APPENDIX G

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

NOTE: The following is a sample form that may be tailored to satisfy individual agencies' needs and project circumstances. It may be used to meet the requirements for an initial study when the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines have been met. Substantial evidence of potential impacts that are not listed on this form must also be considered. The sample questions in this form are intended to encourage thoughtful assessment of impacts, and do not necessarily represent thresholds of significance.

- 1. Project title: Auburn Ski Club Light Addition (PLN22-0092, AAP22-0002, EIS22-0007, VAR22-0003)
- 2. Lead agency name and address:

Nevada County Planning Department

950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170, Nevada City, CA 95959

- 3. Contact person and phone number: David Nicholas, 530-265-1257
- 4. Project location: _____ Boreal Ridge Road, Soda Springs, CA 95728
- 5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Bill Clark - Auburn Ski Club, Inc

P.O. Box 729, Soda Springs, CA 95728

- 6. General plan designation: FOR-40, REC
- 7. Zoning: FR-40, REC
- 8. 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. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

An Amendment to Approved Use Permits U89-039 to install 40 light poles along the

2-kilometer lower loop of an existing 10-kilometer cross-county skiing trail system and to allow nighttime

skiling from dusk until 8:00 P.M. on Wednesday through Saturday nights from early November through

March at the Auburn Ski Club Nordic Center. Some of the light poles will have two lights installed, resulting

in a total of 48 lights distributed between the 40 poles.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings)

The area of the proposed trails is zoned as Forest 40 (FR-40), and Recreation (REC). The parcel is

surrounded by other Forest zoning districts with minimum parcel sizes ranging from 40 to 160 acres. The

surrounding parcels are mostly undeveloped.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

N/A

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?


California Native American Tribes with ancestral land within the project area were routed the project during distribution. The California Native American Tribes will be sent a

Notice of Availability for Public Review and Notice of Inten 1 to Adopt a Millipsted Negative Declaration for this project, which will allow the California Netice American Tribos the opportunity to comment on the analysis of environmental Properties

NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.



DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

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.

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.

Vicuolas

Signature

7/5/2022

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors, as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
- Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

	issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I.A	ESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Sec	tion 21099, would	the project:		
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			\checkmark	
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			\checkmark	
c)	In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			1	
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			\checkmark	
11.	AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timber to the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timber to information compiled by the California Department of Economic Statements and Economic Sta	ia Agricultural La I model to use ir erland, are signifi	and Evaluation end assessing impact cant environmental	d Site Assessmen is on agriculture at l effects, lead agei	t Model (1997) nd farmland. In ncies may refer

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 forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?
- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- 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))?
- d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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?

	1
	 Image: A start of the start of
	 Image: A start of the start of
	 Image: A start of the start of
	√

Leon Thee

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

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
- b) 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?
- c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

erminatio	ons. Would the	project:	0	•
				\checkmark
nt		\checkmark		
		\checkmark		
		\checkmark		

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			\checkmark	
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			\checkmark	
C)	Have a substantial adverse effect on slate or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			\checkmark	
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migretory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		\checkmark		
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			\checkmark	
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?				1
V, (CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?		\checkmark		
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?		\checkmark		
c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?		\checkmark		
VI.	ENERGY. Would the project:				
a)	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			\checkmark	
b)	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				\checkmark
VII.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a)	Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on			\checkmark	
	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.			\checkmark	
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			\checkmark	
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
	iv) Landslides?			\checkmark	
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			\checkmark	

C)	Issues Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impa ct	No Impact
	would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			\checkmark	
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			\checkmark	
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?			\checkmark	
f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		\checkmark		
VIII.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			\checkmark	
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			\checkmark	
IX.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the pro	biect:			
a)	Creete a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				\checkmark
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?			\checkmark	
c)	Emit hazerdous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				\checkmark
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				\checkmark
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the			\checkmark	
f)	project area? Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted				
''	emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			¥	
g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or deeth involving wildland fires?			\checkmark	
	IYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?		\checkmark		
b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				\checkmark
c)	Substantially after the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:		\checkmark		

	i)	Issues result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	i)	substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;				\checkmark
	117)	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; or				\checkmark
	iv)	impede or redirect flood flows?				\checkmark
d)		ood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of				
e)	Con	Itants due to project inundation? flict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality rol plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?		$\overline{\checkmark}$		
XI. L	ANI	USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a)	-	sically divide an established community?				\checkmark
b)	any	se a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the lose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			\checkmark	
XII. a)	Res	ERAL RESOURCES. Would the project: ult in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource would be a value to the region and the residents of the a?				\checkmark
b)	reso	ult in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral urce recovery site delineated on a local general plan, cific plan or other land use plan?				
XIII. a)	Gen in al of si	SE. Would the project result in: eration of a substantial temporary or permanent increase mbient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess andards established in the local general plan or noise nance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		\checkmark		
b)		eration of excessive groundborne vibration or indborne noise levels?				\checkmark
c)	For an a ado airp	a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or irport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been pted, within two miles of a public airport or public use ort, would the project expose people residing or working in project area to excessive noise levels?				7
		PULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a)	eith bus	ice substantial unplanned population growth in an area, er directly (for example, by proposing new homes and inesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of is or other infrastructure)?				\checkmark
b)	nec	place substantial numbers of existing people or housing, essitating the construction of replacement housing where?				\checkmark
XV . a)	Res the faci faci env sen	BLIC SERVICES. Would the project: ult in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with provision of new or physically altered governmental itites, need for new or physically altered governmental ilties, the construction of which could cause significant ironmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable vice ratios, response times, or other performance victives for any of the public services:				<

	lssues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Fire protection?				\checkmark
	Police protection?				
	Schools?	Ц			
	Parks?				
	Other public facilities?				\checkmark
XVI . a) b)	RECREATION. 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? 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?				 Image: A start of the start of
XVI	I. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
a)	Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			\checkmark	
b)	Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			\checkmark	
c)	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
d)	Result in inadequate emergency access?			\checkmark	
XVI a)	II. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
	 Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or 				\checkmark
	ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		\checkmark		
XIX a)	. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project: Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications fecilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			\checkmark	

			Less Than Significant		
		Potentially Significant	With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No
	Issues	Impact	incorporated	Impact	Impact
b)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				\checkmark
c)	Result in a determination by the waste water 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?		\checkmark		\checkmark
d)	Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?		\checkmark		
e)	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			\checkmark	
XX.	WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or project:	lands classified	as very high fire h	azard severity zo	nes, would the
a)	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				\checkmark
b)	Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other fectors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			\checkmark	
c)	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			\checkmark	
d)	Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?			\checkmark	
XXI. a)	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habital of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining lavels, 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?		\checkmark		
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, end the effects of probable future projects.)			\checkmark	
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		\checkmark		

Form F

Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #:			
Project Title:	Auburn Ski Club (PLN22-0092, AAP22-0002, EIS22-0007, VAR22-0003)		
Lead Agency:	Nevada County		
Contact Name	. David Nicholas		
Email: <u>david.r</u>	icholas@co.nevada.ca.us	Phone Number: 530-265-1257	
Project Locati	on: Soda Spings	Nevada	
	City	County	

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

An Amendment to Approved Use Permit U89-039 to install 40 light poles along the 2-kilometer lower loop of an existing 10-kilometer cross-county skiing trail system and to allow nighttime skiing from dusk until 8:00 P.M. on Wednesday through Saturday nights from early November through March at the Auburn Ski Club Nordic Center. Some of the light poles will have two lights installed, resulting in a total of 48 lights. There will be 39 Type A lights which are proposed to be Wisconsin Lighting Lab LP-SHM-250-40-XX-3 and 9 Type B Wisconsin Lighting Lab LP-SHM-250-40-XX-3 and 9 Type B Wisconsin Lighting Lab LP-SHM-250-40-XX-3 and 9 Type B Wisconsin Lighting Lab LP-HSX-410-50-HV-70-BK-PTT. Due to the high levels of snow on Boreal Ridge during the winter, the light poles are proposed to be 40 feet tall to extend over the snow base, which exceeds the height limitation of 15 feet established by Section L-II 4.2.8 of the Nevada County Land Use and Development Code. Therefore, the project is being processed with a variance to the light pole height restrictions.

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

Nevada County Land Use Development Code Sec. L-II 4.2.8 Lighting states that light poles shall be restricted to a maximum of 15 feet in height. However, shielding has a larger effect on the quality and control of light than pole height. A photometric study from Norris Electric determined that light will not trespass off the parcel. Section L-II 4.2.8 states that outdoor light fixtures used for outdoor recreational facilities shall utilize partial shielding when full shielding would cause an impairment to the visibility required in the intended recreational activity. Both models of lighting from Wisconsin Lighting Lab analyzed in the photometric study are either directional and partially shielded or downcast and fully shielded. Additionally, the lighting will be below the tree canopy so the leaves should provide additional shielding. In the winter there can be a potentially high level of snow that the skiers traverse on. The poles need to be high enough to safety clear the heads of the cross-county skiers. A Condition of Approval A.5 will require that the applicant submit a letter from the light installer verifying that the estimated light levels have been achieved.

The habitat of the project area consists of Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest and Montane Conifer Forest. The United States Geological Survey identifies Upper Castle Creek on the north-eastern end of the parcel as a watercourse, but it will not be impacted by the project since it is not in the same vicinity of the project site. No other wetlands or other aquatic features were identified on the USGS map. Based on history provided by the applicant, the cross-county skiing trails are essentially modified old logging roads.

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

N/A

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

Truckee Fire Protection District Caltrans Highways Calfire Washoe Tribe Nevada City Rancheria Nisenan Tribe T si Akim Maidu United Auburn Indian Community Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians

Appendix C

Notice of Completion & Contractor Decument Teacordittel

Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal			
Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, G		SCH #	
For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacra	amento, CA 95814		
Project Title: Aubum Ski Club Amendment to an Approved Perm	it (PLN22-0092, AAP22-0002, EIS22-000	07, VAR22-0003)	
Lead Agency: Nevada County	Contact Person:	David Nicholas	
Mailing Address: 950 Maidu Avenue	Phone: 530-265	-1257	
City: Nevada City		a	
Project Location: County: Nevada County		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Cross Streets; Boreal Ridge Road		Zip Code: 95728	
Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes and seconds): 39 • 20	·1 "N/-120 ◇20 ′58 "W	Total Acres: 193.8	
Assessor's Parcel No.: 047-450-004 Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #:	Waterways: Upper Castle Creek	Kaige. <u> </u>	
Airports:	Railways:	Schools:	
Document Type:			
CEQA: NOP Draft EIR Early Cons Supplement/Subsequent EIF Neg Dec (Prior SCH No.)	E EA EIS	cr: Joint Document Final Document Other:	
Local Action Type:		·	
General Plan Update Specific Plan General Plan Amendment Master Plan General Plan Element Planned Unit Development Community Plan Site Plan	 Rezone Prezone It Use Permit Land Division (Subdivision) 	Annexation Annexation Redevelopment Coastal Permit , etc.) Other:	
Development Type:		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Residential: Units Acres	Power: Type Waste Treatment:Type Hazardous Waste:Type	MW MGD	
Project Issues Discussed in Document:			
 Aesthetic/Visual Agricultural Land Flood Plain/Flooding Air Quality Forest Land/Fire Hazard Geologic/Seismic Biological Resources Coastal Zone Drainage/Absorption Economic/Jobs Fiscal Fiscal Flood Plain/Flooding Forest Land/Fire Hazard Geologic/Seismic Minerals Noise Population/Housing Balan Public Services/Facilities 	 Recreation/Parks Schools/Universities Septic Systems Sewer Capacity Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grad Solid Waste Toxic/Hazardous Traffic/Circulation 	 Vegetation Water Quality Water Supply/Groundwater Wetland/Riparian Growth Inducement Land Use Cumulative Effects Other: 	

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

The area of the proposed tests is zoned as Fareal 40 (FR-40), and Reception (REA). The parcel is sufficuence by other Fareal coning districts with Informum parcel sizes nging (non: 40 in: 150 ecres

Project Description: (please use a separate page if necessary)

An Amendment to Approved Use Permits U88-10 and U89-039 to install 40 light poles along the 2-kilometer lower loop of an existing 10 kilometer cross-county skiing trail system and to allow nighttime skiing from dusk until 8:00 P.M. on Wednesday through Saturday nights from early November through March at the Auburn Ski Club Nordic Center.

Note: The State Clearinghouse will assign identification numbers for all new projects. If a SCH number already exists for a project (e.g. Notice of Preparation or previous draft document) please fill in.

Reviewing Agencies Checklist

	Agencies may recommend State Clearinghouse distribute have already sent your document to the agency please	
	Air Resources Board	Office of Historic Preservation
	Boating & Waterways, Department of	Office of Public School Construction
	California Emergency Management Agency	Parks & Recreation, Department of
	California Highway Patrol	Pesticide Regulation, Department of
	Caltrans District #	Public Utilities Commission
	Caltrans Division of Aeronautics	Regional WQCB #
s	Caltrans Planning	Resources Agency
	Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Resources Recycling and Recovery, Department of
	Coachella Valley Mtns. Conservancy	S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Comm.
	Coastal Commission	San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers & Mtns. Conservancy
		San Joaquin River Conservancy
	Conservation, Department of	Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy
	Corrections, Department of	State Lands Commission
	Delta Protection Commission	SWRCB: Clean Water Grants
	Education, Department of	SWRCB: Water Quality
	Energy Commission	SWRCB: Water Rights
	Fish & Game Region #	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
	Food & Agriculture, Department of	Toxic Substances Control, Department of
	Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of	Water Resources, Department of
	General Services, Department of	
	Health Services, Department of	Other:
	Housing & Community Development	Other:
<u>x</u>	Native American Heritage Commission	
Local	Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency	y)
Startin	g Date 7/8/2022	Ending Date <u>8/8/2022</u>
Lead A	Agency (Complete if applicable):	
Consul	ting Firm: <u>N/A</u>	Applicant: Bill Clark
	ss;	
City/St	tate/Zip:	City/State/Zip: Soda Springs, CA, 95728
Contac	st:	Phone: 530-386-2054
Phone		-
Signat	ure of Lead Agency Representative:	Usla S Date: 7/5/2022

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21161, Public Resources Code.