NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on March 12, 1980, at 10:00 a.m.
at the Crystal Bay Club, Crystal Bay, Nevada, the Advisory Planning
Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its
regular meeting. The agenda for said meeting is attached to and
made a part of this notice.

Dated: March 3, 1980

[Signature]

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

Crystal Bay Club
Crystal Bay, Nevada

March 12, 1980
10:00 a.m.

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

I  CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II  APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III  DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV  PUBLIC HEARING - General Plan Amendments

A. Douglas County, 4 Lots Fronting Laura Drive, Douglas County, from High Density Residential to Recreation

B. 9.91 Acres Owned by the Bliss Family, Located on Pray Meadow Road, North of Glenbrook Unit 2, Douglas County, from Conservation Reserve to Rural Estates; and Specific Plan for 3 Single Family Dwellings

C. 2.9 Acres Owned by Cecelia Clements, 1/4 Mile East of the Intersection of U.S. Highway 50 and Kingsbury Grade, Across from the Chart House, Douglas County, from Medium Density Residential, General Commercial, and Low Density Residential to Tourist Commercial

D. Incline Village General Improvement District, 20.6 Acres Bordered by Tahoe Boulevard, Southwood Boulevard and Incline Way, Washoe County from Tourist Commercial to Recreation; and 6 Adjacent Acres to be Deeded to the Washoe County School District, from Tourist Commercial to Public Service

E. 10 Acres Leased by the Tahoe City Public Utility District from the California Department of Parks and Recreation, Placer County, 2 Miles East of Tahoe City at State Highway 28 and Lake Forest Road in Star Harbor, from Rural Estates to Recreation

V  PUBLIC WORKS

A. Incline Village/Crystal Bay Visitor and Convention Bureau, Incline Village Community Center and Pool Complex, Building Height Variance and Variance to Grade in a Stream Environment Zone, Washoe County

B. Incline Village General Improvement District, Height Variance for Light Standards and Modification of Prior Approval for Incline Park Athletic Fields, Washoe County

C. Caltrans, Luther Pass Chain On/Off Road Improvement, El Dorado County
VI  CLEARINGHOUSE

Douglas County Engineering, Marl's Bay/Zephyr Heights Resource Conservation and Development Project, Erosion Control Improvements

VII  PLANNING MATTERS

A. Reports from the Following Entities on the Status of Traffic, Water Supply, and Sewage Capacity in Incline Village, Washoe County

- Nevada Division of Water Resources
- Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
- Nevada Department of Highways
- Washoe County Manager's Office
- Washoe County Regional Planning Commission
- Incline Village General Improvement District
- Douglas County Planning Department

B. State of California, State Water Resources Control Board, Draft Water Quality Plan: Lake Tahoe Basin

C. Land Use Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance Amendments Relating to a High Density Apartment Land Use District, Timesharing, and Condominium Conversions

VIII  REPORTS

A. Status Report on the Soil Conservation Service Activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin

B. Public Interest Comments

C. APC Members

IX  RESOLUTIONS

X  CORRESPONDENCE

XI  PENDING MATTERS

XII  ADJOURNMENT
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

February 13, 1980
10:00 a.m.

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

The meeting was called to order by Second Vice Chairman Dean Prigmore at 10:20 a.m. A letter from Neil Eskin resigning his citizen membership on the APC was read into the record, along with letters designating Glenn Smith to sit in this meeting for Jon Hoefer and Bill Combs to replace Dean Prigmore at future APC meetings. Larry Wahrenbrock was sitting in for Bob Hadfield as the Douglas County Health Officer; John Hoole was introduced as the new Carson City Planning Director; and it was noted that Bill Curtis would be sitting in this meeting instead of citizen member Maurice Bidart.

APC Members Present: Mr. Milam, Mr. Bradhurst, Mr. Scribner, Mr Hoole, Mr. Minedew, Mr. Rosse, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Wahrenbrock, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Prigmore

APC Members Absent: Mr. Walton, Mr. Burnham, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Smith, Mr. Koch, Placer County Citizen Member (position vacant)

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Mr. Milam with a second by Mr. Scribner to approve the agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

MOTION by Mr. Scribner to approve the January 9, 1980 APC minutes as presented. Second by Mr. Rosse. The motion carried unanimously.

IV CLEARINGHOUSE

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Proposed Wastewater Treatment Facilities, South Shore, Lake Tahoe Basin

Agency Manager Phil Overeynder presented the staff's summary and recommendation on the DEIS prepared by EPA. The DEIS deals totally with offsite impacts such as growth inducing impacts which could be accommodated by the upgraded facilities at the South Tahoe Public Utility District and the Douglas County Sewer Improvement District. A meeting of the APC was held on January 16 to discuss the mitigation measures outlined in the DEIS, and the results of that discussion are set forth in the draft letter to Paul DeFalco, Region IX of EPA. The City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County and the South Tahoe PUD have formed a mitigation measures committee which is working out a memorandum of understanding committing each respective entity to implementation of specific mitigation measures, and the Douglas County Commissioners are working with the Douglas County SID to respond with comments on the EIS for that county's facility.
With regard to the proposed comments to be forwarded to EPA, it is generally agreed by both entities that the expansion and upgrading of both facilities is a necessity and is consistent with TRPA plans from a local and a regional standpoint. TRPA took the approach that the impact analysis was really an assessment of the Agency's General Plan. The impacts of the no action alternative, in TRPA's opinion, were not adequately analyzed in the DEIS and any direct adverse impacts from a failure to provide for improved wastewater treatment facilities were not included in the analysis of alternatives.

Phil briefly outlined the various proposed mitigation measures, the responsible entities, and possible TRPA comments and explained that the memorandum of understanding basically follows the same format, i.e. giving existing authorities and what is already on the books in terms of capabilities of these entities to offset the various identified impacts. The memorandum of understanding outlines various measures and commits the involved entities to pursuing certain programs. These relate to future action on a Tahoe Basin County at South Shore, traffic and transit improvements, preservation of environmentally sensitive areas, and air quality programs.

Ken Milam informed the APC that the memorandum of understanding had not been formally adopted by the El Dorado County Supervisors and several APC members indicated they were not ready to tie in TRPA's comments on the DEIS with the memorandum of understanding between El Dorado County and the City of South Lake Tahoe. At some point in the future TRPA and the local entity efforts can be coordinated.

Ms. Lorrene Kashuba, Director of the South Tahoe PUD, explained that the memorandum of understanding was developed because the District is responsible for obtaining commitments from all the agencies responsible for the mitigation measures to offset any expansion or change in the facility. Larry Wahrenbrock pointed out that Douglas County disagrees with the EPA mandate designating the Districts as the lead agencies responsible for coordinating all the issues addressed in the EIS.

Jim Scribner objected that the five growth scenarios in the DEIS appear to be established alternatives, when in fact TRPA never took official action on its General Plan Update material which outlined these various growth alternatives. EPA's document tends to view these growth patterns as TRPA accepted possibilities.

To a question regarding the likelihood of EPA funding for the Districts in light of the Fazio National Scenic Area bill, staff pointed out that the funding decision is up to the EPA Regional Administrator and must be in accord with the State's 208 Plan. That plan calls for a different type of facility than what is proposed by the South Tahoe PUD.

Dick Pyle commented that the DEIS did not adequately address the no action alternative and because of this deficiency the report is not following the established NEPA guidelines. Larry Wahrenbrock commented that the mitigation measures are not correlated to the various growth scenarios nor does the report outline at what level of completion the various measures will be acceptable. At what point in the process does the funding for the plants become available? Jim Jones, a member of the STPUD Board, indicated that whether or not the funding is to come locally or from the Federal Government, everything is currently at a standstill and this in itself is strong incentive for EPA to look closer at the no growth alternative.

**MOTION** by Mr. Minedew to send the EPA draft letter on to the Governing Board as presented by the staff with a request for a specific response from EPA on the lack of a no growth alternative.

Second by Mr. Rosse.
Larry Wahrenbrock raised other items of concern, namely that the DEIS in addressing the air quality and social impacts of spillover of residents into the Carson Valley did not speak to the increased pressure from spillover occurring as well from Carson City and Reno; there is no indication whether or not one district will be permitted to proceed if its mitigation measures are adequate and the other district’s are not, i.e. the scenarios are not broken down for each facility. Ms. Kashuba commented that EPA would handle the programs separately. The EIS also asks for commitments to implement mitigation measures before the final draft document is prepared and the legality of this procedure is open to question. Additionally, there is no guarantee that if the commitments are given the funding will be forthcoming.

Mr. Minedew asked that Mr. Wahrenbrock’s concerns be included in his motion. Mr. Rosse agreed.

Ms. Unsicker commented that the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board had agreed that the document did not adequately address a no growth alternative or the alternative of funding expansion only to existing commitments. Comment is necessary on the effects of spillover especially in Alpine County and the health effects of alternative means of sewage disposal. If the State of California's 208 Plan goes into effect, more stringent measures relating to protection of high hazard lands and stream environment zones will be necessary than what is currently available. Mr. Pyle commented that the State's 208 Plan is still at the hearing stage.

Mr. Minedew's motion carried unanimously.

V  PLANNING MATTERS

A. Land Use Ordinance Amendments - High Density Apartment
   Land Use District and Standards for Timesharing, Interval Ownership Condominiums

Senior Planner Gordon Barrett explained the proposed amendment which would provide for an apartment only zone. APC member Bill Curtis questioned the practicality of such a land use district in view of the high cost of land in the Basin. Staff pointed out that additional areas will be considered for the new HDA zone than those outlined in the APC packet. Mr. Curtis suggested that a density override should be considered as an incentive for apartment development. Dean Prigmore pointed out that even though it may not now be financially feasible for apartments to be developed in these HDA zones a time will come when these areas will be needed for such uses; this zone would "bank" these areas.

MOTION by Mr. Curtis to accept the staff-proposed amendment and to further amend the ordinance to provide overrides for density, height and coverage in this new HDA zone. Second by Mr. Hoole. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Milam, Mr. Bradhurst, Mr. Scribner, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Wahrenbrock

Nays: Mr. Minedew, Mr. Rosse, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Prigmore

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Walton, Mr. Burnham, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Smith, Mr. Koch
Mr. Barrett summarized the timesharing issue which originally came to the Agency as a request for clarification from Washoe County. The Board was concerned about the apparent use pattern which was developing with these projects and wanted to assure that they remain in commercial land use districts and not in residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Ray Nuttall, from the audience, distributed a letter he had written on January 14 asking that timesharing projects be allowed 18 units per acre and 50% land coverage.

Jim Scribner pointed out that, because the timesharing units show a 100% occupancy rate as a rule, the sewage flows and demands on fire protection are higher than they are for motels and hotels. Steve Bradhurst urged that future timesharing projects be kept uniform throughout and that condominiums, apartments, and timesharing units not be mixed in one project.

MOTION by Mr. Milam to recommend that the Governing Board adopt the timesharing amendments as proposed by staff limiting the use to the Tourist Commercial zone. Second by Mr. Bradhurst. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Subdivision Ordinance Amendments Relating to Condominium Conversions

After staff's presentation, concerns were raised regarding stock cooperatives, corporation owned apartments and community apartments. Dean Prigmore suggested that the staff obtain copies for the APC members of the condominium conversion pamphlet prepared by the California Office of Planning and Research.

MOTION by Mr. Milam with a second by Mr. Hansen to continue the discussion on condominium conversion amendments to the Subdivision Ordinance for one month. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Work Program - General Plan Update and Threshold Carrying Capacities

This item is on the agenda because of a request by the Governing Board for the staff to prepare a revised work program to include establishment of threshold limits for the Basin as described in the Western Federal Regional Council (WFRC) environmental assessment. Dean Prigmore commented that since TRPA's adoption of the General Plan in 1971 and Placer County's subsequent adoption of that same plan as a guide in the Tahoe Basin, Placer County has looked to TRPA to provide a higher level of planning than what is provided at the County level and will continue to cooperate in expanding the work program.

When questioned on the practicability of staff extending itself in its current situation to update the General Plan, Phil explained that the Board has directed staff to come up with an amended work program and budget requests for submittal to the states. Because of the federal interest documented in the WFRC report, the recommendation that a threshold carrying capacity analysis be undertaken, and the need to update the General Plan, there may be some federal resources available. Ken Milam suggested that the staff move ahead as quickly as possible to update the General Plan since the state of the art for land capability planning and establishment of environmental thresholds has moved far beyond what it was 10 years ago; a cost-of-services analysis must be done on all infrastructure services.
Dean Prigmore commented that much information to aid in establishing threshold limits has been developed in the last five years at federal, state and local levels along with data which has been compiled by the utilities themselves. With regard to planning in Douglas County, Larry Wahrenbrock indicated that he did not anticipate anything specific for the Lake portion of the County. The Tahoe Basin is so complex that planning needs to be done from an overall perspective, and Douglas County intends to do any future planning for the area in cooperation with all other involved entities. Stan Hansen suggested that a memorandum of understanding be prepared between all parties concerned if TRPA is to take the leadership role. There was general concurrence among the APC members that the General Plan prepared and adopted 10 years ago should certainly be updated.

D. State of California, State Water Resources Control Board,
Draft Water Quality Plan: Lake Tahoe Basin

Phil Overeynder indicated that California wanted comments on its 208 Plan by April 4 for certification and transmittal on to EPA. The options that are available to TRPA are: 1) to work with the existing TRPA-adopted 208 Plan; 2) to embrace the State's Water Resources Control Board Plan; or 3) to go with something inbetween the two. TRPA is on a tight time schedule to review and comment on the plan and staff intends to schedule the report for a detailed review in March.

Dean Prigmore commented that the State's plan is talking about sums of money so far out of the scope of public financing possibilities that it is mind-boggling. The same problems which were faced when TRPA first put together its plan will once again be resurfacing. Dick Pyle agreed and indicated that the State's plan shows SCS coming up with funds that simply aren't available. Everyone is in favor of implementation and mitigation measures but there are legal questions with committing funds to future programs. No federal agency can commit by law more than it receives in any one year. Jim Scribner pointed out that no credit is given in the State's plan for the erosion control programs which have already been undertaken by the local governments. Better perspective should be given to existing development conditions and to recognizing existing land use patterns.

VI REPORTS

A. Public Interest Comments - none

B. APC Members

Steve Bradhurst commented that Washoe County would support updating the TRPA General Plan. The Washoe County Regional Planning Commission is in the process of fine-tuning the Incline Village plan, but attempts to obtain additional staffing have not been successful. TRPA will have to do the planning for this area.
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Since the APC is currently without a chairman due to the vacancy in the Executive Director position, Ken Milam suggested that a second vice chairman should be elected.

MOTION by Mr. Scribner with a second by Mr. Bradhurst that Ken Milam be elected second vice chairman. (Neal Walton is the first vice chairman.) The motion carried unanimously.

Verne Rosse advised that all data collected in the General Plan update should be checked carefully because some data which is currently available is erroneous.

Dick Pyle asked that the Soil Conservation Service be placed on the March APC agenda to give an update on its existing and future programs in the Tahoe Basin. SCS is currently going through a national hearing process and APC comments are requested on whether or not there should be a conservation program and, if so, at what level. Information will be transmitted on to the staff for the mailing.

Stan Hansen asked that the staff make copies available to the APC members of the Fazio bill which calls for a National Scenic Area at Tahoe.

Staff informed the APC members that the March meeting will be taking place at the Crystal Bay Club in Nevada. Five General Plan amendment public hearings have been scheduled along with an update on the sewage treatment capacity, water and transportation problems in the Incline Village area. The meeting will likely take most of the day and all APC members should plan to attend.

Dean Prigmore asked that all APC members not in attendance be called and advised of the March schedule.

VII RESOLUTIONS - none

VIII CORRESPONDENCE - none

IX PENDING MATTERS - none

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

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may make an appointment by calling (916) 541-0246.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie D. Frame
Senior Secretary
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Crystal Bay Club
Crystal Bay, Nevada

March 12, 1980
10:00 a.m.

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Phil Overeynder at 10:10 a.m. The new citizen members to the APC were welcomed (Germaine McMorris for Douglas County and Rick Bailey for Placer County). It was noted that Stan Hansen and Maury Bidart were reappointed to represent the citizens of El Dorado County and Washoe County, respectively. The APC members were informed that Phil Overeynder had been selected by the Governing Board to fill the Executive Director position and thus to serve as the APC chairman.

The meeting was properly noticed as required by the Nevada Open Meeting Law.

APC Members Present: Mr. Combs, Mr. Milam, Mr. Walton, Mr. Bradhurst (present at beginning of discussion on agenda item IV C.), Mr. Scribner, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Hoefer, Mr. Minedew, Mr. Rosse, Mr. Antonucci (present during the discussion on agenda item IV C), Mr. Bidart, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Bailey, Mr. Wahrenbrock (for Mr. Hadfield), Mr. Pyle

APC Members Absent: Mr. Burnham, Mr. Hansen

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Mr. Pyle to approve the agenda as presented.
Second by Mr. Walton. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

MOTION by Mr. Scribner with a second by Mr. Milam to approve the February 13, 1980 minutes as presented.
The motion carried unanimously.

IV PUBLIC HEARING - General Plan Amendments

A. Douglas County, 4 Lots Fronting Laura Drive, Douglas County, from High Density Residential to Recreation

Senior Planner Gordon Barrett presented the staff's summary and recommendation for the reclassification of 4 lots from HDR to Recreation, explaining that the 4 lots in question were deeded by Harvey's Inn to Douglas County as a compromise solution to create the open space necessary on the Harvey's Inn site which is over the permitted coverage due to extensive paving. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Board agreed that Douglas County would take over ownership of the lots and develop them into a neighborhood park. Staff is in favor of the amendment and requests assurances from Douglas County
that the site will be protected immediately with adequate barriers to prevent vehicle parking, that the site be stabilized as per SCS recommendations before May 1, 1980, and that within one year the site be developed into the community park with a minimal amount of impervious surface. Larry Wahrenbrock, from the Douglas County Planning Department, voiced concern with the request that the County complete the park within one year. The County's budget hearings are almost closed at this point, making it uncertain that the commitments can be made for capital improvements to develop the park. Two to three years would be a more practical timeframe.

The public hearing was opened for audience comments. Mr. Daniel Follosco, a neighboring property owner to the subject property, submitted a petition signed by 12 nearby residents objecting to the park from a noise nuisance and litter standpoint. With so few children living in the vicinity, the park would likely serve only the patrons of Harvey's Inn as a recreation center. The need for a park in this area is not present, especially with the Forest Service acquisition of the Jennings casino site, an ideal location for a day-use park.

APC member Dick Pyle asked that the staff's recommendation to stabilize the site as per SCS recommendations before May 1, 1980 be amended to June 15 in view of the site's current condition as a snow storage area for Harvey's Inn.

In view of the concern raised by Mr. Follosco, Larry Wahrenbrock suggested that the item be placed on the Douglas County Parks and Recreation Commission agenda for an advisory comment to the Douglas County Commissioners and to obtain more public comment on the intended park. Mr. Wahrenbrock commented that he did not think the Commissioners had specifically approved the site for a park.

MOTION by Mr. Walton to continue the public hearing on the 4 lots fronting Laura Drive for 90 days and to request comment from the Douglas County Parks and Recreation Commission and the County Commission on future plans for the site. Second by Ms. McMorris.

Mr. Barrett explained that the deeding of the lots to Douglas County did not tie down the intended use to a park because of tax purposes. At the time the Board accepted the compromise (the 4 lots for the additional coverage on the Harvey's Inn site), Board member Ken Kjer had the deed in hand and represented to the Agency that the site would be a park. Staff was directed at that point to start the amendment proceedings to reclassify the site to Recreation. Even though a motion is on the floor to continue the item for 90 days, staff requests that SCS continue with its recommendations for site stabilization.

The motion carried unanimously.

B. 9.91 Acres Owned by the Bliss Family, Located on Pray Meadow Road North of Glenbrook Unit 2, Douglas County, from Conservation Reserve to Rural Estates; and Specific Plan for 3 Single Family Dwellings

Planning Assistant Jim Dana presented the staff summary and recommendation for approval of the requested amendment and specific development plan for three proposed parcels owned by the Bill Bliss Family. Milt Sharp, on behalf of Mr. Bliss, was present to answer questions and to explain that this proposed amendment would simply acknowledge the existing uses and remove the nonconforming feature of the
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

Douglas County
General Plan Amendment
High Density Residential to Recreation
Douglas County

Proposed Amendment

At the direction of the TRPA Governing Board, Agency staff is initiating a change in the land use designation on four lots located in the Oliver Park Subdivision from High Density Residential (HDR) to Recreation (Rec). These lots were deeded to Douglas County to be used as a local park as part of an agreement between the Agency and Harvey's Inn.

Property Location and Description

Lots 9, 10, 11, and 12 are located on Laura Drive across the street from Harvey's Inn. At present, the lots are surrounded by other single family dwellings. The four lots which total .55 acre are unimproved and have been used for parking and the storage of construction material for the last few years.

Analysis

It is staff's interpretation of the agreement that the lots were to be used as a local park and the land coverage permitted was to be severely limited. The TRPA Land Use Ordinance would permit land coverages up to 10,400 square feet (43%) if the properties were classified Recreation. Since General Plan amendments cannot be conditioned, the limitation of land coverage must rest on Douglas County assurances. Also, the site is in a disturbed condition and needs immediate revegetation work, and parking barriers need to be installed and maintained since the site is very susceptible to vehicle parking.

Recommendation

Agency staff recommends approval of the change in land use districts from HDR to Recreation and requests assurances from Douglas County that the site will be protected immediately with adequate barriers to prevent vehicle parking and other such use, that the site be stabilized as per Soil Conservation Service recommendation before May 1, 1980, and that within one year the site be developed into a community park with a minimal amount of impervious surface.

Staff recommends that an effectuating ordinance be prepared.
Glenbrook Company  
General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan  
Conservation Reserve to Rural Estates  
Douglas County

Summary

The applicant, the Glenbrook Company, represented by Milton Sharp, is requesting approval of a specific development plan and General Plan amendment to reclassify certain portions of land in Glenbrook from Conservation Reserve to Rural Estates. The proposal affects approximately 10 acres which consist of 3 proposed parcels with existing single family residences. The applicant has previously submitted a request for review of a proposed parcel map. Due to the Conservation Reserve land use designation, this parcel map could not be exercised until a General Plan amendment had been processed and approved by TRPA. Agency staff informed the applicant of this requirement and requested submittal of a General Plan amendment application. The specific plan submitted recognizes only the existing development conditions and does not propose any further development potential.

Proposal Background

When TRPA adopted its General Plan, Glenbrook was classified as Conservation Reserve. Conservation Reserve was created to identify lands susceptible to future development based upon a specific development plan. A specific plan can only be implemented by amending the General Plan Conservation Reserve classification. In 1973, the R.T. Nahas Company initiated development proposals by developing a master plan and requesting TRPA approval of a specific development plan and associated land use classifications. At this time, the Bliss family indicated its desire to retain ownership of 3 residences located adjacent to the southerly edge of the Glenbrook golf course. Consequently, the properties occupied by these 3 residences were not included in the specific plan and General Plan amendments granted to the Nahas Company in 1975.

In 1979, the Nahas Company received approval for Glenbrook Unit 3. Recordation of the final subdivision map for Unit 3 will separate the golf course from the 10 acres containing the 3 existing residences. The golf course and the 3 residences are currently part of the same 92 acre parcel. The Glenbrook Company wishes to further divide the 10 acre parcel into 3 lots each containing one of the existing residences. As part of this application, the creation of any new land coverage over that currently existing is not proposed. In order to bring the land use classification into conformity with the use of the 10 acre parcel, this specific plan and General Plan amendment to reclassify the property to Rural Estates has been initiated. This amendment will be accomplished in conjunction with the recordation of a parcel map.

Land Capability and Land Coverage

The property is classified as JaC, Jabu coarse sandy loam, 0-9% slopes, capability level 5, allowable land coverage 25%. This soil classification was determined by Glenbrook Properties as part of the full soils investigation for the Glenbrook development. The property is located on a gently sloping area approximately 20-30 feet above the elevation of Lake Tahoe. The property contains a moderately dense stand of trees which provide screening for the residences from Lake Tahoe. Pray Meadow Road traverses the property and provides access from Glenbrook Unit 2 to Unit 3, the golf course and other residential development north of Unit 3. Land coverage associated with Pray Meadow Road is included in the coverage calculations for Glenbrook Unit 3.
Impact Analysis

This General Plan amendment request is to apply the Rural Estates classification in recognition of the existing development pattern. No changes to density or land coverage are proposed as part of this application.

Public Services - The property is currently being provided with all necessary services. The residences are served with sewer, water and power by various local service providers. No adverse impacts associated with this request are anticipated to accrue to service providers.

Traffic - No new traffic will be generated specifically as a function of this request. Existing traffic from the 3 residences is estimated at 27 vehicle trips per day. For comparison, Glenbrook Units 1, 2, and 3 are anticipated to generate approximately 2,034 vehicle trips per day at buildout. The Rural Estates classification allows densities up to 1 unit per acre. This leaves open the possibility that new units or guest houses could be constructed on these lots. However, this would require modification of the specific plan which only recognizes the existing development. If this occurs in the future, additional traffic could occur. Under the Rural Estates classification, a maximum of 10 units is the potential for this 10 acre area. This could generate approximately 90 vehicle trips total as currently calculated.

Environmental - This request will not alter the existing development. Therefore, additional negative environmental impacts are not foreseen as a result of this proposal. However, no drainage, slope stabilization, or revegetation is proposed so it is anticipated that this proposal will not improve the existing environmental condition either.

Glenbrook Master Plan - This request is not expected to affect the Glenbrook area or the Glenbrook master plan. No new development is proposed or anticipated. This request will not affect the use of Pray Meadow Road by other Glenbrook residents.

Conclusion

Agency staff finds that this application for a General Plan amendment is consistent with the land use trends in Glenbrook and will not substantially affect these trends. This request will have a positive impact by reconciling the existing land use pattern with TRPA land use districts, thus avoiding future concerns regarding nonconformity.

Recommendation

Agency staff recommends that the requested specific plan for three single family residential units be approved. Agency staff also recommends that the General Plan amendment be approved and that an effectuating ordinance be prepared.
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NOTES:
1. THE BOUNDARY OF THIS MAP IS PARCEL NO 3 OF
DIVISION OF LAND MAP FIELD IN THE OFFICIAL RECORDS
OF DOUGLAS COUNTY, NEVADA, DOC. NO 23689
Cecelia Clements  
General Plan Amendment  
Douglas County

Amendment Request

The applicant is requesting an amendment to the TRPA Land Use District Map to reclassify a 2.9 acre parcel from General Commercial (GC), Medium Density Residential (MDR), and Low Density Residential (LDR) to Tourist Commercial (TC). The General Plan amendment is proposed by the applicant in order that she may process a 24 unit condominium development.

Property Location and Description

The subject parcel is located adjacent to Kingsbury Grade, approximately 1.4 miles above the Kingsbury Grade and Highway 50 intersection. The 2.9 acre parcel (Douglas County Assessor Parcel No. 07-292-04) abuts Kingsbury Grade to the north, Palisade Road to the south, Tourist Commercial and General Forest (GF) properties to the east, and MDR and LDR properties to the west. The property is relatively undeveloped except for an unimproved road which serves adjacent property.

Local Zoning

Douglas County zoning has recently been changed to residential (R-2) which will permit residential units up to 8 units per acre.

Land Capability

The TRPA land capability maps indicate this site is located in a high hazard (1A) land capability district. The soils on this property are mapped as Cagwin with slopes varying from 10 to 50%. Under the land capability system, the site would be permitted a maximum 1% land coverage (1,200 square feet) but the General Commercial classification provides a maximum land coverage of 38,374 square feet.

Existing Permitted Uses

The applicant has stated in information received with this application that the most probable use under the present land use classification would be a restaurant. Staff concurs with this analysis since as noted in Attachment C the land coverage limitations would exclude any residential development in the MDR and LDR areas of the property. For analysis purposes, staff has chosen a restaurant two-thirds the size of the Chart House Restaurant based on the fact that the applicant's permitted impervious surface is two-thirds of the existing impervious surface existing at the Chart House.

Impacts

The proposed amendment would change the potential uses on the site from commercial to multi-residential.

Public Utilities - The applicant will submit the proposed use reclassification to the Kingsbury General Improvement District, Kingsbury Fire Protection
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Analysis

The applicant's request for TC is based on the fact that this is the only land use district that will permit a grandfathered 35% land coverage for residential use. The MDR district which might be more suitable in terms of an 8 units per acre limitation, as opposed to the 15 units per acre permitted under TC, does not grandfather coverage on parcels over 2 acres. It is the applicant's contention that the land coverage limitations and Douglas County zoning will limit the achievable density to something under 8 units per acre. As has been discussed in recent applications, the TRPA staff-recommended General Plan amendments have supported a trend toward MDR development. This support is contingent on findings that there will be no substantial increase in adverse impacts resulting from these land use changes. Attachment C summarizes the differences between the development potential and impacts under the existing zoning and that permitted under the applicant's proposal. Staff has also included a staff-recommended plan with a recommendation that the southern portion of the parcel not remain LDR but be reclassified General Forest (GF). It is evident from the comparison that the staff plan permits substantial development which is consistent with the development pattern in the area and will result in substantially less adverse impacts than that proposed by the applicant.

Recommendation

Agency staff recommends approval of the applicant's request for reclassification to Tourist Commercial on the northern 82,734 square foot portion of the property with the land coverage limitations of 35% for residential uses and land coverage limitations as outlined in Section 6.20 of the Land Use Ordinance for commercial uses. The remaining 42,900 square foot portion of the property should be reclassified to General Forest.
## CECELIA CLEMENTS PROPERTY
### SUMMARY COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Land Coverage (Allowed)</th>
<th>Max. Development</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Traffic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>23,500 sq. ft.</td>
<td>235 sq. ft. @ 1%</td>
<td>4 units</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>53,872 sq. ft.</td>
<td>37,710 sq. ft. @ 70%</td>
<td>140 seat restaurant</td>
<td>5.5 AF</td>
<td>4200 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>42,900 sq. ft.</td>
<td>487 sq. ft. @ 1%</td>
<td>4 units</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125,634 sq. ft.</td>
<td>38,374 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>125,634 sq. ft.</td>
<td>43,972 sq. ft. @ 35%</td>
<td>24 units</td>
<td>9.6 AF</td>
<td>7200 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td>(62,817 sq. ft. @ 50% for commercial)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>82,734 sq. ft.</td>
<td>28,957 sq. ft. @ 35%</td>
<td>10-15 units</td>
<td>4-6 AF</td>
<td>3000-4500 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>42,900 sq. ft.</td>
<td>429 sq. ft. @ 1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125,634 sq. ft.</td>
<td>29,386 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Not sufficient land coverage for actual construction
2. Douglas County zoning limit - 8 units per acre
3. Land coverage should limit maximum units on the site
4. 2/3 of Chart House Restaurant - 60,670 sq. ft. of land coverage, 200 seats, 7,400 sq. ft. restaurant

AF = acre feet per year
GPD = gallons per day
VTD = vehicle trips per day
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TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

Tahoe City Public Utility District
General Plan Amendment
Placer County

Amendment Request

The Tahoe City Public Utility District is requesting an amendment to the TRPA Land Use Map to reclassify a 10.34 acre parcel from Rural Estates (RE) to Recreation (Rec) and Public Service (PS). The applicant proposes to construct two baseball fields and a parking lot in the Rec portion of the property; the lakeward PS portion of the property will possibly be used at a later date for a research center (Attachment A).

Property Location and Description

The 10 acre site which was recently purchased by the State of California is located in the Lake Forest area of Placer County adjacent to Star Harbor and the District's boat launching facility (Attachment B). The parcel now under lease to the Tahoe City PUD is a filled meadow area that fronts Lake Tahoe and is bounded by Burton Creek and Barton Creek. Although the site was filled years ago, the applicant contends there is significant disturbance to the site which would be mitigated by the proposed project.

Local Zoning

The Placer County zoning for this parcel is residential (TR2) but the applicant has applied for a change of zoning that would permit the proposed uses. The CTRPA land use designation is the same as TRPA's and the applicant is processing a land use amendment with the California agency.

Land Capability

The TRPA land capability maps indicate this site is a fill area (FD) which is classified as high hazard (1B) land (Attachment C). This finding is further substantiated by the TRPA's 208 stream environment zone maps which indicate the site is in a stream environment zone. At issue is the extent of the site that is still 1B and that portion of the site that has been substantially disturbed so that it is no longer an area of poor natural drainage. The attached flood plain map and recent discussions (on the Tahoe Keys issue) in regards to FD soils designations support the applicant's contention that the site is substantially disturbed and that the construction of the fields would not impact any stream environment zones in the area.

Land Coverage

The applicant contends there is 128,676 square feet of impervious surface on the site existing in the form of compacted dirt areas. At this time, staff does not have the evidence to concur with the applicant's contention and until such findings are verified by the Agency the permitted land coverage on the site would be 1% of the 10 acres, or approximately 4,350 square feet.

3/4/80
Impacts

The permitted use now existing on the site would be the construction of 10 residential units which would be highly unlikely since the State of California now owns the property. The change to Recreation designation would permit the construction of a day recreation area or any other recreational use permitted under the ordinance - including camp sites. The Public Service designation would permit the construction of most any public service-oriented facility including the educational facility for U.C. Davis. Based on a negative declaration by Placer County, it appears that the resultant impacts regarding public services, traffic, etc., will be less than the uses currently permitted.

Recommendation

Agency staff recommends approval of the applicant's request to reclassify the subject parcel from Rural Estates to Recreation and Public Service. The land coverage limitations shall be established as per the requirements of Section 6.20 of the TRPA Land Use Ordinance (land capability).
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POOR QUALITY ORIGINAL (S) TO FOLLOW

HIGH DESERT MICROIMAGING, INC.
1225 FINANCIAL BLVD
RENO, NV 89502
(775) 359-6980
Incline Village/Crystal Bay Visitor and Convention Bureau, Incline Village Community Center and Pool Complex, Building Height Variance and Variance to Grade in a Stream Environment Zone, Washoe County

Summary

The applicant, Incline Village General Improvement District is requesting approval of a relocation of a swimming pool and community center complex previously approved by the Agency near the Incline Village golf course. The revised location of the project is on the north side of Incline Way adjacent to the proposed middle school. The project utilizes part of a 20.6 acre parcel (Assessor Parcel No. 127-030-01) owned by the District. The project is to be funded by Washoe County and the Reno/Sparks Convention Authority and operated by the Incline Village GID.

The proposed project consists of a 25,000 square foot enclosed 50 meter long, 8 lane covered indoor/outdoor swimming pool joined to a 3-story building at the north. The lower floor of the 3-story building will house support facilities, i.e. lockers, showers, administration and recreation rooms, for the pool complex. The two upper floors will be for building entry, meeting rooms, and multi-use rooms. A total of 201 parking spaces are proposed, 100 on the pool site and 101 on the middle school site.

Existing Environmental Setting

The site is presently heavily forested along Incline Way. The vegetative cover consists of a pine and fir overstory and a manzanita and squaw carpet understory. There are 217 identified trees with a diameter of over 6" located within the area of disturbance. The property slopes to the east to a depression bordering Third Creek which runs along the east side of the property. A portion of the lower parking area is located within the 100 year flood plain of Third Creek. The applicant’s report does not contain information relative to the extent or boundaries of any riparian or stream zone vegetation. As yet, the full extent of the affected stream environment zone has not been determined.

Land Use Classification

The project area is currently classified as Tourist Commercial and Recreation. The Agency has initiated public hearings to reclassify this property to Recreation. The proposed project would be a conforming use under either land use classification.

Land Capability

The project area's soil type has been identified as IsC, Inville, stony, coarse, sandy loam with 2 to 9% slopes, land capability 6, allowable land coverage up to 30%. Previous approvals including the athletic fields and middle school have utilized approximately 12.6% of the allowable land coverage. With the proposed project, the total land coverage for the 26.6 acres, which includes all three projects, is 19%.

Surrounding Uses

The project is to be located on the southeast fringe of the central core area of Incline Village in an area that borders High Density Residential subdivisions. The pool site
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Incline Village Community Center and Pool Complex
Building Height and SEZ Variance
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is bordered on the north by ball fields, on the west by the middle school, on the east by Incline Village Park and on the south by McCloud Condominiums. Virtually all commercial property, high density housing, transient housing, public services, schools, and recreation facilities are located within 1 mile of the project site.

Height

The maximum permitted height in Recreation is 35 feet. The average height of the 3-story building and pool enclosure is 51.5 feet. Due to the excess height associated with this building, a variance to the height limit in the Recreation district must also be granted.

Grading

The construction of the project will result in substantial grading and land disturbance on the site. The pool support facilities located on the basement floor will have a finish floor elevation approximately 11 feet below natural grade on the north side. As proposed, the second floor of the building will be the entry floor. The pool enclosure will be located to the south of the 3-story building. There will be a substantial excavation associated with the construction of the 50 meter pool. Surface grading and clearing will need to be done to provide for the onsite parking spaces. The plans submitted do not provide specific information relative to the finish grades proposed for the parking areas. No indication is provided as to the cubic volume of material proposed for excavation or the location proposed for disposal.

Since part of the proposed parking area will be located within the boundaries of a stream environment zone, a variance to Section 7.80 of the Grading Ordinance must also be granted.

This submittal does not coordinate with the previous approval of the middle school and athletic fields in two areas. In both areas, sections identified to be stabilized fill slopes for the middle school are shown as driveways or parking areas in this proposal. Failure to coordinate these opposing uses of these areas could result in the need to make site alterations for which proper allowances have not been made, including further encroachment into the stream environment zone.

Slope Stabilization

The location and extent of resulting cut and fill slopes is not specifically provided in relation to proposed improvements. Two areas of concern relate to areas where roads and parking areas are proposed in this application in the same area as fill slopes on the previous applications. Adequate area does not exist for both proposed improvements without providing retaining walls. Backfilling is proposed around the north side of the building to reestablish existing grade. On the south side of the complex, a 10 foot retaining wall will be constructed.
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Drainage

The applicant’s plans show conceptual drainage facilities designed to collect all stormwater runoff generated by a 2 year-6 hour storm and allow for infiltration on the site. The pool enclosure will be covered with a retractable pool cover which will slope from north to south. Drainage is proposed to sheetflow off the pool cover across a concrete walkway and deck and into drain pipes set into a 4 foot high rock facade safety wall. Should the drain pipes freeze, this system does not provide for controlling ice formation on the concrete surfaces of the pool structure. The fabric pool cover will provide for the rapid transfer of heat from the inside of the building. This will increase the relative runoff rates from the structure. Infiltration trenches should be designed to handle larger stormwater accumulations by providing excess storage capacity.

The roof line of the 3-story structure slopes to the north. Drainage from the roofline is proposed to be collected in infiltration trenches located adjacent to this wall. The north wall will have a basement level finish floor elevation approximately 11 feet below natural grade. Agency staff is concerned that directing all of the building drainage into an infiltration trench located adjacent to this extended wall may cause water seepage problems along the north side basement level walls.

Drainage emanating from the paved surfaces is proposed for collection in infiltration trenches located at the edge of paving. This design has not been coordinated with the drainage and slope stabilization measures proposed for the middle school and athletic field sites. Along the west edge of the site, a 6 foot fill slope is proposed at the edge of the lower middle school parking lot. An infiltration trench for middle school drainage is proposed where these plans show parking area. Along the north edge, an 8 foot stabilized fill slope is shown as part of the ball fields proposal. This application proposes a paved driveway in this area. Conflicting use of these areas may result in the need to make unplanned site modifications which may result in further encroachment into the stream environment zone.

The applicant has provided calculations regarding the approximate linear foot requirement for infiltration trenches in general but has not related the design considerations to the specific needs of the site. Trench locations do not seem to be responsive to either the anticipated flow lines or to the storage capacity requirements at specific locations. The plans submitted do not indicate measures to direct stormwater flows in excess of a 2 year-6 hour storm to stable drainages adjacent to the project. No consideration is given to providing infiltration trenches around snow storage areas in the plans submitted.

Traffic Impacts

The project has had a traffic evaluation study prepared by the firm of Creegan & D'Angelo, consulting engineers. As part of this application, Agency staff requested that a traffic evaluation be done based upon the entire project area including the middle school and the ball fields. Calculations were derived for all three projects in this area estimating peak day and hour flows, average annual flows, and peak 8 hour flows.

The middle school is anticipated to have most of its traffic generation occur during school hours 5 days a week during the months October to June. The total estimated daily trip generation is 211 trips per day. Use of the ball fields will occur mostly in the evening.
after 3:00 p.m. during the week and on weekends. The middle school and the ball fields will probably not result in extended periods of concurrent peak generation due to different use characteristics. What will occur from this dual use is average increases to traffic loads in the area over extended periods of time. Traffic generated by the school will be replaced by traffic from the athletic fields during the week in the spring and fall months. During the summer months, the school will be closed and will not add to daily traffic. During the summer months, the accumulation of traffic will be due to the concurrent use of the ball fields and the proposed pool complex. The pool complex is anticipated to generate 823 trips on a peak summer weekend day. This combined with the trip generation from the athletic fields of 160 peak summer weekend day will result in a total trip generation from the site of 983 vehicle trips on a peak summer day. Winter peak summer day generation is a function of the concurrent use of the middle school and the pool site. The applicant's report does not evaluate peak traffic generation for winter. Due to the relative staggering of peak traffic generation from each project, the total traffic from the site will not result in periods of traffic congestion. However these three projects will substantially increase the average traffic loads in the area over that currently existing. In the submitted report, the applicant estimates the traffic flows at adjoining intersections around the project. Based upon a peak day generation of 983 vehicle trips, traffic movements through these intersections were estimated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Location A</th>
<th>Location B</th>
<th>Location C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Traffic</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Generation</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>1,325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*see attached map

These increased loads will be spaced over different time periods resulting in average daily traffic loads over that currently existing. At this time, the roads in the area have the remaining capacity to handle these loads. The primary intersections surrounding this project are primarily controlled by stop signs which can effectively control interactions resulting from intermittent traffic flows. As these flows are increased, greater interaction control may be needed both for traffic and pedestrian safety. This project will result in both pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Due to this fact, improved intersection control other than that provided by stop signs may be needed. No evaluation of the impact upon these intersections is provided except to estimate aggregate traffic loads.

**Air Quality Impacts**

Ambient air quality data collected for the years 1976 - 1978 indicate that no Nevada ambient standards have been exceeded in the study area. Utilizing estimated vehicle generation figures and computing average emission levels from vehicles, concentrations at certain specific locations were evaluated. The analysis included only CO emissions and did not
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evaluate hydrocarbons or suspended particulates. Below is a table regarding CO emissions at the three evaluation sites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Maximum 8 Hour Total</th>
<th>Maximum 8 Hour Project</th>
<th>Peak Hour Total</th>
<th>Peak Hour Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project is anticipated to provide sufficient parking, adequate loading and discharge points, provide sufficient driveways to prevent excess congestion and idling time. The applicant is also assuming that coordination of this project with the proposed bike trail system for Incline will encourage walking and bicycle use. For peak activities, a busing system has been indicated which will bus participants to the project. Agency staff has received no documentation indicating that this will be implemented. Based upon the above considerations, it is concluded that the air quality impact of the project will be minimal.

**Required Actions**

Due to the excess height of the building, a variance to allowable height must be granted by the Agency. To approve this variance, the following findings must be made:

1. that the provision has been made for protection from fire hazards and against aviation accidents;
2. that consideration has been given to the protection of view and to the character of the neighborhood;
3. that proper provision has been made for light and air; and
4. that such greater height will better promote the protection of the environment in the area.

The building is designed in accordance with the standards of the State of Nevada regarding building and fire safety.

The building is partially underground so that the full effect of the height of the structure is partially mitigated. The building has been designed to blend as much as possible into the existing environment. The main reason for the additional height is to provide the required structural characteristics for proper functioning of the retractible pool cover. The pool area will be covered with the pool cover during the winter months; the rest of the time, the cover will be retracted. The building has been designed to provide adequate light and air flow. Staff is unable to find that the additional height will better protect the environment.
Incline Village Community Center and Pool Complex
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To allow the construction of the lower parking area, consisting of 43 parking spaces, a variance to grade in a stream environment zone must be approved. The applicant's information report and accompanying maps identify a substantial portion of this lower parking lot as being within both the 25 year and 100 year flood plains. The applicant's report is inconclusive as to the extent of riparian vegetation on the site due to the presence of snow on the site. Without this information, staff is unable to make a firm determination of the impacts of this parking area upon the stream environment zone. Due to the incompleteness of the drainage and slope stabilization plans, staff is unable to determine that the proposed improvements will have no substantial effect on the natural water flows or other detrimental effect on water quality.

Compatibility with Master Plan

IVGID has prepared a report entitled "Incline Village Park Master Plan" which has not been formally adopted by TRPA. The master plan for park development indicates that the subject 26.6 acre parcel would be the site of the middle school, athletic fields, performing arts center and related parking facilities. The Agency has approved the middle school and athletic field projects in their approximate locations as shown on the master plan. However, the proposed community pool project is located in an area shown as the performing arts center in the master plan. Relocation of the pool complex to the proposed location raises questions with regard to the location of the performing arts center if the facility is eventually to be constructed by IVGID.

Conformance With Previous Approvals

In considering the Incline Village Park athletic fields, the site plan and representations made by IVGID to the Governing Board indicated that the subject area would be left as open space and permanently revegetated. This was a consideration in granting the variance to allow grading in the SEZ to allow construction of the athletic fields.

Analysis

The relocation from the previously approved site near the Incline golf course to the proposed site near the athletic fields and middle school has some advantages in terms of joint utilization of a portion of the parking facilities and centralization of community facilities. However, there are unanswered questions with regard to displacement of the performing arts center as shown in the master plan as well as significant environmental concerns related to the proposed site. The proposed project site requires a variance to grade within a stream environment zone to place a driveway access as well as paved parking for approximately 40 cars within the flood plain of Third Creek.

Staff Concerns

At this time, there are numerous unresolved questions regarding the proposed site, site design and layout, drainage, slope stabilization, building height, conformance with other
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plans and encroachment into the stream environment zone. Agency staff has scheduled a field review to take place March 11 in order to resolve the following concerns.

1. Information regarding the extent of riparian vegetation on the site and an evaluation of the importance of surface groundwater interchange in the vicinity of the proposed parking area located within the 100 year flood plain. Further substantiation that there will be no detrimental effects on water quality or the SEZ is required.

2. Specific drainage plans for the building, pool area, and parking areas. This plan should include coordination with the drainage devices proposed on the adjoining sites.

3. Information regarding the extent and location of all proposed cut and fill slopes and specifications of proposed management measures. This plan should coordinate the plans for the pool, athletic fields, and middle school to provide for an integrated control strategy.

4. Details on proposed grading including clear specification of finished floors and finished grades for all improvements.

5. Information regarding the proposed shuttle buses to be provided for special events held at the pool site.

6. Information regarding IVGID's plans for a performing arts center and where such a facility would be relocated.

7. Substantiation that the building height variance would better promote the protection of the environment, particularly on this site.

Recommendation

Agency staff cannot make any specific recommendations on this project at this time because of the above-listed concerns which have not been resolved to date. Agency staff will report on the progress made to resolve these concerns and will be prepared to make a recommendation by the date of the March 12, 1980 APC meeting.
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Public Works
Caltrans
Luther Pass Chain On/Off Improvements
El Dorado County

Summary

The California Department of Transportation proposes to construct two 300 foot by 12 foot wide chain control turnouts on Highway 89 near Luther Pass. The project will involve a shallow fill adjacent to the northbound lane and extension of an existing paved area adjacent to the southbound lane. The project will take place within the highway right-of-way and is adjacent to the South Tahoe PUD effluent export pipeline.

Drainage and Slope Stabilization

The project provides for extension of existing culverts to provide for drainage. The proposed fill slope would be constructed at a 3:1 or flatter angle which would allow for revegetation. However, no specifications for revegetation were included with the proposal for either the existing or proposed fill slopes.

Approvals

The project has been declared categorically exempt from the requirements of CEQA and has been approved by the CTRPA.

Recommendation

Agency staff recommends approval of the project subject to submission of a revegetation plan to be approved by Agency staff.
Clearinghouse
Douglas County Engineering Department
Marla Bay/Zephyr Heights
Resource Conservation & Development Project
Douglas County

Summary

The Douglas County Department of Engineering is making application to the U.S. Soil Conservation Service for grant funds to provide for critical erosion area treatment in the Zephyr Heights and Marla Bay areas of the Basin. The project would be funded under the Resource Conservation and Development program utilizing a grant which matches a percentage of local funding with federal funding.

Consistency With Agency Plans

The Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Plan as adopted by TRPA identified a conceptual surface water management plan for the area. The Agency's conceptual plan included recommendations for substantial mechanical slope stabilization and drainage facilities in order to correct existing erosion problems on high hazard lands. The Agency has also provided staff level comments to the Soil Conservation Service which support the application by estimating the quantity of erosion from the site.

The proposed grant would provide for mechanical slope stabilization and revegetation. The project itself would be subject to Agency review to ensure that the erosion controls and drainage facilities conform to the recommendations of the Handbook of Best Management Practices.

Recommendation

Agency staff recommends support of the proposed federal funding to provide for erosion control on high hazard lands.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 6, 1980

TO: The Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: The Staff

SUBJECT: Incline Village Status Report #2

In November, 1979, the APC considered information and reports from interested entities in regards to water supply, sewage treatment, and traffic in Incline Village. Based on this information which was forwarded to the TRPA Governing Board, several applications for tentative maps were denied without prejudice pending Washoe County and Incline Village General Improvement District efforts to resolve the problems identified by the APC. Agency staff has scheduled this agenda item because there are five projects before the Agency for approval of 289 units. The staff has contacted the applicable agencies to provide reports on the following items of concern:

Water Supply

Status at November APC Meeting - As of the November APC meeting, there was an identified water supply shortage in Incline Village. At this time, it was estimated that without any new subdivisions there would be a 1,600 unit shortfall in achieving buildout with existing water supplies. It was also concurred that only 1,530 additional units could connect to the system at current rates of water utilization and under existing permitted water rights. At current rates of development, the APC estimated that the remaining water supplies may be completely utilized within two construction seasons. The future prospects of obtaining additional water rights were determined to be uncertain because of unresolved questions regarding the Truckee River Basin Compact and current lawsuits involving the Truckee River.

Current Status - In order to provide an up-to-date analysis of the water supply situation in Incline Village, reports will be presented by the following:

Incline Village General Improvement District - report by Kermit McMillin, General Manager, which will summarize the current assessment of water usage, projections and status of water rights (Jan. and Feb. IVGID reports are attached).

Nevada Division of Water Resources - report by Brian Randall to include current water right status in Incline with comments on prospects for future water right acquisitions.
Regional Planning Commission - report by Steve Bradhurst to include comments on water usage and future growth projections in Incline.

TRPA Staff - report by staff to include comments on basinwide water usage in comparison to Incline Village.

Sewage Treatment and Disposal

Status at November APC Meeting - At the November APC meeting, questions were raised with regard to the ability of IVGID to meet 1982 revised waste discharge requirements through modification of the effluent disposal facilities in Douglas County. Douglas County asked for the facility plan prepared by IVGID to address specific issues regarding public health, water supplies and beneficial uses of water. Douglas County took the position that any effluent disposal mechanisms in Douglas County must be proven to be beneficial to residents of Douglas County and that Douglas County would not support any further development proposals in Incline Village until the effluent disposal matter was resolved.

Current Status

Incline Village General Improvement District - report by Kermit McMillin will address the status of IVGID's updated facility plan which addresses Douglas County's concerns and the 1982 waste discharge requirements.

Douglas County Planning Department - report by the Douglas County staff to include the status of IVGID's waste disposal plan in Douglas County.

Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) - report by Verne Rosse to include status of IVGID in meeting 1982 standards.

Traffic

Status at November APC Meeting - It was indicated that additional traffic lanes would need to be provided on State Route 28 through Incline Village in addition to providing public transportation in the area. Highway 28 at North Stateline was projected to exceed its physical capacity while service levels in the center of Incline were projected to lower. It was indicated that the area was low on Nevada's priority list for capital improvements and that there were no county improvement plans for the area.

Current Status

Nevada Highway Department - a report by Don Pray to include the most current traffic counts and projections for Incline Village and also comments on possible efforts by Nevada in this area.

Washoe County Manager's Office - report by John MacIntyre, County Manager, or his representative to include a status report on the county's proposed improvements and planning efforts in Incline Village.
Water Rights Issue Hits Incline

How much water does IVGID have available for current and future growth? That's the question that has hit the headlines at Incline Village.

Interest in the question was triggered by planners, prodded by those who are concerned about growth at Lake Tahoe. Planning agencies, like Washoe County Regional Planning Commission, (PCP) and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, (TRPA) are on the alert for any deficiencies that might be a sign of building beyond the capabilities of the area.

Capability constraints include sewage treatment and export capacity, water supply, air quality and traffic congestion. Because of issues raised regarding water availability, I VGID has been thoroughly questioned on its water rights, current consumption and future requirements.

September 11, 1979, Washoe County, PCP, as part of its review of Incline development proposals totaling some 459 dwelling units, issued a report that I VGID's water supply was only sufficient to provide for 286 more dwelling units.

Headlines proclaimed a temporary moratorium imposed by Washoe County until I VGID's staff dug out the facts.

The Washoe County PCP report was shown to be inaccurate, due to lack of complete information.

The Washoe County Commission called a special meeting Sept. 24, at which Kermit McMillin, I VGID general manager supplied a detailed report on I VGID's water rights, establishing service limitations.

The moratorium ended.

But Incline's water rights had become an important news subject. McMillin was called before TRPA to again present facts and figures to set the record straight.

This leads to the logical question: Does I VGID have sufficient water rights for buildout?

The answer is: No!

The District has long been aware that additional water rights along with strict water conservation practices will have to be employed to reach buildout. Applications for sufficient additional water rights were made in 1969 and 1970.

IVGID, through its meters on all service, keeps a carefully detailed record of water use.

Over the past five years, the district has experienced a decline in unit consumption of water. Below is shown how this has occurred.

Please turn to page 4

REAL ESTATE SALES TOP LAST YEAR'S

Real estate sales at Incline Village this year have topped last year's by a good 40 per cent, according to John Ross, president of the Incline Village Board of Realtors.

This year's total sales processed through Incline Village Multiple Listing Service had reached $33 million by Dec. 15, Ross reported at the Dec. 18, MLS breakfast meeting. Last year's total was $43.5 million.

The number of sales was down a bit, standing at 610 sales, Dec. 15, as compared to 670 last year, about a 10 per cent drop. Also, there is more property on the market than at the end of 1978: 524 vs. 303.

Wes Howell, former Board of Realtors president, said he believed the number of sales hit a higher figure last year because of the boom in lot sales. This would account for the lower gross volume, as lot sales average about a third of the price of a home.

"Lot sales bottomed at the beginning of 1977, then peaked in the latter part of 1978," Howell said.

Ross said the price of lots is going up.

The day of the $10,000 lot is long gone and the days of the $30,000 lot are numbered.

"This year we expect the $40,000 lot will be at the bottom of the list, with the average lot going for about $60,000," Ross said.

Ross stressed that condominium projects do not go through MLS, so their sales can't be considered in his report.

Ross expects another big building year in 1980, as he believes a large number of individual lot owners intend to build their own homes.

They can be expected to build homes in the $50,000-plus bracket and then live in them. They use their own cash for financing," Ross said.

Ross did not think high interest rates would put a crimp in Incline real estate sales, even though he expects interest rates to drop a bit.

"Interest rates have never deeply affected Incline real estate sales. It's the availability of money, not the cost, that makes a difference," Ross said.

Ross predicted another good year for Incline real estate, with a leveling off of price increases.

Please turn to page 2.

Washoe Orders Allocation Plan

Washoe County Commissioners Dec. 18, directed trustees of the Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID) to set up a water allocation system to manage the water supply available under the District's present water rights.

The commissioners at the same time ordered a 60-day suspension of building permits while the water study is being made.

The Washoe Commission did not order a moratorium, but made it clear no more building permits would be issued until the District comes up with its allocation plan to stretch out the water it is legally entitled to use.

The plan would be for the balance of Incline Village's buildout, consistent with available resources, the commissioners stated.

Kermit McMillin, IVGID General Manager, conceded the Commissioners' action came at the most opportune time, inasmuch as during the 60-day suspension no new construction could be started due to the TRPA grading ordinance which prohibits breaking ground until the first part of May. For this reason, the decision of the County Commissioners is not seen as detrimental. It will permit the District to determine the best process for handling new applications for service without the County dictating such action.

"The Trustees have been reviewing the availability of water for over one year, a County action which was not unforeseen. The District is in a good position from the standpoint of knowledge of its water consumption to respond to the County Commissioners' request," McMillin said.

McMillin would like to see a plan that would eliminate any panic moves by those who own unimproved property, prompted by fear they will not be able to get water if they wait and build later.

Editor's Note: The water rights issue has been raised by Washoe and Tahoe Planners during the past few months. This newsletter has been prepared to answer as many questions on the subject as possible.

Numbers Confusing? Use Your Calculator

In the measure of water quantities, different numbers are used to simplify the description of vast quantities. Also, water is measured in rates of flow as well as quantity. To help our readers understand the terms and do their own arithmetic, we provide the following table:

1. Rate of Flow:
   1 cfs (Cubic foot per second) equals 7 1/2 gallons per second.
   1 cfs flowing for a full year equals 724 acre-feet.

2. Quantity:
   1 acre foot of water is the quantity required to cover one acre with water one foot deep.
   1 acre foot equals 325,000 gallons.
   1 acre foot of water will supply domestic water for 8 to 12 people, per year.
IVGID Maintains Water Conservation Policy

The Incline Village General Improvement District is very conservation conscious, according to Kermit McMillin, general manager. It’s the District’s policy to make the best use of the water to which it has rights.

“With the drought of 1976-77 conservation became vital to the existence of many Northern Nevada and Northern California communities,” McMillin said.

A conservation move introduced or proposed by many communities was mandatory metering. Homeowners faced large water bills if they used more than a specified amount of water.

Incline Village was ahead of the game. IVGID began its mandatory metering program in 1969. Meters have apparently cut wasteful use of water, when consumption is compared to unmetered communities.

Reno and other Washoe County communities estimate it takes one acre foot of water to serve each dwelling unit. Incline Village’s average is about one third of that amount. Water consumption in resort communities is traditionally less than in urban areas.

Some 10 years ago, while meters were being installed, IVGID launched another program which has saved tremendous amounts of water. The District installed non-conductive couplings between its mains and the service line connecting to consumers.

“These neoprene bushings stopped the electrical currents that had for years created electrolysis-corrosion in the District’s steel mains,” McMillin said. “The copper houses services lines were far more conductive than the thin wall steel mains. This caused corrosion blisters to form in the mains. This corrosion ultimately ate the walls of the mains, causing leaks,” McMillin said.

Some of the mains became so corroded that massive leaks caused up to 50 per cent loss of the water being carried through the lines. Those mains had to be replaced. The largest section of these leaky mains was replaced in the summers of 1978 and 1979.

“More replacements will be needed before the district can reach its goal of a system loss of less than 10 per cent,” McMillin said.

Consumer conservation programs would be effective in making better use of Incline’s water supply. These include installation of conservation devices in water closet tanks, shower heads and pressure regulators.

“There have been discussions of requiring such devices in all new construction and perhaps even retrofitting existing homes, apartments and hotel/motel rooms. It is estimated between 600 and 1,200 acre feet of water per year could be conserved if all District customers had these devices installed,” McMillin said.

He said simple repairs to leaking fixtures should immediately save water and cut water bills.

Outside use of water can be important to maintaining the property’s appearance, but overuse is costly plus detrimental to lawns and flower beds.

McMillin recommends natural landscaping, using pines, manzanita, etc., which exist without water, even in drought years.

“Consider using a car wash that recycles water instead of washing the car in your driveway. Leaving a hose running when not in use, wastes water with absolutely no benefit,” McMillin said.

The district is now investigating a chemical to add to its irrigation water on fields and golf courses, which make it absorb into the soil faster. This saves water and does a better job.

Building Permits Set Record

Building permits for construction at Incline Village/Crystal Bay reached an all-time record 824, with a total value of $70,819,820, during the first 11 months of 1979, according to the November report from Washoe County Building Department.

Here’s a comparison with prior years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Permits</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>$5,380,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>$5,563,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>$10,507,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>$26,197,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>$48,727,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979 (11 mos.)</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>$70,819,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heading the construction parade this year was a merched single family homes, with 351 permits representing a total value of $32,466,936. There were 43 fewer homes built, compared to last year, but the average value of those built soared from $95,302 each to $92,498. Total value topped last year by $6,737,747.

Let’s compare the last five years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Permits</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
<th>Average Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>$3,714,027</td>
<td>$47,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>$7,421,060</td>
<td>$51,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>$15,414,460</td>
<td>$56,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>$25,729,189</td>
<td>$66,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979 (11 mos.)</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>$32,466,936</td>
<td>$92,498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most visible at Incline Village is construction of multiple dwelling units, apartments and condominiums. Spurred by the threat of Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) controls, condominiums were seriously overbuilt in the early 1970s. They stopped dead until demand recovered in 1975.

Multiple dwelling unit construction has made a comeback this year’s crop of 483 dwelling units surpassed the number of single family homes.

The construction pace has zoomed in the last five years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Permits</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
<th>Average Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$135,212</td>
<td>$33,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$643,666</td>
<td>$27,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$4,251,826</td>
<td>$84,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>$15,790,019</td>
<td>$143,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979 (11 mos.)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>$27,824,572</td>
<td>$57,607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combined total of single family dwelling units this year reached 834, compared to 760 last year.

Permits for commercial buildings and miscellaneous improvements generally lag behind dwellings, but the boom in commercial construction has become highly visible at Incline Village.

With 321 permits totaling $10,528,322 in value, a new record is set.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Permits</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$1,714,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$2,442,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>$5,430,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>$7,162,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979 (11 mos.)</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>$10,528,322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incline Village General Improvement District is closely watching growth in order to provide adequate water, sewer, trash collection services and recreation facilities. The new 56-acre park, with seven new tennis courts and a new middle school with three playing fields to be started this year are part of the program to supply community needs.

PRICES LEVEL OFF

Continued from page one

Howell blamed two years of inflation for the price spiral and predicted it would continue, but at a slower rate.

He said prices were now leveling off a bit and said condominiums as well as single family homes were coming on the market.

“People are listing prices with us they are really serious about. They’re not giving us inflated prices like they were last year,” Howell said.

He said there will be good demand for low priced lots, citing the $30-40,000 range and low priced houses, using $140,000 as the cutoff point.

Howell expects construction will be down a bit, but still sees a good year. He said there’s a strong demand for custom houses and that there are some being built on “spec.”

“We still have inflation. There’s still a wealthy clientele for Incline, to keep sales moving well.”

“But I think it will take a while for Incline to absorb all the condominiums that are on the drawing boards,” Howell concluded.
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IVGID Keeps Carefully Detailed Records...

1) Construction activity has been moving from the lower elevations of the District that are more conducive to lawns and gardens to the upper elevations that are steeper terrain and therefore less likely to have outside use of water.

2) Large hotels such as the Hyatt Lake Tahoe have not been duplicated. It is very questionable at this point whether any of the Tourist-Commercial properties will be developed in this manner.

3) Some degree of conserving of water has been experienced through metering of all water services and general public awareness of the need to conserve.

4) The District has embarked on a continuing program of replacement of defective water mains. Thus far, approximately 25,000 lineal feet of main have been replaced, which has had a marked effect on water loss reduction.

Here is the current water supply data:
Existing Water Rights: 3,115.5 ac.ft./yr.
Estimated Use, 1979 2,335 ac.ft./yr.
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... With Meters On All Water Consumption

Remaining ................. 780.5 ac. ft./yr.
Estimated Additional Demand to Build-
out (before year 2000) .......... 2,000 ac. ft./yr.
Potential Shortage ............ 1,200 ac. ft./yr.

Then comes the inevitable question: How long will this last?

There are two big variables:
1. How fast will dwelling units be built?
2. How much water will each unit consume?

The Washoe County RPC report stated Incline dwelling units use .49 acre feet per year each. That figure was proven wrong.

IVGID's metered service shows the average single family home uses .43 acre feet per year, while the average condominium/apartment units use .24 acre feet per year. The demand for these combined dwelling units now averages out to .39 acre feet per unit per year, including commercial (Hyatt Hotel, Incline Center, Shopping Center, etc.), consumption.

So with 780.5 acre feet per year of water available, there's enough water for over 1800 single family homes or 3,700 condominiums. At .39 acre feet per unit, there's enough water for at least 2,000 additional dwelling units, making no allowance for expected conservation measures.

The question of how fast they'll be built is anybody's guess. At this year's buildout rate of just over 800 units, the District would run out of water in 1983.

In view of high interest rates and scarcity of financing, it would seem a slowdown would be inevitable. This would allow additional time for the State to act on pending water right applications or the acquisition of rights from private interests.
Population Growth Projected

The estimates of Incline Village’s total population at buildout can best be described as educated guesses. Past population figures are used as a yardstick to project future population. According to a 1969 study prepared by CH2M Hill, IVGID engineering consultants, the population of Incline Village will total 20,683 during the 1980 summer peak. The engineering firm said the 1969 population peak would reach 10,526 in 1975 and top 20,683 in 1980. These estimates were based on average occupancy of dwelling units as follows:

- **Persons Dwelling unit**
  - 4.0 - Single Family
  - 2.75 - Condominium/Apartment
  - 2.5 - Mobile Home
  - 2.0 - Hotel/Motel room

CH2M Hill’s population estimates based on a buildout were projected as follows:

**Dwelling Unit** | **Population Estimate**
--- | ---
Single Family | 2,236 3,965 10,728
Condo/Apartment | 2,056 5,338 7,688
Mobile Homes | 75 205 238
Hotel/Motel* | 428 1,028 1,852

*Not counted as permanent population

Since these population figures assume full occupancy, the realistic population was pegged at approximately 2/3 of the number that could be housed at the peak level. This gives a resident population level of 14,488.

Incline Creek Water Plan Set

The Incline Village General Improvement District has a permit to draw up to 1,448 acre feet of water from Incline Creek. That amount of water is included in IVGID’s total water rights of 3,115.5 acre feet.

The amount of water taken from Incline Creek is “diverted” from the stream and fed into the system most of the year. During the spring, when the snow is melting among the peaks above, the stream becomes filled with silt and debris from the high rate of runoff. When this happens, the water treatment facilities at the plant cannot handle the water. The turbid water causes operational problems, so it must be shut off and allowed to flow untouched into Lake Tahoe.

When winter comes, the opposite condition prevails. The flow drops considerably. At times, during this period, the water is not taken into the system because of color and taste problems.

Thus, IVGID is not drawing its full water right from Incline Creek. The District has proposed a management plan to correct the problem.

The District has asked the State of Nevada to allow the water to pass the diversion, enter Lake Tahoe and be picked up at the Burnt Cedar intake. This plan gives Incline Creek water a chance to mingle with lake water and lose the characteristics that make it unsuitable to take into the system at the Incline Creek diversion.

As part of the water management plan, the District proposes to install two stream-gauging stations: one on Incline Creek and one on Third Creek.

What is proposed is a permanent weir-type structure immediately below the point of diversion on Incline Creek and at a proposed point of diversion on Third Creek under Applications Nos. 25064 and 25065 for 1,825 acre feet each.

The structures would be capable of measuring from 0 to 5 cubic feet per second. A recorder will be employed on each to obtain a continuous record.

The principal purpose of measuring flows on Incline Creek will be for the accounting of water at the point of diversion. It will provide data for an exchange account between Incline Creek and Lake Tahoe. With this measurement, the District will determine the amount of divertible flow that is allowed to pass the point of diversion that could be picked up at Lake Tahoe in exchange.

The Third Creek record will be used for planning and development purposes at the time the District decides to pursue the Third Creek water right applications. These records will be helpful to the District and the State Engineer during the processing of those applications.

STATE QUESTIONS
WATER POLICY

When someone wants to file a subdivision map for development of condominiums or a large commercial building, he drops by the Incline Village General Improvement District and asks for a letter stating that water is available for the project.

That’s called a “will serve” letter. The District has been issuing “will serve” letters since the mid-1970’s. They are required by public planning agencies before final approval can be granted.

IVGID has issued these letters to all applicants in the belief that water rights held by the District are for the benefit of all properties within its service boundaries.

“... And there has never been a reservation of water for any particular class of property. Rather, the service was, and continues to be, based on need,” said Kermit McMillin, IVGID general manager.

“The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) does not accept this approach. TRPA believes IVGID should reserve water for all existing single family and multiple family lots at some volume that has not been determined,” McMillin said.

“Whether TRPA actually has this authority has not been shown. However, they certainly have the authority to deny subdivision of condominium projects and this they have chosen to do,” he said.

In a letter from William J. Newman, Nevada State Engineer and TRPA member, McMillin was told that no new subdivisions or condominium projects will be approved by the State Engineer’s office based on “will serve” letters until the concerns of water supply by the Regional Planning Commission, Washoe County Commission and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency have been evaluated.

Single family homes are being served whenever the owners decide they are ready to build.

“The District accepts its responsibility to serve its property owners when service is required,” McMillin said. He pointed out that this responsibility has always been met, even though other communities surrounding the lake have not been so fortunate. He said the District fully expects to be able to continue to meet the requirements of its property owners as community growth continues.

“New development, including Tahoe Shores, a large condominium project planned for the last remaining Incline Village casino site, has been issued “will serve” letters because the District is presently able to serve each project,” McMillin said.

“In fact from a water consumption standpoint, if a casino-hotel had been developed on the Tahoe Shores property it is estimated that the water requirement may have been double what the condominium project will need,” he concluded.

WINTER 1980 RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES
SCHEDULE AVAILABLE NOW!
Sign up at IVGID office
QUESTION: When Will Incline Be Built Out?

There's a lot of talk about buildout these days.

A community reaches that state when every vacant lot is gone. It means there's a single family home, apartment/condominium, mobile home, or commercial structure on every existing lot.

In 1975, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency made a study of Lake Tahoe's holding capacity. Its buildout figure was 15,925 units for the Incline/Crystal Bay area.

Through its planning, environmental constraints and down-zoning process the buildout capacity has been cut one third.

TRPA dropped Incline/Crystal Bay maximum buildout to 10,711, cutting 5,214 dwelling units from the zoning that had then existed.

In 1978, EDAW, Inc., IVGI's recreation facilities consultant, completed a study of population and buildout in order to forecast community recreation needs.

Their report projected buildout at 10,387 units, reducing the TRPA maximum by 3 per cent. To reach a practical limit, other areas of Lake Tahoe use a rule of thumb reduction of from 15 to 20 per cent of buildout.

It's a good idea to observe, at this point, that large parcels of land zoned tourist commercial at Incline, once planned for casino hotels, is being converted to lighter density condominiums and apartment developments. This trend could cut Incline's buildout total as much as 1,000 units, according to the EDAW report.

Public agencies are now eyeing Incline/Crystal Bay's maximum buildout figure as a means to determine adequacy of water supplies.

These agencies are also looking at growth rate and picking a year in which they believe there will not be enough water supply to allow further construction.

According to IVGI's statistics, Incline's growth rate since 1972 has been as follows:

- 1972: 2.2 per cent
- 1973: 1.4 per cent
- 1974: 0.9 per cent
- 1975: 0.8 per cent

The average growth rate for these eight years is 1.7 per cent.

There is a potential total of 4,768 single family homes within IVGI's maximum buildout. At this time, 2,575 have been built, or 54 per cent of the total.

There is a potential of 5,138 if property, now zoned tourist commercial, is converted to multi-residential developments. To date, 2,600 units have been completed, or 55 per cent of the total possible.

So let's see how long it may be before we reach buildout.

1. Using 3.6 per cent, a sound figure according to the above table:

   | Single Family | 4,758 |
   | Multiple Family | 5,138 |
   | Total Potential | 9,906 |
   | Already Constructed | 5,384 |
   | Balance Remaining | 4,529 |

   (9,906 x .036) = 357 units per year
   12.7 years or 1992

2. If buildout continues at 1978-79 rates:

   (9,906 x .025) = 4,529
   817 units
   5.5 years or 1985

3. If buildout slips back to 1972-76 average:

   (9,906 x .014) = 4,529
   1,192 units
   32.6 years or 2012

IVGI's best guess is that Incline will be built out in 1992.

The EDAW report, titled "Population and Buildout Analysis: Recreation Needs," is available for inspection at IVGI's office or the public library.

The report in early 1978 anticipated the current building boom, with the following paragraph:

"Projected residential buildout patterns: Taking short-term development pressures into account, it is estimated the North Shore area in Nevada will experience a continued, accelerated buildout over the next three years. After 1980, buildout will continue at an estimated 6 per cent growth rate."

The number of unsold homes and condominiums on the market at Incline, the shortage of mortgage money and high interest rates would indicate a sharp reduction of new construction during the coming year.
IVGID May Purchase Water Rights

IVGID’s water supply is more than adequate for the Incline’s current needs, but public agencies concerned about growth at Lake Tahoe have forced a hard look at future water supply.

For this reason the District has approached several potential water sources to determine the possibility of purchasing water required for ultimate buildout.

Franktown Irrigation Company holds a decreed right to a substantial amount of water diverted from Third Creek across Tahoe Meadow into Ophir Creek. Ophir Creek flows into Washoe Valley, where its water is used for irrigation on agricultural land. Very preliminary discussions have been held with the shareholders of Franktown Irrigation Company but nothing has been decided at this date.

The State of Nevada has a permit to divert 3,000 acre feet of water from Marlette Lake. At present the State sells a portion of this water to Virginia City (500,000 GPD), Lakeview Estates (230,000 GPD) and to itself (400,000 GPD) totaling approximately 1,266 acre feet. At the last session of the State Legislature some commitment was made to Carson City to sell some or all of its remaining water to the State Capitol. During the first look into the possibility of purchasing some of the water the State appeared interested. However, it now appears Carson City will require all the excess water.

Initial steps have been taken to determine the possibility of securing water from the North Tahoe PUD. Due to restraints on growth in that district unrelated to water, there may be surplus water which IVGID could buy on a wholesale basis until some other water source is secured. The North Tahoe PUD board has authorized its staff to explore the possibility of such a sale to IVGID. This purchase may allow the District the supply it needs until its water search is completed.

Incline Water Rights Detailed

The Incline Village General Improvement District has been supplying Incline Village with water since it was organized under Nevada Statutes in 1961.

It now possesses two certificated water rights:

- **Lake Tahoe No. 7760**: 1,250 acre feet
- **Mill Creek No. 829**: 275 acre feet
- **Incline Creek No. 25145**: 1,277.5 acre feet

It also holds two permits for water:

- **Lake Tahoe No. 35903**: 390.0 acre feet
- **Incline Creek No. 25145**: 1,448.0 acre feet

Total permitted and certified: 3,115.5 acre feet

Applications are now on file with the Nevada Division of Water Resources as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/15/69</td>
<td>Third Creek</td>
<td>1,825 acre feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/15/69</td>
<td>Third Creek</td>
<td>1,825 acre feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/17/70</td>
<td>Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>7,300 acre feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These applications were filed when it was known the valid water rights in hand were not sufficient to serve the new subdivisions being proposed by Boise Cascade Corporation. Since Boise units Nos. 6, 7 and 8 were not approved and were ultimately abandoned by Boise Cascade, it was known that not all the water applied for would be necessary to serve buildout.

Because of a suit brought against the State of Nevada by the Pyramid Lake Indians and the U.S. Department of Interior, the Nevada State Engineer has been unwilling to act upon any of the applications.
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AC. FT./YR.

IMPROVED
219.0
AC. FT./YR.

IMPROVED
445.5
AC. FT./YR.

UNIMPROVED
76.1
AC. FT./YR.

UNIMPROVED
155.0
AC. FT./YR.

IMPROVED
105.0
AC. FT./YR.

IMPROVED
7.0
AC. FT./YR.

ALL OTHER
590.0 AC. FT./YR.

SYSTEM LOSSES

ESTIMATED CONSUMPTION AT BUILDOUT
3,190 AC. FT./YR.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Trustees
Incline Village General Improvement District

FROM: Kermit McMillin
General Manager

SUBJECT: Review of Water Availability and Use

DATE: January 30, 1980

Over the past few weeks, a great deal of information has been developed with regard to trends and water use in the District to determine to what extent existing water rights will allow development of single family lots, multiple family subdivisions, unsubdivided parcels, and other potential water services.

Through the computer, we have developed average consumption of our customers by service area. However this information from the computer has only been continually available since July of 1979. Therefore, our reviews have been limited to the July through December consumptions and we have annualized that consumption based on production records that indicate approximately 57½% of all water consumed within a year is consumed in the second half of that year, or between the first of July and the end of December. We have, therefore, taken the available consumption of our water customers, divided that consumption between July and December by 57.6% to determine an approximate annual consumption. Through this method, we have projected the total annual consumption of each service classification and have further annualized the consumption of single family and multiple family dwellings within a service area. We then determined the number of potential water service customers by service classification within these various service areas and have multiplied the average annual consumption by the total potential customers within a service area and grand totalled those consumptions to determine a total buildout water requirement.

Inasmuch as the District has a vigorous ongoing program of replacing defective water lines, we have anticipated a
systems loss of 4.86%, which is the equivalent of 50,500,000 gallons per year. Systems losses are not limited to leaking lines, but would also be water used for fire protection and other unauthorized or unmetered use. In checking this with Jack Shefchik, he feels this is sufficient allowance for systems losses.

We have found that the average single family home will consume approximately 90,500 gallons of water per year with Area 2, which is that area containing Lakeview Subdivision, Lakeside No. 1 Subdivision, and Winding Wood Subdivision, to consume 154,500 gallons per year compared to Area 3, which contains the Ponderosa Subdivisions and Units 1, 1A, 1B, 2 and 4, to consume only approximately 51,700 gallons per year. The other three service areas are very near the average, so these two areas represent the extremes in use. However, we have also found that Area 2, where the high consumption customers reside, amounts to only 8% of our remaining buildout, while Area 3 constitutes 63% of our remaining growth. These are important figures because they indicate that the 90,500 gallon average use by our single family residents should reduce over the next period of years and that ultimately that average annual consumption will reduce to approximately 81,200 gallons per year, or approximately a 10% decrease over the present rate of consumption.

In evaluating the consumption history of our multiple family dwellings, we do not find this wide disparity in use, but find that the average annual consumption of 57,650 gallons per unit will remain almost constant to buildout. According to the present consumption habits of our multiple family dwellings, at buildout the average annual consumption will be slightly less than 55,000 gallons per unit per year.

In evaluating commercial use of water, we have identified the various sizes of existing services to commercial customers and have found that these sizes are somewhat consistent with the acreage of commercial development being served. We find that a parcel of 7/10ths of an acre or less will typically be served by a 3/4 inch service, a parcel averaging 8/10ths of an acre will require a 1 inch service, parcels averaging 1.6 acres will require a 1 1/2" service, a parcel containing 3-3/4 acres on an average will require a 2 inch service, and a parcel of 11 1/2 acres on an average will require a 3 inch service. These requirements are important in order to determine the future needs for commercial services, as we know the sizes of properties that will be served in the future. As an example, we find that 40 of the 67 remaining potential services within the District are 7/10ths of an acre or less in size. Two commercial parcels
may require a 1 inch service, 13 are of a size that could require a 1\frac{1}{2} inch service, and 12 are of a size that could require a 3 inch service. We have determined through the average consumption of these various sizes of commercial services that the preponderance of the commercial needs of the District are already being served and that the remaining commercial properties should require only about 25 million gallons of water per year to service those undeveloped properties.

Our final examination was that of all other classifications of services, which would be to other public authorities, (i.e., schools, library, county offices, etc.), interdepartmental needs such as swimming pools, expanded recreation properties, etc., and individual irrigation systems. We have determined that there is a potential requirement for an additional 19 million gallons per year to service these additional facilities. The District does contain some single family and multiple family parcels that have not been subdivided. Although it is virtually impossible for the staff to determine at what level these parcels will be developed, we have taken a very conservative approach and used maximum development as our criteria in determining total water consumption.

There is a total of 69\frac{1}{2} acres in the District zoned either high density residential or tourist commercial which might be developed into condominium developments and at 15 units per acre the total density would accommodate 1,042 additional condominium or apartment units. There is 2\frac{1}{2} acres of medium density residential that has not been subdivided which would allow a total of 20 units to be developed, 81 acres of rural estates which developed at 1 unit per acre would provide for 81 single family homes, and 42 acres of low density residential which, if developed at 4 units per acre, would provide for 168 single family homes. This potential of 1,311 additional dwelling units is expected to consume approximately 80,500,000 gallons of water if developed to the total maximum density.

In our evaluation, we have not considered the Washoe No. 1 portion of the District due to the fact that the existing permitted water usage in that area should be sufficient to handle buildout. We are also not anticipating that any of that water would be available for use in the balance of the District.

With all of these assumptions, we find that the buildout requirement for the District will amount to 3,190 acre feet of water per year. Our current authorized consumption
of water is 2,725.5 acre feet, leaving us with a potential shortfall of 464.5 acre feet. If we were to continue our rate of growth for the past two years over the next 2.5 years, our existing water rights would be totally consumed. If we were to continue at our annual rate of growth that has been experienced between 1972 and 1979, our existing water supply would be adequate to meet growth through 1985. If we fall back to the annual rate of growth that was experienced between 1972 and 1976, the present water supply would be adequate to meet growth needs until 1994.

Any observer of the construction activity within the District during the last two years would have to admit that this has been a phenomenal growth period and not likely to continue for any sustained period of time. However, if, because of economic conditions or other parameters that affect building cycles were to be conducive to continued high construction activity, the District through conservation efforts or through the State's authorizing the reuse of treated effluent on the District's irrigated turf areas could resolve this water shortfall within a matter of days. The Trustees have been discussing the possibility of needed conservation to see the District through the period of time that it might take to acquire additional water and that might be the best possible approach in satisfying the growth needs of the community on a short-term basis.

It would seem unnecessary at this point in time to establish any sort of an allocation program. However, continued monitoring of consumption habits and continued efforts to increase the allowable water use should certainly be a high priority for the District.
INCLINE VILLAGE GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
CONSUMPTION ANALYSIS BY SERVICE CLASSIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single Family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Services</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>1,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Annual Consumption</td>
<td>112,700</td>
<td>154,480</td>
<td>51,700</td>
<td>88,510</td>
<td>79,710</td>
<td>90,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. Ft/Yr</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Services</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>3,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Annual Consumption</td>
<td>52,100</td>
<td>56,270</td>
<td>52,260</td>
<td>71,170</td>
<td>48,750</td>
<td>56,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. Ft/Yr</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Avg. Annual Consumption |   |   |   |   |   |       |
| 3/4" (.71 Ac.)*       | 80,860| 26,180| 23,670| 79,120| 28,639| 67,510 |
| 1" (.82 Ac.)*         | 274,300| 172,140| -     | 221,340| 68,910| 222,280 |
| 1 1/2" (1.57 Ac.)*    | 485,090| 364,490| -     | 385,010| 980,020| 454,280 |
| 2" (3.73 Ac.)*        | 1,620,150| 552,500| -     | 1,340,630| 312,060| 1,076,060 |
| 3" (11.53 Ac.)*       | 1,544,860| 154,340| 95,720| -    | 5,799,910| 9,546,020 |
| 8" (15.99 Ac.)*       | 11,619,080| -   | -    | -    | -   | -     |
| 12" (7.98 Ac.)*       | -     | -   | -    | -    | 3,625,890| 3,625,890 |

| Ac. Ft/Yr             |   |   |   |   |   |       |
| 3/4"                 | .25 | .08 | .07 | .24 | .09 | .21   |
| 1"                   | .84 | .53 | -   | .68 | .21 | .68   |
| 1 1/2"               | 1.49 | 1.12 | -   | 1.18 | 3.01 | 1.39  |
| 2"                   | 4.36 | 1.70 | -   | 4.11 | .96 | 3.30  |
| 3"                   | 4.74 | .47 | .29 | -   | -   | 4.08  |
| 8"                   | 35.04 | -   | -   | -   | 17.80 | 29.29 |
| 12"                  | -   | -   | -   | -   | 11.13 | 11.13 |

*Average Acreage
INCLINE VILLAGE GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

ACRE FEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>ACFT/YR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL AVERAGE 1,756</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXISTING SERVICES 267

AVERAGE SINGLE FAMILY HOME CONSUMPTION
INCLINE VILLAGE GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

AVERAGE MULTIPLE FAMILY DWELLING CONSUMPTION

EXISTING SERVICES 939
AREA 1 160 AC.FT/yr
AREA 2 173 AC.FT/yr
AREA 3 160 AC.FT/yr
AREA 4 218 AC.FT/yr
AREA 5 150 AC.FT/yr
OVERALL AVERAGE 3,013

ACRE FEET
### Incline Village General Improvement District
#### Potential Water Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Customers</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single Family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Services</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>1,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved Lots</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>1,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Potential</strong></td>
<td>386</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>3,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Services</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>3,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved Lots</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>1,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Potential</strong></td>
<td>2,019</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>4,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsubdivided Parcels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Estates</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Commercial</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Potential</strong></td>
<td>346</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Service</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved Lots</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Potential</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation (Irrigation/Subirrigation Only)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved Lots</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Potential</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Others</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Potential</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>4,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>4,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Potential</strong></td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>10,316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**INCLINE VILLAGE GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT**

**PRESENT AND FUTURE WATER CONSUMPTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Consumption</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gallons</td>
<td>Ac. Ft/Yr</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Services</td>
<td>158,913,390</td>
<td>487.61</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Potential</td>
<td>152,130,600</td>
<td>466.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Services</td>
<td>169,195,210</td>
<td>519.16</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Potential</td>
<td>100,440,380</td>
<td>308.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsubdivided Parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Potential</td>
<td>80,482,740</td>
<td>246.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Services</td>
<td>71,371,890</td>
<td>219.00</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Potential</td>
<td>24,790,410</td>
<td>76.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Services</td>
<td>145,188,450</td>
<td>445.50</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Potential</td>
<td>3,813,030</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Services</td>
<td>63,559,060</td>
<td>195.03</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Potential</td>
<td>19,220,540</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Losses</td>
<td>50,514,500</td>
<td>155.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>v4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,039,620,200</td>
<td>3,190.00</td>
<td>58.51</td>
<td>41.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INCLINE VILLAGE GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
WATER CONSUMPTION ANALYSIS
FOR YEAR ENDED 12-31-79

**Existing Water Rights**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit No.</th>
<th>Certificate No.</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Rate of Diversion</th>
<th>Limit of Annual Diversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25145</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incline Creek</td>
<td>2.00 CFS</td>
<td>1,448 Ac. Ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20849</td>
<td>7760</td>
<td>Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>5.00 CFS</td>
<td>1,250 Ac. Ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20850</td>
<td>7761</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00 CFS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17080</td>
<td>4829</td>
<td>Mill Creek</td>
<td>.07 CFS</td>
<td>27.5 Ac. Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

1979 Diversion

Available for Future Development

Projected Consumption at Buildout

1979 Diversion

Projected Additional Consumption at Buildout

Available for Future Buildout

Potential Shortfall

Growth Rate Use of Remaining Water:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual % Growth</th>
<th>Ac. Ft/yr to Supply Growth</th>
<th>Years Available Supply Would Last</th>
<th>Year More Water Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972-1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-1979</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>109.20</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-1979</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>245.69</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout Projections</td>
<td>Average Growth Rate for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1972-76</td>
<td>1972-79</td>
<td>1978-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout Rate</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Consumption</td>
<td>4,067,500</td>
<td>10,449,300</td>
<td>23,212,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. Ft/Yr</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>71.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout Rate</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Consumption</td>
<td>4,515,200</td>
<td>11,603,000</td>
<td>25,726,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. Ft/Yr</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>35.60</td>
<td>78.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsubdivided Parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout Rate</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Consumption</td>
<td>3,174,700</td>
<td>8,206,300</td>
<td>18,209,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. Ft/Yr</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>55.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout Rate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Consumption</td>
<td>817,600</td>
<td>2,452,800</td>
<td>5,723,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. Ft/Yr</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>17.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout Rate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Consumption</td>
<td>1,439,600</td>
<td>2,879,200</td>
<td>7,198,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. Ft/Yr</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>22.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout Rate</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>1,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Consumption</td>
<td>14,014,600</td>
<td>35,590,600</td>
<td>80,069,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. Ft/Yr</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>245.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 3, 1980

TO: The Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: The Staff

SUBJECT: Proposed Subdivision Ordinance Amendments

At the direction of the Advisory Planning Commission in February, the staff forwarded the Land Use Ordinance amendments to the Governing Board for consideration at the February 27 meeting. Also at the APC's direction, Agency staff withheld the Subdivision Ordinance amendments from Governing Board action and rescheduled them for further APC discussion in March. Staff has contacted the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) at Dean Pricemoore's suggestion and received a copy of the report entitled: Condos, Co-ops, and Conversions: A Guide On Rental Conversions for Local Officials. (Unfortunately OPR was able to send us only one copy of this document.) As a result of this report, staff has added the following definitions to the proposed Subdivision Ordinance amendments:

Community Apartment - A multi-residential project in which the buyer receives a right of exclusive occupancy to a particular unit without separate ownership of air space.

Stock Cooperative - A multi-residential project in which the buyers hold their right to occupancy through ownership of stock or membership in a cooperative corporation.

Attached are these and other proposed amendments to the Subdivision Ordinance as previously presented.

As a further discussion item, staff will report on the recent Governing Board actions regarding the HDA and the timesharing amendments. Staff would request that the APC members come prepared to discuss the local government's role and regulations in regard to condominium conversions and timesharing and whether or not there is any need for regional regulations in these areas.
SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS

Add to Section 3.00 - Definitions:

Community Apartment - A multi-residential project in which the buyer receives a right of exclusive occupancy to a particular unit without separate ownership of air space.

Condominium Conversion - Any change in the form of ownership of real property wherein persons obtain ownership interest of individual units thereof, including but not limited to condominiums, community apartment, stock cooperatives, and any other form of such interest regulated by this ordinance.

Stock Cooperative - A multi-residential project in which the buyers hold their right to occupancy through ownership of stock or membership in a cooperative corporation.

Subdivision - Any real property, improved or unimproved, or a portion thereof, shown on the latest adopted tax roll of a local government as a unit or as contiguous units, which is divided for the purpose of use, sale, lease or financing, whether immediate or future, into five (5) or more condominiums, or into five (5) or more condominium units through condominium conversion, or into five (5) or more lots, or in which five (5) or more undivided interests are created or are proposed to be created.

Add new Section 4.34:

Approval by the permit-issuing authority and the Agency may be granted only if it is found that the tentative map is in compliance with all applicable TRPA plans and ordinances and that the establishment, maintenance or operation of the proposed subdivision or associated uses will not be detrimental to health, safety, peace, morals, comfort and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed subdivision 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.

Change Section 4.34 to 4.35.