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

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on May 9 and 10, 1984 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: April 30, 1984

By:
Gary D. McCall
Acting 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 ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

V PLANNING MATTERS

A. Regional Plan Status Report

B. APC Schedule for Regional Plan Review
   1. Ordinance Subcommittees
   2. Plan Area Subcommittees
   3. Implementation Programs

C. Subcommittee Reports
   1. Water Quality Ordinance
   2. Water Quality and Air Quality Mitigation Fees

D. Land Capability Challenges
   1. Incline Village Units 1, 1R, 2, and 4, and Ponderosa Unit 5, Washoe County
   2. Portions of Tahoe Marina Estates and Tahoe Estates, Tahoe Vista, Placer County
   3. Vicinity of Beverly, Clayton and Arch off of Old County Road, Placer County
   4. Alpine Way Near Snowflake, Tahoe Tavern Heights, Placer County
   5. Vicinity of Club and John Cain Drives, Talmont Area, Placer County
   6. Vicinity of Williams, King George, Rubicon and Forest, Rubicon, El Dorado County
7. Vicinity of Mohican, Chippewa and Pawnee, Tahoe Paradise #0, El Dorado County

8. Vicinity of Skyline and Crystal Aire Drive, Tahoe Paradise #48, El Dorado County

9. Vicinity of Grizzley Mountain Drive and Mount Rainer, El Dorado County

10. Other

E. Man Modified Determinations

1. Industrial Tract Stream Environment Zone, City of South Lake Tahoe

F. Transportation

1. Section 8 Planning (JHK & Associates Report)

2. RTPA Designation

3. Status Report A.B. 120

VI PUBLIC HEARING

A. Code of Ordinances

B. Plan Area Statements

VII REPORTS

A. Staff

B. Legal Counsel

C. Public Interest Comments

D. APC Members

VIII RESOLUTIONS

IX CORRESPONDENCE

X PENDING MATTERS

XI ADJOURNMENT
CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Mike Harper called the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission to order at 9:40 a.m.

APC Members Present: Ms. Temple, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs (present at the afternoon portion of the meeting), Mr. Hoefer, Mr. Hampson, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Pyle, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Curtis (present at the afternoon portion of the meeting), Mr. Popoff, Ms. Michael, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Harper

APC Members Absent: Mr. Hoole, Mr. Ryerson, Mr. McMullen, Ms. Sparbel

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The APC members requested that this meeting be conducted in one day instead of two days, as noticed.

MOTION by Mr. Dodgion, with a second by Mr. Hoefer, to approve the agenda with no changes. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Ms. Temple, Mr. Renz, Mr. Hoefer, Mr. Hampson, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Pyle, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Popoff, Ms. Michael, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Harper
Nays: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Ryerson, McMullen, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Curtis

DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

MOTION by Mr. Pyle, with a second by Mr. Hansen, to approve the minutes of February 8, 1984 with no changes. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Ms. Temple, Mr. Renz, Mr. Hoefer, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Pyle, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Popoff, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Harper
Nays: None
Abstain: Mr. Hampson, Ms. Michael
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Ryerson, McMullen, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Curtis
APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES APRIL 11, 1984

MOTION by Mr. Popoff, with a second by Mr. Dodgion, to approve the minutes of March 14, 1984 with no changes. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Ms. Temple, Mr. Renz, Mr. Hoefer, Mr. Hampson, Mr. Dodgion,
      Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Popoff, Ms. Bogush
Nays: None
Abstain: Mr. Pyle, Ms. Michael, Mr. Harper
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Ryerson, McMullen, Ms. Sparbel,
        Mr. Curtis

IV ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Election of Advisory Planning Commission Vice Chair

Mr. Harper announced that Ms. Bogush was leaving the City of South Lake Tahoe and that it would be necessary to elect a vice chair to fill the term through January 1985. Mr. Popoff nominated Mr. Combs, with a second by Mr. Renz. There were no further nominations, and Mr. Pyle moved that the nominations be closed.

MOTION by Mr. Popoff, with a second by Mr. Renz, to elect Mr. Combs as vice chair to fill the term to January, 1985. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Ms. Temple, Mr. Renz, Mr. Hoefer, Mr. Hampson, Mr. Dodgion,
      Mr. Pyle, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Popoff, Ms. Michael,
      Ms. Bogush, Mr. Harper
Nays: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Ryerson, McMullen, Ms. Sparbel,
        Mr. Curtis

Mr. Harper requested that a resolution of appreciation be prepared for Ms. Bogush.

B. Seating of Tahoe Transportation District Representative

Mr. Harper stated that on March 29, 1984 the Governing Body appointed Bill Murphy, Transit Manager of the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) to serve on behalf of the District as a bistate lay member on the Advisory Planning Commission.

V PLANNING MATTERS

B. Distribution of Bitterbrush Environmental Impact Statement

The APC members received copies of the Bitterbrush Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the Appendix. Nora Shepard, Associate Planner explained that the preparation of this EIS was required by terms of a settlement agreement between the TRPA and Leroy Land Development Corporation, developer of the Bitterbrush Subdivision at Incline Village, Nevada. The comment period on the EIS ends June 1, 1984 and the APC will review the document at the June 13 meeting.
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A. Status of Regional Plan - Governing Board Action on Adopting Ordinance

Gordon Barrett, Principal Planner, stated that the first reading of the Ordinance Adopting and Implementing the Regional Plan took place at the March 28, 29, 1984 Governing Board meeting. Copies of the adopting ordinance were provided to the APC. Mr. Barrett explained that due to recent Governing Body action one of the high priorities for discussion was the proposed mitigation fee schedule. Gary Midkiff, Acting Executive Director, added that second reading and adoption of the ordinance was scheduled for the April 26, 1984 Governing Board meeting and, once adopted, the ordinance would become effective immediately.

C. Subcommittee Meetings on Ordinance Review

The APC recessed at 10:05 a.m. to allow the Transportation/Air Quality Subcommittee and the Resource Management Subcommittee to discuss air and water quality mitigation fee schedules. The Land Use and Growth Management Subcommittees commenced review of the draft ordinance Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and 9.

The APC returned at 1:35 p.m. Mr. Midkiff briefly outlined the sections of the adopting ordinance for the Regional Plan, a list of projects and activities that cannot be processed until adoption of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and the screening process for project review applications under the adopting ordinance. Mr. Midkiff clarified that all new single family dwelling permit applications with land capabilities 4 through 7 will be processed under this ordinance, and the pending single family dwelling permit applications received on or before August 26, 1983 will be reviewed under the criteria in use at that time by the CTRPA/TRPA. The TRPA legal counsel will provide a legal opinion if the Agency could accept and process applications, providing that no permit would be approved or issued, prior to adoption of the mitigation fee schedule.

D. Subcommittee Reports

1. Water and Air Quality Mitigation Fees

Jon Hoefer, Chairman of the Resource Management Subcommittee, reported that the staff used data from the State of California Water Quality Plan, and one of the fees looked at was the base fee for a single family residence on high capability land. Mr. Hoefer stated that initially the figure looked appropriate, but the subcommittee expanded some of the figures to low capability land and excess land coverage and the fee seemed to be inadequate for meeting water quality mitigation. Mr. Hoefer further reported that the subcommittee felt that more analysis was needed before they could recommend a reasonable water quality mitigation fee.

Transportation Chairwoman Sarah Michael stated that the traffic mitigation fee schedule needed to be designed to raise $8,000,000 over the next five years. Staff calculated how many trips would be generated from both residential and commercial projects. The resulting figure was approximately a $1280 mitigation fee per resident, but to apply that same figure to commercial square feet the figure was very high. Staff will prepare a list of projects that could be funded from the mitigation fees. The subcommittee will meet again on May 1 to refine/develop recommendations from those figures.
Rick Heitkemper, alternate for Ms. Bogush, City of South Lake Tahoe reported that the combined Land Use and Growth Management Subcommittees generally agreed that additional time would be needed to review the material in more detail. He stated that they expressed concern regarding the actual role of the Plan Area Statements; whether the Plan Area Statements could in fact be more or less restrictive than the general policies and the inter-relationship of these two. Mr. Heitkemper stated that with regard to these issues there were some legal questions which have to be resolved, and the subcommittee also felt that it would be infeasible to have the Plan Area Statements completed, circulated for review, scheduled for additional public hearings, and adopted by July 1. Mr. Heitkemper further stated that the subcommittee suggested that a recommendation be made to the Governing Board to look at the alternatives available and perhaps extend the timeframe.

Mr. Midkiff explained that when reaching a compromise the Governing Board was primarily interested in moving forward with adoption of the Regional Plan so that there would be some type of 1984 building season. If the Agency is in a position where 4-7 applications will not be allowed before June 1, it could be extremely difficult for any of those applicants to have time to construct this year.

Mr. Combs pointed out there is a current water quality mitigation fee that has been in effect. Because of the lead time necessary for notification and processing applications, he suggested we keep the fee schedule in effect that was established by the 208 Plan, and possibly hold off on the transportation mitigation fee until a later time. Mr. Midkiff responded that the adopting ordinance specifies that those things have to happen prior to processing new single family residence applications.

Ms. Michael and Mr. Hoefar agreed that more time was needed for both staff and the subcommittees to review the fees and reach a recommendation.

Mr. Midkiff suggested that an interim fee schedule could be adopted, pending further study, and that it could be modified later. Mr. Curtis stated that he would like to see those funds come in rather than not come in at all. He agreed that an interim fee schedule could be adopted while the studies continue.

The APC members suggested that applications could be accepted and processed, but the Agency inform the applicants that the applications are subject to fee schedule change. The APC recommended further discussion was needed and that the mitigation fee schedule be brought back to the APC in May.

Ms. Temple suggested that the Agency provide the counties with some guidelines to explain the mitigation fees to applicants.

Mr. Harper stated that the APC feels pressed for time in reviewing the Plan Area Statements and concerned about the ability of local entities to review them and to hold a second round of public hearings. Mr. Harper asked if the date of the second reading of the ordinance could be changed? Ms. Scholley responded that an insubstantial change could be made in the ordinance at the second reading, changing the date from July to September. Mr. Midkiff added that the practical effect of that would not be great in that most activities which are held up by
the Plan Area Statements would also be held up by the Code of Ordinances, but it would depend if the Governing Board felt there was a significant change. Mr. Midkiff referred to Section 2.12 of the ordinance that "the document entitled Draft, Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, Part I: Plan Area Statements, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, is adopted as an interim policy guideline, effective until July 1, 1984, unless otherwise provided by amendment to this ordinance. The Governing Body shall amend said document and the Plan Area Overlay Maps referred to in subsection 2.13(1), pursuant to at least one duly-noticed public hearing, the subject of which hearing shall be the adoption of said document and said maps, as they may be amended, as final land use regulations." Mr. Midkiff commented that if the Governing Board chose not to act at the April Board meeting to change the language in the adopting ordinance, there would be time to process an amendment to this ordinance prior to July 1, 1984. Mr. Midkiff added that if the concerns of local governments are such that they would like to process them through their normal planning procedures, in addition to the Agency's and any public hearings that the Agency will hold, then there is a definite reason for extending the July 1, 1984 date.

VI PUBLIC HEARING

A. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Code of Ordinances

B. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Plan Area Statements

Mr. Harper opened the meeting for public hearing comments on the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Code of Ordinances and Plan Area Statements at 2:30 p.m. There were no comments received from the audience, and the public hearing was continued to May 9, 1984 APC meeting.

VII REPORTS

D. APC Members

1. Redevelopment Financial Feasibility Study Report

The agenda was modified due to the length of time needed to present the City of South Lake Tahoe's Redevelopment Financial Feasibility Study Report. Ms. Bogush distributed copies of the Executive Summary prepared by Peat Marwick, and she explained that the summary briefly described the background of this study, its objectives and scope, and the approach used in conducting the study. On December 2, 1982 the South Tahoe Redevelopment Agency (STRA) issued a request for qualifications from firms interested in conducting a preliminary redevelopment feasibility study. Peat Marwick in conjunction with Phillips Brandt Reddick and Management Resources submitted a statement of firm qualifications. Subsequently, the Peat Marwick team was asked to submit a proposal to conduct the study. Peat Marwick's proposal was selected by STRA staff and its advisory committee. On March 15, 1983 STRA approved the award of the contract to Peat Marwick and a contract was executed on March 25, 1983.
Ms. Bogush stated that as a redevelopment agency, STRA was interested in applying the redevelopment mechanism to encourage rehabilitation and economic development in South Lake Tahoe. Prior to undertaking redevelopment, STRA determined that it was necessary to assess the feasibility of redevelopment as a strategy for the City. The current revision of the City's General Plan and the TRPA's Regional Plan provided a logical framework within which to examine the feasibility of redevelopment in view of the environmental constraints.

During a slide presentation, Ms. Bogush reported that this review focused on the factors affecting development from a physical, land use, environmental and regulatory perspective. The land use and environmental issues that need to be looked at include transportation, access, and image along highway 50; under-utilization of Lake Tahoe as an asset; sewer, transit and water quality constraints; low density, single purpose land uses; a lack of open space/view corridors to the Lake; and inadequate public access to the Lake. Ms. Bogush pointed out the consultant's recommendations were, from an economic perspective, parallel to the results of the TRPA Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity Study. The major opportunities for new development identified were private lands in the Al Tahoe/Johnson Boulevards area; upper Ski Run Boulevard area; and areas near the airport and on Highway 89 west of the "Y". This review also examined the real estate market facing South Lake Tahoe with limited office and industrial development opportunities; improving the quality of the tourism economy base; an over-supply of hotel/motel units; more intensive use of land in selected areas; land assembly; high infrastructure and regulatory costs; and improving accessibility. The opportunities for economic development should be oriented to attracting tourism and new visitors to the area by increasing specialty retail; indoor-outdoor recreational uses; entertainment facilities; up-scale hotel/conference facilities; and adaptive re-use of under-utilized motels.

The marketing audit review examined current programs and activities. The major findings of this analysis were: inadequate tourism data base; lack of funding for research; absence of marketing objectives; lack of marketing identity or image for South Lake Tahoe; inadequate communication with consumers, employees, and residents; funding for an on-going research program; and coordination of marketing efforts with the gaming industry. The principal financing techniques currently available to California community redevelopment agencies were reviewed. The findings of this analysis were to coordinate local resources and package feasible projects; use the City's transient occupancy tax for seeding near-term economic revitalization; and use other forms of public financing including special assessment, lease financing, and mortgage revenue bonding. State and federal community and economic development funds have been significantly reduced and should not be relied upon as a major financing source.

Based on the study team's analysis of existing conditions and the identification of opportunities and constraints, the following conclusions were reached: public intervention in the real estate development process is warranted in South Lake Tahoe; redevelopment is a viable strategy for promoting economic growth; redevelopment will require a long term commitment on the part of the City and the private sector; and redevelopment will occur on an incremental basis.
With the use of maps, Ms. Bogush described the redevelopment concepts for the "Y" area and north on Highway 89, Stateline, the shorezone, and Al Tahoe. Ms. Bogush further reported that the Redevelopment Feasibility study recommended that the City focus its efforts on facilitating the creation of a town center mixed use development in the area of Al Tahoe and Johnson Boulevards. The concept includes a resort-oriented hotel/lodge containing recreational amenities, specialty shops, and restaurant situated with views to the Lake; community recreation facilities surrounding the existing recreation center; a pedestrian plaza/park; conference center/learning center to be used jointly by the hotel and community college; a pedestrian greenbelt path linking the hotel/lodge to the conference center and college campus; and a residential buffer between the conference/learning center and the existing shopping center.

Ms. Bogush concluded the report adding that until a new planning director is hired, the City Council has temporarily deferred action on the redevelopment plan.

E. Plan Area Statements Update

The discussion on planning matters resumed and Mr. Barrett explained that the Plan Area Review Committee suggested that at least two key people from each jurisdiction who were familiar with their particular area were needed to discuss planning areas by jurisdiction, creating a format change. Staff would like to get consensus from the APC on the change.

Mr. Barrett commented that the issue of the second round of public hearings was still undecided, but the input that he received indicated that the Agency should hold a second round of public hearings. Mr. Combs added that one of the main points the subcommittee suggested was that the new Planning Area Statements will be more specific about permitted/prohibited uses. The subcommittee also felt there was a strong need for cross referencing from the Plan Area Statements to the other planning/environmental documents.

F. Design Review Guidelines Update

Mr. Barrett stated that the staff considered the Design Review Guidelines as a rough draft; an attempt to deal with new and mapped areas and to bring together criteria into one document. Mr. Barrett explained the concept was not to include these as rigid standards in an ordinance, but rather the framework related to local design guidelines and meeting the thresholds, allowing for alternatives and flexibility in the Region.

G. Land Capability Mapping Update

Discussion was continued to the May APC meeting.

H. Transportation Planning (Section 8) Status Report

Dave Ziegler, Chief of Long Range Planning, briefly reported that the TRPA was a grantee on a Section 8 grant from the federal government to carry out the
planning for the near-term operations of the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) as it affects the transit operations on the south and north shores, the possible consolidation of STAGE and TART into the TTD, and financing. Mr. Ziegler stated that there have been a number of meetings with the consultant, JHJ Associates. Mr. Ziegler further stated that one of the primary issues was the fact that the operations planning cannot be done for the transit system in a vacuum. The parking standards, parking management program, and the transportation systems management are all spelled out in general terms in the Regional Plan. Mr. Ziegler stated as an example that the Regional Plan calls for coordination of privately-owned casino shuttles on the south shore. If those shuttles are in competition with the TTD buses it will be difficult for the TTD to get ridership in that area. Mr. Ziegler pointed out that if given a choice between a free service and a pay service, people would tend to take the free service. He added that there is an on-going effort with the consultant trying to identify and work out the issues of mutual concern.

The Transportation Implementation Plan has to be completed by June 1, and Mr. Murphy reported that the TTD hopes to complete review with a special committee of the TTD Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the TRPA. Mr. Murphy also reported that the TTD met with the special subcommittee and with the TTD Board of Directors. The TTD will meet again with the special subcommittee on April 25, the Board of Directors on April 27, and the subcommittee on May 8. The TTD will present the draft plan to the APC on the 9th of May; then meet with the TAC on May 14, the Board of Directors on May 18, the TRPA Governing Board on May 23 or 24, and by June 1 there will be a plan for implementing the transportation program.

I. Other

Mr. Midkiff reported to the APC that there is a negative declaration being circulated for an expansion of service for Air Cal to increase the number of flights per week to 29 at the South Lake Tahoe Airport, and the Agency will make arrangements with the City to obtain copies.

Mr. Midkiff also reported that the City of South Lake Tahoe was expected to complete a process of selecting a consultant to undertake the master plan. Mr. Midkiff noted that if the APC was interested, a briefing could be arranged with either the City or the consultant.

VII REPORTS

A. Staff Reports

1. Status of Proposed Lake Fishery Study

Senior Planner Dave Greer explained that one of the provisions of the Regional Plan was to undertake a study to evaluate the impacts of shorezone development on the Lake Tahoe fishery. In October, 1983 staff mailed requests for proposals to major universities in the western United States. Based on those requests the Agency received three proposals. Action on those proposals was deferred because the Regional Plan was not adopted at that time, and the Agency cannot proceed
with the study until the mechanisms are in place to collect mitigation fees from the additional pier development. Staff will proceed with the evaluation on the proposals that were received and review them with a technical advisory team so that when the mechanisms are in place and the funds are available the study can proceed. Staff mailed letters to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California and Nevada Fish and Game Agencies requesting them to designate a person to serve on the technical advisory team. Staff also requested that the APC designate an individual to serve on that committee as well. The APC appointed Mr. Popoff as the designee to serve on the technical advisory committee.

B. Legal Reports - None

C. Public Interest Comments - None

D. APC Members

Mr. Hoefer reported that the U.S. Forest Service will begin a study of Zephyr Cove Resort for future use determination. The U.S. Forest Service acquired the resort in 1979 from the Whittell estate and issued a short term permit for operation until a more detailed study was completed to determine how the land could be best used for the public. The U.S. Forest Service extended the initial three-year permit twice and it will expire in 1985. It is anticipated that the study will be completed in 1985. Mr. Renz suggested that if the Forest Service determines that boating will continue at Zephyr Cove it would seem appropriate to have repair facilities there.

Mr. Murphy commented that one of the other activities that the TTD recently undertook was a project between the City of South Lake Tahoe STAGE bus system and the school district where the STAGE system overlaps some of the school district bus routes. The TTD is attempting to develop a system where STAGE could pick up the children and thereby reduce the traffic for school buses. This project will take about a year and is funded by UMTA.

Ms. Temple reported that El Dorado County is still recruiting for a community development director for the consolidated Environmental Health and Planning Departments.

Mr. Hampson stated that the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board will meet on April 12, and one item of interest scheduled on the agenda was the elevation of Lake Tahoe and erosion impacts.

Mr. Hansen expressed his appreciation working with Ms. Bogush, noting that she lent professional credibility to the City of South Lake Tahoe during her employment as Chief Planning Officer.

Mr. Combs thanked the APC for their support in electing him as Vice Chairman.

Mr. Heitkemper stated that he looked forward to working with the members of the Commission.
Mr. Poppoff asked if it was feasible to move the APC meeting dates to the first week of the month rather than the second week, suggesting that it would give staff three weeks to transmit the APC's recommendations to the Governing Board. Mr. Harper responded that the APC has previously made this request, but staff indicated that moving it up a week or back a week creates scheduling problems for the APC and Governing Board packet mailings. Mr. Ziegler suggested that this be discussed further with the Executive Director and the Governing Board.

Ms. Bogush stated that she had enjoyed working with the APC and staff, and expressed her appreciation.

Mr. Harper reported that Washoe County was reviewing the Galena Ski Resort development standards handbook. Mr. Harper noted that he would provide copies upon request and welcomed comments. Mr. Ziegler explained that the TRPA met with Bob Weiss, J.J. Johnson Engineers, and the Forest Service with regard to the difficulty the Agency had with the traffic assumptions in the analysis. Staff and Galena engineers agreed on a set of assumptions and the traffic impacts will be re-run, particularly at the intersection of Mount Rose Highway and Lake Tahoe Boulevard in Incline and in both directions out to Kings Beach and Sand Harbor. Mr. Ziegler stated that the Galena project puts both the staff and the Agency in an awkward position because there will definitely be impacts of that development on the Tahoe Basin in VMT and trips, and yet it is not clear whether the Agency is in a position to demand mitigation for this development. Mr. Ziegler further stated that at the present time the position of the Agency was to try to understand what the impacts will be. When there is a clearer knowledge of the impacts Mr. Ziegler suggested that some adjustments may have to be made in the TRPA Regional Plan, perhaps the Plan Area Statements in the Incline area, or we may have to approach the developer or Washoe County and ask them to include some mitigation components in the development. Mr. Ziegler added that in fairness to the Galena Resort developers this is a destination resort concept unlike any other ski resort that we are familiar with in the Basin and, therefore, the impacts will be different and difficult to compare.

VIII RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 84-5 Expressing Appreciation to Stan Randolph

Mr. Hampson stated that he would like to see more formalized resolutions rather than using first names within the content. Mr. Harper stated that he preferred the informality of the resolutions.

Mr. Hoefer suggested modifying the resolution. In paragraph 8 delete the word: input and add: and common sense; and in paragraph 11 delete: (always given with a smile) and add: of special value and appreciation for his cheerfulness.

Ms. Michael suggested that in paragraph 2 the resolution include the date when Mr. Randolph last served as Vice Chairman.

MOTION by Mr. Hoefer, with a second by Mr. Dodgion, to approve Resolution No. 84-5 expressing appreciation to Stan Randolph as amended. The motion carried unanimously.
Resolution No. 84-7 Expressing appreciation to Ken Milam

Mr. Pyle suggested that paragraph 6 be corrected to read: Whereas Ken is leaving El Dorado County and is going to the City of Auburn in Placer County. The APC recommended that this paragraph be deleted.

Mr. Hoefer recommended that in paragraph 5 the word input be deleted

MOTION by Mr. Hoefer, with a second by Mr. Hansen, to approve Resolution No. 84-7 expressing appreciation to Ken Milam as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

Staff was directed to prepare a resolution for Ms. Bogush.

IX CORRESPONDENCE - None

X PENDING MATTERS - None

XI ADJOURNMENT

The APC meeting adjourned at 4:05 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
MEMORANDUM

May 2, 1984

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: APC Schedule for Regional Plan Review

The Agency is responsible for developing nine items to implement the Regional Plan. The APC will have to consider all of these items during the next four months:

- Code of Ordinances (including Design Review Guidelines)
- Monitoring and Evaluation Program
- Capital Improvements Programs (transportation, water quality)
- financial strategy and program
- SEZ restoration program
- MOU’s with implementing agencies
- Plan Area Statements
- Scenic Restoration Plan
- BMP Handbook Revisions

Subject to the review and approval of the APC, the staff recommends the following agendas for the June, July, and August APC meetings:

June

- Air Quality Ordinance (public hearing approval)
- Land Use Ordinance (public hearing approval)
- presentation on water quality element of monitoring and evaluation program
- pilot SEZ restoration projects (APC review and comment)
- Plan Area Statements (hearing, partial approval)

July

- Subdivision Ordinance (public hearing approval)
- Shorezone Ordinance (public hearing approval)
- Monitoring and evaluation program (all elements)
- MOU’s with implementing agencies (review, comment)
- Plan Area Statements (hearing, partial approval)
- Scenic Restoration Program (review scope of work)
- BMP Handbook Revisions (review preliminary BMP assessment)

APC Agenda Item V B.
August

- Rules and Regulations (public hearing, approval)
- Growth Management Ordinance (public hearing, approval)
- Capital Improvements Program (public hearing, approval)
- Financial Strategy and Program (public hearing, approval)
- MOU's with implementing agencies (review, comment)
- Plan Area Statements (hearing, partial approval)

This tentative schedule reflects several major assumptions. First, the staff will work with the Ways and Means Committee and local implementing agencies during June and July to develop a consensus on a capital improvements program and financial program for Phase I of the Plan. Second, the APC subcommittees will review and refine the monitoring and evaluation program elements during June. Third, the staff and the implementing agencies will prepare draft MOU’s during May and June.

With respect to Plan Area Statements, staff hopes that a joint Governing Board, APC, and local government committee will work out most of the details. The role of the full APC will be to conduct additional public hearings and approve the Statements, by local jurisdiction.
I  PROCEDURE COMMITTEE  Staff Contact - Greg George

A. Rules and Regulations
   1. Project Review
   2. EIS

B. Chapter I - General Provisions
   1. Definitions
   2. Projects Exempt
   3. Variances
   4. Findings

II  LAND USE COMMITTEE AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT
Staff Contact - Greg George, Gabby Barrett

A. Chapter II - Land Use Ordinance
   1. Permitted Uses
   2. Land Coverage
   3. Nonconforming

B. Chapter III - Subdivision Ordinance

C. Chapter IX - Growth Management Ordinance
   1. Allocation
   2. Phasing
   3. Transfer Development Rights (TDR)
   4. Redevelopment
   5. Evaluation System - Special Committee
      Bill Combs
      Roy Hampson
      Bill Curtis
      Dick Pyle

Revised May 2, 1984

APC COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Representatives from Committees below
C. Design Review Guidelines - Nora Shepard
   1. Site Design
   2. Building Height, Bulk, and Scale
   3. Snow
   4. Scenic Quality
   5. Historic
   6. Individual Criteria for ± 75 Uses

D. Design Review Guidelines - Nora Shepard
   1. Lighting
   2. Signing

III TRANSPORTATION/AIR QUALITY COMMITTEE  Staff Contact - Dave Ziegler

A. Chapter VIII - Transportation/Air Quality Ordinance
   1. Implementation and Maintenance (I & M)
   2. Woodstoves, Gas Heaters
   3. Indirect Source

B. Design Review Guidelines - Jim Brennan
   1. Parking & Access
   2. Highway and Streets
   3. Energy Efficiency

IV RESOURCE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  Staff Contact - Dave Greer

A. Chapter IV - Shorezone Ordinance
   Jon Hoefer
   Roy Hampson
   Leo Poppoff
   Dick Pyle
   Lew Dodgion

B. Chapter V - Grading Ordinance

C. Chapter VI - Resource Management Ordinance
   1. Timber Harvest
   2. Vegetation Management
   3. Wildlife
   4. Fisheries

D. Chapter VII - Water Quality Ordinance

E. Design Review Guidelines - Nora Shepard
   1. Grading and Drainage
   2. Landscaping and Revegetation
   3. Design for Shoreline
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Jon Hoefer
7.00.00.0 WATER QUALITY AND WATER RESOURCES PROVISIONS:

7.01.00.0 WATER POLLUTION CONTROL:

7.01.01.0 Discharge Limitations: The intent of this Section is to set forth standards (environmental thresholds) for the discharge of runoff water from properties in the Tahoe region, and to prohibit the discharge of domestic, municipal, or industrial wastewaters in the region. These standards and prohibitions apply to discharges to both surface waters and groundwaters. The Agency presumes that compliance with the requirements of the Regional Plan, including requirements for the application of BMP's, will allow all persons to meet the runoff thresholds, until and unless monitoring tests prove otherwise. State water quality agencies will also issue discharge permits in the region under state and federal law, in accordance with the water quality management plan.

7.01.01.1 Applicability: All discharges to the waters of the region shall not exceed the following standards:

a. Surface Runoff: Pollutant concentrations in surface runoff shall not exceed the following readings at the 90th percentile:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Maximum Concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved Inorganic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen as N</td>
<td>0.5 mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved phosphorus as P</td>
<td>0.1 mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved Iron as Fe</td>
<td>0.5 mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grease and Oil</td>
<td>2.0 mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Sediment</td>
<td>250 mg/l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) If the constituent levels of water entering a site from upstream areas are of a superior or equal quality to the above, those waters should meet the quality level listed above prior to discharge from the site.
2) If the constituent levels of waters entering a site do not meet the above, there should be no more than a 10% increase in the concentrations of these constituents in water discharged from the site, based on a 24 hour average.

b. Discharges to Groundwaters: Waters infiltrated into soils should not contain excessive concentrations of nutrients which may not be effectively filtered out by soil and vegetation and shall not exceed the following maximum constituent levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Maximum Concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Nitrogen as N</td>
<td>5 mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phosphate as P</td>
<td>1 mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>4 mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>200 JTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grease and Oil</td>
<td>40 mg/l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where there is a direct and immediate hydrologic connection between ground and surface waters (i.e., saturated flow conditions), discharges to groundwater shall meet the standards for surface runoff. This part includes maximum turbidity values to protect infiltration devices from siltation. Persons shall utilize sediment traps consistent with the Handbook of Best Management Practices upstream of infiltration devices which may be subject to excessive levels of siltation.

c. Prohibition of Wastewater Discharge: The discharge of domestic, municipal or industrial wastewater to Lake Tahoe, its tributaries, the groundwater of the Tahoe region, or the Truckee River within the Tahoe region is prohibited, except for discharges under alternative plans for wastewater disposal approved by the state agency of appropriate jurisdiction.
1) Holding Tanks and Other No-Discharge Systems: To avoid a discharge of wastewater that is prohibited under Subsection 7.01.01.0, holding tanks or other no-discharge systems may be used, only in the following instances:

i. As a temporary measure associated with a temporary use, including but not limited to sporting events, community events, and construction.

ii. As a permanent measure associated with remote public recreation sites, including but not limited to trailheads and undeveloped walk-in campgrounds.

7.01.02.0 Runoff Controls: To meet the runoff discharge standards of Subset 7.01.01.1(a) and (b), all persons who own or manage land within the region shall apply best management practices as generally set forth in the Handbook of Best Management Practices. BMP's consistent with the Handbook shall specifically be applied to all compacted areas, denuded areas, cut slopes, and fill slopes. In cooperation with other agencies, such as the Soil Conservation Service, the Agency shall provide technical assistance to all persons who require it for the design and application of BMP's. During the first five years of Regional Plan implementation, application of BMP's shall be voluntary, with certain exceptions noted below. After five years, however, persons who own or manage land within the region must either have BMP's in place, and maintain them, or agree to a schedule of compliance. The Agency shall develop a program to certify compliance with these requirements.

7.01.02.1 Best Management Practices: Best management practices as described in the TRPA Handbook of Best Management Practices shall include, at a minimum, the standards of Subset 2.05.05.2. Where special circumstances obviate the need for standard BMP's, the TRPA Executive Director shall prescribe required BMP's based on best professional judgment, after consultation with appropriate experts.

7.01.02.2 Other Management Practices: For situations not covered in the Handbook of Best Management Practices, the TRPA Executive Director may define required BMP's based on best professional judgment, after consultation with appropriate experts.
7.01.02.3 Off-site BMP's: Where, for technical reasons, the application of BMP's on the property is infeasible and all feasible alternatives have been exhausted, the property owner or managing public agency may propose off-site BMP's of equal or greater effectiveness, subject to the approval of the TRPA Executive Director. Required easements or purchase of additional property for offsite application of BMP's shall be the discharger's responsibility and not binding on the Agency. Such off-site BMP's shall:

a. Directly treat the runoff of the property in question; and

b. May not be used as a credit for water quality mitigation required under Section 7.02.00.0 of this ordinance.

7.01.02.4 Compliance with Application of Best Management Practices (BMP's): Application of BMP's shall be mandatory five years after the adoption of this Ordinance, unless there is an approved schedule of compliance which sets a different deadline. For projects included in the Water Quality Capital Improvements Program, the schedule shall be consistent with a 20-year CIP. In addition, application of BMP's may be required as follows:

a. Under a mandatory action required to abate pollution from a gross violation requiring immediate action, pursuant to Subsection 1.08.03.0 of this Code.

b. As a mandatory condition of approval for any project approved by the Agency.

c. Under a clean-up order from the state agency of appropriate jurisdiction.

7.01.02.5 Maintenance of BMP's: All BMP's shall be maintained as described in the Handbook of Best Management Practices. For situations not covered in the Handbook, the TRPA Executive Director may prescribe appropriate maintenance practices, based on best professional judgment, after consultation with appropriate experts. Failure to maintain a BMP shall constitute a violation of this ordinance.
7.01.02.6 Vegetation Protection: All property owners and public property managers shall protect the vegetation on their property from unnecessary damage in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 6 of this ordinance.

7.01.03.0 Snow Disposal: All persons conducting public, commercial or private snow removal operations in Tahoe Region shall dispose of snow in accordance with site criteria and management standards in the Handbook of Best Management Practices, and the criteria below. The TRPA shall enforce these requirements consistent with the provisions of part 7.01.02.4.

a. Snow Removal: Removal of snow shall be limited to structures and paved areas unless a permit for such activity is issued by the Agency. No vegetation shall be removed nor shall any grading occur in the act of snow removal. The TRPA will encourage all persons to utilize appropriate barriers to confine snow removal to structures and paved areas.

b. Snow Storage: All new development shall provide areas sufficient to contain the expected volume of snow. All new commercial, tourist, and multi-family development shall designate on their plans snow storage areas sufficient to contain the expected volume of snow. These areas shall be stable or gravelled areas with infiltration systems of sufficient capacity for the anticipated snow melt volume. Acceptable storage areas shall not include areas adjoining streams or the shoreline of lakes.

c. Highway/Street Clearing: Public agencies involved in highway and street snow removal operations shall not grade road shoulders in the process of clearing roads unless such activity is authorized by the Agency. Sand, cinders and other materials shall not be allowed to accumulate and shall be removed utilizing highway vacuum equipment.

7.01.04.0 Salt and Abrasive Control: Salt and abrasives used to control ice on streets and highways shall be regulated in accordance with the following standards:

a. Storage Areas: Storage areas for deicing salt shall be in conformance with the TRPA Handbook of Best Management Practices.
b. Reporting: The Highway Departments and other large users of salt identified by the TRPA Executive Director shall initiate a tracking program to monitor the use of deicing salt in their respective jurisdictions. Annual reports shall be presented to the Agency on June 1st and shall include information on the rate, amount, and distribution of use. This information shall be presented in a format developed by TRPA, and must be verifiable.

c. Restrictions: The use of deicing salt and abrasives may be restricted where damage to vegetation in specific areas can be linked to their use, or where their use results in other environmental impacts. Mitigation for the use of road deicing salt or abrasives will be required and may include requirements to use alternative substances, and changes as to distribution patterns, frequency of application, and amount of application. Revegetation of some sites will be required where evidence indicates deicing salts have caused vegetation mortality.

7.01.05.0 Sewage Spills: Sewage collection, conveyance, and treatment districts shall have spill contingency, prevention, and detection plans approved by the TRPA at least every three years.

7.01.05.1 Cooperative Plans: Such agencies may join together to develop cooperative plans, provided that the plans clearly identify those agencies covered by the plan and are agreed to by each agency.

7.01.05.2 Spill Plan Criteria: Spill contingency, prevention, and detection plans shall comply with the criteria set forth by the Agency. Such plans shall include provisions for detecting and eliminating sewage exfiltration from sewer lines and facilities.

7.01.06.0 Pesticide Use: The use of insecticides and herbicides within the Tahoe Basin is discouraged as a means of pest management. Integrated pest management practices recognized by the federal government and other entities include many alternatives to chemical applications which must be investigated, including management of forest resources in a manner less conducive to pest problems, reduced reliance on potentially hazardous chemicals and development of additionally environmentally sound pest management tactics.
7.01.06.1 Criteria for Agency Review:

a. Registered Chemicals: Only chemicals registered with both the Environmental Protection Agency and the California Department of Food and Agriculture may be used and only for their registered application.

b. Alternatives: Alternatives to chemical application must be employed where practical.

c. Stream Environment Zones: At no time shall any amount of any pesticide enter any stream environment zone or within 100 feet of a stream environment zone unless used in association with mosquito control procedures by a public agency or otherwise approved for use in accord with a TRPA permit.

7.02.00.0 WATER QUALITY MITIGATION:

7.02.01.0 Required Offsets: New residential, commercial, and public projects in the Tahoe region shall offset 150% of the water quality impacts of the project through one of the following methods:

a. Mitigation Projects: Implementing off-site water quality control projects as a condition of project approval and subject to Agency concurrence as to effectiveness. Should the applicant wish to exercise this option, the plans for the offsite project must be included with the project application and be approved in conjunction with the project; or

b. Mitigation Fund: Contributing to a fund established by the Agency for implementing offsetting programs. The amount of such contributions is established in Subsection 7.02.03.0.

7.02.02.0 Fee Schedule: When a person or public entity responsible for a new residential, commercial, or public project elects to offset the water quality impacts by contributing to a fund established by the Agency for implementing such offsets, a fee shall be assessed in accordance with the table below. Such fees must be received by the Agency within 30 days of project approval.
a. **Base Fees:** The following base fees shall be assessed for each new square foot of land coverage (net for the site) created within the limits of the coefficients set forth in Subsection 2.02.04.0, Limitations on Land Coverage. [Fees reserved.]

b. **Additional Fees:** Additional fees will be added to the base mitigation fee for the number of square feet of impervious coverage in excess of the land capability system, as follows: [Fees reserved.]

c. **Reduction of Coverage:** Where there is a net reduction of coverage which existed prior to development of the proposed project and total resulting coverage is less than allowable coverage the project is exempt from offset requirements. (This rule shall apply to approved redevelopment plans under Section 9.05.00.0.)

d. **Multiple Land Capabilities:** Development of impervious coverage on parcels with multiple land capabilities shall calculate mitigation fees based on the actual coverage located on the specific land capability class.

e. **Transfer of Development:** Impervious coverage which is permitted as a result of TDR for a project is exempt from offset requirements.

7.02.04.0 **Use and Distribution of Mitigation Funds:** The Agency shall collect and administer mitigation fees based on the offset requirements and such fees shall be known collectively as the Water Quality Mitigation Fund. The mitigation fees shall be deposited into commercial bank accounts, liquid asset funds, and/or purchase of certificates of deposits. [Language reserved on the distribution of mitigation funds.]

Water Quality Mitigation Funds shall be dispersed to the counties or city upon request for expenditure on remedial erosion control projects within the jurisdiction of origin for such funds as set forth in the Regional Plan and with the approval of the Agency.

7.02.05.0 **Monitoring Set-Aside:** To evaluate the effectiveness of water quality mitigation measures, 5% of collected mitigation funds will be spent on water quality monitoring under the Interagency Tahoe Monitoring Program, for carrying out, in part, the Monitoring and Evaluation Program of the Regional Plan.
7.02.06.0 Administration Set-Aside: One-half percent of the total Water Quality Mitigation fund balance per month will be utilized for the TRPA administration of the fund. However, at no time shall such administration costs exceed 1/2 of the monthly investment income.

7.02.07.0 TRPA Revolving Fund: The TRPA shall also establish a fund, to be known as the Water Quality Revolving Fund, for the purpose of depositing funds received through grants, fines, and contributions. The TRPA may make grants from this fund to units of local government, and other public entities as appropriate, for abatement and control of water quality problems in the Tahoe region.

7.03.00.0 WATER SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION:

7.03.01.0 Water Conservation Devices: All new development shall employ appropriate devices to conserve water and reduce water consumption. Existing development shall be retrofitted with water conservation devices on a voluntary basis in conjunction with a public education program operated by the water purveyors and the utility districts. (See also the Design Review Guidelines, Water Conservation Element.) The installation of these water conservation devices shall include shower and faucet flow restricters, toilet tank devices, and practices such as odd and even watering days for landscaped areas. The installation of these devices shall be completed within 5 years following plan adoption.

7.03.02.0 Water Rights Demonstration: No additional development requiring water should be allowed in any area unless it can be demonstrated that there is adequate water supply with an existing water right. Where the adequacy of a water supply or water right is challenged by Agency staff or any other person or party, the water purveyor shall provide documentation of adequate rights and supplies prior to the issuance of a permit by the TRPA.

7.03.03.0 Reporting Requirements: TRPA, water purveyors, and the states shall monitor the use of water within the Tahoe Region and evaluate conformance with the California-Nevada Interstate Compact (1969) which addresses water diversions in the Basin. All water purveyors shall report their total gross diversion for use for the previous water year (October through September) to the TRPA by February 1 each year. No water purveyor shall supply or cause to be supplied water to any proposed or existing subdivision so that the total gross diversion as stated in the Nevada-California Interstate Compact, is exceeded.
7.03.04.0 **Storage and Distribution Requirements:** No additional development requiring water shall be allowed in any area unless there exists adequate storage and distribution systems to deliver adequate quantity and quality of water for domestic consumption and fire protection. The Agency shall not accept applications for new developments without adequate proof from the appropriate fire protection agency. Proof of adequate water supply and distribution systems are contained in Subset 3.06.02.2.

7.03.05.0 **Annual Reports:** In accordance with the Nevada-California Interstate Water Compact and the TRPA plan, the appropriate state agencies California State Water Resources Control Board, and the Nevada State Engineer shall report on an annual basis, the uses of waters within the Basin. This report shall be received by June 1 of each year and shall be in a format developed by the Agency.
MEMORANDUM

May 2, 1984

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: Water Quality and Air Quality Mitigation Fees

At the April 25, 26, 1984 meeting the Governing Board adopted interim mitigation fees for water quality and transportation to be applied to single family residential applications. These schedules are to be applied pending final recommendations on revisions from the Advisory Planning Commission.

Attached is the briefing paper prepared for the Governing Board meeting which describes the fee schedule alternatives developed prior to the Governing Board meeting. For water quality the fee adopted is $.29 per square foot of land coverage. For transportation the adopted fee is $100 per vehicle trip or $1000 per residential unit. The Governing Board did not adopt schedules for commercial or public projects.

Subsequent to the Governing Board meeting the transportation subcommittee of the APC met to discuss the transportation fee schedule and provided further direction to the staff on preparation of a final schedule. The water quality subcommittee is scheduled to meet Friday, May 4, 1984. The results of these meetings will be discussed at the May APC meeting.
STAFF BRIEFING

MITIGATION FEES FOR
SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES
UNDER THE AMENDED PLAN

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
April 25, 1984
REGIONAL PLAN POLICIES

WATER QUALITY

* NEW HOMES SHALL OFFSET 150% OF THE WATER QUALITY IMPACTS THROUGH:

1) IMPLEMENTING PROJECTS
2) CONTRIBUTING TO A FUND

TRANSPORTATION AND AIR QUALITY

* NEW HOMES SHALL OFFSET THE TRANSPORTATION AND AIR QUALITY IMPACTS OF THEIR DEVELOPMENT

NOTE: SEE FEBRUARY '84 GOALS AND POLICIES, P. 129
KEY ISSUES

WATER QUALITY

* HOW TO CALCULATE OFF-SITE IMPACTS
* HOW TO CALCULATE COST OF MITIGATING IMPACTS

TRANSPORTATION/AIR QUALITY

* HOW MUCH OF AN OFFSET IS DESIRED? HOW LARGE A FUND IS NEEDED?

GENERAL

* HOW TO DEAL WITH INFLATION
* ABILITY TO PAY/TOTAL RECEIPTS
ALTERNATIVE WATER QUALITY APPROACHES

1. MARGINAL COST APPROACH BASED ON PER-PROJECT SUSPENDED SEDIMENT YIELDS AND COSTS OF OFFSET IN PHASE I

2. AVERAGE COST APPROACH BASED ON TOTAL C.I.P. COSTS AND TOTAL LAND COVERAGE

3. EXISTING SCHEDULE ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION
1. MARGINAL COST APPROACH

DESCRIPTION

* ESTIMATE SUSPENDED SEDIMENT YIELDS AND COST OF TREATMENT FOR INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS BASED ON 208 PLAN DATA
* FEE EQUALS APPROXIMATELY 29¢/SQ. FT. INCLUDING 150% OFFSET

PROS

* ABILITY TO PAY
* MARGINAL COST APPROACH

CONS

* APC SUBCOMMITTEE DID NOT SUPPORT
* SS-YIELD INADEQUATE MEASURE OF OFF-SITE IMPACTS
2. AVERAGE COST APPROACH

DESCRIPTION

* ESTIMATE COST OF TRPA WATER QUALITY C.I.P., DIVIDE BY TOTAL ULTIMATE COVERAGE TO DETERMINE AVERAGE COST PER SQUARE FOOT
* FEE EQUALS APPROXIMATELY 80¢/SQ. FT. INCLUDING 150% OFFSET

PROS

* APC SUBCOMMITTEE SUPPORT
* CONSIDERS ALL IMPACTS, COSTS

CONS

* ABILITY TO PAY
* NEW DEVELOPMENT PAYS FOR PORTION OF BACKLOG PROBLEM
3. EXISTING SCHEDULE ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION

DESCRIPTION

* ASSUME 6% INFLATION FROM 1981 TO 1986½ (5.5 YRS.)
* TYPICAL FEE EQUALS $1033

PROS

* SIMPLE TO DEVELOP, ADMINISTER
* CONSISTENT

CONS

* DOES NOT INCORPORATE NEW DATA; ORIGIN OF SCHEDULE NOT CLEAR
* NOT BASED ON MARGINAL OR AVERAGE COSTS
TRANSPORTATION/AIR QUALITY APPROACH

DESCRIPTION

1. ESTIMATE FUNDING SHORTFALL FOR IMPLEMENTING PHASE I TRANSPORTATION PLAN

2. ALLOCATE SHORTFALL AMONG NEW DEVELOPMENT ON PER-TRIP BASIS

SHORTFALL (PHASE I)

1. ESTIMATE: $5,900,000

2. INCLUDES: $3,000,000 FOR TTD

3. TYPES OF PROJECTS:
   - SHELTERS, PULLOUTS
   - HI-WAY IMPROVEMENTS
   - BIKE/PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES
   - TTD CAPITAL NEEDS
   - MINOR LOCAL PROJECTS

NEW DEVELOPMENT (PHASE I)

1. 3000 RESIDENTIAL UNITS = 30,000 NEW DAILY TRIPS

2. 325,000 SQ. FT. COMMERCIAL FLOOR SPACE = 32,000 DAILY TRIPS

3. TOTAL (PHASE I) = 62,000 NEW DAILY TRIPS

AVERAGE COST PER TRIP: $95

RECOMMENDED ONE-TIME FEE: $100/TRIP FOR NEW SINGLE-FAMILY (OR $1000/UNIT)

ESTIMATED ANNUAL RECEIPTS: $600,000 FROM RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Coverage (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>SUS Sed Yield ($ .29 Per Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Average CIP Cost ($ .80 Per Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Current Table ($1986/87) (5.5 Years @ 6%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>2080</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2800</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2900</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>2320</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3100</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3200</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>2640</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3400</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>2720</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3600</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>2880</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3700</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>2960</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3800</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>3040</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3900</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>3120</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

May 1, 1984

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
FROM: Agency Staff
SUBJECT: Redelineations of Land Capabilities in Portions of Incline Village Units 1, 1B, 2, and 4, and Ponderosa Unit 5, Washoe County

Redelineations:

In response to a number of individual land capability challenges filed during 1981-82 the Agency utilized an interdisciplinary team to reevaluate the land capability classifications of portions of Incline Village. Attached is the summary report accompanying the redelineation map which indicates the results of the team's field work and describes the methodology used and the team's recommendations on revised land capability designations depicted on a map of Incline Village.

SC:md

AFC Agenda Item V D. 1.
INCLINE VILLAGE UNITS 1, 2, and 4
SOIL MAP UNIT REDELINEATION
for the
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

August 18, 1982

Review Team Members: John Munn, Soil Scientist
                          Paul Seidelman, Geomorphologist
                          Robert Coats, Ecologist
                          William Vandivere, Hydrologist

PURPOSE

Numerous successful land capability challenges in the Incline Village area have demonstrated that the soil units mapped in this area by the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey (Rogers, 1974) are, in places, incorrect. This situation has been most evident in development units 1, 2, and 4.

The review and administration of land capability challenges by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is expensive and time consuming. Therefore, the agency has directed the TRPA Land Capability Review Team to review and, where appropriate, remap soils in areas with numerous successful land capability challenges in the Incline Village area.

SETTING

Incline Village is located on a complex combination of geologic units. The upland areas of development units 2 and 4 are primarily composed of weathered volcanic mudflows with a few areas underlain by welded, hot andesite flows. Occasional outcroppings of underlying granitic bedrock are evident. The volcanic units are occupied by Jorge, Tahoma, Umpa, and Meiss soils. Development unit no. 1 is on dominately granitic bedrock with associated Cagwin soils. The footslopes of both volcanic and granitic areas are covered by dissected alluvial fan and outwash deposits of mixed volcanic and granitic materials. These relatively young geologic units underlie Inville soils, which are also found on isolated upslope fan remnants.

Slopes on the area vary from less than 10 percent on volcanic and granitic benches and on alluvial fan terraces to greater than 50 percent on steep canyon sideslopes.
SOIL MAPPING PROCEDURES

Landform boundaries were identified by field inspection and mapped by stereo interpretation of 4-inch per mile, color aerial photographs. Soil unit boundaries were established by stereo aerial photo interpretation with close reference to soil and slope information collected during field review and in previous land capability challenge reports. Soil map unit descriptions and symbols established by the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey were used in this analysis.

Soil boundaries were transferred from aerial photographs to an overlay on the 1980 parcel location map of Incline Village. Line transfer in the developed area is very accurate because of the large number of identifiable cultural features on both the map and the aerial photographs. Line placement outside of the developed area is approximate due to lack of identifiable features on the base map.

A copy of the corrected soil map for the area of Incline Village Units No. 1, 2, and 4 is enclosed with this report, and parcels with current land capability challenges within this area are listed in attached Table 1 with the recommended soil unit and land capability class based on the revised soil map.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Munn, Jr.
Paul Seidelman
Robert Coats
William Vandivere
INCLINE VILLAGE UNITS 1, 2, AND 4 SOIL REDELINEATION:
OVERLAY TO TAHOE BASIN AREA SOIL SURVEY MAP SHEET NO. 1

SCALE = 1: 24,000
SOLID LINES = REDELINEATED SOIL UNIT BOUNDARIES.
DASHED LINES = ADJACENT, UNCHANGED SOIL UNIT BOUNDARIES.

RM 6/83
Soil Mapping Procedures Used for Redelineation of Soil Units in Incline Village Units 1, 2, and 4.

by:

John R. Munn, Jr.
Soil Scientist
(CPSS No. 1989)

Introduction

Numerous successful land capability challenges in the Incline Village area have demonstrated that the soil units mapped in this area by the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey (Rogers, 1974) are, in places, incorrect. This situation has been most evident in development units 1, 2, and 4.

The review and administration of land capability challenges by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is expensive and time consuming. Therefore, the agency directed the TRPA Land Capability Review Team to review and, where appropriate, remap soils in areas with numerous land capability challenges in the Incline Village area.

Review team members participating in the review and redelineation of Incline Village Units 1, 2, and 4 were as follows:

- Jeff Borum - Geomorphologist
- Robert Coats - Ecologist
- John R. Munn, Jr. - Soil Scientist
- Paul Seidelman - Geomorphologist
- William Vandivere - Hydrologist

Setting

Incline village is located on a complex combination of geologic units. The upland areas of development units 2 and 4 are primarily composed of weathered volcanic mudflows with a few areas underlain by welded, hot andesite flows. Occasional outcroppings of underlying granitic bedrock are evident. The volcanic units are occupied by Jorge, Tahoma, Umpa, and Meiss soils. Development unit no. 1 is on dominantly granitic bedrock with associated Cagwin soils. The footslopes of both volcanic and granitic areas are covered by dissected alluvial fan and outwash deposits of mixed volcanic and granitic materials. These alluvial deposits are occupied by Inville soils, which are also found on isolated upslope fan remnants.

Slope steepness in the redelineation area varies from less than 10 percent on volcanic and granitic benches and alluvial fan terraces to greater than 50 percent on canyon sideslopes.
Soil Unit Boundary Identification

Soil unit boundaries were identified by stereo analysis of 4-inch per mile, color aerial photographs. Interpretation of the photographs was guided by soil, slope, and landform information collected during review team field inspections and from previous land capability challenge reports.

Soil profiles, parent materials, and slope were observed and inspected along the cut banks of all the numerous roads within the redelineation area. In addition, soil and slope data were available from more than 30 land capability challenge reports for parcels located in units 1, 2, and 4. Each of these reports contains a soil profile description that is representative of the parcel and surrounding area. Most of these reports were prepared by soil scientist Grant Kennedy.

Following photo interpretation, the identified soil unit boundaries were spot checked in the field. Questions concerning soils, landforms, and slope steepness that originated during the photo analysis were resolved at this time.

Soil Map Preparation

Soil Unit boundaries were first delineated on the aerial photographs. The boundaries were then transferred to the 1980 Incline Village parcel map, and have now been placed on an overlay to map sheet 1 of the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey.

Line transfer in the developed portion of the Incline Village parcel map is very accurate because of the large number of cultural features that can be identified on both the map and the aerial photographs. Transfer of lines to the soil survey overlay is somewhat less accurate because the soil survey photo base has a much smaller scale than the aerial photos and predates development in portions of the remapped area.

Discussion of Soil Map Modifications

Soil units within the redelineation area have been substantially changed relative to soils mapped in this area by the Tahoe Basin Soil Survey. In order to describe these changes, the remapped area can be divided into western, central, and eastern parts. The western area is bounded on the west by First Creek and on the east by Second Creek; the central portion lies between Second Creek and an unnamed (on my maps) drainage east of Dorcey Drive; and the eastern area is located east of the unnamed drainage.

Changes in the western portion of the remapped area include:

1. Delineation of Tahoma stony sandy loam, 2 to 15 percent slope (TaD) and Jorge-Tahoma very stony sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slope (JwE) soil units in areas previously mapped as Umpa very stony sandy loams, 15 to 30 percent slope and 30 to 50 percent slope (UmE and UmF).

2. Remapping part of a Meiss cobbly loam, 30 to 50 percent slope (MxF) unit as Jorge-Tahoma very stony sandy loam, 30 to 50 percent slope (JwF).
3. Moving the Inville soils boundary upslope.

The soils in areas remapped as TaD, JwE, and JwF were observed to be deep and have well developed subsoils that grade into weathered volcanic mudflow deposits. The Inville soils boundary change was based on roadcut exposures showing slightly developed subsoils overlaying alluvial deposits. Slope group changes are based on numerous field measurements.

Soil map changes in the central part of the redelineation area consist of several new JwE delineations. These include:

1. Mapping of JwE soils in the southern portion and along the western edge of a large area that was previously mapped as TaD. These modifications are primarily the result of slope group changes.

2. The identification of JwE soils in the area surrounding Lariat Circle, which was previously mapped as UmF and Inville stony coarse sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slope (IsE). Soils in this area were found to have well developed profiles and are apparently derived from volcanic mudflow materials.

3. JwE soils have been delineated adjacent to the Mount Rose Highway in an area that previously included UmF, TaD, and Inville stony coarse sandy loam, 9 to 15 percent slope (IsD). This area was observed to have well developed soils formed from volcanic mudflow parent material and has a slope steepness in the range of 15 to 30 percent.

Soil map changes are more extreme in the eastern redelineation area. Here, modifications include the delineation of Cagwin-Rock outcrop complex, 5 to 15 percent slope (CaD) and Cagwin-Rock outcrop complex, 15 to 30 percent slope (CaE) in an area previously mapped as UmF, Meeks very stony loamy coarse sandy, 15 to 30 percent slope (MsE), and Rock land (Ra). Also, a small area of TaD was mapped in an area that had been designated as UmF. The terrain in this part of the remapped area is complex and contains a number of scattered surface deposits; but the area delineated as CaD and CaE is dominated by moderately deep, coarse textured soils with undeveloped subsoils that grade into weathered granitic bedrock, which are typical of the Cagwin soils series. The area remapped as TaD was observed to have deep, well developed soils over volcanic parent materials.

Conclusions

Soils within Incline Village Units 1, 2, and 4 have been remapped by the TRPA Land Capability Team in response to the large number of successful land capability challenges in this area.

The placement of new boundaries was guided by numerous field observations within the remapped area and by a large number of soil profile descriptions submitted to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agencey as a requirement of the land capability challenge process. The new boundaries were delineated using stereo interpretation of 6-inch per mile, color aerial photographs, and have been transferred to overlays of the Incline Village parcel map and map sheet 1 of the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey. Transfer accuracy should be greater for the Incline Village map because of the larger scale and the greater number of cultural features that could be identified.

Soil unit boundary changes were based on observed differences in soil depth, soil profile development, soil parent materials, and slope steepness.
From: John R. Munn, Jr. - Soil Scientist  
2811 Almeria Streer, Davis, California  95616

To: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, attn: Jim Dana  
P.O. Box 8896, South Lake Tahoe, California  95731

Date: January 29, 1983

Re: Inville Soils Mapped on Slopes Steeper than 30 Percent

Dear Jim:

This memo is in response to your recent inquiry about the presence of slopes steeper than 30 percent in areas mapped by the Review Team as Inville stony coarse sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent (map symbol IsE) during last summers redelineation of the Incline Village Unit No. 1 area.

The steep slopes in question have soil profile characteristics and parent materials that are typical of the Inville soil series, but the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey (Rogers, 1974) did not establish a map unit for Inville soils on slopes greater than 30 percent, and the known extent of this soil and slope combination is too small to establish a new soil survey map unit. For these reasons, the Inville soils on slopes steeper than 30 percent were mapped as inclusions in the IsE unit.

Regarding your question about the land capability rating of the steeper slopes, inspection of Table 4 in Bailey's "Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin ..." (1974) shows that Inville soils (which are in hydrologic group B) located on slopes between 30 and 50 percent should be assigned to land capability class 2, which allows only 1 percent impervious surface cover.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Yours truly,

John R. Munn, Jr.  
Soil Scientist
February 1, 1983

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Attention: Jim Dana
P. O. Box 8896
South Lake Tahoe, CA 95731

Re: Relative Erosion Potential of Inville Soils on Slopes Steeper Than 30 Percent

Dear Jim:

This letter is in reply to your request for an assessment of the relative erosion potential of Inville soils on slopes greater than 30 percent.

Inspection of erosion hazard and relative erosion potential interpretations listed in the "Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey" (Rogers, 1974) and the "Geomorphic Analysis of the Lake Tahoe Basin" (Bailey, 1974) shows that the erosion hazard is rated as high for all soil units mapped on slopes steeper than 30 percent, and high erosion hazard ratings are assigned to soils that are mapped on slopes steeper than 30 percent and have profile characteristics similar to the Inville series. Therefore, Inville soils on slopes steeper than 30 percent should have a relative erosion potential rating of high. This rating is consistent with a land capability class rating of 2 as described in my memo dated January 29, 1983.

Sincerely,

John R. Munn, Jr.
Soil Scientist
2811 Almeria Street
Davis, CA 95616
MEMORANDUM

May 1, 1984

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: Area Land Capability Map Amendments Previously Approved by the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

In 1982, the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, through Governing Board actions, amended their maps to reflect revised land capabilities. The action was based on the recommendations of the interdisciplinary Land Capability Review Team (the same team utilized by TRPA). The team had identified several areas where field conditions did not coincide with the mapped land capability and the CTRPA, therefore, adjusted their maps to reflect those actual field conditions.

Maps and land capability review reports follow for each of the eight affected areas. All affected property owners will be publicly noticed per Agency requirements.

Agency staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission recommend amending the land capability maps to reflect this CTRPA approval based upon the recommendations of the Land Capability Review Team. The amended maps will be incorporated with Agency stream environment zone maps.

SC:md

APC Agenda Item V D.2. through 9.
To: Governing Board Members

From: Dennis Winslow, Executive Officer

Date: December 3, 1982

Re: Area Land Capability Reclassifications (7)

At the September 10, 1982 CTRPA Governing Board meeting the Board approved several land capability challenges. At that time the Board amended the land capability maps in regard to the individual parcel only and directed staff to return to the Board at a later date to amend the land capability maps on an area basis. Attached are 7 area land capability challenges. All affected property owners have been public noticed per Agency requirements.

Background:

The land capability map adopted by the Agency as part of the Land Use Ordinance is based upon the land capability classification system developed by Robert G. Bailey. Dr. Bailey's system is based largely on the "Soil Survey of the Lake Tahoe Basin Area California and Nevada" by J. H. Rogers, Soil Conservation Service (SCS).

The Tahoe Basin soil survey is based upon both a second and third order survey. A second order survey consists of field observations (pits) to determine the soil series and use of aerial photographs and field verification to delineate mapping unit boundaries. A third order survey consists of less intensive field observations and aerial photo interpretations to delineate mapping unit boundaries. Third order survey's were utilized in those portions of the basin that had potentially less intensive use, such as ridge tops, and those areas not easily accessible.

Due to the published scale of the SCS Soil Survey, the minimum mapping unit delineated was 10 acres. During field mapping of the Basin, SCS soil scientists frequently found several different soil types within a mapped soil unit, however, the different soil types did not occur in a large enough contiguous area (10 acres) to be delineated. These "islands" are referred to in the soil survey as inclusions.

In conducting individual and Agency initiated land capability challenges the 1982 Land Capability Review Team noted several areas where field conditions did not coincide with mapped land capability. To facilitate coordinated review by the CTRPA and TRPA, the Land Capability Review Team was directed to review the Land Capability Challenges in regard to a 5 acre minimum mapping unit as presently utilized by the TRPA.

The 7 acre Land Capability Challenges being brought before the Governing Board involve only those challenges where a third order survey was required to delineate mapping unit boundaries. Those areas requiring a first order survey (boundaries determined by extensive soil sampling) will be presented upon completion of field review by the Land Capability Team.
December 8, 1982

To All Interested Parties:

On December 3, 1982, the CTRPA Governing Board approved seven area-wide land capability reclassifications. A summary of the amendments and maps showing the reclassified areas are enclosed for your information. These amendments were based on the standards of the Soil Survey (Rodgers, 1974, and the Land Capability System, Bailey, 1974).

If you have any questions concerning the actions taken, please contact Harry Gibson or myself at the CTRPA offices.

Sincerely,

Rick Angelocci
Associate Planner CTRPA/TRPA

RA/dm

cc: SCS
TRPA

Enclosure
1. Portions of Tahoe Marina Estates and Tahoe Estates; Tahoe Vista, Placer County (lc and 3 to 5).

The Land Capability Review Team determined that areas which were mapped Rx (lc) and UmE (3) should be revised to a land capability classification UmD (5). The CTRPA staff utilized slope characteristics to establish a boundary between the UmE (slope 15-30%) and UmD (slope 5-15%). Vegetation was used to distinguish between the Rx and UmD classifications. Rx is described as essentially barren with scattered conifers and open stands of mountain shrubs. UmD areas characteristically support good stands of Jeffrey pines and firs and a thick understory of manzanita and other dry site species.
VOLKMANN PARCEL LAND CAPABILITY REVIEW
for the
California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

August 15, 1982

Parcel Location: Lot 1 in Tahoe Estates Unit No. 1, on Laurel Drive, in Tahoe Vista, California.

Investigation Date: July 16, 1982

Review Team Members: Robert Coats, Ecologist
                       John Munn, Soil Scientist
                       Paul Seidelman, Geomorphologist
                       William Vandivere, Hydrologist

OBSERVATIONS

The Volkmann parcel is underlain by hard andesitic flow-breccias. Slope steepness on the parcel is less than 15 percent, and steepness in the surrounding area generally ranges between 5 and 15 percent.

Vegetation on the lot is a second growth mixed conifer stand, with Jeffrey pine, white fir, incense cedar and sugar pine. The shrub understory includes chinquapin, snowbrush, huckleberry oak, greenleaf manzanita, bitterbrush and snow berry. The vegetation does not indicate any unusual limitations to development.

The soil unit mapped in the area of the Volkmann parcel by the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey (Rogers, 1974) is Umpa very stony sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slope (map symbol UmE), which is assigned to land capability class 3 with 5 percent allowable impervious surface cover (Bailey, 1974). The UmE soil is developed from hard andesitic parent materials on mountainous uplands and is 20 to 40 inches deep over andesite. Soil texture is sandy loam throughout the profile. The soil surface contains numerous stones and boulders, and the subsoil is 40 to 75 percent gravels, cobbles, and stones.

The landscape in the area of the Volkmann parcel is typical of Umpa soils, but the parcel slope is less than 15 percent, which is gentler than the UmE soil presently mapped at this site. This area of Umpa soils on slopes less than 15 percent is greater than 5 acres in extent. Therefore, the correct soil unit in the area of the Volkmann parcel is Umpa very stony sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slope (map symbol UmD). This soil is assigned to land capability class 5, which allows 25 percent impervious surface cover.
CONCLUSIONS

Soils on the Volkmann parcel should be mapped as Umpa very stony sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slope (map symbol UmD), and assigned to land capability class 5, which allows up to 25 percent impervious surface cover.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert Coats

John R. Munn, Jr.

Paul Seidelman

William Vandivere
CALASCIGETTA PARCEL LAND CAPABILITY REVIEW

for the

California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

August 15, 1982

Parcel Location: Rim Drive directly across from the intersection of Stag Drive, in Tahoe Vista, California.

Investigation Date: July 16, 1982

Review Team Members: Robert Coats, Ecologist
                    John Munn, Soil Scientist
                    Paul Seidelman, Geomorphologist
                    William Vandivere, Hydrologist

OBSERVATIONS

The Calascigetta parcel is underlain by hard, fractured andesite. Slope on the parcel is less than 15 percent, and the steepness of the surrounding terrain ranges between 5 and 15 percent.

Vegetation on the lot is an open stand of white fir, Jeffrey pine and sugar pine, with an understory of snow brush and chinquapin. The vegetation does not indicate any unusual limitations to development.

The soil unit mapped in the area of the Calascigetta parcel by the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey (Rogers, 1974) is rock outcrop and rubble land (map symbol Rx), which is assigned to land capability class 1c with only 1 percent allowable surface cover (Bailey, 1974). The Rx map unit consists of a mixture of hard, bare faced rock outcrops and stony colluvial land, which is composed of more than 90 percent stones and boulders. There is little or no vegetation.

Field observations in the parcel area show that this site is covered by an extremely stony soil that is similar to the Umpa series. There is a thick stand of vegetation, the parcel slope is less than 15 percent, and the area of similar soils exceeds 5 acres. Therefore, the correct soil unit in the area of the Calascigetta parcel is Umpa very stony sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slopes (map symbol UmD). This soil unit is assigned to land capability class 5, which allows 25 percent impervious surface cover.
CONCLUSIONS

Soils on the Calascigetta parcel should be mapped as Umpa very stony sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slope (map symbol UmD) and assigned to land capability class 5, which allows up to 25 percent impervious surface cover.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert Coats

John R. Munn, Jr.

Paul Seidelman

William Vandivere
SUMMARY OF RESULTS

2. Vicinity of Beverly, Clayton and Arch off of Old County Road; Placer County (3 to 5).

The Land Capability Review Team determined that a large area which was mapped as UxM was actually a continuation of the neighboring UxM unit. The CTRPA staff utilized the slope characteristics between the two (15 to 30% versus 5-15% respectively) to determine the location of the boundary line.
AREA OF AMENDED LAND CAPABILITY

Vicinity of Beverly, Clayton, and Arch off of Old County Road; Placer County

Extent of the area to be amended from land capability unit UmE (3) to land capability unit UmD (5)
JOHANSEN PARCEL LAND CAPABILITY REVIEW
for the
California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

August 23, 1982

Parcel Location: On Clayton Way west of Arch Way in the Ridgewood area between Carnelian Bay and Dollar Point.

Investigation Date: July 16, 1982

Review Team Members: Robert Coats, Ecologist
John Munn, Soil Scientist
Paul Seidelman, Geomorphologist
William Vandiviere, Hydrologist

OBSERVATIONS

The Johansen parcel is located on a wavecut terrace formed during a period of higher lake level and underlain by andesitic bedrock materials. Slope steepness on the parcel is less than 10 percent, and the steepness of the surrounding terrain is less than 15 percent.

Vegetation on the lot is an open second growth stand of white fir and Jeffrey pine with a well developed shrub cover. Shrub species include greenleaf manzanita, huckleberry oak, whitethorn and squaw carpet. The vegetation does not indicate any unusual limitations to development.

The soil unit mapped in the area of the Johansen parcel by the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey (Rogers, 1974) is Umpa very stony sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slope (map symbol UmE), which is assigned to land capability class 3 with 5 percent allowable surface cover (Bailey, 1974). The UmE soil is developed from hard andesitic parent materials on mountainous uplands and is 20 to 40 inches deep over bedrock. Soil texture is sandy loam throughout the profile. The soil surface contains numerous stones and boulders, and the subsoil is 40 to 75 percent gravels, stones, and cobbles.

The terrain observed in the area of the Johansen parcel is typical of the Umpa series, but the slope is less than that of the mapped UmE unit. Therefore, the parcel area should be included with an adjacent area mapped as Umpa very stony sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slope (map symbol UmD), which is assigned to land capability class 3 with 25 percent allowable impervious surface cover.
CONCLUSIONS

Soils in the area of the Johansen parcel should be mapped as Umpa very stony sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slope (map symbol UmD) and assigned to land capability class 5, which allows 25 percent impervious surface cover.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Coats

John R. Munn, Jr.

Paul Seidelman

William Vandivere
SUMMARY OF RESULTS

3. Alpine Way near Snowflake, Tahoe Tavern Heights; Placer County (3 to 5).

The Land Capability Review Team determined that the boundary line between the mapped TdD and TeE land capability units was incorrect. The principal surface characteristics differences between these two units are slope (TdD has a 5-15% slope, TeE has a 15-30% slope) and the amount of surface stones (TdD has stones on 1 to 5% of its surface. TeE has stones covering 5 to 15% of its surface). Both of these characteristics were field checked by the CTRPA staff and reviewed by the Team Leader.

LOCATION MAP
Area of Amended Land Capability

Alpine Way near Snowflake, Tahoe Tavern Heights, Placer County

Extent of the areas to be amended from land capability unit TeE (3) to land capability unit TdD (5)
EDWARDS PARCEL LAND CAPABILITY REVIEW
for the
California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

August 23, 1982

Parcel Location: Alpine Way above Woodland Way in Sunnyside, California.

Investigation Date: July 15, 1982

Review Team Members: Robert Coats, Ecologist
                        John Munn, Soil Scientist
                        Paul Seidelman, Geomorphologist
                        William Vandivere, Hydrologist

OBSERVATIONS

The Edwards parcel is located on glacial deposits dominated by volcanic rocks. Slope steepness on the parcel area is 10 to 15 percent.

Vegetation on the lot is an open second growth mixed conifer stand with a discontinuous shrub understory. Tree species include Jeffrey pine, sugar pine, incense cedar and white fir. Shrubs include greenleaf manzanita, snow berry and whitethorn. The vegetation does not indicate any unusual limitations to development.

The soil unit mapped in the area of the Edwards parcel by the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey (Rogers, 1974) is Tallac very stony coarse sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent (map symbol TeE), which is assigned to land capability class 3 with 5 percent allowable impervious surface cover (Bailey, 1974). The TeE soil is formed on glacial moraines from basic volcanic or metamorphic rock materials. Soil depth is 40 to 70 inches to a weakly silicate cemented hardpan. Surface soil textures are light loam to gravelly coarse sandy loam, and subsoil texture is gravelly to very cobbly coarse sandy loam to loamy coarse sand.

The soil profile was not examined at this site because no exposure was available near the site and the high rock content of the soil precluded hand excavation. However, the terrain in the area of the parcel is typical for the Tallac series, and the parcel is located within a large area that is mapped as Tallac soils. Slope steepness on the Edwards parcel is less than 15 percent, and the site is adjacent to an area mapped as Tallac stony coarse sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slope (map symbol TdD). Therefore, the area of the Edwards parcel should be combined with the existing TdD soil unit.
CONCLUSIONS

The soil in the area of the Edwards parcel should be mapped as Tallac stony coarse sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slope (map symbol TdD), which is assigned to land capability class 5 with 25 percent allowable impervious surface cover.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert Coats

John R. Munn, Jr.

Paul Seidelman

William Vandenver
SUMMARY OF RESULTS

4. Vicinity of Club and John Cain Drives; Talmont Area, Placer County (3 to 5).

The Land Capability Review Team determined that a mapped area of TeE surrounded by TdD was not as extensive as the original survey showed. The principal surface distinctions between the TeE and TdD units are slope (TdD has 5 to 15% slope; TeE - 15 to 30% slope) and the amount of surface stones (TdD has stones covering 1 to 5% of its surface; TeE has stones covering 5 to 15% of its surface). The CTRPA staff inspection confirmed the slope characteristics of the revised TdD/TeE boundary.
AREA OF AMENDED LAND CAPABILITY

Vicinity of Club and John Cain Drives;
Talmont area, Placer County

Extent of the area to be amended from land capability unit TdE (3) to land capability unit TdD (5)
SONNENBERG PARCEL LAND CAPABILITY REVIEW
for the
California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

August 23, 1982

Parcel Location: East side of Club Drive between Sunrise Drive and Silver Tip Crive in Twin Peaks Estates, near Sunnyside, California.

Investigation Date: July 15, 1982

Review Team Members: Robert Coats, Ecologist
                      John Munn, Soil Scientist
                      Paul Seidelman, Geomorphologist
                      William Vandivere, Hydrologist

OBSERVATIONS

The Sonnenberg parcel is located on glacial moraine deposits composed of volcanic and metamorphic materials. Slope steepness on the parcel is and in the surrounding area is generally in the range of 10 to 15 percent.

Vegetation is a dense second growth stand of white fir, red fir and Jeffrey pine. The shrub herb understory contains snow berry, whitethorn, Ribes, sp., and double-fruited honeysuckle. The vegetation does not indicate any unusual limitations to development.

The soil unit mapped in the area of the Sonnenberg parcel by the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey (Rogers, 1974) is Tallac very stony coarse sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slope (map symbol TeE), which is assigned to land capability class 3 with 5 percent allowable impervious cover (Bailey, 1974). The TeE soil is developed on glacial moraines composed of basic volcanic or metamorphic rock materials. Soil depth is 40 to 70 inches to a weakly cemented silica hardpan. Surface soil textures are light loam to gravelly coarse sandy loam, and subsoil textures are gravelly to very cobbly coarse sandy loam to loamy coarse sand.

The terrain observed in the area of the Sonnenberg parcel is typical of the Tallac series, but the parcel slope of 10 to 15 percent on the parcel is less than that of the mapped TeE unit, and the site is adjacent to an area presently mapped as Tallac stony loamy coarse sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slopes (map symbol TdD), which is assigned to land capability class 5 with 25 percent allowable impervious cover. Therefore, the area of the Sonnenberg parcel should be combined with the adjacent TdD soil unit.
CONCLUSIONS

Soils in the area of the Sonnenberg parcel should be mapped with the adjacent area of Tallac stony coarse sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slope (map symbol TdD), which is assigned to land capability class 5 with 25 percent allowable impervious surface cover.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert Coats

John R. Munn, Jr.

Paul Seidelman

William Vandivere
SUMMARY OF RESULTS

5. Vicinity of Williams, King George, Rubicon and Forest; Rubicon, El Dorado County (3 to 5).

The Land Capability Review Team determined that there was an area which was mapped as JdC that was large enough to be a mappable unit of JdC. The principal surface distinction between the two units is slope (JdC has a 0 to 9% slope; JdD has a 9 to 20% slope). The CTRPA staff used a clinometer to field check the area for slope. These results were then reviewed with the Land Capability Review Team Leader and changes were made to the Team's original boundaries. The additional field work was able to distinguish slope changes which were hidden by the forest canopy in the aerial photographs.
AREA OF AMENDED LAND CAPABILITY

Vicinity of Williams, King George, Rubicon, and Forest; Rubicon, El Dorado County

Extent of the area to be amended from land capability unit JaD (3) to land capability unit JaC (5)
MILLER PARCEL LAND CAPABILITY REVIEW

for the

California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

August 24, 1982

Parcel Location: North side of Williams Lane between George Drive and Rubicon Drive in the Rubicon Bay area, California.

Investigation Date: July 15, 1982

Review Team Members: Robert Coats, Ecologist
John Munn, Soil Scientist
Paul Seidelman, Geomorphologist
William Vandivere, Hydrologist

OBSERVATIONS

The Miller parcel is located on a mixture of reworked glacial moraine and outwash deposits that are dominated by granitic materials. Slope steepness on the parcel and adjoining areas is about 5 percent.

Vegetation on the lot is a dense second growth stand of white fir with some suppressed Jeffrey pine. A former shrub understory has died out as the tree canopy closed. The site appears to have good capability for revegetation and does not present any unusual limitations to development.

The soil unit mapped in the area of the Miller parcel by the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey (Rogers, 1974) is Jabu coarse sandy loam, 9 to 20 percent slope (map symbol JaD), which is assigned to land capability class 3 with 5 percent allowable impervious surface cover (Bailey, 1974). The JaD soil is developed on glacial outwash terraces composed of mixed materials that are dominated by granitics. Soil depth is 40 to 80 inches to a dense fragipan. Surface soil texture is loamy coarse sand to coarse sandy loam, and the subsoil is a coarse sandy loam to loamy coarse sand that contains up to 45 percent coarse fragments.

The soil and landform observed on the Miller parcel are similar to the Jabu series, but the 5 percent slope of the parcel and surrounding area is less than that of the mapped JaD soil unit. This gently sloping area extends west to Forest Drive and is easily large enough to constitute an individual map unit delineation. Therefore, the Miller parcel area should be mapped as Jabu coarse sandy loam, 0 to 9 percent slope (map symbol JaC), which is assigned to land capability class 5 with 25 percent allowable impervious cover.
CONCLUSIONS

The soil on the area of the Miller parcel should be mapped as Jabu coarse sandy loam, 0 to 9 percent slope (map symbol JaC) and assigned to land capability class 5, which allows 25 percent impervious surface cover.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Coats

John R. Munn, Jr.

Paul Seidelman

William Vandivere
SUMMARY OF RESULTS

6. Vicinity of Mohican, Chippewa and Pawnee; Tahoe Paradise #9, El Dorado County (3 to 5).

The Land Capability Review Team determined that there was a substantial area between Mohican and Pawnee which was originally mapped JaD, but should be mapped as an extension of the neighboring JaC unit. The principal surface distinction between the two units is slope (JaC has a slope of 0 to 9%; JaD has a slope of 9 to 20%). The CTRPA staff inspection revealed an area of consistent 6 to 8% slopes surrounded by an area of 10 to 20% slopes.

LOCATION MAP
AREA OF AMENDED LAND CAPABILITY

Vicinity of Mohican, Chippewa, and Pawnee;

Tahoe Paradise #9, El Dorado County

Extent of the area to be amended from land capability unit JaD (3) to land capability unit JaC (5)
ELLIS PARCEL LAND CAPABILITY REVIEW

for the

California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

August 25, 1982

Parcel Location: Chippewa Street between Apache Avenue and Iroquois Circle near Meyers, California.

Investigation Date: July 14, 1982

Review Team Members: Robert Coats, Ecologist
John Munn, Soil Scientist
Paul Seidelman, Geomorphologist
William Vandivere, Hydrologist

OBSERVATIONS

The Ellis parcel is located on glacial moraine deposits dominated by granitic materials. Slope steepness on the parcel and the surrounding area is less than 9 percent.

Vegetation on the lot is a dense mixed conifer stand; trees include Jeffrey pine, lodgepole pine, white fir and incense cedar. Reproduction of fir and cedar is especially dense. Shrubs present include whitethorn, snow brush, Ribes sp., and service berry. The vegetation does not indicate any unusual limitations to development.

The soil unit mapped in the area of the Ellis parcel by the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey (Rogers, 1974) is Jabu coarse sandy loam, 9 to 20 percent slope (map symbol JaD), which is assigned to land capability class 3 with 5 percent allowable impervious cover (Bailey, 1974). The JaD soil is developed on glacial outwash terraces dominated by granitic materials and is 40 to 80 inches deep over a dense fragipan. Soil texture ranges from loamy coarse sand to coarse sandy loam with up to 45 percent gravel in the subsoil and a slight increase in clay content with depth.

The terrain observed on the Ellis parcel meets the criteria for the Jabu soil, but the slope of the parcel area is less than the 9 to 20 percent range of the JaD unit map. This area of gentler slope encompasses the area between Mohican Drive, Apache Avenue, and the slope break south of Pawnee Drive and joins an area presently mapped as Jabu coarse sandy loam, 0 to 9 percent slope (map symbol JaC) on the east. Therefore, the area of the Ellis parcel should be combined with the nearby JaC soil unit, which is assigned to land capability class 5 with 25 percent allowable impervious cover.
CONCLUSIONS

Soils on the Ellis parcel should be mapped as Jabu coarse sandy loam, 0 to 9 percent slope (map symbol JaC) and assigned to land capability class 5 with 25 percent allowable impervious surface cover.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert Coats

John R. Munn, Jr.

Paul Seidelman

William Vandivere
SUMMARY OF RESULTS

7. Vicinity of Skyline and Crystal Aire Drive; Tahoe Paradise #48, El Dorado County (6 to 4).

The Land Capability Review Team determined that minor changes were needed regarding the Ebc/Ebe boundary line along Crystal Aire Drive and between Thunderbird and Skyline Drive. The principal differences between the Ebc and the Ebe units are location, slope, and the possible presence of seeps. Ebc units are described as being on the crests of moraines and characteristically have a 0 to 9% slope. Ebe units are described as being on the sides of moraines, having slopes of 9 to 30% and having seeps in some areas. The CTRPA staff investigation showed the slope along Skyline and Crystal Aire Drives from the top of the crest were 2 to 7% and slopes along the sides were 18 to 28%. No signs of seeps were noticed along Skyline or Crystal Aire Drives, but both wet and dry site vegetation was observed along Thunderbird.

LOCATION MAP
STAGER PARCEL LAND CAPABILITY REVIEW
for the
California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

August 25, 1982

Parcel Location: Northwest side of Skyline Drive between Crystal Air Drive and Coto Street near Meyers, California.

Investigation Date: July 14, 1982

Review Team Members: Robert Coats, Ecologist
                      John Munn, Soil Scientist
                      Paul Seidelman, Geomorphologist
                      William Vandivere, Hydrologist

OBSERVATIONS

The Stager parcel is located on glacial deposits dominated by granitic materials. Slope steepness on the parcel and on adjoining areas ranges between 25 and 35 percent.

Vegetation on the lot is a second growth stand of Jeffrey pine and white fir with a shrub understory. Species present include greenleaf manzanita, chinquapin, whethorn, Ribes sp., snow berry and bitterbrush. The vegetation does not indicate any unusual limitations to development.

The soil unit mapped in the area of the Stager parcel by the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey (Rogers, 1974) is Elmira gravelly loamy coarse sand, 0 to 9 percent slope (map symbol EbC), which is assigned to land capability class 6 with 30 percent allowable impervious cover (Bailey, 1974). The EbC soil is formed on morainal crests and is deeper than 60 inches over weathered glacial till dominated by granitic alluvium. Soil texture is loamy sand to coarse sand and the subsoil can contain up to 40 percent gravels.

The soil in the area of the Stager parcel was examined in a nearby roadcut. The observed soil was deep, with sandy texture, and contained a small amount of rounded gravels. This soil is similar to the Elmira soil mapped in this area. However, the parcel slope of 25 to 35 percent is much steeper than the 0 to 9 percent EbC unit slope range. This area of steep slopes extends along the lower side of Skyline Drive and is contiguous with a downslope soil delineation of Elmira gravelly loamy coarse sand, 9 to 30 percent slope (map symbol EbE). Therefore, the area of the Stager parcel should be combined with the adjacent, steeper EbE soil delineation. The EbE soil unit is presently assigned to land capability class 4 with 20 percent allowable
impervious cover, but the CTRPA Governing Board is presently reviewing this rating because the large slope range of the EbE map unit results in comparatively large amounts of impervious coverage on the steeper slopes of the highly erodible Elmira soils.

CONCLUSIONS

The soil on the Stager parcel should be mapped with the adjacent EbE soils. The land capability classification of this soil unit is presently under review.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert Coats

John R. Munn, Jr.

Paul Seidelman

William Vandivere
GRIZZLY MOUNTAIN DRIVE - MOUNT RAINER DRIVE

Area Soil Unit Redelineation

for the

California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

August 24, 1982

Review Team Members: Robert Coats, Ecologist
                      John Munn, Soil Scientist
                      Paul Seidelman, Geomorphologist
                      William Vandivere, Hydrologist

INTRODUCTION

CTRPA staff observations and land capability reviews in the Pyramid Circle and Grizzly Mountain Drive areas have indicated that the Jabu coarse sandy loam, seeped, 2 to 15 percent slope (map symbol JaD) mapped in this area by the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey (Roger, 1974) often lacks evidence of wetness, which is the major criteria for the restrictive 1b land capability classification (Bailey, 1974) assigned to the JbD soil unit.

The review and administration of land capability challenges by the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is expensive and time consuming. Therefore, to prevent unnecessary repetition of reviews on adjacent or nearby parcels, the agency has requested a review of the JbD soil unit in the vicinity of Pyramid Circle and Grizzly Mountain Drive, and, where needed, remapping of the soils in this area.

Project Location

The subject area is located along upper Truckee Road and Lake Tahoe Boulevard between the southern intersection with Grizzly Mountain Drive and the northern intersection of Mount Rainer Drive.

Method

Soils in the subject area were observed in the field for signs of wetness, including mottles, phreatophytic vegetation, and the presence of a high water table. These observations were noted on 4 inch per mile color aerial photographs covering the area in question, and stereo interpretation of landforms, slope, and vegetation was combined with field observations to locate soil unit boundaries. These boundaries were transferred to a base map by reference to the numerous cultural features in the area.
OBSERVATIONS

As described on page 20 of the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey, the JbD soil occupies concave positions on glacial moraines. The soil has sandy loam to loamy coarse sand textures with up to 45 percent coarse fragments in the subsoil, and soil depth is limited to 30 to 40 inches by a dense fragipan. The downward movement of water on this soil is impeded by the fragipan and underlying compacted till, so water moving from higher slopes accumulates to develop seeps and raises the water table to a depth of 2 to 3 feet during spring and summer. Vegetation is typically a thicket of lodgepole pine and white fir.

The soils observed in large portions of the project area differed from the JbD soil in two important respects. First, they occupy convex terrace surface positions that do not receive substantial lateral subsurface flow from higher slopes. Second, soil properties and on-site vegetation do not indicate the presence of a perched water table. An alternative soil unit that does not display the wetness characteristics but is otherwise similar to the JbD unit is Jabu coarse sandy loam, 0 to 9 percent slope (map symbol JaC), which is assigned to land capability class 5 with 25 percent allowable impervious cover.

CONCLUSIONS

Corrected soil unit boundaries for the Grizzly Mountain Drive and Mount Rainer Drive areas are shown on the attached map. All of the proposed boundary changes are within areas previously mapped as JbD, and the new boundaries are substantially different than the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey delineations. A large part of the Pyramid Circle area is combined with the adjacent Meeks stony loamy coarse sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes (map symbol MmB) map unit, and the terrace crests surrounded by Mount Diablo Circle and the Grizzly Mountain Drive - Zuni Street area have been changed to JaC. In each case, the change in land capability rating is from class 3 with 5 percent allowable impervious cover to class 5 with 25 percent allowable cover.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert Coats

John R. Munn, Jr.

Paul Seidelman

William Vandivere
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MEMORANDUM

May 2, 1984

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
FROM: Agency Staff
SUBJECT: Man Modified Determination, Industrial Tract Stream Environment Zone, City of South Lake Tahoe

As a result of a litigation settlement involving the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and Gerald Martin, the Agency has been reviewing a land capability challenge on 4.5 acres located in the Tahoe Valley industrial park in South Lake Tahoe.

The matter is being brought to the Advisory Planning Commission's attention to discuss the feasibility of addressing the entire industrial park area concurrently with Mr. Martin's 4.5 acre portion in determining the extent of the man modified area.
MEMORANDUM

May 1, 1984

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: Agenda Item F, Transportation Planning Topics

1. Section 8 Planning (JHK & Associates Report)

   JHK and TTD staff will provide a status report regarding the UMTA Section 8 Short Range Transit Plan.

2. RTPA Designation

   TRPA staff will provide an informational report regarding the additional responsibilities involved with being designated the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the Tahoe Basin.

3. Status Report A.R. 120

   The TRPA and designated consultant are in the process of completing an Elderly and Handicapped Transportation Services Study. Staff will present a progress report regarding this study.
RESOLUTION OF THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
EXPRESSING APPRECIATION TO ANN BOGUSH

RESOLUTION NO. 84 - 11

WHEREAS Ann Bogush was appointed to serve on the Advisory Planning
Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency on November 12, 1980 on behalf
of the City of South Lake Tahoe Planning; and

WHEREAS Ann served as the Vice Chair of the Commission from February 9,
1983 to April 11, 1984; and

WHEREAS the Advisory Planning Commission has taken on the task and
fulfilled the valuable function of reviewing, analyzing and transmitting
recommendations on all important planning matters to the Governing Body of the
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency; and

WHEREAS of particular note has been the valuable role played by the
Advisory Planning Commission in preparation and final adoption of Environmental
Threshold Carrying Capacities for the Lake Tahoe Basin which were adopted in
August, 1982 as called for in Public Law 96-551; and

WHEREAS the Advisory Planning Commission has participated in the
preparation of the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin to protect and enhance
the quality of Tahoe’s water, air, land, recreation, and wildlife, and to ensure
that the Tahoe of the future will retain the irreplaceable and unique ecological
and environmental values for which the Region has become so famous; and

WHEREAS Ann’s judgment, technical knowledge, and professionalism as
exhibited in the numerous planning and environmental documents prepared by the
Agency will be long appreciated; and

WHEREAS Ann has earned the respect of Agency staff and Commission
members alike for her dedicated service and many contributions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Advisory Planning Commission
of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency expresses its appreciation to Ann for her
service to the Agency in helping to ensure the protection of Lake Tahoe’s many
resources and wishes her well in her future endeavors.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ninth day of May, nineteen hundred and eighty-
four by the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

________________________________________
Michael Harper, Chairman

APC Agenda Item VIII