TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

July 26, 1978 10:00 a.m.
July 27, 1978 9:00 a.m.

REvised Agenda

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

V. BOARD DETERMINATION

City of South Lake Tahoe Request for Litigation by TRPA Against CTRPA

VI. PUBLIC HEARING

A. General Plan Amendment - Park Cattle Company, Douglas County
   1.84 Acres containing 200 feet of frontage on the west side of U.S. Highway 50,
   having a depth of 400 feet, and abutting the loop road right-of-way to the
   south, from Recreation to General Commercial

B. General Plan Amendment - Park Cattle Company, Douglas County
   1.69 Acres containing 120 feet of frontage on the west side of U.S. Highway
   50, having a depth of 610 feet, and abutting the Sahara Tahoe Hotel property
   to the north, from Recreation to Tourist Commercial

VII. AGENCY REVIEW

A. Park Tahoe Hotel-Casino, Administrative Permit for Modification of Approved
   Parking Plan, Douglas County, Continued from June, 1978 TRPA Meeting

B. Stillwater Cove, Tentative Map for 47 Condominium Units, Washoe County

C. Kingsbury Square, Administrative Permit for Modification of Condition of
   Approval to Permit Three Drive-Through Bank Windows, Douglas County

D. Chimney Rock Estates, Tentative Map for 23 Lots, Douglas County

E. Incline Village General Improvement District, Administrative Permit for
   Ski Lift Replacement at Ski Incline, Washoe County

F. Heavenly Valley, Administrative Permit for Ski Lift Replacement,
   El Dorado County
VIII REPORTS

A. Environmental Protection Agency Update on Stream Environment Zone Sampling Program

B. Status of the Non-Attainment Air Quality Plan

C. Status of the 208 Water Quality Management Plan

D. Insurance for Governing Body Members

E. Public Interest Comments

F. Appeals of Staff Decisions

G. Executive Session

H. Business Manager Report

I. Executive Director Report on Administrative Matters

J. Legal Counsel Report

K. Governing Body Members

IX PLANNING MATTERS – 9:00 a.m., July 27

General Plan Update

X ORDINANCES

First Reading of Ordinance Amending the Regional Plan for 4 Acres, More or Less, Classified High Density Residential and General Commercial, Douglas County

XI PENDING MATTERS

XII RESOLUTIONS

XIII OTHER BUSINESS

XIV ADJOURNMENT
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BODY MEETING - JULY 26, 27, 1978

CONSENT CALENDAR

ITEM

A. Clearinghouse

Washoe County Public Works Department,
Clean Lakes Grant Approval

Support

B. Public Works

1. Caltrans, Left Turn Lane in Tahoe City, Placer County

Approval

2. El Dorado County, Left Turn Pockets on Pioneer Trail

Approval

3. Sierra Pacific Power Company, Conduit at Tahoe
   City Dam, Placer County

Approval

4. Nevada Highway Department, State Route 27
   (Mt. Rose) Modifications, Washoe County

Approval

5. Douglas County Public Works Department,
   Minor Modifications of Loop Road Golf Course Access

Approval

C. Agency Review

1. C. Lingenfelter, Variance to Grade in Stream
   Environment Zone, Lot 108, Country Club Drive,
   Washoe County

Approval

2. Taylor/Pollack, Variance to Grade in Stream
   Environment Zone, Northwood Professional
   Center, Washoe County

Approval
Clearinghouse
Lake Tahoe Clean Lakes Sediment and Nutrient Control Project at Incline Village
Washoe County, Nevada

Summary

This Clean Lakes Grant application is being submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for potential funding of a demonstration project which will implement control of sediment and nutrient loads into Lake Tahoe through a slope stabilization project. The report states that the control measures to be implemented are as defined in the TRPA 208 Handbook of Best Management Practices and that this demonstration will be a pilot project of the TRPA Water Quality Management (208) Program.

Clean Lakes grant monies are a 50% match between EPA and the local entity. Washoe County has allocated $200,000 for their match, making a total project value of $400,000.

This proposal is strictly for mechanical slope stabilization on oversteepened slopes by the use of rock-type toe walls. Slope stabilization on oversteepened slopes requires installation of toe walls which will then allow the soils to sough behind the walls, hopefully bringing the embankment to a 2:1 slope (the natural angle of response) which then allows for successful revegetation. The project's retaining walls will be modeled after the 208 BMP native rock and gabion retaining walls.

The exact location of work is not specified nor is approximate amount of footage which can be undertaken based on the available funds. No revegetation is included in the proposal.

The proposal predicts that the revegetation will be undertaken by additional monies budgeted by Washoe County, Resource Conservation Funds, other possible public grant programs or with the help of the Washoe County SWEEP (Solid Waste Elimination and Environmental Preservation) which utilizes CETA people.

Water Quality Monitoring to test the reduced sediment yield from installation of the BMP is included in the proposal. However, no specifications are given for location of monitoring (i.e. on-site, stream, lake sampling).

Recommendation

The TRPA supports this proposal as a pilot demonstration of the Water Quality Management (208) Program and Handbook of Best Management Practices (BMP's). The 208 Program as approved by the TRPA Governing Board in January 1978 called for a demonstration project to test and evaluate the effectiveness of the BMP's. Although this project will be strictly mechanical slope stabilization, it will act to test the precise benefit of decreased sediment load from stabilization of eroding slopes.
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However, there are additions to this proposal which we feel will increase the efficiency and value of the demonstration project. These recommendations are listed below.

1. A definite location for the demonstration project should be identified utilizing the 208 Program problem identification and priority mapping. Also, Washoe County Highway Dept. in Incline Village has expressed a desire to have two oversteepened slopes which drain into First Creek stabilized. These are lots 7 and 8 on Sugarpine and lots 2 through 6 on Dale. The Highway Department feels that these two slopes are contributing the heaviest sediment yield judging from the amount of sediment they remove off the site each year. This information should be considered in determining locations. These slopes are shown on the 208 maps as requiring slope stabilization. The Nevada Tahoe Conservation District should also be consulted as they are extremely familiar with the Incline Village erosion problems.

2. Whichever slopes are chosen to be stabilized, the exact extent of linear footage to be undertaken should be designated along with the specific solution design and cost calculations. Cost information is provided in Volume I and II of the 208 Plan.

3. Stabilizing oversteepened slopes requires both the mechanical stabilization along with revegetation. This program is strictly mechanical. It is not certain how the revegetation program will be carried out. Since there is an uncertainty of available funding for revegetation from other sources, revegetation should be included as a part of this proposal and grant request. The experience of U.S. Soil Conservation Service should also be utilized to provide for the most successful revegetation effort.

4. The Washoe County SWEEP program has revegetated approximately 40,000 linear feet of previously eroding slope throughout Incline Village and are continuing this effort throughout the summer of 1978. This was primarily done on slopes already at 2:1 and where revegetation could be successful without mechanical stabilization as funds were not available for the necessary equipment and supplies. This program has been extremely successful. A few of the steeper slopes which SWEEP undertook did not revegetate due to the continuous erosion and need for mechanical stabilization. For this reason we would recommend coordination with the SWEEP project as SWEEP could provide input from their experience and recommend slopes that they feel are most in need of stabilization.
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MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 18, 1978

TO: Governing Board

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT Caltrans, Left Turn Lane, Tahoe City
      El Dorado County, Left Turn Pockets, Pioneer Trail
      Sierra Pacific Power Company, Conduit at Tahoe City Dam

The above referenced projects have been reviewed and recommended for approval by staff. These projects are all California projects and require CTRPA review. All three of these projects are scheduled for CTRPA review in August or September and under normal circumstances TRPA review would not be conducted until approval is secured from CTRPA. All three projects are intending to go to construction this year, however, and staff is concerned that withholding of TRPA review until approval is secured from CTRPA could jeopardize the ability of the projects to initiate and complete construction during this year.

Our review of the plans indicates that they are in order, and based upon discussion with the applicants and with CTRPA staff, we do not anticipate any major modifications of the projects pursuant to CTRPA review. For this reason we recommend that TRPA approve the projects at this time, subject to the specific conditions set forth in each Summary and Recommendation. The condition requiring TRPA review and approval of final plans provides a vehicle for us to review any modifications which may result from the CTRPA review. It would be staff's intent to bring any significant changes back before the TRPA Governing Board for concurrence.
Public Works  
Caltrans, Left Turn Lane  
Tahoe City

Summary

Caltrans has authorized the Lighthouse Shopping Center in Tahoe City to undertake road improvements along approximately 750 feet of Highway 28 in Tahoe City to provide a left hand turn lane, improve three driveways and remove a fourth, and to relocate an existing portion of the Tahoe City PUD bicycle trail. The improvements are necessary due to extensive turning movements along the stretch of two lane roadway, with a significantly higher than normal accident rate. The proposed improvements would enable turning movements to be accomplished without significant interference with through traffic along the roadway.

At the maximum point the roadway surface would be widened by approximately 30 feet, though approximately eight feet of that total is road-surface to be placed over an existing asphalt bicycle trail. The existing two-way bicycle trail will be replaced by one-way trails at either edge of the road surface (the one-way trails are already existing to the west of the project in the central Tahoe City area).

All of the work will be within the highway right-of-way, with the actual pavement confined to existing disturbed areas with the exception of approximately three feet of width along the northerly edge of the roadway and westerly entrance to the shopping center. At that westerly entrance, an existing bicycle trail bridge will be removed and the roadway extended approximately six feet over an existing stream channel. This will be accomplished by an extension of an existing 48" culvert to a new headwall, with fill being placed behind the headwall. Also in this same area an existing 17' wide entrance into the shopping center is proposed to be widened to 24'.

The applicant proposes revegetation of a large berm between the westerly and central shopping center entrances and revegetation of open areas adjacent to the roadway between the other entry points. An existing entry point at the easterly edge of the shopping center will be blocked off with the existing pavement removed and the area revegetated.

Drainage will be handled through an existing roadside drainage ditch along the upland side of the highway. Along the shopping center side drainage will be channeled to a drop inlet with a two foot deep settling basin, connected via metal pipe to a cobble-lined outfall at the stream channel.

Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the project subject to the following condition:

Final plans for the project shall be submitted for TRPA staff review and approval and shall identify temporary erosion control measures to prevent transport of disturbed material into the stream channel in the event of storm conditions.
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existing paved road - to be removed
Public Works  
Left Turn Pockets, Pioneer Trail  
El Dorado County

Summary

El Dorado County is proposing various roadway improvements to provide left turn channelization at the intersections of Pioneer Trail and High Meadow Trail, Cold Creek Trail, and Black Bart Avenue. Pioneer Trail is only two lanes and these particular intersections have been subjected to increasingly high traffic volumes. All three are major subdivision access points to Pioneer Trail, with the High Meadows Trail also being the access point for Sierra House Elementary School. A significant number of accidents along this stretch of roadway have been attributed to left turn movement conflicts with through traffic. Acceleration and deceleration tapers are also proposed at the intersections to enhance safety for right hand turning movements.

El Dorado County has submitted a soil stabilization and erosion control report indicating application of various practices called for in the TRPA Handbook of Best Management Practices for the control of potential erosion and runoff problems resulting from the projects.

High Meadows Trail Intersection

A standard 12' wide left turn pocket will be provided with a length sufficient to provide 100 feet of vehicle stacking without interfering with through traffic. To accomplish this the road surface will be widened by approximately four feet on either side of the roadway. This will necessitate some cutting and restabilizing of embankments at two points. One of the embankments will be stabilized and revegetated at a two to one slope. The other will be stabilized by means of a rock retaining wall approximately 50 feet in length. Asphaltic concrete dikes are to be provided to channelize runoff to existing drainageways.

Cold Creek and Black Bart Intersections

These two streets intersect Pioneer Trail from opposite sides, but are within 200 feet of one another. This proximity prevents provision of adequate left turn storage for the roads. As a result, the County is proposing to provide 40 feet of storage length for the Cold Creek Trail turn pocket and 65 feet of storage for the adjacent Black Bart Avenue turn pocket.

To provide sufficient width to accommodate the left turn pockets, the roadway in this area is being widened by a maximum of approximately 15 feet, with most of the widening accomplished by modification of the easterly side of Pioneer Trail. This will require the construction of rock retaining walls along either side of Cold Creek Trail at the intersection with Pioneer Trail and the cutting and restabilizing of approximately 250 feet of embankment along Pioneer Trail north of the Cold Creek intersection.
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Cold Creek Trail is the only access point for the adjacent Montgomery Estates Subdivision, which includes approximately 475 lots. As these lots build out additional pressure will be placed on the intersection. For this reason some widening of Cold Creek at the intersection will be undertaken, though right-of-way limitations will prevent attainment of the full 32 foot width necessary to meet the long term needs.

Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the proposed projects, subject to the following conditions:

1. Submission of the final plans for TRPA staff review and approval.

2. Compliance with the temporary and permanent erosion and stabilization measures identified in the soil stabilization and erosion control report submitted with the projects.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
Staff Summary and Recommendation

Sierra Pacific Power Co.
Underground Conduit
Tahoe City

Summary

Sierra Pacific Power Company is proposing to underground approximately 1,000 feet of electrical and cable TV conduit in the Tahoe City area. The undergrounding will extend from a point approximately 200 feet south of the Truckee River outlet to the dam. The conduit will then cross above the water line affixed to the dam structure. From the northerly point of the dam the conduit will then be undergrounded along Macinaw Road to its connection with Highway 28. No disturbance of the lake or river will be required. This is part of a continuing undergrounding program in the Tahoe City area.

Trenching for the underground portions of the project will be four feet deep and three feet wide. Sierra Pacific is proposing immediate removal of excess excavated material and revegetation of the trenches where they cross open space (most of the trenching will be along existing roadways).

Recommendation

Staff recommends support of the proposed project with the following condition:

Final plans for the underground portions of the project shall be submitted for TRPA staff review and approval and shall include temporary erosion control measures such as gravel or straw bale berms along trenching operations sufficient to prevent transport of disturbed material away from the trenching site in the event of storm conditions.
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TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
Staff Summary and Recommendation

Department of Highways
State of Nevada
Mt. Rose Highway - Emergency
   Truck Escape Ramp Modification
Washoe County

Summary

Nevada Department of Highways has requested TRPA review and comment on the Mt. Rose Highway Emergency Truck Escape Ramp extension and modification proposal. This ramp is located on Highway 28 approximately 2 miles before Highway 28 intersects with Highway 27 and is utilized by trucks experiencing brake problems. Recent episodes have proven the ramp to be too short as trucks have gone beyond the 300’ road and collided into trees.

The existing ramp is 300’ long and has an ascending grade of +27.8%. It has a 20’ wide bed with 36” depth of beach sand to decelerate a runaway truck. The proposed escape ramp will be 500’ long with 180’ of -6.2% grade, 120’ of +17% grade and 200’ of +2% grade. The arresting bed will be 19’ wide with 36” depth of special Type 3 Class B gravel. Adjacent and parallel to it will be an asphalt paved 10’ wide section which will be used by tow trucks when pulling trucks out of the arrestor bed.

All disturbed areas will be treated by an acceptable method to preclude the possibility of erosion. There is one backslope which is 3/4:1 and varies to 1¾:1 that will be stabilized with gabions. The 2:1 backslopes will be hydro-seeded and stabilized with light riprap. The 2:1 and flatter fill slopes and the backslopes flatter than 2:1 will be hydro-seeded, covered with a straw mulch blanket and sprayed with a state furnished binder. Asphalt paved ditches and rock ditches will be used to collect runoff waters and convey them to appropriate drainage structures.

Recommendation

The U.S. Soil Conservation Service and TRPA staff reviewed the site and proposed plans on July 14, 1978 and concurred with the necessity of the project and the accompanying erosion and drainage plans. The specifications for the erosion and drainage measures are the same as those utilized for the Mt. Rose Highway project and which have proven successful.

Staff recommends approval of the plans as submitted to TRPA.
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TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
Staff Summary and Recommendation

Public Works
Minor Modification: Loop Road Golf Course Access Point
Douglas County

Summary

Douglas County is seeking TRPA Governing Board concurrence in a modification of the Edgewood Golf Course access point on the Loop Road. The March 23, 1978 TRPA approval of the Douglas County Loop Road included approval of an access point on the outside of the Loop Road to service the Edgewood Golf Course. In the final plans approved by TRPA, pursuant to that Governing Board action, that access point was located at the point of intersection between the Loop Road, the existing golf course access road and the Sahara Tahoe parking lot. This would have created a four-way intersection at that point, with the Loop Road access points for the Sahara parking lot and the golf course opposite one another.

As the construction of the Loop Road has proceeded, this situation has been re-examined by the project engineers and they have concluded that a relocation of the access to a point approximately 300 feet west of the approved location could be accomplished with minimal site disturbance and could avoid the potential traffic conflicts associated with creation of a four-way intersection on the Loop Road.

The revised plans submitted for the relocation of the access point show a net reduction of approximately 150 feet in access road from the golf course, with approximately 300 feet of existing roadway removed and approximately 150 feet of new roadway added to connect with the revised access point. Though the timber stand in the particular area is substantial, the location of the revised access point is adjacent to a relatively clear area. As a result, approximately the same number of trees would be removed for the new access connection as would be required to re-orient the point of intersection of the existing golf course road from its present oblique angle.

The proposed relocation would have the additional advantage of allowing a slight adjustment of the Sahara Tahoe access point to utilize existing paving to the maximum degree. Some additional paving would have been required under the original approval to provide a proper intersection opposite the golf course road.

Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the proposed relocation of the golf course access road and related modification of the Sahara Tahoe parking lot access, as per the plans submitted.
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C. Lingenfelter
Variance to Grade in a Stream
Environment Zone
Section 7.70 of the Grading Ordinance
Washoe County

Summary

The applicant is requesting a variance to grade in a Stream Environment Zone on Lot 108, Country Club Drive, near the corner of Country Club and Driver Way in Incline Village. Along Country Club Drive where this lot is situated a stream has been rock-lined with large boulders and is stabilized with vegetation. This area will have to be crossed for access to the property. On the other side of the stream is a marshy area. Behind the marshy area is a dry, stable area where an old dirt access road is located and where a dwelling unit can be located with little adverse impact.

The TRPA Development Review Committee reviewed this site on July 5, 1978 and found that the stream will need to be bridged in some manner and that the house will need to be situated out of the marsh. There are a large number of lots along Country Club, both above and below Driver Way, which have identical characteristics and the conditions applied on this lot will also need to be applied to these adjoining lots.

Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of this variance to grade in a Stream Environment Zone with the following conditions:

1) The stream will be bridged with a platform so as not to disturb the rock-lined channel and vegetation.

2) The house is to be sited outside of the marsh in the area of the access road and back up against the trees, according to plans submitted to and approved by TRPA.

3) Erosion control measures will be utilized to prevent any runoff from entering the stream zone or marsh area, as shown on the approved plans.

Applicant concurs with the above conditions.
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Northwood Professional Center
Variance to Grade in a Stream
   Environment Zone
Section 7.70 of the Grading Ordinance
Washoe County

Summary

The applicant, represented by Doug Pollack, is requesting a variance to grade in a Stream Environment Zone at 778 Northwood Blvd., corner of Northwood and Village Blvd. in Incline Village. The parcel abuts Incline High School and already has an existing building on the site which will be removed. Rose Creek flows down one side of the property and is a major creek in Incline Village. The applicant has submitted plans showing that the new structures have a setback of 40 feet from the creek, which is in the 100-year flood plain.

The TRPA Development Review Committee reviewed the site on July 5, 1978 and found the setback adequate to preserve the Stream Environment Zone. The new structures will not encroach any further than the existing structure and if the creek was, in fact, to overflow, there is a series of existing man-made ponds into which the overflow would run.

Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the variance to grade in a Stream Environment Zone with the following conditions:

1) The structures be sited according to the plans submitted to and approved by TRPA.

2) Erosion control measures will be utilized to prevent any runoff from entering the stream zone, as shown on the approved plans.

Applicant concurs with the above conditions.
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MEMORANDUM

To: Chairman Jim Henry and Members of the TRPA Governing Board

From: Norman C. Woods, Representative of the City of South Lake Tahoe

Re: Litigation by TRPA Against CTRPA

Date: May 24, 1978

As you are aware, the City of South Lake Tahoe has long been interested in resolving the conflicts existing between this body, TRPA, and the CTRPA. City officials, as well as their citizens, have felt that we Californians are really second class citizens. The TRPA Compact was designed and adopted for the benefit of both states and, because of the restrictive and conflicting plans and ordinances of CTRPA, we are not able on the California side to effectively deal with our problems on the expected bi-state level.

Important, also, is the fact that, because of another layer of government created by California through the CTRPA, individual property owners have been bantered from agency to agency in order to realize an equitable return on their property.

The City, itself, has been stung by the conflict between CTRPA and TRPA. Many months ago the City and Douglas County entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to complete the so-called Loop Road System, which is authorized by the TRPA Transportation Plan. Both the City of South Lake Tahoe and the County of El Dorado on the California side have long supported that system as a necessary part of our transportation capacities. We have felt that the health and safety of our citizens, insofar as police and fire and other aspects are concerned, demand that the traffic snarls in the Stateline area be resolved. Despite our concerns in this area, the State of California, primarily through Caltrans and CTRPA, has adopted another transportation plan conflicting with the TRPA plan.

Recently, in the Federal District Court in Reno, Judge Bruce Thompson, in denying a Caltrans request for a temporary restraining order to halt the construction of the Loop Road, indicated that, in his opinion, the TRPA was the paramount transportation planning authority in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Judge also indicated that the TRPA Compact pre-empted those areas of planning which were addressed in the Compact. Importantly, the Judge further stated
that the CTRPA Transportation Plan had to be consistent with that of this agency. Judge Thompson's comments are the first in this regard and, in our opinion, make it appropriate for TRPA to clarify through the courts its planning powers within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

I ask you today to authorize our attorneys to once and for all resolve through litigation the powers of this agency with respect to California agencies. Whether this is more appropriately done through already existing litigation or by the filing of a new lawsuit, I will leave to the judgment of legal counsel. I realize that there are risks to such a procedure. Some will indicate that there is the potential for loss of funding from California but this will always be a problem and we must not delay at this time. Moreover, and more importantly, it's time for this agency to act responsibly in resolving these problems. Environmentalists complain that the agency is not efficient and is not effective. Part of the reason is because of this ongoing conflict. Responsibility demands that we act as soon as possible.

You are aware that currently other entities, including the City of South Lake Tahoe and private landowners who have raised questions of conflict between TRPA and CTRPA, are directly attempting to resolve TRPA powers through the court system, without the participation of this agency. We should not rely upon others who certainly will not represent us as well as our attorneys would in these cases, which are construing the TRPA Compact and the powers of this agency. It is not unforeseeable that adverse decisions may be rendered with respect to that Compact in these private suits, which will affect us to the greatest extend and for which we will be sorry.

I believe - and I say this from the experience of serving the Lake Tahoe Basin as a Mayor, Councilmember, and representative of regional planning - that it is absolutely necessary that the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency act now through proper legal channels to secure our legislative mandate to protect the environment and the citizens of this Basin before inaction paralyzes us.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Woods
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

Park Cattle Company - First National Bank of Nevada
General Plan Amendment, Recreation to General Commercial
Douglas County

Location and Description

The subject 1.84 acres are located in the casino core area of South Stateline at the northwesterly corner of Highway 50 and the loop road intersection. The property contains 200 feet of Highway 50 frontage and extends 400 feet, more or less, back from the Highway 50 right-of-way. The site is part of a larger 229 acre parcel (Assessor Parcel No. 07-03-01) which is owned by the Park Cattle Company and presently contains the Edgewood Tahoe Golf Course and the Sahara Tahoe valet parking.

Amendment Request

The applicants are requesting that the 1.84 acres, currently zoned Recreation under the TRPA General Plan, be reclassified to General Commercial. The applicant proposes to use this site for the relocation of the First National Bank of Nevada.

Land Capability

The land coverage permitted on the 1.84 acres in question under Section 6.20 of the Land Use Ordinance is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Types</th>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Allowable Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ElsB - Elmira-Gefo Loamy Sand 0-5% slopes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>30% 18,960 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JeD - Jabu Coarse Sandy Loam, shallow-variant, 5-15% slopes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>5% 840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 1.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Land Use

Currently, the Sahara Tahoe utilizes the subject property for valet parking. The existing land coverage is 75%.

Local Zoning

In a recent action, Douglas County rezoned the 1.84 acres from Resort Hotel (RH) to Limited Commercial (C-1) provided the property was to be utilized for a bank.

Proposed Use

The First National Bank of Nevada wishes to relocate to the subject property in order to expand the bank's facilities. The existing bank is located diagonally across the intersection from the subject property on a 1.0 acre parcel currently zoned Tourist Commercial. The bank is nonconforming in use and coverage on its existing site, which would preclude expansion of its facilities.
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Impacts of the Proposed Use Relative to:

1. **Subregional Needs:** The existing bank is the only nonconforming use in the casino core. At present, the bank provides services to the casinos and to the residents of both states. The staff finds that a bank in the casino core is appropriate if the function is limited to only that necessary to service that area.

2. **Regional Needs:** The Regional Plan identifies the casino core area as Tourist Commercial. The specific purpose of this area is stated in Section 7.81 of the Land Use Ordinance: "(1) To provide adequate space for motels, hotels and related facilities to house and provide services for tourist visitors to the Region in appropriate locations".

   The Land Use Ordinance identifies financial institutions, i.e. banks, as a General Commercial use because they serve mainly the residents of the region. Staff finds the proposed expansion of banking services to be inappropriate in the casino core area.

3. **Permitted Uses:** The 1.84 acre site with General Commercial zoning would permit up to:
   - 74 motel/hotel units
   - commercial shopping center
   - office building
   - a 40 foot high structure(s)
   - commercial parking

4. **Open Space:** Currently, an open vista of Lake Tahoe with the Edgewood Golf Course in the foreground extends 2,000 feet along Highway 50 from Sahara Tahoe to Kingsbury Grade. This proposal would remove 200 feet of this open vista. The applicants have also requested the full 70% coverage, 110,990 square feet, allowed under Section 7.93 of the Land Use Ordinance. The expansion of high coverage uses in the core area would be inappropriate due to the abundance of nonconforming coverage in the Stateline area.

5. **Transportation:** The Stateline area has been identified as a traffic and air quality problem area in numerous reports and studies. In a June 26, 1978 letter the Nevada Department of Highways projected that the construction of half the loop road with the two pedestrian separations would result in a 1978 average summer day projection of 42,000 ADT north of the casino core, 27,300 ADT within the casino core, and a 36,000 ADT south of Stateline Avenue in California. The Stateline Subregional Study done for the TRPA in 1973 estimates capacity of U.S. Highway 50 at approximately 32,000. In regards to air quality, the Stateline area is listed by the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection as a non-attainment area because in 1976 there were three recorded violations of the one hour carbon monoxide (CO) standard, 17 violations of the eight hour CO standard, and 90 violations of the one hour oxident standard.
Traffic Impacts - The Traffic Report submitted by the applicant indicates the relocation of the bank, which generates an average of 1,564 vehicle trips per day, would be consistent with the traffic flow design of the loop road. The applicant indicates the current bank access on Highway 50 would be removed and the new facility would utilize the approved access points on the loop road thus improving traffic circulation. The applicant's report states "the continued Bank operation will not be growth inducing" thus the facility would not generate new trips to the area; staff would agree with this statement if the new Bank was of a similar size and capacity as the existing bank.

Air Quality Impacts - In a June 9, 1978 memo, the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection made the following statement in regards to the project: "FNB Relocation: The analysis was based on materials provided by the Nevada Dept. of Highways and Grant Bastian of Chilton Engineering. Based upon the results of the HIWAY model the new bank facility emits a greater amount of CO than the old bank facility due mainly from the two additional drive-up windows. With the combination of the concentrations from the loop road and the new bank facility the one hour CO concentration level of 35 ppm is close to the estimated concentration of 30 ppm. This value does not take into account the point source impact of the area." Since this analysis, Jim Koch of FNB has stated the Bank proposes only one additional drive-up window. However, even adding just the one additional drive-up window will result in air quality deterioration in respect to CO.

Public Services: If the bank is relocated to the 1.84 acre site, the impact would be minor on the public service entities since they now serve the existing bank, which will be demolished according to the applicants. The staff has received copies of will-serve letters from the Douglas County Sewer Improvement District, the Edgewood Water Company, and the Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District. If the bank is not constructed, there are uses permitted under General Commercial zoning, such as a 74 unit motel/hotel, that would have significant impact on public services.

Alternatives to the Proposed Reclassification

An investigation of the commercially zoned property in the Kingsbury-Round Hill area indicates there are several alternate sites that are properly located and zoned to provide a bank service to the resident population. Based on this, the existing First National Bank or a branch office could be located outside the casino core area without having to rezone land for this purpose.

Regional Planning Policy

Both the existing site and the proposed site for the First National Bank of Nevada are located within an area that is totally dominated by tourist oriented uses. The casino core has in the past and must continue to be planned to accommodate and provide for the needs primarily of tourists. Through careful planning, actions should be taken to eventually separate establishments that provide services for permanent residents, such as banking, from those areas that have been intensely developed into tourist-oriented uses. To require the permanent residents from the Round Hill or Kingsbury communities of Douglas County or the City of South Lake Tahoe to drive into the intensely developed
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casino core area for financial services will only aggravate the existing congestion and air quality problems. There are currently several alternate, undeveloped commercial sites in the Kingsbury and Round Hill areas that are more properly located relative to the service area by the First National Bank of Nevada. The recently completed A Study of the Impacts of Alternative Land Use Plans for the Tahoe Basin indicates that, as of January 1, 1977, there were approximately 117 acres of General Commercial zoning available for development in Douglas County.

Recommendation

The staff recommends this request for a General Plan amendment for the subject property be denied because the spot zoning of 1.84 acres of General Commercial zoning in the South Shore casino area is expansionary and therefore not appropriate under present conditions of traffic congestion and air quality violations, unless and until the applicant provides assurances that:

a) The facility will not result in an increase in capacity or height and will be primarily an accessory use to the tourist-oriented area.

b) The existing bank building will not be utilized for future commercial uses.

c) The facility be so designed as to minimize air quality impacts in this non-attainment area.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

Park Tahoe Hotel-Casino
Administrative Permit for Modification
of Approved Parking Plan (Continued
from June 29, 1978 Meeting)
Douglas County

Project Description and Location

The applicant seeks an administrative permit for a revised parking plan which is currently under construction at the site of the Park Tahoe Hotel-Casino in Stateline.

The applicant seeks to revise his parking plan for the following reasons:

1. The recent action by Douglas County and the TRPA which approved the new alignment of the Loop Road with the concept that all parking would be located in the interior.

2. The applicant's desire to open without the total project being completed (without the showroom, hotel and parking structure) and to expand the parking capacity of the facility.

Background

On March 27, 1973, the Douglas County Commissioners conditionally approved a Special Use Permit for the Park Tahoe Hotel-Casino at Stateline. Following this action, the Nevada Tahoe Regional Planning Agency conditionally approved this project on June 14, 1973.

At the June 27, 1973 Tahoe Regional Planning Agency meeting, the project was presented and the Governing Board failed to take a positive action, and after 60 days the project was deemed approved as presented (including the Douglas County and NTRPA conditions). On March 23, 1978, the TRPA Governing Board approved the Douglas County portion of the Loop Road which by virtue of its alignment and design required the Park Tahoe Hotel to redesign the 1973 approved parking plan.

In May, 1978, the Douglas County Commissioners found in "substantial conformance" a plan submitted by the applicant which indicated all surface parking to be removed from the exterior of the Loop Road and relocated to the interior. The plan increased the surface parking from the approved 600 open surface parking spaces to 871 open surface parking spaces.
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The applicant and Douglas County were notified by TRPA staff on May 17, 1978 that the proposed modification of the parking plan required TRPA review. Agency staff, with advice from legal counsel, informed the applicant that this review would require an administrative permit for modification to a prior approval based on the fact that new lands were to be included in the project and the approved surface parking was to be increased by 271 parking spaces.

At the June 26, 1978 NTRPA meeting, the NTRPA Governing Body found the same revised plan for open surface parking to be in "substantial conformance" but added several new conditions.

Later, at the June 28-29, 1978 TRPA meeting, the TRPA Governing Body found the total project which included the revised parking plan to be in "substantial conformance" with the 1973 approval. The application for an administrative permit for the subject parking plan was continued until the July Governing Body meeting because it was discovered that there were procedural difficulties in processing the administrative permit.

On June 30, 1978, the applicant commenced construction based on a revised parking plan.

On July 13, 1978, the applicant submitted a site plan labeled "As-Built Site Survey of the Park Tahoe", dated July 7, 1978. This plan indicates an increase of 480 surface parking spaces over the 871 such spaces identified on the original revised plan (those found in substantial conformance by Douglas County, NTRPA, and TRPA). The July 7, 1978 modifications show temporary surface parking at locations indicated for a swimming pool and parking structures on the original revised plans.

On July 19, 1978, TRPA received a letter from Mr. Bob Gardner indicating Douglas County approval of an administrative permit for the parking plan as shown on the July 7, 1978 "As-Built Site Survey" (letter attached).

Land Coverage

1973 Approval - The project was originally approved for a total impervious surface coverage of 16.9 acres or 49.2%. The open surface parking indicated on the approved plans is 5.06 acres.

1978 "Substantial Conformance" Plans - The plans found to be in substantial conformance at the June 28-29 Governing Body meeting indicate that the impervious surface coverage is approximately 17.4 acres or 49.2%.
1978 "As-Built" Plans - The plans labeled "As-Built Site Survey" submitted in July for the administrative permit indicate the project area as follows:

- Total Site: 37.201 acres
- Total Impervious Surface: 17.9 acres (47.0%)
- Permanent Open Surface Parking: 7.12 acres

These calculations are based on a surveyed legal description submitted by the applicant. The applicant did not include the 0.26 acres (0.7%) of coverage associated with the "Friday's Station" historical landmark nor was it included in the substantial conformance plans or the 1973 approved plans.

Parking Capacity

1973 Approval - The project was originally approved for 600 open surface parking spaces and 1,000 parking spaces to be located in the parking structure.

1978 "Substantial Conformance" Plans - The plans found to be in substantial conformance indicated a parking capacity of 871 surface parking spaces with all parking located inside the Loop Road (increase of 271 spaces over the 1973 approval). This plan does not designate any temporary parking sites, but does indicate parking on the 1973 approved site for tennis courts.

1978 "As-Built" Plans - The revised plan submitted to the Agency on July 13, 1978 indicates a potential open surface parking capacity of 1,351 utilizing the Douglas County standard of 300 square feet per space. The plan indicates approximately 317 of these spaces are temporary and are located on the 1973 approved sites for the tennis courts, the swimming pool and the parking structure. This plan increases the total surface parking by 751 spaces over the 1973 approved plans and by 480 spaces over the 1978 "substantial conformance" plans.

Construction Phasing

1973 Approval - The construction phasing plan submitted by the applicant indicated the parking structures would be completed prior to the surface parking. The plans indicated the total approved project would come "on line" at approximately the same time with the approved 1,600 spaces.

1978 "Substantial Conformance" Plans and 1978 "As-Built" Plans - The plans submitted indicate the applicant proposes to open prior to completion of the hotel and parking structures. Douglas County parking standards require a minimum 840 parking spaces, to service the facilities that will be in operation.
Analysis

Based upon analysis of the project as portrayed on the "As-Built" plans, Agency staff has identified three principal issues posed by the modification of the 1973 plans:

1. The relocation of surface parking within the Loop Road.

2. The phasing of the project, particularly the proposed opening prior to completion of the Loop Road and the parking structure.

3. The amount of surface parking.

Staff believes the relocation of surface parking entirely within the Loop Road is appropriate and, in fact, beneficial to maintaining the efficiency of the Loop Road.

Since the most intensive trip generating uses of the project are to open initially, staff is concerned with the absence of the parking structure and the traffic impacts of the facility. The parking structure was to have housed over 60% of the parking for the facility. Without the parking structure, the ability to meet the parking demand is jeopardized and the likelihood of increasing traffic congestion is enhanced. With respect to the traffic impacts, staff is concerned that opening prior to completion of at least the Douglas County portion of the Loop Road poses the prospect of significantly increased turning movement conflicts along Highway 50.

If the project is to open as proposed, there will be a need for additional surface parking beyond that indicated in the 1973 approval, since the parking structure will not be complete. However, staff is not satisfied that the applicant has documented a need for more total parking for the project than was originally approved in 1973. For this reason, staff believes all but 600 of the proposed surface parking spaces should be designated as temporary. These temporary spaces should be removed upon the completion of the parking structure and returned to open space or to the uses proposed in the original 1973 approval.

Recommendation

Based upon the above considerations, Agency staff recommends approval of the revised parking plan as indicated on the July 7, 1978 "As-Built" site survey, provided that all but 5.06 acres (600 parking spaces) of the identified surface parking areas are designated as temporary; and provided the following additional conditions are satisfied:
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1. Prior to the issuance of any occupancy permit for the Park Tahoe:
   a. The Nevada portion of the Loop Road shall be completed and operational.
   b. A water treatment system shall be implemented to treat all runoff from the Park Tahoe site.
   c. The applicant shall submit to the Agency a signed copy of the implementation schedule for the pedestrian separation. This schedule should reflect the statements made at the June 28-29 TRPA Governing Body meeting.

2. The subject 37.201 acre parcel shall be legally recorded within 30 days of this approval.

3. Prior to this approval becoming effective, the applicant shall submit the following for Agency staff approval:
   a. A temporary and permanent traffic circulation and parking plan.
   b. Final plans of the proposed drainage treatment system.
   c. A slope stabilization and revegetation plan for both the temporary parking plan and for the permanent parking plan.

4. The applicant shall submit a revised construction phasing plan for the remainder of the project to include the completion of the parking structure and removal of all temporary surface parking.
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TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

Stillwater Cove
Tentative Map for 47 Condominium Units
Washoe County

Summary

On June 28, 1978, the applicant for Stillwater Cove, Winston Zirjacks, representing Raymond Vail and Associates, requested that the Governing Board grant an extension of the tentative map approval for the project. The Agency approval of the Stillwater Cove tentative map expires on July 27, 1978. At the June meeting, the Board did not take action to extend the tentative map approval due to the absence of provisions in the Subdivision Ordinance to do such. However, the Board did take action to request that other agencies give top priority and full cooperation to the processing of the project so that the final map could be filed prior to July 27, 1978.

As per letter dated July 17, 1978, copy attached, from the State of Nevada Division of Water Resources, it appears that the Agency can not give approval for the final map for Stillwater Cove Condominiums.

The applicant, in case the final map was not recorded prior to July 27, 1978, submitted an application for reapproval of that tentative map for the July Governing Board meeting. Enclosed for your information is a copy of the original Staff Summary, location map, and approved conditions dated January 17, 1977.

Recommendation

Agency staff, in light of the above referenced letter from the Nevada Division of Water Resources indicating that the Washoe County Sewer Improvement District No. 1, in which the subject project is located, can not, at the present time, provide domestic water service to the project, recommends that the tentative map for Stillwater Cove be denied without prejudice pending resolution of this problem.
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Stillwater Cove
Tentative Map for a 47 Unit Condominium
Washoe County Assessor's Parcels 123-072-1 and 123-051-4

Location and Project Description

The Stillwater Cove project is located in Crystal Bay, Nevada, directly east of the North Shore Club. The site is bordered on the west by Highway 28 and on the east by Lake Tahoe. The 23.2 acre parcel presently contains a single family residence, a beach house and a pier.

The project proposes the construction of 47 dwelling units in 17 two- and three-story buildings, two tennis courts on grade, a two-level parking structure with two tennis courts on the roof, a swimming pool and a new pier. The development includes eight duplex buildings, five triplex buildings, and four fourplex buildings. If this condominium development is approved by the Governing Body, the construction of the new pier, the swimming pool, remodeling of the beach house, and the removal of the existing pier shall be the subject of a separate application under the Shorezone Ordinance with a hearing before the Executive Officer.

The parking structure will provide parking for 80 cars and offices for the club manager, a security guard and a tennis professional. The existing residence will be converted into a restaurant and bar and community center for the residents of the development. The restaurant and bar will also be open to the general public. The existing beach house will be remodeled for the use of the residents. All automobiles entering the site will use the parking structure, and access from the parking structure to the residential units will be by electric-powered golf carts and by foot. The pathways to the units will be 10' wide, 5' of which will be grass-covered, with the remaining 5' to be paved. The pathways could be utilized for service or emergency vehicles.

Land Use and Land Capability

The two on-grade tennis courts will be located in 9.1 acres of the General Forest District. Five condominium units, the pool and the beach house will be located in 8.9 acres classified Rural Estates. The remainder of the units, the club house and the parking structure will be in the 5.2 acres of Tourist Commercial.

The allowable and proposed coverages are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Allowable Coverage</th>
<th>Proposed Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grading and Drainage

There is an existing graded roadway to the club house and to the beach house. The roadway to the club house will be improved and connect with the parking garage.
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Grading and Drainage (continued)

The roadway to the beach house will also be improved but its use will be restricted to pedestrians and golf carts. The construction of the tennis courts will involve a maximum cut of 2' and a maximum fill of 6'. Sixty trees will be removed to allow the proposed construction.

Utilities

Will-serve letters have been provided from the water, electric and gas companies. Washoe County Sewer Improvement District #1 has provided a will-serve letter. The District is negotiating with the Incline Village General Improvement District on a merger agreement. The merger agreement would result in the sewage from the Washoe County SID #1 being transported to the Incline Village CID for treatment and export. In the interim, sewage would continue to be transported to the North Tahoe Public Utility District for treatment and export, and the North Tahoe PUD has reaffirmed its intent under their present contract to provide sewage export service. Attached is a letter dated Jan. 12, 1977 from Raymond Vail & Associates outlining the sequence with respect to the merger agreement.

Other Considerations

The applicant has had a land capability report and soils map prepared by a consultant. The report is a refinement of the soil types and land capabilities shown on the Agency's 1:4800 scale map. This land capability report and map have been reviewed by the Soil Conservation Service and found to be accurate.

Approved Conditions

The soils map prepared by the applicant's consultant and reviewed by the Soil Conservation Service was approved.

The development project, not including the pier, the swimming pool, and the remodeling of the beach house, was approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Each of the following conditions shall be completely performed prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits.

   a. An undertaking by corporate surety guaranteeing the performance of landscaping and revegetation shall be posted with the permit-issuing authority as provided in Section 7.130 of the Grading Ordinance.

   b. Construction plans and specifications shall adequately depict: fencing for vegetation protection; temporary and permanent erosion control devices; landscaping and revegetation measures; slope stabilization measures; dust control; sewage lift stations designed so that if failure occurs sewage will not spill on to the surface of the ground; and measures to insure adequate quality of storm runoff (Grading Ordinance). In each instance the above portions of construction plans and specifications shall be subject to TRPA staff review and approval.
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Stillwater Cove
Tentative Map for a 47 Unit Condominium
Washoe County
Approved Conditions (continued)

c. All authorizations (except building and grading permits) from competent public authority applicable to the proposed development shall be obtained (e.g., state highway encroachment permits).

d. Conditions, covenants and restrictions respecting all of the real property of the proposed development shall be subject to TRPA review and approval. Such document shall include: a prohibition of the use of chemicals for deicing in all vehicular areas except public streets; a prohibition of vehicles in all nonvehicular open spaces; Vegetation Preservation and Protection Plan with adequate provision to insure the permanent maintenance of open spaces; and a provision making TRPA an express beneficiary of such document with the right to pursue such judicial remedies as it wishes arising out of or relating to such document.

e. The developer will enter into an agreement with Washoe County to dedicate a reasonable right-of-way when and if needed to construct the North Stateline loop road, intersections and turn lanes across that portion of the development site described as follows: the southwest corner of subject property lying between the proposed condominiums and tennis courts, the U.S. Post Office and the existing right-of-way for Highway 28.

2. Upon the issuance of building and grading permits, construction shall proceed in the following sequence:

a. Such trees as TRPA has authorized shall be removed and the initial phase of the Vegetation Preservation and Protection Plan shall be completed as recommended in the Division of Forestry letter dated December 18, 1975.

b. Installation of fencing for vegetation protection.

c. Installation of temporary erosion protection devices.

d. Prior to the removal of spoil materials from the construction site, a separate grading permit shall be obtained from the permit-issuing authority for offsite disposal of spoil materials.

e. Installation of utilities including water mains and fire hydrants required by the fire department.

f. Completion of rough grading including installation of mechanical stabilization devices.

g. Completion of structure foundations.

h. Final grading and installation of base for paved areas.

i. Completion of structures.

j. Paving.

k. Landscaping and revegetation.
Stillwater Cove
Tentative Map for a 47 Unit Condominium
Washoe County
Approved Conditions (continued)

3. Continuing conditions:

a. Compliance with all requirements and conditions of the permit-issuing authority. None of said requirements and conditions shall be waived or modified without the concurrence of TRPA.

b. All utilities shall be underground.

c. No building shall exceed 40 feet in height in the Tourist Commercial District or 35 feet in any other district.

d. Grading, vegetation clearing and soil disturbance are prohibited between October 15 and May 1.

e. Mud shall not be tracked off the construction site. Grading operations shall cease in the event that a danger of tracking mud offsite exists.

f. During construction, environmental protection devices such as adequate erosion control devices, dust control and vegetation protection barriers shall be maintained.

g. The final subdivision map shall show the allowable land coverage for each lot and building envelope.

h. This approval expires eighteen (18) months from the date of Governing Body approval unless within said time a final subdivision map has been recorded.

i. All other permits regarding the development shall comply with these conditions.
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Kingsbury Square
Administrative Permit for Modification
of Condition of Approval to Permit Three
Drive-Through Bank Windows, Douglas County

History

On April 26, 1978, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board approved an administrative permit for Kingsbury Square, a 3.86 acre commercial shopping center to be located on the north side of Kingsbury Grade. One of the three buildings proposed as part of the shopping center, Building C, a single story 8,000 square foot bank, was originally to include four drive-up windows. However, the drive-up windows were excluded from the Governing Board approval due to a concern that their use would result in additional adverse air quality impacts. Condition of approval #20 states: "This approval does not include the four drive-through windows proposed as part of Building C and as shown on the site plan."

The Governing Board, at the April meeting, indicated to the applicant that upon submittal of additional information relative to the effects of drive-up windows on air quality they would reconsider the action of excluding the drive-up windows from the approval.

Air Quality Impacts

The applicant has submitted a report entitled: "A Study of Relative Carbon Monoxide Emissions from Vehicles Using Drive-Up Window Banking Facilities", dated July 10, 1978 and prepared by H. Stanton Shelly, environmental consultant with Creegan & D'Angelo Engineers. The report approaches the problem by first identifying a reduction in total vehicle miles traveled and an associated reduction in emissions due to the relocation of the Round Hill Branch of Nevada National Bank to the site on Kingsbury Grade and then lessening the reduction due to relocation by an identified increase in emissions resulting from the use of three proposed drive-up windows.

Based on a recent survey of customers of the Round Hill Branch of Nevada National Bank which identifies the general distribution of their home and work locations, the report indicates that a net reduction in trip length of .3 mile per customer will result from the bank relocating to Kingsbury Square. Table 4 of the report shows that, based on (1) the emission factors from the latest emissions data published by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, dated March, 1978, and (2) a customer volume of 850 to 1,700 per week, the .3 mile trip length reduction per customer will result in a reduction in carbon monoxide (CO) emissions of from 816 to 1678 grams per business day.
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Kingsbury Square
Administrative Permit for Modification
of Condition of Approval to Permit Three
Drive-Through Bank Windows, Page Two

The applicant's analysis of the impacts on air quality resulting from the use of the three proposed drive-up windows is preceded in the report by the statement that "It is also clear that a bank operation with drive-up windows will produce more CO emissions on the property than one without drive-in service, all other things being equal."

To determine the additional amounts of CO emitted from the idling vehicle using the three drive-up windows, two critical factors had to be determined: 1) the grams of CO emitted per minute from an idling vehicle in the Tahoe Basin; and 2) the total idling time of each vehicle based on an average transaction time plus waiting time. Again, using data recently published by the EPA, the applicant determined that for 1978 the average vehicle idling in the Tahoe area emits approximately 18.5 grams of CO per minute.

Based on a survey at a Bank of America in Ventura, California which indicates an average transaction time of 2.5 minutes per customer and the opinion of Nevada National Bank officials that with newer and faster equipment they could achieve an average transaction time of 45 seconds per customer, the report utilizes a midpoint figure of 1.7 minutes per customer. To allow for some short-term peaking, an average wait of .3 minutes per customer was used to establish a total idling time of 2.0 minutes per customer. Using the 2.0 minute total idling time per customer and a CO emissions factor of 18.5 grams per minute, the report indicates that each customer using the drive-through window facilities would generate 37 grams of CO more than customers using the walk-in facilities. Assuming 850 total customers per week, the 215 customers estimated by the applicants that would use the drive-up windows would generate an additional 7,955 grams of CO per week, or 413,660 grams (912 lbs) per year. However, to arrive at a net decrease in CO emissions, the applicant's report subtracts the increases in CO emissions resulting from the use of the three proposed drive-up windows from the decreases in CO emissions resulting from the relocation of the Nevada National Bank to Kingsbury Square. This process results in a net decrease in CO emissions of approximately 816 grams per day for 850 customers per week.

Staff Analysis

Review of the applicant's report on air quality impacts resulting from the use of drive-up windows and similar information developed by the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection reveals a significant difference in the suspected CO emissions per drive-up window. In a report received by the TRPA on May 22, 1978, prepared by George M. Thiel of the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, he calculates that the four drive-up windows proposed for the First National Bank would, under worst case conditions, generate approximately 127,915 grams of CO.
Kingsbury Square
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per day. Using this factor for CO emissions, Mr. Thiel's calculations
indicate that the three drive-up windows proposed for the subject bank
could generate approximately 28,000 grams of CO per day. Applying
Mr. Thiel's factor for CO emissions per drive-up window, it can be
shown that the reduction of 816 to 1,678 grams per day of CO due to
the relocation of the subject bank, as calculated by the applicant,
could be totally negated by the 28,000 grams per day of CO emitted
by idling vehicles using the three proposed drive-up windows.

Mr. Thiel's calculations result in a much greater amount of CO emissions
per drive-up window because he uses a figure of 23.6 grams of CO per
idling minute and a 4.0 minute idling time per customer whereas the
applicant's report uses 18.5 grams of CO per idling minute and a 2.0
minute idling time per customer.

The additional CO emissions resulting from the use of the subject
drive-up windows must be considered significant, not only due to
the Tahoe Basin's designation as a non-attainment air quality area
but the proximity of Kingsbury Square to the South Stateline area
where there have been recorded violations of the State of Nevada
air quality standard for CO emissions.

Recommendation

Agency staff recommends that the applicant's request to modify or
remove condition #20 of the approval granted Kingsbury Square on
April 26, 1978 and therefore be allowed to include three drive-up
windows in Building C be denied without prejudice pending the
adoption by the TRPA of the non-attainment air quality plan required
by the 1977 Amendments to the Clean Air Act (P.L. 95-95). If drive-
up windows are not permitted in the subject bank building, there will
not be a decrease in air quality at the Kingsbury Square site.

The reason for recommending denial without prejudice is that, although
there is a significant difference in the magnitude of the adverse impacts
on air quality resulting from the use of drive-up windows as identified
by the applicant and by the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection,
both analyses indicate that a facility containing drive-up windows will
generate significantly more CO emissions than an identical facility
without drive-up windows.
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TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
STAFF SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION  

Chimney Rock Estates  
Tentative Map for 21 Lots  
Douglas County  

Project Description  

The applicant, William Pillsbury, Inc., representing Jack Shelley, is requesting approval of a tentative map as required under Section 4.0 of the Subdivision Ordinance for a 21 lot subdivision. The applicant is also requesting that one of the roads of the proposed subdivision, Terrace View Drive, be found to be a local public road as provided for under Section 8.25 of the Land Use Ordinance. The proposed subdivision is to be constructed on an 11.29 acre site located at the end of Terrace View Drive in the Kingsbury Grade area of Douglas County. 

Based on the applicable land capability districts, eight of the lots will be allocated 1,800 square feet of land coverage; twelve of the lots 2,582 sq. ft. of coverage; and one of the lots 4,582 sq. ft. of land coverage for the construction of one single family dwelling and accessory facilities.  

Access  

Access to the proposed subdivision is to be provided by two 29 foot wide roads referred to as Terrace View Drive and McKay Court. McKay Court will be a cul-de-sac extension of McKay Drive located on the west edge of the project. McKay Court will serve four residential lots. Terrace View Drive will be an extension of the existing Terrace View Drive and will also enter on the west side of the property south of McKay Court. Terrace View Dr. will extend east for a distance of 270 feet, then extend north for 730 feet to the north edge of the subdivision. The 730 foot extension runs through the center of the subdivision and follows one of two existing graded roads. Terrace View Drive will provide access to the remaining 17 lots. Access to Lot 5 which is in the southeast corner of the subdivision will be provided by a 140 foot long, 10 foot wide private driveway. 

On February 23, 1978, the applicant requested a determination that the extension of Terrace View Drive was a regional public facility. At the February Governing Board meeting the Board failed to make the findings of a regional public facility but directed the staff to prepare an amendment to the Land Use Ordinance to include a category for a local public road with a provision to allow land coverage credit to an applicant required to provide access to adjoining properties and, in doing so, road improvements larger than would otherwise be required for his project. The amendment to the Land Use Ordinance (Ordinance No. 78-8) was approved and adopted by the Governing Board on June 29, 1978. Section 8.25(4) of the amended Land Use Ordinance allows for a 50% coverage credit on roads determined to be local public roads. 

Existing Environmental Setting  

There is one small tributary stream running along the easterly edge of the property. This stream will be crossed in one place to provide access to Lot 5. The stream crossing will be accomplished with an arched culvert so that the natural streambed is not disturbed. 

Natural drainage currently sheet flows into the stream channel or down the existing graded roads. The slopes on the parcel range from 10 to 30%. There are two large Cagwin rock outcroppings located on the property. Building envelopes as shown on the tentative map restrict construction activities to the higher capability lands. 
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The upperstory vegetation consists of small and medium sized fir and pine trees. The tree cover is fairly dense in the southern portion of the property and less dense to the north. The lowerstory vegetation consists mostly of shrubs.

**Land Use Classification**

The entire 11.29 acre site is classified Low Density Residential (LDR) which permits up to 4 single family dwelling units per acre. The density of the proposed tentative map is 1.86 units per acre.

**Land Capability/Land Coverages**

On February 23, 1978, the Governing Board approved an administrative permit to recognize revised capability districts on the subject property as shown on the "Land Classification Map" prepared by Pillsbury Engineering. The revised land capability analysis identifies five separate land capability districts as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Capability District</th>
<th>Soil Type</th>
<th>% Coverage Allowed</th>
<th>Permitted Coverage (sq.ft.)</th>
<th>Proposed Coverage (sq.ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>244,025</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CaD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48,805</td>
<td>48,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>100,975</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CaD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20,195</td>
<td>20,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CaD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>131,040</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CaE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>3,045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>13,050</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CaE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The amount of proposed land coverage in Area D exceeds the maximum amount permitted by 1,735 sq. ft.

To bring the amount of proposed land coverage into conformance within Area D, the applicant has requested the Agency to recognize one of the existing graded roads that traverse the property as existing nonconforming land coverage. The request is based on the fact that the graded road is frequently used for vehicular travel. The existing graded road is currently used to provide fire protection by the Kingsbury Fire protection District. The road, which has been in existence for approximately 50 years, is also used to provide access to properties located to the north of the proposed subdivision. The tentative map shows 1,735 sq. ft. of land coverage over the amount permitted in Area D. Under Section 9.21 (3)(c)(ii) of the Land Use Ordinance, permitted replacements of nonconforming land coverage may be located on alternative sites on the property where the following findings are made:
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"(i) The applicant demonstrates beyond any reasonable doubt that the relocation to the alternative site will protect and enhance the natural environment of the parcel and surrounding lands to a substantially better extent than replacement on the original site.

(ii) The total nonconforming land coverage that exists on the parcel before the replacement will be reduced in amount by at least 10%, provided, however, that in the case..."

In order to bring the proposed over-coverage in Area D into conformance and to make required finding (ii), the applicant must reduce the existing nonconforming coverage in Area D by an amount equal to the proposed new coverage plus 10%. The total reduction in nonconforming coverage therefore must be at least 2,078 sq. ft. The existing graded road surfaces proposed to be revegetated amount to 3,435 sq. ft. The areas to be revegetated are outlined on a map prepared by William Pillsbury, Inc. which was submitted to the Agency on July 11, 1978.

Finding (i) can be made based on the fact that the existing graded roads that currently show signs of erosion are to be revegetated and that the proposed subdivision roads are to include proper drainage facilities.

Grading

A substantial amount of grading and clearing of vegetation will occur during the construction of the proposed roads and utility improvements. Construction of road improvements for Terrace View Drive will result in several cut and fill slopes, one of which will be approximately 7 feet in vertical height.

Slope Stabilization and Drainage

All cut and fill slopes created due to construction of the project will be layed back to a 2:1 slope or flatter and protected from erosion by rock rip rap or revegetation. All stormwater runoff emanating from the roads is to be collected by curbs and gutters and directed into infiltration trenches. All proposed infiltration trenches will be designed to accommodate a 2 year 6 hour frequency storm. Overflow from all proposed trenches will be collected and transported to the natural drainage systems on the property.

Public Services and Facilities

Will-serves letters for this project have been received from the Kingsbury General Improvement District for water, sewer service, and solid waste removal; Sierra Pacific Power Company for electrical service; and the Kingsbury Fire Protection District.

Traffic

It is projected by Don Pray, of the Nevada Highway Department, that the 21 lots in this project will generate 73 vehicle trips per day. This figure utilizes a unit trip
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nine vehicle trips per day. Using this figure, it is estimated that this project will generate 189 vehicle trips per day. Figures in the letter from Don Pray indicate that State Route 19 will carry approximately 11,000 vehicles per day during peak periods this summer. The vehicles generated by this project represent less than a 2% addition to the projected peak flows on State Route 19.

The origin-destination information developed in the Tahoe Regional Transportation Study indicated that 74% of the vehicle trips generated from residential units in the Kingsbury Grade area will enter the intersection of Kingsbury Grade and U.S. Highway 50. Using this percentage figure it can be projected that, based on Don Pray's trip generation factor of 3.5 trips per day per residence, the 21 lots proposed will generate approximately 54 vehicle trips per day through the intersection of U.S. Highway 50 and Kingsbury Grade or, using the trip generation factor included in "Attachment A" of nine trips per day per residence, 140 vehicle trips per day through the intersection.

As indicated in a letter dated June 6, 1978, from George B. Westenhoeffer, P.E., Chief Planning Survey Engineer with the Nevada Highway Department (copy attached), the Department projects that during an average day this summer the traffic volumes on U.S. Highway 50 north of the South Shore casino core will be 36,000 vehicles. Don Pray, Planner for the Nevada Highway Department, informed Agency staff that the recorded traffic volume along this section of U.S. Highway 50 in May of this year was 39,700 vehicles per day. The Stateline Subregional Study, done for the TRPA in 1973, estimates the capacity of U.S. Highway 50 to be approximately 32,000 vehicles per day.

In conclusion, it can be shown that the subject tentative map for 21 lots will generate additional vehicle trips on a section of U.S. Highway 50 that can be shown by the preceding analysis to presently be over-capacity.

Approvals

The Douglas County Planning Commission approved a tentative map for this property showing 23 building sites on January 19, 1978. Subsequently, two of the building sites were removed. On June 29, the Douglas County Planning Commission found the revised tentative map showing 21 building sites to be in substantial conformance with the original approval.

Findings

To approve this tentative map application, the Governing Board must make the following determinations:

1. That the proposed Terrace View Drive is a local public road. Under Section 8.25(4) of the amended Land Use Ordinance (Ordinance No. 78-8) the following findings relative to a local public road must be made: The excess land coverage exists or is to be created in connection with the construction or improvement of a local road which construction or improvement: (a) is required to provide access to property other than that owned by the applicant; (b) will be constructed or maintained by a public agency or is required
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to be so constructed or improved by the terms of a lawfully created easement recorded prior to February 10, 1972; (c) the road is designed to minimize land alteration and prevent erosion; and (d) the road as so constructed or improved will be sited in such a manner as to minimize the additional coverage.

Facts supporting the required findings are as follows: a) The road will provide access to three parcels owned by Mr. Shelley that are not part of this application. It will also provide access to developable lands located north of the proposed project. b) The road is required to satisfy the terms of a lawfully recorded easement granted to Mary Hansen on April 11, 1964. c) The road as proposed generally follows an existing graded road on the property. The road has been designed and situated in order to minimize cuts and fills. d) The road is sited over an existing graded road that is approximately 12 feet wide. By placing the proposed road, which is 29 feet wide, over the existing graded road, the creation of new land coverage will be minimized.

2. That the replacements of nonconforming land coverage in Area D, as proposed by the applicant, satisfy the requirement of Section 9.21 (3) (c) (i) and (ii) which were discussed on page 3 of this summary. Facts supporting the required findings are as follows:

   i. The existing graded roads that currently show signs of erosion are to be revegetated and the proposed subdivision roads are to include proper drainage facilities.

   ii. The total amount of existing land coverage that must be removed from the subject property is 2,078 sq. ft. The applicant proposes to revegetate 3,435 sq. ft. of existing graded roadway.

Recommendation

Agency staff could recommend that the required findings be made to recognize Terrace View Drive as a local public road and to allow the relocation of the existing nonconforming land coverage in Area D as proposed by the applicant. However, to be consistent with Section 4.60 of Ordinance No. 78-6, which states "Nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the application of all standards for review of projects existing before the effective date of this ordinance to projects exempt from the permit procedure pursuant to this section, including, without limitation, that such project unreasonably degrades air quality and unreasonably overburdens traffic." Agency staff recommends that the subject tentative map be denied without prejudice due to the fact that the 21 lots proposed will generate additional vehicle trips at the intersection of U.S. Highway 50 and Kingsbury Grade and therefore degrades air quality and overburdens traffic. This section of U.S. Highway 50 presently experiences levels of traffic that are well in excess of its practical capacity and future development in the vicinity, such as the buildup of existing subdivision lots, and the operation of the Park Tahoe Casino Hotel could result in a serious threat to the public's safety and welfare. The subject tentative map will worsen traffic congestion and likewise air quality in an area where violations of the present State of Nevada air quality standards have been recorded.
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June 6, 1978

Mr. James J. Jordan, Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 8896
South Lake Tahoe, California 95731

Re: Traffic Analysis of Projects at Tahoe

Dear Jim:

There appears to be some question concerning the level at which this Department reviews traffic impacts of proposed individual projects and I hope this letter will clarify our procedures. I first emphasize that our jurisdiction is legally confined to federal and state interest routes which at Tahoe are U.S. 50, S. R. 27 and S. R. 28 (although a designated state route, S. R. 19 in the Basin is strictly a local Douglas County Road).

When a project is proposed the Highway Department may be called upon to review the validity of estimated traffic impacts set forth by the developer, or if a federal or state interest route is involved we may take it upon ourselves to estimate impacts and voice a concern where appropriate. The Planning Division performs this function using trip rates from local source data or recognized trip generation manuals, and estimates are usually in terms of high-low ranges, pertain only to traffic volumes, and are only to the project location and not the specific design of the project.

If a project is approved and a federal or state interest route is directly effected, then the Design Division of the Highway Department becomes involved and a project design plan must be submitted with necessary traffic assignments. The Design Division then requests the Planning Division to review traffic assignments or, if none have been provided, to estimate traffic volumes related to the project design.

Relating this to parking garage projects proposed by Sahara-Tahoe, Harrah's, Harvey's, and Park Tahoe, we estimate there will be no additional trip generations although the interior circulation pattern could change. To this end we agree with conclusions of the Chilton "Traffic Report for Sahara-Tahoe Parking Structure" that traffic and customer convenience and safety could better be facilitated by a parking garage than by acres of open space parking as now exists.

With respect to the Loop Road and Park Tahoe projects, our Design Division has worked with the developers where access to U.S. 50 is involved.
Concerning traffic impacts of Park Tahoe which is scheduled to open in July, all assignments were predicated upon the Loop Road and Harvey’s expansion being completed. If these assumptions are taken out the resulting traffic estimations for an average day this summer on U.S. 50 would be 36,500 vehicles north of the casino core, 46,000 within the casino core, and 53,900 south of Stateline Avenue.

If only the casino portion of Park Tahoe were to open in July the decrease in traffic volumes would be negligible in terms of the total on U.S. 50, but turning movements in and out of the casino would be measureable. The 1974 TRTS indicates 8 percent of casino trip generations are by hotel patrons. Using 10 percent of estimated total of 10,160 trips for Park Tahoe to allow for hotel service trips would decrease traffic on U.S. 50 by only 1,000 vehicles.

If there are any questions, please direct them to Don Pray of my staff.

Sincerely,

GEORGE B. WESTPHAL/ER, P.E.
Chief Planning Survey Engineer

GBW:DAP:ss
Incline Village General Improvement District
Administrative Permit for Ski Lift Replacement
and Addition
Ski Incline
Washoe County

Summary
The applicant, Incline Village General Improvement District, is requesting review and
comment of a Ski Incline proposal to allow installation of one additional uphill chair
lift (Wiggle Chair) and replacement of an existing T-bar with a chair lift (B-Chair).
Ski Incline is located on Ski Way and Fairview Boulevard in Incline Village. Incline
Village GID feels that these two chairs will increase uphill lift capacity and provide
more efficient circulation.

B-Chair

B-Chair will replace the existing T-bar near the parking lot area. The Incline Village
GID proposal states that the terrain at this site is 6 to 10 percent grade. The proposed
chair lift will be 850–900 feet long and follow the same alignment as the existing T-bar.
The T-bar was designed for a capacity of 300 skiers per hour, but due to the difficulty
that beginner skiers have using it, its actual capacity is only 100 per hour. The B-Chair
is designed for 1,000 skiers per hour.

The applicant's report states that construction of the B-Chair lift will not require any
additional tree or ground clearing. No new or additional roads will be cut. Line towers
will be placed either by helicopter or by crane from the existing roads.

Wiggle Chair

The proposed double chair lift for the upper slopes is called the "Wiggle Chair". The
report states that maximum uphill lift capacity of the new chair will be 1,200 skiers per
hour. The length of the proposed chair lift will be 1,435 feet. The design of the lift
calls for seven intermediate line towers and an upper and lower terminal station. Line
tower construction will require the removal of approximately 60 trees; all clearing and
evacuation for tower foundations will be done by hand to minimize disturbance to the
existing vegetation. No new roads will be cut and helicopters will be used for all tower
placement. The required terminals are accessible by available roads.

Existing Environmental Setting

The replacement of the T-bar and addition of Wiggle Chair will make no appreciable
change in the land use pattern of the immediate area. There will be no land alterations.
The existing vegetation includes Evergreen Conifers, sparse grasses, herbs, and low
shrubs.

Land Use

The Ski Incline property is classified General Forest. The proposed T-bar replacement
and additional chair lift is permitted under the terms of the Land Use Ordinance since
the Ski Area is a conforming use in the General Forest classification.
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Land Coverage

Land capability shows the Ski Incline area to be classified 1a and 2 with 1% allowable coverage. The ski area covers 367.53 acres. Current coverage is approximately 3/10 of 1%. The proposed lift terminals and towers will only cover an additional 2,000 square feet.

Public Services and Facilities

The two chairs will utilize additional electrical energy, but Incline Village GID states that this will not place an extraordinary burden on existing availability.

Transportation

The area generates an estimated 500 to 588 trips per day on an average ski season weekday, and 1,300 to 1,500 trips are generated per day on a normal winter Saturday or Sunday. Of the number of these trips passing through the North Stateline or South Lake Tahoe areas is unavailable. Because many ski area users stay either in Incline Village or nearby, the applicant’s report states that it is likely that most of these trips are confined to the Village and its immediate vicinity.

The report states that the proposed new lifts at Ski Incline will increase the traffic generated by the facility on weekdays. However, the increased effect on weekend trips to and from the ski area will be negligible since the size of the existing parking lot restricts capacity, and the applicant is not proposing any increase in parking capacity. The relatively small amount of skiable terrain and the small lodge and base facilities will also serve to limit growth in weekend use and trip generation.

The applicant's report states that the average number of skiers using Ski Incline each day has been increasing at a rate of 6 percent per year. Assuming the additional lift capacity would increase the growth rate in Ski Incline on weekdays by 4 percent, as many as 37 automobile trips per day would be added to the upcoming 78-79 ski season. In addition to weekday trips to and from Ski Incline, the new facilities could also generate other trips within the Lake Tahoe Basin. If the lifts attract new overnight visitors to Incline Village, they will make trips other than to the ski area. It appears that nearly all weekday users of Ski Incline are either residents or visitors staying overnight. A 4 percent increase in the number of visitors could add in the range of 60 vehicle trips to the Basin. The report states that the traffic impact of the new lifts can be mitigated by reducing the number of person trips made by automobile. Incline Village GID operates a regular shuttle bus through the Village to Ski Incline. The shuttle bus normally carries an estimated 200 people per weekend/day to the ski area. Incline Village GID is attempting to encourage more people to use the service.

Height

The maximum permitted height for any structure in General Forest is 35 feet. The average tower and terminal height is approximately 31 feet.
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Storm Drainage

The applicant's report states that the proposed project will not impact the topography of the area. The slope under B-Chair will remain the same. The Wiggle Chair will require some clearing and excavation for the line tower foundations, but there will be no alteration to the slope or terrain. All excavation in the undisturbed areas will be by hand, and no new roads will be cut.

The report also notes that, prior to the District's purchase of Ski Incline in 1976, the ski area's slopes and ground cover were in extremely poor condition, which brought on severe drainage and erosion problems. To solve the environmental problems, Ski Incline embarked on a long-range erosion and drainage plan. The first phase of this improvement plan includes a five-year Erosion Control Program. The program requires the adherence to a number of annual revegetation procedures as well as stormwater management and maintenance.

Approvals

The project has been granted an administrative permit by Washoe County (see attached letter).

Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the Incline Village GID ski area modification of B-Chair lift and the addition of Wiggle Chair. The two modifications will increase circulation on the hill. There will be no adverse water quality impacts due to temporary and permanent erosion control measures. There will be a long term benefit to water quality in that Incline Village GID is prepared to undertake a five-year erosion and drainage plan which includes not only the ski area but also the parking lot area. Incline Village GID states that the air quality and traffic congestion impacts will be negligible due to the limited parking area which is already at capacity and is not to be expanded. However, there may be an increase of trips on weekdays since the parking lot is not full during the week. The number of increased trips on weekdays could only be estimated, but Incline Village GID runs a shuttle bus service for which they plan to encourage ridership and mitigate any increase in weekday trips.

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. Erosion control measures are to be utilized on the construction of the Wiggle Chair terminals. The individual towers are to be dug by hand and do not require individual erosion control. B-Chair will also require erosion control around the terminal construction. However, each individual tower on B-Chair will require erosion control as B-Chair is directly in the ski area drainage path.

2. The five-year erosion and drainage plan, as submitted to TRPA with this application, is to be expanded to include cleanup of the parking lot's existing erosion and stormwater runoff problems. The 208 Program identified parking lot runoff as a major water pollution problem. This plan should include slope stabilization and revegetation, sediment retention measures, and a prioritization of work. The applicant agrees with this and will submit a comprehensive five-year erosion and drainage plan to TRPA by January 1, 1979.
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Conditions of Approval (continued)

3. Revegetation specifications, as developed for Ski Incline by the Soil Conservation Service, are to be utilized.

4. Immediate stabilization of the disturbed areas will be required.

5. Power lines will be put underground.

6. No earth-moving equipment will be used except at the top and bottom loading and unloading area.

7. Towers and concrete for Wiggle Chair will be flown in by helicopter.

8. Debris from loading and unloading area will be removed.

9. Stump height will be limited to six inches on the uphill side in steep terrain, cut flush to ground when possible.

10. Slash will be treated through methods approved by the Nevada Division of Forestry.

11. If possible, trees should be topped instead of removed.

12. All lift components will be painted flat black to blend with the existing tree stands and the shadows they cast.

13. All signing necessary for skier information and safety will be erected prior to operation of ski lift.

14. Grading and filling shall not occur during periods of inclement weather.

15. At the end of each working day, either straw bales or an erosion control berm shall be placed or reconstructed across the driveway.

16. Mud shall not be tracked off the construction site. Grading operations shall cease in the event that a danger of tracking mud offsite exists. The site shall be cleaned up and road right-of-way swept clean when necessary.

17. An undertaking by corporate surety guaranteeing the performance of landscaping, revegetation, and proper installation of slope stabilization and drainage facilities shall be posted with the permit-issuing authority as provided in Section 7.130 of the Grading Ordinance. This will apply only to the current project, not to the five-year erosion and drainage plan.

18. Agency staff shall be notified at least 48 hours prior to the commencement of construction. This notification shall include: a) who will be doing the work; b) when work will commence; and c) when the completion of work is expected.

7/19/78
July 7, 1978

Kermit McMillian
General Manager
Incline Village General Improvement Dist.
P.O. Drawer P
Incline Village, Nevada  89450

RE: Administrative permit for Ski Incline Chair lifts

Dear Kermit:

This office has reviewed the above request to replace an existing ski lift and the addition of one chair lift. We have solicited comments for approval or disapproval from Washoe County Regional Planning Commission, Washoe County Engineering, Washoe County Health, Soil Conservation Service and Nevada Division of Forestry with no objection received (copies of written correspondence is enclosed.)

Following reviews and consideration the following finding were made.

1. Findings are that this is a needed facility in that the long lines now experienced by skiers severly curtails the enjoyment realized by customers while using this facility.

2. The restraints realized in parking will lose any impact on air quality through added vehicle trips.

3. The shuttle bus system now in use should be promoted and developed so as to encourage its use and discourage the use of individual vehicles.

4. This project has been granted a Special Use Permit Number SP-53-78W by the Board of Washoe County Commissioners to replace an existing T-Bar lift with a small chair lift and install an additional chair lift at Ski Incline.

Therefore in accordance with TRPA Ordinance # 4 Section 4.10 (2) an administrative permit is hereby issued for the replacement of one T-Bar lift with a small chair lift and to construct one additional wiggle chair lift.

Very truly yours,

LYNN E. KRUPP
Chief Building and Safety Inspector

cc: Jean Stoess
    John MacIntrye
    George Oshina
June 27, 1978

Washoe County Building Department
P. O. Box 11130
Reno, Nevada 89520

Attention: Mr. Lynn E. Krupp

Dear Lynn:

Enclosed you will find three copies of the Environmental Information Report regarding the construction of the Ski Incline chair lifts. Mr. Tom Nance filed two of these reports with you last Friday, and this will make a total of five that have been filed with your department.

I would ask that the Building Department proceed with the issuance of the Special Use Permit for the construction of those two chair lifts. I have been notified that the Washoe County Commissioners have taken affirmative action on the issuance of that permit and unless there are other requirements that have not been met, I would appreciate the issuance at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

INCLINE VILLAGE GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

Kermit McMillin
General Manager

KM/av

Enc.
Lynn Krupp  
Washoe County Building Department  
1205 Mill Street  
Reno, NV 89502

Dear Lynn:

On Monday, July 3, 1978, I inspected the proposed chair lift site at Ski Incline as was requested. After looking over the area, I could not come up with any major objections to the plan for the "Wiggle" chair lift.

However, I am not sure that all the trees (60+) mentioned need to be removed. Possibly, some of the smaller trees may be left in place if they will not interfere with safe operation of the lift. Dave Freitas or I would be happy to inspect the site with representatives of the ski area and go over this with them.

Sincerely,

Bill Johnston  
Urban Forester

BJ:sm
June 28, 1978

Kermit McMillan, General Manager
Incline Village General Improvement District
P.O. Drawer P
Incline Village, NV 89450

Re: New Lifts, Ski Incline

Dear Mr. McMillan:

On behalf of the Nevada Tahoe Conservation District, we are pleased to provide the following information per your request.

After review of plot plans and site inspection, we find the project satisfactorily designed for drainage control. We would like to recommend the following:

1. Removal of old lifts and construction of the new lifts should be scheduled during dry periods.

2. Damage to surrounding vegetation and landscapes should be kept to a minimum.

3. Areas disturbed should be revegetated using the grass mixture enclosed, or the mixture used by Ski Incline management in previous years. If fertilization is desired, it should be applied in the final stages of seedbed preparation, or with the seed. Use 16-20-0 at 250 lbs/acre. Mulching is also suggested.

If there are any questions concerning this report, please contact Mark Parson of our office.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Pyle
District Conservationist

RCP:br
Mr. Kermit McMillin
Incline Village General Improvement District
P. O. Drawer D
Incline Village, Nevada 89450

Dear Mr. McMillin:

I, Alex Coon, County Clerk and Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners, Washoe County, hereby certify that at its regular meeting of June 20, 1978, the Board made the following order:

78-1224   PLANNING - SPECIAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. SP-53-78W

11:15 a.m. The County Manager advised that the applicant had been notified by certified mail of time set to consider Special Use Permit Case No. SP-53-78W.

Dan Whitmore, Principal Planner, was present to answer questions.

Upon recommendation of the Board of Adjustment, on motion by Commissioner Nelson, seconded by Commissioner Stoess, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that Special Use Permit Case No. SP-53-78W be issued in the following form:

SPECIAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. SP-53-78W
INCLINE VILLAGE GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
(SKI INCLINE) C/O KERMIT McMILLIN

WHEREAS, the Board of Adjustment has recommended that a Special Use Permit be issued to Incline Village General Improvement District (Ski Incline) c/o Kermit McMillin, and

WHEREAS, findings show this is a needed facility for the Ski area and traffic trips outside the area will not increase since the present facility will be utilized, and

WHEREAS, no appeal from the decision of the Board of Adjustment has been made to the Washoe County Commissioners, and

WHEREAS, the time within which an appeal may be taken from said decision of the Board of Adjustment has lapsed, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Washoe County Commissioners has authorized the Clerk of the Board to issue such Special Use Permit.
NOW, THEREFORE, Special Use Permit Case No. SP-53-78W is hereby issued to Incline Village General Improvement District (Ski Incline) c/o Kermit McMillin to install an additional chair lift at Ski Incline and to replace existing T-Bar with small chair lift in an E-1 (First Estates) zone and A-4 (Farm & Forestry) zone on Ski Way and Fairview Boulevard, Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada, subject to the following five (5) conditions:

(1) Plot plans as submitted.

(2) Project to be completed within one year.

(3) Full compliance with all applicable ordinances, rules and regulations of Washoe County.

(4) Approval of the Washoe County Building Department.

(5) Review in two years.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

ALEX COON, County Clerk
and Clerk of the Board
of County Commissioners
Washoe County, Nevada

AC:pr

cc: Planning
Building
Engineer
Public Works
Heavenly Valley
Administrative Permit for
Ski Lift Replacement
El Dorado County

Summary

The applicant, William Killebrew, owner of the Heavenly Valley Ski Area, is requesting approval of an administrative permit to construct a triple chair lift to replace the existing Gunbarrel lift at Heavenly Valley. The old lift, which was constructed in 1955, is to be removed and the new triple chair lift is to be located in a slightly different location, the top terminal being moved approximately 120 feet to the north. The relocation of the upper lift terminal will relieve the congestion currently experienced due to the merging of skiers from the Gunbarrel, Patsys and West Bowl chairs.

The proposed lift will extend from an elevation of 6,700 feet to an elevation of 8,300 feet. The lower terminal and one lift tower are located on private land. The remaining towers will be located on National Forest land managed by the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit of the U.S. Forest Service.

Gunbarrel Lift

The existing Gunbarrel lift is used for transporting skiers uphill to access the upper slopes which provide skiing for a broad range of skills and for transporting skiers downhill in the afternoon. The new lift will double the existing downloading capacity and therefore significantly improve the skier experience by reducing wait times.

The new lift will have the potential to more than double the uphill capacity of the existing lift. The uphill capacity of the existing lift is 500 persons per hour and the uphill capacity of the new lift will be 1,400 persons per hour. The new lift will increase the overall uphill capacity of the ski area by approximately 23%, from 2,700 to 3,500 persons per hour.

Existing Environmental Setting

The replacement of Gunbarrel lift with a new modern lift is a project of limited scope in an area already modified by man's activities. This proposal will make no appreciable change in land use pattern. Naturally occurring vegetation consist of White Fir and Jeffrey Pine, with Manzanita and Chinquapin undergrowth. Revegetative species include Squaw Carpet, Penstemon, Whitethorn and pasture mixture grasses. There are no streams or watercourses in the area of the project.

Land Use

The property on which the new chair lift is to be located is classified General Forest. The proposed replacement of the old chair lift is permitted under the terms of the Land Use Ordinance since the Heavenly Valley Ski Area is a conforming use in the General Forest use classification.
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Land Coverage

Land coverage in conjunction with the proposed lift on both U.S. Forest Service and private land will be reduced by approximately 80%. This reduction is accomplished by elimination of the Midway Station, a large reduction in coverage at the top terminal, and a 2/3 reduction at the base terminal (see table).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Coverages</th>
<th>Old Gunbarrel Lift</th>
<th>New Gunbarrel Lift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway:</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top:</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>3126</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grading

The construction of the loading and unloading terminals will require the following amounts of grading:

- Lower Terminal (private land): 550 cubic yards
- Upper Terminal (removal of old lift): 500 cubic yards (federal land)
- Upper Terminal (new construction): 1100 cubic yards (federal land)

The placement of the lift towers will result in a total of 210 cubic yards of excavation. The applicant has shown on a temporary erosion control plan a system of temporary erosion control berms to adequately protect the undisturbed areas.

Revegetation

The applicant's temporary erosion control plan identifies areas to be revegetated around each lift terminal and the lift towers. If this project is approved a final revegetation and landscaping plan will be reviewed for approval by the Agency staff and the U.S. Forest Service.

Public Services and Facilities

The new Gunbarrel lift will utilize more electrical energy than the old Gunbarrel lift. The increase in electrical energy use will be from 162 Kwh to 350 Kwh. It will place no extraordinary burden on existing availability.

The Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board has conditioned their approval of the project requiring the Pioneer Lodge at the top of the tram to be sewer by the South Tahoe Public Utility District on or before October 15, 1980. The lodge facility is exempt from the South Tahoe PUD permit allocation process. No other public services are involved in this project.
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Transportation

Although the replacement of the Gunbarrel lift will more than double the uphill capacity of the existing lift and will increase the uphill capacity of the entire ski area, it is not anticipated that this replacement will generate additional traffic to Heavenly Valley. The lift is primarily proposed to increase skier safety, skier circulation, and the quality of the skiing experience at Heavenly Valley. The main constraint on skier capacity is parking. Heavenly Valley is not proposing any increase in parking capacity.

Height

The maximum permitted height for any structure in General Forest is 35 feet. The lower terminal building and first lift tower, which are the only structures proposed on private land, are 17.5 feet and 18 feet in height, respectively. The average height of the lift towers and upper terminal structure located on federal land is 41.6 feet. The two tallest lift towers on federal land are 60 feet in height.

Storm Drainage

The applicant has not submitted a storm drainage plan as part of this application. The only storm drainage facilities necessary for the proposed chair lift would be those required to collect and infiltrate the runoff emanating from the lower terminal building.

Agency staff is concerned with the quality of the stormwater runoff released from the large parking lot located at the California base facility. Presently, contaminants such as greases and oils are not properly removed from the parking lot runoff prior to release into Lake Tahoe tributaries. The 208 Program has identified this parking lot as a source of major water pollution. To improve this situation the applicant should prepare an erosion control and stormwater runoff plan for the parking lot.

Approvals

The project has been approved by the CTRPA, subject to 37 conditions (copy attached). The U.S. Forest Service has approved the project subject to 19 conditions (copy attached).

Recommendation

Agency staff recommends that based on the finding that the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the subject chair lift is not detrimental to health, safety, peace, morals, comfort and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of Heavenly Valley, or detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the region, and will not cause any substantial harmful environmental consequences on the land of the applicant or on other lands or waters, the Governing Board conditionally approve an administrative permit for the subject application. The recommended conditions of approval are:

1. A five year erosion control and stormwater runoff plan for the parking lot at the California base facility shall be submitted to and approved by Agency staff. This plan shall clearly depict methods to be used to stabilize all existing cut or fill slopes adjacent to the parking lot and all drainage improvements necessary to properly treat, as set forth in the 208 Handbook of Best Management Practices, all stormwater runoff emanating from the paved surfaces. This plan shall be submitted to the Agency by January 1, 1979.
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Conditions of Approval (continued)

2. Each of the following conditions shall be completely performed prior to the issuance of the approval letter for this administrative permit:

   a. The final construction drawings for all site improvements shall be submitted to and approved by Agency staff. The final construction drawing shall clearly depict: 1) slope stabilization methods to be performed to stabilize all cut and fill slopes and areas denuded of vegetation; 2) areas to be revegetated, including complete specifications for such revegetation; 3) fencing for vegetation protection; 4) temporary and permanent erosion control devices; 5) measures to be taken for dust control; and 6) all drainage facilities.

   b. An undertaking by corporate surety or other similar and appropriate document guaranteeing the performance of landscaping, revegetation, and proper installation of slope stabilization and drainage facilities shall be posted with the permit-issuing authority as provided in Section 7.130 of the Grading Ordinance. The undertaking or other document shall provide that the Agency may enforce the same and use the funds provided therein to assure compliance with the landscaping, revegetation and slope stabilization and drainage plans.

   c. Calculations showing the adequacy of the infiltration trench design prepared by a qualified civil engineer shall be submitted to the Agency.

   d. The final construction drawings for all site improvements shall be found by Agency staff to be in substantial conformance with the plans and information submitted as part of this application and this finding so indicated in writing to the permit-issuing authority.

3. There shall be no grading or land disturbance performed with respect to the project during periods of inclement weather or when there is snow on the site.

4. Replanting of all exposed surfaces, as per the revegetation and slope stabilization plan, shall be accomplished within the first growing season following disturbance. Planting shall be accomplished prior to October 15.

5. During construction, environmental protection devices such as adequate erosion control devices, dust control and vegetation protection barriers shall be maintained.

6. Rehabilitation and cleanup of the site following construction must include removal of all construction waste and debris.

7. This approval expires eighteen (18) months from the date of Governing Board approval unless substantial work has commenced on the project.

8. Construction of all improvements shall be completed within twenty-four (24) months of the date of Governing Board approval. If construction is not completed within said time, this approval shall expire and the applicant or his successor in interest shall immediately remove all partially completed work and return the site, as far as possible, to its original condition. If the applicant or his successor in interest fails to do so, the permit-issuing authority or the Agency may have the work performed at the applicant's or his successor's in interest expense, costs to constitute a lien against all the real property which is the subject of this approval.
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9. Agency staff shall be notified at least 48 hours prior to the commencement of construction. This notification shall include: 1) who will be doing the work; b) when the work will commence; and c) when the completion of work is expected.

10. All disturbed sites shall be maintained and revegetated in precise accordance with the requirements of the U.S. Forest Service and shall include a minimum of the following on lands subject to TRPA approval:

   a. All disturbed soils shall be immediately stabilized and maintained in place in accordance with instructions of the U.S. Forest Service inspector and the plans approved by TRPA.

   b. All disturbed sites shall, upon completion of work, be revegetated and maintained in accordance with plans and proposals approved by the U.S. Forest Service and the TRPA.

   c. If upon site inspection, the inspector for the U.S. Forest Service or the TRPA determines temporary erosion control measures are required on lands subject to TRPA approval, temporary erosion control berm of a design approved by Agency staff shall be in place prior to any land disturbance.

11. Power lines will be put underground.

12. Use of old, non-maintained roads or new road construction for access to towers will not be permitted because of the need to avoid disturbance of the ground and removal of ground vegetation.

13. No earth-moving equipment will be used except at the top and bottom loading and unloading area.

14. The ski lift tower base will be excavated by hand to avoid destruction of ground vegetation.

15. The tower and concrete will be flown in by helicopter.

16. The old tower will be removed by helicopter.

17. The concrete tower base will be removed to below ground level and covered.

18. Debris from the loading area will be removed.

19. All lift components will be painted flat black to blend with the existing tree stands and the shadows they cast.

20. Trees and natural vegetation to remain on the site shall be fenced for protection. Scarring of trees shall be avoided and, if scarred, damaged areas shall be repaired with tree seal.
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CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The "Management Requirements and Constraints" contained in the U. S. Forest Service's Environmental Analysis Report shall be included as conditions of approval of the Agency.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. The permit does not become effective, and the project may not be commenced, unless and until the applicant and the contractor who will be constructing the project accepts the findings and conditions in writing and transmits the acceptance to the CTRPA (Land Use Ordinance Section 4.15-b-3).

The acceptance should be returned within ten working days following issuance of the permit but in any case prior to the commencement of construction. If the acknowledgement has not been returned within the time for commencement of construction, the Chairperson or Executive Officer shall not accept any application for extension of the permit. (Agency Regulations Section 88.1).

2. If the terms and conditions of the approval are violated, the CTRPA in addition to criminal and civil judicial proceedings, may, if appropriate, issue a stop order requiring the cessation of work, revoke this permit, require removal of any improvements made in reliance upon this permit with costs to constitute a lien on the property, and/or order restoration of the property (Land Use Ordinance Section 4.17).

3. This permit expires one year from date of issuance, but may be extended for good cause for one additional year if you so apply prior to expiration. (Land Use Ordinance Section 4.15-b-4). Permit extensions will be evaluated for compliance with the ordinance provisions in effect at the time of the request for the extension.

This permit may become invalid or ineffective if any other required permit for this project expires or will-served letters are cancelled. It is the applicant's responsibility to request appropriate permit extensions.

4. There shall be no grading or land disturbance performed with respect to the project between October 15, and May 1, or extension thereof. (Land Use Ordinance Section 5.15, 7.14 and 8.16).

5. The requirements of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency shall be complied with.

6. The waste discharge requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region, shall be complied with.

7. No filling or grading shall be permitted in any wet lands, stream environment zone or flood plain.

CONSTRUCTION PRACTICE PROVISIONS

8. Soil disturbance shall be minimized. All disturbed soil areas shall
immediately after construction be stabilized by revegetation or mechanical techniques, or a combination of both.

9. There shall be no grading or land disturbance to existing drainage area.

10. All work must be performed in such a manner that the project can be winterized within 24 hours.

11. All disturbed area shall be stabilized and protected from erosion and siltation at all times (Section 5.15).

12. Excess debris and waste construction material shall be placed in a centralized area free from flooding or washout and shall be removed from the site as soon as possible.

13. Loose soil mounds or surfaces shall be protected from wind or water erosion by being appropriately covered when construction is not in active progress or in anticipation of a storm.

14. Slopes exceeding the natural angle of repose or an angle of two horizontal to one vertical must be mechanically stabilized.

15. The construction of land fills, excavation, cuts and clearing of vegetation shall be conducted only in accordance with the TRPA Grading Ordinance and is prohibited between October 15 and May 1.

16. All excavated material shall be stored upgrade from the excavated areas. No material shall be stored in any stream environment zone.

17. The length of open trenches (excluding foundation) at the end of each working day shall not exceed 50 feet.

18. Temporary erosion control and vegetation protection measures shall be in place prior to the start of construction or grading.

19. The CTRPA Executive Officer shall be notified in writing at least one day before any work is started on stream crossing.

20. No excavation or backfill will be permitted when snow is present or ground is frozen unless written permission is obtained from the CTRPA Executive Officer.

21. No vehicles or heavy equipment shall be allowed in any stream environment zone.

22. No cleaning of equipment, including cement mixers, shall be permitted where the waste material can enter any stream environment zone.

23. All runoff emanating from the construction site shall be contained within temporary berms or other barriers. The location of these temporary erosion control facilities shall be approved by the CTRPA staff.

24. Workers should avoid tracking mud or debris onto public right-of-way. Site shall be cleaned up and road right-of-way swept clean when necessary.

25. Rehabilitation and clean-up of the site following construction must include removal of all construction waste and debris and restoration of topography.
26. All disturbed sites shall be maintained and revegetated in precise accordance with the requirements of the U.S. Forest Service and shall include a minimum of the following on lands subject to CTRPA approvals:

   a. All disturbed soils shall be immediately stabilized and maintained in place in accordance with instructions of the U.S. Forest Service inspector and the CTRPA.

   b. All disturbed sites shall, upon completion of work, be revegetated and maintained in accordance with plans and proposals approved by the U.S. Forest Service and the CTRPA.

   c. Proposed revegetation materials and methods on lands subject to CTRPA approval shall be subject to the prior written approval of the Agency.

   d. If upon site inspection, the inspector for the U.S. Forest Service or staff of the CTRPA determines temporary erosion control measures are required on lands subject to CTRPA approvals, temporary erosion control berms of a design approved by the Agency shall be in place prior to any land disturbance.

   e. Security in the form of a bond, letter of credit, or certificate of deposit for the purpose of assuring revegetation and maintenance of vegetation and in an amount of 100% of the estimated cost of the re-vegetation and subject maintenance for a period of three (3) years, shall be posted by the applicant prior to commencement of construction. This shall apply only to land subject to CTRPA approval.

DISPOSAL OF WASTE MATERIAL PROVISIONS

27. All waste material from the project shall be disposed of only at a site specifically approved of by the CTRPA staff. Said approval shall be obtained prior to the transport of the waste material.

AGENCY NOTIFICATION PROVISIONS

28. The CTRPA Executive Officer shall be notified in writing at least one day before any work is commenced on the project.

29. The CTRPA Executive Officer shall be given written notification when the work is completed.

30. Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the project, the applicant shall provide the following information in writing to the CTRPA staff:

   1. The name, address, phone number and contractor's license number of the contractor who will be constructing the project.

   2. The name, address, and phone number of the construction supervisor who is responsible for the project.

31. Any change in any of the above shall be immediately reported in writing to the CTRPA staff.

TRAFFIC

32. No work activity shall be allowed during any holiday, weekend, or Friday afternoons which would adversely affect traffic on the adjacent roadways.
33. A U. S. Forest Service representative shall be available for inspections at all times and shall have authority to stop work and order immediate remedial action at any time.

34. The "Management Requirements and Constraints" included in the U. S. Forest Service's Environmental Analysis Report shall be included as mitigation measures - conditions of the Agency.

35. No new or substantial replacement ski facilities which in conjunction with this facility will cause potential significant increase in numbers of skiers may be reviewed or approved without submittal to the Agency of a long range Master Plan which includes all plans for ultimate ski areas development (CTRPA Ski Area Criteria).

HANDICAPPED PARKING

36. At least two parking spaces shall be provided for the handicapped at the base facility parking lot. Said spaces shall conform to the Caltrans standard G-81 with respect to signs. The minimum width of the space shall be 12'.

37. The location of said spaces shall be reviewed and approved by the CTRPA Executive Officer prior to the issuance of the permit for the project.
1. A detailed construction plan of all elements of the lift, including loading and unloading areas, will be submitted and approved prior to starting construction.

2. A fire plan will be developed, if necessary.

3. Immediate stabilization of the disturbed areas will be required.

4. Power lines will be put underground.

5. Use of old, non-maintained roads or new road construction for access to towers will not be permitted because of the need to avoid disturbance of the ground and removal of ground vegetation.

6. No earth-moving equipment will be used except at the top and bottom loading and unloading area.

7. Ski lift tower bases will be excavated by hand to avoid destruction of ground vegetation.

8. Towers and concrete will be flown in by helicopter.

9. Old towers will be removed by helicopter.

10. All debris from the midway loading station will be removed by a method approved by the Forest Service.

11. All concrete tower bases will be removed to below ground level and covered.

12. Debris from loading and unloading area will be removed.

13. Individual marking of trees to be cut will be made by the Snow Ranger under the supervision of a forester.

14. Forest Service will cruise the timber; Heavenly Valley to pay current stumpage rates.

15. Stump height will be limited to six inches on the uphill side in steep terrain, cut flush to ground when possible.

16. Slash will be treated through methods approved by the Forest Service.

17. All lift components will be painted flat black to blend with the existing tree stands and the shadows they cast.

18. All signing necessary for skier information and safety will be erected prior to operation of ski lift.

19. A Forest Service representative will inspect all phases of construction.
Lake Tahoe “Meadowland Treatment” Study

The EPA Regional Office in San Francisco (Region IX) requested the Laboratory provide assistance to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency in its development of an Area-wide Waste Treatment Management Program for the Lake Tahoe Basin (Nevada – California). This program is mandated by Section 208 of the 1972 Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments. In this article, Dr. Williams, an aquatic biologist, discusses the Laboratory's one-year study to measure the effect of “meadowland treatment” on nutrient and suspended sediment loads contributed by rainfall and snowmelt runoff to tributary streams of Lake Tahoe.

by Llewellyn R. Williams, Ph.D.

The extraordinarily pure clear waters of Lake Tahoe are being threatened. Land disturbances associated with development and construction activities and increased land surface coverage by roadways, parking lots, etc., have led to increases in erosion and surface water runoff. Silt, sediment, and dissolved nutrients carried by tributary streams contaminate the waters near the shore and hold potential for accelerated eutrophication of Lake Tahoe.

While the great volume of water in Lake Tahoe provides substantial assimilative capacity for pollutants, the shallow near-shore areas are vulnerable to relatively small changes in the character of contributing water sources. This increases the potential for algal problems (reducing water clarity) and intrusion of aquatic weeds in shallow tributary delta areas.

Land disturbances and increased land surface coverage have led to increases in erosion and surface water runoff.

The Laboratory's study will measure the effect of “meadowland treatment” on the nutrient and suspended sediment loads contributed by rainfall and snowmelt runoff to tributary streams of Lake Tahoe.

In theory, natural meadows offer resistance to waters flowing over them, resulting in decreased velocities and increased deposition of suspended silts and sediments. Surface soils of periodically inundated meadows should also provide large surface area for physical adsorption and root surfaces for active nutrient uptake processes.

Under extremely low water conditions, such as those experienced during the past three years, streams have remained channelized and offered little, if any, opportunity to evaluate the treatment capabilities of associated meadowlands.

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency has done limited preliminary sampling in one test meadow in the South Lake Tahoe area. This sampling indicates significant reductions in suspended sediments and nutrient levels of a rainfall runoff episode.

Silt, sediment, and dissolved nutrients contaminate the waters near the shore and hold potential for accelerated eutrophication of Lake Tahoe.

The current study is evaluating meadowlands associated with four tributary streams and two local drainage areas in the South Lake Tahoe area. The streams include Trout, Cold, Talack, and Angora Creeks. The local drainage areas are designated Chenokis-Glen Road and Blackwood Meadow.

Samples are collected at 22 sites on a regular basis and at an additional 15 to 20 sites under episodic snowmelt or rainfall runoff conditions. Physical and chemical analyses performed in the field include temperature, conductivity, flow, turbidity, suspended sediments (total and volatile solids), dissolved oxygen, total alkalinity and chlorophyll a.

Preserved samples are returned to the Laboratory for nutrient analyses, e.g., total phosphorus, dissolved phosphorus, dissolved orthophosphorus, nitrate-nitrate nitrogen, ammonia nitrogen, and total Kjeldahl nitrogen. Organic carbon samples are analyzed under contract. Biological samples are analyzed for fecal coliforms and algal identification and enumeration.

A side benefit resulted when preliminary analyses of fall data showed an apparent sewer leak contributing 10-fold increases in nitrate-nitrogen to Cold Creek. (Domestic sewage is collected, treated, and exported from the Basin.)
Costa Honored

Charles F. (Chuck) Costa, Chief of the Laboratory's Radiation Monitoring Branch, has been named Federal Employee of the Year by the Southern Nevada Federal Executive Association. Las Vegas Mayor, William Briare presented Costa with an engraved plaque at a recent luncheon honoring Costa and the three other nominees for the award.

In announcing the selection, the Association cited Costa for the important public relations contribution he has made "by traveling throughout the State lecturing and talking with audiences about the operation of the nuclear testing program and the elaborate precautions taken to safeguard the public health."

Harold F. Mueller, Chairman of the Association's Selection Committee said, "Mr. Costa and his staff have provided an essential and extremely reliable response capability and have enhanced the image of his Laboratory, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Energy."

Costa has been with the EPA's Las Vegas Laboratory since 1962 and has been involved with the off-site radiation safety program the Laboratory carries out for the U.S. Department of Energy’s nuclear testing program for most of that time.

Lake Tahoe (continued)
The Laboratory, Region IX, State and local agencies are cooperating to isolate and characterize the problem. A special study has confirmed the location and magnitude of the problem.

Episodic runoff events (rainstorms, snowmelt, etc.) classically carry heavy loads of suspended sediments and dissolved nutrients to the lake. Some of these events are of short duration but inordinate impact. In an effort to "capture" runoff episode data, the field team has enlisted the efforts of volunteers from local, State and Federal agencies within the Basin. The volunteer response will provide invaluable sampling assistance during critical periods of high sediment and nutrient transport. While such runoff episodes have been few and far between over the previous years, the current snowpack and succession of winter storms promises an average to above average snowmelt runoff this spring and should provide excellent conditions for evaluating the effectiveness of meadowland treatment processes.

Laboratory Reports Published

The technical reports listed were recently published by the Laboratory and will be available for purchase from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161.


These reports present the species and abundance of phytoplankton in lakes sampled by the National Eutrophication Survey, along with results from the calculation of several commonly used biological indices of water quality and community structure.
To: The TRPA Governing Body  

From: The Staff  

Subject: 208 Water Quality Management Plan  

Date: July 18, 1978  

On Thursday, July 20, the California State Water Resources Control Board has scheduled consideration of certification of the 208 Plan for the Tahoe Basin. As staff discussed with you last month, there is a great possibility that the State Board will not certify the Plan and will de-designate TRPA as the 208 planning agency for the Basin. Staff will be attending the meeting on the 20th and will provide you with a verbal report of the actions taken by the State Board.

Following is a copy of a letter from the City of South Lake Tahoe to the State Board which sets forth its views on the Plan and the role TRPA should play in implementation. Support of this nature is certainly helpful in terms of implementing the Plan.

Attachment
July 6, 1978

Executive Director
State Water Resources
Control Board
P. O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95811

Dear Sir:

The City of South Lake Tahoe has been actively involved in the planning process undertaken by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency for erosion and drainage control in the Tahoe basin.

The City has supported the planning process through participation in the Technical Advisory Committee and by having local elected representation on the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. It was local government input of the program that deleted the fixed implementation schedule. At the present local government is not endorsing a fixed schedule because of the uncertainties of local funding sources. This point could not be better emphasized than with the recent Proposition 13 passage which will drastically affect our ability as a local government to fund these projects.

The City wholeheartedly supports the erosion control program in concept, the Council also supports the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency as the planning and implementing agency. But again, without outside funding sources the fixed implementation schedule is entirely unacceptable. This City lacks revenue sources which will permit City financing and we have no capability at this time to impose assessment proceedings to seek property owner contribution separately from local taxes.

Yours very truly,

Richard Milbrodt
City Manager

RM: wm
## Statement of Revenue & Expenses from July 1, 1977 Thru June 30, 1978

Percentage of Fiscal Year Completed: **100%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue &amp; Expenses</th>
<th>Budgeted Thru 6/30/78</th>
<th>Actual Revenue Thru 6/30/78</th>
<th>Actual In Proportion To Budgeted</th>
<th>Actual (Over)/Under Budgeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of California</strong></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>($0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of Nevada</strong></td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>($0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carson City</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>($0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Douglas County</strong></td>
<td>18,897</td>
<td>18,897</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>($0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>El Dorado County</strong></td>
<td>63,450</td>
<td>63,450</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>($50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Placer County</strong></td>
<td>41,334</td>
<td>41,334</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>($0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washoe County</strong></td>
<td>26,311</td>
<td>26,311</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>($0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Filing Pec Income</strong></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>27,305</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>(2,305)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conference Room Income</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment Income</strong></td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>7,796</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>(1,446)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sales/Printed Matter</strong></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>(212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance 7/1/77</strong></td>
<td>75,942</td>
<td>75,942</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>($75,942)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Income</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>($72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.P.A.</strong></td>
<td>106,681</td>
<td>102,074</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.U.D.</strong></td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>50,800</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.E.T.A.</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>($164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$529,973</td>
<td>$530,365</td>
<td>101 %</td>
<td>($392)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>In Proportion</th>
<th>Over/Under Budgeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Salaries</strong></td>
<td>$224,032</td>
<td>$224,361</td>
<td>101 %</td>
<td>($329)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Benefits</strong></td>
<td>26,839</td>
<td>25,962</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.E.T.A. Salaries</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>(1371)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.E.T.A. Benefits</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>(193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Notices</strong></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repairs/Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Supplies</strong></td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>4,033</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications</strong></td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>9,193</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>(393)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postage</strong></td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>3,563</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Expenses</strong></td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto Expenses</strong></td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insurance</strong></td>
<td>3,711</td>
<td>3,711</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>($0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Expenses</strong></td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>49,576</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>(576)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Equipment Rent</strong></td>
<td>10,201</td>
<td>10,283</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>(82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auditing Services</strong></td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>($0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consulting Services</strong></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>($0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reproduction/Printing</strong></td>
<td>38,070</td>
<td>31,979</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Expenses</strong></td>
<td>917</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Services</strong></td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>67,952</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspection Fees</strong></td>
<td>575</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>($0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$471,895</td>
<td>$468,602</td>
<td>99 %</td>
<td>$3,293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Revenue 6/30/78** $58,078

**Net Revenue 6/30/78** $61,763

(Continued on next page)
ALL PROGRAMS BUDGETED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1977/78

CONDITION OF NET REVENUE ON 6/30/78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash On Hand</td>
<td>$2,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings, Investments</td>
<td>$82,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>$13,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Accounts Payable</td>
<td>($36,461)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NET REVENUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>$61,763</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement of Revenue & Expenses From July 1, 1977 Thru June 30, 1978

Percentage of 12-Month Budget Period Completed: 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue &amp; Expenses</th>
<th>Budgeted Revenue &amp; Expenses Thru 6/30/78</th>
<th>Actual Revenue &amp; Expenses Thru 6/30/78</th>
<th>Actual In Proportion To Budgeted</th>
<th>Actual (Over)/Under Budgeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Nevada</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson City</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>18,897</td>
<td>18,897</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>63,450</td>
<td>63,500</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>41,334</td>
<td>41,334</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>26,311</td>
<td>26,311</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing Fee Income</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>27,305</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>(2,305)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Room Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7,205</td>
<td>122%</td>
<td>(1,305)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Printed Matter</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance 7/1/77</td>
<td>65,253</td>
<td>65,253</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>(572)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$ 360,253</td>
<td>$ 364,506</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>(4,253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Contributions to Other Programs</td>
<td>(73,211)</td>
<td>(62,958)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>(10,253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.T.A.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>(1,564)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$ 287,042</td>
<td>$ 303,112</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>$ (16,070)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual In Proportion To Budgeted</th>
<th>Actual (Over)/Under Budgeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Salaries</td>
<td>$ 109,741</td>
<td>$ 111,216</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>$ (1,475)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>13,061</td>
<td>12,663</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.T.A. Salaries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>(1,371)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.T.A. Benefits</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>193%</td>
<td>(193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Notices</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs/Maintenance</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>4,554</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>(325)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>2,131</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Expenses</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Expenses</td>
<td>25,279</td>
<td>25,635</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>(356)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment Rent</td>
<td>4,937</td>
<td>5,068</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing Services</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction/Printing</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>62,356</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>(4,356)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$ 230,392</td>
<td>$ 235,888</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>$ (5,496)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Revenue 6/30/78 $ 56,650
Net Revenue 6/30/78 $ 67,224

(Continued on next page)
CONDITION OF NET REVENUE ON 6/30/78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash On Hand</td>
<td>$1,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings, Investments</td>
<td>$69,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>$12,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Accounts Payable</td>
<td>($15,403)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NET REVENUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>$67,224</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Statement of Revenue & Expenses From July 1, 1977 Thru June 30, 1978

Percentage of 12-Month Budget Period Completed: **100%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue:</th>
<th>Budgeted Revenue &amp; Expenses</th>
<th>Actual Revenue &amp; Expenses Thru 6/30/78</th>
<th>Actual In Proportion To Budgeted</th>
<th>Actual (Over)/Under Budgeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.P.A.</td>
<td>$ 106,681</td>
<td>$ 102,074</td>
<td>96 %</td>
<td>$ 4,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRPA Contributions</td>
<td>36,779</td>
<td>31,300</td>
<td>85 %</td>
<td>5,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td>(280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 143,460</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 133,654</strong></td>
<td>93 %</td>
<td><strong>$ 9,806</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Salaries</td>
<td>$ 54,231</td>
<td>$ 55,620</td>
<td>103 %</td>
<td>$(1,389)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>6,742</td>
<td>6,680</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs/Maintenance</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>(109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Expenses</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Expenses</td>
<td>11,526</td>
<td>12,783</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>(1,257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment Rent</td>
<td>3,168</td>
<td>3,198</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing Services</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction/Printing</td>
<td>28,495</td>
<td>28,045</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,514</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 143,460</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 145,273</strong></td>
<td>101 %</td>
<td><strong>$ (1,813)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Revenue 6/30/78**  
-0-

**Net Revenue 6/30/78**  
$ (11,619)

### Condition of Net Revenue on 6/30/78

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash On Hand</td>
<td>$ 1,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings, Investments</td>
<td>5,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>1,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Accounts Payable</td>
<td>(20,111)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Net Revenue**  
$ (11,619)
STATEMENT OF REVENUE & EXPENSES FROM JULY 1, 1977 THRU June 30, 1978

Percentage of 12-Month Budget Period Completed: 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue &amp; Expenses</th>
<th>Budgeted Thru 6/30/78</th>
<th>Actual Revenue Thru 6/30/78</th>
<th>Actual In Proportion To Budgeted</th>
<th>Actual (Over)/Under Budgeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.U.D.</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>$50,800</td>
<td>98 %</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRPA Contributions</td>
<td>28,173</td>
<td>23,399</td>
<td>83 %</td>
<td>4,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance 7/1/77</td>
<td>10,689</td>
<td>10,689</td>
<td>129 %</td>
<td>(102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>452</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.T.A.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>$91,212</strong></td>
<td><strong>$85,340</strong></td>
<td><strong>94 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,872</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Salaries</td>
<td>$53,484</td>
<td>$51,750</td>
<td>97 %</td>
<td>$1,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>6,378</td>
<td>5,961</td>
<td>93 %</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.T.A. Salaries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.T.A. Benefits</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs/Maintenance</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>93 %</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>98 %</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>81 %</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>53 %</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Expenses</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>73 %</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Expenses</td>
<td>12,177</td>
<td>11,140</td>
<td>91 %</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment Rent</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>97 %</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing Services</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction/Printing</td>
<td>7,277</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>6,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Fees</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$89,784</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,182</strong></td>
<td><strong>88 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,602</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NET REVENUE 6/30/78** $1,428

**NET REVENUE 6/30/78** $6,158

**CONDITION OF NET REVENUE ON 6/30/78**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash On Hand</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings, Investments</td>
<td>7,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Accounts Payable</td>
<td>-947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NET REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$6,158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FISCAL YEAR 1976/77 PROGRAM COMPLETION

STATEMENT OF REVENUE & EXPENSES FROM JULY 1, 1977 THRU June 30, 1978

Percentage of 5-Month Budget Period Completed: 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE:</th>
<th>Budgeted Revenue &amp; Expenses</th>
<th>Actual Revenue &amp; Expenses Thru 6/30/78</th>
<th>Actual In Proportion To Budgeted</th>
<th>Actual (Over)/Under Budgeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRPA Contributions</td>
<td>$ 8,259</td>
<td>$ 8,259</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>$ -0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Salaries</td>
<td>$ 6,576</td>
<td>$ 5,775</td>
<td>88 %</td>
<td>$ 801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Expenses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Expenses</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction/Printing</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td>209 %</td>
<td>(801)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL EXPENSES                 | $ 8,259                    | $ 8,259                                | 100 %                           | $ -0-                        |

NET REVENUE 11/30/77            -0-                          |

NET REVENUE 6/30/78             $ -0-                          |
TO: The TRPA Governing Board

FROM: The Staff

SUBJECT: TRPA Budget

As you know, the budget of the State of California as adopted by the Governor contains a $75,000 appropriation to TRPA. Following are information sheets concerning this budget allocation and the conditions that were put upon it. At the present time, there appears to be some contention that the $75,000 will only be allocated to the Agency upon approval by the Secretary of the California Resources Agency. If the Secretary does not allocate this money in a timely fashion, it will have severe cash flow impacts on the Agency. As yet, when and how much of the $75,000 will be allocated is up in the air. Staff will continue to work with all parties in Sacramento to try to establish when the money will be allocated.

Staff will report to the Board concerning this matter and the budget in general, since the fiscal year 1978/79 work program/budget cannot be finalized for Board action until such time as these matters are solidified.
**Item: 170**

**Description:** Subvention to California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

**Account/Fund:** General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor's Request</th>
<th>Sub Committee Action</th>
<th>Committee Greater (+) or Less (−) than Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item Total</td>
<td>$ 330,100</td>
<td>$ 230,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schedules:**

(a) Local assistance 230,100 230,100 −0-
(b) Attorney General contract services 100,000 −0- 100,000

**Explanation of Changes/Differences:**

Reduced by $100,000 to eliminate funds for Attorney General contract services in order to make this a conference item.

**Item: 170.1**

**Description:** Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

**Account/Fund:** General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor's Request</th>
<th>Sub Committee Action</th>
<th>Committee Greater (+) or Less (−) than Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item Total</td>
<td>$ −0-</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation of Changes/Differences:**

Added new Item to provide support for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

**Item Language Change:**

Added language to restrict allocations to such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary for Resources.

**Supplemental Language:**

The Secretary for Resources shall not allocate funds provided by the State of California for support of the bi-State Tahoe Regional Planning Agency if he finds that that agency will apply any of the financial resources at its disposal toward support of legal action against any California State agency.
Item: 170.1  
Description: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
Account/Fund: General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor's Request</th>
<th>Assembly Version</th>
<th>Senate Version</th>
<th>Assem/Sen Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ -0-</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ -0-</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item Total

Explanation of Changes/Differences:

Assembly added new Item to provide support for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

Difference: Assembly +$75,000

Item Language Change:

Assembly added language to restrict allocations to such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary for Resources.

Conference Action

Adopted Assembly version

Adopted Senate version with language to restrict expenditure of these funds to enforcement of ordinances, defense of inverse condemnation suits, and for the establishment of air and water quality standards in the Tahoe Basin.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SUPPLEMENTARY LANGUAGE</strong></th>
<th><strong>Item 170.1</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSEMBLY VERSION</strong></td>
<td><strong>SENATE VERSION</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. The Secretary for Resources shall not allocate funds provided by the State of California for support of the bi-State Tahoe Regional Planning Agency if he finds that that agency will apply any of the financial resources at its disposal toward support of legal action against any California state agency. | 1. None | Adopted  
Senate version |
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

MEMORANDUM

To: The TRPA Governing Body

From: The Staff

Subj: Compact Amendments

Date: July 18, 1978

Since the last meeting, staff has been asked to provide additional information to Charles Warren, Chairman of the President's Commission on Environmental Quality, concerning changes that could be made to the Compact. In light of this, staff, at the request of Mr. Warren, attended a meeting in Sacramento on Saturday, July 15 to answer questions concerning the red line area and alternatives related thereto. Staff will be prepared to discuss its participation in the meeting at the July Board meeting.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 18, 1978

TO: Governing Board

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: General Plan Update

Attached for your information are additional comments received to date from various state agencies regarding the proposed General Plan Revisions and the Impact Assessment on the Proposed Plan.

At the upcoming Governing Board meeting we will be prepared to discuss the General Plan Map, and the material on buildout rates and potential growth presented to you at the last Governing Board meeting.

kl
Our traffic analysis for the Tahoe Basin has not been accomplished to the point that we can either verify or dispute the traffic values presented in the consultant report. We recognize that a severe traffic problem presently exists at Southshore Lake Tahoe; and, recent developments at the north end of Lake Tahoe is beginning the same trend in that insufficient capacity (number of travel lanes) exists to handle the traffic.

We concur that immediate action is of paramount importance to relieve today's problems at Southshore and further emphasis is added because of the extreme danger that exists in dispatching emergency equipment to the stateline area in case of a major fire or other potential calamities. On a given day, with bumper to bumper traffic, it is all but impossible to clear a path for emergency vehicles and the Highway Patrol has even implemented the use of motorcycles to help thread their way through traffic.

While we have an open mind as to how mix to provide adequate transportation for today and whatever level of Tahoe Basin growth is agreed upon by the two states, from a safety standpoint the first action must be development of the inner loop system together with a by-pass around stateline to provide relief for traffic having no purpose for stopping at stateline; and, provide a means for emergency vehicles to get to stateline and through the entire Southshore area.

We cannot verify the statement that: Even with a by-pass constructed and transit system implemented, the transportation system at Southshore will be unable to handle the demand by 1985, assuming minimal growth. Our previous evaluations showed that a four lane freeway on the Nevada side and two added lanes (6 lanes) on the California side would handle traffic volumes up to 70,000 v.p.d. Together with the existing travel lanes on U.S. 50 and with the inner loop in existence along with transit service, it should go far toward meeting the 1985 demands.

Beyond 1985, any substantial growth in the Basin by either internal growth and/or by visitors to the area will require implementing other forms of transportation.

STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS
MEMORANDUM

To: Bruce Arkell, State Planning Coordinator
1050 E. Williams Street, Carson City

From: Ivan Laird, Program Engineer, Highway Dept.

Subject: SAT #0 # 78100484 - TAHOE REGIONAL PLAN.

SEE ATTACHED COMMENTS.
June 21, 1978

Mr. Bruce D. Ackell
Planning Coordinator
1050 East Williams
Carson City, NV 89701

Dear Mr. Ackell:

Reference is made to SAI NV #7819484 - Tahoe Regional Plan.

The Department of Fish and Game feels Alternative 1 would create the least amount of damage or deterioration to the basin in relation to its environmental quality. In this report it has already been pointed out that even under Alternative 1, air and water quality has already deteriorated. It is also a fact, that even under present conditions streams are used as storm drains in collecting much of the runoff water from streets and highways.

It appears that to accept Alternatives, specifically 3 through 6, would create more problems and degradation of the basin with the expansion of land use, transportation, traffic and that segment of recreation that involves expansion of casinos. These alternatives would also effect critical habitat areas, stream environment zones, landmarks, etc.

Because of Lake Tahoe's uniqueness and to retain as much of this quality as possible, Alternative 1 should be selected towards the general plan.

Sincerely,

GLEN K. GRIFFITH, DIRECTOR

A. Jack Dieringer
Acting Director
MEMORANDUM

To: Bruce Arkell

From: Division of Historic Preservation and Archeology

Subject: SAI NV#78100484, Tahoe Regional Plan

June 19, 1978

This Division, acting as the designated State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), has reviewed the Impact Statement for the proposed Tahoe Regional Plan. The Division's review relates directly to the applicants' compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Advisory Council procedures 36 CFR Part 800, and Executive Order 11593. In light of the close association of TRPA with United States Forest Service administered lands, we have taken the liberty of evaluating the plan in accordance with these federal regulations.

Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act requires that federal agencies and federally assisted or licensed undertakings must consider the effect of project activities on properties listed on, or eligible to, the National Register of Historic Places. An eligibility determination or listing on the register represents an acknowledgement of the resource's significance. In reading the impact assessment no reference to the National Register was found. Such a reference is required in connection with 36 CFR Part 800(a)(1). Unless eligible properties are identified, then no determinations of effect can be made. Advisory Council procedures require that the SHPO be involved in both determinations of eligibility and effect.

Executive Order 11593 is of relevance since it requires that all properties potentially eligible to the National Register within the areas to be effected, be located and properly evaluated.
Evidence exists in the report (pages 14-15 and 35) that this order may have been at least partially met. The actual survey methods employed to locate historical and archeological sites is not included however, and so it is very difficult to evaluate the comprehensiveness of the effort. This office has already commented on the inadequacy of the archeological and historical assessment presented in the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Management Plan, Volume III. If the present report is based on this earlier plan, then it is also inadequate.

This Division, as the SHPO, requests that documentation be provided on the extent and nature of the historical and archeological survey work already completed. As deemed appropriate by TRPA, the USFS, and this Division, determinations of eligibility should be made or the sites nominated to the National Register. Provisions should be built into existing project review mechanisms, that require additional field survey activities if felt necessary by TRPA or the SHPO. This will provide specific data on any historical and/or archeological resources present in the project area. Determinations of effect could then proceed on a case by case basis.
There appears to be few policies in the Tahoe Regional Plan (proposed) that would affect the Division of State Parks property or programs. Policy A-1-e does state that:

"The TRPA shall actively encourage and support any public land acquisition or development proposals within the region which will preserve or enhance the natural scenic and recreation resources of the region or the ability of the public to experience or utilize these resources."

To totally review the regional plan it is necessary to have some additional material, such as a copy of the TRPA Land Use District Map, that was not provided.

The following are our comments on specific goals and policies in the proposed plan.

1. Goal B-6 regarding energy should include a statement on transportation modes and efficiency.

2. Goal B-5 regarding noise should be expanded to include transportation and construction sources. Noise reduction should also be included in the transportation policies.

3. Goal B-3 regarding air quality should include policies encouraging other means of air pollution mitigating measures such as fuel evaporation recovery measures and car pooling.

4. Goal B-2 regarding water supply should be expanded to assure adequate supply of water for natural scenic and recreation resources.

5. Goal E-2 should include the listing in the National Register as a prime means of historic preservation. The historic preservation district land use classification (A-1-b) definition may want to be expanded to include specific sites rather than neighborhoods.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this plan.

/ha

a division of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
MEMORANDUM

TO: Steve Robinson, Assistant Director
FROM: Verne Rosse, Program Director

SUBJECT: SAI NV 77810484 - Tahoe Regional Plan.

In reference to the above project, the Division of Environmental Protection staff has the following comments:

Air Quality Control

The Tahoe Basin has been designated as a non-attainment area for carbon monoxide, and total oxidants. A modification to the State Implementation Plans of Nevada and California must be prepared, adopted and submitted to EPA by January, 1979. TRPA has been designated by Governor O'Callaghan and ARB has been designated by Brown to prepare and adopt the plan which shall incorporate a growth rate with anticipated locations. Any new projects which are approved for construction will have to be included as growth in the Non-Attainment Plan or offset with emission reductions not already contained in the Non-Attainment Plan after January 1979. If this is not done the Clean Air Act may require suspension of any Federal funds. Evaluations of area source emissions include those from heating added marketing of hydrocarbons products. The Non-Attainment Plan will require more than the general overview contained in these documents. The technical impact assessment will be provided to TRPA through the Bi-State Tahoe Air Program AD-HOC Committee.

Water Pollution Control

No comment.

Solid Waste Management

No comment.
MEMORANDUM

To: The TRPA Governing Body

From: The Staff

Subject: First Reading of Ordinance Amending the Regional Plan

Date: July 17, 1978

The following ordinance reflects the General Plan amendment approved by the Governing Body for the Mark Michelsen property south of Kingsbury Grade in Douglas County, Nevada. The northerly 3 ± acres of the property were reclassified General Commercial for the purpose of constructing a market with the southerly portion of the property to retain its High Density Residential use classification with the coverage to be as approved by the Board for a land capability challenge. (See June 28, 1978 minutes, page 2.)
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE NO. 78-

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LAND USE ELEMENT OF THE REGIONAL PLAN OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY BY AMENDING EXHIBIT "A" TO ORDINANCE NO. 22, BY ADDING PARAGRAPH 73 THERETO, TO CHANGE THE LAND USE DISTRICTS APPLICABLE TO CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY.

The Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency does ordain as follows:

Section 1.00 Findings

The Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency finds that the following amendment to the land use element of the Regional Plan is in accordance with the provisions and purposes of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, and that all required notices have been given and public hearings held as required by Article V of said Compact.

Section 2.00 Change In Land Use Districts

Exhibit "A" to Ordinance No. 22 of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto new paragraph 73 to accomplish changes in the applicable land use districts which paragraph shall read as follows:

"73. The following described real property, situate in Douglas County, Nevada, containing 3.058 acres more or less and further described as beginning at a point on the Section line between Sections 23 and 26, T13N, R18E, MDB&M, which is 1146.6 feet West from the Quarter corner between Sections 23 and 26; thence South 00 degrees 08 minutes 00 seconds East, 190.00 feet to the True Point of Beginning; thence continuing South 00 degrees 08 minutes 00 seconds East, 850.35 feet; thence North 89 degrees 46 minutes 00 seconds West, 157.85 feet; thence North 00 degrees 02 minutes 17 seconds West, 815.36 feet; thence South 89 degrees 46 minutes 00 seconds East, 60.00 feet; thence North 00 degrees 08 minutes 00 seconds East, 35.00 feet; thence South 89 degrees 46 minutes 00 seconds East, 100.29 feet to the point of beginning is reclassified from High Density Residential to General Commercial with the limitation on land coverage to be 64.9 percent of said property.

The following described real property, situate in Douglas County, Nevada and containing 1.00 acre more or less and further described as beginning at a point on the Section line between Sections 23 and 26, T13N, R18E, MDB&M, which is 1146.6 feet West from the Quarter corner between Sections 23 and 26; thence South 00 degrees 08 minutes 00 seconds East, 1040.35 feet to the True Point of Beginning; thence continuing South 00 degrees 08 minutes 00 seconds East, 276.78 feet; thence North 89 degrees 42 minutes 00 seconds West, 157.02 feet; thence North 00 degrees 02 minutes 17 seconds West, 276.60 feet; thence South 89 degrees 46 minutes 00 seconds East, 157.85 feet to the point of beginning is classified High Density Residential, and the limitation on land coverage shall be as approved by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Body on June 28, 1978 as indicated in a report entitled: "Soil Investigation - Michelsen Tract, Stateline Lake Tahoe - Douglas County, Nevada" dated May 11, 1978 and prepared by Grant M. Kennedy."
Section 3.00  Severability

If any part or provision of this ordinance, or the application thereof to any person, thing or circumstance, is held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect the parts, provisions or applications that can be given effect without the invalid part, provision or application, and to this end the parts and provisions hereof are severable.

Section 4.00  Effective Date

This ordinance shall be effective immediately upon its adoption.

FIRST READING:

SECOND READING:

PASSED and ADOPTED by the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at its regular meeting held , 1978 by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

__________________________
Chairman