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: Barton Hospital Nevada Campus

Project Assessor's Parcel Number (APN): 1318-22-002-114, 115 and 116

Project Address: 168 US Highway 50

County/City: Douglas

Project Description: Enclosed.

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:

1a. This will be addressed in the EA using the land capability verification and land coverage verification files from TRPA database.
1d. This will be addressed in the EA once the project description/site design is finalized and grading plans are available.

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:

2a and 2b. Air pollutant emissions will be modeled for analysis in the EA using tools available for the state of California (CALEEMOD).

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:

3b. This will be addressed in the EA through study of the proposed stormwater system.
3f and 3g. This will be addressed in the EA once the project description/site design is finalized and grading plans are available.

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:

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:

4d. This will be addressed in the EA through study of adjacent wildlife habitat, such as Rabe meadow.

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:

6a, 6b, 6c, 6e and 6f. These questions will be addressed in the EA with study of noise from hospital operations (including ambulance and care flight helicopter traffic) and construction (vibration).

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:

7a, 7b, 7c and 7d. This will be addressed in the EA once the project description/site design is finalized and exterior building and lighting plans are available.

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:

8a. Hospital facilities for the project site currently require special use findings and a South Shore Area Plan amendment is proposed as part of the project description to make such uses permissible by right.

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:

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:

10b. To be studied in the EA. The hospital may be able to serve as a shelter in place location during emergency conditions.

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:

11a. This will be addressed through socioeconomic analysis within the EA.

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:

12b. There are no direct effects to housing for the Project. Potential indirect effects to nearby housing/neighborhood (e.g., from new employment as part of the Project) will be addressed through socioeconomic analysis within the EA.

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:

13a. To be evaluated in the EA. Compared to previous land use (casino and hotel), the Project may reduce trip generation and VMT.
13b. To be evaluated in the EA. New parking is proposed for the hospital and will be evaluated against calculated parking demand.
13d. Relocation of hospital land uses from California to Nevada will be studied as part of the traffic and circulation analysis in the EA.

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:

14a and 14b. Service levels for fire (and equipment needs) and police services will be evaluated in the EA.

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:

15a and 15b. This will be studied in the EA, recognizing the plan to relocate existing hospital facilities from California to Nevada.

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:

16. This will be analyzed in the EA, including coordination with local utility providers at both the California relocation site and proposed Nevada site.

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:

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:

18a, 18b, 18d and 18e. These questions will be addressed in the scenic quality evaluation report, including modeling and preparation of detailed photographic simulations of the proposed hopsital facilities from scenic threshold viewpoint (roadways and other public areas) locations.

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:

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:

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:

a. Although no biological or cultural resources are present on the project site, impacts to water and air quality will be addressed in the EA analysis.
b. The EA will study whether the relocation of the hospital from California to Nevada may achieve short-term goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
c. The EA will study whether the project may result in cumulative (or indirect) impacts related to the relocation of hospital facilities from California to Nevada.
d. The EA will study whether the project may result in adverse effects to humans.

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:

at

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

Barton Hospital Nevada Campus Project Description

Barton Health (Barton) proposes to construct a new, state of the art, full-service hospital on the 6.67-acre site of the former Lakeside Inn & Casino, 168 US Highway 50, Stateline, Nevada. The Project is located within the Kingsbury Town Center of the Douglas County South Shore Area Plan (SSAP). The Project will enable Barton to defer demolition of the existing hospital located at 2170 South Avenue, South Lake Tahoe, California, ("CA Campus") built in 1963 until the new hospital is operational, thereby avoiding a multi-year interruption of full-service healthcare to the South Shore and surrounding communities.

The Project is located across US Highway 50 from Barton's existing Nevada campus located at 145-165 US Highway 50 which consists of approximately 20,000 square feet, providing primary care, urgent care, imaging, physical therapy, occupational therapy, orthopedics and laboratory services. In-patient hospital service will be relocated from the CA Campus to the Project. The new hospital will include:

- 60 Private Patient Rooms
- 28 Inpatient hospital rooms
- Intensive Care Unit with 5 beds
- Obstetrics / Labor & Delivery with 5 labor/delivery/recovery/postpartum (LDRP) rooms
- Level III Trauma Center with 20 beds
- Surgery Department with 7 Operating Rooms and surgical short stay rooms
- Imaging Center (MRI, CT, X-Ray, Mammo, Ultrasound, Dexa)
- Gastroenterology
- Comprehensive Cancer Center
- Heart and Vascular services
- 22 Skilled Nursing / Long Term Care Beds
- Laboratory
- Pharmacy
- Cafeteria
- 1,800 sf Café
- Central Utility Plant
- Receiving and Central Supply
- Administration

EXISTING CONDITION

The Project replaces the Lakeside Inn & Casino, and 3 commercial buildings located on Kahle Drive ("Prior Uses"). The Prior Uses were built in the early 1960's and included 2 levels of basement facilities at excavation depths exceeding 15' that intercepted, rerouted and discharged groundwater for over 60 years. The Prior Uses structures were set back from US Highway 50 between 26 and 50 feet and contained approximately 400 surface parking spaces. None of the Prior Uses obtained TRPA Best Management Practices certificates of compliance. Prior Uses building heights along the US Highway 50 travel route measured up to 63 feet. Prior Uses structures, including subsurface structures that intercepted and daylighted groundwater for over 60 years, have been demolished, asbestos hazardous materials have been abated, PCE contamination has been successfully remediated and closed, and the Prior Uses parcels have been regraded pursuant to an interim TRPA BMP permit. A 0.87-acre of land (APN 1318-22-002-117) previously occupied by a portion of the Prior Uses has been restored to a natural state and will not be redeveloped with the Project.

PROPOSED CONDITION

On March 15, 2024, the State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services issued a Letter of Approval to Barton for a Hospital Replacement Project, a Certificate of Need ("CON"), consistent with the Project. Upon completion of the Project, the CA campus facilities will be renovated to better serve the more than 90 percent of patient visits that are outpatient. Urgent care, primary care, specialty and ancillary services such as laboratory, imaging and rehabilitation will continue without interruption, including operation of the Robert Maloff Center for Orthopedics and Wellness, as well as the Barton Community Health Center, providing comprehensive medical services to underserved populations (Medi-Cal and uninsured patients).

Proposed amendments to the SSAP to facilitate the Project include the creation of a Healthcare (HC) Subdistrict overlay within the Kingsbury Town Center to encourage consolidation of a new hospital and other healthcare services and facilities in a centralized location served by a major roadway and public transit. The HC Subdistrict will comprise approximately 11.65 acres of land to include APNs 1318-22-002-114, 115 and 116 and 1318-23-401-007, 036, 042, 043 and 044. Existing Barton healthcare services already play a dominant role in this area, and the expansion of healthcare facilities in the Healthcare (HC) Subdistrict will increase access to healthcare services in the Region. Hospitals and other compatible healthcare uses such as nursing and personal care, residential care and day care centers will be allowed uses, instead of special uses, within the HC Subdistrict. Additional height up to 80 feet within the HC Subdistrict, limited to hospital uses on the properties on the west side of Highway 50, will reduce the amount of land coverage required for the Project and avoid interception of groundwater. (An amendment to Table 13.5.3-1 in Chapter 13: Area Plans of the TRPA Code of Ordinances is also required to allow additional height in the Kingsbury Town Center.)

The Project consists of an approximately 230,000 square-foot hospital building, at a maximum height of 80 feet for the central five story section, that includes one level of below grade parking. Four stories will be visible from US Highway 50. The bottom level and four stories above will be visible from Laura Drive and the Laura Drive/Kahle Drive intersection. A total of 255 parking spaces consists of 170 surface parking spaces and 85 below grade parking spaces. The Project includes a pedestrian overpass across US Highway 50, safely connecting the existing Nevada Campus on the east side of US Highway 50 to the Project. Pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle access will occur via the US Highway 50 frontage, with emergency room walk in, ambulance ingress/egress and service vehicles via Kahle Drive. No access is proposed from Laura Drive. Energy conservation and efficiency measures will be incorporated throughout the building including an onsite central utility plant (CUP).

The new hospital design features sloped roofs, natural stone, wood elements, a healing design maximizing natural light, generous public spaces, landscaped streetscapes and pedestrian circulation, resulting in a signature northern gateway to the urban core and Kingsbury Town Center. The Project will be compliant with IBC seismic requirements constructed of non-combustible materials.

Landscaped outdoor spaces surrounding the Project provide for public assembly, wellness, passive recreation, and pedestrian circulation. The landscaped walkways total approximately 2,760 linear feet, and 28,800 sq. ft. In addition to removing approximately 400 surface parking

spaces which will eliminate the transport of contaminants of concern, the Project will incorporate state of the art storm water treatment as well as low impact development technologies. Significant reductions in sediment loading will occur. After pre-treatment, storm water will be conveyed to the existing Kahle Drive regional storm water treatment system. A landscaped parkway consisting of approximately 52,000 sq. ft. will be constructed along Laura Drive, with building setbacks ranging from 28 to 75 feet. The Project will reduce legally existing land coverage by over an acre.

The Project will contain a Level III Trauma Center, in place of the Level III Trauma Center located at the California Campus. A helipad will be located near the northern side of the Project above the Emergency Room, at a height of approximately 43 feet. Care flight/lifesaving transport is anticipated to occur at the same frequency experienced at the California Campus, approximately 10-12 flights per month on average.

The Project is forecast to reduce baseline vehicle trips by 57 percent and baseline vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, by 59 percent. The Project will provide alternatives for cancer patients traveling to and from Truckee and the Carson Valley for oncology therapies as well as cardiology patients requiring services not now locally available. In addition, Barton will initiate a vanpool option for the more than 100 hundred employees living in the Carson Valley.