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NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 9, 1986, in the Manzanita Room of the North Tahoe Recreation and Parks Community Center at 8318 North Lake Boulevard in Kings Beach, California. The agenda for said meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that this meeting will be continued to July 22, 1986, at 9:30 a.m. in the TRPA office, 195 U.S. Highway 50, Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, Nevada. The APC at this time will be making a recommendation on the technical adequacy of the Supplement to the Environmental Impact Statement for Regional Plan Revisions and on the Revisions to the Regional Plan Goals and Policies.

July 1, 1986

By: William A. Morgan
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
MEETING AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV PLANNING MATTERS

A. Discussion and Recommendation on the U.S. Forest Service Proposed Land and Resource Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin

B. Discussion on Resolution 86-15 Endorsing Litigation Committee Solution to Residential Unit Foundations and Directing Litigation Committee to Draft Implementing Ordinance

C. Discussion and Public Comment on Supplement to the EIS for Regional Plan Revisions

D. Discussion and Public Comment on Revisions to the Regional Plan Goals and Policies

E. Schedule of Ordinance Committee Meetings

V REPORTS

A. Staff

B. Legal Counsel

C. Public Interest Comments

D. APC Members

VI SPECIAL PLANNING MATTERS - This Advisory Planning Commission meeting will be continued to July 22, 1986 at the TRPA office, 195 U.S. Highway 50, Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, Nevada, to take up the following items:

A. Finding of Technical Adequacy, Supplement to the Environmental Impact Statement for Regional Plan Revisions

B. Recommendation on Revisions to the Regional Plan Goals and Policies
VII RESOLUTIONS

VIII CORRESPONDENCE

IX PENDING MATTERS

X ADJOURNMENT
MEMORANDUM

July 2, 1986

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Staff Analysis and Recommendation on the U.S. Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management Plan and EIS

The Agency has been requested to comment on the draft U.S. Forest Service Basin Management Plan before July 27, 1986. Copies of the plan were given to all APC members, and a presentation was made by the U.S. Forest Service at the May APC meeting.

Attached is a staff analysis and recommendation on the draft plan. This memo and the APC recommendation will be presented to the TRPA Governing Board at the regular July 23, 1986 Governing Board meeting. With the Governing Board's concurrence, the memo will then be forwarded to the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit.
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MEMORANDUM

July 2, 1986

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Staff Comments and Recommendations on the USFS Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit Forest Plan and EIS

The staff have reviewed the Draft Forest Plan and EIS and have several concerns regarding each of the alternatives presented. Therefore the staff recommend still another alternative which would be consistent with the TRPA's Regional Plan, allow the TRPA's Environmental Thresholds to be achieved within the first two decades and the long range Recreation Goals to be met through response to demonstrated need.

The recommended alternative described below would combine features of Alternative A (Preferred) and Alternative F (Amenity). The combination is compatible and superior in terms of TRPA's objectives to any of the alternatives presented. Staff has chosen the various components based primarily on information supplied in the Draft Forest Plan and DEIS in an attempt to encourage faster attainment of affected TRPA Goals, Policies and Thresholds. During its presentation at the APC meeting staff will present greater detail regarding the source of the various components in the USFS documents and why staff recommends those components over the "preferred alternative" component.

The Recommended Alternative

*** a. Theme This alternative would provide a high degree of environmental protection and would emphasize a variety of recreational opportunities including developed and dispersed activities. Wilderness values would be preserved. Fish and wildlife habitat, water quality, air quality, scenic quality, would be intensively managed consistent with the TRPA Regional Plan. Water quality objectives would be achieved relatively early in the Forest Plan cycle for the greatest net environmental benefit.

* From LTBMU's Preferred Alternative.
** From LTBMU's Alternative F (Amenity Emphasis).
*** From other alternatives, new proposals, or combinations thereof.
Resource Program Direction

Recreation Developed and dispersed (both wilderness and nonwilderness) recreation would be increased, with emphasis on nonmotorized activities. Access to underused areas would be improved through trails and trailheads where feasible. New developed recreation sites consistent with the Regional Plan would be built in response to demonstrated need. OHV use would be strictly regulated so as to be consistent with environmental protection. Close coordination with transit providers would be needed to mitigate potential impacts from additional recreation development. Some trails would be designed for bicycles and pedestrians to reduce automobile use.

Visual Quality Maintain and enhance the existing overall visual quality.

Wilderness Current management would continue for Desolation Wilderness. The Freel Peak roadless area would be recommended for wilderness or roadless area with management standards similar to those proposed for the Meiss Management Area. The Lincoln Creek roadless area would be managed as semiprimitive nonmotorized recreation.

Wildlife and Fisheries Mule deer, waterfowl, peregrine falcon, Lahontan cutthroat trout, and rainbow trout are Management Indicator Species (MIS) which could be emphasized in direct habitat improvement projects. A lesser amount of induced benefits for the above MIS would be realized through the watershed restoration and vegetation management programs. Habitat capability for all other MIS would be maintained at current levels, or improved substantially for such MIS as pileated woodpecker and spotted owl mainly through ecological succession of vegetation types.

The fisheries and wildlife program would be 150 to 200% greater than the current levels. Approximately 4 miles of stream habitat and 100 acres of terrestrial improvement per year would occur. Riparian areas would be protected and restored as part of the watershed restoration, wildlife and fisheries programs.

Forest Pest Management Emphasis would be in hazardous tree and vegetation management in developed sites. Opportunities for prevention would occur as new sites are developed and vegetation management is implemented.

Range Livestock grazing would be phased out in order to eliminate conflicts with increased dispersed recreation and to achieve water quality and fish and wildlife habitat objectives.

Timber and Vegetation Timber and vegetation would be managed to achieve diversity of species and structure for scenic, watershed, and wildlife habitat objectives. The most common harvest method would be group and single tree selection. Patch cuts of less than 8 acres would be allowed as a part of management plans to create openings for wildlife, to provide vegetational and habitat diversity, or to combat insects and disease. Patch cuts would be designed to be as natural in appearance as feasible.
*** Water Improvement of water quality would be a high priority. All disturbed sites in the watershed restoration backlog would be restored within 20 years at a rate of 180 acres per year. All existing facilities would be retrofitted with Best Management Practices. Additional water above current usage would be required to support new recreational facilities and for revegetation.

*** Air Traffic generated by new recreation facilities would require mitigation. Alternatives to the single family automobile would be necessary. Current smoke levels would be reduced as a result of emphasis on lop and scatter and chipping as slash treatments. Some slash may be left for wildlife cover.

* Cultural Resources Cultural Resources would be managed at a high level. Inventory and evaluation of all cultural resources would be completed by 1995, and an active program of cultural site protection and interpretation would be carried out.

* Research Natural Areas Grass Lake moss bog would be recommended for inclusion in the RNA system.

*** Fire The fire organization would remain at the current budget level and combination of fire suppression and prevention forces. This alternative would include approximately 33% prevention, 6% detection, 52% attack and 9% fuels. The wildfire response strategy would be control within or near urbanized areas. Forested lands outside of urbanized areas and high elevational pine areas would require a modified containment strategy that would promote wildlife habitat benefits. Amenity values would emphasize treatment of activity fuels consistent with air quality protection, soil protection, and scenic and wildlife habitat goals.

*** Land Uses No utility corridor would be designated through the basin.

*** Transportation and Facilities Bikeways and trails would be added to the transportation network. New recreation sites would be developed as needed. Reconstruction of roads and construction of trailhead parking would encourage dispersed recreation activities. Reconstruction of 60 miles of road at a rate of three miles per year to control erosion relatively early in the forest plan cycle would yield the greatest net water quality benefit. New road construction would be confined to that necessary for access to recreation sites. Recreation and administrative sites would be maintained to standard service levels and made energy efficient in the most cost-efficient manner.

*** c. The Environment to be Created The LTBMU would appear to the casual observer in 2030 to be quite like it was in 1980. The more discerning eye would note that in the large undeveloped areas the basin would be returning to conditions similar to those which existed when nature was the prevailing influence in the basin, prior to the late 1800s.

7/2/86

AGENDA ITEM IV A.
Vegetation would be more diverse and would offer more diverse wildlife habitat. Old growth forest, which is becoming increasingly rare elsewhere, will increase and shelter sensitive species which require old growth to survive.

There would be more recreational facilities. Developed facilities would be somewhat more evenly distributed around the basin, mostly near the existing areas of development. Access to dispersed recreation areas throughout the basin would be improved.

All TRPA environmental thresholds would be achieved in 20 years. The water quality standards would be met within 20 years as a result of intensive watershed restoration. Soils, vegetation, fish and wildlife, noise, and scenic thresholds would also be met. Recreational Goals would be met in accordance with demonstrated demand.

Benefits of the Recommended Alternative

All social groups would benefit from this alternative. The expanded recreation capacity would serve the public and the recreation-dependent business community. The environmental group would approve of the protection afforded amenity values, water, air, and scenic quality, and fish and wildlife.

The national interest would be served in the protection of Lake Tahoe by the early completion of watershed restoration. The sooner that water quality protection can be achieved, the more efficient the process would be since less total water quality degradation would occur. Therefore, the watershed restoration program would yield a greater net benefit.

The significant environmental and recreational values of the Lake Tahoe Basin were recognized in the enactment of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact. Substantial public and private investments have been and will continue to be required in order to protect the unique qualities of the basin. The cost of the recommended plan would be consistent with the high priority placed nationally and regionally on the preservation of Lake Tahoe.

General Comments

Water Quality Improvement of water quality is the highest environmental priority in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Whatever the final alternative selected, it should provide the highest level of water quality protection, including reconstruction of roads, retrofitting facilities with BMPs, and perhaps most important, early and complete watershed restoration. Watersheds must be protected in the future against destructive activities, such as inappropriate logging practices, grazing, mining, and OHV use.
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There is particular concern about the continued use of OHVs on certain basin lands. TRPA's policy on OHVs limits their use to "specified roads, trails or designated areas where the impacts can be mitigated." Continued cooperation of four-wheel drive clubs, the USFS, county and state governments, and this Agency is urged to determine appropriate areas of use, where mitigation measures can succeed and where enforcement can be effective. If impacts cannot be adequately managed, OHV use will have to be further curtailed.

Air Quality No alternative which would allow deterioration of air quality in the basin would be acceptable to TRPA. Management of forest service land and facilities could degrade air quality in two major ways, by vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) and by burning of slash. The expansion of facilities to meet the recreational goals could increase VMTs unless specific effort is made to reduce reliance on the automobile for recreation access.

There is some misunderstanding in the LTEMU DEIS of the TRPA standard regarding the reduction of VMTs, (e.g., page 4-10). The TRPA management standard is, "Reduce vehicle miles of travel in the Basin by 10% of the 1981 base year values." The TRPA standard does not specify 150% offsetting mitigation.

The adopted alternative should emphasize management of activity fuels to reduce reliance on burning in order to protect air quality.

Recreation Recreation is extremely important in the Lake Tahoe Basin. It is the single most important element of the economy. Visitors are attracted by the varied recreational opportunities offered, which includes viewing the spectacular scenery of the area. The public has a vested interest in the preservation of the Lake Tahoe environment, and it is appropriate that the public be able to enjoy the basin within the limits of its environmental capacity.

Recreational facilities need to keep pace with the usage so that the quality of the recreational experience is not degraded. Demand for overnight facilities appears to be high. The level of service must be adequate to maintain facilities and mitigate their environmental impacts.

Land Uses A major utility corridor through the basin would be inconsistent with TRPA's scenic threshold. Construction activity and road access for construction and maintenance of a major transmission line would have a negative effect on water quality. In addition, road access would also invite expanded OHV use.

Pest Management TRPA supports the concept of integrated pest management. The DEIS does not mention, much less discuss, the use of chemical controls for forest pests, either insects or plants. Therefore, it is not possible to assess the potential environmental hazards of pest management related to the various prescriptions or alternatives.
MEMORANDUM

July 1, 1986

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Discussion on Resolution 86-15 Endorsing Litigation Committee Solution to Residential Unit Building Foundations

Attached is a copy of Resolution No. 86-15 adopted by the Board last month. Also attached is a copy of the Litigation Committee minutes from the June 18 meeting. APC comments on the proposal are being solicited for use in the ordinance-drafting process.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RESOLUTION NO. 86-15

RESOLUTION ENDORSING LITIGATION COMMITTEE SOLUTION TO
RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOUNDATIONS AND DIRECTING LITIGATION
COMMITTEE TO DRAFT IMPLEMENTING ORDINANCE.

WHEREAS, at the request of the Governing Board, the Litigation
Committee has held several meetings to discuss solutions to the potential legal
problems posed by the existence of over four hundred (400) existing residential
unit foundations without current TRPA approvals; and

WHEREAS, foundations cause aesthetic, erosion, and safety problems; and

WHEREAS, the Litigation Committee has developed a proposed solution
which it has endorsed in conceptual form; and

WHEREAS, the Litigation Committee desires to refine the proposed
solution into ordinance form and present the ordinance to the Governing Board
as part of the regional plan package at the regular July meeting or as soon
thereafter as possible; and

WHEREAS, the Litigation Committee also desires to have the support of
the full Governing Board before embarking on the refinement of the proposed
solution into ordinance form;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, on the recommendation of the
Litigation Committee, the Governing Board endorses in concept the following
proposed solution to the problem posed by the existence of over four hundred
(400) existing residential unit foundations without current TRPA approvals:

1. A period of at least one year will be designated during
which owners of foundations built after January 1, 1976 will
be eligible to apply for exemption of their projects from
the residential allocation system;

2. In order to be exempt from the residential allocation
system, certain criteria, as defined by ordinance, shall be met;

3. The criteria shall include, at a minimum, a valid local
building permit, current TRPA standards for BMPs, woodstoves,
fireplaces, and heaters, and a structurally sound foundation;

4. Foundations not qualifying for an exemption shall be subject
to abatement by the appropriate governmental agency; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Litigation Committee be directed to
prepare a draft ordinance incorporating the above and setting forth the
administrative details of the program and the draft ordinance shall be presented
to the Governing Board at their regular July meeting or as soon thereafter as
possible; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Litigation Committee is directed to draft a proposed solution to the problem posed by existing commercial and tourist accommodation unit foundations without current TRPA approvals.

PASSED and ADOPTED by the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at its regular meeting held on this twenty-sixth day of June, nineteen hundred and eighty-six by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Stewart, Mr. Fruett, Mr. Woods, Mr. Hibdon, Mr. Henrikson, Mr. Miller, Mr. Westergard, Mr. Houghteling, Mr. Sharp, Mr. Reed, Mr. King, Mr. Gibbs

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Haagen, Mr. Hansen

/s/
CHESTER GIBBS, Vice Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Governing Board Litigation Committee
June 18, 1986
10:00 A.M.
TRPA Offices, Round Hill, Nevada

Present:
Jim Reed
DeArmond Sharp
Norm Woods
Roland Westergard

Audience:
Rob Hunt, IVGID
Neil Eskind, NTPUD
Bob Leonard, Local Architect
Mike Van Wagenen, Individual
Rusty Nash, Washoe Co. Deputy DA
Gregg Lien, TSPC
Rick Skinner, Cal. Deputy AG
Jim King, Governing Board

ISSUE: 400 FOUNDATIONS WITHOUT CURRENT TRPA APPROVAL

GOAL: RECOMMENDATION OF A SOLUTION TO GOVERNING BOARD

The discussion of needs and concerns involved both the committee and the audience:

Identification of Needs and Concerns:

1. Identify who truly wants to build on their foundations
2. Address the myriad of situations potentially before us (jurisdictional diversity)
3. Time certain for end of problem
4. Administrative simplicity of solution
5. Resolution of entire problem with one fell swoop
6. Diligent pursuit requirement of Compact (Article VI(p))
7. Keep the foundations separate from the allocation system
8. Avoidance of litigation between the public utility districts and property owners over sewer connection fees, etc.
9. Opportunity for transition between refund v. no refund policy for utility districts
10. Address what to do with the foundations that are determined to be unbuildable
11. Keep residential foundations separate from commercial/other foundations
12. Notice to affected property owners

13. Procedural simplicity in identifying affected group of foundations

14. Avoidance of lots with unsightly foundations

The proposed solution was originally recommended by the Litigation Committee at the May meeting and was expanded on by the participants:

Proposed Solution:

1. If foundation "grandfathered" in then not subject to the allocation

2. Does not include commercial/other foundations which will be discussed separately

3. Allow all foundations to "prove up" by a certain date and then cutoff the remainder

4. "Prove up" includes obtaining a valid local building permit; all necessary utility services; structurally sound foundation

5. Local jurisdictions will determine if foundations are structurally sound

6. Project must comply with current BMP requirements and regional plan standards for woodstoves, heaters, etc.

7. Notice to property owners should be joint notice from TRPA and county/city and should include both individual notice and other legally recognized forms of notice

8. Abatement program for leftover foundations in conjunction with the counties/city

9. Must build on existing footprint according to original plans (if available)

10. If property allowed additional coverage under Bailey, then additions may be permitted as a modification

11. If no original plans available, then coverage limited to foundation footprint and minimum necessary to provide access

12. Substantial modification of plans will be reviewed as new project (but not subject to allocation) unless modification is to comply with current building codes

13. Notices to owners will state that they have until September __, 1987 to "prove up" and must complete the structure within two years of receiving TRPA go-ahead under this plan
14. Possibility of cutoff date of 1975 such that any foundations predating the cutoff date are not eligible for the window

15. Separate out permits which are currently valid and send separate notices advising them of expiration date of the permit and the need to diligently pursue construction so they do not become part of problem

Jim Reed left shortly before the meeting concluded. The remaining committee members asked that the notes from the meeting be presented to them at their regularly scheduled meeting on June 25th. At that time they would consider making a recommendation to the Governing Board.

Meeting adjourned at 12:10 P.M.
FOUNDATION STATISTICS

DOUGLAS........30 pre-12/80 foundations
               3 post-80 foundations
               Low Capability lots........7 pre-12/80
               3 post-80
               High Capability lots........19 pre-12/80
               (10 low vs. 19 high)

EL DORADO.......18 pre-12/80 foundations
               59 post-80 foundations
               Low Capability lots........3 pre-12/80
               11 post-80
               High Capability lots........15 pre-12/80
               48 post-80
               (14 low vs. 63 high)

PLACER.........78 pre-12/80 foundations
               56 post-80 foundations
               Low Capability lots........6 pre-12/80
               10 post-80
               High Capability lots........72 pre-12/80
               46 post-80
               (16 low vs. 118 high)

WASHOE.........54 pre-12/80 foundations
               95 post-80 foundations
               Low Capability lots........12 pre-12/80
               31 post-80
               High Capability lots........42 pre-12/80
               64 post-80
               (43 low vs. 106 high)

Totals: 28 low capability in pre-12/80 group out of 180
               55 low capability in post-80 group out of 213
               (83 low vs. 306 high)

GRAND TOTAL: 393

* Numbers may not add up exactly as certain foundations are of unknown date or land capability
Pre December 19, 1980 Local Building Permits
Currently Valid and with Foundations

Douglas........30
Placer.........50
Washoe.........14
El Dorado.......2
City of SLT....?

Total..........96

Commercial Foundations

Douglas........1
Washoe.........3
El Dorado.......0
City of SLT....0
Placer.........2

Total..........6
MEMORANDUM

July 2, 1986

To: The Advisory Planning Commission
From: Agency Staff
Subject: Discussion and Public Comment on Supplement to the EIS for Regional Plan Revisions

The 60-day comment period for the Draft Supplement to the EIS for Adoption of a Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin began on April 17, 1986. On June 10, the Agency extended the comment period to July 11, 1986, to give the public an opportunity to review the draft supplement and the draft Regional Plan Goals and Policies together. The tentative schedule for certification is as follows:

Comment period ends: July 11
Final EIS distributed: July 15
Public hearings on Goals and Policies: July 16 and 18
APC meeting to consider certification of EIS supplement and recommendations on Goals and Policies: July 22
Governing Board certifies EIS supplement: July 23 and 24

To date, the Agency has received about 10 written comments on the draft supplement. Copies of the comment letters are attached. At the July APC meeting, the staff will make a brief presentation on responses to the comments and answer questions from the APC. Also, the APC and staff will receive comments from the general public on the draft supplement.

Please contact Dave Ziegler at (702) 588-3296 if you have any questions or comments on this agenda item.

DSZ
7/2/86
MEMORANDUM

May 29, 1986

To: Dave Ziegler
From: Joe Houghteling
Subject: Draft EIS Supplement

Please add to my list of economic activity generated by the "consensus" revised plan the 200 tourist units and the 1600 multi-family units.

[Hand-delivered this date.]
Mr. David Ziegler  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
Post Office Box 1038  
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448-1038

June 6, 1986

Dear Mr. Ziegler:

The State has reviewed the Draft Supplement EIS, Adoption of Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, submitted through the Office of Planning and Research.

Review was coordinated with the Air Resources, Reclamation, and Regional Water Boards, State Lands Commission, and the Departments of Boating and Waterways, Conservation, Fish and Game, Forestry, Parks and Recreation, Water Resources, Health Services, and Transportation.

The Lahontan Regional Water Board will send its comments directly to you regarding this document. Questions regarding the Board's position should be directed to Dr. Judith Unsicker, Box 9428, 2092 Lake Tahoe Boulevard, South Lake Tahoe, CA 95731-2428.

Thank you for providing an opportunity to review this report.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

for Gordon F. Snow, Ph.D
Assistant Secretary for Resources

cc: Office of Planning and Research  
1400 Tenth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

(SCH 83030704)
Memorandum

To: Dr. Gordon Snow
   Resources Agency
   1416 Ninth Street
   Sacramento, CA  95814

From: James Kuykendall
   Interim Executive Officer
   California Regional Water Quality Control Board
   Lahontan Region
   P. O. Box 9428
   2082 Lake Tahoe Boulevard
   South Lake Tahoe, California  95731-2428

Date: May 30, 1986

Subject: REVIEW OF DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR ADOPTION OF A REGIONAL PLAN FOR THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN, SCHR #83030704

We intend to submit detailed comments on the document above directly to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). We do not feel that the adequacy of the environmental document can be evaluated until the "project" is completely defined. The TRPA has not yet completed drafting of revised Regional Plan Goals and Policies, or completely defined the "Individual Parcel Evaluation System" which is intended to be a key element of the revised plan. Completion of these tasks is projected for mid-June.

TRPA staff have approved our submittal of comments directly to their agency. We understand that the public comment period may also be extended. We will send a copy of our final comments to the State Clearinghouse. Please contact Dr. Judith E. Unsicker at this office if you wish to discuss these comments.

Attachment

cc: Regional Board Members
   Kenneth Smarkel, SWRCB/Div. of Water Quality
   TRPA

lk

RECEIVED
BY______________

JUN 03 1986
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
June 6, 1986

RECEIVED

BY

JUN 1, 1986
Tahoe Regional Plan–EIS Supplement
SCH 83030704

Mr. David Ziegler
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

Dear Mr. Ziegler:

Thank you for the opportunity to review an EIS supplement for amendments to the Tahoe Basin Regional Plan. We offer the following:

With regard to the Capitol Improvement Program, we wish to remind TRPA that transportation and erosion control projects on State highways must be programmed in the 5-Year State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), with or without State or Federal funding. Cost estimates, funding sources and proposed project schedules should be identified in the Capitol Improvement Program. We request that TRPA inform District 3 of proposals on State highways and allow the District an opportunity for input before the Program is revised each year.

We note that several projects identified in Caltrans' Commitment Statement (June 14, 1982), concerning the 1982 Air Quality Plan, have been completed. The remaining projects are subject to funding.

It is Caltrans' policy to work with local agencies and the private sector to develop financial partnerships to provide State highway improvements. The District is willing to meet with TRPA, local government and private interests in the Tahoe Basin to discuss State highway improvements.

We recommend that TRPA review District 3's System Management Plan and Route Concept Reports for State Routes 28, 50, 89 and 257 as they pertain to the Basin. We also recommend the District Scenic Highway Reports for reference to segments of Routes 50 and 89 in El Dorado County.
Mr. David Ziegler  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
Page 2  
June 6, 1986

If you have any further questions on these comments and recommendations, please contact Mr. Dana Cowell, telephone (916) 741-4543, or Mrs. Jeannie Baker, telephone (916) 741-4498.

W. R. GREEN  
District Director

[Signature]

By 
R. Rogers  
Deputy District Director  
Planning and Public Transportation
June 10, 1986

Mr. Dave Ziegler
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

Dear Mr. Ziegler:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the supplement to the draft environmental impact statement for the adoption of a regional plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin. The habitat and fisheries staff from our Fallon office have reviewed the DEIS and offer the following comments and suggestions.

General Comments

The document adequately covers most fish and wildlife concerns. However, there appears to be a reluctance in the document to address the problem of conflicts or potential conflicts with piers and buoys on the lake and topline anglers. This issue has the potential to be a continuing problem that should be positively addressed.

Specific Comments

On page II-8, first paragraph, last sentence we recommend that you add the following:

"... and controls runoff from parking areas, paved streets and highways;..."

On page II-15, last paragraph add:

"... removing blockages, protecting streambank vegetation, reducing ..."

And on page IV-4, first paragraph, first sentence, add:

"... will degrade the quality of the runoff water in streams and lakes."
Mr. Dave Ziegler
June 10, 1988
Page 2

If I can provide any additional comments or answer any questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

William A. Molini
Director

cc: Region I
State Clearinghouse
June 11, 1986

Mr. Dave Ziegler
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448-1038

Re: SAI NV #86300078  Project: Draft Supplement, EIS for Adoption of a Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin

Dear Mr. Ziegler:

Attached are the comments from the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources concerning the above referenced project.

These comments constitute the State Clearinghouse review of this proposal as per Executive Order 12372. Please address these comments or concerns in your final decision.

Sincerely,

John B. Walker, Coordinator
State Clearinghouse, OCS/SPOC

JBW/11
Enclosures
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Walker, Clearinghouse
   Office of Community Services

FROM: Mike Del Grosso, Land Use Planner

SUBJECT: SAI 863000078, TRPA EIS Draft Supplement
         for Lake Tahoe Regional Plan

Attached are the comments from various agencies of the Department of
Conservation & Natural Resources. These agencies are the Divisions of Water Resources,
State Parks, Environmental Protection and Historic Preservation and Archaeology.

The Division of State Lands has no comment of Draft Supplement.

JMD/mc

Attachments
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Walker, Office of Community Services

THROUGH: Pam Wilcox, State Lands

FROM: Alice M. Becker, Staff Archeologist

DATE: 5/30/86

SUBJECT: DRAFT SUPPLEMENT, EIS FOR ADOPTION OF A REGIONAL PLAN FOR THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN, SAI NW# 86300078

The Division has reviewed the document. Archeological and historical sites are an important part of the environment in the Lake Tahoe Basin and are non-renewable natural resources. The Division appreciates the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's commitment to identify and protect significant cultural properties.

The Agency already recognizes that some of the actions proposed within the supplemental EIS have the potential to affect these resources. The renovation, revitilization, and removal of blighted areas (described on page II-8) may involve modification or destruction of historic properties not previously identified in cultural resource surveys in the Basin. Archeological sites may be disturbed due to growth in regional land use and population. We therefore agree that the Agency should establish and apply special project review criteria (see page IV-10); the Division offers its assistance in the preparation of such criteria.

If you have any questions regarding these comments please call us.

AMB: emt
MEMO

TO Pam Wilcox
FROM Steve Weaver (Jaw)         DATE 5/30/1986
SUBJECT TRPA EIS Draft Supplement for Lake Tahoe Regional Plan

The Nevada Division of State Parks is pleased to comment on the above mentioned document SAI #86300078. Overall, we concur with the general concepts of the proposed actions. We are pleased that the proposal will provide for additional recreation development. Included are provisions for low-density recreational experiences involving expansion of trail systems, managing areas for nature study and wildlife observation, and establishment of separate areas for snowmobiling and cross-country skiing. In addition, scenic ratings of individual shoreline and roadway units, bike paths and recreation areas would be improved or maintained.

We are unclear, however, about the proposed 6114 PAOT for overnight, 6761 PAOT for summer day use and 12400 PAOT for winter day use. Are these intended for both indoor and outdoor recreation? If so, what is the percentage breakdown?

Our only criticism is the apparent emphasis on private and commercial development versus the development of public use facilities. Up to 2,000 private homes are projected over the next five years, along with significant commercial development. Of particular concern is the effect SEZ restrictions will have on public access. However, as long as some exceptions to such environmental restrictions are permissible for public recreation development, we believe that this problem can be overcome.

SW:sw
806
trpaplan.eis
Draft Supplement EIS for Adoption of a Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin.

AIR-Lowell Shifley

Page II-4 Transportation

The 10% lower traffic counts at the Upper Truckee River Bridge does not seem to be a reasonable indicator for all traffic in the Lake Tahoe Basin or even at the South Shore of the basin. There has been a 5% increase in average annual daily traffic from 1981 through 1985 at the Kingsbury Counter on U.S. in Nevada.

Page II-4 Air Quality

Nevada demonstrated compliance with the Federal Ambient Air Quality Standard for carbon monoxide on December 31, 1982 for the Nevada portion of the basin, and provided a report in July 1983 which demonstrated maintenance of the standard through 1984. Data for 1985 shows that maintenance of the standard continued through 1985 in Nevada.

Page II-15 C2 Transportation Element

This item should be C3 as C1 Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and C2 Land Use Element are on page II-6. These items contain in this subsection represent a unrealistic concept. While reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) may be a desirable goal, it probably will not reduce traffic congestion in the California portion of the South Lake area to provide achievement of the Ambient Federal Carbon Monoxide Standard. Increased bus service will mean an increase in cost and fares. The most recent bus fare increase resulted in decreased bus patronage. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's recent action against one of the waterborne excursion services shows a policy of curtailment rather than expansion. This is also true of airport use where TRPA has recently been on record to reduce the number of flights into the Tahoe Basin. There is a relatively small permanent population in the basin and a relatively large area. People movers or trams probably are not feasible because of these factors. An unrealistic Light Rail transit system was proposed in the TRPA 1982 Air Quality Plan. Bike and pedestrian facilities may reduce annual
VMT's but the carbon monoxide problem is a winter month (December through February) occurrence. With snow on the ground these facilities are unusable and do nothing to reduce the use of motor vehicles or carbon monoxide.

Page III-2 Clean Air Act

This section does not recognize that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has approved two different SIP's for the Lake Tahoe Basin. There is an approved plan for Nevada, the 1979 TRPA Air Quality Plan, and there is also an approved plan for California, the 1982 TRPA Air Quality Plan. Nevada has demonstrated attainment in the Nevada portion of the basin and has requested redesignation to attainment status. California has requested redesignation to attainment status for the portion of Placer County in the basin.

Page IV-3 E. Air Quality

The inadequacy of VMT reduction to achieve the carbon monoxide standard has already been discussed in the Transportation Element, Page II-15. Fee initiation systems cannot pay for measures needed to offset effects of development with community plan areas. This is the figment of someones imagination.

Page IV-5-6 Transportation

Again the inadequacy of VMT reduction has been previously discussed but highway operational improvements, zone to zone transportation strategies to offset the impacts of new development and a possible enforcement linkage between progress on threshold attainment and rate of new development are included in this element. While these items could make achievement of the ambient carbon monoxide standard possible the cost may be prohibitive and it appears that the transportation element is still in its very early planning stages.

WATER-Wendell McCurry

No comment.

WASTE-Verne Rosse

No comment.

GROUNDWATER-Dan Gross

Ground-water impacts are not addressed. Page 2 of Attachment 1, the ground-water management standard is very general and to be implementable will require more definitive standards, such as distances between ground water discharges and surface waters that could be impacted. Essentially, all ground-water flow is the basis to Lake Tahoe.
May 8, 1986

Mr. William A. Morgan
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nv. 89448-1038

Re: The Draft EIS on a Plan Revision

Dear Bill:

I offer these following initial comments on the this Draft with a general opinion that it's most confusing and inadequate, qualities that I suspect are by-products of the speed and pressures under which it was put together.

1> There ought to be up-front a clear summary statement of what the proposed amendments are:

a) 

b) 

c) etc.

Right now, a reader wanders through the document that often intermixes existing Plan and the amendments until Community Planning Process is found on page II-8, the IPES proposal on page II-10, and the Development Allocations on page II-20.

It isn't clear, either, whether the EIS should address a five or six year plan since 1986 was agreed upon by stipulation outside the EIS process and the permit process is already underway.

Quite often in lengthy documents there is at their start a short, two to five page "executive summary" of their contents. Such might be included here.

2> The discussion of the "208" requirements is confusing. They're mentioned in connection with "Bailey" with the appearance of "208" Plan), page II-10 without any definition of what "208" is. It's only back in III that the document tells what "208" is. I suggest that at the least there ought to be cross-references between the early mentions and the later definitions. There might even be a directory of acronyms.
3> There ought to be explicit mention of the existing sewer capacity limitations in parts of the Basin under Public Service etc. page II-19. What is the implication in "Notes for Table I" (no page number) that "in the event STPUD has the ability to serve new development in years 1989, 1990, and 1991" etc. Given that the STPUD plant work, as I recall, specifically provided for no new capacity, how can there be an "in the event" condition.

( I get the impression the draft was written by people who know the subject so very well that they fail to realize the lesser level of knowledge of most of us readers.

4> I suggest that, as appropriate, the findings of both the Economic Technical Committee (ETC) and the Urban Land Institute be incorporated into the EIS.

5> Significant and realistic aspects that should be discussed in this EIS are the fairly clear economic advantages of TRPA adopting the proposed Plan changes as compared to the murky what-occurs if they aren't accepted. In brief, what's the "bird in the hand" and what's out there in the bushes.

The hand bird has two clear measureable dollar benefits, the 1,700 new homes allowed over the five years and the 400,000 square feet of commercial allowed over ten years.

To figure how many construction dollars (in 1986 dollars) are involved here ought to be fairly simple; 1,700 times the building costs of an "average" house and 400,000 times the average square foot commercial building costs.

Is there any informed estimate on how much redevelopment might occur. If so, another construction dollar figure could be estimated.

But for the purpose of this letter, let's say for convenience the average new house would have a construction cost of $100,000, so 1,700 of them would generate $170,000,000. Using the Economic Technical Committee's $60 per square foot base building cost, the 400,000 square feet of commercial could result in at least $24,800,000 in construction costs.

A summing up:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,700 new houses (1987-91)</td>
<td>170,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400,000 s.f. new commercial</td>
<td>24,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation (s.f. x ETC's bldg. cost)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Possible Construction dollars</td>
<td>194,000,000+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 9, 1986  
William A. Morgan - EIS  
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Now somewhere there must be an informed estimate as to the fallout economic activity generated by construction dollars (i.e. the carpenters have to buy groceries so the store needs a new clerk.) So might not the formula for the economic "bird in the hand" be "construction dollars plus "fall-out" economic activity dollars plus estimate on rehabilitation. And, I suspect this all may be translated, too, to new jobs created. But I'm sure you and staff can sharpen my assumptions or challenge them.

So much for "bird in the hand"; what's out in the bushes.

Let's assume no consensus plan amendments adopted; this is the "no action" alternate.

a) The AG/League suit would go to trial, then probably to appeal. Susan could give you a time estimate on this. It's uncertain which side would prevail at the trial court, although certain the plaintiffs have won so far. What happens to the injunction against new construction if at the trial level 1) the plaintiffs win and 2) the defendants win and there is an appeal.

b) More likely, without a law suit settlement this year, Nevada, would withdraw from the Compact (nearly did so in 1985). What are the time schedules on withdrawal. And then what follows, especially on "208" revisions in each State that might allow building within some different restraints than that still would qualify as meeting the mandated water quality and other environmental standards.. There are more informed folk that I who can lay out this parade of uncertainties, including the possibility of more law suits over the adequacies of one State's, or both's, replacement plan, each plan being more difficult to fulfill since it only would cover part of the Basin.

Most likely your response is that no one can predict what might follow if the consensus amendments are rejected. That's exactly my point.

So consequences get clearer. On the one hand, there's the opportunity of at least $194,000,000+ new economic activity coming into the Tahoe Basin over the next ten years or so. On the other, great uncertainty as to what construction/economic activity might occur, if any, for the next few years. This seems to me to be the reality the public and then Board members have to make a central part of their decision-making, and thus needs discussing in the draft EIS.

Joseph C. Houghteling
MEMORANDUM

July 2, 1986

To: Advisory Planning Committee
From: Agency Staff
Subject: Discussion and Public Comment on Revisions to the Regional Plan Goals and Policies

In mid-June, the staff mailed copies of the draft Regional Plan Goals and Policies to the APC. This document is a major milestone in the consensus-building process, and will lay the groundwork for more-detailed ordinances and implementing programs.

Although the APC has reviewed and commented on virtually all of the affected policy changes in the past, the staff would encourage the APC members to review the exact language of the draft Goals and Policies and to identify any areas where clarification or further modification may be required.

On July 9, the staff will be prepared to answer questions from the commissioners on the draft Goals and Policies. In addition, the staff and APC will receive comments from the general public. If you have any questions about the Goals and Policies prior to the July 9 meeting, please contact Gordon Barrett or Dave Ziegler at (702) 588-3296.