TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

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.gov

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name: IVGID - Beach House, Bar, Guard Shack, and Bandstand

Project Assessor's Parcel Number (APN): 127-280-01

Project Address: 967 Lakeshore Blvd. Incline Village, Washoe County, NV 89451

County/City: Washoe / Incline Village

Project Description: The Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID) is requesting approval of a project at Incline Beach, 967 Lakeshore Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada. The project includes demolition of the existing beach house (concession/bathroom) and one of two guard shacks, construction of a new beach house (concession/bathroom), guard shack, bar structure, and covered bandstand, and reconfiguration of an existing parking lot.

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. Use the blank boxes to add any additional information and reference the question number and letter. If more space is required for additional information, please attached separate sheets and reference the question number and letter.

For information on the status of TRPA environmental thresholds click on the links to the Threshold Dashboard.

I. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. LAND

Current and historic status of soil conservation standards can be found at the links below:

- Impervious Cover
- Stream Environment Zone

Will the proposal result in:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Compaction or covering of the soil beyond the limits allowed in the land capability or Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES)?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b. A change in the topography or ground surface relief features of site inconsistent with the natural surrounding conditions?	☐	☑	☐	☐
c. Unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the proposal?	☐	☑	☐	☐
d. Changes in the undisturbed soil or native geologic substructures or grading in excess of 5 feet?	☐	☑	☐	☐
e. The continuation of or increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?	☐	☑	☐	☐
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?	☐	☑	☐	☐
g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, backshore erosion, avalanches, mud slides, ground failure, or similar hazards?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: The total base allowable land coverage is 109,215 square feet. The proposed land coverage with this project (and existing development) is 107,860 square feet. There are no coverage changes proposed in Land Capability District (LCD) Class 1b (stream environment zone), LCD Class 1b (backshore), or LCD Class 4. All new land coverage will be in LCD Class 6, which is considered high-capability land suitable for development. The new coverage being added with the project will be mitigated through the payment of a water quality mitigation fee.

2. AIR QUALITY

Current and historic status of air quality standards can be found at the links below:

- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Nitrate Deposition
- Ozone (O3)
- Regional Visibility
- Respirable and Fine Particulate Matter
- Sub-Regional Visibility

Will the proposal result in:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Substantial air pollutant emissions?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b. Deterioration of ambient (existing) air quality?	☐	☑	☐	☐
c. The creation of objectionable odors?	☐	☑	☐	☐
d. Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?	☐	☑	☐	☐
e. Increased use of diesel fuel?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

Temporary Best Management Practices will be installed during construction and all soil will be stabilized following the completion of construction to prevent impacts to air quality.

3. WATER QUALITY

Current and historic status of water quality standards can be found at the links below:

- Aquatic Invasive Species
- Deep Water (Pelagic) Lake Tahoe
- Groundwater
- Nearshore (Littoral) Lake Tahoe
- Other Lakes
- Surface Runoff
- Tributaries
- Load Reductions

Will the proposal result in:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?	☐	☑	☐	☐
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?	☐	☑	☐	☐
c. Alterations to the course or flow of 100-yearflood waters?	☐	☑	☐	☐
d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?	☐	☑	☐	☐
e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?	☐	☑	☐	☐
f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground water?	☐	☑	☐	☐
g. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?	☐	☑	☐	☐
h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?	☐	☑	☐	☐
i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occurrence or seiches?	☐	☑	☐	☐
j. The potential discharge of contaminants to the groundwater or any alteration of groundwater quality?	☐	☑	☐	☐
k. Is the project located within 600 feet of a drinking water source?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: The construction site is outside of the 100-year floodplain and shorezone. Permanent stormwater Best Management Practices will be installed with the project.

4. VEGETATION

Current and historic status of vegetation preservation standards can be found at the links below:

- Common Vegetation
- Late Seral/Old Growth Ecosystems
- Sensitive Plants
- Uncommon Plant Communities

Will the proposal result in:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Removal of native vegetation in excess of the area utilized for the actual development permitted by the land capability/IPES system?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b. Removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat, either through direct removal or indirect lowering of the groundwater table?	☐	☑	☐	☐
c. Introduction of new vegetation that will require excessive fertilizer or water, or will provide a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?	☐	☑	☐	☐
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)?	☐	☑	☐	☐
e. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare, or endangered species of plants?	☐	☑	☐	☐
f. Removal of stream bank and/or backshore vegetation, including woody vegetation such as willows?	☐	☑	☐	☐
g. Removal of any native live, dead or dying trees 30 inches or greater in diameter at breast height (dbh) within TRPA's Conservation or Recreation land use classifications?	☑	☐	☐	☐
h. A change in the natural functioning of an old growth ecosystem?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: The subject site is located within the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan, Incline Village Tourist Special Area #1. It has a recreation land use designation on the Regional Land Use Map. The proposed project requires the removal of nine Jeffery Pines and one Aspen Tree. Five of the trees proposed for removal are greater than 30 inches diameter at breast height (dbh). The trees to be removed are within the proposed building footprints or within the area of the reconfigured access and parking lot. Other mature trees on the site will remain and will contribute to scenic screening and site character. Vegetation protection fencing will be installed during construction to protect trees that are not approved for removal.

5. WILDLIFE

Current and historic status of special interest species standards can be found at the links below:

- Special Interest Species

Current and historic status of the fisheries standards can be found at the links below:

- Instream Flow
- Lake Habitat
- Stream Habitat

Will the proposal result in:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
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)?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b. Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?	☐	☑	☐	☐
c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?	☐	☑	☐	☐
d. Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

No potential impacts have been identified.

6. NOISE

Current and historic status of the noise standards can be found at the links below:

- Cumulative Noise Events
- Single Noise Events

Will the proposal result in:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
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?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	☐	☑	☐	☐
c. Single event noise levels greater than those set forth in the TRPA Noise Environmental Threshold?	☐	☑	☐	☐
d. The placement of residential or tourist accommodation uses in areas where the existing CNEL exceeds 60 dBA or is otherwise incompatible?	☐	☑	☐	☐
e. The placement of uses that would generate an incompatible noise level in close proximity to existing residential or tourist accommodation uses?	☐	☑	☐	☐
f. Exposure of existing structures to levels of ground vibration that could result in structural damage?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: The subject site is within the Incline Village Tourist Special Area #1 of the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan. The maximum community noise equivalent level (CNEL) in this area is 55 dBA (A-weighted decibel). CNEL is a measure of noise that is the logarithmic average of single noise event values as measured by a noise monitor. The proposed bandstand will support existing seasonal music events that currently occur at the site. TRPA does not anticipate the CNEL standards being exceeded from music on the beach. To prevent impacts to adjoining property owners, the draft permit includes a condition prohibiting outdoor music between 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m.

7. LIGHT AND GLARE

Will the proposal:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Include new or modified sources of exterior lighting?	☑	☐	☐	☐
b. Create new illumination which is more substantial than other lighting, if any, within the surrounding area?	☐	☑	☐	☐
c. Cause light from exterior sources to be cast off -site or onto public lands?	☐	☑	☐	☐
d. Create new sources of glare through the siting of the improvements or through the use of reflective materials?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: All exterior lighting must comply with the TRPA Code. The following note has been added to the plans:

> *All exterior lighting shall be consistent with TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 36.8 Exterior Lighting Standards. Specifically, all exterior lighting shall be fully shielded and directed downward so as not to produce obtrusive glare onto Lake Tahoe or adjoining properties. Illumination for aesthetic or dramatic purposes of any building or surrounding landscape utilizing exterior light fixtures projected above the horizontal is prohibited.*

8. LAND USE

Will the proposal:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Include uses which are not listed as permissible uses in the applicable Area Plan, Plan Area Statement, adopted Community Plan, or Master Plan?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b. Expand or intensify an existing non-conforming use?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

Beach recreation and accessory uses, such as those proposed, are an allowed use on the subject site .

9. NATURAL RESOURCES

Will the proposal result in:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. A substantial increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b. Substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resource?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: No potential impacts have been identified.

10. RISK OF UPSET

Will the proposal:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
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?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b. Involve possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: No potential impacts have been identified.

11. POPULATION

Will the proposal:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b. Include or result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: No potential impacts have been identified.

12. HOUSING

Will the proposal:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
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?	☐	☑	☐	☐
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?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: No potential impacts have been identified.

13. TRANSPORTATION / CIRCULATION

Will the proposal result in:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Generation of 650 or more new average daily Vehicle Miles Travelled?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b. Changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking? (see below)	☑	☐	☐	☐
c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, including highway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities?	☐	☑	☐	☐
d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?	☐	☑	☐	☐
e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?	☐	☑	☐	☐
f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: The project includes reconfiguring and improvements to existing access and a parking lot.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES

Will the proposal have an unplanned effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas?:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Fire protection?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b. Police protection?	☐	☑	☐	☐
c. Schools?	☐	☑	☐	☐
d. Parks or other recreational facilities?	☐	☑	☐	☐
e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	☐	☑	☐	☐
f. Other governmental services?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: No potential impacts were identified.

15. ENERGY

Will the proposal result in:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: No potential impacts were identified.

16. UTILITIES

Except for planned improvements, will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Power or natural gas?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b. Communication systems?	☐	☑	☐	☐
c. Utilize additional water which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the service provider?	☐	☑	☐	☐
d. Utilize additional sewage treatment capacity which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the sewage treatment provider?	☐	☑	☐	☐
e. Storm water drainage?	☐	☑	☐	☐
f. Solid waste and disposal?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: No potential impacts were identified.

17. HUMAN HEALTH

Will the proposal result in:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: No potential impacts were identified.

18. SCENIC RESOURCES / COMMUNITY DESIGN

Current and historic status of the scenic resources standards can be found at the links below:

- Built Environment
- Other Areas
- Roadway and Shoreline Units

Will the proposal:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Be visible from any state or federal highway, Pioneer Trail or from Lake Tahoe?	☑	☐	☐	☐
b. Be visible from any public recreation area or TRPA designated bicycle trail?	☑	☐	☐	☐
c. Block or modify an existing view of Lake Tahoe or other scenic vista seen from a public road or other public area?	☐	☑	☐	☐
d. Be inconsistent with the height and design standards required by the applicable ordinance, Community Plan, or Area Plan?	☐	☑	☐	☐
e. Be inconsistent with the TRPA Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) or Design Review Guidelines?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: The proposed project adheres to all TRPA scenic code guidelines and requirements. Scenic level 5 option 2 is selected for this project; the total lakefront facade square footage is significantly below the allowable visible square footage for the proposed project. Existing trees will help to screen the project from Lake Tahoe. Earthtone colors will be used for the project. The buildings are below the forest canopy. The project design adheres to all TRPA and Washoe County code requirements. No potential scenic impacts have been identified.

19. RECREATION

Current and historic status of the recreation standards can be found at the links below:

- Fair Share Distribution of Recreation Capacity
- Quality of Recreation Experience and Access to Recreational Opportunities

Will the proposal:	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Create additional demand for recreation facilities?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b. Create additional recreation capacity?	☐	☑	☐	☐
c. Have the potential to create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed?	☐	☑	☐	☐
d. Result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway, or public lands?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

The proposed project replaces and modernizes existing recreation support facilities and does not expand beach access or recreation capacity.

20. ARCHAEOLOGICAL / HISTORICAL

Will the proposal result in:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. An alteration of or adverse physical or aesthetic effect to a significant archaeological or historical site, structure, object or building?	☐	☑	☐	☐
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? (See below)	☐	☑	☐	☐
c. Is the property associated with any historically significant events and/or sites or persons?	☐	☑	☐	☐
d. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	☐	☑	☐	☐
e. Will the proposal restrict historic or pre-historic religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: TRPA has determined that the parcel is in close proximity to a TRPA Designated Historic Resource (#64 – Sierra Nevada Wood and Lumber Company Narrow Gauge Railroad) and a site that may maintain cultural significance for the Washoe Tribe. Due to the location of the construction in proximity to a TRPA Designated Historic Resource, there is a possibility that artifacts or other archaeological and/or below-grade resources may be discovered. The applicant has sent a consultation email to the Washoe Tribe and the draft permit includes a condition requiring that upon discovery of any artifact during earth-moving activities or construction of the project, the applicant pause any activity disturbing the site and consult with TRPA and the Washoe Tribe (ref. HIST2025-1001).

II. FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
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?	☐	☑	☐	☐
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.)	☐	☑	☐	☐
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?)	☐	☑	☐	☐
d. Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human being, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

No potential impacts were identified.

III. DECLARATION:

I hereby certify that the statements furnished above and in the attached exhibits present the data and information required for this initial evaluation to the best of my ability, and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature:

Jaden Wuelzer	at Washoe	01/14/2026
Person preparing application	**County**	**Date**

Applicant Written Comments: (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

IV. DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this evaluation:

a. The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment and a finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules of Procedure	☑ YES	☐ NO
b. The proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but due to the listed mitigation measures which have been added to the project, could have no significant effect on the environment and a mitigated finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules and Procedures.	☐ YES	☐ 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 Procedures.	☐ YES	☐ NO

_____ Date _____

Signature of Evaluator

_____

Title of Evaluator