are discovered during project activity, law requires that project managers contact the county coroner. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, both the Native American Heritage Commission and any identified descendants should be notified.

Water Board staff have reviewed DFs 82 and 83 and find that they are adequate to sufficient to protect cultural resources in the Project area. Therefore, the appropriate finding is less than significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impacts to soil resources are discussed in the Angora EA Section 3.3 (Soil and Watershed Resources). Section 3.3 describes the soil types, soil conditions and erosion potential within the Project area. The Project will result in decreasing sediment from implementing stream channel, gully and meadow restoration actions. Erosion and SEZ disturbance will be lessened through the redesigned trail system. The Water Board concurs with that analysis, however requires that additional mitigation be added to reduce Project impacts to less than significant.

Project-wide, significant erosion will be reduced through implementation of the prescribed DFs, including:

- DF 1 (review BMPs prior to rain events)
- DF 2 (limit grading and soil disturbance to dry season)
- DF 58 (groundwater levels in construction area)
- DFs 59-60 (temporary roads)
- DF 61 (seasoning of new channel)
- DF 62 (soil erosion control)
- DF 64-65 (revegetation)

a i-iv) The proposed project is not located in an Earthquake Fault Zone, therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

b) The Angora Fire increased hydrophobicity of the soils and decreased ground and canopy cover, resulting in the potential for increased sedimentation as compared to pre-fire conditions. The Angora Fire Restoration Project, of which this Project is a subset, is intended to restore the ecosystem function of the burn area to a more erosion-resilient condition by improving riparian and wetland habitat, stream channel function, forest health, and decommissioning user created trails. However, Project implementation could result in short-term increases in erosion potential from the use of mechanical equipment for stream and wetland restoration, trail building, and temporary access roads. The stream restoration element includes excavation and fill of alluvial materials to restore riparian habitat and function in Angora Creek.

The Design Plans and SWPPP provide additional mitigation measures necessary to mitigate potential soils impacts. The Design Plans, page C12, include revegetation specifications for sod harvest, seeding, and live planting that will ensure successful revegetation, which will stabilize soils after construction. BMPs in the SWPPP (Section III) which mitigate potential soil erosion include:

- EC-1 Scheduling
- EC-2 Preservation of Existing Vegetation
- EC-8 Wood Mulching
- EC-12 Stream Bank Stabilization
- SE-1 Silt Fence
- NS-2 Dewatering Operations

These measures are adequate to mitigate impacts to soils resources in the Project area to less than significant.

c-e) The Project is not located on an unstable geologic unit or expansive soil, and does not involve any wastewater disposal, therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are discussed in the Angora EA Section 3.11. Due to the small scale of carbon released from Project activities when compared to the amount of carbon sequestered regionally on forest lands, GHG emissions and carbon sequestration effects from the Project are not significant issues. The Water Board concurs with that analysis and considers it to sufficiently describe how the Project will have no impact to greenhouse gas emissions.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-b) The Project will not routinely transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The LTBMU will use excavators and other heavy equipment within the Project area during construction. There is the potential for gasoline, diesel fuel, oil, and hydraulic fluid spills and leaks that could create a hazard to the environment. The Angora EA describes standard practices for transport, storage, use and disposal of any hazardous materials, including:

- DF 43 (Hazardous material transport, storage, handling and spill procedures)
- BMP 2-12 (Servicing and refueling equipment, spill procedures)
- BMP 7-4 (Spill prevention, control and countermeasure plan)

Additional BMPs in the SWPPP (Section III) that mitigate impacts from hazardous materials include:

- WM-4 Spill Prevention and Control
- WM-5 Solid Waste Management
- WM-6 Hazardous Waste Management
- NS-8 Vehicle and Equipment Cleaning
- NS-9 Vehicle and Equipment Fueling
- NS-10 Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance

These measures will mitigate impacts from the minimal use of hazardous materials in the Project area to less than significant levels.

c) The Project is not located within one-quarter mile of any school, therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

d) The Project does not alter or weaken any requirements to identify risks due to hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

e-f) The Project does not involve activities near an airport or airstrip that would result in a safety hazard, therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

g) The Project will not alter paved traffic routes, nor impede traffic flow and thus will not interfere with an emergency evacuation or response plan, therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

h) The Angora Fire Restoration Project involves fuels reduction activities, and these activities should result in decreased risk of exposure to wildland fires. Upgrades to the road system in the Project area will improve access for future fuels/vegetation management and fire suppression, therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impacts to hydrology and water quality are discussed in the Angora EA Sections 3.7 (Riparian Resources) and 3.3 (Soil and Watershed Resources). Section 3.7 describes the condition of the primary riparian resources in the Project area: Angora Creek, Seneca Pond, and Gardner Mountain Meadow. The Project will have direct and indirect impacts on these resources with the goals of increasing groundwater levels, enhancing floodplain connectivity, decreasing fine sediment,

and improving riparian and aquatic habitat. Section 3.3 provides a description of each sub-watershed affected by the fire and cumulative watershed effects analysis. Overall the Project will result in upward trends in riparian resource conditions. The Water Board concurs with that analysis, however requires that additional mitigation be added to reduce Project impacts to less than significant. Those additional mitigation measures will be made requirements of the permits for the Project.

The LTBMU has incorporated DFs to reduce potential impacts, including:

- DF 1 (review BMPs prior to rain events)
- DF 2 (limit grading and soil disturbance to dry season)
- DF 58 (groundwater levels in construction area)
- DFs 59-60 (temporary roads)
- DF 61 (seasoning of new channel)
- DF 62 (soil erosion control)
- DF 64-65 (revegetation)

a), c), d), f) Project components involving SEZ restoration have the potential to cause short-term violations of water quality standards and applicable waste discharge requirements both during construction and immediately following Project completion.

The Design Plans and SWPPP provide additional measures necessary to mitigate potential impacts to hydrology and water quality. The Design Plans contain on the following pages specifications that will mitigate potential impacts:

- C11 Imported material and channel substrate
- C12 Revegetation
- C13 Access and temporary roads
- C17 Dewater, diversion, and channel flushing

BMPs in the SWPPP (Section III) which mitigate impacts to hydrology and water quality include:

- WM-3 Stockpile Management
- EC-2 Preservation of Existing Vegetation
- EC-12 Stream Bank Stabilization
- NS-1 Water Control and Conservation
- NS-2 Dewatering Operations
- NS-5 Clear Water Diversion
- NS-6 Illicit Connection and Illegal Discharge

Water Board staff have reviewed these measures, and find that they are adequate to mitigate impacts in the Project area to less than significant levels.

In addition, all stream restoration work would comply with requirements of permits issued by the Water Board, including NPDES construction stormwater permit requirements and requirements set forth in a Clean Water Act section 401 State Water Quality Certification. The mitigation identified herein and in the attached Project documents will be incorporated into the terms of the permits.

b) The Project does not propose any use of groundwater supplies and will not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge; therefore, the appropriate finding is no impact.

e) The Project will not increase storm water drainage therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

g) There is no housing developed for this Project, therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

h) Placement of large woody debris within Angora Creek may impede or redirect flood flows in the SEZ; however this is a desired outcome of the placement and mimics the natural historic condition. The Project would not increase the volume of flood waters, nor would it cause flooding beyond the SEZ boundary, therefore the appropriate finding is less than significant impact.

i) The Project will not subject people or non-natural structures to flooding; therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

j) The Project does not create a risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Consistency with local plans and policies is discussed in Angora EA Section 3.6.5. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Regional Plan contains environmental thresholds for both habitats and species of interest. No TRPA Special Interest Species, fish, or wildlife habitats of significance would be adversely affected by the Project. The Water Board concurs with that analysis and considers it to sufficiently describe how the Project, including its DFs, will have a less than significant impact to land use and planning.

a) The Project does not include any development or construction that will physically divide the community, therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

b-c) The proposed project does not conflict with any applicable land use plans, habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Because the project does not involve these elements, the appropriate finding is no impact.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-b) There are no known mineral resources or locally-important mineral resource recovery sites within the Project area; therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:

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

a-f) The Project is located in National Forest but access to some work areas is through residential communities. The Project may cause minor, short-term noise impacts from equipment usage. To ensure that noise impacts are reduced to less than significant levels, the LTBMU will generally restrict significant noise-generating activities to the hours between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, which is a requirement in DF 3.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-c) The Project does not include plans that would influence population growth, housing, businesses, or infrastructure; therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-e) The Project will improve access for future fire suppression through an improved road and trail network. The Project does not include provisions for new or physically altered governmental facilities that would affect public services; therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

XV. RECREATION:

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

Recreation resources are analyzed in the Angora EA Section 3.4 (Recreation and Scenic Resources) and Section 3.10 (Transportation). Section 3.4 describes how the recreation experience has been altered by the Angora fire due to the area being less attractive, and in general recreation use has declined in the area. Local users have created many trails in the area that often lack proper design and have a negative impact on wildlife habitat, sensitive plants, and water quality. Section 3.10 describes how the new trail system links itself outside of the Project area and facilitates administrative and public use inside, outside and through the Project area. Overall, implementation of the Project will improve recreation access with a more environmentally sustainable and connected trail network. The Water Board concurs with that analysis, however requires that additional mitigation be added to reduce Project impacts to less than significant.

a) Recreation use throughout the Project area is dispersed where roads, trails, and trailheads are the only developed facilities. Use of the area generally declined after the fire. Implementation of the Project will facilitate restoration which will attract recreationalists back to area but is not likely to substantially increase usage of the area, therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

b) The Project involves alteration to the existing trail network, including new trail construction, decommissioning of redundant and user created trails, work in SEZs, and installation of a footbridge over Angora Creek. These activities have potential adverse effects on the environment related to equipment usage, SEZ disturbance, earth moving, and removal of existing vegetation. The LTBMU will construct trails and the footbridge in accordance with the engineering plans and specifications in the SWPPP, Appendix C. In addition, potential impacts from trail construction and bridge installation will be mitigated by the following BMPs described in Section III of the SWPPP:

- WM-3 Stockpile Management
- EC-1 Scheduling
- EC-2 Preservation of Existing Vegetation

- EC-8 Wood Mulching
- EC-12 Stream Bank Stabilization
- NS-1 Water Control and Conservation
- NS-2 Dewatering Operations
- NS-5 Clear Water Diversion
- NS-6 Illicit Connection and Illegal Discharge
- SE-1 Silt Fence

Implementation of these additional BMPs and adherence to the engineering plans and specification will mitigate potential impacts from the recreation facilities to less than significant levels.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Transportation impacts are analyzed in the Angora EA Section 3.10 (Transportation). The transportation system in the Project area consists of natural surface roads, trails, and trailheads on National Forest lands. According to Section 3.10 portions of the existing transportation system in the Project area exist without a clear objective, proper design, or appropriate maintenance for Forest Service standards. The Project will result in improved access, connectivity with outside transportation routes, and positive impacts on soil, water, and other resources when compared to current conditions. The Water Board concurs with that analysis and considers it to sufficiently describe how the Project will have no impact to transportation resources.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-g) The Project will not have any effect on utilities or service systems, including storm water or wastewater treatment facilities, nor will it produce much, if any, solid waste; therefore the appropriate finding is no impact.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-b) Without adequate mitigation, the Project has the potential to degrade the environment. Specifically, temporary stream flow diversions may cause short term impacts to biological resources, heritage resources may be encountered during construction; gasoline, diesel fuel, oil, and hydraulic fluid spills and leaks from construction equipment are possible; and short-term violations of water quality standards may occur during and immediately following project construction.

However, due to the short duration of construction and the implementation of design features described in the Angora EA and FONSI and mitigation measures described in the SWPPP and Design Plans, identified potential impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels.

The Project is the final phase of the LTBMU's restoration effort in the Angora Fire burn area. Although all phases have resulted in temporary, short term environmental impacts associated with construction, the cumulative effect will be environmental enhancement.

c) The Project is intended to improve human's experience in this National Forest area by providing a well-connected trail system and improved riparian ecosystem.