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

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on  June 8 and 9, 1983  at
9:30  a.m. at the hearing room of the Tahoe
Regional Planning Agency, located at 2155 South Avenue, South
Lake Tahoe, California, the Advisory Planning Commission of
said agency will conduct its regular meeting. The agenda for
said meeting is attached to and made a part of this notice.

Dated:  June 1, 1983

By:  Philip A. Overeynder
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
PRELIMINARY AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV APPEALS

A. Lowry/Pillsbury, Logan Creek Estates, Appeal of Staff Rejection of an Application for Subdivision Improvement, Douglas County (June 8, Estimated Time 9:45 a.m.)

B. Loomis/Barrow, Appeal of Staff Decision Pursuant to the Case-by-Case Lot Review Criteria, Lot 15 Tyrolian Village Unit #7, Washoe County APN 126-083-10, TRPA File #82674 (June 8, Estimated Time 10:00 a.m.)

V ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS, DETERMINATION OF TECHNICAL ADEQUACY

A. Lake Parkway (Loop Road) Completion, City of South Lake Tahoe (June 8, Estimated Time 10:40 a.m.)

B. Third Street and South Avenue Extensions and Improvements, City of South Lake Tahoe (June 8, Estimated Time 11:00 a.m.)

C. Rubicon Water System Reconstruction, Tahoe City Public Utility District, El Dorado County (June 8, Estimated Time 11:20 a.m.)

VI PLANNING MATTERS

Draft Regional Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for the Lake Tahoe Basin (June 8, Estimated Time 1:00 p.m. and June 9, Estimated Time 9:30 a.m.)

VII ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- W & M > Consultant SELECTION

VIII REPORTS

A. Staff Reports

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

May 11, 1983
9:30 a.m.

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Mike Harper called the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission to order at 9:45 a.m.

APC Members Present: Mr. Kortick, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Randolph, Mr. McMullen (arrived at 9:50 a.m.), Mr. Smith, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Pyle, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Curtis (arrived at 10:20 a.m.), Mr. Popoff, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Harper

APC Members Absent: Ms. Michael

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Phil Overeynder, Executive Director stated the APC had reviewed and requested that the applicant, Bambridge/Fleming provide specific items as part of the appeal of staff determination. The applicant was concerned about his ability to provide that information and has requested Item IV A be withdrawn from the agenda. Mr. Overeynder stated that Item IV B., the applicant Lowry/Pillsbury Appeal of the Subdivision Rating requested a continuance in order to provide additional information. Mr. Harper suggested moving Item IX Resolutions after Disposition of Minutes.

MOTION by Mr. Pyle, with a second by Mr. Dodgion, to approve the agenda as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

The following changes were noted for the April 13 and 14, 1983 minutes:

Page 6, fourth paragraph, second sentence should read: Speaking for his jurisdiction, Placer County, would be agreeable to keep in effect some sort of growth management program as has been going on for the past several years while in this state of transition.

Page 8, first paragraph, fifth sentence should read: Mr. Kortick commented there was no discussion in the transportation section of the EIS concerning out of Basin transport.

Page 9, first paragraph, second sentence should read: He stated that while the State Water Quality Control Board believes that TRPA may have overestimated the importance of atmospheric inputs of nitrogen, we still need to reduce atmospheric inputs.
Page 20, third paragraph, first sentence should read: Mr. Sawyer commented that in his opinion the way to deal with the situation of litigation settlement that when it comes to approve the project to decide if there are overriding considerations, not by taking a short cut on the procedural rules.

Page 20, third paragraph, second sentence should read: Mr. Sawyer expressed his concern for the lack of supervision for the preparation of the DEIS, there are no responses to the letter dated March 18, 1983 submitted by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, nor any responses to any APC comments.

Page 22, fourth paragraph, should read: It was suggested that Mr. Sawyer and Gary Midkiff would put together a set of guidelines for the APC based on the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) regulations and the Resources Agency California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines to help determine the technical adequacy for future EIS's.

Page 23, first motion should read: MOTION by Mr. Sawyer, with a second by Mr. McCurry, that the appeal be denied.

Page 23, eighth paragraph, should read: Mr. Sawyer withdrew his motion but expressed a concern that a delay so the applicant could provide information was not likely to change the outcome.

MOTION by Ms. Sparbel, with a second by Mr. Kortick, to approve the minutes of April 13 and 14, 1983, as amended. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Kortick, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Randolph, Mr. McMullen, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Pyle, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Poppoff, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Harper

Nayes: None

Abstain: Mr. Smith

Absent: Mr. Curtis, Ms. Michael

IX RESOLUTIONS

A.  Randy Sheffield

MOTION by Mr. Sawyer, with a second by Mr. McMullen, to approve the resolution expressing the APC's appreciation to Randy Sheffield. The motion carried unanimously.

B.  Glenn Smith

Mr. Sawyer suggested in the sixth paragraph the word "inciting" be changed to insightful. Mr. Randolph stated that Mr. Smith was instrumental in the process to develop the thresholds before the TRPA took on the task under the revised Compact. Mr. Randolph further suggested that additional language should be included in the resolution to reflect this information. It was agreed that Mr. Randolph would provide the language for another draft resolution to be considered before the meeting adjourned.
MOTION by Mr. Sawyer, with a second by Ms. Sparbel, to approve the amended Resolution 83-12 expressing the APC's appreciation to Mr. Smith for his service to the Agency. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Kortick, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Randolph, Mr. McMullen, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Pyle, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Popoff, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Harper

Nayes: None

Abstain: Mr. Smith

Absent: Mr. Curtis, Ms. Michael

Mr. McMullen suggested language in the seventh paragraph of the resolution for Randy Sheffield would be more appropriate to read as follows: WHEREAS Randy's manner of judgment, dedication, knowledge, and professionalism has earned the respect of Agency staff, Commission members, and the general public alike;

MOTION by Mr. Sawyer, with a second by Mr. McMullen, to approve the amendment to Mr. Sheffield's resolution. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Overeynder stated that Dave Antonucci from the Tahoe City Public Utility District was present at the APC meeting and since the appeals had been removed from the agenda he suggested that Item VII Administrative Matters be considered next. The APC agreed to this recommendation.

VII ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Distribution of Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Rubicon Water System Reconstruction, Tahoe City Public Utility District, El Dorado County

Mr. Overeynder explained this agenda item indicates that the EIS is available for review, and that Dave Antonucci, Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD), requested to address brief comments to the APC.

Mr. Antonucci stated this is the District's third attempt in ten years to get the project started to correct the public health and environmental problems associated with the existing water system in the Rubicon area. Mr. Antonucci explained that two previous attempts had failed because of the financial and environmental concerns that the District could not answer at that time. The financial problem has been solved with a 1.5 million dollar loan, and the District then focused attention on the environmental concerns that had to be resolved. The TCPUD Board of Directors resolved to answer all the environmental concerns to the best of their ability and to do this during the planning stage so that when the project concept was developed the problems and answers could be incorporated in the project. Mr. Antonucci stated that Brown and Caldwell was chosen to prepare the EIR/EIS because of their experience with the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities for the Lake Tahoe Basin and their recent completion of that study. Mr. Antonucci explained the fundamental planning phase began with input from the various regulatory agencies, interested persons in the service area that would be affected and required to pay for this system within the Basin, who helped the District develop the project concept. An advisory committee provided guidance and feedback to the District to help
identify the environmental concerns and appropriate solutions on the project concept. The committee met during a four month planning process, with approximately 25 persons representing 15 agencies, including Steve Chilton, Gary Shellhorn and Jim Brennan from the TRPA. Mr. Antonucci stated the District is looking for a consensus of approval when the APC reviews the EIS at the June meeting.

V PLANNING MATTERS

A. Recommendation on Extension of Allocation System Until the Adoption of the Regional Plan

The APC members received a copy of a memo addressed to the Governing Board regarding the allocation system. Mr. Overeynder stated that the allocation limits listed in the Compact will expire within the Basin effective May 1. The other controlling factors that limit development such as the 208 Plan in California, the case-by-case limitations in Nevada, and the prohibition on subdivisions contained in the 208 Plan will continue in effect. Mr. Overeynder pointed out there is a great deal of concern with the allocation system, whether or not local governments have the authority to continue their own allocation systems, and whether or not there is a need to continue the allocation system until adoption of the Regional Plan.

Mr. Overeynder explained the commercial square footage allocations in the City of South do not have effective limitations at this point, and residential construction within Douglas and Washoe Counties is limited only to high hazard lands with no limits on capability classifications 4 through 7. There is the possibility where additional permits could be granted within those areas that may potentially conflict with the attainment of the thresholds or Regional Plan objectives as they are developed. Mr. Overeynder stated that staff prepared three alternatives for the Governing Board to consider: (1) to extend Ordinance 81-8, which is the Compact limitations until adoption of the Regional Plan or the end of the year; (2) to consider adoption of an emergency ordinance extending those limits through the end of the year or the adoption of the Regional Plan; or (3) take no action. The Governing Board referred this matter to the APC, requesting input on whether or not they felt there was a need for continuing the allocation system until the Regional Plan is adopted. The Board also requested the APC's recommendations on extending accepting case-by-case applications beyond May 28 and the processing deadline of August 28. The Board did not take a formal action to amend the schedule because they were concerned with the potential legal consequences as a result of changing the schedule. However, there was general concurrence to follow the APC's recommendations on the timeframes as a guideline to complete the process preferably by August, 1983 which is officially one year from the date of adoption of the thresholds.

Mr. Combs commented it was his understanding one of the ideas of the Governing Board was that an allocation program could be implemented by each of the local governments and, based on that information, he prepared a draft ordinance for the Placer County Board of Supervisors to consider continuing an allocation program. Mr. Combs stated that it might be appropriate for local governments to take that lead in continuing an allocation system.
Mr. Harper stated he felt an allocation process was necessary and is concerned that there may be a rush for building permits on lots in areas where a project may result in creating an opposite effect than what should have occurred had the Plan been adopted earlier this year, and he is not comfortable seeing the rules change for several months and then changing them back again. Mr. Harper also expressed concern that two types of lawsuits may occur if the Regional Plan is not completed on time: (1) because the Agency or local governments did not take into account the progress being made on the Regional Plan and (2) if the rules keep changing during this interim timeframe. Mr. Harper stated that both the APC and Governing Board recognized the Regional Plan could not be completed within the timeframe as originally stipulated in the Compact, that no adverse impacts would take place during the interim period and, from the Agency's standpoint, it might be appropriate to have a consistent Basin wide continuation of the allocation system.

Mr. Renz stated that the definition of a subdivision in Ordinances 81-5 and 81-8 needed to be clearly addressed because there are other legal opinions that a subdivision, as defined in Ordinance 81-5, does not apply to parcel maps. Mr. Overeynder explained that legal counsel advised staff that the subdivision prohibition in Ordinance 81-5 and 81-8 were intended to be identical and the definitions were intended to be the same, but the Compact language is very general in terms of what a subdivision is. The Governing Board interpreted the Compact language, which dealt with the number of residential and commercial permits allowed and the prohibition of subdivisions, adopted Ordinance 81-8. Mr. Overeynder further explained there were legal opinions from both states. One state interpreted that it did not include parcel maps and another state declared it clearly intended it to include parcel maps. There were extensive hearings on this issue and the Board finally adopted an ordinance which clearly prohibited parcel maps on anything other than an already existing constructed unit. Mr. Overeynder stated that the prohibition expires on April 30, 1983 both in the Compact and in Ordinance 81-8. The timing on the prohibition in the Water Quality Ordinance 81-5 expires upon adoption of the Regional Plan, and as far as new subdivisions are concerned it is legal counsel's recommendation that the prohibition remain the same as it has been for the last two years.

Ms. Bogush commented the City of South Lake Tahoe does not anticipate a large influx of commercial development and the City would rather not have limitation for commercial development. She suggested there should be a confirmation of a growth management system, and expand that concept to include that if a local government has a growth management system that the TRPA will not regulate and/or duplicate it.

Mr. Overeynder informed the APC members that the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (CTRPA) recently extended their emergency ordinance through the end of September, 1983 which limits residential and commercial construction, and also requires the transfer of development rights on high hazard lots that are not built on.
Mr. Combs commented he thought it would be more appropriate to use the next one-third of the calendar year as the framework for timing which would be the first of September that ties in with the target date for the adoption of the Regional Plan and he recommended that the pro-rata allocation be continued for the next third of the calendar year. Mr. Combs noted the Compact provisions called for the issuance of building permits within the same calendar year and he would like to see that requirement removed because it is not practical. Mr. Combs shared the concern that elimination of the commercial allocation altogether may be appropriate since the Regional Plan EIS anticipates that it may not be necessary in the future, and that the market place conditions may give the appropriate determination for commercial development.

Mr. McMullen commented the pro-rata extension offered a more flexible time period in the sense that the one-third of the year allocation might cause suspicion to arise that all could be issued right now and, he thought, it would be better to shape the system on a more stable incremental basis. Mr. Combs responded that due to the limited building season in the Basin, the amount of time during the calendar year to do a site survey, and have plans drawn, puts those people notified in August or September at a serious disadvantage for getting these things accomplished.

Mr. Harper suggested that the APC may want to reaffirm their action of April with the following changes: (1) instead of going on a month to month pro-rata, consider a one-third year pro-rata; (2) consider eliminating the commercial allocation limits, but retain the residential allocation limits based on a one-third year pro-rata or a month to month pro-rata (3) consider eliminating the requirement that the building permit has to be obtained in the same year it was issued.

Larry Hoffman, Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council, stated there is a need for a specific set of rules for the 1983 building season process, not month by month or day by day. Mr. Hoffman pointed out the minimum time for TRPA to get an emergency ordinance adopted and become effective is 60 days, and the same existing problems will continue if a recommendation is made to the Governing Board to adopt an allocation system. He suggested that a unanimous recommendation be made to the Board with the understanding that the local governments will implement the program. Mr. Hoffman also pointed out the allocation system on the Nevada side is first come, first served and there hasn't been a rush to get permits. He suggested that Washoe and Douglas Counties could adopt an ordinance to continue with the same 1982 rules that will be applied through 1983. Mr. Hoffman stated the City of South Lake Tahoe has already adopted an ordinance; an ordinance is pending in El Dorado County which would extend the allocation system, and Placer County is in the process of drafting an ordinance to adopt on an emergency basis at their next meeting.

Mr. Hoffman addressed the fact that the allocation system in the Compact has expired, and suggested if there is an allocation system the language "that a building permit must be used by the end of the year or you lose it" be deleted and the problem would be avoided. In addition, Mr. Hoffman commented that El Dorado County has a list of single family dwelling projects that may exceed the commercial projects and that CTRPA's extension of their ordinance covers that
problem. Mr. Overeynder responded CTRPA's ordinance extension is effective through September but there is a larger backlog of potential commercial projects than what the Compact would have permitted had it been extended. Ms. Bogush added there is the South Tahoe Public Utility District (STPUD) limitations to consider and there are not enough sewer units to cover that development.

Mr. Hoffman suggested that the APC recommend that the Governing Board extend the May 28 deadline for accepting applications and the August 28 deadline for processing applications. Mr. Overeynder responded that in a majority of the cases the mechanisms are in place to control development or with very minimal efforts there may be the opportunity for local government to step forward to fill that gap with an ordinance to address that situation. Mr. Overeynder explained that there was already one extension of the case-by-case deadlines for both the filing and processing dates initially expired September, 1982 but were extended to May for filing applications and August of 1983 for processing. The rationale for that was an agreement between the California and Nevada delegations of the Governing Board over adoption of the threshold standards. At this point there has been almost a complete change of the Nevada delegation membership to TRPA and there may not be a complete understanding as to exactly what the agreements were at that time. Mr. Overeynder stated the extension of the case-by-case process was intended to be effective until the point of adoption of the Regional Plan, not beyond adoption of the Regional Plan and the dates were very carefully thought out in terms of where they should and should not extend.

Mr. McMullen commented the ordinance should be done at the TRPA to extend the allocation in four month units until the end of the year with the understanding that those permits be issued for this building season or for the next immediate building season and that the timing factor be clarified.

Ms. Bogush commented that the TRPA has encouraged local government to take responsibility for implementing the policies and this is one case where local government has adopted systems. If Washoe and Douglas Counties would be willing to continue the existing system, this may a good place to start with the APC recommending to the Board confirmation of what the locals are doing.

Mr. Overeynder stated that with regard to the allocation system there may be no impending real problem in the issuance of more commercial square footage or residential permits, but suggested the APC may want to consider a resolution recommending to the Board to defer it to local governments and continue monitoring the situation to see if there is a need for TRPA to become involved. At this point there doesn't appear to be any real need for TRPA to adopt either an ordinance limiting commercial square footage, because that is controlled on the California side by the CTRPA ordinances, and there is no real problem with regard to residential construction in terms of meeting those limitations.

Mr. Sawyer pointed out the Governing Board made two motions and the case-by-case process and permit allocations should be discussed separately. Mr. Sawyer clarified the definition of the subdivision issue discussed earlier that Ordinance 81-8 states that the Governing Body of the Agency finds that this ordinance is necessary to interpret Article VI(c) of the Compact, and so it is
clearly stating that 81-8 is interpreting the definition of subdivisions. Ordinance 81-5 states that we take the definition of subdivisions from the Compact, and as he interpreted 81-5 and 81-8 they have the same definition.

Mr. Sawyer stated he found no need for an extension of the present moratorium for the sewage treatment capacity expansion, explaining that the environmental documentation process for any expansion would take too long and there was no reason to require extension of that part of the Compact for California. Mr. Dodgion agreed there would be no need for it in Nevada either because the funds would not be available to build/expand.

Mr. Sawyer commented that if the permit issuance matter was going to be done differently than was done under the Compact moratorium it should be explicitly stated because otherwise there is a danger the ordinance will be interpreted to say more than it is implying.

On the issue of local responsibility and implementation of the allocation system, Mr. Sawyer also suggested if the APC recommends that the TRPA extend the allocation system that this is not to the exclusion of local efforts and because of the potential 60 day problem for adopting an ordinance we would encourage concurrent action by local governments, and the APC should make a specific recommendation on whether this should be adopted as an urgency ordinance. Mr. Sawyer noted this was very important to him because he had a lot of ideas that he would like to include in the allocation system.

Mr. Combs suggested that he would like to distribute copies to the APC of the draft ordinance that he prepared for the Placer County Board of Supervisors and this matter could be discussed after the local government representatives had reviewed it and, if they found it appropriate, use it as a format.

Mr. Harper suggested the APC may want to consider a recommendation to the Governing Board to adopt an emergency ordinance, but at the same time recommending that the Board draft a similar resolution to each local government urging them to adopt local ordinances which reflect the TRPA's emergency ordinance in order to prevent conflicts between what the Governing Board may eventually adopt and what the local entities adopt. Mr. Harper pointed out that three things would be accomplished: the public relations aspect which is important; the conflict between local government and the TRPA would be eliminated; and because of the 60 day requirement which would close the gap but would not absolve the TRPA Governing Board of having to take a stand. Mr. Harper explained this would be a hand-in-hand approach to an interim problem which does not change the rules dramatically at this point.

**MOTION** by Mr. McMullen, with a second by Mr. Renz, for a resolution that the Governing Board by emergency ordinance or resolution extending the allocation system presently in place to the end of the year or adoption of the Regional Plan whichever is earlier; that the allocation system based on a four month period as defined from January 1, through April 30, 1983 be extended throughout the year on that basis; that in some fashion building permits be made effective for this building season or they be immediately proceeded upon at the outset of the next building season; and that the effective date of the ordinance would be retroactive to May 1, 1983.
Mr. Smith questioned the rationale for a four month period as opposed to a year time period. Mr. McMullen responded there are specific numbers in the Compact for the beginning four month period of this year and he thought they could be used as a settled upon maximum that wouldn't create any new problems extending those throughout the year. Mr. Harper added that it gives the county planners a lump sum for the next four month period.

Mr. Hansen commented his concern is that an emergency ordinance will not be passed unanimously unless there is a trade off on the case-by-case issue. Mr. Overeynder responded that in order to place it on the agenda the Governing Board must make a finding of urgency which first takes a unanimous vote of all members present; then it is the required vote of the Board. Mr. Overeynder stated this should be checked with the legal counsel.

Mr. Harper suggested the APC should recommend that the Governing Board attempt to place this on the agenda as an urgency ordinance; if it is not, then they process it as an ordinance.

Mr. Combs suggested that action on the motion be deferred until he had a chance to distribute the draft ordinance and the APC has an opportunity to consider the format.

Ms. Bogush stated she could not support the motion because it just extended the existing system and it did not recognize that local governments have come forward with a proposal. The orientation of the resolution should recognize a residential allocation and to reaffirm what the local governments have proposed or adopted.

Mr. Poppoff stated he did not understand the reason for requiring a permittee to start work immediately. Mr. Curtis responded that if the uniform building code is followed by its strict interpretation the applicant has to proceed with construction and if, in a period of 60 or 90 days, work has stopped the permit lapses. Mr. Curtis stated that Washoe County has addressed this issue for the Tahoe Basin by making the permit effective for 18 months. Mr. Curtis suggested it might be a good idea for the other jurisdictions to take a look at that problem to see how it relates to the permit being valid to allow some flexibility because on the California side people are being forced to break ground and continue with their construction or they will lose their permit.

Mr. Renz stated the current policy in Douglas County for the permit is good for six months from the day it is issued. If there is an inspection during that six months it is good for another six months, or the applicant can request an extension.

Mr. Combs clarified on the California side the entire Compact direction was toward permit issuance not towards breaking of ground. The application of the uniform building code in California requires completion of construction within two years of the date the building permit is issued with a third year extension available beyond that.

Ms. McMorris supported the motion stating it clarifies the issue, one concise program instead of all the local governments having different programs.
Mr. Dodgion suggested a resolution would seem more appropriate deferring to the local governments rather than suggesting the Governing Board adopt an emergency ordinance when there really isn't an emergency. Mr. Dodgion stated the sewer plants are not going to start immediately expanding, subdivisions are still prohibited, and to suggest that the Governing Board go through an emergency ordinance procedure is going through an exercise that is not required.

It was agreed to hold the motion until the APC had reviewed the draft ordinance which Mr. Combs distributed, and further discussion followed.

Mr. Harper suggested the APC explore the possibility of recommending to the Governing Board that they affirm the local governments allocation systems that are presently in effect, or will soon be in place, that meets the needs of the Agency. Where the allocation systems are not in place, encourage those local governments either to develop an allocation system that would address the needs of the Agency during the interim, or adopt an allocation system similar to the one that has been in effect for the last two and a half years.

Mr. Harper stated there has to be an effort by both the local entities and TRPA to approach a common goal for an allocation system. If nothing is done or there is not that inter-relationship, the TRPA is going to blame local government for the problem or vice versa. Mr. Harper reiterated that the Governing Board should urge local government to pursue an allocation system that meets the intent of the ordinance; not have new and different rules to occur for a short time; the allocation systems that are currently adopted by local governments in California which the Governing Board feels meet the intent that they endorse those; encourage the Nevada local governments to adopt either similar allocation systems or actually adopt a similar ordinance to Ordinance 81-8; and at the same time the Governing Board should make a commitment on their part to pursue that.

Mr. Renz agreed with Mr. Harper's suggestion, but he stated if Douglas County was asked to adopt a similar ordinance the Agency would get the opposite effect of the intent and he could not support that recommendation.

Mr. Sawyer stated that listening to comments had persuaded him that this issue has to be dealt with as an urgency ordinance. Because of the practical problems under normal circumstances it usually takes 30 days to properly notice an ordinance, 60 days for first and second reading, another 60 days to take effect, for a total of 150 days, unless it is an urgency ordinance. The only way get an urgency ordinance adopted is if every unit of local government supports it; if every unit of local government supports it, then we should be able to get independent ordinances from each unit of local government. Mr. Sawyer suggested that even though slight differences each local ordinance may have will not make a difference in effectiveness, but it could make enough of a difference which might make it impossible to reach a unanimous decision. Mr. Sawyer stated he believes the alternative most likely to be successful would be for TRPA to adopt a resolution supporting the local effort to continue, and urging the adoption of allocation systems within each local area.

Mr. Combs commented that Mr. McMullen's motion for the allocation system takes it from May 1 to the end of the calendar year. He had thought of taking it
through just the next third of the year in view of the fact that around September 1 there will be a better indication what direction the Regional Plan is going to take. However, Mr. Combs stated he would not have any problem with the allocation system to the balance or end of the year.

Mr. McMullen stated that what has been presently in place has worked until now and he did not want the TRPA or himself to be put in the position of having no allocation system in effect. Mr. McMullen felt there should be a provision where if a local government has in effect now or in the future develops a system for the issuance of permits that meets this allocation system as extended and is compatible with staff, staff can exempt them from the provisions of this ordinance, and that would be an acceptable amendment to his motion. Mr. McMullen stated he would like to see a unanimous agreement, that the Governing Board understand that the APC recognizes the sensitivity of this issue, that something has to be in place and he does not see any problem with continuing the existing system.

Mr. Renz stated that he would not want to see local government forced into making an issue of it at that local level by having to go back to the Board telling them they have to adopt an ordinance to address this.

Ms. Bogush cautioned that the language should be carefully defined in terms of meeting the general intent of the Compact and determine the flexibility of the allocation system.

Mr. McMullen commented it is extremely important that the status quo be maintained through the development of the Regional Plan - that is the intent of the Compact.

Mr. Pyle commented that presently there is stability through this season; don't confuse people changing the rules back and forth.

Mr. Smith questioned if there was sewer capacity for commercial development. Ms. Bogush responded no; there was enough sewer for 373 houses and some of that capacity may be reserved for commercial, but it is not a real threat. Mr. Smith replied it seemed a moot point to hold off on keeping that as a separate item, and suggested continue with the existing situation.

Mr. Sawyer pointed out that TRPA's legal counsel has taken the position that the due date for the Regional Plan is June 19, 1983, noting there is case law in California to the effect that if the Agency does not have the Plan on time the Agency cannot approve projects and it is possible that if there is no extension of the allocation system there will be no permits at all. Mr. Sawyer explained TRPA's argument in court will be that the Agency is proceeding in good faith to get the Plan done as diligently as possible; it will help the case to the extent that there is an allocation system but it will hurt a case if there is not an allocation system.
MOTION by Mr. McMullen, with a second by Mr. Renz, that the APC urge the Governing Board to adopt, through the most urgent vehicle, continuation of the allocation system set forth in the Compact to the end of calendar year 1983; that the operative effect of this vehicle be retroactive to May 1, 1983 to adopt an allocation system for development rights; to encourage efforts of local government to adopt an allocation system for development rights that meets the intent of the Compact that any allocation system currently in effect or to be put into effect in the future by any jurisdiction within the Basin shall be exempt from any such allocation ordinance, provided it meets the intent of the Compact. The motion carried unanimously on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Kortick, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Randolph, Mr. McMullen, Mr. Smith, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Pyle, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Popoff, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Harper

Nayes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Ms. Michael

B. Recommendation on Extension of Case-by-Case Process Beyond Ordinance Deadline

Mr. Overeynder explained the Governing Board requested recommendations from the APC on the continuation of the case-by-case process, pointing out there may be a link between the continuation of the case-by-case process along with the allocation system. Mr. Overeynder suggested that the APC evaluate if there is a modification of conditions that would lead to recommending extending the case-by-case and, if so, to what extent. Mr. Overeynder commented that to be consistent with the previous action on the allocation process, the APC should limit an extension of the ordinance to a date certain rather than until adoption of the Regional Plan.

Mr. Overeynder explained that the case-by-case process is the only exception as far as private development is concerned to creating land coverage in capability classifications 1, 2, and 3 as mapped. The prohibition on 1-3's extends through the adoption of the Regional Plan and initially case-by-case had an expiration date of September, 1982, which was extended to August, 1983 for the processing deadline. The relationship of case-by-case with the 208 Plan is that both California and Nevada certified the 208 Plan, including case-by-case with the condition that the Agency submit a report on the effectiveness of the case-by-case process. Mr. Overeynder stated the report was submitted to both states and to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), however there is no formal action required verifying the effectiveness. There was a certain assumption in terms of the maximum number of permits that would be processed under that and the fact that the program was an interim program to be evaluated prior to carrying on any program similar to that in the Regional Plan. There was a general understanding that the case-by-case process would help to provide the decision making framework to evaluate how well the program worked and to see whether or not it should be carried into the Regional Plan.
Mr. Renz commented that in his opinion the case-by-case process should be extended and continue as it is until the Regional Plan is adopted and the implementing ordinances are in effect.

Mr. McMullen stated that in terms of the status quo and what in fact was a negotiated arrangement last year, the important thing is that it has worked. The timing of the case-by-case process should be similar to the timing of the recommendation for the allocation system, and he suggested to extend the process until the end of the year since there is a sense of balance already established which should not be disrupted and tie the two together until adoption of the Regional Plan.

Mr. Sullivan asked if the case-by-case process was extended, was it anticipated that review of these items would interfere with the Regional Plan? Mr. Overeynder responded there is a problem with the work load and where the emphasis should be placed. If it were just the case-by-case process that staff would have to deal with it would not necessarily be a problem. Staff is dealing with the situation of the existing limitation on commercial development, the existing backlog of significant litigation settlements coming from the CTRPA, in addition to the case-by-case review process. Staff is then put into a position of choosing where to put their resources and the question of timely processing of an application versus doing long range planning and is in a very difficult situation.

Mr. Dodgion commented the report submitted to both states and the EPA shows there are 110 applications to be processed carried over from last season, but there have only been nine completions on the case-by-case process. It was his opinion the most important thing was to get the Regional Plan completed since there is a backlog in the case-by-case workload for staff.

Mr. Curtis commented that since there are a number of litigation matters from CTRPA it would seem like it should balanced out by getting rid of those as well as the case-by-case which is only on the Nevada side. That way staff could dedicate their full time to working on the Regional Plan.

Mr. Sawyer asked why relax the system to allow more applications because of the high rate of applications? He stated if the current rate continues there would be far less than would result with the relaxation. Mr. Sawyer pointed out the Governing Board recognized that the Regional Plan might not be adopted before the end of August, 1983 and specifically provided for it in Ordinance 81-5; there is no need for any extension of case-by-case review. An extension will require an EIS to be prepared and staff will have to devote their time to an EIS on case-by-case review instead of devoting time for completing an EIS on the Regional Plan. With the time it takes to prepare an EIS and the circulation period involved, the TRPA would be admitting that the Regional Plan will not be adopted by August and leaves the Agency open to a lawsuit by any relaxation of interim controls pending adoption of the Regional Plan. If the Regional Plan is not adopted according to the time schedule, it is possible a lawsuit could be brought which would result in a prohibition against any further permits being issued in the Basin. Mr. Sawyer stated that sound planning principals say the
last thing that should be done during this period when the Plan is overdue would be to relax the current ordinance before the Plan is adopted. This proposed action is the exact opposite of the proposed action on the allocation system, and there is no need or justification for it.

Mr. Overeynder explained staff is proposing a system which would be similar to the case-by-case system in the draft EIS for the Regional Plan which would be a development priority system on all lands that would allow capability classes 1, 2, 3, and stream environment zones to be rated against one another on a point priority system and would be phased in over time which would allow some development. Staff also proposes to respond to this issue in an addendum to the EIS.

Mr. Sullivan commented that regardless of whether the May 28 date is extended or not, the August 28 date should be extended and there should be adequate time to process the applications which assures people a fair processing system. Mr. Overeynder responded that he thought there was an understanding on the part of the Board that if staff found at the end of May there was a substantial backlog, that the staff could request extending the processing deadline.

Mr. Randolph commented the APC is a technical body and he would like to reserve the political philosophy for the Governing Board. The recommendation should be based on the technical expertise and not what the APC thinks the Governing Body should do as a political body.

Mr. Dodgion pointed out he is concerned with the staff time involved in the case-by-case process extension and whether the Agency has enough staff to do the field work necessary if the process is extended. Mr. Overeynder stated it was dependent on whether or not there is approval on next year's budget and work program which basically covers the current level of construction activity in the Basin.

Mr. Hoffman stated a great deal of time will be spent in the Nevada legislature trying to justify why the TRPA has gone back to a moratorium on properties on the Nevada side of the Basin which will be counter-productive and would create a whole new issue provoking major reactions in the Nevada legislature.

Ms. McMorris agreed that case-by-case review has placated the public and the Nevada legislators and she would hate to see it come back again in another back-lash. She stated the Governing Board seems to be working together and there won't be that many applications to overload staff. Since the initial dates were tied to the adoption of the Regional Plan which has been extended she thought the case-by-case should be extended.

Mr. Combs stated the point had been raised that the Agency could be in the position of approving projects without an adopted plan. He asked if the existing 1971 plan was still the governing plan until the new Regional Plan is adopted? Mr. Overeynder responded that there are two plans - one for the California side and one for the Nevada side. The Compact was structured as such that an amended plan which implements the threshold standards would be in effect by August of 1983. If that date was not met then the Agency does not have the
ability to show attainment of the federal and state standards, or attainment of the threshold standards within the time lines established by the Compact. Therefore, any action beyond that date even if it was consistent with the limitations or an interim moratorium type of allocation system could be questioned in terms of whether or not it was implementing the intent of the Compact.

MOTION by Mr. McMullen, with a second by Ms. McMorris, that dates for accepting and processing case-by-case review applications be extended by 90 days (on or around September 1, 1983) on the same basis that is presently in effect. This is done with the understanding that said extensions be tied to the allocation system; this retains the status quo procedures in order to facilitate the adoption of the Regional Plan in a most timely fashion. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Kortick, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. McMullen, Mr. Pyle, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Poppoff, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Harper
Nayes: Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Dodgion
Abstain: Mr. Smith, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Hansen
Absent: Ms. Michael

VI ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS, DETERMINATION OF TECHNICAL ADEQUACY

A. Lake Parkway (Loop Road) Completion, City of South Lake Tahoe

Greg George, Chief of Project Review, stated that due to concerns with the project and that the Agency will be receiving comments from Caltrans which will warrant a response, changed the scheduling for a determination on the EIS back another 30 days.

Mr. Poppoff stated that according to the EIS they did models for three air quality stations; two of them showed a decrease, the third one showed an increase, the memo from the Air Resources Board indicates there would be an increase in air pollution, and he asked how each of these conclusions could be supported.

Mr. Randolph responded that he did not think that the letter from the Air Resources Board was inconsistent. The evaluation completed by QUAD Consultants lists the benefits and the disbenefits of the various alternatives, and at the Travel Lodge site the 8-hour count for the "No Project" in 1987 is 19.3 ppm concentrations. The one-way has a 19.5 or an increase of .2 and the limited access to Chonokis has a 23.5 with an increase of 4.2. QUAD has suggested that they are both the same, and ARB's letter tried to point out there is a significant difference. The reason for the increase and decrease is that there will be more traffic on Highway 50 between Park Avenue and Stateline with a one way operation, and the Sugar House site would have higher concentrations.
Mr. Overeynder clarified the analysis showed that depending on whether or not there is a two-way Loop Road or a one-way Loop Road, trip distributions within this area will have a different impact at each of the intersections.

Mr. Kortick asked why a center turn lane on Highway 50 was needed and Mr. George responded that the part that the county has already constructed contains a center turn lane, possibly to match the same width, they proposed to extend the same road section.

Mr. Kortick also asked what the effects on the neighborhood would be and if there would be positive or negative affects on the people who live on the California side. Keith Maki, Senior Planner, responded there are approximately 3,000 vehicle trips per day through the neighborhood and the building of the barrier on Montreal will essentially keep it at the same level. Without the barrier there would be more vehicle trips in the neighborhood which would create more emissions or more noise. The one-way would keep the neighborhood basically the same and the two-way with the barrier would also keep it in the existing condition; there would be no increased impacts. Mr. Maki added the traffic analysis showed that if Phase II of Caltrans improvements in that intersection is completed it would actually generate more trips on Highway 50 than without it because it would be easier to use Highway 50 than the neighborhood streets.

Mr. Randolph commented that the mitigation for air quality degradation resulting from traffic increases would be to improve mass transit, but the EIS does not mention how it will be mitigated. Since this is a draft document the APC has not seen the final comments to determine that it is technically adequate. Mr. Randolph pointed out the question of timing indicated in the staff report that the project will be opened in July, and since certification of the Regional Plan has been delayed, he asked can there be a project?

Mr. Sawyer asked if coverage could be reduced by eliminating the left turn lane? In addition, Mr. Sawyer also asked if this document is certified for the Regional Plan will staff look at the Regional Plan to see if there are new impacts or consider whether a supplemental document is necessary and coordinate two environmental documents? Mr. Overeynder responded staff proposed to coordinate the two environmental documents if this document assesses the environmental impacts of this specific project and the alternatives to it. The EIS on the Regional Plan and, specifically the transportation element, only includes alternatives that would allow some sort of Loop Road configuration. If staff receives any specific comments with regard to that on the EIS for the Regional Plan staff would respond to those in addition to these specific concerns that are addressed in the project EIS.

Mr. Smith commented the EIS could be improved if there had been an aerial photograph showing the entire area to make it easier for people to relate to the types of buildings, both commercial and residential areas that are connected and the relationships, rather than line drawings of just the roads. Mr. Smith also commented he was pleased to see the changes made in the side slopes laying back so they can be vegetated rather than minimize the amount of cut and fill.
Tim Oliver, City of South Lake Tahoe, responded to some of the APC's questions. He stated that the preliminary plans depict approximately 40 feet on an exact curve, and the same geometric configuration of the existing Loop Road will be kept because the City does not want to change it or narrow it down to the Montreal Street area. Using a display drawing, Mr. Oliver stated the area to the north where there is an apartment building is the only access available off the Loop Road presently. There is another access on Van Sickle Road, which is private, and that is why a left turn lane will provide extra width keeping the geometrics, and allow access to the apartment buildings. Mr. Oliver also clarified that once the preliminary plans are complete the City will meet with all the agencies to get their approval for a vegetation plan which will be included in the specification document.

Ms. Sparbel asked why Montreal Road was not brought back into Pioneer Trail or Highway 50 and why the EIS did not address/resolve this situation? Mr. Oliver responded that this was a heavy residential area with narrow streets, and presently only 40 feet of right-of-way, containing a number of cross streets. It would create more of a congestion problem in that area by bringing people back onto Park Avenue and then back out to the highway. Ms. Sparbel commented it appeared on the map to be just a short distance, which is a question that needed to be answered. Ms. Sparbel pointed out that just because a motel is presently there is not a reason to ignore the possibility of using that road, particularly from the standpoint of long range planning. Mr. Oliver stated the map was not to scale which is deceiving and he agreed that an aerial map would have been helpful to see the contours, physical structures, and the widths.

Mr. Sawyer explained that there is a requirement under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) that is reasonable for interpretation of the Bistate Compact. Once an EIS/EIR is prepared no further document is necessary unless there are changes either in the project, environment, or in the information that shows significant impacts or values. If the APC certifies this EIS first, either staff or the City as the lead agency could double check to make sure that nothing new came up in the Regional Plan that adds new information or changes in the surrounding environment that creates significant impacts that were not evaluated. If it is determined that there are such changes, then a supplement is prepared to address them. This process makes it possible to complete this EIS first before the Regional Plan.

Mr. Overeynder restated the Regional Plan EIS addressed the Loop Road as a completed element of all of the alternatives that staff has evaluated. To some extent the scale of the Loop Road changes, i.e., depending on whether or not a pedestrian corridor along the casino core area is installed. In all cases staff looked at that as a baseline in all the alternatives for completion of this particular section of the Loop Road. If staff receives any comments regarding those additional long range transportation system concerns in that area staff would respond to those in the EIS for the transportation element of the Regional Plan.
B. Third Street and South Avenue Extensions and Improvements, City of South Lake Tahoe

Jim Dana, Associate Planner, stated this draft EIS evaluates the environmental impacts of extending Third Street and South Avenue within the City of South Lake Tahoe. The purpose of the project is to alleviate traffic congestion with intersections within a half mile of the South Tahoe "Y" and provide safer and more direct access to Barton Memorial Hospital. The EIR prepared for this project was previously circulated in California in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements. Upon incorporation of responses to comments received during the EIR circulation, Agency staff initiated the required 60 day review and comment period on March 30, 1983. The circulation period ends on May 29, 1983. As of this date no comments have been received on the draft EIS. At this point if there are no major comments on the EIS staff is recommending that the APC certify this EIS as technically adequate. However, if there are comments on the EIS, it is recommended that Agency staff and the City of South Lake Tahoe be given 30 days in order to address those comments and bring it back to the APC in June.

Mr. Randolph stated he had a different interpretation since going through the previous discussion without having the complete document on the Lake Parkway (Loop Road) project, how could the APC do differently on this project. Mr. Dana responded there was a minor difference between the two projects. This draft EIS has already been circulated in California and all the comments were incorporated during the EIR circulation period. Under the EIR procedure staff did not receive any indication from the Nevada agencies that they have any intent to comment nor has staff received any formal comments from them. Mr. Dana clarified that the Governing Board will not take any action on this until the June Board meeting.

Mr. Overeynder stated that the APC's comments will be taken and a response document will be brought back to the APC for certification in June.

Mr. Dana stated the South Avenue extension west towards Highway 50 had three alternatives that were evaluated during the draft EIS procedures. One was to extend South Avenue between McDonalds and the Lakeside Theatre; the second was to bring it out between the Chevron Station and Mom's Restaurant; the third alternative was to extend it out on the existing Tahoe Valley Campground road. Mr. Dana explained the reason for the rejection of the first two alternatives dealt with potential conflicts of heavy traffic between McDonalds and the theatre, in addition to potential conflicts with the two access driveways to the Raley's Center. The City of South Lake Tahoe proposed the recommended alternative because it would be located the furthest away from these potential conflicts.

Mr. Sawyer stated that the comments from the Lahontan Board indicated that the document should address the requirements for allowance of coverage in stream zones and those requirements will require offsetting mitigation. Mr. Sawyer pointed out the response document mentions there will be no offsetting restoration in stream zones and that is false. As a condition for the waste discharge requirements for this project the Lahontan Board will require that
completion of another project that the City has planned does involve a stream
environment zone restoration and will allow this project to move forward
consistent with the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Plan. Mr. Sawyer further
pointed out that if the statement in this EIS that there is no offsetting
mitigation was correct the project could not move forward and that statement has
to be corrected, and also the response to the stream environment zone threshold
where it says this involves some coverage in stream zones and there won't be any
restoration, has to be corrected.

Mr. Smith stated that in looking at the South Avenue extension seems that one of
the existing roadways, Melba Drive, is very close to that route and he asked if
there was any reason why that was not discussed as a connecting point for the
South Avenue activity. Mr. Dana responded that was one of the alternatives; it
was addressed in the EIS and the reason the City does not propose to extend
South Avenue to interconnect with Melba and to use that as the access point,
would be the existing residential use of the neighborhood and they chose not to
direct additional traffic down that street. The City also recognized the
ambulance use of this roadway, and another right or left hand turning movement
at the intersection of C Street and Melba.

Mr. Smith suggested the stop sign on the east side of Ruth Avenue should be
removed to expedite traffic.

Mr. Oliver stated the reason for the South Avenue extension was for the
ambulance emergency access and by going any other route would create a lane plus
a 90° turn was why that area had been put in there.

Mr. Randolph commented his concerns of why Melba didn't tie into this extension,
and he could not find in the EIS the traffic conflicts between the bottom access
drive and 150 feet south of where South Avenue comes in since the traffic count
states there will be 1500 cars in an out during the day. Mr. Randolph noted
that two-thirds of the traffic is headed south or coming from the south, and
one-third going in the other direction. Mr. Randolph stated this could create a
conflict with someone traveling south wanting to turn left onto South Avenue
with someone coming out of the lower access drive wanting to head north and then
fighting for position in a left turn lane. He also suggested if this becomes a
problem it appeared there are other options without going all the way to C
Street. Mr. Randolph stated that between the South Side Auto and Sandor's
Chateau Motel there is a vacant area that puts motorists out on the highway
opposite from the USA gas station. Mr. Randolph noted this was an alternative
that wasn't discussed and could be considered as an option.

There was no further discussion on this item and it will be brought back to the
APC in June.

Mr. Harper noted his memo dated May 2, 1983 to the APC indicated that additional
meetings may be necessary because of conflicts for reviewing administrative
items and long range planning items. Mr. Harper suggested that with two day APC
meetings, one day could be spent discussing administrative/planning matters and
the second day strictly focus on the Regional Plan items. Discussion followed
and it was agreed that a workshop would be held on June 1 to discuss the
Environmental Impact Statement for the Regional Plan and the Regional Plan, and that the next APC meeting would be a two day meeting scheduled for June 8 and 9.

It was also decided that no report would be given on item VIII A, Report on the TRPA Public Hearings for the Regional Plan EIS. Mr. Overeynder commented he thought most of the APC members attended at least one or more of the public hearings and the time would be more productively used to review the EIS for the Regional Plan amendments.

C. Environmental Impact Statement for Adoption of Regional Plan Amendments

Dave Ziegler, Acting Chief of the Long Range Planning Division, distributed copies of the major issues regarding the EIS for adoption of a Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Mr. Overeynder stated that in response to public comments and the concerns of the APC for additional supporting data, staff prepared a summary of major issues pertaining to the EIS. Staff made every effort to document the data, the references, and assumptions they used in preparing the EIS. Where staff had to rely on best professional judgment, the summary identifies the rationale behind the decision, and all reference materials are available for inspection or duplication.

Mr. Overeynder stated he would like to focus discussion on the EIS and the comments received on the EIS, the Regional Plan, and the implementing ordinances. Using a chart which depicted how three key environmental parameters - VMT's, NO emissions, and DIN loads from runoff, Mr. Overeynder outlined the improvements and reductions anticipated to reach the thresholds, and responded to questions.

Mr. Overeynder then explained the issue question of how land coverage was calculated, the methods used for calculating land coverage and allowable coverage, comparing existing coverage to allowable coverage, and the rationale for using watershed associations to evaluate coverage. Mr. Ziegler added there is a separate technical attachment that was put together by Brown and Caldwell on how the water quality modeling was done and how they generated the coverage figures. It was noted this document was not included with this report, but copies are available.

Mr. Ziegler clarified the question of nutrient loading where there were existing situations of overcovered watersheds and undercovered watersheds, that could be right next to each other. There was considerable discussion as to how staff could evaluate this and if this area was in compliance with the Bailey system or not, and if more development could be allowed assuming the area is overcovered. Mr. Ziegler stated staff came to the conclusion that on a watershed level with overcoverage, as far as sediment generation concerned, the BMP's are very effective in reducing sediment. But in areas of overcoverage, as far as nutrients go, Mr. Ziegler pointed out that the BMP's are less effective in reducing nutrients. Nutrients do not tend to have environmental impacts in tributary streams and the environmental impacts tend to be seen in the ultimate
receiving water of the Lake. Mr. Ziegler further stated in the overcovered watershed associations extra precaution was taken to reduce the nutrients as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3 with the additional offsite mitigation.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the BMP's for infiltration, slope stabilization, drainage stabilization, and revegetation are extremely effective in reducing particulate matter discharge as high as 90% efficiency. He explained he had seen reports of 95% and 99% efficiency at reducing dissolved nutrients such as nitrate, DIN, or any dissolved constituents, but staff does not feel that the BMP's are that effective. Brown and Caldwell investigated this question and their conclusion is that there is very little data available on this topic. Based on discussion with numerous people both inside and outside of the Basin, staff decided to arrive at an assumption of best judgment of what was thought the maximum efficiency for dissolved nutrients. Mr. Overeynder added part of the reason for differentiating the two is that nitrogen is very mobile and once it reaches the surface water or the groundwater there is very little chance of removing it.

Mr. Pyle asked when the modeling was being done if staff looked at the natural fertility of the soils and why there may be some changes in the watersheds since there is quite a difference in nitrogen from one soil to the other and there could be a watershed that shows a high coverage and high nitrate, but is that naturally a watershed that has soils that are more productive than another watershed? Mr. Ziegler responded staff did not look at that, the reason being there was no data available that was specific to a given soil type, but he stated the USGS is presently doing a detailed study of the mechanics of sediment generation and nutrient generation. Mr. Pyle stated soil survey information on major development soils is available and the Soil Conservation Service is going to see if there is any correlation.

The APC decided that further discussion and questions on the major issues would be continued to the June 1 workshop. Mr. Overeynder stated that staff attempted to address the major questions and backup information, and they will be available to answer any questions for more detailed information.

VIII REPORTS

A. Report on TRPA Public Hearings on Regional Plan Environmental Impact Statement

This item will be discussed at the June 1 workshop.

B. Public Interest Comments - None

C. APC Members

Mr. Smith commented that the APC is moving into an intensive role by providing assistance to the Governing Board, and that the APC working with staff will be a key role in the development of the new Regional Plan and ordinances. Mr. Smith stated he has enjoyed his association with staff and the APC.
Mr. Sawyer reported that the Burton-Santini appropriation for federal fiscal year 1984 will come up for markup about the first week in June. Congressman Fazio has applied to the appropriation subcommittee requesting $10 million in land purchase, $2.5 million in local erosion control, and $835,000 in forest service erosion control. Mr. Sawyer suggested writing to the subcommittee chairman, Sidney Yates, supporting Congressman Fazio's recommendations for full funding for both land purchase and erosion control.

Mr. Popoff stated it seemed to him that several workshops would be needed to work on the EIS for the Regional Plan before the APC could certify it or not, and he suggested more workshops might be more productive. Mr. Renz agreed and suggested a workshop be held in May. Gary Midkiff, Assistant to the Executive Director, suggested the APC could form subcommittees, or individual members could meet with staff if they wished.

Mr. Renz reported that Douglas County is proceeding with the Kahle site for the government center and BMP's erosion controls will be installed on the upper site this summer to take care of the drainage off of Kingsbury.

Ms. Bogush announced that the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities Study was submitted to the American Planning Association for an award as an outstanding planning project and she will keep the APC posted on the progress. Mr. Kortick noted that six El Dorado County planning projects are competing with the Threshold Study also.

X CORRESPONDENCE - None

XI PENDING MATTERS - None

XII ADJOURNMENT

The APC meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Dailey
Secretary II
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY

Lowry/Pillsbury, Logan Creek Estates Unit #2, Appeal of Staff Rejection of an
Application for Subdivision Improvement, Douglas County, TRPA File #83462

Applicant: William F. Pillsbury/Albert J. Lowry

Project History: The applicant has submitted 30 applications for case-by-case
review in Logan Creek Estates Unit #2. This area was previously not rated due
to the unimproved status of the subdivision. The roads are not paved, there are
no drainage or slope stabilization improvements, and no utilities to the individual
lots. As a result of the applications being submitted the sub-division has
been rated as "in need of further evaluation". (See attachment A for subdivision
evaluation.) The subject applications are therefore not eligible for review
until: 1) drainage and erosion control improvements are made to the subdivision,
as per plans approved by the Agency, and the subdivision is then reclassified as
either "Adequate" or "Potentially Adequate"; or 2) adoption by the Agency of
amendments to the Regional Plan pursuant to Article V(c) of the Compact.

The applicant has therefore submitted plans for subdivision improvements for
Logan Creek Estates Unit 2. These improvements include widening and paving
existing dirt roads, placement of sewer and water lines, stabilization of road
cuts and fills and infiltration of roadside drainage.

Section 12.60 of Ordinance 81-5 prohibits any grading, clearing, removal of
vegetation, filling or creation of land coverage in land capability districts
1a, 1c, 2, and 3. Additionally, Section 13.10 of Ordinance 81-5 prohibits
disturbance in a stream environment zone. It is staff's opinion that
construction of necessary subdivision improvements would fall under this section
of the ordinance and would therefore be prohibited. The application has therefore
been rejected. The applicant is now requesting an appeal of this staff rejection.

Site Description: The area consists of steep slopes with rock outcrops. Small,
dirt roadways traverse the slopes (North Peak, South Peak and Rim Rock Drive).
These roadways are of variable width, being as narrow as 8 to 10 feet in areas.
Vegetation is being established on the roadway and on the cut and fill slopes.
The soil type in the subdivision is primarily mapped as RtG (Rock outcrop - Toem
Complex 50 to 70% slopes). Some CaF (Cagwin-Rock outcrop complex, 30 to 50% 
slopes) also exists in the area. The entire area is mapped as a C2, High Hazard
Geomorphic Unit. According to the Bailey Report, 1974 "these lands are the
primary source of potential erosion in the Basin. Soils are shallow and are
underlain by almost impermeable bedrock. Water concentrated from impervious
surfaces, such as paved roads, produces severe gully and channel erosion in
loose decomposed granitic material".

Because the subdivision encompasses such a large area, slopes are variable.
Generally, however, slopes exceed 30%. The undisturbed slopes are fairly well
vegetated with manzanita and mature pines and firs. The road cuts and fills
have begun to revegetate.
Lowry/Fillsbury, Logan Creek Estates Unit #2

Project Description: The proposed subdivision improvements include: (See details attached)

1. Placement of sanitary sewer (6" PVC pipe) on one side of the road and water lines (6" PVC pipe) on the opposite side.

2. Widening and paving of North Peak Drive, South Peak Drive and Rim Rock Drive to a width of 16 feet.

3. Curb and gutter with drop inlets to infiltration trenches along the roadways.

4. Revegetation of cut and fill slopes, where feasible.

5. Rip-rap of cut and fill slopes where slopes are 1:1.

5. Retaining walls where cut slopes are of excessive height.

Review Per Section: Article VI(b) of the TRPA Compact Section 12.11 and 12.12, 12.60 of Ordinance 81-5.

Land Use District: Logan Creek Estates Unit #2 is classified as General Forest. The Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at its regular meeting on January 26, 1977 made the following findings with regard to the subject subdivision:

1. There has been construction of roads, sewers or other substantial facilities to serve the subdivision prior to February 10, 1972.

*2. The subdivision does qualify for one single family house per lot under Section 9.14 of the Agency's Land Use Ordinance; and

*3. The subdivision does qualify for the land coverage allowed under Section 9.24 of the Agency's Land Use Ordinance.

*It is Agency legal counsel's opinion that the provisions of these sections of the ordinance must comply with currently applicable ordinances and regulations. The ability to construct a single family dwelling on the subject parcels must therefore comply with Ordinance 81-5 and can be processed only as applications for case-by-case review.

Conformance with Case-by-Case Lot Review Criteria: Each lot would be rated individually, although the general character of the area indicates that the majority of the parcels would be rated as a high risk in at least one of the four criteria:
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Proximity to Stream or Wetland: Most of the parcels appear to be away from the influence of a stream or wetland.

Runoff Potential: The general character of the area is one of very rocky soils and rock outcrop. Additional information would be required to adequately evaluate the infiltration capacity of each lot.

Land Stability: Slopes are generally well over 30% slope which results in a high risk rating for land stability. Additionally, cut slopes created for the dirt road causes access problems.

Vegetation: Because of the rocky soils and steep slopes, revegetation of disturbed areas may prove difficult. High risk ratings may therefore be assigned for many of the parcels.

A high risk rating in any of the four criteria precludes an application from further review under the case-by-case procedure.

Project Analysis and Issues for Discussion:

1. Determination of Environmental Impact - Prior to approval, the Governing Body must make a finding of no significant effect. Staff can identify a number of impacts which would result from the proposed improvements:
   
   a. The widening of the roadway and placement of utilities will create additional land coverage and disturbance in a high hazard area.
   
   b. Potential cumulative impacts will result from approval of the subdivision improvements. Some 30 applications for case-by-case review have been received by TRPA to date. The cumulative impacts of this single family dwelling construction should be considered. The slopes are steep and include road cuts and fills which may cause access difficulties.
   
   c. Impacts on public services should be addressed. Additional sewer capacity will be required as well as water supply. The applicant contends that there are water rights currently allocated to this area. The water supply system will have to be upgraded which is to include a water tank and underground water lines. Analysis of point of diversion should also be addressed.

Additional single family dwellings will result in increased traffic generation and will impact the existing roadways in Logan Creek Estates Unit #1.

Although the proposed improvements will resolve some erosion problems on the site, TRPA staff feels a more complete environmental assessment (Environmental Impact Statement) is necessary to adequately assess negative impacts which may result from this project.
2. Intent of Ordinance 81-5 - The case-by-case review procedure, as set forth in Ordinance 81-5, is intended for review of single family dwellings in subdivisions which are "potentially adequate" or "adequate". Some subdivisions, or portions of subdivisions, rated as "in need of further evaluation" require only minor drainage and slope stabilization improvements to bring the areas up to a "potentially adequate" standard.

This subdivision, however, requires substantial improvements which involve new coverage and disturbance in high hazard areas. This is contrary to the intent of Ordinance 81-5 which was to only allow new coverage associated with single family dwellings in already-improved subdivisions, as addressed in Section 12.60 of ordinance 81-5.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

SUBDIVISION
Logan Creek Subdivision

SUB-AREA
Unit #2

DRAINAGE AREA
Logan Creek

1. Road Placement

   Good Placement in Relation to Natural Features
   Fair Placement in Relation to Natural Features
   Poor Placement in Relation to Natural Features
   Remarks - Roadway traverses steep slopes and rock outcrops. Width expansion would involve severe excavation/cross slopes.

2. Drainage System

   Good Placement in Relation to Natural Features
   Fair Placement in Relation to Natural Features
   Poor Placement in Relation to Natural Features
   Remarks - No existing drainage system. Vegetation is being naturally re-established to minimize erosion problems on roadway.

3. Maintenance

   Good Maintenance of Vegetation/Structures/Snow
   Fair Maintenance of Vegetation/Structures/Snow
   Facilities Not Adequately Maintained
   Remarks - Roadway not maintained. Natural vegetation being established.

4. Downstream Impacts

   No Channel Cutting, Flooding, Deposition Evident
   Some Channel Cutting, Flooding, Deposition Evident
   Channel Cutting, Flooding, Deposition is Evident
   Remarks -

5. Stable Cuts and Fills

   Cuts & Fills Stabilized by Vegetation/Structures
   Some Cuts & Fills Stabilized by Vegetation/Structures
   Inadequate Stabilization
   Remarks - Natural revegetation is in process. Fills/cuts still unstable.

ATTACHMENT A
6. **Stable Internal Drainage**

- No Internal Channel Instability/Cutting Deposition
- Some Internal Channel Instability/Cutting Deposition
- Internal Channel Instability

Remarks -

7. **Access Difficulties**

- Low Percentage of Lots with Severe Access
- Moderate Percentage of Lots with Severe Access
- High Percentage of Lots with Severe Access

Remarks - Extreme access to most lots in rock outcrop areas. Lots would not conform with 30% slope criteria.

8. **Land Coverage**

- Land Coverage Generally in Conformance with Land Capability
- Land Coverage Generally Not in Conformance with TRPA Ords.
- Land Coverage in Excess of TRPA Ords.

Remarks - Improvement of roadway to county standards would create new coverage in excess of land capability in high hazard area.

**Planning Team Classification**

- Adequate
- Potentially Adequate
- Needs Further Evaluation

Remarks - Application would create new coverage in excess of capability in high hazard area in order to make necessary improvements. Existing vegetation and drainage could be managed to better assist in water quality control without roadway/subdivision improvements.
3' Machine Placed Plant Mix, A.C.

Type 1 C&D

Infiltration Trench, See Det.

Utility Trench, See Det.

Select Native Material @ 95% R.C.

Rock Rip-Rap

See Det.

NOTES:
1. Top of Paving shall match existing ground.
2. Uphill edge of dirt road where practicable.
3. Scarify and compact supergrade to 95% R.C.
4. Proposed roadway.

Typical Road Section (Not to Scale)

North Peak Dr. 2.0 W. x 3.5 D. = 18' @ PMP
South Peak Dr. 2.5 W. x 4.0 D. = 24' @ PMP
Rimrock Dr. 2.5 W. x 4.0 D. = 24' @ PMP
SLOPE STABILIZATION GENERAL NOTES

Slope

\[
\begin{align*}
\leq 2:1 & \quad \text{Stabilization} \\
1\frac{1}{2}:1 & \quad \text{Ravageate} \\
1:1 & \quad \text{Hand place and set in mortar native} \\
1:1 & \quad \text{angular rock (Minimum 30\#)} \\
\geq 1:1 & \quad \text{Masonry retaining wall}
\end{align*}
\]

SLOPE STABILIZATION NOTES

INfiltration Trench Detail

LOGAN CREEK ESTATE
CONSTRUCTION NOTES
NOTES:
1. All PCC curb, gutter, and sidewalk shall be class AA or DA concrete unless otherwise specified (3,000 psi).
2. All concrete curb, gutter, and sidewalk shall have 1/2" expansion joints every 30' and at all curb returns and shall have weakened plane joints every 10 feet.
3. Aggregate base material shall conform to the specifications for Type 2 Aggregate Base and be comp. to a min. 96 % max. dry density.

TYPE 1 P.C.C. Curb & Gutter,
A.C. Curb, and Gen. Notes
MASONRY RETAINING WALL II - L

NOTE:
See Masonry Retaining Wall General Notes, Dwg. No. 1-17.1 and 1-17.2 and Details, Dwg. No. 1-19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS AND REINFORCING STEEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H (max.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T (min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W (min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 4 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 8 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 10 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 12 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 14 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. soil press.(psf)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

Date: June 2, 1983

TO: Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: Loomis/Barrow, Appeal of Staff Decision Pursuant to the Case-by-Case Lot Review Criteria

The applicant requests that the subject appeal be continued 30 days to allow additional time for preparation of detailed drainage plans.
LAKE PARKWAY
(LOOP ROAD) COMPLETION
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
AND
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

MAY 25, 1983

Prepared for
the
City of South Lake Tahoe
and
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

by
QUAD Consultants
in association with
DKS Associates

RECEIVED
BY:

MAY 26 1983

TAHOE REGIONAL
PLANNING AGENCY
This document, supplementing the Draft Environmental Impact Report on the referenced project and including Appendices C, D and # to the Draft, comprises the Final EIS/EIR on the proposed Lake Parkway (Loop Road) completion project in the City of South Lake Tahoe, California. Appendix C lists all organizations, agencies and individuals submitting comments to the City on the Draft EIS/EIR. Appendix D summarizes all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and responds to each such comment, supplementing, correcting or reiterating portions of the Draft. Appendix E consists of reproductions of the actual written comments received on the Draft.
APPENDIX C

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS, AGENCIES AND INDIVIDUALS COMMENTING UPON THE DRAFT EIR
APPENDIX C

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS, AGENCIES
AND INDIVIDUALS COMMENTING
UPON THE DRAFT EIS/EIR

State of Nevada, Office of Community Services; John B. Walker
for Linda A. Ryan, Director

State of California, Office of Planning and Research; Ron
Bass, Director, State Clearinghouse

State of California, Air Resources Board; Gary Agid, Chief,
Local Project Support Branch, Regional Programs Division

State of California, Transportation Agency, Department of
Transportation, District 3; E.F. Galligan, Acting
District Director of Transportation

State of Nevada, Department of Conservation and Natural
Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and
Archeology; Alice M. Becker, Staff Archeologist

State of California, Resources Agency, California Regional
Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region; James
Kuykendall for Roy C. Hampson, Executive Officer

State of Nevada, Department of Conservation and Natural
Resources, Division of Environmental Protection; L.H.
Doddgion, P.E., Administrator

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Advisory Planning Commission
meeting, May 11, 1983; minutes of discussion re Lake
Parkway (Loop Road) Completion EIS/EIR prepared by Mary
Dailey, Secretary II.

Kenneth C. Smith, M.D., South Lake Tahoe, Planning
Commissioner
APPENDIX D

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS
COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIS/EIR AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS


Comment

"The State Clearinghouse has processed the proposal and has no comment. Based on the information contained therein and the responses of interested parties, the proposed project is, as of this date, found not to be in conflict with the State's plans, goals or objectives."

Response

The Comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR.

Comment Letter B. Letter dated May 6, 1983 from the State of California, Office of Planning and Research; Ron Bass, Director, State Clearinghouse.

Comments

Statements regarding procedures and legal requirements for EIR processing; see full text in Appendix E.

Response

None required.

Comment Letter C. Letter dated April 28, 1983 from State of California, Air Resources Board; Gary Agid, Chief, Local Project Support Branch, Regional Programs Division.

Comment C-1

"The Draft EIR/EIS identifies the air quality impacts of the Proposed Project and three alternatives: the No Project, the Limited Access to Chinokis, and the One-Way Alternative. The air quality analyses of the Limited Access to Chinokis and the One-Way Alternative assumes considerable mitigation and the Draft EIR/EIS includes a statement that the mitigation is required to allow for acceptable levels of service on the affected roadways. The Draft
EIR/EIS also indicates that the Proposed Project will reduce trips and improve the traffic flow along the US 50 corridor. Our analysis of the Proposed Project does not support this conclusion. In fact, we believe the Proposed Project, if approved, would add to the congestion at the US 50/Park Avenue intersection and further degrade the existing significant carbon monoxide (CO) problem at this location. As a result of our analyses, the only configurations of the Lake Parkway extension that will reduce the traffic congestion and the CO problem in the area are the Limited Access to Chinokis and the One-Way Alternative."

Response C-1

The Draft EIS/EIR evaluates air quality impacts for the No-Project Alternative and for "two project alternatives considered capable of achieving project objectives" (p. 4-7), the One-Way Access Alternative and the Limited Access to Chinokis Alternative. The conclusions of the commentor regarding air quality are noted; the Draft EIR/EIS states similar conclusions on p. 4-7 and p. 4-8.

Comment C-2

"Our analyses of the project related air quality impacts for the two viable alternatives differs somewhat from that of Quad Consultants as described in the Draft EIR/EIS. We agree with the drafters of the report, when they say on page 4-8, concerning the Limited Access to Chinokis Alternative, "This alternative would result in a slight increase in air quality at two stations and a slight decrease in air quality at a third station in 1987, as compared to the No Project Alternative. The increase at the third location is significantly greater than that for the One-Way Alternative; however, the decrease at one of the other stations is significantly greater for this Alternative." We do not, however, agree that both alternatives have the same air quality impacts. The drafters of the report overlooked the importance of the significant reduction in CO concentrations at the Travel Lodge station resulting from the One-Way Alternative as mitigated. It is true that the Limited Access to Chinokis Alternative does provide a greater reduction in CO concentrations at the Sugar Haus station than does the One-Way Alternative, but both alternatives show decreases in CO concentrations as compared to the existing condition. It is the significant decrease in the CO concentration at the Travel Lodge station as a result of the One-Way Alternative as mitigated that needs more consideration. As the 1982 Air Quality Plan for the Basin depicted, the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for CO at the Travel Lodge station may not be attained even with full implementation of the Plan. The Sugar Haus and Sonora Fire House stations are of less concern because the 1982 Plan projects attainment at these locations."
Response C-2

The opinion of the commentor regarding the relative value of air quality improvements at the noted stations is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR.

Comment C-3

"Because the No Project Alternative provides no air quality improvements and the Proposed Project and the Limited Access to Chinokis Alternative significantly degrade the air quality at the US 50/Park Avenue intersection, we cannot support the Proposed Project, the No Project, or the Limited Access to Chinokis Alternatives, but do support and recommend the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) approve the One-Way Alternative as mitigated. The One-Way Alternative will improve the circulation and air quality at the US 50/Park Avenue intersection provided the mitigation identified on pages 4-4 and 4-5 accompany the completion of the 490 foot connection of Lake Parkway. It is our belief that if the 490 foot Lake Parkway section is allowed to open prior to the implementation of the mitigation measures, the impacts to traffic congestion and air quality will adversely affect the public health and safety. We strongly recommend the TRPA approve the One-Way Alternative, and condition the approval of the One-Way Alternative to include the mitigation measures as outlined in the Draft EIR/EIS."

Response C-3

It will be the responsibility of the lead agency to balance the relative air quality impacts and the traffic benefits and impacts of the various project alternatives, and to incorporate those mitigation measures deemed feasible and timely in the project approval process for the selected alternative. The recommendations contained in the comment should be considered during the legislative deliberation process which considers project alternative selection and the determination of appropriate mitigation measures.

Comment Letter D. Letter dated May 10, 1983 from State of California, Transportation Agency, Department of Transportation, District 3; E. F. Galligan, Acting District Director of Transportation.

Comment D-1

"We understand that this EIR is intended to be a part of the EIS on the TRPA Regional Plan as well as a project level EIS."
Response D-1

This EIS/EIR is directed to the environmental evaluation of the impacts of the construction and operation of the Lake Parkway (Loop Road) completion project. It is assumed that the broader issues which may conceivably impact this project will be addressed in the TRPA Regional Transportation Plan and its environmental evaluation process.

Comment D-2

"We concur with several important conclusions stated in the EIS. First of all, we agree that TRPA must adopt its Regional Transportation Plan prior to taking final action on the project (Page 2-5). We also agree with the conclusion that none of the alternatives evaluated will achieve the project objectives unless they incorporate the recommended traffic and environmental mitigation measures (Page 4-7). And finally, we agree that it will be the responsibility of TRPA and the City of South Lake Tahoe to ensure that any negative impacts resulting from growth induced by the project will be properly mitigated (Page 5-2). In going beyond these points of concurrence, we do have a number of concerns summarized below which should be addressed in the Final EIR."

Response D-2

The comments are noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR.

Comment D-3

"The EIS needs to be revised to clarify that the two-way Loop Road project will include the 490' connection to Montreal Road, restriping the traffic lanes on Park Avenue at the intersection with US 50 and the mitigation measures listed on Page 4-4:

a. traffic control barrier at Park and Montreal
b. a free right-turn lane from Pioneer Trail to eastbound Highway 50
c. an additional 12' lane with curb, gutter and sidewalk parallel to and contiguous to the south side of Highway 50 between Pioneer Trail and Park Avenue
d. a free right-turn lane from eastbound Highway 50 to Park Avenue
e. two left-turn lanes from Park Avenue to westbound Highway 50
f. new structural sections both north and south on Park Avenue
g. modification of the signal system at Pioneer Trail and Park Avenue

h. cul-de-sac on Fern Road because the existing Fern Road connection would not be compatible with the free right-turn lane from Pioneer Trail to eastbound Highway 50

The project description on Page 2-1 of the EIS; subsequent descriptions of the project on Pages 2-4, 2-5, 2-6, 4-5 and 4-8; and Figures 2-2, 3-1 and 3-8 should all be revised to conform to the complete project description as discussed above."

Response D-3

The comment is repetitive of suggestions made by the Department of Transportation during the EIS/EIR scoping process. It was determined at that time that the project description in the Draft EIS/EIR would be utilized, and that the additions thereto suggested by the Department of Transportation would be incorporated in the EIS/EIR as suggested mitigation measures.

Comment D-4

"The EIS should clearly point out that it will provide environmental clearance for the mitigation measures listed in #1 (Comment D-3) as well as for the 490' of pavement and the restriping of Park Avenue."

Response D-4

The mitigation measures listed in Comment D-3 are an integral component of the environmental evaluation for this project.

Comment D-5

"The air quality and traffic analysis in Chapter 4 should be revised to incorporate the positive impacts of the full mitigation program."

Response D-5

The air quality and traffic impacts analyses in Chapter 4, as presently written, incorporate evaluation of the impacts of the mitigation program.

Comment D-6

"Page 2-4 There should be bike lanes provided on the Loop Road."
Response D-6

The provision, or non-provision, of bike lanes as a part of the project is a policy decision not directly related to the environmental impact analysis in this EIS/EIR.

Comment D-7

"Page 2-6 The EIS states that TRPA will assume the responsibility as the basin wide regional transportation planning agency once the TRPA Regional Transportation Plan is adopted. It will be the responsibility of the California Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing in conjunction with local agencies to make the final decision on whether or not to designate TRPA as the RTPA for the California side of the basin."

Response D-7

The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR.

Comment D-8

"Page 3-4 The air quality section should discuss the 6 PPM State standard for carbon monoxide as well as the 9 PPM Federal Standard. The TRPA carbon monoxide threshold is 6 PPM. (see next comment)"

"Page 3-5 Under the air quality threshold language TRPA adopted in August of 1982, the threshold of 9 PPM for carbon monoxide changed to 6 PPM on February 28, 1982 because neither state changed their 6 PPM standard prior to February 28, 1983."

Response D-8

If each state (Nevada and California) reviewed and certified to TRPA by February 28, 1983, what their carbon monoxide standards were as of that date, then the TRPA threshold standard was to have been modified accordingly.

No substantive change in the text of the Draft EIS/EIR appears to be required, since textual and mapped references are to the Federal standard.

The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR.

Comment D-9

"Page 3-6 The funding sources for the proposed increases in STAGE service should be identified."
Response D-10

The identification of specific funding sources from among those available is outside the scope of this EIS/EIR.

Comment D-11

"Page 3-13 The EIS fails to address the secondary impacts on vegetation of opening up the zoning to development."

Response D-11

If development occurs on land adjacent to the project in accord with existing zoning, loss of native vegetation will occur. A suggested mitigation measure for visual impacts, on page 3-33 of the Draft EIS/EIR, inferentially discusses mitigation for this vegetation loss.

Comment D-12

"Page 3-19 The EIS needs to identify specifically where noise levels are expected to decrease along Van Sickle due to traffic being diverted to Lake Parkway."

Response D-12

Noise levels along Van Sickle Drive from its northerly terminus to Park Avenue are expected to decrease because of traffic diversion to Lake Parkway.

Comment D-13

"Page 3-21 The EIS should assess the possible trip generation and growth resulting from increased access to the Tourist Commercial (TC) and High Density Residential (HDR) zones along Lake Parkway. Development in these areas would have a detrimental effect on traffic service at the Park Avenue/50 Intersection."

Response D-13

Pending adoption of the TRPA Regional Plan, it is difficult if not impossible to predict area development levels and resulting trip generation from the specified zones along Lake Parkway. It is not anticipated that such trip generation would be sufficient to adversely affect the EIS/EIR-predicted levels of service at the Park Avenue/50 intersection.

Comment D-14

"Page 3-21 Under the provisions of the Compact, the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will not be de-activated until TRPA adopts both its Regional Plan and the implementing ordinances."
Response D-14

The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR.

Comment D-15

"Page 3-23 The EIS claims that the project will not generate any significant population growth. This does not appear to be consistent with the fact that the project will improve access to the undeveloped lands in a TC and HDR zone."

Response D-15

The determinants of population growth in the Tahoe Basin will be incorporated in the finally-adopted TRPA Regional Plan; total population growth, under the constraints of this overall planning program, will not be determined by road locations.

Comment D-16

"Page 3-25 The discussion of the existing STAGE service needs to be updated."

Response D-16

An updated statement regarding the South Tahoe Area Ground Express operations follows:

**Setting - Public Transit:** The City of South Lake Tahoe operates the South Tahoe Area Ground Express (STAGE) on a 24-hour, year around basis. Operations include an express service on U.S. 50 and four neighborhood day routes and two neighborhood night routes. In addition, commencing in July, 1981, El Dorado County initiated a five month demonstration project operated by the City to provide bus service to the Tahoe Paradise and Meyers area. Due to the lack of ridership and lack of funding, this service was terminated after eight months of operation.

During the winter months four routes are added to serve the Heavenly Valley Ski Area and the City of South Lake Tahoe. Three of these routes operate within the City to serve the main base of the Heavenly Valley ski operation and a fourth route serves the hotels located at Stateline in Douglas County with service to Heavenly Valley North atop Kingsbury Grade. The buses used on this shuttle service have been purchased by Heavenly Valley and are operated by the City of South Lake Tahoe.

The STAGE operates all daytime routes on 30 minute headways and service is limited to those areas within the City limits. STAGE carried 678,159 passengers during the Fiscal Year (FY) 1981-82 which marks a 39% increase from the FY 1978-79 and a 11%
increase over the FY 1980-81. The winter ski bus shuttle carried 89,214 passengers in FY 1979-80, 43,931 in FY 1980-81, and 73,557 in FY 81-82.

The fare to ride STAGE is 15 cents for seniors and handicapped, 25 cents for students, and 75 cents for regular passengers. Tokens may be purchased for 50 cents at various public facilities in advance. In October, 1981, STAGE also implemented a monthly pass program providing unlimited passenger trips for the price of the pass. Monthly costs are $10.00 for the elderly and handicapped, $20.00 for juniors, and $30.00 for adults. This program has been quite successful to date.

Comment D-17

"Figure 4-2 The peak hour traffic counts for Highway 50 eastbound between Pioneer Trail and Park Avenue are very high and do not correspond with the counts previously concurred with by Caltrans. An intersection traffic analysis should have been included in the EIR particularly for the Park Avenue/50 Intersection."

Response D-17

The counts reviewed by Caltrans were midday counts; they have been adjusted to reflect peak hour conditions, based on machine counts and other available data. Caltrans machine counts for the approach in question actually slightly exceed the number shown. Detailed traffic analysis were undertaken for the Park Avenue/50 intersection, the results of which are reflected in Chapter 4. A Technical Appendix Traffic Analysis detailing these intersection studies is on file with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

Comment D-18

"Figure 4-4 The figure depicts ADTs which are 10.5% above existing ADTs. There should be an explanation of these impacts and a discussion of necessary mitigation."

Response D-18

Figure 4-4 reflects the projected increases in traffic flows over the period 1982-1987 with the No-Project Alternative. The impacts of these flows are described on page 4-7 under the heading The No-Project Alternative. The two other alternatives discussed and evaluated, the One-Way Access Alternative and the Limited Access to Chinokis Alternative are, in effect, mitigation measures for the increased traffic flow impacts of the No-Project Alternative.
Comment D-19

"In summary, we believe it is very important for the EIS to be revised in a manner which will enable the document to provide environmental clearance for both the 490' pavement connection and the mitigation measures which go with this connection."

Response D-19

Reference should be made to the Response to Comment D-3.

Comment D-20

"We would also like to stress that all identified mitigation measures should be implemented to insure an effective transportation system upon completion of Lake Parkway."

Response D-20

The recommendation is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR. The determination of mitigation measures to be implemented is the responsibility of the legislative body of the lead agency.

Comment Letter E. Letter dated May 10, 1983 from State of Nevada, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology; Alice M. Becker, Staff Archaeologist.

Comment

"This Division has reviewed a summary statement from the Draft EIS for Lake Parkway (Loop Road) Completion. The National Register of Historic Places has been checked and no properties listed on or eligible to the Register are located within or near the proposed project area. Further, the project should have "no effect" on properties of National Register quality.

If prehistoric or historic materials are discovered during the course of the project, work should be temporarily halted and this office notified in order to record and photograph the remains."

Response

The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR.

Comment F-1

"The preferred alternative in your agency's Regional Plan EIS includes completion of the Loop Road together with a pedestrian mall on Highway 50. Will the Loop Road as presently designed be adequate to handle all of the traffic to be diverted from Highway 50? If redesign is necessary, will there be additional water quality impacts?"

Response F-1

It has been calculated that the Lake Parkway (Loop Road) as presently designed will be adequate to handle all of the traffic to be diverted from Highway 50.

Comment F-2

"On page 3-10, an increase of 0.05% in dissolved inorganic nitrogen loading to Lake Tahoe is predicted. It this a percentage of the total loading from the watershed, the watershed association, or the entire Basin?"

Response F-2

This is a percentage of the total loading from the entire Basin.

Comment F-3

"Nitrate deposition impacts are not addressed in relation to projected traffic increases. Although the feeling at the scoping meeting was that these impacts would not be significant, it might be appropriate to reevaluate them in connection with the recent determination that most nitrate deposition is produced within the Lake Tahoe Basin, and with the projection in this EIS that traffic will increase 10.5% per year."

Response F-3

Traffic increase projections are for 10.5% for the five year period from 1982 to 1987, 2.1% per year. This increase is not a result of the project, and the amount of nitrate deposition resulting from such traffic increase has not, therefore, been calculated in connection with the preparation of this EIS/EIR.

Comment Letter G. Letter dated May 13, 1983 from State of Nevada, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of Environmental Protection; L. H. Dodgion, P.E., Administrator
Comment G-1

"We agree with the conclusion of the report that the project should be constructed but do not agree that the Lake Parkway should be a one-way northbound roadway."

Response G-1

The EIS/EIR neither concludes that the project should be constructed nor that Lake Parkway should be a one-way northbound roadway. The environmental impacts of project construction and operation, including those of operation of the project as a one-way northbound roadway, are evaluated.

Comment G-2

"The traffic analysis and mitigation provided by QUAD Consultants for the two build options is incomplete. It does not appear that they had a good understanding of the current traffic flow of the Nevada side of the Stateline area especially the egress and ingress of the Harrah's parking lot. At the present time a significant amount of the traffic exiting from Harrah's parking lot to California uses Van Sickle Road so this traffic is already impacting the US 50 and Park Avenue intersection. One advantage of completion of Lake Parkway (the loop road) would be to relieve traffic on Park Avenue. The consultant's mitigating measure for two-way traffic on Lake Parkway includes channelization of the Montreal-Park-Lake Parkway intersection with an island which forces southbound traffic on Lake Parkway to the US 50 and Park Avenue intersection. This channelization is only one of the possible solutions to improve traffic flow through the intersection in question. It certainly does not improve the traffic conditions at US 50 and Park Avenue. This measure is counter productive and appears to be designed to discredit the potential benefits in an analysis of a two-way traffic operation on Lake Parkway. It appears that more than one set of mitigating measures should have been considered and presented in the report for both the one-way and the two-way operation of Lake Parkway. If the consultants did evaluate more options than were considered in the assessment they should have been discussed in the report."

Response G-2

It is axiomatic that the limitation of traffic ingress to the Chinokis neighborhood from Lake Parkway will increase traffic flows at Park Avenue and Highway 50. The EIS/EIR concludes that, with the implementation of adequate mitigating measures, resulting traffic flows at that intersection can be accommodated at acceptable levels of service. A number of alternatives and mitigating measures in addition to those evaluated and described in the EIS/EIR were evaluated during the EIS/EIR scoping process and it was determined that those now included would be the ones to be environmentally evaluated.
Comment G-3

"As the report is written the proposed one-way Lake Parkway completion connects with the two-way portion of Lake Parkway in Nevada. There is no discussion or consideration given to resolving this problem. Our evaluation of the one-way vs. two-way operation of Lake Parkway shows an increase in vehicle miles driven in the core area from the one-way operation which will impact the overall emission inventory. The proposed two-way operation of Lake Parkway with the mitigation measure will result in added vehicle miles and by recirculation increased congestion in a major existing hot spot. Other mitigating measures are available and should have been presented and analyzed in the report."

Response G-3

The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR. It is not evident that the proposed two-way operation of Lake Parkway with the mitigation measure (restriction of ingress from Lake Parkway to the Chinokis neighborhood) will result in added vehicle miles, or to increased congestion "by recirculation".

Comment G-4

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) modeling used in the study is extremely conservative and biased against any automobile operation. The basis of emission factors was also not explained. Background estimates are from the 1981 CARB study which contained some questionable values especially in model validation. This is highlighted by measured background concentrations which exceeded observed downwind concentrations. CARB used only the factor of 0.7 to convert from 1-hour CO values to 8-hour average CO values. This conversion factor considers only meteorological variations. It does not provide for a reduction in traffic volume and potential change of speed during the worst 8-hour period. The NDEP "Stateline, Nevada 1983 Carbon Monoxide Study", April 1983, showed the peak hour traffic value which was used to model the 1-hour CO values which in reality does not occur during the meteorological conditions which were described as worst case."

Response G-4

The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR.

Comment Document H. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Advisory Planning Commission meeting, May 11, 1983; minutes of discussion re Lake Parkway (Loop Road) Completion EIS/EIR, prepared by Mary Dailey, Secretary II.
Response, Document H

The environmental issues pertinent to the Lake Parkway (Loop Road) Completion project which were raised at this meeting were each the subject of written comments by individuals or agencies responding to the circulation of the Draft EIS/EIR, and responses thereto have been provided herein. Other key issues relating to long-range transportation planning, and to the Lake Parkway design, were discussed but are not appropriately covered in this document.

The full text of the minutes of this meeting is included in Appendix E.


Comment I-1

"p. 2-5 Planned "lease" of Caltrans - why a lease rather than purchase?"

Response I-1

This is a policy or procedural question, rather than one of environmental analysis or evaluation, and no response can be proferred in this document.

Comment I-2

"p. 3-1 (next page chart): Ozone and regional visibility not considered in this EIS - they should be."

Response I-2

It was determined during the scoping process that the project would not have a significant impact on these two air quality criteria, and they were not, therefore, further environmentally evaluated.

Comment I-3

"p. 3-2 Project being completed in a Watershed already 150% over the allowed coverage!"

Response I-3

The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR. Paragraph 4, page 3-3, of the Draft EIS/EIR notes this coverage problem and the project's relative impact with respect thereto.
Comment I-4

"p. 3-2  25,000 cubic yards of material to be excavated and removed from the site. Where this material is to be disposed is not addressed in the EIS. This is a significant impact."

Response I-4

The location of the materials disposal site or sites has not been selected, and will not be until after project contract award. It is the City's standard procedure with respect to such disposal sites to secure approval thereof from the appropriate Regional agencies prior to initiation of disposal operations. The best current estimate of the yardage of material to be disposed of is approximately 11,500 yards.

Comment I-5

"p. 3-6  "Reducing trips" on Highway #50 means shifting trips to other roadways in the immediate vicinity."

Response I-5

The comment is correct.

Comment I-6

"p. 3-6  Parkway would reduce trips on Hwy #50 and "may" improve traffic flow."

Response I-6

The projected improvements in traffic flow are outlined in Chapter 4 for the alternatives evaluated.

Comment I-7

"p. 3-6  Comment on potential benefit from buying 8 additional busses and building 30 pullouts and 45 bus shelters makes no commitment that this will be done."

Response I-7

An EIS/EIR cannot make mitigation measure commitments; such commitments, if deemed essential or feasible by the governing body of a lead agency, must be made by the governing body or secured by that body or agency from responsible agencies.

Comment I-8

"p. 3-8  Surface runoff: Diverted from the project to Tahoe Meadows where we already have an uncontrolled drainage mess which only "might" be corrected by the Wildwood Project if it is funded."
Response I-8

The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR.

Comment I-9

"p. 3-10 Pelagic zone: Increase of 0.05% of DIN load to the lake is not a very understandable figure."

Response I-9

"DIN" is an abbreviation for dissolved inorganic nitrogen. The percentage increase described is believed to be more descriptive of the comparative impact than a numeric statement. (See Response to Comment F-2)

Comment I-10

"p. 3-10 An increase of 0.1% of the DIN load for the whole Association #8 is described as small, but it is 0.1% of the whole contribution from South Shore which may or may not be "small".

Response I-10

The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR.

Comment I-11

"p. 3-10 An increase in a factor that cannot be quantified is hard to describe as small, moderate or large."

Response I-11

The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR.

Comment I-12

"p. 3-13 How does it happen that the Calif. Department of Fish and Game is doing vegetation analysis?"

Response I-12

The Department of Fish and Game has undertaken vegetational mapping for the Tahoe Basin, and the information obtained was obtained through a Department biologist from that mapping.

Comment I-13

"p. 3-13 Revegetation of the disturbed portions of the project should not be with species "similar" to those in the immediate vicinity but should be identical native plants."
Response I-13

The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR.

Comment I-14

"p. 3-14 Using boulders on site for erosion control is essentially useless there are many available effective methods of erosion control."

Response I-14

The comment is noted. Revegetation, one of the other available effective methods, is discussed in the same section of the Draft EIS/EIR.

Comment I-15

"p. 3-15 There are at least two active osprey nests in the basin. Spotted owls have been identified on the west shore. They are a resident non-migratory bird so surely they are nesting in the basin - not just feeding here."

Response I-15

The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR.

Comment I-16

"p. 3-15 I doubt if there are as many as 5,000 visitor-days of hunters in the basin. Maybe they are including fishermen as well."

Response I-16

The comment is noted. The cited document cites hunting visitor-days as 5,000.

Comment I-17

"p. 3-24 The text accurately states that the Park Ave. - Hwy #50 intersection experiences severe operational problems during peak summer and winter days. The changes in striping at the intersection are very unlikely to resolve these problems. Physical widening of the Park Ave. part on the east side - available land in the Crescent V Parking lot. The two right angle bends in Park Ave. should be smoothed or eliminated to permit free flow of traffic."
Response I-17

The comment is noted. The suggested mitigation measures, including but not limited to striping changes, are projected to improve intersection capacity. The realignment of Park Avenue, eliminating existing right-angle turns, would assist traffic flows but would create access and corollary traffic problems, and was therefore not recommended as a mitigation measure at this time.

Comment I-18

"p. 3-28 It is often stated that response time for emergency vehicles is excessively long. I have never seen any data supporting this assumption. We cannot plan our traffic circulation system to accommodate bombing incidents like at Harvey's.

Response I-18

Traffic conditions at level-of-service E at peak hours and at level-of-service F provide inherent delay opportunities for emergency vehicles as well as for other traffic.

Comment I-19

"p. 3-28 Is there any data as to evacuation outside of "discussions"."

Response I-19

The discussions cited in the referenced document are the basis for the evacuation concerns noted.

Comment I-20

"p. 3-33 Second paragraph - "orientate" is neither a word nor an adjective."

Response I-20

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1977, G. & C. Merriam Co., p. 809, defines "orientate" as a variant of orient, a transitive or intransitive verb; definition b: "to set or arrange in any determinate position".

The comment is noted.

Comment I-21

"p. 3-38 Any commitment that a buffer strip or just a good idea. I would hope that the new road will not introduce further development east of the road."
Response I-21

See Response to Comment I-7. The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR.

Comment I-22

"3-33 Archaeological surveys performed 1 mile away from the site are of no significance as to this site. Discoveries made during development of a roadway indicate too late a time to accomplish anything as to evaluating the significance of the site or its mitigation - besides bull dozer drivers are not very astute at identifying artifacts. The EIS should admit that archeological resources are being ignored and not beat about the bush."

Response I-22

The mitigation measure suggested is one commonly proposed for project sites involving apparent moderate or lesser sensitivities for historical or archeological remains; reference is made to Letter of Comment E in illustration of the acceptability of the suggested mitigating procedure.

Comment I-23

"p. 4-1 The EIS admits that the traffic counts do not sound very definitive. Off peak counts "adjusted" for peak situation sounds rather weak. Counts for U.S. 50/Stateline and Pioneer/Glen were "factored" from winter data based on adjacent intersections! The report states no growth in traffic coming into the basin on Highway #50 (just below Echo Summit) but does not offer any explanation of this. So a 2% per year growth rate for 1982-97 is assumed without data to support it."

Response I-23

It is believed that the data, including the traffic counts available, are sufficiently definitive to afford an adequate base for the assumptions used in and calculations made for the analyses in the EIS/EIR. The EIS/EIR does not "admit that the traffic counts do not sound very definitive". The 2.1% per year growth rate for 1982-1987 is a conservative estimate based, as indicated in the EIS/EIR, on the Truckee River Bridge count volumes from 1974 to 1982. Confirming data for this estimate was obtained from the U.S. 50/Stateline and Pioneer/Glen count records.
Comment I-24

"p. Chart 4-3: Projects in 1987 3,510 cars will use the loop road on peak summer weekend 24 hour period. This averages 146 cars per hour! 6,230 are predicted to still be using Van Sickle road, more than are using it now. Considering the cost of the project this seems to be rather slight benefit for traffic improvement."

Response I-24

Page 4-1 (the last two lines) and Page 4-3 (the first line) of the Draft EIS/EIR refer to Figure 4-3 as depicting projected traffic volumes in 1987, without completion of the Lake Parkway. Figure 4-3 illustrates the traffic flows that would prevail with the No-Project Alternative.

Comment I-25

"p. 4-3 The EIS admits there is no clear air quality benefit of the two project alternatives over the no project alternative."

Response I-25

Table 4-2 shows air quality (CO concentration) improvements at eighteen of twenty-four measurement points/times for the two project alternatives. The improvements are not of large magnitude, nor are the six decreases.

Comment I-26

"p. 4-4 The EIS quotes "Caltrans Phase 2 plan" to provide additional lane on Highway #50 to provide free right turn onto Park from Hwy. #50 but this is not shown on any of the plans or diagrams. No mention is made whether this "plan" is a commitment by Caltrans or just a dream."

Response I-27

The analysis of traffic impacts for the project alternatives is premised upon the timely implementation of the proposed Caltrans Phase 2 plan mitigation measures. The State Department of Transportation has suggested that these mitigation measures be incorporated in the project. Decisions as to the most appropriate timing for their implementation have yet to be made.

Comment I-27

p. 4-4 I cannot tell from the document whether the additional turning lanes discussed are just striping changes or actual physical additional turning lanes.
I also cannot understand the "one westbound lane" west of the intersection - will they not at least preserve the two westbound lanes presently existing?

Response I-27

The proposed Caltrans Phase 2 mitigation measures incorporate additional right-of-way from the Pioneer Trail-Highway 50 intersection northward to Park, as a turning lane, as described in Section 4.4.2 of the EIS/EIR, page 4-4. The other turn lanes described are striping changes.

Only a single westbound lane west of the intersection of Park and Highway 50 will be required.

Comment I-28

"Fig. 4-8 The Fern road cul de sac is not indicated on any of the diagrams."

Response I-28

The comment is correct. Only major street traffic flows are indicated. Closure of Fern Road, however, is proposed when Caltrans Phase 2 mitigation measures are implemented.

Comment I-29

"p. 4-6 The air quality analysis assumes no increase in traffic by 1987, the traffic analysis assumes a 10±% increase in traffic by then."

Response I-29

The background concentrations only assume no increase in traffic by 1987, inasmuch as this is the basis upon which the CALINE 3 model is programmed. The intersectional and "link" traffic information on which the key-site air quality screening analysis was based, however, utilizes 1987 projected traffic flows and conditions.

Comment I-30

"Chart 4-13 Identified "links for air quality analysis" this term is defined nowhere in the document."

Response I-30

The "links" shown on the Figure (4-13) are the intersection approaches for which peak hour traffic volumes, 8 hour average traffic volumes, traffic speed, and directional traffic information were calculated as air quality model inputs (see paragraph 2, Section 4.5 of the EIS/EIR, p. 4-6).
Comment I-31

"p. 5-2 Public acquisition of the lands zoned tourist commercial east of the project in the forest should be strongly recommended rather than just suggested - these lands could be the major growth inducement effect of the project."

Response I-31

The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR. See Response to Comment D-15.

Comment I-32

"Summary: My conclusion is that when the cost of the project to the city is considered the final effect of providing a road for 3,510 cars each way on the road on a peak summer day is not worth the cost of the completion of the road. Traffic benefits on Highway #50 would probably not be detectable. Air quality would not be benefited. Surface runoff would compound the Wildwood-Tahoe Meadows existing drainage mess. We have no current assurance that plans to solve the Wildwood problems will actually be accomplished."

Response I-32

See responses to previous comments, I-1 to I-31. The summary comment is noted and incorporated in the EIS/EIR.
APPENDIX E

LETTERS OF COMMENT
D. Keith Maki  
Senior Planner  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
P.O. Box 8896  
South Lake Tahoe, California 95331

Re: SAI NV # 83300064  
Project: Lake Tahoe Parkway (Loop Road)  
DEIS

Dear Mr. Maki:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the above mentioned project.

The State Clearinghouse has processed the proposal and has no comment. Based on the information contained therein and the responses of interested parties, the proposed project is, as of this date, found not to be in conflict with the State's plans, goals or objectives.

Sincerely,

John B. Walker  
FOR  
Linda A. Ryan  
Director

JBW:LAR/aa
D. Keith Maki, Senior Planner
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 8895
South Lake Tahoe, CA 95731

May 6, 1983

Subject: Lake Parkway (Loop Road) Completion/ SCH #83032104

Dear Mr. Maki:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to selected state agencies for review. The review period is closed and the comments of the individual agency(ies) is(are) attached. If you would like to discuss their concerns and recommendations, please contact the staff from the appropriate agency(ies).

When preparing the final EIR, you must include all comments and responses (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15146). The certified EIR must be considered in the decision-making process for the project. In addition, we urge you to respond directly to the commenting agency(ies) by writing to them, including the State Clearinghouse number on all correspondence.

A 1981 Appellate Court decision in Cleary v. County of Stanislaus (118 Cal. App. 3d 348) clarified requirements for responding to review comments. Specifically, the court indicated that comments must be addressed in detail, giving reasons why the specific comments and suggestions were not accepted. The responses must show factors of overriding significance which required the suggestion or comment to be rejected. Responses to comments must not be conclusory statements but must be supported by empirical or experimental data, scientific authority or explanatory information of any kind. The court further said that the responses must be a good faith, reasoned analysis.

In the event that the project is approved without adequate mitigation of significant effects, the lead agency must make written findings for each significant effect and it must support its actions with a written statement of overriding considerations for each unmitigated significant effect (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 and 15089).

If the project requires discretionary approval from any state agency, the Notice of Determination must be filed with the Secretary for Resources, as well as with the County Clerk. Please contact Norma Wood at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions about the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Ron Bass
Ron Bass, Director
State Clearinghouse
CC: Resources Agency
Memorandum

To: 1) Gordon F. Snow, Ph.D., Assistant Secretary Resources Agency
    2) Keith Maki, Senior Planner
       Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
       P.O. Box 8896
       South Lake Tahoe, CA 95731

From: Air Resources Board

Date: April 28, 1983

Subject: Lake Parkway (Loop Road) Completion
         Draft EIR/EIS
         SCH No. 83032104

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

RECEIVED

May 9 1983

We have reviewed the subject Draft EIR/EIS and offer the following comments to improve the air quality impact analysis and to support the One-Way Alternative as mitigated.

The Draft EIR/EIS identifies the air quality impacts of the Proposed Project and three alternatives: the No Project, the Limited Access to Chinokis, and the One-Way Alternative. The air quality analyses of the Limited Access to Chinokis and the One-Way Alternative assumes considerable mitigation and the Draft EIR/EIS includes a statement that the mitigation is required to allow for acceptable levels of service on the affected roadways. The Draft EIR/EIS also indicates that the Proposed Project will reduce trips and improve the traffic flow along the US 50 corridor. Our analysis of the Proposed Project does not support this conclusion. In fact, we believe the Proposed Project, if approved, would add to the congestion at the US 50/Park Avenue intersection and further degrade the existing significant carbon monoxide (CO) problem at this location. As a result of our analyses, the only configurations of the Lake Parkway extension that will reduce the traffic congestion and the CO problem in the area are the Limited Access to Chinokis and the One-Way Alternative.

Our analyses of the project related air quality impacts for the two viable alternatives differs somewhat from that of Quad Consultants as described in the Draft EIR/EIS. We agree with the drafters of the report, when they say on page 4-8, concerning the Limited Access to Chinokis Alternative, "This alternative would result in a slight increase in air quality at two stations and a slight decrease in air quality at a third station in 1987, as compared to the No Project Alternative. The increase at the third location is significantly greater than that for the One-Way Alternative; however, the decrease at one of the other stations is significantly greater for this Alternative." We do not, however, agree that both alternatives have the same air quality impacts. The drafters of the report overlooked the importance of the significant reduction in CO concentrations at the Travel Lodge station resulting from the One-Way Alternative as mitigated. It is true that the Limited Access to Chinokis Alternative does provide a greater reduction in CO concentrations at the Sugar Haus station than does the One-Way Alternative, but both alternatives show decreases in CO concentrations as compared to the existing condition. It is the significant decrease in the CO concentration at the Travel Lodge station as a result of the One-Way Alternative as
mitigated that needs more consideration. As the 1982 Air Quality Plan for the Basin depicted, the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for CO at the Travel Lodge station may not be attained even with full implementation of the Plan. The Sugar Haus and Sonora Fire House stations are of less concern because the 1982 Plan projects attainment at these locations.

Because the No Project Alternative provides no air quality improvements and the Proposed Project and the Limited Access to Chinokis Alternative significantly degrade the air quality at the US 50/Park Avenue intersection, we cannot support the Proposed Project, the No Project, or the Limited Access to Chinokis Alternatives, but do support and recommend the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) approve the One-Way Alternative as mitigated. The One-Way Alternative will improve the circulation and air quality at the US 50/Park Avenue intersection provided the mitigation identified on pages 4-4 and 4-5 accompany the completion of the 490 foot connection of Lake Parkway. It is our belief that if the 490 foot Lake Parkway section is allowed to open prior to the implementation of the mitigation measures, the impacts to traffic congestion and air quality will adversely affect the public health and safety. We strongly recommend the TRPA approve the One-Way Alternative, and condition the approval of the One-Way Alternative to include the mitigation measures as outlined in the Draft EIR/EIS.

If you have any questions concerning these comments, please contact Dennis Goodenow at (916) 322-3538.

Sincerely,

Gary Agid, Chief
Local Project Support Branch
Regional Programs Division

cc: Bob Skidmore, Caltrans
    Joan Boruki, Caltrans
    Vernon Peterson, El Dorado Co. APCD
    Richard Milbrodt, City of South Lake Tahoe
May 10, 1983

Mr. Jim Reed, Chairman
and Board Members
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P. O. Box 8896
South Lake Tahoe, CA 95731

Dear Jim:

Caltrans has completed its review of the Draft EIS/EIR for the Lake Parkway (Loop Road) completion. We understand that this EIS is intended to be a part of the EIS on the TRPA Regional Plan as well as a project level EIS. We concur with several important conclusions stated in the EIS. First of all, we agree that TRPA must adopt its Regional Transportation Plan prior to taking final action on the project (Page 2-5). We also agree with the conclusion that none of the alternatives evaluated will achieve the project objectives unless they incorporate the recommended traffic and environmental mitigation measures (Page 4-7). And finally, we agree that it will be the responsibility of TRPA and the City of South Lake Tahoe to insure that any negative impacts resulting from growth induced by the project will be properly mitigated (Page 5-2). In going beyond these points of concurrence, we do have a number of concerns summarized below which should be addressed in the Final EIS.

General Comments

1. The EIS needs to be revised to clarify that the two-way Loop Road project will include the 490' connection to Montreal Road, restriping the traffic lanes on Park Avenue at the intersection with US 50 and the mitigation measures listed on Page 4-4:

   a. traffic-control barrier at Park and Montreal

   b. a free right-turn lane from Pioneer Trail to eastbound Highway 50

   c. an additional 12' lane with curb, gutter and sidewalk parallel to and contiguous to the south side of Highway 50 between Pioneer Trail and Park Avenue

   d. a free right-turn lane from eastbound Highway 50 to Park Avenue

   e. two left-turn lanes from Park Avenue to westbound Highway 50

   f. new structural sections both north and south on Park Avenue
Mr. Jim Reed, Chairman
Page 2
May 10, 1983

g. modification of the signal system at Pioneer Trail and Park Avenue

h. Cul-de-sac on Fern Road because the existing Fern Road connection would not be compatible with the free right-turn lane from Pioneer Trail to eastbound Highway 50

The project description on Page 2-1 of the EIS; subsequent descriptions of the project on Pages 2-4, 2-5, 2-6, 4-5 and 4-8; and Figures 2-2, 3-1 and 3-8 should all be revised to conform to the complete project description as discussed above.

2. The EIS should clearly point out that it will provide environmental clearance for the mitigation measures listed in #1 as well as for the 490' of pavement and the restriping of Park Avenue.

3. The air quality and traffic analysis in Chapter 4 should be revised to incorporate the positive impacts of the full mitigation program.

Specific Comments

1. Page 2-4 There should be bike lanes provided on the Loop Road.

2. Page 2-6 The EIS states that TRPA will assume the responsibility as the basin wide regional transportation planning agency once the TRPA Regional Transportation Plan is adopted. It will be the responsibility of the California Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing in conjunction with local agencies to make the final decision on whether or not to designate TRPA as the RTPA for the California side of the basin.

3. Page 3-4 The air quality section should discuss the 6 PPM State standard for carbon monoxide as well as the 9 PPM Federal Standard. The TRPA carbon monoxide threshold is 6 PPM. (see next comment)


5. Page 3-6 The EIS needs to substantiate the statement that the completion of the Lake Parkway would reduce traffic congestion on Highway 50 by reducing trips and improving traffic flow.

6. Page 3-6 The funding sources for the proposed increases in STAGE service should be identified.

7. Page 3-13 The EIS fails to address the secondary impacts on vegetation of opening up the zoning to development.
Mr. Jim Reed, Chairman  
Page 3  
May 10, 1983  

8. Page 3-19 The EIS needs to identify specifically where noise levels are expected to decrease along Van Sickle due to traffic being diverted to Lake Parkway.  

9. Page 3-21 The EIS should assess the possible trip generation and growth resulting from increased access to the Tourist Commercial (TC) and High Density Residential (HDR) zones along Lake Parkway. Development in these areas would have a detrimental effect on traffic service at the Park Avenue/50 Intersection.  

10. Page 3-21 Under the provisions of the Compact, the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will not be de-activated until TTRA adopts both its Regional Plan and the implementing ordinances.  

11. Page 3-23 The EIS claims that the project will not generate any significant population growth. This does not appear to be consistent with the fact that the project will improve access to the undeveloped lands in a TC and HDR zone.  

12. Page 3-25 The discussion of the existing STAGE service needs to be updated.  

13. Figure 4-2 The peak hour traffic counts for Highway 50 eastbound between Pioneer Trail and Park Avenue are very high and do not correspond with the counts previously concurred with by Caltrans. An intersection traffic analysis should have been included in the EIS particularly for the Park Avenue/50 Intersection.  

14. Figure 4-4 The figure depicts ADTs which are 10.5% above existing ADTs. There should be an explanation of these impacts and a discussion of necessary mitigation.  

In summary, we believe it is very important for the EIS to be revised in a manner which will enable the document to provide environmental clearance for both the 490' pavement connection and the mitigation measures which go with this connection. We would also like to stress that all identified mitigation measures should be implemented to insure an effective transportation system upon completion of Lake Parkway.  

Very truly yours,  
Original signed by  
E. F. Galligan  

E. F. GALLIGAN  
Acting District Director of Transportation  

cc Kiyoh Ushino, CTRPA  
Ron Bass, State Clearinghouse  
Garland Hagen, DTP
May 10, 1983

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P. O. Box 8896
South Lake Tahoe, CA 95731

Dear Sir:

This Division has reviewed a summary statement from the Draft EIS for Lake Parkway (Loop Road) Completion. The National Register of Historic Places has been checked and no properties listed on or eligible to the Register are located within or near the proposed project area. Further, the project should have "no effect" on properties of National Register quality.

If prehistoric or historic materials are discovered during the course of the project, work should be temporarily halted and this office notified in order to record and photograph the remains.

Sincerely,

Alice M. Becker
Staff Archeologist

AMB/lmw

RECEIVED

MAY 12 1983

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
May 13, 1983

Philip Overeynder, Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 8896
South Lake Tahoe, CA 95731

REVIEW OF DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT, LAKE PARKWAY (LOOP ROAD) COMPLETION

Dear Mr. Overeynder:

We have reviewed this report, and wish to offer the following comments:

1. The preferred alternative in your agency's Regional Plan EIS includes completion of the Loop Road together with a pedestrian mall on Highway 50. Will the Loop Road as presently designed be adequate to handle all of the traffic to be diverted from Highway 50? If redesign is necessary, will there be additional water quality impacts?

2. Nitrate deposition impacts are not addressed in relation to projected traffic increases. Although the feeling at the scoping meeting was that these impacts would not be significant, it might be appropriate to reevaluate them in connection with the recent determination that most nitrate deposition is produced within the Lake Tahoe Basin, and with the projection in this EIS that traffic will increase 10.5% per year.

3. On page 3-10, an increase of 0.05% in dissolved inorganic nitrogen loading to Lake Tahoe is predicted. Is this a percentage of the total loading from the watershed, the watershed association, or the entire Basin?

Please contact Dr. Judith Unsicker at this office if you wish to discuss these comments.

Very truly yours,

ROY C. HAMPSON
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

cc: Regional Board Members
Andrew Sawyer, SWRCB
Norma Wood, State Clearinghouse
Philip Overeynder
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 8896
South Lake Tahoe, California 85731

Dear Phil:

My staff has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report of the Lake Parkway (Loop Road) Completion, March 1983, which was prepared by QUAD consultants.

We agree with the conclusion of the report that the project should be constructed but do not agree that the Lake Parkway should be a one-way northbound roadway.

The traffic analysis and mitigation provided by QUAD Consultants for the two build options is incomplete. It does not appear that they had a good understanding of the current traffic flow of the Nevada side of the Stateline area especially the egress and ingress of the Harrah's parking lot. At the present time a significant amount of the traffic exiting from Harrah's parking lot to California uses Van Sickle Road so this traffic is already impacting the US 50 and Park Avenue intersection. One advantage of completion of Lake Parkway (the loop road) would be to relieve traffic on Park Avenue. The consultants mitigating measure for two-way traffic on Lake Parkway includes channelization of the Montreal-Park-Lake Parkway intersection with an island which forces southbound traffic on Lake Parkway to the US 50 and Park Avenue intersection. This channelization is only one of the possible solutions to improve traffic flow through the intersection in question. It certainly does not improve the traffic conditions at US 50 and Park Avenue. This measure is counter productive and appears to be designed to discredit the potential benefits in an analysis of a two-way traffic operation on Lake Parkway. It appears that more than one set of mitigating measures should have been considered and presented in the report for both the one-way and the two-way operation of Lake Parkway. If the consultants did evaluate more options than were considered in the assessment they should have been discussed in the report.

RECEIVED

MAY 16 1983

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
Mr. Overeynder
May 13, 1983
Page 2

As the report is written the proposed one-way Lake Parkway completion connects with the two-way portion of Lake Parkway in Nevada. There is no discussion or consideration given to resolving this problem. Our evaluation of the one-way vs. two-way operation of Lake Parkway shows an increase in vehicle miles driven in the core area from the one-way operation which will impact the overall emission inventory. The proposed two-way operation of Lake Parkway with the mitigation measure will result in added vehicle miles and by recirculation increased congestion in a major existing hot spot. Other mitigating measures are available and should have been presented and analyzed in the report.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) modeling used in the study is extremely conservative and biased against any automobile operation. The basis of emission factors was also not explained. Background estimates are from the 1981 CARB study which contained some questionable values especially in model validation. This is highlighted by measured background concentrations which exceeded observed downwind concentrations. CARB used only the factor of 0.7 to convert from 1-hour CO values to 8-hour average CO values. This conversion factor considers only meteorological variations. It does not provide for a reduction in traffic volume and potential change of speed during the worst 8-hour period. The NDEP "Stateline, Nevada 1983 Carbon Monoxide Study", April 1983, showed the peak hour traffic value which was used to model the 1-hour CO values which in reality does not occur during the meteorological conditions which were described as worst case.

If there are any questions about these comments please contact Lowell Shifley of my staff.

Sincerely,

L. H. Dodgion, P.E.
Administrator

LHD/nd
VI  ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS, DETERMINATION OF TECHNICAL ADEQUACY

A. Lake Parkway (Loop Road) Completion, City of South Lake Tahoe

Bogush:  Question the staff's recommendation on the staff report says "Agency staff recommends that the APC determine the draft EIS is technically adequate".  Is that based on the fact that when you wrote this there were no comments?

George:  Yes that was based on hope and because of scheduling, concerns with the project itself and when that project construction could actually commence.  We were hoping that we would not receive any comments that required a response, that way we could keep on our schedule. That is not the case.  I have also been informed today that we will be receiving separate comments from Caltrans.  So I think we definitely do have comments that warrant a response so that really pushes our scheduling for a determination on the EIS back 30 days as I see it.

Popoff:  I'm a little puzzled about the air quality analyses that are in here.  According to the EIS they did models for three air quality stations; two of them showed a decrease, and the third one shows an increase.  And a quick scan of the memo from the Air Resources Board indicates that they would all end up in an increase in air pollution.  I really don't understand how each of these conclusions can be supported and I wondered if somebody could at least do a little hand waving argument and show me why if you build this Loop Road you decrease the air pollution on this side of the Loop Road, you increase it in the middle someplace and decrease it again just a little ways farther on.  Either there is something wrong with the model in the analysis or I fail to understand what's up.

Randolph:  First off I don't think that the letter is inconsistent.  We didn't say in the letter that there would be a worsening at all locations.  Our letter says there would be a betterment.  The concern..... you know I'd like to have you concentrate on the last sentence of the big paragraph on the last page where we are recommending an alternative.

Popoff:  No no that not what it says.  The last paragraph does; well maybe I'm reading it too fast.

Randolph:  Well let me......I think we have because what I guess I would want to emphasize is we're recommending an alternative.  We're not say no to a Loop Road.  We're simply saying that in the evaluation done by QUAD Consultants they have pointed out very clearly on page Table 4-2 the benefits and the disbenefits of the various alternatives, and if you look at that I would suggest that you turn to it, its near the end, and you look at the travel log site on the 8 hours count the "No Project" in 1987 is 19.3 ppm concentrations.  The one way has a 19.5 or an increase of .2; the limited access to Chonokis has a 23.5 with an increase of 4.2.  Now we said that in our letter that there are increases and decreases.  What we are trying to point out in our letter is rather than as the staff has suggested that they are both the same, they aren't the same; there is one better than the other and the one way alternative is.  The reason you can have an increase and a decrease is that you are going to have more traffic on Highway 50 between Park Avenue and Stateline with a one way operation.  So therefore the Sugar House site would have higher concentrations.
Poppoff: I don't understand what you're saying. With the Loop Road you should be taking traffic off of the section of Highway 50. The one that increases is Station 8 where it says Travelodge.

Randolph: No the 8 hour concentration is the Travelodge.

Poppoff: Well then I guess I'm sure where the Travelodge is here on the map.

Randolph: It's at the intersection of Park Avenue and Highway 50.

Poppoff: Now why would there be more traffic with the Loop Road at that point? I don't see why there should be any more than if you had no Loop Road. What would be the maximum, right?

Randolph: The Loop Road... maybe I ought to defer to staff... the Loop Road with a two-way operation the traffic that gets onto the Loop and comes off the Loop has to come out at that intersection or wander back through the community and the narrow...

Poppoff: But without the Loop Road that same traffic had to go through that same intersection.

Randolph: But you didn't have them stop at an intersection fighting for green time. There's a whole lot that went into the models.

Poppoff: Oh yes you do, that's not my experience, I don't know.

Randolph: You asked me whether the model was used was the same model that was used in the 1982 Nonattainment Plan.

Poppoff: And that model is based uses the assumption that there will be a traffic tie-up at the signal, is that what you are saying.

Randolph: It uses the assumption that there will be more traffic on a two-way operation trying to come out and make a left turn on Highway 50 to head west.

Poppoff: Not more traffic, they would just be sitting there longer.

Randolph: Well okay, let's use... I don't know, I didn't look at the traffic count as far as whether there is more or not, I... the point is that you are questioning the air quality output. It deals with the amount of traffic, the amount of idle time, or the speed of operations overall, plus the meteorology and all those other aspects.

Poppoff: Yeh but between the Sonora Lodge and Sonora Fire Station and the Travelodge is just a short distance, there's not any difference in the meteorology.

Randolph: It's not that short of distance, the only time its difference in meteorology.

Poppoff: The number of cars and there's probably little difference in their speed.
Randolph: Significant difference

Poppoff: and there was a big difference in the air pollution than the model showed.

Randolph: If you will look back perhaps you haven't looked at clearly as you should have, but you will find the speeds of operation are much more higher at the Sonora Fire House, than they are at the Travelodge.

Overeynder: I think perhaps to clear up Leo's question, to me it not a question of whether or not the air quality analysis that you are questioning is much as what are the trip distributions within this area with the different alternatives. I think what the analysis shows is that depending on whether or not you have a two-way Loop Road or a one-way Loop Road, you've got a different impact on different specific intersections. Now I think Keith (Maki) could explain very simply the differences between the different alternatives, as simply as possible with regard to Highway 50 in particular.

Maki: Okay I will try to make it simple and hopefully I can answer Mr. Poppoff's concern. With the one-way northbound into the Loop Road, in other words not a two-way basically I think the air quality analysis tells us that...that's not going to be very simple. Let me start this way, the two-way the reason the two-way is has the Sugar House is less is because you are removing trips a lot of vehicle trips off the Highway 50 Corridor. They are still a lot of those trips are still at the Park Avenue intersection or the Travelodge. An to agree with what Stan (Randolph) is saying the reason that particular site is not improved in air quality is because you've got more idle time for cars trying to make a left turn to 50 westbound. And in the modeling basically said that you wouldn't improve air quality. But what you do with the two-ways you take em off of that highway between the Travelodge and Stateline, so that improves in that area, but does not improve at the Travelodge. Okay the one-way what the one-way does is basically does not improve at the Sugar House because you've still got the same number of cars essentially going north and south, but it takes those cars that would be making a left turn onto Highway 50 and basically puts them into a through trip mode. In other words, they can pass through the area and therefore have less emissions because they are a through trip than they are a left turn. That's as simple as I can put it.

Poppoff: That means that your analysis has decided that people will idle at that intersection longer with the Loop Road than they do now with various traffic tie-ups that occur on Highway 50, is that right?

Maki: Yes. Basically yeh that's what the analysis is showing. What the analysis is showing with the two-way Loop, or with the two-way the big difference is that they did a traffic distribution analysis, and the big difference is the Caesar's trips. I'll just call them Caesar's trips, because right now the Caesar's trips use Highway 50; with the two-way Loop they would use or the two direction thing they would use the Loop Road therefore they would be making a right turn into and a left turn out of, instead of a through trip. That puts more left turns at the intersection which is the critical movement at that intersection is the left turn from Park Avenue on Highway 50 westbound, because that's the critical movement and because the amount of green time that's allowed there, its basically saying that its going to sit there longer.
Poppoff: Which way is the one-way go...I don't have the thing in front of me?

Maki: The one-way is northbound or from toward the casinos that the way the one-way goes.

Poppoff: Okay fine, okay, all right now I see.

Maki: Now nothing else affects it, it's only the Caesar's trips that affect it. Basically that's the big difference between the two analyses. Harrah's trips doesn't make any difference whether there's a two-way Loop or a one-way Loop because Harrah's people would either access through Van Sickle or they would access through the Loop, but it doesn't make any difference. The other difference that can be drawn but it wasn't modeled because it wasn't an alternative as we saw it, was the limited access to the Chonokis neighborhood. Now from a traffic analysis standpoint that would even reduce the emissions at the Park Avenue but it would basically take those take that emissions and move them into the neighborhood and we felt that because that wasn't a viable alternative.

Randolph: That's a good summary, thank you.

Harper: Brad (Kortick) you had a question.

Poppoff: I don't think its true, but it's a good summary. I don't think it'll happen that way, I guess is what I'm saying.

Kortick: Just two points, first one being I don't understand why you needed a center turn lane on the highway, maybe someone from the City can explain that, on the extention I mean in an area where supposedly you're not going to have any growth inducing affects. Is that because of some emergency access that needs emergency vehicles that need an extra lane to travel through or something like that?

Maki: In other words you're saying why are they building this non-critical extention with a left turn median or a left turn lane the whole distance?

Kortick: I don't understand why it would be needed.

George: I would like to answer that the part that the County has already constructed contains a center turn lane and so I think just to match the same width and not have to bring it down they proposed to extend the same road section.

Kortick: Can actually left turn lanes be done?

Randolph: No. You're in a big cut I think aren't you for the whole thing?

Maki: Well I'm not saying that what Harrah's is going to propose to do, Stan could probably address that, but I know Harrah's will probably put, maybe I should say to qualify that, will probably put an entrance to their parking lot from this road that would require some left turn, but as to why they are going to build a whole section with it I can't answer that, I'll have to defer that to the City.
Randolph: But that part is built, right? I think his question is what about this other piece where you're in a cut and there's no place to go, why have... you know maybe it's a...it doesn't bother me that much, and I think I understand what you're saying. You've got three lanes of traffic that you have no need for a left turn lane through that area.

George: I don't think that access off the Loop Road is prohibited right now. It does require review and approval by the Agency. At the time the Governing Board approved the Douglas County portion of the Loop Road, the Agency did not review commercial projects unless they were three acres or more in size. They were concerned that without their review, Douglas County could approve commercial projects along that Loop Road and allow access off the Loop Road so they put a condition on their approval of the Loop Road that there would be no access off the Loop Road unless it was approved by the Agency. And that's even more the case today with the new Compact. But I don't think that it's actually prohibited. There's also access to I think a horse stables or Sierra Pacific Power Plant or power substation or something up in that area that the City has had to deal with and that may be necessary, I'm not sure, but maybe Tim Oliver could answer that question also.

Kortick: Before he answers that, one more question. I just wondered if you could review real quickly the effects on the neighborhood where you feel the net affect would be positive or negative on the people who live down there on the California side?

Maki: Well existing, there is approximately 3,000 trips per day through that neighborhood right now. What the barrier with the completion of the, well the building of the barrier on Montreal, essentially try to keep that at the 3,000 vehicle level. If you didn't have the barriers, essentially you're gonna not double, but put a lot more trips into that neighborhood which is more emissions or more noise. So essentially both alternatives would keep the neighborhood status quo. That was why the one-way would keep the neighborhood basically the same existing situation and the two-way with the barrier would keep it hopefully keep it in the existing condition also. So there would be no increase impacts. The locals use the neighborhood already, and there's not much we can do about that unless we close off the neighborhoods from you know access off of Pioneer Trail. The locals use...come down Pioneer Trail cut through the neighborhood and go into the casino parking lot as it is.

Pyle: Well I'm from one of those locals who go that way and if you give me a better access I wouldn't wander up through the neighborhood.

Maki: An interesting point in the traffic analysis showed that if we go through with the Phase II Caltrans improvements in that intersection it actually generated more trips on the Highway 50 than without it and that was because all of a sudden it would be easier to use Highway 50 than the neighborhood and it would generate...pull more trips from Pioneer Trail on the Highway 50 back then onto Park Avenue.

Harper: Okay. Further comments or questions.

Randolph: Yeh I would like to make some comments, rather than try to respond. I didn't do my response very well.
Harper: Connie (Sparbel)

Sparbel: I have a question when you come down Montreal Road, why do you dump everybody into the puzzle labeled Chonokis? Why don't you bring them through to Glen Road or bring them through to Pioneer Trail, or bring them through to Highway 50, or do anything but dump 'em or dump everybody who's lost or wants to get through down into the neighborhood?

Maki: Well that's the purpose of the barrier; basically to take the visitor and dump him back onto Highway 50 at Park Avenue.

Sparbel: But why don't you take the visitor and get him through all that puzzle and back out on the Highway 50 instead of just dumping him into that neighborhood. I think the neighborhood is going to be screaming.

Maki: I think ultimately that would be the plan.

Renz: This isn't the ultimate plan?

Maki: I can't speak for the City, I don't know what the...you know I've asked the City to address that same question, but you know they basically don't want to address it right now.

Sparbel: Maybe I need to address that question to the City then, is that what you're saying?

Maki: Yeh.

Sparbel: Thank you.

Randolph: What I'd like to do is kinda go through systematically my thoughts on it and just offer them as comments. First off, looking at the summary of the staff report, there's about three things that troubled me because in reviewing the document it is very clear that QUAD has said you need the mitigation measures to go along with this project to make the improvements in air quality and the traffic flow and everything else. And in the summary it makes a statement that the City this is the project, the construction project. The City will stripe the traffic lanes at Park Avenue at its intersection with Highway 50 as interim measures in conformance with Caltrans recommendations. Then later on it says, and this is just a thought, mitigation for air quality degradation resulted for potential of increased traffic is to improve mass transit, it doesn't say how that will happen. And then, lastly, is the conclusion which I do want to get back to that chart and claim why I disagree with the conclusion. It says it is concluded that the one-way access alternative and the limited access to Chonokis alternative are equally superior to the no project alternative because of their lessor traffic impacts because there is no significant differential in air quality impacts between the three alternatives and because there is no significant unmitigatable environmental differences between the three alternatives. And if you look on Table 4-2 and you look under no project one-way and limited access for 1987 under the Travelodge for 8 hour, the 1987 with no project we had a 19.3 part per million concentration. Under the one-way alternative is an increase of two tenths of a percent, 19.5. Under the limited access it increase to 23.5 for a 4.2 increase. That's in the document. As opposed to, and I want to point out that it was the Sugar House
location where in the 1982 Air Quality Plan that we had the most difficulties demonstrating attainment of the standard...the federal standard. As a matter of fact, at one point in the plan, and maybe it still does have it, that a little pie shaped piece where we would never make 9 parts per million, we didn't find that we couldn't make the federal standard in '87 at either the Sonora Street Fire House Station or the Sugar House. So that station is more critical and you'll find that we have a significant increase at that one location with a limited two-way project, and its at that basis that we disagree with the staff recommendation that they're the same, and that recommendation was also incorporated in the document for that analysis is that they were substantially the same. In our letter, again I'll point out that we did not say no to the Loop Road, we're saying yes to it but lets make it perform properly. We think the one-way alternative is the best one, but in any case nothing should be accomplished without the mitigation measures that Caltrans and this document say are essential to generate the air quality of its values that are included in the program. And then I get some other problems of timing that I guess I need to espouse. For one thing we are looking at a draft document, we haven't seen the final comments for us to determine that it's technically adequate. I don't know how I can do that without a final document. So I don't see how we can take an action other than provide comments, and I guess that's what Greg was saying on the pulpit up there is that maybe that's all we can do today. And then the other part of it I guess would be, can there be a project, and I don't believe there can be without certification of the Regional Plans document, and a plan developed whether it be simply a transportation element of the general plan or whatever, which brings me back then to the time line of.....

McMullen: Wait a minute, explain that one before we move on.

Randolph: Okay. You can't... you cannot have a project on the Loop Road until you have a transportation plan, the way I read the Compact.

McMullen: Oh thats that consideration of a Loop Road argument.

Randolph: But that brings me back then to the question of timing which is in the staff report where it indicates that this proposal is to have it open this July. I don't see how that can happen. We've delayed certification through the environmental impact statement for the plan and if we don't have a plan how can you have a project?

Harper: Okay. Andy (Sawyer).

Sawyer: A couple of comments mostly dealing with the process. One, I think that in the case of all environmental impact statements and the APC (inaudible) hearing is within the comment period, and APC comments are made which are not mere duplication of our written comments, that the comment and response document should include those. That was done on Roundhill, and Brockway, and I think we should follow the Roundhill (inaudible). Specificaly I'm interested in Chonokies; because I haven't thought of it before, is that is can we reduce the coverage by eliminating the left turn lane for example? Thats a comment I'd like to see a response to if I can provide a way of reducing impacts. But finally I have a question on process and that is what can if this document is certified for the Regional Plan, are you going to take another look at the Regional Plan and see if there are new impacts that have (inaudible) or consider whether a supplemental document is necessary and coordinate two environmental documents?
Overreynder: Basically the way we proposed to coordinate the two environmental documents is this document assesses the environmental impacts of this specific project and its alternatives to it. The EIS on the Regional Plan and specifically the transportation element only includes alternatives that would allow some sort of Loop Road configuration. If we were to receive any specific comments with regard to that on the EIS for the Regional Plan we would respond to those in addition these specific concerns that are addressed in the project EIS.

Harper: Okay this is a comment and question period. It is my understanding that you're not looking for action today, we'll provide you the comment response document that action on this will occur next month. Correct?

George: Yes.

Harper: Any other comments, questions? Glenn (Smith)

Smith: It seemed like the statement could be improved if there had been an aerial photograph showing the whole general area there to make it easier for people to relate to the types of buildings and residential areas, and so forth that are connected and also the business relationships in that area, rather than the line drawings of just the roads. I was pleased to see the changes made in the side slopes; they're speaking about laying them back so that they really can be vegetated rather than minimize the amount of cut and fill the original draft had had. I think that's a good step forward. That's all I had.

Harper: Tim (Oliver from City of South Lake Tahoe).

Oliver: Mike, I'd like to make a comment the preliminary plans what I'd like to point out is it was brought up why we have it the width it is...it's 40 so feet on exact curve. What it presently means we will keep the same geometric of the existing Loop Road; we don't want to change it, we don't want to narrow it down to the Montreal areas. And also on this area which is to the north there is an apartment building in there that's the only access they have is off the Loop Road presently now. They do have another access on Van Sickle Road, but that's private, if anybody wanted to cut it off they probably could. So that's why we do need that left turn lane in there to provide that extra width and also keep the geometrics and give that man access into their apartments.

Randolph: What is the cut depth...where would that access be? Physically you're going to have a difficult time putting that in.

Oliver: No, no the access is on the area where there is no cut over there. If you cut that side it's

Randolph: Okay - near the front then?

Oliver: The cut on that side is zero basically.

Randolph: Okay, so your near Montreal then, or near Park Avenue?

Oliver: We're near the Park Avenue where the bell is down there.
Randolph: With about 490 feet then, how much of that is in a fairly extensive cut that you wouldn't be able to physically put left turn?

Oliver: You've got approximately about 300 feet there on the south side of that roadway.

Randolph: I think that was your point.

Harper: Any further questions.

Pyle: I've just got one and I have reviewed this very quickly, but I guess on 3-13 there is something on vegetation and I'm not sure is totally correct, and I have to know they've got a vegetation plan put together for this, but the EIS says that your...a Soil Conservation Service says don't use native vegetation, but you didn't say in the EIS what you're going to use. That's on 3-13.

Oliver: What we've always done Dick, as you probably aware of and just to clarify with everybody else, once we get our preliminary plans done we meet with all the agencies and get their approval.....

Pyle: We've already got it in but it isn't in the EIS is what I'm saying.

Oliver: No, but it'll be included in our contract document that using a set of plans we can put it on make a set of plans, if not then its in our contract specifications, so it is always included on the construction phase of it.

Pyle: Yeh, I've seen those, I've already review them.

Harper: Connie (Sparbel)

Sparbel: Since I presume you're with the City I would like to know why Montreal Road, the question why it wasn't brought back into Pioneer Trail or Highway 50, why that wasn't addressed, resolved or something done. I think you are just creating more problems.

Oliver: You mean addressed in the EIS?

Sparbel: Yes, why did you decide not to solve that problem?

Oliver: You mean take Montreal presently continued on through and into...

Sparbel: Into Pioneer Trail and Highway 50.

Oliver: That is a heavy residential area. I'm not sure if you are familiar with its narrow streets in there, quite a bit of old housing, narrow streets in there presently only 40 feet of right-of-way, a lot of cross streets, and that would be more of a congestion in that area, I believe than what you have now, by bringing it into Parking Avenue and get 'em back out to the highway.

McMullen: Give her some indication to if you could of what the distance is from the turn on Montreal to maybe potentially Ski Run Boulevard and Pioneer Trail.
Oliver: You're probably talking almost a mile in that area, and probably from the present Montreal at Park intersection to Pioneer Trail if you meandered and made several left hand or right hand turns or 90 degree turns you're probably looking at half a mile to Pioneer Trail.

Sparbel: I'm not talking about that, I'm just talking about where Pioneer Trail stops to the south, why it, I mean where Montreal Road stops to the south why haven't you brought it over to Pioneer Trail? I know you said that there are narrow streets, 50 foot, I mean 40 foot and you aren't going to put them on 40 foot streets, but why aren't you bringing the road around.

(several people replied there's a motel there.)

Sparbel: But, so buy the motel and condemn it, that's what it's for. I'm not advocating buying and condemning that motel, we're talking about long range planning, and it seems to me if we are talking about long range planning that motel could be gone in 20 years, or it could be gone in 10 years, or it could be gone tomorrow, but there's no there's no consideration of doing that and you...

Harper: So I think it's a question that genuinely needs to be addressed in your response document.

Sparbel: I just think it needs to be discussed.

Oliver: Okay, I still don't understand where you are talking about; at the corner of Park and Montreal?

Harper: No, you know where Montreal dips to the north and then actually becomes Chonokis, why Chonokis does not go to Pioneer Trail.

Sparbel: And then over to Highway 50

Harper: Or why your not proposing Montreal over to Glen Road.

Oliver: I see what you're talking about now.

Sparbel: It just appears to me that on the map it just a short distance and it seems to me it's a question that needs to be answered, when we are talking about long range planning, just because a motel is there, to me is not a reason to ignore the possibility of using it, or whatever.

Olive: What is deceiving is this map is not to scale and I think that's quite deceiving if like what was mentioned before about an aerial that would have been very helpful and I think you would have seen not only the contours of the mounds, the physical structures, and the widths, etcetera and that type of thing it would not be a good access through that area and that is why this one has been chosen. It had been looked at, but I'm not sure if it has been addressed or not.

Sparbel: Thank you.

Harper: Further comments, questions. If not...sorry Bill (Combs).
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Combs: It is a question perhaps more in terms of where this one goes to project and as far as the adequacy of the EIS, but Stan raised a point about provision of the Compact that requires adoption of a transportation element prior to project approval. I don't have my copy of the Compact, but is that the case?

Overeynder: That is the case, yes.

Combs: So implementation of this as a project cannot happen until after the Regional Plan?

Overeynder: We've got a processing problem in terms of approving some particular project absent a Regional transportation element.

Combs: Thank you.

Harper: Further comments, questions. If no lets move on to 3rd Street and South Avenue extensions and improvements. Again the City of South Lake Tahoe.

Randolph: Mike excuse me, Connie brought up a point I think the reason you know ultimately in long range, back to the Loop, something needs to be done perhaps to get people back out onto Pioneer Trail that way, but I don't think it was within the ability of this particular consultant to look that far ahead, and they were trying to come up with a project to get the Loop Road opened and these were short term type solutions. That doesn't preclude long range planning process looking at that and coming up with a better solution. Wouldn't you agree Ann.

(reply inaudible)

Harper: Would you suggest then that that is something that needs to be addressed in the transportation element of the Regional Plan.

Randolph: I would be ready to certify this thing the way it is, would be resolution of the concerns that I have, without that...

Harper: Okay.

Randolph: Personally, but I think that in the long range we need to be looking at that, because for an example that's where the city bus operates back that way right now, and they pick their way through the roads.

Harper: On this, or on the next one?

Sawyer: It's in response to what Stan was saying. My thoughts on this is that there is a requirement under the California Environmental Quality Act that it think is quite reasonable for interpretation of the bistate Compact, that once you prepare an environmental impact statement/environmental impact report no further document is necessary unless there are changes either in the project or in the environment, or in the information we have about either that shows either significant impacts or values. And I think that means that if we certify this EIS first, what we have to do is, after the plan is completed, that is not to either the staff can do it, or even the City the lead agency could do it, go back check and make sure that nothing new came up in the Regional Plan that's added.
information or changes in the surrounding environment that creates significant impacts that weren't evaluated. If there are such things then you do a supplement to address them - the process makes it possible to complete this EIS first before the Regional Plan, and just take a look and make you've got it covered after the Regional Plan is completed. We don't know that some new idea won't come through in the Regional Plan that completely changes the surrounding circumstances so that this project will have a different impact than we originally thought.

McMullen: Could we have Phil restate what he said?

Overeynder: In terms of how the Regional Plan EIS will fit with this project EIS? As I indicated the Regional Plan EIS addresses the Loop Road as a completed element of all of the alternatives that we've evaluated. Although to some extent the scale of the Loop Road changes, depending on whether or not you're talking about a pedestrian corridor along the... for instance along the casino core. But in all cases we looked at that as a baseline in all the alternatives, completion of this particular section of the Loop Road. What I indicated to Andy is that if we receive any comments regarding any of those additional concerns about long range types of concerns for transportation systems in that area we would respond to those in the EIS for the transportation element of the Regional Plan.

McMullen: Does this EIS take into account possibility of a mall?

Overeynder: This project EIS? No

McMullen: I didn't think so.

I certify that to the best of my ability this is a verbatim transcript of the Environmental Impact Statement, Determination of Technical Adequacy for the Lake Parkway (Loop Road) Completion, City of South Lake Tahoe, as discussed and taped in its entirety at the May 11, 1983 Advisory Planning Commission meeting.

Signed
Mary Bailey
Secretary II

Dated: May 17, 1983
Edith A. Wilson
Community Development Coordinator
Current Planning Division

Dear Edith:

The following are my comments on the EIS for the Loop Road Completion.

I will give them sequentially listing the page on which the data is entered:

p. 2-5 Planned "lease" of Caltrans - why a lease rather than purchase?

p. 3-1 (Next page chart): Ozone and regional visibility not considered in this EIS - they should be.

p. 3-2 Project being completed in a Watershed already 150% over the allowed coverage!

p. 3-2 25,000 cubic yards of material to be excavated and removed from the site. Where this material is to be disposed is not addressed in the EIS. This is a significant impact.

p. 3-6 "Reducing trips" on Highway #50 means shifting trips to other roadways in the immediate vicinity.

p. 3-6 Parkway would reduce trips on Hwy #50 and "may" improve traffic flow!

p. 3-6 Comment on potential benefit from buying 8 additional busses and building 30 pullouts and 45 bus shelters makes no commitment that this will be done.

p. 3-8 Surface runoff: Diverted from the project to Tahoe Meadows where we already have an uncontrolled drainage mess which only "might" be corrected by the Wildwood Project if it is funded.

p. 3-10 Pelagic zone: Increase of 0.05% of DIN load to the lake is not a very understandable figure.

p. 3-10 An increase of 0.1% of the DIN load for the whole Association #8 is described as small, but it is 0.1% of the whole contribution from South Shore which may or may not be "small".

p. 3-10 An increase in a factor that cannot be quantified is hard to describe as small, moderate or large.

p. 3-13 How does it happen that the Calif. Dept of Fish and Game is vegetation analysis?
p. 3-13 Revegetation of the disturbed portions of the project should not be with species "similar" to those in the immediate vicinity but should be identical native plants.

p. 3-15 Using boulders on site for erosion control is essentially useless there are many available effective methods of erosion control.

3-15 There are at least two active osprey nests in the basin. Spotted owls have been identified on the west shore. They are a resident non-migratory bird so surely they are nesting in the basin - not just feeding here.

p. 3-15 I doubt if there are as many as 5,000 visitor-days of hunters in the basin. Maybe they are including fishermen as well.

p. 3-24 The text accurately states that the Park Ave. - Hwy 550 intersection experiences severe operational problems during peak summer and winter days. The changes in striping at the intersection are very unlikely to resolve these problems. Physical widening of the Park Ave. part on the east side - available land in the Crescent V Parking lot. The two right angle bends in Park Ave. should be smoothed or eliminated to permit free flow of traffic.

p. 3-28 It is often stated that response time for emergency vehicles is excessively long. I have never seen any data supporting this assumption. We cannot plan our traffic circulation system to accommodate bombing incidents like at Harvey's.

p. 3-28 Is there any data as to evacuation outside of "discussions".

p. 3-33 Second paragraph - "orientate" is neither a word nor an adjective.

p. 3-38 Any commitment that a buffer strip or just a good idea. I would hope that the new road will not introduce further development east of the road.

p. 3-33 Archaeological surveys performed 1 mile away from the site are of no significance as to this site. Discoveries made during development of a roadway indicate too late a time to accomplish anything as to evaluating the significance of the site or its mitigation - besides bull dozer drivers are not very astute at identifying artifacts. The EIS should admit that archeological resources are being ignored and not beat about the bush.

p. 4-1 The EIS admits that the traffic counts do not sound very definitive. Off peak counts "adjusted" for peak situation sounds rather weak. Counts for U.S.50/Stateline and Pioneer/Glen were "factored" from winter data based on adjacent intersections! The report states no growth in traffic coming into the basin on Highway 50 (just below Echo Summit) but does not offer any explanation of this. So a 2X per year growth rate for 1982-97 is assumed without data to support it.

p. Chart 4-3: Projects in 1987 3,510 cars will use the loop road on peak summer weekend 24 hour period. This averages 146 cars per hour! 6,230 are predicted to still be using Van Sickla road, more than are using it now. Considering the cost of the project this seems to be rather slight benefit for traffic improvement.

p. 4-3 The EIS admits there is no clear air quality benefit of the two project alternatives over the no project alternative.
p. 4-4 The EIS quotes "Caltrans Phase 2 plan" to provide additional lane on Highway 50 to provide free right turn onto Park from Hwy. 50 but this is not shown on any of the plans or diagrams. No mention is made whether this "plan" is a commitment by Caltrans or just a dream.

p. 4-4 I cannot tell from the document whether the additional turning lanes discussed are just striping changes or actual physical additional turning lanes.

I also cannot understand the "one westbound lane" west of the intersection - will they not at least preserve the two westbound lanes presently existing?

Fig. 4-8 The Fern road cul de sac is not indicated on any of the diagrams.

p. 4-6 The air quality analysis assumes no increase in traffic by 1987,

The traffic analysis assumes a 10+% increase in traffic by then.

Chart 4-13 Identifies "links for air quality analysis" this term is defined nowhere in the document.

p. 5-2 Public acquisition of the lands zoned tourist commercial east of the project in the forest should be strongly recommended rather than just suggested - these lands could be the major growth inducement effect of the project.

Summary: My conclusion is that when the cost of the project to the city is considered the final effect of providing a road for 3,510 cars each way on the road on a peak summer day is not worth the cost of the completion of the road. Traffic benefits on Highway 50 would probably not be detectable. Air quality would not be benefited. Surface runoff would compound the Wildwood - Tahoe Meadows existing drainage mess. We have no current assurance that plans to solve the Wildwood problems will actually be accomplished.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Kenneth C. Smith M.D.
Planning Commissioner
(speaking only for myself)
MEMORANDUM

June 2, 1983

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: Third Street and South Avenue Extensions and Improvements, Environmental Impact Statement Response to Comments, Agenda Item V B.

During the APC's consideration of the technical adequacy of the subject EIS in May the following comments were received:

1. In order to comply with TRPA Ordinance 81-5 the project must directly offset the additional land coverage within stream environment zones by restoring stream environment zone elsewhere.

2. Consideration should be given to connecting the South Avenue extension to Melba and connecting with Highway 50 south of the proposed intersection.

3. The potential for traffic conflicts within the left turn lane between the proposed campground road intersection with Highway 50 and the Raley's shopping center south entrance should be further addressed.

The attached addendum from the City of South Lake Tahoe addresses these three comments.

The comment period for the Draft EIS ended on May 29, 1983. No additional comments have been received.

Based upon the information contained in the Draft EIS and the attached addendum, Agency staff recommends certification of the technical adequacy of the EIS.

JD:md

Attachment
Comments received from members of the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission at its May 11, 1983 meeting, and the responses thereto, constitute an Addendum to the environmental impact document for the project listed above:

COMMENT:
Andrew Sawyer of California State Water Resources Control Board referred to construction within the stream environment zone and offsetting mitigation measures required by State law.

RESPONSE: See paragraph 2b on pages N.9 and N.12 of the document in response to similar comments from Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.

As a project necessary to protect public health and safety, the proposal conforms to the requirements for a variance from the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Plan’s prohibition against construction within an SEZ.

The Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, in establishing waste discharge requirements for this project, has decreed that no offsetting mitigation is otherwise required in view of the City’s intention to proceed with the proposed D Street Drainage Project, now in the design stage.

COMMENT:
Glenn Smith, U.S. Forest Service, questioned if consideration had been given to using Melba Drive-C Street to exit onto Emerald Bay Road (Highway 50-89). Another member’s comment referred to possible routing of the extension through another of the parcels located between the preferred alternative (the Tahoe Valley Campground Road) and C Street.

RESPONSE: See paragraph 4 on page F.2 and that part of paragraph 3i commencing at the top of page N.22 of the document.

It is true that neither of the two narrow undeveloped parcels extending through from Melba Drive to Highway 50-89 were mentioned in the document. Nor were two other parcels in this vicinity – one semi-developed parcel fronting
Melba Drive and the contiguous vacant parcel fronting the highway. However, their consideration was rejected for the same reasons (other than encroachment into the Campground area) for which other properties between existing South Avenue and existing Melba Drive were rejected, as noted in the document. Use of any of these parcels, in any event, would mean a somewhat longer trip for emergency vehicles and would interfere with Campground traffic moving between the Campground Road and the main campground entrance off Melba Drive at C Street.

(It should be noted that, since the original information was developed for the environmental document, the City, as a separate project, has paved Melba Drive.)

**COMMENT:**

Stan Randolph of Air Resources Board was concerned as to the possible conflict in the left turn lane with vehicles either entering or exiting the southernmost SOUTH Y SHOPPING CENTER driveway.

**RESPONSE:** See paragraph 3c on page N.18. Exhibit No. 13, page N.19, discloses there were no accidents 1979-1982 in the 190 foot stretch between the centerline of the shopping center driveway and the centerline of the proposed South Avenue extension. However, the possibility of such conflict as Mr. Randolph suggests is real, but considered minimal at this time and should be eliminated shortly.

Although there is sufficient stacking room between the two points for 7 or 8 cars or a semi truck-trailer and 4 cars, periodic observations over the past few weeks have disclosed but one occasion when more than one car (two in this instance) were waiting in the left turn lane. It is only a rare shopper who does make a left turn into this entrance; the shopper-preferred access from Highway 50-89 is very apparently the 35 ft. next northerly driveway.

The south driveway was originally designed, and approved, as a narrow "entrance only" to enable delivery trucks to reach the rear of stores within the Center, with exit point onto Lake Tahoe Blvd. Consequently, left turn entrances into this south drive most generally occur in early morning hours by Raley's, K-Mart, or other delivery trucks. It is recognized that some vehicles do exit from this point, and some of these do indeed turn left to move northward on Highway 50-89.

At this time, the City of South Lake Tahoe is handling with the property owner, when repairing the parking lot this 1983 season, to restore the 90° parking configuration originally approved for the Center. This will enable cars to more easily maneuver so as to exit from the wider driveway. At the same time, some sort of "entrance only" designation will be required for the south driveway in order to conform with the Center's original conditions of approval. This should eliminate the potential for conflict caused by exiting left turns.
Third Street and South Avenue Extensions and Improvements, Draft Environmental Impact Statement, City of South Lake Tahoe

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) evaluates the environmental impacts of improving and extending Third Avenue and South Street within the City of South Lake Tahoe. The purpose of the project is to alleviate traffic congestion at intersections within one-half mile of the South Tahoe WYE and to provide safer, more direct access to Barton Memorial Hospital.

The first segment of the project is improvement of the existing Third Street and its extension to Tahoe Island Drive. General improvements include widening the street to 32 feet, adding curb and gutter, and improving the existing storm drainage system along Third Street between U.S. Highway 50 and James Avenue. The second segment will be an extension of Third Street south of U.S. Highway 50 through undeveloped property to connect with Second Street, which provides access to Barton Memorial Hospital. Improvements include paving, curb and gutter, and drainage facilities. The third segment involves extension of South Avenue westerly to connect with U.S. Highway 50 one-quarter mile south of the South Tahoe WYE. Improvements include pavement widening, curb and gutter, and drainage facilities.

Environmental Setting: The existing Third Street segment is located in the EfB (capability level 7) and Ev (capability level 1b and stream environment zone - SEZ) soil types. This section of roadway will be widened creating 6,784 square feet of additional land coverage within the SEZ. The extension of Third Street is located in an EfB soil type.

Between Highway 50 and Barton Avenue 9,180 square feet of additional land coverage within an SEZ is proposed. From Barton Avenue to Second Street the soil type is EfB (capability 7).

The southward extension of South Avenue will add 20,822 square feet with an SEZ (Ev soil type). A portion of this extension will be over the existing Tahoe Valley Campground road. The total new impervious surface due to the project is 94,111 square feet. The new land coverage within identified SEZ's is 47,730 square feet. The number of trees proposed for removal is 180. The trees are primarily Jeffrey pine.

Alternatives to the Proposed Project: The draft EIS/EIR evaluated alternative alignments for the portion of the project south of Highway 50 connecting with either Fourth Street or Second Street. Both alignments would result in additional land coverage within the SEZ adjacent to Highway 50. The Second Street alignment is proposed to connect directly with the revised emergency entrance to Barton Hospital. This alignment does not involve adding an additional conflict at the Fourth Street intersection which is now a 4-way intersection. This alignment also involves no removal of structures.
Third Street and South Avenue Extensions and Improvements
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Three alternatives were analyzed for the extension of South Avenue. The first alternative leads between the Lakeside Theatre and McDonald's restaurant adjacent to the South Tahoe Wye. This alignment was rejected for three reasons. First, the alignment would cross a natural drainage channel that is classified as a first order stream. Second, the alignment would conflict with the theatre and McDonald's operations. Third, this alignment would result in traffic movement conflicts along Highway 50 south of and at the Wye. This extension would be located about 500 feet south of the Wye.

The second alternative would extend South Avenue between Mom's Restaurant and the Standard Station. This alignment was also rejected due to proximity to the South Tahoe Wye and encroachment in the first order stream.

The chosen alternative will extend South Avenue to intersect with the existing Tahoe Valley Campground road which avoids crossing the first order stream, utilizes the existing disturbed power pole alignment and utilizes the existing campground road.

Traffic: Currently, traffic accessing the Tahoe Island Drive area from Highway 50 must use Tahoe Keys Boulevard. It is estimated that the proposed Third Street extension will divert approximately 1500 vehicle trips per day from this intersection. This will raise the service level at the Tahoe Keys intersection and result in a reduction of 344 vehicle miles per day. The estimated carbon monoxide emissions reduction is 15 kilograms per day. In addition, the intersection of Third Street and Highway 50 will be signalized with the signal phasing controlled in conjunction with the Tahoe Keys intersection.

The extension of Third Street to interconnect with Second Street will provide more direct access to the residential, commercial and hospital area south of Highway 50. This will confine more of the traffic in this area to a central corridor and provide more direct access to Barton Hospital for emergency vehicles. The South Avenue extension will achieve the same goals. The South Avenue extension is projected to carry approximately 1300 vehicles daily. The total estimated carbon monoxide emission reduction is 29.1 kilograms per day.

Unavoidable Impacts:

1. Removal of approximately 180 Jeffrey pine trees.

2. Creation of 47,730 square feet of land coverage within identified SEZ's.

3. Creation of land coverage in excess of 1% within identified SEZ's.
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Mitigation Measures:

1. The applicant proposes to acquire sufficient land area adjacent to the project to bring the project land coverage to 30%. The project will not comply with the 1% land coverage standard applicable to SEZ's. Under Section 13.31 of TRPA Ordinance 81-5 public works projects can be allowed to exceed the land coverage standards if the following findings are made:
   
   The project is necessary to comply with the nonattainment air quality plan, or the transportation element of the Regional Plan, or is necessary for public health, safety and welfare, and all feasible alternatives not involving construction within the SEZ have been exhausted.

2. TRPA Best Management Practices for drainage and erosion control will be implemented for the project impacted areas.

3. Signalization of Third Street and Highway 50 will be completed as part of the project.

4. Evaluation will be undertaken of the need to signalize the South Avenue and Highway 50 intersection.

Recommendation:

Based upon the information submitted as part of the EIR and the responses to comments incorporated prior to circulation of the draft EIS, Agency staff recommends certification of the technical adequacy of the EIS by the Advisory Planning Commission.
POOR QUALITY ORIGINAL (S) TO FOLLOW

HIGH DESERT MICROIMAGING, INC.
1225 FINANCIAL BLVD
RENO, NV 89502
(775) 359-6980
MEMORANDUM

June 2, 1983

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Certification of Rubicon Water System Reconstruction EIR/EIS

The Tahoe City Public Utility District proposes to reconstruct the water system in the Rubicon Properties Subdivision on the west shore of Lake Tahoe in El Dorado County. The present system is in a state of extreme deterioration and is in need of major renovation in order to provide water supply which meets drinking water standards and fire protection demands, and which can operate all year. The California Department of Health Services has ordered an improvement in the water quality supplied to Rubicon Properties Subdivision.

Alternatives

All alternatives include abandonment of the present point of diversion (Lonely Gulch Reservoir) and require replacement of the 3 inch lines with 6 inch lines to provide adequate fire flows. The new distribution system will be winterized to prevent freezing. The key features of the proposed alternatives are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Supply</th>
<th>Storage System</th>
<th>Distribution System</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 1</td>
<td>Lake intake</td>
<td>2 tanks - 200,000 gal.</td>
<td>Complete replacement. $1,579,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 150,000 gal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 2</td>
<td>Lake intake</td>
<td>3 tanks - 140,000 gal.</td>
<td>Complete replacement. $1,670,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 140,000 gal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 70,000 gal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 3</td>
<td>Lake intake</td>
<td>2 tanks - 280,000 gal.</td>
<td>Partial replacement. $1,399,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70,000 gal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 4</td>
<td>Lake intake</td>
<td>3 tanks - 140,000 gal.</td>
<td>Partial replacement. $1,496,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140,000 gal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70,000 gal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 5</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>2 tanks - 280,000 gal.</td>
<td>Partial replacement. $1,391,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70,000 gal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rubicon Water System Reconstruction
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All of the proposed alternatives would provide adequate service for new development permitted in the service area, which would include 19 new residences under the present CTRPA and State of California 208 Plan criteria. The sizing of the distribution system is based on meeting the fire flow requirements which are greater than the customer service demands.

Consequences and Impacts

- Water use will decrease since the system will not require "bleeding" during the winter to prevent freezing.

- Water conservation programs will be implemented.

- Vehicle trips would be increased dependent upon the level of development permitted by the 1983 TRPA Regional Plan. Utilizing the present development criteria permitting only 19 more residences would increase total VMT by 12,841.

- Water quality of Lonely Gulch and Meeks Creek would not be significantly affected. Lonely Gulch reservoir would continue to reduce sediment loads until the reservoir is filled (in approximately 10 years). Nitrogen loading would not be significantly altered.

- Stream flows in Lonely Gulch would return to natural conditions.

- Stream flows in Meeks Creek could be affected by development of a well adjacent to Meeks Creek associated with extreme pumping conditions.

- Riparian vegetation within 26 feet of the proposed well could be impacted with worst-case pumping rates due to dewatering.

- Some loss of vegetation will occur due to construction of the water system.

- The proposed storage tanks would create impervious coverage on high hazard lands in excess of the 1% allowed coverage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tank Type</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Percentage of Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lonely Gulch</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative #1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,320 sq. ft.</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives #2 and #4</td>
<td></td>
<td>910 sq. ft.</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives #3 and #5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,810 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Tank</td>
<td>la</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative #1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,320 sq. ft.</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives #2 and #4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,260 sq. ft.</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives #3 and #5</td>
<td></td>
<td>620 sq. ft.</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubicon Glen</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>450 sq. ft.</td>
<td>requires acquisition of 1 acre lot to meet allowable coverage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Nitrate loading into Lake Tahoe would be decreased under Alternative #5 utilizing the well, since the groundwater would be utilized.

- There would be a minor impact on fish in Meeks Creek due to increased suspended sediment during construction.

- For the lake intake alternatives, the District would be required to obtain a change from the California State Water Quality Control for points of diversion of existing water rights.

- The well diversion would not require a change in existing water rights.

Mitigation

- Best Management Practices for erosion control to be utilized during construction.

- Revegetation of areas disturbed during construction.

- Construction in or near Lake Tahoe and streams would be conducted to minimize suspended sediment.

- Storage tanks will be painted to blend and will be screened with vegetation.

- The 4,000 square feet of disturbed area where the proposed upper tank is to be located will be stabilized and areas not covered by the tank will be revegetated.

Preferred Alternative

Alternative 5, the well diversion, is the District's preferred alternative. This alternative would have the least cost and would not require a change in points of diversion of their existing water rights. Potential for environmental impacts are greater due to the uncertainty of the groundwater impacts due to pumping adjacent to Meeks Creek.

The document adequately addresses the relationship of the proposed alternatives and the environmental threshold carrying capacities as required by TRPA. The EIR/EIS provides a comprehensive disclosure of the alternatives and the impacts of three alternatives. The California EIR review period ends June 13, 1983 due to the differences in review requirements.

The staff recommends the Commission certify the EIS as technically adequate with the addition of the addendum which addresses the comments and changes generated during the EIR review. Staff further suggests that, should additional comments be received between the APC meeting (June 8) and June 13, 1983, the EIS and responses to those comments be brought back to the APC at its regular July meeting. If no comments are received, the EIS would be taken to the Governing Board for certification at the regular June, 1983 meeting.
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