

## Mail PO Box 5310 Stateline, NV 89449-5310

#### Location 128 Market Street Stateline, NV 89449

**Contact**Phone: 775-588-4547

Fax: 775-588-4527 www.trpa.org

# INITIAL DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST

## **Project Name:**

Tourist Core Area Plan Amendment (Tahoe Wellness Center)

#### **Area Plan Amendment Description:**

The proposed amendments affect Appendix C, Table 1: Permitted Uses by Land Use District and Table 2: List of Primary Uses and Use Definitions of the Tourist Core Area Plan as follows:

- Allow small scale manufacturing, industrial services, and wholesale and distribution land uses within the Tourist Center Gateway (TSC-G) District, Special Area #1.
- Add a provision that the subject land uses would only be allowed in connection with a retail
  commercial use where it will enhance the visitor experience and is limited in size to 30% of the
  associated retail space.
- Amend the land use definition of industrial services to better reflect the goals and intent of the TCAP.
- Add a land use definition for wholesale and distribution consistent with the goals of the TCAP.

The following questionnaire will be completed by the applicant based on evidence submitted with the application. All "Yes" and "No, With Mitigation" answers will require further written comments.

#### I. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

# 1. Land

Wi	I the proposal result in:		
a.	Compaction or covering of the soil beyond the limits allowed in the land capability or Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES)?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		□ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
b.	A change in the topography or ground surface relief features of site inconsistent with the natural surrounding conditions?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		□ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient

		□ Yes	⊠ No
		□ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
d.	Changes in the undisturbed soil or native geologic substructures or grading in excess of 5 feet?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
e.	The continuation of or increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		□ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
f.	Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sand, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion, including natural littoral processes, which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		□ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
g.	Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, backshore erosion, avalanches, mud slides, ground failure, or similar hazards?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
0		□ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
Qual			
	I the proposal result in:		
a.	Substantial air pollutant emissions?	□ Voo	I₩ No
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		<ul><li>□ No, With Mitigation</li></ul>	<ul><li>□ Data</li><li>Insufficient</li></ul>
b.	Deterioration of ambient (existing) air quality?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No

c. Unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the proposal?

2. Air

			<ul><li>□ No, With Mitigation</li></ul>	<ul><li>□ Data</li><li>Insufficient</li></ul>
	c.	The creation of objectionable odors?		
			□ Yes	⊠ No
			□ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
	d.	Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?		
			□ Yes	⊠ No
			☐ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
	e.	Increased use of diesel fuel?		
			□ Yes	⊠ No
			☐ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
3. Wat	er Q	uality		
	Wil	If the proposal result in:		
	a.	Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?		
			□ Yes	⊠ No
			☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
	b.	Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff so that a 20 yr. 1 hr. storm runoff (approximately 1 inch per hour) cannot be contained on the site?		
			□ Yes	⊠ No
			□ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
	C.	Alterations to the course or flow of 100-yearflood waters?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
			☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
	d.	Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?		
			□ Yes	⊠No

		□ No, With Mitigation	<ul><li>□ Data</li><li>Insufficient</li></ul>
e.	Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
f.	Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground water?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
g.	Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
h.	Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
i.	Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occurrence or seiches?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
j.	The potential discharge of contaminants to the groundwater or any alteration of groundwater quality?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		<ul><li>□ No, With Mitigation</li></ul>	□ Data Insufficient

## 4. Vegetation

Will the proposal result in:

a.	Removal of native vegetation in excess of the area utilized for the actual development permitted by the land capability/IPES system?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
b.	Removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat, either through direct removal or indirect lowering of the groundwater table?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
C.	Introduction of new vegetation that will require excessive fertilizer or water, or will provide a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
d.	Change in the diversity or distribution of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, micro flora and aquatic plants)?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
e.	Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		<ul><li>□ No, With Mitigation</li></ul>	☐ Data Insufficient
f.	Removal of stream bank and/or backshore vegetation, including woody vegetation such as willows?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		□ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient

	g.	Removal of any native live, dead or dying trees30 inches or greater in diameter at breast height (dbh) within TRPA's Conservation or Recreation land use classifications?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
	h.	A change in the natural functioning of an old growth ecosystem?	□ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
			□ Yes	⊠No
E MAGILI	1:4-		□ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
5. Wild				
	VVII	I the proposal result in:		
	a.	Change in the diversity or distribution of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms, insects, mammals, amphibians or microfauna)?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
			☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
	b.	Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
			<ul><li>□ No, With Mitigation</li></ul>	□ Data Insufficient
	C.	Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
	d.	Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality?	☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
	ű.	Determination of officially for quality.	□ Yes	⊠No
			<ul><li>□ No, With Mitigation</li></ul>	<ul><li>□ Data</li><li>Insufficient</li></ul>

## 6. Noise

Will the proposal result in:

a.	Increases in existing Community Noise Equivalency Levels (CNEL) beyond those permitted in the applicable Area Plan, Plan Area Statement, Community Plan or Master Plan?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
b.	Exposure of people to severe noise levels?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
c.	Single event noise levels greater than those set forth in the TRPA Noise Environmental Threshold?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		<ul><li>□ No, With Mitigation</li></ul>	□ Data Insufficient
d.	The placement of residential or tourist accommodation uses in areas where the existing CNEL exceeds 60 dBA or is otherwise incompatible?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
е.	The placement of uses that would generate an incompatible noise level in close proximity to existing residential or tourist accommodation uses?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
f.	Exposure of existing structures to levels of ground vibration that could result in structural damage?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient

## 7. Light and Glare

Will the proposal:

a. Include new or modified sources of exterior lighting? □ Yes ⊠No □ No. With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient b. Create new illumination which is more substantial than other lighting, if any, within the surrounding area? □ Yes ⊠No □ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient c. Cause light from exterior sources to be cast off -site or onto public lands? □ Yes ⊠No □ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient d. Create new sources of glare through the siting of the improvements or through the use of reflective materials? □ Yes ⊠ No □ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient 8. Land Use Will the proposal: a. Include uses which are not listed as permissible uses in the applicable Plan Area Statement, adopted Community Plan, or Master Plan? ☐ Yes ⊠No □ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient b. Expand or intensify an existing non-conforming use? □ Yes ⊠No □ No. With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient

## 9. Natural Resources Will the proposal result in: a. A substantial increase in the rate of use of any natural resources? ☐ Yes ⊠No □ Data □ No, With Mitigation Insufficient b. Substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resource? □ Yes ⊠No □ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient 10. Risk of Upset Will the proposal: a. Involve a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation in the event of an accident or upset conditions? ☐ Yes ■ No □ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient b. Involve possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan? □ Yes ⊠No □ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient 11. Population Will the proposal: a. Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human

population planned for the Region?

☐ Yes

b. Include or result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents?

□ No, With □ Data Mitigation

Insufficient

☑ No

☐ Yes ⊠No

			<ul><li>□ No, With Mitigation</li></ul>	<ul><li>□ Data</li><li>Insufficient</li></ul>
12. Ho	usin	9		
	Wil	the proposal:		
	a.	Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?		
		To determine if the proposal will affect existing housing or create a demand for additional housing, please answer the following questions:		
	(1)	Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
			☐ No, With Mitigation	<ul><li>□ Data</li><li>Insufficient</li></ul>
	(2)	Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region historically or currently being rented at rates affordable by lower and very-low-income households?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
			☐ No, With Mitigation	<ul><li>□ Data</li><li>Insufficient</li></ul>
		Number of Exis	ting Dwelling Uni	ts:
		Number of Pro	oosed Dwelling U	nits:
	b.	Will the proposal result in the loss of housing for lower-income and very-low-income households?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
			☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
13. Tra	nsp	ortation/Circulation		
	Wil	the proposal result in:		
	a.	Generation of 100 or more new Daily Vehicle Trip Ends (DVTE)?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
			□ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient

b	).	Changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?		
			□ Yes	⊠ No
			☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
C		Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, including highway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
			☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
d		Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?		
			□ Yes	⊠ No
			☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
е	€.	Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
			□ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
f.		Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
			☐ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
14. Publi	ic S	Services		
V		the proposal have an unplanned effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas?		
а	à.	Fire protection?		
			□ Yes	⊠ No
			☐ No, With Mitigation	<ul><li>□ Data</li><li>Insufficient</li></ul>

	b.	Police protection?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
			□ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
	c.	Schools?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
			□ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
	d.	Parks or other recreational facilities?		
			□ Yes	⊠ No
			☐ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
	e.	Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
			□ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
	f.	Other governmental services?		
			□ Yes	⊠ No
45. Em			□ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
15. Ene		I the proposal result in:		
		Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?		
	u.	coo or outstand amounts or raor or onorgy.	□ Yes	⊠No
			□ No, With	□ Data
			Mitigation	Insufficient
	b.	Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?		
			□ Yes	⊠No
			□ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient

## 16. Utilities

Except for planned improvements, will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

a.	Power or natural gas?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
b.	Communication systems?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
c.	Utilize additional water which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the service provider?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		□ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
d.	Utilize additional sewage treatment capacity which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the sewage treatment provider?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
e.	Storm water drainage?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
f.	Solid waste and disposal?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient

#### 17. Human Health

Will the proposal result in: a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)? ☐ Yes ■ No □ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards? □ Yes ⊠No □ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient 18. Scenic Resources/Community Design Will the proposal: a. Be visible from any state or federal highway, Pioneer Trail or from Lake Tahoe? ☐ Yes ■ No □ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient b. Be visible from any public recreation area or TRPA designated bicycle trail? □ Yes ⊠No □ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient c. Block or modify an existing view of Lake Tahoe or other scenic vista seen from a public road or other public area? □ Yes ⊠No □ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient d. Be inconsistent with the height and design standards required by the applicable ordinance or Community Plan? ☐ Yes ⊠No □ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient

				Yes	X	No
				No, With tigation		Data sufficier
Discussion (Item 18.a): The privisible from US Highway 50. development is subject to condesigned to ensure compatible consistent with relevant heign further ensure scenic compatible, no impact to visible, no impact to visible.	such development would npliance with citywide de lity with scenic threshold nt-related findings in Chap bility. Because these are	be authorized under sign standards and g s. Development can oter 37 of the TRPA (	r current st guidelines, only be ap Code of Ord	andards. Any which are oproved wher dinances, whi	n ch	
<u>Discussion (Item 18.b)</u> : Pleas potentially affect land within amendment would not result result in more visually imposi	proximity to the Class-I m in impacts to views from	ulti-use trails along these facilities, as th	US Highway ne amendm	y 50. The ent would no	ot	
<u>Discussion (Item 18.c)</u> : Pleas not affect views from the lake amendment would not result community plan.	. Resulting development	may be visible from	public road	ds, but the		
Discussion (Item 18.e): The parent and the Area #1, which is adjacent to scenic threshold. The 2015 the improvements help to provide intended to encourage additional scenic quality improvement.	Scenic Roadway Unit #33 reshold evaluation notes e incremental benefits to	(The Strip), which is that redevelopment scenic quality. As th	in non-atta , remodelir e proposed	ainment for t ng, and façad I amendment	he e : is	
Area #1, which is adjacent to scenic threshold. The 2015 th improvements help to provid intended to encourage additiscenic quality improvement.	Scenic Roadway Unit #33 reshold evaluation notes e incremental benefits to	(The Strip), which is that redevelopment scenic quality. As th	in non-atta , remodelir e proposed	ainment for t ng, and façad I amendment	he e : is	
Area #1, which is adjacent to scenic threshold. The 2015 th improvements help to provid intended to encourage additi scenic quality improvement.	Scenic Roadway Unit #33 reshold evaluation notes e incremental benefits to	(The Strip), which is that redevelopment scenic quality. As th	in non-atta , remodelir e proposed	ainment for t ng, and façad I amendment	he e : is	
Area #1, which is adjacent to scenic threshold. The 2015 th improvements help to provid intended to encourage additi	Scenic Roadway Unit #33 reshold evaluation notes e incremental benefits to onal tourist-related uses a	(The Strip), which is that redevelopment scenic quality. As th and redevelopment i	in non-atta , remodelir e proposed	ainment for t ng, and façad I amendment	he e : is	
Area #1, which is adjacent to scenic threshold. The 2015 th improvements help to provid intended to encourage additiscenic quality improvement.  reation  Does the proposal:	Scenic Roadway Unit #33 reshold evaluation notes e incremental benefits to onal tourist-related uses a	(The Strip), which is that redevelopment scenic quality. As th and redevelopment i	in non-atta , remodelir e proposec it can be se	ainment for t ng, and façad I amendment	he e : is ting	No
Area #1, which is adjacent to scenic threshold. The 2015 th improvements help to provid intended to encourage additiscenic quality improvement.  Teation  Does the proposal:	Scenic Roadway Unit #33 reshold evaluation notes e incremental benefits to onal tourist-related uses a	(The Strip), which is that redevelopment scenic quality. As th and redevelopment i	in non-atta	ainment for ti ng, and façad I amendment en as promo	he e : is ting	Data
Area #1, which is adjacent to scenic threshold. The 2015 th improvements help to provid intended to encourage additiscenic quality improvement.  Teation  Does the proposal:	Scenic Roadway Unit #33 reshold evaluation notes e incremental benefits to onal tourist-related uses a	(The Strip), which is that redevelopment scenic quality. As th and redevelopment i	in non-atta	ainment for ting, and façad damendment en as promote Yes  No, With	he e : is ting	Data
Area #1, which is adjacent to scenic threshold. The 2015 the improvements help to provide intended to encourage additistic action.  Teation  Does the proposal:  a. Create additional demands	Scenic Roadway Unit #33 reshold evaluation notes e incremental benefits to onal tourist-related uses a	(The Strip), which is that redevelopment scenic quality. As th and redevelopment i	in non-atta	ainment for ting, and façad damendment en as promote Yes  No, With	he e : is ting	Data sufficie

c. Have the potential to create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed?

		□ Yes	⊠No
d	Result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway,	□ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
u.	or public lands?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		□ No, With Mitigation	<ul><li>□ Data</li><li>Insufficient</li></ul>
20. Archa	eological/Historical		
a.	Will the proposal result in an alteration of or adverse physical or aesthetic effect to a significant archaeological or historical site, structure, object or building?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
b.	Is the proposed project located on a property with any known cultural, historical, and/or archaeological resources, including resources on TRPA or other regulatory official maps or records?		
		□ Yes	⊠ No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
C.	Is the property associated with any historically significant events and/or sites or persons?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		☐ No, With Mitigation	☐ Data Insufficient
d.	Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
0	Will the proposal restrict historic or pro-historic religious or sacred	☐ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient
e.	Will the proposal restrict historic or pre-historic religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?		
		□ Yes	⊠No
		□ No, With Mitigation	□ Data Insufficient

## 21. Findings of Significance. a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California or Nevada history or prehistory? □ Yes ☑ No □ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time, while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.) □ Yes ⊠No ■ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environmental is significant?) ☐ Yes ⊠No □ No, With □ Data Mitigation Insufficient

d. Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human being, either directly or indirectly?

☐ Yes 🗵 No

□ No, With Mitigation

□ DataInsufficient

Determination:									
	On the basis of this evaluation:								
	a.	The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the and a finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in account TRPA's Rules of Procedure.							
				X	Yes		No		
	b.	The proposed project could have a significant effect on the e due to the listed mitigation measures which have been added could have no significant effect on the environment and a mit of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with and Procedures.	d to the project, igated finding						
					Yes	X	No		
c. The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment and an environmental impact statement shall be prepared in accordance with this chapter and TRPA's Rules of Procedure									
					Yes	X	No		
Jen Jen	Jen	Signature of Evaluator  nifer Self, Principal Planner Title of Evaluator	Date	Nove	ember 30,2021		_		