



---

***INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST  
FOR DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT***

---

**Project Name: Boulder Bay CEP Project – Waldorf Astoria Plan Revision**

**APN/Project Location:** 123-042-01, 123-042-02, 123-052-02, 123-052-03, 123-052-04, 123-053-02, et al./ Crystal Bay  
**County/City:** Washoe County

**Project Description:**

This Plan Revision (PR) to the approved Boulder Bay Community Enhancement Project (CEP) Project (Approved Project) involves full build-out of the remaining Approved Project components with some programming changes. The mix and type of units have been refined and vary in size and count. The revised project reduces the number of hotel units from 275 to 134 (includes 22 lock-off units) and decreases the number of residential units from 59 to 43 which includes the previously constructed 18 units in the building that fronts Highway 28. This results in a net reduction of 157 units, a 47 percent reduction in density. This reduction in density allows additional space for amenities to support the level of service necessary to achieve the desired resort experience. Accessory uses total 48,930 square feet and include uses such as: casino restaurant and bar, hotel meeting spaces/halls/galleries, hotel gym/fitness, hotel spa, hotel salon, hotel kids club, pool bar/grill, and the hotel lobby and restaurant. There is no change to the approved gaming (10,000 square feet), commercial (18,700 square feet) or employee housing components (38 total bedrooms – 28 provided onsite in 14 units and 10 provided offsite).

This PR does not reduce the number of approved buildings (8), and their configuration remains substantially unchanged. It does involve slight changes to footprint size, building height, placement and architectural design. The Approved Project's architectural character has been refined with orientation of the roof shapes and additional features that are consistent with the recently adopted Tahoe Area Plan. Overall, massing is consistent with the Approved Project evaluated in the EIS. Pursuant to Hauge Brueck Associates Memorandum, dated October 14, 2022, with some additional vegetation, "the revised project does not result in new scenic quality impacts associated with the overall threshold composite score for Roadway Unit 20D, nor does it require modifications to the existing mitigation measures included in the DEIS."

The Approved Project's internal driveway (Boulder Way) has been eliminated and the size of Building F has been reduced to expand the public plaza (the "Grove") in the middle of the development and add a guest arrival area between Buildings D and E. These revisions allow for an outdoor programmable plaza and include preservation of a collection of mature pines creating a "grove", an amphitheater nestled into the grade change to reduce vertical terracing toward the hotel (Building D), opportunities for year-round events (concerts, plays, etc.), retail focused inward rather than outward toward SR 28, a central gathering place open to the public as well as to guests and residents of the Approved Project.

As a result of the decrease in density, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) will be reduced from the Approved Project and the existing condition. The primary entrance to the Approved Project has been moved from SR 28 to Lakeview Avenue. The drainage plan has been updated to incorporate improved technology which will enhance treatment. The plan also increases water quality treatment and storage on-site. New infiltration basins, water quality improvement methodology, and techniques for low-impact development are retained to achieve the approved sediment reduction. To improve accessibility for maintenance, the water quality facilities have been reconfigured.

Land coverage and open space are unchanged compared to the Approved Project.



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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. A change in the topography or ground surface relief features of site inconsistent with the natural surrounding conditions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Changes in the undisturbed soil or native geologic substructures or grading in excess of 5 feet?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The continuation of or increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, backshore erosion, avalanches, mud slides, ground failure, or similar hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

The Project involves grading, excavation, and the placement of fill material for construction of facilities, BMPs and landscaping associated with the Project. The Project includes large excavations necessary for the foundations and parking garage. Potential environmental effects related to land capability and coverage, soils and geology, topographic alteration, seismic hazards, slope stability, and erosion potential are described in EIS Section 4.2 Geology and Earth Resources. Mitigation for addressing excess land coverage in the project area is outlined in EIS mitigation measure GEO-1 and summarized below.



**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](http://www.trpa.gov)

Per EIS Appendix AD, verified existing land coverage within the project area (including existing Washoe County ROW that will be abandoned) is 325,886 square feet over the TRPA allowable base land coverage. Excess land coverage would be reduced to 284,007 square feet under the Approved Project, which proposed to reduce land coverage by 15.9 percent. Excess land coverage is a significant impact that must be mitigated to reduce the impact to a less than significant level. As reported in the land coverage calculations for the Plan Revision (Coverage Plan sheet L0.05), TRPA land coverage would be reduced by 16.5% in the project area. The proposed land coverage reduction is greater than the 5 percent goal designated in the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan (Section 110.220.40) and consistent with the TRPA CEP goals of the Boulder Bay Project.

The Plan Revision (Coverage Plan sheets L0.05 and L0.06) is consistent with the proposed land coverage reductions approved for the Project, documented in the 2011 TRPA Permit, and reported in the EIS. Mitigation of excess land coverage (including retirement of banked or existing land coverage within the Project Area) will benefit the project area and larger North Stateline planning area. As documented on Plan sheet L0.05, at a minimum excess land coverage will be mitigated with permanent retirement of 71,283 square feet of banked or existing land coverage from the former Sierra Park parcels (APN 123-071-34, 35, 36, 37), Crystal Bay Motel/Office and parking lot (APN 123-042-01, 02), Old Firehouse (APN 123-053-04), California offsite WQ treatment site (APN 090-305-016) and reductions in existing offsite land coverage within the SR 28 ROW. The final requirements for excess land coverage mitigation will be calculated in accordance with TRPA Code Subsection 30.6 as a condition of the Plan Revision permit.

The project area is located in IBC Seismic Hazard Zone 3. An appropriate level of engineering mandated by Washoe County Building Codes for Zone 3 areas governs project design and construction for the Project. Adherence to the IBC design requirements adopted and amended locally for Washoe County will minimize the potential effects of seismic hazards on future visitors. With redevelopment of the 1940s era existing buildings, the Project will reduce, but cannot completely eliminate, the adverse effects that could result from a significant seismic event. Even with facility upgrades, the Project cannot guarantee that there will be no future structural failures. In the event of facility failure personnel and visitors will need to be evacuated from the project area and possibly the Lake Tahoe Basin. As such, mitigation in the form of an emergency response plan is provided (GEO-2B Emergency Response Plan) to reduce the impact to a level of less than significant.

Excavation depths studied and approved for the Project are consistent with excavation proposed for the Plan Revision. Excavation depths were approved by TRPA staff as part of the Soil/Hydro Report on February 24, 2009 (Letter from Gustafson to Brian Helm) and allow excavation depths between 5 and 49 feet.

No changes to the proposed emergency response plan mitigation (GEO-2B) are required as a result of the Plan Revision.



## 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Deterioration of ambient (existing) air quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The creation of objectionable odors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Increased use of diesel fuel?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

Project construction will involve temporary emissions from construction equipment and vehicle trips associated with construction personnel, and the generation of fugitive dust, both contributing pollutants to the air basin. An assessment of short-term (i.e., construction) air quality impacts and long-term (i.e., operational) regional air pollutant emissions, including mobile, stationary, and area source emissions was performed for the EIS. The analysis discusses the long-term benefits that occur from the replacement of existing buildings (including offsite TAUs that will be transferred to the project) with more efficient buildings as well as a reduction in vehicle trips and/or vehicle miles traveled as a result of transitioning land uses from gaming/commercial and hotel to a smaller gaming use and mixed use residential development. An Integrated Resource Model and Carbon Footprint study prepared for the Project (ARUP, 7/22/2009, Figure 3) documents the potential for 38 percent reduction in total energy use compared to existing conditions. The VMT study prepared by LSC Transportation Consultants (February 2023) documents a net reduction in annual average Tahoe Basin daily VMT of 2,234 compared to the Baseline Biltmore (existing) condition.



### 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Alterations to the course or flow of 100-yearflood waters?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occurrence or seiches?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. The potential discharge of contaminants to the groundwater or any alteration of groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Is the project located within 600 feet of a drinking water source?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Discussion

Impacts to water quality that may result from construction and the introduction of permanent facilities are discussed in the EIS. The impacts that may result to hydrology and water quality involve the creation of storm



**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](http://www.trpa.gov)

water runoff from impervious surfaces associated with the Project and the excavation and fill to prepare the site for redevelopment. There are no active stream channels identified within the project area that will be impacted as a result of project construction or implementation. The Project area is not associated with flooding hazards, nor would it create flood conditions off-site. Effectiveness of proposed Best Management Practices (BMPs) on water quality are addressed. BMPs, standard practices incorporated into the Project, and recommended mitigation measures are proposed to address the potential short- and long-term impacts to hydrology and water quality. The EIS addresses the need for long-term water quality monitoring to ensure treatment levels are met and maintained.

Proposed storm water management consists of collection systems, infiltration and detention basins, drop inlets, pre-treatment vaults, underground infiltration vaults and underground piping to intercept runoff generated in the project area. The Project will treat runoff from the 50-year, one-hour storm event on-site, exceeding the standards required by TRPA Code. In addition one additional off-site water quality project will be constructed in conjunction with EIP No. 732 and will also be designed to the 50-year, one-hour storm event (California Stateline Road parcel). This off-site water quality treatment project was completed in 2014.

The Boulder Bay project proposes the use of a network of interrelated storm water conveyance and TMDL treatment strategies appropriate for urban infill regions. These strategies fall into four distinct categories and are designed to reduce annual run-off of total sediment, fine sediment, nitrogen and phosphorus. The TMDL treatment strategies are described below.

1. Pollutant Source Control (PSC): Reduce impervious coverage, improved roadways, stabilized eroding slopes and snow melted roadways.
2. Hydrologic Source Control (HSC): underground storm water infiltration, pervious pavement, roof storm water catchment systems and planted roofs.
3. Storm water Treatment (SWT): planted bio-retention systems in-line with storm water conveyance.
4. Airborne Source Control (ASC): regenerative air street sweeper, underground parking and alternative and public transportation program.

The Plan Revision would also exceed TRPA Code requirements for stormwater capture and treatment (NCE, Overall BMP Plan, Sheet C3.0). The system designed for the Plan Revision includes three components: CDS Hydrodynamic Separator, Stormwater Management StormFilter and Corrugated Metal Pipe (CMP) Stormwater Detention and Infiltration. Two detention locations are proposed to capture and treat stormwater and shown on sheet C3.0. One is located below building F (hotel) just above building H and captures runoff from zone 1. The other is located below building F (hotel) just above building G and captures runoff from zone 2. Both locations are in close proximity to each other and provide easy access for maintenance equipment within the pedestrian/emergency vehicle corridor.

The CDS Hydrodynamic Separator is first in line and captures debris, sediment and hydrocarbons from stormwater runoff and is sized for the 50 year, 1 hour storm event. The Stormwater Management StormFilter, second in line, is comprised of media-filled cartridges that trap particulates and absorb pollutants from stormwater runoff. It is also designed to capture the 50 year, 1 hours storm event. The last stormwater treatment component, the CMP is perforated for captured runoff to infiltrate the soil and is sized to detain the 100 year, 1 hour storm event. According to NCE application materials, the proposed system uses better technology and a higher level of water quality treatment than the system included in the approved Project and studied in the EIS.

CDS utilizes water velocity to create a swirling vortex to trap floatables and solids in the center that's larger than the screen aperture. StormFilter utilizes rechargeable, media-filled cartridges. The media is field and laboratory performance verified by the most stringent stormwater technology evaluation organizations. CDS is used to meet



Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) requirements for stormwater quality control, inlet and outlet pollution control, and as pretreatment for filtration, detention/infiltration, rainwater harvesting systems, and Low Impact Development (LID) designs. StormFilter is used to trap particulates and adsorb pollutants such as total suspended solids, hydrocarbons, nutrients, metals and other common pollutants. Finally, CMP is perforated to infiltrate the soil to treat captured stormwater runoff naturally. In total, the Plan Revision includes a system that meets or exceeds the stormwater plan included in the approved 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat, either through direct removal or indirect lowering of the groundwater table?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Introduction of new vegetation that will require excessive fertilizer or water, or will provide a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare, or endangered species of plants?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Removal of stream bank and/or backshore vegetation, including woody vegetation such as willows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. A change in the natural functioning of an old growth ecosystem?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

The Project will result in minimal impacts to vegetation due to the existing developed nature of the project area. The EIS evaluates the potential direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the Project on: 1) existing vegetation





communities; 2) common and ecologically significant vegetation; and 3) special-status plant species, including TRPA Special Interest Species. No significant impacts were identified that required application of mitigation measures.

The Project Revision would not alter the conclusions of the EIS, nor require any additional protections.

## 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

The Project will result in minimal impacts to wildlife due to the existing developed nature of the project area. The EIS evaluates the potential direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the Project on: 1) existing wildlife habitats, and aquatic resources; 2) common and ecologically significant wildlife and aquatic resources; and 3) special-status wildlife and aquatic species, including TRPA Special Interest Species. The relationship of Project effects to TRPA thresholds for wildlife and fisheries is also evaluated. With the exception of potential harm to nesting bird species, no significant impacts were identified that required application of mitigation measures. Mitigation measure BIO-3 Active Raptor and Migratory Bird Nest Protection is included in the EIS to ensure nesting birds are not harmed during construction.

The Project Revision would not alter the conclusions of the EIS, nor require any additional protections.





## 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Single event noise levels greater than those set forth in the TRPA Noise Environmental Threshold?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The placement of residential or tourist accommodation uses in areas where the existing CNEL exceeds 60 dBA or is otherwise incompatible?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The placement of uses that would generate an incompatible noise level in close proximity to existing residential or tourist accommodation uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Exposure of existing structures to levels of ground vibration that could result in structural damage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

Short-term (e.g., construction) and long-term (e.g., traffic and building equipment) noise impacts, relative to sensitive receptors and their potential exposure are assessed and compared with current TRPA, Washoe County and Federal noise standards in the EIS. Noise levels and vibration of specific construction equipment are determined and resultant noise levels at nearby receptors (at given distances from the source) are calculated. Standard practices to reduce and regulate noise impacts are incorporated into the Project's mitigation and monitoring program. Mitigation measures (NOISE-1) call for use of alternative pavement options on Stateline Road to lower noise levels from increases in traffic on that roadway. Mitigation measures NOISE-3A (Time of Day Construction Restrictions and Noise Barriers), NOISE-3B (Equipment Location Guidance) and NOISE-3C (Noise Complaint Coordination and Response) address short-term construction noise. Mitigation measures NOISE-5A (Mechanical Equipment Noise Level Specifications and Sound Control) and NOISE-5B (Loading Dock and Truck Circulation Design) address consistency with noise standards contained in the North Stateline Community Plan.

The Project Revision would not alter the conclusions of the EIS, nor require any additional protections.



## 7. Light and Glare

### Will the proposal:

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Include new or modified sources of exterior lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create new illumination which is more substantial than other lighting, if any, within the surrounding area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Cause light from exterior sources to be cast off -site or onto public lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create new sources of glare through the siting of the improvements or through the use of reflective materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

The EIS disclosed that the Project would use high efficiency, low reflective windows to reduce glare onsite. In addition, landscaping trees and architectural elements such as balconies, overhangs and shutters would reduce the overall presence and glare caused by windows. To reduce the potential for increased glare, the Project utilizes setbacks and variations in the upper floor plan of most buildings, as well as overhangs and other architectural details to reduce reflectivity.

Lighting fixtures will add glare and affect night time views in the area. Although lighting currently exists on the site, the amount of lighting will increase under the Project. Lighting will be located on the structures for safety and will be located at building entrance and exit locations, along the vehicle circulation routes, at parking lot entrances and within the pedestrian village. The increased number of units and facilities will increase the amount of light emitted within the project area. The project complies with existing County and TRPA ordinances to avoid impact to offsite properties from new light fixtures included on proposed structures.

Use of multistory landscaping, particularly tall trees and the preservation of tall trees on site will help to reduce the offsite impacts of increased night lighting. While light sources will increase within the project area under the Project, the potential effects of increased night lighting will be sufficiently reduced by complying with TRPA exterior lighting standards and design guidelines and other Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan policies.

The Project Revision would not alter the conclusions of the EIS, nor require any additional protections.

## 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



- b. Expand or intensify an existing non-conforming use?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

### Discussion

Land use impacts include changes to onsite uses, land use compatibility, and community character. Land use compatibility issues with the surrounding neighborhood are studied in the EIS. The EIS addresses the Project's consistency with TRPA (e.g., Code of Ordinances, Goals and Policies, Community Plans, and Community Enhancement Program Guidelines adopted by the TRPA Governing Board) and Washoe County planning guidelines and concludes that no significant impacts would result.

The Project Revision would not alter the conclusions of the EIS, nor require any additional protections.

## 9. Natural Resources

### Will the proposal result in:

- a. A substantial increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?

Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- b. Substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resource?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

### Discussion

No natural resources impacts were identified in the EIS and the Project Revisions do not change the findings.

## 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 mitigation	Data insufficient
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- b. Involve possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

### Discussion

With site redevelopment the Project will reduce, but cannot completely eliminate, the adverse effects that could result from a significant seismic event. Even with facility upgrades, there could be future structural failures in the event of seismic activity. Wildfire is also an existing threat to any development within the Lake Tahoe region. In the event of emergency conditions, personnel and visitors will need to be evacuated from the project area and possibly the Lake Tahoe Basin. Mitigation in the form of an emergency response plan (GEO-2B Emergency Response Plan) is included in the EIS to reduce the impact to a level of less than significant.



The Project Revision would not alter the conclusions of the EIS, nor require any additional protections.

## 11. Population

### Will the proposal:

- |  | Yes                      | No                                  | No, with<br>mitigation   | Data<br>insufficient     |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Include or result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents?                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### Discussion

No population impacts were identified in the EIS and the Project Revisions do not change the findings.

## 12. Housing

### Will the proposal:

- |   | Yes                      | No                                  | No, with<br>mitigation   | Data<br>insufficient     |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
| <i>To determine if the proposal will affect existing housing or create a demand for additional housing, please answer the following questions:</i>                          |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
| 1. Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### Discussion

The approved Project provides a benefit to workforce housing by including a commitment to provide 38 bedrooms of affordable housing. As included in the TRPA permit, the Project will provide a total of 38 bedrooms in affordable housing units. Based on a request from Placer County during the Project approval hearings:

The Project will provide 28 of the workforce housing bedrooms on site in two bedroom units located in buildings G or H. The Project will provide a minimum of 10 bedrooms in off site infill locations within a 10-mile radius of the project site. Boulder Bay will purchase the offsite bedrooms in one and two bedroom configurations located in pre-existing infill housing in the vicinity of the project site. The units may be single family, duplexes and condominiums. Each property will be refurbished to specific quality and sustainability standards developed according to the local jurisdictional requirements.

The Plan Revision provides 14 workforce housing units (2 bedroom units) in Building G and maintains the TRPA permit condition for the approved Project to secure offsite housing units within 10 miles of the project area to provide a minimum of 10 additional bedrooms. The selection of the offsite housing will be coordinated with Placer



County Community Development Department staff, and will be refurbished and deed restricted as affordable housing.

### 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, including highway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Discussion

The EIS analysis discusses potential transportation benefits (e.g., trip reduction, improvements to traffic flow along State Route 28, improvements to pedestrian and bicycle facilities) that may result from project implementation as well as potential impacts. A new traffic study (LSC, March 23, 2023) has been prepared to compare the Plan Revision to the existing conditions defined in the EIS. Construction of the Project will generate short-term, construction-related traffic. Long-term traffic generated by the Project is analyzed because of changes to the current density and mix of uses at the project area (e.g., replacement of gaming area with additional residential and TAU development). The transportation analysis includes identification of major roadways and intersections that may be affected by the Project, traffic volumes on those roadways, and potential neighborhood effects from abandonment of public roadway right of way within the project area. Because of changes to the existing roadway network, the effects on local circulation patterns are discussed in the EIS. In addition, the analysis discusses the project's ability to meet the generated parking demand and the adequacy of the onsite parking supply.

As documented in the EIS, when compared to the existing approved uses (No Project Alternative) within the project area (using trip rates to model operations), the approved Project would reduce daily project trip generation by approximately 2,352 trips and VMT by approximately 9,955. When compared to traffic counts collected in 2008 during a recession, the reduction in trips is less (approximately 348 trips). The Project's VMT reduction exceeds the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan goal of no more than a 1,150 increase in VMT for redevelopment projects. The Project will decrease vehicle trips and VMT primarily due to the proposed reduction in gaming floor area and a greater mix of onsite land uses. The Project includes an Alternative Transportation Plan, including transit shelters, a bus and shuttle turnout, financial subsidies to increase public transit service to the site, employee shuttle services, car- and bike-share services onsite, a shuttle for guests, and other alternative transit amenities.



**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

Parking requirements were analyzed in the EIS transportation study to determine adequate parking for the proposed land uses. The approved Project includes the Crystal Bay Motel and Overflow parking lot property in the project area as modified for the proposed BMP retrofits, TAU relocation and site restoration plan.

In an effort to increase the incentives to utilize public transportation and eliminate passenger vehicle trips, the Project agreed to reduce the proposed parking to equal the Fehr & Peers Transportation Study minimum parking demand calculation of 460 spaces. The Plan Revision proposes 413 total spaces.

The Plan Revision moves the primary entrance to the Project from SR 28 to Lakeview Avenue by way of Stateline Avenue. In addition, the Project's internal driveway (Boulder Way) has been eliminated to expand the public plaza (provide more gathering space) in the middle of the development and adds a guest arrival area between Buildings D (hotel) and E (casino). The Plan Revision would reduce development compared to the existing condition by eliminating 199 of the approved hotel units and adding only 20 more residential condos (42 when counting the lock offs) to the 59 previously approved. The reduction in total number of hotel and residential units would reduce Project related daily vehicle trips and VMT when compared to existing conditions. At the site access points, the Plan Revision would result in a net reduction of 537 daily one-way vehicle-trips (or a 13-percent reduction) over the Baseline Biltmore use (LSC, 3/23/23, Table 3). LSC Transportation Consultants (February 2023) also documents that the Plan Revision would reduce VMT by 2,234 compared to the baseline conditions for the existing Biltmore site, and up to 4,497 when compared to the approved Project studied in the EIS (Table 7).

## 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks or other recreational facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

The EIS evaluated impacts on power, water treatment and distribution, wastewater collection, solid waste collection and disposal, law enforcement services, fire protection services, schools, and communications. A discussion of emergency evacuation is also included in this section. Mitigation measures are included in Public



Services and Utilities section (PSU-1A, 1B, 1C, and 1D and PSU-3A, 3B) to ensure that the Project coordinates with service providers during final project design, construction and special events to ensure public safety.

The Project Revision would not alter the conclusions of the EIS, nor require any additional protections.

## 15. Energy

**Will the proposal result in:**

	Yes	No	No, with mitigation	Data insufficient
a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion:

No energy impacts were identified in the EIS and the Project Revisions do not change the findings. An Integrated Resource Model and Carbon Footprint study prepared for the Project (ARUP, 7/22/2009, Figure 3) documents the potential for 38 percent reduction in total energy use compared to existing conditions.

## 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Communication systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Utilize additional water which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the service provider?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Utilize additional sewage treatment capacity which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the sewage treatment provider?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Solid waste and disposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion





The EIS evaluated impacts on power, water treatment and distribution, wastewater collection, solid waste collection and disposal, law enforcement services, fire protection services, schools, and communications. A discussion of emergency evacuation is also included in this section. Mitigation measures are included in Public Services and Utilities section (PSU-1A, 1B, 1C, and 1D and PSU-3A, 3B) to ensure that the Project coordinates with utility providers during final project design and construction to ensure provision of adequate services.

The Project Revision would not alter the conclusions of the EIS, nor require any additional protections.

## 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

No human health impacts were identified in the EIS and the Project Revisions do not change the findings.

## 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Be visible from any public recreation area or TRPA designated bicycle trail?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Block or modify an existing view of Lake Tahoe or other scenic vista seen from a public road or other public area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be inconsistent with the height and design standards required by the applicable ordinance, Community Plan, or Area Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Be inconsistent with the TRPA Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) or Design Review Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**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](http://www.trpa.gov)

---

**Discussion**

The impacts from the proposed Height Amendment and construction of the Project are evaluated in the EIS through the use of site visits and photographs from sensitive viewpoints on and near the project area and the review of visual simulations. Viewpoint locations were selected to include scenic travel routes from SR 28 and Lake Tahoe. The project area is located in Roadway Unit 20D (North Stateline Casino Core) and Shoreline Units 22 (Brockway) and 23 (Crystal Bay). The TRPA's latest Threshold Evaluation Report continues to identify Roadway Unit 20D as non-attainment and "at risk" for additional degradation as a result of the introduction of new structures. Both Shoreline Units 22 and 23 are currently listed as out of attainment.

The effects analysis considers the relationship of the Project's building massing, height and design to TRPA scenic ordinances and thresholds and Design Guidelines from the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan. The evaluation addressed the proposed height amendment and the associated impacts on density and neighborhood character.

The height of the Tahoe Biltmore (76 ft) as measured by current TRPA standards is legally existing but not consistent with Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan Standards or TRPA Code. Visual simulations were completed from TRPA designated scenic resource locations and indicate that the project would improve travel route ratings along SR 28 and maintain travel route ratings from the Lake Tahoe shoreline. The Boulder Bay Permit issued by TRPA in 2011 (Section 5.F) includes a requirement to complete a balloon study to confirm the accuracy of the scenic simulations used in the EIS analysis. 3dFX Design and Hauge Brueck Associates completed the balloon study and published the results on January 3, 2023. The balloon study was completed for three viewpoints used in the EIS analysis. In each case, the balloon lines up closely to the roofline of the subject building in the corresponding photo-simulation. As such, the balloon study confirms the accuracy of the maximum building heights depicted in the photo-simulations prepared for the project EIS (2011) and subsequent Plan Revision application (2022).

TRPA recognize the need to allow additional height to achieve the goals in the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan and the CEP. This is achieved by varying setbacks, creating a variety of roof pitches and creating building articulation. Proposed building heights do not exceed the height of the existing Tahoe Biltmore and require SR 28 setbacks of at least 180 feet for the tallest structures. Buildings have been designed to stairstep up the hill as viewed from SR 28 (e.g., only two and three story buildings are placed along the SR 28 frontage near the existing Biltmore) to reduce visible impact.

The Project is subject to TRPA design standards for building materials and colors to help reduce the visual impact from new structures. The Project includes neighborhood buffers on SR 28, Lakeview Avenue, and Wassou Road through setbacks and deed restricted open space, increases building set backs along SR 28, and includes the removal of the existing surface parking lots west of SR 28 and the Crystal Bay Motel east of SR 28. In addition by removing non conforming signage and relocating non-conforming building heights through the use of building setbacks, a higher degree of visual enhancement is achieved.

Under the Plan Revision the configuration of the new buildings remains substantially the same but there are slight changes to footprint size, building height, placement and architectural design. According to the HBA Scenic Analysis Report, dated Oct. 14, 2022, the revised Project structures are nevertheless consistent with building design, location and massing analyzed in the 2009 DEIS. With protection of certain existing trees and additional vegetative screening of Building A as viewed from southbound SR 28, the proposed Plan Revision does not result in new scenic quality impacts to Roadway Unit 20D or require modifications to the existing mitigation measures included in the EIS. The scenic quality threshold improvement scores identified in the 2009 DEIS (Table 4.5-6) should also be realized with the Plan Revision.



## 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create additional recreation capacity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Have the potential to create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway, or public lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

Construction and operation of the Project will have limited impacts to existing public access and recreational uses adjacent to the project area and in the project vicinity. The Project includes a public park and open space area and the potential for a connection to existing and proposed recreational trails adjacent to the project area. The EIS evaluated changes to existing recreation areas and uses, recreation area capacity and user experience as a result of project implementation.

The approved Project includes bike lanes along its frontage on SR 28 through Crystal Bay. The Project will also provide an easement through the Project area for the future shared use trail proposed for the SR 28 corridor. The Project includes an easement for the Nevada Stateline to Stateline multi-use trail through the project area, including an easement through the northern portion of the project area near Building A for the trails eventual construction, and use of the Boulder Bay transportation route through the pedestrian village to connect to Stateline Road and SR 28.

The approved Project includes 5.7 acres of deed restricted public open space, including 1.87 acres of public parks within the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan area. The Project will construct and maintain two parks totaling 1.87 acres. The larger park (1.49 acres) on the northern end of the project area includes seating areas, footpaths, historical interpretive kiosks, and lake vistas and will be developed and maintained by Boulder Bay. The Stateline mini-park (0.38 acre) will be vegetated with native grasses and trees and will include a low stone monument celebrating both states, seating areas, NV, CA and USA flags and several kiosks with educational information on the stormwater function of the park site.

During TRPA Hearings on the EIS, the Project agreed to mitigation measures to reduce impacts to Speedboat Beach. The measures state that the Project shall not provide guests with van service to Speedboat Beach. Although access to Speedboat Beach cannot be restricted, as it is a public beach, the resort shall not promote the use of Speedboat Beach in informational materials or provide shuttle service to the beach to avoid overcrowding and environmental degradation that may result from overuse.

The Project Revision would not alter the conclusions of the EIS, nor require any additional protections.



## 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Is the property associated with any historically significant events and/or sites or persons?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Will the proposal restrict historic or pre-historic religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

The Project is located entirely on developed land. The cultural and historical report prepared for the Project identifies certain existing structures as eligible for listing on the National Historic Register. The potential for disturbance of known and/or undiscovered cultural or historic resources due to project implementation are addressed. In addition, the evaluation methodology included consultation with the Washoe Tribe and the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office (NVSHPO) and evaluation of potentially significant resources in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Mitigation measure CUL-1A Prepare Resource Protection Plan to Preserve Historically Eligible Signs and Document History of the Biltmore Resort is included in the EIS to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

The Project Revision would not alter the conclusions of the EIS, nor require any additional protections.



**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

## 21. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human being, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion



**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](http://www.trpa.gov)

**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:

<b>Paul Nielsen</b> <small>Digitally signed by Paul Nielsen DN: cn=Paul Nielsen, o=Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, ou, email=pnielsen@trpa.gov, c=US Date: 2023.04.17 12:33:20 -0700</small>	at <b>Douglas</b>	<b>4.17.23</b>
Person preparing application	County	Date

**Applicant Written Comments:** (Attach additional sheets if necessary)



**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](http://www.trpa.gov)

---

## 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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Evaluator

Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title of Evaluator