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NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on __August 13, 1980__ at
____10:00____ a.m. at the hearing room of the Tahoe
Regional Planning Agency, located at 2155 South Avenue, South
Lake Tahoe, California, the Advisory Planning Commission of
said agency will conduct its regular meeting. The agenda for
said meeting is attached to and made a part of this notice.

Dated: __August 1, 1980__

By: [Signature]
Philip A. Overeynder
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

August 13, 1980
10:00 a.m.

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

URGENCY ITEM: CALTRANS, STABILIZATION OF SLIDE AT EMERALD BAY

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV PUBLIC WORKS

A. Douglas County Public Works Department, Clean Lakes Grant and Erosion Control Project for Kingsbury Grade

B. Incline Village General Improvement District, Water Distribution System Improvements, Water Tank Addition, Washoe County

V CLEARINGHOUSE

California Department of Parks and Recreation, Kings Beach State Recreation Area, Preliminary Development Plan, Placer County

VI REPORTS

A. Public Interest Comments

B. APC Members

VII RESOLUTIONS

For Former APC Member Neal Walton

VIII CORRESPONDENCE

IX PENDING MATTERS

Appointment of APC Vice Chairman

X ADJOURNMENT
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

July 9, 1980
10:00 a.m.

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. by Chairman Phil Overeynder. John Renz was sitting in as the Douglas County Health Department representative and Carol Drawbaugh was replacing Neal Walton who had resigned as the City of South Lake Tahoe Planner.

APC Members Present: Mr. Combs, Mr. Milam, Mr. Drawbaugh, Mr. Iturreria, Mr. Scribner, Mr. Hoefer, Mr. Fred Sanford (for El Dorado County Health), Mr. Wright, Mr. Rosse, Mr. White, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Bailey, Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle

APC Members Absent: Mr. Burnham, Mr. Hoole

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Phil asked that agenda item VIIA. (Request for Reconsideration by Tahoe Resource Conservation District, TCPUD, Star Harbor Athletic Field, Placer County) be moved up on the agenda to be heard before public works projects.

MOTION by Mr. Hoefer with a second by Mr. Iturreria to approve the agenda as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

MOTION by Mr. Milam with a second by Mr. Combs to approve the regular meeting minutes for June 11, 1980. The motion carried unanimously.

IV SPECIAL REPORT

U.S. Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Management Alternatives for Lots or Parcels Acquired Through Purchase or Donation

Phil Overeynder explained that this item was on the agenda at the request of APC members at the June meeting who were concerned about how the Forest Service would manage existing lots in existing subdivisions if proposals such as the Burton-Santini Bill are passed. Jon Hoefer, the Forest Service representative on the APC, asked that his presentation be put off indefinitely until the legislation is more firm. The Forest Service hasn’t really given much consideration to management of these lots should they be acquired, and it would be rather premature at this point to study the matter without further direction from Congress on the management of the land.

As pointed out in June, individual lots which are now acquired would hopefully be consolidated with the rest of the National Forest lands and managed accordingly.
Ken Milam explained that the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors was concerned about the long-term management of these odd lots picked up by the Forest Service and the impacts on governmental costs and services to nearby or adjoining privately-owned parcels. From the standpoint of maintenance, i.e. trash cleanup, weed control, etc., the Forest Service should have at least some short-term management alternatives pending adoption of the Burton-Santini Bill. Jon pointed out that, if the Bill were passed with no additional administrative funds to be applied to the subject lands, the acquired parcels would be paid the same attention as other properties in the National Forest system. The Forest Service could consider sale of these properties to adjoining property owners for open space should the legislation take such a direction.

Although no formal presentation was made, Jon indicated that he would make a report when something more definite was known and assured that the Forest Service was aware that there were concerns on the part of local governments with regard to management of the lands and potential for impacts on services and revenue resources.

VII REPORTS

A. Request for Reconsideration by Tahoe Resource Conservation District, TCPUD, Star Harbor Athletic Field, Placer County

Phil Overeynder explained the history of the project pointing out that the APC in May considered the District's Star Harbor project as an urgency item at the request of the District. The APC recommended a continuance since sufficient information was not submitted to assess the merits of the project. The Governing Board in May heard the project, also as an urgency item, and acted upon a staff recommendation presented pursuant to meetings between staff and the District to resolve some of the difficulties. Staff recommendation for approval with modifications was adopted by the Board. In June, the staff reported back to the APC on the progress toward making requested changes; however, in the interim, the Tahoe Resource Conservation District appealed the Board's decision in June, and the request for reconsideration along with consideration of the project's merits have been scheduled for the July Governing Board agenda. The project is on the July APC agenda because of the APC's previous concerns about the project's design.

Senior Planner Gordon Barrett described the proposed site plan which basically meets the criteria agreed on in previous meetings with Placer County, CTRPA and Lahontan. Staff's concern, however, is the extension of fill for the access road. Additionally, the revegetation specifications have not yet been worked out so staff is not ready to approve the final construction drawings. Although the site is 90% revegetated, there are still disturbed areas from construction and equipment storage and vehicle access onto the site. Portions of the site are within the stream environment zone (SEZ) and would return to that use if left alone.

APC member Jim Scribner explained the history of Burton Creek which runs through the site and the effect of the Star Harbor development and California Department of Fish and Game activities on the water rights and fish spawning.
Chuck White, the Lahontan representative, explained that the project was not compatible with the 208 Plan without a finding that the site had been man-modified and the first step here should be to go through the process of making that finding. Ken Milam advised that the fill on the site was 2 to 3 feet above the natural grade, and eight years ago the site was barren. Any disturbance because of the proposed road should be properly revegetated according to SCS recommendations.

Chuck White advised that originally Lahontan had waived discharge requirements and had decided to go with the consensus of the other organizations involved. However, Lahontan is now in the process of reevaluating that decision in light of the 208 Plan and could rescind the waiver. TRPA should be consistent in its approach and pursuit of the objectives of its 208 Plan and should request a determination on the man-modified status of the site along with a simultaneous determination on what areas are in the SEZ. All work should be prohibited from the SEZ.

Stan Hansen questioned the future use of the entire site and the scope of this project. Staff explained that the University of California at Davis has its eye on the lakeward portion of the site for a research facility. Coverage for that project has not been established. With the man-modified process, a different coverage could be established for the entire site. If the athletic field project is constructed, the coverage it uses is subtracted from total permitted coverage thereby constraining future development on the total site. UC is aware of this procedure.

Bruce Shindler, on behalf of the District, advised that the State of California, the owner of the property, is well aware of the District's project and has an operating agreement with the District for use of the site. Because of the possible loss of $80,000 in funds, the District took the project to the Governing Board over the objection of the APC since it was felt that many of the problems could be resolved with staff. The suggested alternate site owned by the North Tahoe PUD is fully master-planned already and barely handles that area's needs now. This project has been in the works for six years and the other two sites considered were unacceptable. The operating agreement with the State runs for 25 years and can be extended for another 25 years. California Fish and Game has given approval to the project after discussions on the fish habitat; Lahontan has worked extensively with the District on fertilizers and nutrients; Placer County and CTRPA have worked on the project. The access road although not on the original plan was discussed on the site and its location does not matter so long as there is provision for maintenance vehicles for mowing and cleanup. The District is willing to work with staff on this. Proposed coverage will be 7% although previous determinations put the maximum allowable at 12%. The District would be willing to reduce coverage and to return many areas to natural vegetation. No permanent structures are proposed and portable bleachers will be used for spectators.

APC member Germaine McMorris suggested that the photos of the site indicate that the entire area is in an SEZ and the applicant should be required to show that the site has been man-modified before being allowed to proceed with the project. It seems odd that the CTRPA and the State of California could find this area is in an SEZ and yet permit the development to proceed when the Tahoe Keys area (which has been determined by TRPA to be man-modified) has not been given the same consideration. APC member Rick Bailey suggested that it was the responsibility of the land owner, the State of California, to resolve all the problems. Stan Hansen commented that CTRPA would have "nailed the applicant to the wall" if this were a private development project. It is hard to understand how this project got through so many agencies.
Bruce Shindler advised that the District's project already had Agency approval and this discussion was only for the benefit of bringing the APC members up to date on new information.

MOTION by Mr. White to recommend to the Governing Body that it should make a finding on what areas of the subject site are in fact man-modified and what areas are stream environment zones. Any activity should be completely precluded from those areas which are found to be in an SEZ. Second by Ms. McMorris.

Walt Bailey, President of the Tahoe Resource Conservation District, read the June 19 letter from his district requesting the reconsideration of the project and the letter from Lahontan to the TCPUD withdrawing the statement of intent to issue a waiver of waste discharge requirements for the project.

Bill Combs, speaking for the Placer County Planning Commission, explained that the Commission had approved the project only because the site was previously, heavily disturbed and this project proposes reseeding and relandscaping of the total site. There was further discussion on the man-modified characteristics of the site, and staff pointed out that in discussions with Bill Johnson, U.S. Forest Service hydrologist, he had advised that a watershed restoration program for the site would call for leaving the site alone since it is revegetating itself. The only improvements undertaken would be raising the water table and taking care of some of the channeling and stream bank erosion.

The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes:    Mr. Combs, Mr. Iturreria, Mr. Hoefer, Mr. Wright,  
         Mr. Rosse, Mr. White, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart,  
         Ms. McMorris, Mr. Bailey, Mr. Renz  
Nays:    Mr. Milam, Mr. Drawbaugh, Mr. Scribner, Mr. Sanford  
Abstain: Mr. Pyle  
Absent:  Mr. Burnham, Mr. Hoole

Mr. Pyle explained that he had abstained because of his technical interest in the site.

MOTION by Mr. Scribner that the APC sees no real need for reconsideration of the project but that the Governing Board finds that the staff of the TRPA and the staff of the TCPUD presently working on the site are solving what minor problems still remain to be solved. Second by Mr. Combs.

It was pointed out that the passage of this motion would contradict the previous motion.

The motion failed on the following vote:

Ayes:    Mr. Combs, Mr. Milam, Mr. Scribner, Mr. Sanford  
Nays:    Mr. Drawbaugh, Mr. Iturreria, Mr. Hoefer, Mr. Wright,  
         Mr. Rosse, Mr. White, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. McMorris,  
         Mr. Bailey, Mr. Renz  
Abstain: Mr. Pyle  
Absent:  Mr. Burnham, Mr. Hoole
MOTION by Mr. White that the intention of his previous motion (first motion page 4) was to refer the project to the Governing Body for a decision on the man-modified or nonman-modified status of the TCPUD Star Harbor site. Second by Ms. McMorris.

Mr. White advised that the man-modified criteria as outlined in the Land Use Ordinance should be applied to the project site.

The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Combs, Mr. Drawbaugh, Mr. Hurrieria, Mr. Hoefer, Mr. Wright, Mr. White, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Bailey, Mr. Renz

Nays: Mr. Milam, Mr. Scribner, Mr. Sanford, Mr. Rosse

Abstain: Mr. Pyle

Absent: Mr. Burnham, Mr. Hoole

(Ms. McMorris left the meeting at 11:50 a.m.)

V  PUBLIC WORKS

A. Washoe County Clean Lakes Sediment/Nutrient Control Project, Incline Village

Phil Overeynder explained that the proposed project is being undertaken as a pilot demonstration project for mechanical slope stabilization of eroding cut and fill slopes in Incline Village as part of a clearinghouse review of Washoe County's 1978 Clean Lakes Grant application. Staff recommends approval of the project with SCS conditions, i.e. the compaction density for fill areas be modified, side slopes for rock-lined ditches be decreased to 1-1/2 to 1 and connecting wires for gabions be utilized. Jim Arden, from Waterresource Engineers, spoke on behalf of the project for the Washoe County Public Works Department and explained the proposed erosion and slope stabilization methods. Concern was expressed by APC members on the continued maintenance of the gabions and protecting them from snowplows. Mr. Arden explained that this had been considered and the Public Works Director came up with a rip rap V type ditch in front of the gabions. It was felt the snowplows could be controlled. Mr. Pyle pointed out that EPA will require maintenance of the mechanical measures over a period of time.

Mr. Frank Payne, president of the Nevada North Property Owners Association, spoke in favor of the project since the majority of the erosion problems in Incline come from the streets and roads rather than single family dwellings. This project is really "hitting the nail on the head". No objections have been received from the homeowners to this project.

MOTION by Mr. White to recommend to the Governing Body that approval be given to the project with the understanding that Washoe County is responsible for continued maintenance of drainage and slope stabilization mechanisms. Second by Mr. Hoefer. The motion carried unanimously.

The APC meeting recessed for lunch.
B. Washoe County, Phase I Bicycle Trail Improvements, Incline Village

Planning Assistant Jim Dana presented the staff recommendation for approval of the Incline bike trails which propose 23,900 feet of bike paths and 5,400 feet of bike lanes. The paths are proposed for location entirely within the existing road rights-of-way and will involve five stream crossings. Staff is satisfied with proposed grading, slope stabilization and revegetation but is concerned with drainage along existing roads and has asked for typical sections of these areas to review and approve. Ted Frantz of Nevada Fish and Game has opposed any culverts or reinforced concrete boxes in live streams so the applicant has been asked to reevaluate the stream crossings. Staff has prepared conditions of approval on the project among which is one providing for striping and signing for bicycle traffic at the Tahoe Boulevard and Southwood Boulevard intersection.

Chuck White pointed out that the project would be totally against the requirements of the California 208 Plan because it would exceed coverage allowed by the land capability.

Bob Hammer, from Summit Engineering, explained that the State funding for construction of the project would be lost by October 15 if the project is not completed. To relocate the bike paths would be impossible at this late date since the bids go out on August 12.

MOTION by Mr. Hoefer to approve the project with the staff conditions.
Second by Mr. Rosse. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Combs, Mr. Milam, Mr. Iturreria, Mr. Scribner
Mr. Hoefer, Mr. Wright, Mr. Rosse, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart,
Mr. Bailey, Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle

Nays: Mr. White

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Drawbaugh, Mr. Burnham, Mr. Sanford, Mr. Hoole,
Ms. McMorris

Mr. Pyle criticized being asked to approve a project without being able to make any changes or modifications simply because the funding will be cut off if the project does not proceed.

C. California Department of Transportation, Erosion Control and Slope Stabilization at El Dorado Beach and U.S. Highway 50, South Lake Tahoe

Shorezone Assistant Phil Caterino presented the staff summary and recommendation for approval of the Caltrans project which will provide slope stabilization on the eroding shoreline while maintaining public access to the beach. It has been learned that an endangered plant species is not present near this project as originally thought. Bob Skidmore, from Caltrans, pointed out the project would cost $110,000 and has been in the planning stages for quite some time.

MOTION by Mr. Pyle to approve the project subject to the condition that erosion control methods applied during construction be shown on the final plans. Second by Mr. Hansen. The motion carried unanimously.

VI CLEARINGHOUSE

A. California Department of Transportation

1. A-95 Process Memorandum of Understanding Between Caltrans and TRPA
Phil Overeynder pointed out that the reason for Caltrans requesting a memorandum of understanding is to reduce its paper work load with regard to the number and type of projects to come before TRPA. Caltrans and staff have agreed on which projects should be exempt from review and these are outlined in the APC’s packet.

**MOTION** by Mr. Bidart with a second by Mr. Hoefer to approve the Caltrans and TRPA memorandum of understanding exempting certain types of projects from TRPA review. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Negative Declaration and Initial Study for State Route 89 Improvements from South Lake Tahoe to Eagle Creek at Emerald Bay, El Dorado County

Jim Dana presented the staff summary and recommendation for approval of the clearinghouse application. The proposed project would consist of reconstructing portions of the existing roadway, placing asphalt concrete overlay, improving the alignment of four existing curves, cut slope improvement of one curve, improving stability on an existing slope, correcting existing drainage problems, and providing revegetation planting. Mr. Hoefer complimented Caltrans on its cooperation with all agencies to improve the low standard highway but cautioned that the improvements may cause vehicles to go at higher speeds. Bob Skidmore, representing Caltrans, agreed that in some cases this was true but this project was aimed at getting rid of hidden hazards which the traveler is not expecting. Mr. White asked if Caltrans would ever reach a point where it was undertaking an erosion control project for the sake of correcting an erosion problem and not only in connection with highway straightening or road work. Mr. Skidmore pointed out that Caltrans does have projects which concentrate strictly on erosion control; the next one is near Bliss State Park.

**MOTION** by Mr. Pyle to support the Caltrans negative declaration and initial study for State Route 89 improvements from South Lake Tahoe to Eagle Creek. Second by Mr. Bidart. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Heavenly Valley/U.S. Forest Service, Clearinghouse Review and Administrative Permit for Canyon Ski Lift, El Dorado County

Jim Dana presented the staff’s summary and recommendation for approval of the clearinghouse review and administrative permit for a new ski lift at Heavenly Valley. CTRPA has indicated that it would be appropriate in this case due to timing problems for TRPA to review the project prior to CTRPA. Jon Hoefer, U.S. Forest Service representative, pointed out that the proposed addition would not add to the capacity of the mountain although it would provide for better circulation of skiers. The Forest Service has approved the proposal in concept but is waiting for regional agency approval and an indirect source review of Heavenly Valley’s mitigation measures before giving final approval. This approval would come from the Regional Forester and would require amendment to the special use permit for Heavenly Valley. Stan Hansen, Heavenly Valley general manager, advised that, because of the indirect source analysis undertaken for CTRPA, Heavenly is proposing to put two additional buses into service as a mitigation measure. This bus will circulate from Stateline to Lakeshore.

**MOTION** by Mr. Milam with a second by Mr. Scribner to approve the clearinghouse review and administrative permit for Canyon Ski Lift. The motion carried on the following vote:
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Ayes: Mr. Combs, Mr. Milam, Mr. Iturreria, Mr. Scribner,
Mr. Wright, Mr. Rosse, Mr. White, Mr. Bidart, Mr. Bailey,
Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Drawbaugh, Mr. Burnham, Mr. Sanford, Mr. Hoole,
Mr. Hoefer, Mr. Hansen, Ms. McMorris

C. California Water Resources Control Board,
Details on Clean Lakes Grant Application

Phil Overeynder reminded the APC that in June it had given a conceptual approval to the California Water Resource Control Board's Clean Lakes Grant application but wanted more specific details on what projects were requesting to be funded. Concern was expressed that the grant request may be in conflict with Douglas County's request for funding to do work on Kingsbury Grade. Staff has assurance from Andy Sawyer, project leader, that in no way is there competition for the same pot of funds. What is being proposed is a wish list of what the State would like to see funded. Staff recommends continued support of the State's request. Chuck White explained that the project list was based in part on the priorities submitted by local governments. No action was required on this agenda item.

VII REPORTS (continued)

B. Public Interest Comments - none

C. APC Members

Dick Pyle thanked those APC members who were able to attend the Nevada Tahoe Conservation District's tour.

Ken Milam asked that the APC members adopt a resolution commending Neal Walton for his years on the APC.

VIII RESOLUTIONS - none

IX CORRESPONDENCE - none

X PENDING MATTERS - none

XI ADJOURNMENT - The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call for an appointment at (916) 541-0246.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Julie D. Frame
Administrative Assistant
Incline Village General Improvement District
Water Distribution System Improvements
Washoe County

Summary

The applicant, the Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID), is requesting approval to construct an additional 250,000 gallon water storage and distribution tank in Incline Village, Nevada. The new tank is proposed to be located adjacent to an existing water tank on the Ski Incline property which is of equal size and capacity to the proposed tank. The added tank would augment the existing fire protection capacity in the area. The North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District has indicated that, due to the construction of the Bitterbrush project, inadequate fire protection flow would be available in the area without the new tank. This new tank will provide both domestic and fire protection water flows to Bitterbrush.

Project Description

The new tank will be located adjacent to the existing tank at an elevation of 7370 feet on the Ski Incline ski area property. Water is currently pumped from Incline Creek up to the existing tank through a pump station located adjacent to Ski Way. The new tank will be constructed to the same dimensions as the existing tank and will be located at the same elevation. The new tank will be connected to the existing transmission main and will be interconnected to the existing tank so that water level in the two tanks will always be equal. No additional piping, controls or pumping facilities are anticipated. Access to the site will be over an existing graded road. No improvements or modifications to the existing road are proposed.

Existing Environmental Setting

The proposed tank site is located on the divide between the Incline Creek sub-basin and the Mill Creek sub-basin. Since the tank site is located on the divide between the sub-basins, there is little watershed area tributary to the site and little potential for substantial concentration of surface runoff. The tank site is not within a stream environment zone.

The proposed tank site is presently vacant with a scattered stand of Ponderosa pines with a diameter ranging from 6" to 36". The limited understory vegetation is primarily grasses, probably induced by the existing water tank. The land surrounding the project contains limited facilities associated with the ski area. The development of the ski area has resulted in the clearing of trees and understory vegetation for ski lifts and runs.

Land Capability

The land capability designation is CaF, Cagwin rock outcrop, 30-50% slopes, land capability level 1, allowable land coverage 1%. The proposed tank site is relatively flat. There are no geologic fault zones identified in the area. The amount of land coverage associated with this project is within that allowed on the ski area property.
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Slope Stabilization

The applicant has submitted a permanent slope stabilization plan to the Agency. Areas disturbed by the construction activity will be revegetated. All cut and fill slopes will be rock riprapped at a 2:1 ratio. Graded areas forming the tank apron will be rock-surfaced and graded to connect with the proposed drainage system.

Drainage

The drainage plan submitted proposes placement of an infiltration trench around the perimeter of the tank. Overflow from this trench will be directed through the rock apron into a drainage swale and into another set of infiltration trenches. No drainage improvements are proposed for the existing tank.

Incline Creek Diversion

Water for the two tanks will be diverted from Incline Creek. The allowable diversion rate according to the IVGID water report is 2 cfs (cubic feet per second). Assuming a continuous diversion rate year round, the maximum diversion would be 1,440 acre feet per year. The calculated maximum diversion is not practically achievable due to seasonal alterations in the stream. IVGID estimates that the practical maximum diversion is 1,000 acre feet (AF) annually. The estimated diversion for the calendar year 1978 from Incline Creek was 240 million gallons, or 736 AF. Assuming a continuous diversion, the current rate is approximately 1 cfs. The subject application does not provide information relative to the proposed rate of diversion or amount of diversion with the new tank. A 250,000 gallon tank has storage capacity of .765 AF. Increased diversion rates could have an effect on fish migration and spawning patterns all along Incline Creek. The report does not contain comments from the Nevada Department of Fish and Game.

Due to the problems of high and low stream flow and turbidity, diversions from Incline Creek are irregular with the diversions being periodically discontinued. IVGID has proposed to make a thorough study of methods to upgrade the existing diversion and treatment facilities to cover all flows. The District also proposes the placement of a permanent Parshall flume structure for measuring year round stream flows. Agency staff would recommend that the proposed study for Incline Creek be undertaken immediately and that all proposed improvements be reviewed by the Nevada Department of Fish and Game.

Agency Action

Agency staff will conduct a Development Review Committee field review of this project on Wednesday, August 6, 1980. At that time, the following issues will be addressed:

1. Necessity of improvements on access road to tank sites;
2. Placement of drainage control mechanisms around existing tank;

8/5/80
3. Adequacy of proposed slope stabilization and drainage measures on new tank;

4. Proposed rate of diversion in cfs from Incline Creek;

5. Total amount of proposed diversion annually from Incline Creek;

6. Comments from Nevada Department of Fish and Game on the effect of this proposal on Incline Creek;

7. Improvements to the Incline Creek diversion and treatment facility; and

8. Establishment of a stream flow monitoring program on Incline Creek.

Due to these remaining unresolved questions, Agency staff will make its recommendation at the Advisory Planning Commission meeting.
California Department of Parks and Recreation
Kings Beach State Recreation Area
Preliminary General Development Plan
Placer County

Summary and Project Location

The California Department of Parks and Recreation has submitted a copy of the proposed
development plan for the Kings Beach State Recreation Area for TRPA review and comment.
The documents also contain a preliminary environmental impact report. The conclusions
of that report are included as attachment 1. Agency staff has scheduled this item on the
agenda to receive comment on this proposal from the APC prior to responding to the State
of California. This project will require subsequent TRPA review as backshore construc-
tion. The land coverage calculations for the proposal are incomplete but indicate that
the project may also require review for replacement of nonconforming land coverage. A
request for regional public facility designation and land coverage credit would also require
Agency review.

Initial acquisition of this site was made in 1974 from the Joseph King estate. Funding
for the capital improvements will be $250,000 appropriated from the Bagley Conservancy
Fund.

Project Description

Kings Beach State Recreation Area is located at the north end of Lake Tahoe in the
community of Kings Beach, about 9 miles northeast of Tahoe City and 1 mile west of
the Nevada State line. It is also about 1/2 mile east of the intersections of State Highway
28 and 267. The area is bordered to the west by the North Tahoe Visitors and Recreation
Center and the Landing Restaurant and to the east by the State of California Kings Beach
State boat launching ramp (attachment 2). It consists of a 7 acre group of lots south
of Highway 28 between it and the lake shore. The beach itself is about 900 feet in
length. The average beach width can vary from approximately 120 feet to 250 feet,
depending on the level of the lake. The property supports a scattering of pole-size
and larger pine trees. The ground surface has been recently disturbed by the
demolition of structures on the site in 1976, and much of the area is utilized for informal
parking by beach users.

Kings Beach State Recreation Area has been a popular swimming area for many
years and receives heavy day use by sunbathers during the summer months. The
site was classified a State Recreation Area by the State Parks and Recreation Commission
on July 1, 1977.

Current facilities include permanent restrooms, built by the State Department of Boating
and Waterways in 1977; picnic tables; and volleyball courts on the beach. Projects
expected to be completed with Bagley Conservation Fund monies are paving additional
parking, fencing, landscaping of the area, as well as repairing present unsafe facilities
such as the pier, night lights, and walkways.
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Land Use and Land Capability

The subject property is classified as Recreation by the Agency. The proposed use is allowed in Recreation. The Agency's Conservation, Recreation and Open Space Element identifies this area as a day use recreation area. The proposed project is consistent with this plan element.

The land capability classification on the subject property is Be, Beaches, capability level 1B, allowable land coverage 1%, and JhC, Jabu stony sandy loam, moderately fine subsoil variant, 2-9% slopes, land capability level 5, allowable coverage 25%. The land coverage calculations are not complete and need to be revised. The plans identify sufficient paving for 250 cars.

Development Plan

The preliminary development plan emphasizes use of the facility by visitors for swimming, sunbathing, beachcombing, picnicking, and sightseeing. The parking areas are proposed adjacent to the highway in an area currently disturbed. There will be three entrances off of Highway 28. Wood posts are shown as open space barriers. No drainage facilities are shown for the parking areas. There are 20 existing picnic sites. An increase is proposed but the total is not specified. Planting of native vegetation is proposed. This would be primarily for landscaping purposes. The existing rock walls on the shoreline are proposed to be repaired and extended. The existing pier will be connected to a walkway providing access to the lake.

Staff Concerns

This preliminary document has been circulated so that responsible agencies can comment prior to finalizing the specific development plan. In reviewing this proposal, Agency staff has two primary concerns. First, the need to assure that adequate information is gathered to assess this project within the specific onsite requirements of the Agency. This information relates to land use, land coverage, land capability, existing land coverage, site stabilization and drainage. Second, that the project's environmental information report adequately assess the impacts of this project. This report should assess the on- and off-site primary and secondary impacts and provide for mitigation measures if necessary.

At this time, the plans submitted do not adequately address the on-site concerns of the Agency. The land coverage calculations are not sufficiently detailed and do not relate to the two separate land capability districts. No calculations have been derived for allowable or existing land coverage. The plans show mixing public and private parking with adjacent commercial establishments. Access to one parking area is shown across a dirt road off of Coon Street. Inadequate parking barriers are shown. No drainage facilities are shown for the parking areas. An unpaved bus turnout is shown. No analysis of the scale of this project is provided. The only alternative addressed was the no-project alternative.
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One specific impact which is not addressed is traffic generation. The design assumption is peak summer usage by 2,500 people with an assumed capacity of 1,000 persons at one time. This facility would provide 250 parking spaces. No figures are available on current usage or number of vehicle trips. Assuming 4 persons per car, this project would generate approximately 1,200 vehicle trips per peak summer day. When incorporated with the Recreation and Visitors Center and the existing commercial establishments which will use the same parking areas, the likely peak traffic generation will be greater. Agency staff will request that greater detail on these points be provided prior to final review.

Agency Action

Agency staff is requesting the APC members provide additional comments on the contents and scope of this preliminary development plan and environmental information report for the Kings Beach State Park project. These comments will be incorporated into the Agency's comments to the State of California regarding this project.
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PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED ACTION

Kings Beach State Recreation Area consists of 6.82 acres bordering the north shore of Lake Tahoe. The area is bordered to the west by the 15,000 square foot North Tahoe Recreation and Visitors Center and to the east by the State of California, Department of Boating and Waterways, Kings Beach State Boat Launching Ramp. Initial acquisition of the beach area was made in March of 1974 for $682,000.00 from the Joseph King Estate by the State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation. The unit was classified a State Recreation Area by the State Park and Recreation Commission on July 1, 1977.

The primary objective in acquiring the unit was to provide public ownership of, and access to, the Lake Tahoe shoreline, so people could make use of the recreational opportunities afforded by the facility.

Use concepts for the facility will emphasize visitor use of the sandy beach for such activities as beachcombing, sunbathing, picnicking, swimming, fishing, sightseeing, nature study, and photography. The development of facilities will be restricted to areas already highly modified by past human activities, where natural values will not be affected. Plans call for areas of additional paved parking (the dirt areas currently being used for parking), landscaping, and fencing, plus repairs to the existing pier and light standards.

ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED IF THE PROPOSAL IS IMPLEMENTED

There are no identifiable adverse impacts related to the plan for Kings Beach State Recreation Area property with the exception of some visual impact created by increased day use parking along State Highway 28.

MITIGATING MEASURES PROPOSED TO MINIMIZE THE IMPACT

Visual impacts that may be identified in the area will be mitigated through the development of a buffer zone, including plant materials, trees, shrubs, etc.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The alternative of not undertaking any development would not deter the increasing use of the facility, nor would it address the public needs for an expanded and improved quality of recreation experience. In light of the existing heavy use, this alternative would seem inadvisable. The proposed development provides a balance between the provision of recreational opportunities and preservation of resources.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USE AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY OF THE ENVIRONMENT

The proposed project is designed to improve the quality of the existing recreation facilities and to enhance the natural environment, including
wildlife resources. Therefore, the project, if implemented will be beneficial with respect to both the short-term use and long-term productivity of the area.

ANY IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES AS A RESULT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

No significant irreversible changes are foreseen.

GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Growth in this area is restricted by the character of the land, accessibility, and Placer County zoning practices. It is unlikely that commercial or residential development will increase as a result of the proposed project.