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: Tahoe Keys Marina Redevelopment

Project Assessor's Parcel Number (APN): 022-210-032, 022-210-040, 022-210-041, 022-210-044

Project Address: 2435 Venice Dr.

County/City: South Lake Tahoe, CA

Project Description: Redevelopment of the existing marina facilities

Upland redevelopment includes new buildings, reconfigured parking and circulation, and new utilities. Shorezone improvements include relocation of the existing boat ramp, replacement of the bulkhead, and formal review of 66 existing operating boat slips in excess of the 239 slips identified in the Tahoe Keys Marina Master Plan. The 66 slips were addressed in the Settlement Agreement approved by the TRPA Governing Board on November 20, 2024, which required the applicant to seek formal approval and recognition through a complete project application. The Applicant is also seeking amendments to the TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 37 and 90.

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:

a. The project area is verified as Land Capability Class 6, allowing 30% land coverage. Additional coverage beyond 30% has been verified as legally coverage established prior to 1972. The applicant will pay an excess coverage mitigation fee consistent with Section 30.6.1.B.3 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, as well as a water quality mitigation fee consistent with the terms of the 2024 Settlement Agreement.

d. Excavation greater than 5 feet in depth is necessary to construct the building foundations and elevator shafts. The project area is previously disturbed, dating back to when portions of the Upper Truckee Marsh were dredged and filled to create the Tahoe Keys subdivision. The marina was built on approximately 10 feet of fill material above native soil. The project will use pile foundations extending approximately 20 feet in depth below the fill material to provide stability for the above-ground development. This foundation type minimizes soil disturbance by avoiding large cuts into the ground.

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:

Substantial air pollution emissions are not anticipated during construction as the project would not require substantial use of heavy construction (i.e., diesel-fueled) equipment. The project would also provide modern, energy-efficient structures, and substantial air pollutant emissions are not anticipated during long-term project operation.

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 project is designed to minimize impacts to groundwater by using a pile foundation system that allows water to flow around the piles, rather than creating a solid underground barrier.

c. The existing sheet-pile bulkhead is past its service life and would be replaced. The new bulkhead would be constructed in front of the existing bulkhead. This would have minor or negligible impacts on the location of the 100-year floodplain.

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:

Very little native vegetation exists within the project area because the marina was built on top of fill material where the Upper Truckee Marsh once existed. Most of the area to be redevloped is paved, covered with structures, or is compacted soil. A biological survey was completed and no suitable habitat for special species plants and animals was found. The project area is

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:

Consistent with requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code, the project proponent would arrange for a qualified biologist to conduct a nesting bird and raptor survey prior to the beginning of project activities if project activities with the potential to disturb nesting birds and raptors would occur during the nesting bird season (typically February 15th through September 15th).

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 project would not involve a change in on-site use that would result in the generation of substantial additional noise or severe noise levels compared to existing conditions. Consistent with Chapter 68 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, construction activities would be limited to the period between 8:00 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. Further, consistent with California Code of Regulations (CCR), idling of on-site vehicles would be limited to no more than 5 minutes (see 13 CCR Section 2485), and consistent with Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA), all on-site equipment would be maintained in proper working order. Regulatory compliance with both of these regulations would ensure that excessive construction noise associated with equipment operation does not occur. Please refer to "Environmental Noise Assessment, Tahoe Keys Marina" (Saxelby Acoustics 2025) for further details.

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:

a. Exterior lighting would be replaced throughout the project site and would comply with TRPA and/or City standards with respect to design (including established limits pertaining to light intensity, foot candles/lumens, kelvin ratings, and dark sky view protection). Lighting will be used for safety purposes.

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:

a. The property is located in Special Area 1 of Plan Area Statement (PAS) 102 in which marinas, outdoor recreation concessions, eating and drinking places, general merchandise stores, professional offices and various recreation and public services are permissible uses. Residential uses are not permissible In PAS 102. However, TRPA has verified 3 legally existing nonconforming residential units on the site which will be maintained/reconstructed for on-site employee housing consistent with Section 21.5.2(C) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

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:

The project involves the redevelopment of a portion of the existing Tahoe Keys Marina property and would not result in the substantial increase in rate of use or depletion of natural resources.

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:

The Tahoe Keys Marina has served as a fueling station for watercraft in the Lake Tahoe Region for more than 50 years and that would continue as part of the redevelopment. The project would include replacement of an above ground storage tank and related fueling components would comply with all applicable standards, including those related to the proper storage and handling of materials.

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:

The project would involve redevelopment of three existing residential units. Further and upon completion of project development, three residential units would be provided, resulting in no net increase or decrease in housing as a result of project implementation. The employee tenants will be provided with substitute housing during redevelopment.

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:

The project will result in no net change in the number of residential units within the Tahoe Region.

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?	☑	☐	☐	☐
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:

a. The project will create an estimated 218 new average daily VMT, which is below TRPA's low-VMT screening threshold. The project qualifies as a low-VMT generating project and is considered to have a less-than-significant transportation impact. A mobility mitigation fee will be assessed, pursuant to TRPA Code Chapter 65.

b. The existing parking facilities would be modified to accommodate the proposed site layout and design. The existing on-site parking lot would be replaced with paid and valet parking facilities. The number of total parking spaces throughout the project site is anticipated to be reduced by approximately 20 percent compared to existing conditions, some of which would be valet parking spaces. Based on the projected visitation and employment of the project, as well as taking into consideration proposed on-site housing and transit opportunities in the area, peak parking demand would occur midday (i.e., between 2:00 pm and 3:00 pm) and would be for 288 spaces, which would exceed the planned supply. As a result, the project proponent would implement (as a condition of the project) an employee parking program. This program would involve encouraging an increase in non-auto access, providing carpool matching resources, and implementing a limit to each charter's employee parking allowance. Upon implementation of this program, the employee parking demand would be reduced by approximately 50 percent, and adequate parking would be available. Please refer to "SLT Tahoe Keys Marina Redevelopment Transportation Analysis" (LSC 2025) for further details.

c. Adoption of the proposed Code amendments would not authorize new development, increase use intensity, generate vehicle trips, alter circulation, or change parking supply. The Chapter 90 amendment would remove Venice Drive East from the definition of “Major Arterial,” but would not itself alter roadway operations, roadway design, access, or traffic levels. Therefore

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:

The project would not increase on-site population, nor would it increase the service area for existing public services. All on-site structures would be designed and constructed in accordance with current Fire Code requirements with respect to fire prevention and emergency access. The project also includes operational office space for emergency responders, which may increase the

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:

The project would comply with current Building Code requirements and would not substantially increase the demand for or use of fuel or energy during construction (based on on-site conditions and the limited square footage of the proposed buildings) or operation (based on the use type.)

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:

As noted in Section 15. Energy, the project would not substantially increase energy demands such that new facilities would be required. On-site drainage would not change substantively compared to existing conditions. Water tanks will be constructed within the enclosed storage building in order to provide additional water pressure to the marina.

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:

Construction and lon-term operation of the propsoed facility would not create or exacerbate health risks in the area.

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:

a. Buildings A-D, on the north side of the project area, may be slightly visible from Lake Tahoe from certain viewpoints. The view would be distant and limited and the proposed development would not affect scenic threshold ratings. The development would not be visible from any designated bike trails, scenic recreation areas, or bike trails.

b. The project was evaluated for potential changes in visual conditions from multiple viewpoints along Venice Drive, which extends along the southern boundary of the project site, and the Cove East Trail (not a designated scenic recreation area). Although the project would be visible from multiple viewpoints, it would represent the redevelopment of an existing site that is in disrepair, and overall visual conditions would improve with on-site development. Impacted views will be temporary and won't affect the majority of available views.

c. Once mature, cedar, aspen and maple trees shown on the proposed landscaping plan for the commercial plaza and adjacent parking area would further block views from the Cove East Trail through the marina site to the ridgelines. To mitigate impacts on scenic vistas from implementation of the project, landscape plans for the commercial plaza and adjacent parking area shall be revised to reduce or remove taller trees that can block views through the proposed buildings to the ridgelines beyond, replacing them with shorter trees (e.g., flame maple or multi-stem aspen) and shrubs that will not block ridgeline views as viewed from the Cove East trail through the TKM site.

d. The project would involve the redevelopment of the site with buildings that would exceed current TRPA height standards, and a height amendment will be requested as part of the project. The majority of on-site buildings would range in maximum building height from 33 feet to 36.5

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:

b. 66 existing operations boat slips are proposed for recognition as part of this permit. Boat slips create additional recreation capacity which is measured in people at one time, or PAOTs. Each boat slip represents one PAOT. Since PAS 102 does not specify PAOT allocations for additional recreation capacity, the applicant requests an allocation of 66 PAOTs from the pool of summer day use PAOTs reserved for marinas (in which 1,801 allocations remain) consistent with TRPA Code Section 11.6.11.B. The project also includes additional dry boat storage, which also requires allocation of PAOTs (1 PAOT per boat storage space).

d. The proposed project would enhance user access to Lake Tahoe by renovating aging land-side marina infrastructure. Improvements include improved bicycle and kayak accessibility to the marina, improved boat storage and boat launch facilities, and improved bathroom facilities accessible to marina visitors and visitors to the Cove East Trail adjacent to the marina.

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?	☐	☑	☐	☐
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 project site is not historically significant and the existing buildings and accessory structures may be demolished or modified subject to TRPA review and approval. Please refer to TRPA File No. HIST2023-0810. Although not expected, since the development of the marina occurred in the 1960 and 1970s, if any cultural resources or artifacts are discovered during excvation, the permit will require work to cease and appropriate agencies to be notified.

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:

The project will redevelop an existing disturbed site without introducing new land uses. Many environmental and community improvements are included as part of the project, including improved stormwater, AIS controls, access to public recreation, and aesthetic improvements.

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: Julie Roll

Digitally signed by Julie Roll
DN: cn=Julie Roll, o=Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, ou=Permitting and Compliance, email=jroll@trpa.gov, c=US
Date: 2026.06.17 09:00:40 -07'00'

Julie Roll	at El Dorado County	06/08/2026
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