TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

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 February 10, 1988, at the Lakeview Room of the Fairway Community Center, 330 Fairway Drive, Tahoe City, California. The agenda for said meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

February 1, 1988

By: W. A. Morgan

William A. Morgan
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
NOTICE OF AMENDED AGENDA

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the February 10, 1988 agenda for the Advisory Planning Commission meeting is amended to include a recommendation by the Advisory Planning Commission on amendments to Chapter 11 (Foundations) of the Code of Ordinances.

February 2, 1988

By:  
William A. Morgan
Executive Director
AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV PUBLIC HEARING

A. Preliminary Community Plan for Tahoe City

B. Revised Regional Transportation Plan and EIS for the Revised Regional Transportation Plan

C. Public Facilities List for 1988-92

D. Recreation Facilities List for 1988-92

E. Chapter 7 (Temporary Uses, Structures and Activities) and Related Amendments to Chapter 2 (Definitions) and Chapter 4 (Project Review and Exempt Activities) of the Code of Ordinances

F. Chapter 15 (Redevelopment)

V PLANNING MATTERS

A. Recommendation on the Preliminary Community Plan for Tahoe City

B. Finding of Technical Adequacy for the EIS for the Revised Regional Transportation Plan and Recommendation on the Revised Regional Transportation Plan

C. Recommendation on the Public Facilities List for 1988-92

D. Recommendation on the Recreation Facilities List for 1988-92

E. Recommendation on Chapter 7 (Temporary Uses, Structures and Activities) and Related Amendments to Chapter 2 (Definitions) and Chapter 4 (Project Review and Exempt Activities) of the Code of Ordinances

F. Recommendation on Chapter 15 (Redevelopment)
VI REPORTS

A. Executive Director
B. Legal Counsel
C. APC Members
D. Public Interest Comments

VII CORRESPONDENCE

VIII PENDING MATTERS

IX ADJOURNMENT
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 195 U.S. Highway 50
Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, Nevada

January 13, 1988

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Vice Chairman Stan Hansen called the regular January 13, 1988 meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) to order at 9:35 a.m. and asked for a roll call.

Members Present: Ms. Huber, Ms. Jamin, Mr. DeMello, Mr. Hoefer, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Glab, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Popoff, Mr. Harper, Mr. Thrams, Ms. Bedard (present at 10:25 a.m.), Mr. Van Wagenen, Mr. Combs

Members Absent: Mr. Renz, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. Becker

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Combs asked that the discussion on the preliminary Community Plan for Tahoe City be scheduled after the lunch break because members of the Tahoe City Advisory Council wanted to be present.

MOTION by Mr. Dodgion, with a second by Mr. Hoefer, to approve the agenda as presented. The Tahoe City Community Plan would be heard at 1:00 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

MOTION by Mr. Pyle, with a second by Mr. Dodgion, to approve the December 9, 1987 minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

IV PUBLIC HEARING

A. Chapter 7 (Temporary Uses, Structures and Activities) and Related Amendments to Chapter 2 (Definitions) and Chapter 4 (Project Review and Exempt Activities of the Code of Ordinances)

Principal Planner Gordon Barrett advised that the committee working on this ordinance chapter had recently met and recommended approval of the chapter with several conditions. One of these conditions is that the APC and Governing Board not take final action this month but defer action to February so that the Tahoe Basin Association of Governments (TBAG) can have time to reform itself for the purpose of reviewing the document, with particular emphasis on the MOU sections of the chapter. The committee was concerned that local governments may not want to take on the responsibilities for administering temporary uses. Another condition recommended by the committee relates to establishment of a 10-day response time to any application submitted for a temporary activity; this will have to be drafted by the Governing Board Rules Committee. Other conditions relate to establishment of a reasonable filing fee, preparation of an
informational packet and of a model MOU for review by affected entities. Staff does not have any problems with these conditions other than possibly the issue of filing fees.

Mr. Barrett summarized the contents of the ordinance and of the handout to be used to describe the temporary activity regulations to the public.

Following are specific points of concern raised by APC members:

Section 7.6.A (4) - implies that a temporary activity can remove or disturb vegetation. This can occur on the same site up to four times per year. The ordinance should not permit activities that will disturb vegetation such that revegetation will be required as mitigation. Revegetation can take several years to be successful. There is a contradiction in the ordinance. If disturbance of vegetation is not permitted and one site can be used up to four times a year for temporary activities, then revegetation is not a good mitigation measure. (Popoff) Use a case-by-case inspection in each case to determine, after an event has occurred, what revegetation is required. (Thrams) There should be something in the ordinance that refers to the requirement to comply with Chapter 4 (Project Review and Exempt Activities), because it is hard to include everything in this chapter which is pertinent. (Glab) Chapter 4 applies to many chapters; it is not specifically referenced in these chapters. Reference can be made in the handout to the requirements to be met in Chapter 4. (Barrett)

Neither the ordinance nor the handout clearly indicate that the four 14-day events are all that is allowed on a particular site. It is possible for numerous applicants to have four craft shows each on one site throughout the year, such that the use becomes almost permanent. The cumulative impacts are not addressed. (Unsicker) The four events that are permitted per year should apply to four events per year per site and not to four events by one particular project applicant. Anything over four events should require a different level of review and a permit by TRPA (Harper/Glab) The way to accomplish this is to require that the property owner be the permittee. There may be a problem with the same special event applicant moving from site to site on numerous occasions to avoid the regulations. The regulation should address site specific and user specific constraints. (Thrams)

The handout, which will be given to people who inquire about the temporary activities regulations, should be modified in the second section to indicate that certain activities are "generally" exempt, because there are qualifications in Chapter 4 about confining impacts to the project area. (Unsicker)

On the question of requiring staff response within 10 days of submittal of an application for a special activity, Agency counsel Susan Scholley recommended this be addressed in the Rules of Procedure, rather than in an ordinance, because of the timing requirements for processing amendments. Amendment of the rules takes less time than amendment of an ordinance. The question is what action is to be taken by staff within 10 days - approval, denial, notification that the application is complete? According to the Compact the Agency has 180 days to take action once a project application is complete. It would be inconsistent to require action within 10 days. Language could be included which is directory but not mandatory on the 10-day response time. It would be difficult to achieve the thresholds if there were default approval possibilities,
i.e. a project is automatically deemed approved if it is not approved within 10
days of submittal. Mr. Hansen explained that the 10-day time period was con-
sidered by the Committee to be a goal. The purpose of it was to provide the
applicant with some response on how the request for a temporary activity would
be treated, not that approval be granted. Project proponents for major events
will likely not wait until the last minute for these determinations but will
come into the Agency many months ahead of a scheduled event. Mr. Harper
suggested leaving time deadlines out altogether. If, however, a 10-day response
time is addressed in the ordinance or handout, it should be accompanied with a
statement that the Agency legally has 180 days to act on a project application.

With regard to Section 7.6.E, which states that temporary activities may create
noise levels that exceed the noise thresholds, Ms. Scholley suggested this be
reworded to state that "temporal activities are exempt from the noise
limitations in Chapter 23, provided that the reviewing authority..."

Mr. Steve Teshara, Executive Director of the Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council,
questioned whether the four events per year proposal was being recommended for
sites other than those which are "designated special events" sites or sites that
under the ordinance would be exempt. Mr. Hansen responded that this hadn't been
decided as yet. Mr. Teshara suggested that if a site, through the Community
Planning process, were selected as a special use site, then there should be no
limit to its use. The fifth person to use a designated site should not be
penalized. If the area is a sensitive one which would not qualify as a
specially designated area, it might be appropriate to apply this recommendation
if more than four people wish to plan special activities. The Council disagrees
with staff's representation on acceptance of Chapter 7. The Council did not
agree to support Chapter 7 with conditions but asked instead that the whole
subject be discussed by TBAG. Much good has been written into the revisions,
but the Council will not support it until TBAG reviews and comments on it.
There is also a concern that Chapter 7 refers to other chapters which have not
yet been completed. This applies particularly to the sign regulations.

Mr. Tom Martens, Executive Director with the League to Save Lake Tahoe,
commented that the ordinance had come a long way and explained that the intent
of the process had been to get a handle on regulating various types of events to
ensure protection of the environment. He would recommend that the ordinance go
to the Board in February instead of sending it to TBAG for review; TBAG is not
even formed yet and is not the best forum for reviewing a technical document.
Better to have planning directors involved, and they have been. With regard to
specifics of the ordinance, in Section 7.0 delete reference to "major" events
because they are not defined. Refer instead to projects which have "substantial
impacts." "Major" is too vague. It is confusing in the ordinance and is the
lay person's handout whether special event is different from a special activity.
In Section 7.1, it is not clear who is responsible for coming in to get approval
for a special event - the special event promoter or the property owner? What
happens with multiple special events like the winter carnival? He would suggest
that it be the promoter and that it be clear as well that the property owner is
responsible in a way. In Section 7.3.A. there will be difficulty in defining
which special events legally commenced prior to the effective date of the plan.
Special events are hard to pin down; some occur every year; some don't. Be
specific as to which ones have legally commenced. Section 7.5.B provides that
community plans "may designate special event areas..." He would suggest that
the Community Planning process must address special event areas. For some
areas, this may not be appropriate, but they should be looked at. Any special event areas outside of Community Planning areas should be reviewed by TRPA. Section 7.6.B refers to the "reviewing authority." This is inappropriate language for an ordinance. The Compact says TRPA is to be responsible for environmental impacts of projects. The standards are to be set forth in the ordinance. It is acceptable for TRPA to sign an MOU for implementation, but TRPA is the ultimate authority for ordinance purposes. The League would agree with Ms. Scholley's modified language in Section 7.6.D. on the noise threshold. The Compact requires Article V(g) findings to be made to show why a project does not exceed thresholds. It is hard to make those findings if the thresholds are allowed to be exceeded. In this same section, there is a requirement to notify affected property owners of temporary activities which will have noise impacts. Affected property owner regulations usually apply to events occurring near single family dwellings. The Agency has a responsibility to notify the affected owners in, say, the case of a power boat race or an air show off the South Shore. For these kinds of potentially noisy events, either list them in the ordinance as being subject to Board review or make a generic list as to what should be reviewed and include it in Chapter 23. Or be very specific about Executive Director discretion. Whenever a project comes in like this, there should be a public hearing and an opportunity for property owner comment. This section should be strengthened. In Section 4.6.A there is a reference to temporary activities which are considered "part of" or accessory to a primary use. What is part of a primary use? This should be deleted. The League would also like to see a model MOU drafted as required in Section 4.6.C.(2) so that it is clear to local governments exactly what the requirements are. TRPA needs to have some review mechanism.

Because no one else in the audience wished to comment on the ordinance, Vice Chairman Hansen closed the public hearing.

Ms. Unsicker suggested that in Section 7.6.A and in the handout the Agency is adding on something to the existing exemption for activities on high hazard lands by saying the area is disturbed. The ordinance needs to define disturbed in that context. The 208 Plan issue is not whether an activity is temporary but whether there is discharge due to activities in excess of Bailey coverage or disturbance of the SEZ - whether the event is temporary or permanent. The point is not to aggravate existing water quality impacts due to disturbance. In Section 7.6.A.(4) when revegetation is required, does this mean restoration of just the disturbed area or just the further disturbance that has been created? This needs clarification.

With regard to the four times per year per organization v. the four times per year per project site, Ms. Jamin suggested that permitting an activity to qualify for an exempt status four times a year per project site, assuming the site is not a designated special event area, is a reasonable requirement. The ordinance needs to exempt those activities that are along Highway 50, such as a race that traverses a linear area. It would be difficult to confine that activity to one site. It should be clear that specially designated special events sites and linear activities are exempt. With regard to Mr. Marten's remarks on the MOU and designation of local government to enforce the regulations, TRPA planners have not had experience in this area either, and they will experience some of the same difficulties as local planners might. She personally felt that local governments should have the option of enforcing the
ordinance. There will be discussion among local jurisdictions to determine if the language in the ordinance is something they feel they can implement. Staff's recommendation that action not be taken until the TBAG reviews the document (prior to the February meeting) is a reasonable one.

Discussion followed on county administration of the ordinance. Mr. Harper suggested that TRPA was simply passing the administrative task on to local governments. Currently Washoe County's rules have more flexibility, particularly on the setting of conditions. Ms. Jamin explained that the purpose of having local jurisdictions implement the ordinance through MOUs is to alleviate an additional level of government, although the regulations would be TRPA's regulations. Ms. Huber suggested there were additional county concerns, such as garbage removal, health and safety and provision for sanitation facilities, which were traditionally handled by local governments through their special use permits. These should stay within the purview of the counties. Mr. Combs asked that, if there would be MOUs between TRPA and local jurisdictions for implementation of the ordinance, it be a one-step process so that applicants don't have to go to both entities.

Mr. Glab questioned the need for an MOU if agreement could be reached that local governments would administer the ordinance. Ms. Scholley responded that it was appropriate for TRPA and local governments through an MOU to agree on sharing the responsibility and setting up a procedure for reviewing projects. The MOU is important so both will know exactly what the process is.

Mr. Harper questioned whether the review could go the other way, i.e. TRPA issue the permit on behalf of local governments. Ms. Scholley responded that this would not be appropriate, because local governments regulate matters which are not within the Agency's scope of expertise or statutory purpose and place project conditions relating to health and sanitation. These are not typically handled by TRPA.

Ms. Huber questioned the outcome of the discussion on whether only four special events per year could occur on specially designated sites. Mr. Hansen suggested that nothing had been determined as yet.

Discussion followed on the notice provisions for noise events. Mr. Harper suggested that any public notice provision should allow an opportunity for public comment; otherwise, it should be called something else. Mr. Morgan agreed this section of the ordinance needed more work to determine what process would be followed once notice was sent out.

Mr. Harper questioned Section 4.6.C (1) and the reference to emergencies in the context of highways and roadways. A fire could be considered an emergency situation and also a temporary activity. There needs to be some clarification that a temporary activity is not an emergency. Mr. Morgan explained that such emergencies are exempt in the Code. Staff will double check this. Mr. Barrett suggested that emergency should not be referenced here (Section 4.6.C(1)(b).

With regard to the four events per site per year, Mr. Hansen suggested this needed more work by staff. He felt there were enough concerns that the committee needed to review it prior to or after TBAG's review. He felt the
ordinance should go to the Governing Board in February.

MOTION by Mr. Glab to table action on Chapter 7 and refer it back to the committee.

Mr. Glab urged the committee to keep the idea of allowing a one-stop permit, if possible, at the county level.

Second by Mr. Pyle. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Draft Amended Regional Transportation Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Regional Transportation Plan (The comment period on the draft EIS has been extended to January 15, 1988.)

Transportation Planner Jim Brennan explained that the date for submittal of comments on these two documents had been extended from December 30 to January 15. Both documents have been before the APC and numerous interest groups previously. The APC is requested to give additional comments at this meeting. After January 15, the staff will be putting together a revised Transportation Plan incorporating the comments and putting together a response to comments on the EIS, or providing additional analysis if required. Action by the APC and Governing Board will be scheduled for February. (Mr. Brennan had copies of the responses received to date for APC members.)

Because of the volume of material to be reviewed, Mr. Harper suggested that it be sent to specific departments at the county level; he would advise staff where to send this information. Mr. Brennan suggested that staff also flag those areas which have been changed as a result of public comment.

Staff responded to specific questions about the Plan and EIS; following are specific APC comments:

There is no data in the Transportation Plan which shows that the 6 ppm California high altitude CO standard will be met. (Poppoff) This information is in the EIS. (Brennan)

There is some question about the accuracy of the numbers for Placer County. The staff shows 4,500 residences as the base; there are actually 11,200. This is a major difference. Updated counts of lodging units that are not single family units will be made available to staff. (Bedard) There is some confusion or mixing here of existing units with the remaining unbuildable lots. The 4,500 figure reflects the number of unbuilt units that can still be built out. The 11,000 is what is on the ground now. (Combs) Staff will present the figures in a more readable form and will list total occupied housing units and total existing housing units. (Brennan)

Referencing his December 21, 1987 letter, Mr. Tom Martens, Executive Director of the League to Save Lake Tahoe, highlighted specific comments on the Regional Transportation Plan and explained that comments would be coming in later on the EIS. Mr. Martens addressed the Plan's emphasis on road building, lack of institutional commitments, TRPA's leadership role, land use implications, the TTD, mass transit improvements, streets and highways, transportation system management and aviation.
Because no one else in the audience wished to speak, Vice Chairman Hansen closed the public hearing. The meeting recessed for a lunch break from 12:30 p.m. to 1:35 p.m. (Members present after lunch: Glab, Jamin, Brooks, DeMello, Popoff, Thrams, Pyle, Dodgion, Hansen, Harper, Unsicker, Hoefer, Huber, Bedard)

V PLANNING MATTERS

B. Discussion of and Recommendation on Preliminary Community Plan for Tahoe City

APC member Bill Combs introduced members from the Tahoe City Advisory Council present for the day's meeting (Cindy Gustafson, Terry Dyer, Bev Bedard) and Tom Shaffer, the TRPA employee recently hired to aid in formulating the Community Plan (CP) for the North Shore area. While action would not be taken today on the Tahoe City CP, at least a conceptual endorsement will be sought in February. Mr. Morgan explained that a formal public hearing should be conducted on the preliminary plan, and action would be taken by the Governing Board on the preliminary CP since it lays the groundwork for the final CP.

Mr. Combs described the boundaries of the CP (using wall maps) and explained that at this point in time Placer County is not proposing to include Dollar Hill in CP status. Using a flip chart, Mr. Combs presented a detailed summary on the process and participants, the inventory of existing conditions (types and amounts of existing floor space, parking, number of parcels, etc.), traffic, community goals and objectives (urban design, traffic circulation, commercial growth, recreation), commercial opportunities, different scenarios, themes for the CP, work programs, target dates, and unresolved issues.

Principal Planner Gordon Barrett discussed code standards and where the CP can and can't deviate.

Mr. Combs concluded by explaining that after February action on the preliminary CP further modifications will be made. The draft of the final CP will be distributed in April or shortly thereafter, and hearings on the final CP will be conducted in May, with adoption and certification of environmental documents in July. After Tahoe City, Placer County will move on to the CP for Kings Beach. Some additional time may be needed in this process to conduct an initial needs assessment by specialists in the economics and marketing fields. This may move the process to a fall adoption.

Mr. Combs responded to questions by APC members. Mr. Harper asked that the outline used by Mr. Combs for his presentation be typed up and made available to other local planners. Mr. Combs explained that it followed the material in the draft initial assessment (December 1987) which had been mailed prior to the meeting.

Mr. Popoff questioned the assignment of priorities in the surveys that were distributed to property and business owners which were different from the responses on the survey. In the CP, mass transit is one of the top priorities, and yet the surveys indicate this is sixth or seventh in priority. It seems like a contradiction to plan for something that the residents perhaps will not use. The same contradiction goes for additional access to Lake Tahoe, which was down on the list of priorities on the survey yet is number one on the recreation plan. Mr. Thrams suggested that what was deemed by the plan to not be possible,
i.e. an alternative route through town between the commercial area and the golf course, was actually the number one response to needed roadway improvements. The plan goes against the outcome of the survey. He would also recommend a much more thorough analysis of human resources and a determination made on what people really want. There needs to be a better response rate on the surveys; and although it is recognized that the tourist survey was not successful, there should be an analysis of what the tourists want. A 30-40% response rate on a survey means possibly that a large percentage of the population may be missed.

Mr. Combs responded that there would be connecting roads from behind town to the central commercial area; they will, however, be smaller scale roads, not an additional highway. Because of the importance of the road configuration to the plan, additional information can be presented in February. With regard to the tourist survey, the market study will hopefully address this sector of the public. As far as the reliability of the statistics that were obtained, he did feel comfortable accepting the 30-40% response rate.

Ms. Unsicker advised that Lahontan would have to make a separate determination on the man-modified status of stream zone properties in Tahoe City. She would suggest that Placer County get on a Lahontan agenda so the determination can be processed. There is a possibility that any industrial development in Plan Area 001B if on top of the old land fill would have to be responsible for cleanup and monitoring. Ms. Unsicker questioned whether the County was planning on using this initial assessment and preliminary plan as the project EIR for the development? There is a difference between a project EIR and a more general planning EIR. Mr. Combs responded that the Placer County Public Works Department was processing an Environmental Assessment so that Phase I could proceed ahead of adoption of the plan. It would depend on the specificity of the environmental document.

Mr. Morgan commended Bill Combs, Gordon Barrett, and the Tahoe City Advisory Group for their work. This is the first CP, and a good job has been done. A few other things might be addressed in the realm of public service in the final plan which relate to projects to be included on a public service list of projects. There may also be things not on the list that Placer County may want to be thinking about, such as whether the water supply and fire flows as they stand are sufficient to meet anticipated needs. If there is no school proposed within a CP, the location of schools should be addressed. Address bikeways, postal delivery, churches, and multi-purpose facilities.

Discussion followed on the public hearing schedule and meeting location for February. Mr. Morgan suggested there be a public hearing on the preliminary plan at the February APC meeting.

Mr. Pyle asked that the land capability report being prepared for remapping of properties in the Tahoe City area be submitted to SCS for review as soon as possible, since SCS did some of the original work in that area. The first step is the remapping; the determination on man modification will follow.

Mr. Thrams asked that, because of there training, there be some input on landscaping proposals by landscape architects.
Mr. Terry Dyer, member of the Tahoe City Advisory Committee, spoke to the special qualities of the Tahoe City area and suggested that traffic problems were of primary concern. The plan before the APC is a very preliminary plan. Much work needs to be done. The economic evaluation will show what makes Tahoe City tick. In the past the economy was tourist and construction oriented. Now the economy is a tourist economy. Other issues to be addressed relate to transportation, SEZ classification, allocation of limited floor space, and determination of uses for those allocations.

Ms. Judy Russell, a second home owner since 1985, submitted letters she had received from concerned citizens on the future of Plan Area 001B. Past proposals for this 71 acre area have included a mobile home park and a light industrial area. If density in this area is permitted to go up to 15 units per acre, the ultimate buildout could be 1,500 units, making ingress and egress on the 20 foot wide frontage road impossible. She was for an industrial park and keeping the properties in good condition. There is a gluton of property at Tahoe; land has been abused and left. Properties need to be rehabilitated.

Ms. Bedard suggested that the real issue here was not so much the use of this site but gaining access without having to drive through residential areas.

Mr. Tom Martens, Executive Director with the League to Save Lake Tahoe, suggested that there be as much documentation on the survey methodology as possible. If land use changes are being done based on the survey, there should be good documentation. Secondly, this CP process and the surveys will be used as a model for others. Indicate where the surveys were circulated and why. There also needs to be documentation on the land capability study and a statement on the relationship of this plan to other plans, particularly the State Parks Plan. The State Parks owns a large amount of land above Tahoe City, and although the State has no plans as yet, there should be some planning direction from State Parks on general parameters such as future access to the park (Antone Meadows). Another plan which will have a tremendous impact on this CP and which should be addressed is the Squaw Valley Plan. On the whole, the Tahoe City CP is a good plan.

Mr. Steve Teshara, from the Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council, spoke in favor of the economic study. He felt it was important for the people in Tahoe City to have the time necessary to factor in economics. Do not be so interested in keeping to a rearranged time table that this is not done right.

After discussing the schedule for February, it was decided that the APC would meet for a day and a half in February. On February 10, the APC would try to schedule its meeting and a hearing on the Tahoe City preliminary CP in Tahoe City. The February 11 morning session would be conducted at the TRPA office, and the City's redevelopment plan would be the only item on the agenda.

(Members present: Glab, Thrams, DeMello, Popoff, Hansen, Combs, Unsicker, Bedard, Hoefer, Huber, Van Wagenen)

A. Discussion of Threshold Indicators (Chapter 32, Code of Ordinances)

Mr. Dave Ziegler, Chief of the Long Range Planning Division, explained that the threshold indicators were not yet ready for APC or Board action. Today's discussion would center on what work has taken place to date. Referencing the
January 5 memo to the APC, Mr. Ziegler discussed ordinance requirements with regard to the requirement for TRPA to identify and measure indicators for each adopted threshold and discussed draft compliance forms. With regard to interim targets, the APC is requested to give comments on what form the interim targets should take. The options are as follows: 1) to give a year and a number, e.g. by 1995, the concentrations will be down to a certain standard; by 2000, the concentration will be down further, etc. 2) to give a year and a range of numbers, e.g., in the year 2005, it is hoped the concentrations will be down to a range of 6 ppm and 8 ppm, etc. 3) to give an envelope, e.g., at any given time, a table would indicate the envelope that would constitute reasonable progress; as long as the measurement falls within that envelope, the Agency is on track with its interim targets; or 4) similar to an envelope, to work off a forecast line, e.g., staff would model where it expects to be over time on any given date and the forecast line could constitute the interim target. Mr. Popoff suggested that the targets must be realistic, and the way to achieve this is to use a model to forecast into the future, a forecast line.

With regard to the compliance forms and analysis of effectiveness and adequacy, Mr. Ziegler suggested that it did not seem necessary to redo analyses that had already been done in other documents. With regard to air quality, as an example, the 1982 Air Quality Plan set forth a program to achieve compliance with the federal standards. The recent EISs in 1986 and 1987 demonstrated that, within the limits of the modeling, the standards could be met over the long haul. He did not see the need to repeat all that analysis; cross referencing should be adequate. A brief, one to two paragraph summary of the analysis could be included.

Ms. Unsicker suggested that the threshold indicators be sent out to the APC prior to the packet mailing if the staff wants APC action in either February or March. This will give time for review.

C. Discussion of Public Service Facilities List for 1988-1992 - continued

D. Discussion of Recreation Facilities List for 1988-1992 - continued

E. Status Report on Chapter 24 (Parking and Driveway Standards) of the Code of Ordinances

Mr. Morgan explained that the Board in December determined that parking standards should be more in conformance with local standards than what was presented in Chapter 24. In fact it is hoped that local standards can be relied upon. The Board wants the staff to rethink the ordinance amendment with that direction in mind. It will be a while before the chapter comes back to the APC.

F. Status Report on Chapter 91 (Air Quality Control) of the Code of Ordinances to Clarify the Prohibition on the Use of Coal in the Tahoe Region

Mr. Ziegler explained that the amendment to this chapter was initially viewed as very simple. It has turned into something more complicated than originally thought. It will likely be summer before amendments come back to the APC on this chapter.
G. Status Report on Chapter 10 (Structures Housing Gaming) of the Code of Ordinances

Agency counsel Susan Scholley reported that the ad hoc committee would be meeting on this ordinance chapter next week. It will not be back before the APC likely before March.

VI REPORTS

A. Executive Director

Mr. Morgan advised that Roxanne Hutting has been hired as the Secretary II for the Long Range Planning Division.

B. Legal Counsel

Ms. Scholley explained that staff was in the process of working on the final Cove East/Dillingham settlement. Briefing is ongoing in the Kelly cases.

C. APC Members

Mr. Poppoff advised he would not be present for the Thursday, February 11 session of the APC meeting as Lahontan was also meeting that day. Ms. Unsicker explained that Lahontan was going to try and finish everything up on February 10.

Ms. Unsicker advised that Lahontan had been contacted by the Postal Service regarding loss of its lease in Tahoma. The Lahontan Board has a proposed negative declaration up in the air which it a year ago decided not to act on until TRPA acted. What is the schedule? Mr. Morgan responded that the Postal Service had not contacted TRPA. Mr. Combs commented that he had heard the Postal Service had given up on the site in question.

Mr. Morgan gave the APC an update on the status of the Postal Service situation at Incline Village and the policy with regard to home delivery. He had received a confusing response to his earlier letter on whether or not home delivery had to be required if requested. Discussion followed.

Mr. Hoefer advised that the Forest Service last spring made decisions about the Zephyr Cove Resort and its future. Those decisions stirred some concerns which the Forest Service felt could be resolved with development of a more detailed site plan. The site plan alternatives will be discussed at public meetings on the evening of January 20 and the morning of January 21 at the Zephyr Cove Library.

Mr. Combs advised he would be unable to be at the APC meeting on Thursday, February 11 because of other meeting commitments. Mr. Combs also thanked the APC for their attention during his presentation on the Tahoe City Community Plan.
D. Public Interest Comments - none

VII CORRESPONDENCE - none

VIII PENDING MATTERS - none

IX ADJOURNMENT - The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Julie D. Frame
 Administrative Assistant

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call for an appointment at (702) 588-4547.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448-1038

(702) 588-4547

MEMORANDUM

February 1, 1988

To: APC

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Discussion of and Recommendation on Preliminary Community Plan for Tahoe City

Requested Action:

The preliminary plan for the Tahoe City Community Plan was presented to you at the January APC meeting. Based on the plan document, the January presentation, and public testimony to be heard at the February APC meeting, the APC is requested to recommend that the TRPA Governing Board approve, deny or modify the subject preliminary plan.

This document is not the final plan or even a draft of the final plan. It is a preliminary scoping document that is to be reviewed by the APC, Governing Board, Placer County Planning Commission, and Placer County Supervisors. If all the reviewing authorities concur with the direction of the preliminary plan, the Tahoe City Planning Team will proceed to the next step in the process to prepare a final plan. (See Subsection 14.6.B of the Code for details.)

The work program and schedule section of the preliminary plan needs more work. Staff will present a revised work program and schedule at the APC meeting.

Recommendation:

TRPA staff recommends the APC approve the December 1988 Preliminary Plan for the Tahoe City Community Plan which includes:

1. The recommended boundaries for Tahoe City (includes golf course and 64-acre tract), Tahoe City Industrial Area, and Lake Forest as shown on Exhibit 1.

2. A preliminary allocation of 60,000 square feet of new commercial floor area for all three areas.
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3. The land use themes as follows:
   Tahoe City - Major Tourist Accommodation, Retail and Services
   Tahoe City Industrial - Industrial Storage and Services
   Lake Forest - Local Serving Retail, Services, and Storage

4. A finding that a tiered EIS/EIR (tiering off the 1983 TRPA Regional Plan
   EIS and the 1987 TRPA Code and PAS EIS) shall be required and that an
   alternative considering the Dollar Hill area as a CP be included.
MEMORANDUM

February 2, 1988

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Finding of Technical Adequacy for the EIS for the Revised Regional Transportation Plan and Recommendation on the Revised Regional Transportation Plan

The draft TRPA Regional Transportation Plan and EIR/EIS began circulation on Friday, October 30, 1987. The documents circulated until January 15, 1988. Copies of the draft documents were distributed to the APC members at the November APC meeting. The staff presented the draft documents to the APC at the December and January APC meetings.

Comments have been received and enclosed in your packet is a revised Final Regional Transportation Plan and Final EIS/EIR, which includes the Response to Comments. The staff is requesting the APC to make a finding of technical adequacy on the EIS/EIR and a recommendation on the revised Final Regional Transportation Plan.

The staff will be prepared to answer any questions the APC or public may have on the documents at the APC meeting.

If you have any questions, contact Jim Brennan or Leif Anderson at (702) 588-4547.

AGENDA ITEM V.B.
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January 30, 1988

To: APC

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: TRPA List of Additional Public Service Facilities 1988-1992

The TRPA Governing Board is required by Chapter 33 of the Code to adopt the subject list and to update it at the beginning of each year. The staff sent a copy of the attached memo (attachment 1) to the listed public service agencies (attachment 2) requesting projects to be included on the list.

The additional Public Service Facilities list 1988-1992 (Attachment 3) was prepared from the response. This list was first shown to the APC at its January meeting. Since then it has been recirculated and some additions have been made to the list.

The Code limits the list to certain public facilities, generally projects that create additional capacity. Also, projects not on the list may be added at a later date. (See Attachment 1 for details.)

This list is for screening and coordinating public service projects and does not constitute project approval or denial. Approval of this list is not considered to have a substantial impact on the environment.

Action Requested

The staff requests that the APC review and comment on the list. Based on comments and recommendations from the APC, staff will prepare a final list for Governing Board review and approval in February.

Recommendations

Staff recommends a positive APC recommendation on the TRPA list of additional public service facilities.

Attachments

(1) Memo to P.S. agencies with Section 33.5 of Code
(2) Mailing List of Public Agencies
(3) List of Additional Public Service Facilities 1988-1992 (includes most current draft of Action Element, Transportation Plan)

GWBird
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MEMORANDUM

October 27, 1987

To: Public Service Agencies

From: Gordon Barrett

Subject: TRPA List of Additional Public Service Facilities 1988-1992

Chapter 33 of the recently adopted Code (Section 33.5 attached) requires TRPA to prepare a list of proposed public service facilities which are to be constructed in the next five years. In order for TRPA to approve one of the facilities specified by Section 33.5, the public service project must be on the list.

What PS Uses Need to be on the List? The uses listed in subparagraph 33.5.A(1) are the types of uses that are to be included on the list. Public service uses covered by a master plan and other public service uses listed in 33.5.A(1) are not required to be on the TRPA list prior to TRPA action. Definitions of the TRPA use classifications are attached for your convenience.

What Type of Projects for the Eligible Uses Need to be on the List? Only facilities which are considered to be "additional" as described in subparagraph 33.5.A(2) are to be included on the list.

Is This Similar to the Previous TRPA List? Yes, this is a continuation of the recent practice of listing upcoming public service projects. However, since the court action which required the previous list is over, the list is narrowed to include the major projects described above. The purpose of the new list is to identify and coordinate major public service projects occurring in the next five years. This list will be updated every January.

What if You are not on the List? If an unforeseen project or change arises that needs to be on the TRPA list, there are provisions for adding a project to the list. This may happen at any time subject to the TRPA Governing Board making the findings set forth in subparagraph (4).

How do You Get on the List? Fill out the attached form for each individual project you propose which is required to be on the list. Mail the forms to Attention: Gordon Barrett, TRPA, P.O. Box 1038, Zephyr Cove, NV 89448. These forms should be submitted before December 15, 1987 to be assured inclusion on the January 1988 list. If you have any questions please call me at (702) 588-4547.
1988-1992
Public Service and Facility Project List Form

1. Agency

2. Department

3. Name of Project

4. Location

5. Description of Additional Facility

6. Statement of Need

7. Creates additional land coverage: Yes ___ No ___

8. Estimated cost $ __________

9. Estimated date of implementation/purchase 19___

10. Increases service capacity: Yes ___ No ___

11. Outside funding sources: Yes ___ No ___
   If yes, name source ________________

For office use only:

APN ________________  REC ________________

PAS ________________  PS ________________

TRAN ________________
33.5 Regulation Of Additional Public Service Facilities: TRPA shall regulate the rate and distribution of additional public service development as follows:

33.5.A Requirement Of Appearance On List Of Additional Public Service Facilities: No person shall construct a project or commence a use, which creates additional public service unless the project or use appears on the list of additional public service facilities prescribed by this Subsection. In order to construct the additional public service facilities or commence the public service facilities use or activity, the person proposing same shall comply with all other applicable provisions of this Code. Public service facilities, which are within a specific or master plan adopted by TRPA pursuant to Chapter 16, are exempt from this requirement.

(1) Applicable Public Service Facilities: The following public service facilities referred to in Chapter 18 are additional public service facilities eligible for inclusion on the list of additional public service facilities: airfields; convention and assembly facilities; government offices; hospitals; pipelines and power-transmission facilities; power generating; public health and safety facilities; public utility centers; publicly-owned government meeting; schools (colleges only); transit stations and terminals (excluding bus shelters); transportation routes; and solid waste collection stations.

(2) Definition Of "Additional" Public Service Facilities: Public service facilities are considered "additional" if they are to be created pursuant to a TRPA approval issued on or after January 1, 1987. The conversion of an existing nonpublic facility use to a use constituting a public facility is an additional public facility subject to this chapter. The following are not "additional" public service facilities:
(a) The reconstruction or replacement, on the same parcel, of legally existing public service facilities;
(b) Modifications to legally existing public service facilities and accessory uses thereto, that do not create additional service capacity;
(c) Public or quasi-public utility service connections;
(d) Replacement or reinforcement of pipelines or transmission lines which results in no significant increase in service capacity; and
(e) Telephone lines, local distribution facilities and similar facilities.

(3) Preparation Of List: TRPA, in consultation with all appropriate public service entities, shall prepare a list, including a description, of all additional public service facilities, included in the categories in Subparagraph 33.5.A(1), which are anticipated for construction during the first five-year period of the Regional Plan. The list shall be updated, and amended accordingly, at the beginning of each calendar year. The Governing Board shall adopt and amend the list, provided proposed projects meet the criteria in Subparagraph (4) below.

(4) Eligibility For Inclusion On List: Projects included on the list shall be projects, for which the sponsoring entity demonstrates, and TRPA finds that:

(a) There is a need for the project;
(b) The project complies with the Goals and Policies, applicable plan area statements, and this Code;
(c) The project is consistent with the TRPA Capital Improvement Program;
(d) The project meets the findings adopted pursuant to Article V(g) of the Compact as set forth in Chapter 6 as they are applicable to the project's service capacity;
(e) Where the project was unforeseen and action is required before the next annual update, or the project relates to an emergency involving the public health, safety and general welfare, the project must be placed upon the list immediately;
(f) Where the proposed project is to be located within the boundaries of community plan area then, to the extent possible consistent with public health and safety, the project will be compatible with the applicable community plan; and

(g) Where a public service project is proposed for construction in a community plan area before the community plan has been adopted by TRPA, the sponsoring entity shall demonstrate that the need for such a construction schedule outweighs the need for the prior completion of the community plan process.
Airfields, Landing Strips and Heliports: Transportation facilities used for the landing or take-off of aircraft, including helicopters; also, any appurtenant areas used for airport buildings and accessory facilities, including terminals, aircraft sales and rentals, and fueling facilities. This definition includes uses such as airports, heliports, helipads, and seaplane bases.

Collection Stations: Establishments engaged in the temporary accumulation and storage of recyclable discarded materials, which are subsequently transported to recycling centers or solid waste disposal sites for further processing on a regular, and consistent schedule. (Does not include automobile wrecking yards or any recycling processing facilities, which are listed under Recycling and Scrap; does not include storage of toxic or radioactive waste materials.)

Government Offices: Buildings containing offices for public agencies including administrative offices, meeting rooms, and regional post offices, but does not include offices that are incidental and accessory to another government use, such as transit terminals, vehicle storage, campground, or storage yards.

Hospitals: Establishments primarily engaged in providing diagnostic services, extensive medical treatment including surgical and other hospital services; such establishments have an organized medical staff, inpatient beds, and equipment and facilities to provide complete health care.

Publicly Owned Government Meeting (Local Assembly and Entertainment): Facilities for public assembly and entertainment for the local community not to exceed a capacity of 300 people, such as community centers, meeting halls, and multi-purpose centers.

Local Public Health and Safety Facilities: Facilities operated by public or quasi-public entities for the local protection of the public such as fire stations and other fire prevention facilities, police and sheriff substations, highway maintenance and snow removal facilities, water tanks, pumps, and related facilities, and sewage pumps and related facilities, and emergency medical services.

Pipelines and Power Transmission: Transportation facilities primarily engaged in the pipeline transportation of refined products of petroleum such as gasoline and fuel oils; natural gas; mixed, manufactured or liquified petroleum gas; or the pipeline transmission of other commodities. Power transmission includes facilities for the transmission of electrical energy for sale, including transmission and distribution facilities; not including offices or service centers (classified in "Professional Offices"), equipment and material storage yards (classified under "Storage Yards"), distribution substations (classified under "Public Utility Centers"), power plants (classified under "Power Generating Plants").

Power Generating: Establishments engaged in the generation of electrical energy for sale to consumers. Transmission lines located off the site of the power plant are included under "Pipelines and Power Transmission." Electrical substations are included under "Public Utility Centers."
Convention and Assembly Facilities (Public Owned Assembly and Entertainment): Facilities owned and operated by a public or nonprofit entity for public assembly and group entertainment with a capacity of greater than 300 people such as public auditoriums; exhibition and convention halls; civic theaters, meeting halls and facilities for "live" theatrical presentations or concerts by bands, choirs, and orchestras; meeting halls for rent; community centers; and similar public assembly uses.

Public Utility Centers: Public and quasi-public facilities serving as junction points for transferring utility services from one transmission to another or to local distribution and service. These uses include: electrical substations and switching stations; major telephone switching centers; natural gas regulating and distribution facilities; public water system wells, treatment plants and storage; and community wastewater treatment plants and settling ponds. These uses do not include office or service centers (classified in "Professional Offices or Government Offices").

Recycling and Scrap: Establishments engaged in assembling, breaking up, sorting, temporary storage and distribution of recyclable or reusable scrap and waste materials, including auto wreckers engaged in dismantling automobiles for scrap. Does not include terminal waste disposal sites, which are prohibited, and does not include temporary storage of toxic or radioactive waste materials.

Regional Public Health and Safety Facilities: Regional facilities operated by public or quasi-public entities for protection of the public such as fire stations and other fire prevention facilities, water and sewage facilities, transportation maintenance/storage facilities, police and sheriff substations and headquarters, including interim incarceration facilities able to accommodate a maximum of 100 prisoners at one time, and emergency facilities.

Schools - College: Junior colleges, colleges, universities and professional schools granting associate arts degrees, certificates, undergraduate and graduate degrees and requiring for admission at least a high school diploma or equivalent general academic training.

Transit Stations and Terminals: Passenger stations for vehicular and mass transit systems; also terminal facilities providing maintenance and service for the vehicles operated in the transit system. Including, but not limited to, buses, taxis, railway, ferries, etc.

Transportation Routes: Public right-of-ways which are improved to permit vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle travel.
MAILING LIST FOR TRPA PUBLIC SERVICE FACILITY LIST

Scott Cable of Meyers
Dave Pollard
P. O. Box 8935
So. Lake Tahoe, CA 97531

Washoe Comprehensive Planning
Mike Harper
P. O. Box 11130
Reno, NV 89520

Meeks Bay Fire Protection
P. O. Box 189
Tahoma, CA 95733

Tahoe TV Cable
P. O. Box AY
So. Lake Tahoe, CA 95705

El Dorado County
General Services
330 Fair Ln.
Placerville, CA 95667

North Tahoe Fire Protection
Raymond Martin
P. O. Box 1308
Kings Beach, CA 95719

Westar Cable TV
P. O. Box TV
Truckee, CA 95734

El Dorado County
Steve Jackson
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667

So. Tahoe Fire Protection
Bert L. Cherry
P. O. Box 1210
So. Lake Tahoe, CA 95705

Group W Cable
P. O. Box 1388
Kings Beach, CA 95719

Placer County
General Services
11414 B Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection
Bruce Kanoff
P. O. Box 919
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

Pacific Bell
Calvin L. Welch
P. O. Box 15038
Sacramento, CA 95851

Placer County
Jack Warren
11414 B Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Lake Valley Fire Protection
Hugh Thomas
P. O. Box 11132
So. Lake Tahoe, CA 95708

Nevada Bell
Dwight McKenny
645 E. Plumb Ln., Rm C-142
Reno, NV 89520

Douglas County
John Renz
P. O. Box 218
Mindem, NV 89423

Lakeside Community Hospital
Gil Potter
P. O. Box 8160
Incline Village, NV 95734

Con Tel
Clayton D. Johnson
P. O. Box 2200
Stateline, NV 89449

Douglas County
Mark Gonzalas
P. O. Box 218
Mindem, NV 89423

Barton Memorial Hospital
Ronald Newton
P. O. Box 9578
So. Lake Tahoe, CA 95731

U. S. Coast Guard
Chief Davis
P. O. Box 882
Tahoe City, CA 95730

City of So. Lake Tahoe
Gary Marchio
P. O. Box 1210
So. Lake Tahoe, CA 95705

Tahoe Paradise Water and Gas
George Baron
P. O. Box 11117
Tahoe Paradise, CA 95731

Washoe Public Works
Floyd Vice
P. O. Box 11130
Reno, NV 89520

Tahoe City Fire Protection
Gerald Mansur
P. O. Box 77
Tahoe City, CA 95730

Lukins Brothers
Danny Lukins
P. O. Box 7622
So. Lake Tahoe, CA 95731

ATTACHMENT 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Water Co.</td>
<td>John Fulton</td>
<td>P. O. Box W</td>
<td>Tahoe City, CA 95730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quail Lake Water Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P. O. Box 305</td>
<td>Homewood, CA 95718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe Pines Water Co.</td>
<td>Roy Hall</td>
<td>P. O. Box 386</td>
<td>Zephyr Cove, NV 89448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Highway Patrol</td>
<td>Robert G. Baer</td>
<td>P. O. Box 1298</td>
<td>So. Lake Tahoe, CA 95705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City PUD</td>
<td></td>
<td>P. O. Box 33</td>
<td>Tahoe City, CA 95730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Bay GID</td>
<td>Candi Taraporevala</td>
<td>P. O. Box 2220</td>
<td>Stateline, NV 89449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Point SID</td>
<td></td>
<td>P. O. Box 578</td>
<td>Zephyr Cove, NV 89448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Nevada College</td>
<td></td>
<td>P. O. Box 4269</td>
<td>Incline Village, NV 89450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Gas</td>
<td></td>
<td>P. O. Box 135</td>
<td>Tahoe City, CA 95730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent Sanitation  
O. Box 7102  
Incline Village, NV 89450

U.S. Forest Service  
P. O. Box 8465  
So. Lake Tahoe, CA 95731

California State Parks  
P. O. Box 2390  
Sacramento, CA 95811

Nevada State Parks  
201 So. Fall St, Rm 119  
Carson City, NV 89710

Caltrans  
Attn: Dana Cowell  
P. O. Box 911  
Marysville, Ca 95901

NDOT  
Attn: Dennis Barry  
1263 S. Stewart St.  
Carson City, NV 89712

Joe Caraveo  
General Manager/Postmaster  
Western Region  
880 Cherry Ave, Ste 450  
San Bruno, CA 94066

Cal-Vada Aircraft  
P. O. Box 265  
Homewood, CA 95718
TRPA List of Additional Public Service Facilities 1988-92 Which Result in Additional Public Service

Chapter 33, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, Allocation of Development, requires the TRPA to prepare a list of proposed public service projects. This list is limited to the facilities in the categories listed below which constitute additional public service facilities as defined in Subparagraph 35.5.A(2).

The listed public service projects have been considered under the eligibility findings of subparagraph 33.5.A(4) and may be considered for construction by the TRPA. Minor projects not required to be on the list and projects covered under a master plan are exempt from the listing procedure.

I. AIR FIELDS, LANDING STRIPS AND HELIPORTS
   A. Lake Tahoe Airport - Master plan in progress.
   B. Homewood Seaplane Base - No reply.

II. COLLECTION STATIONS
   A. South Tahoe Refuse - No reply.
   B. Independent Sanitation - No reply.
   C. Tahoe Truckee Disposal - No reply.

III. GOVERNMENT OFFICES
   A. Federal - No request.
   B. State - No request.
   C. Local
      1. Incline Administration Building

Description and Need: A 13,000 square foot office and justice court building to consolidate numerous county facilities now located around Incline.
Applicant: Washoe County Public Works Department
Location: PAS 045
Construction Date: 1989
Cost: $1,600,000
Eligibility Findings: Yes
2. **TCPUD Administration Building**  
   **Description and Need:** A new office building to consolidate district facilities to one site.  
   **Applicant:** TCPUD  
   **Location:** PAS 001A  
   **Construction Date:** 1992  
   **Cost:** $1,600,000

3. **Administrative Office Expansion**  
   **Description and Need:** Construct a 2,000 square foot addition for administration, accounting and data processing.  
   **Applicant:** NTPUD  
   **Location:** PAS 024A  
   **Construction Date:** 1992  
   **Cost:** Unknown  
   **Eligibility Findings:** Yes

IV. HOSPITALS

A. **Barton Memorial Hospital**

1. **Physical Therapy Department**  
   **Project Description and Need:** Construct a new 2,700 square foot building for post surgical therapy.  
   **Applicant:** Barton Hospital  
   **Location:** PAS 110  
   **Construction Date:** 1988  
   **Cost:** $300,000  
   **Eligibility Findings:** Yes

B. **Lakeside Community Hospital** - Only minor projects.

V. PUBLICLY OWNED ASSEMBLY AND ENTERTAINMENT FACILITIES

A. **Incline Village Community Center**  
   **Description and Need:** A multi-functional community center building to serve the residents of Incline.  
   **Applicant:** Washoe County Parks and Recreation  
   **Location:** PAS 048  
   **Construction Date:** 1988  
   **Cost:** $3,000,000  
   **Eligibility Findings:** Yes

B. **Valhalla Boat House Conversion**  
   **Description and Need:** Convert the Valhalla Boat House to a small public theater (350 people) to meet existing demand for such a facility.  
   **Applicant:** USFS  
   **Location:** PAS 127  
   **Construction Date:** 1988  
   **Cost:** Unknown  
   **Eligibility Findings:** Yes
C. Incline Park Amphitheater

Description and Need: Construct a amphitheater for summer arts programming to meet existing demand for such a facility.

Applicant: IVDG
Location: PAS 048
Construction Date: 1989
Cost: Unknown
Eligibility Findings: Yes

VI. LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY FACILITIES

A. Federal - No request.

B. State - No request.

C. Local

1. Mt. View Estates Fire Station

Description and Need: A small residential area fire station to serve the Mt. View Estates area.

Applicant: Lake Valley Fire Department
Location: PAS 132
Construction Date: 1992
Cost: $200,000
Eligibility Findings: Yes

VII. PIPELINES AND POWER TRANSMISSION

A. Gas - Only minor projects.

B. Electric

1. Kings Beach/Brockway Summit Upgrade

Description and Need: Rebuild existing 650 power line to 120kv line to provide greater load transfer capability for reliability.

Applicant: Sierra Pacific Power
Location: PAS 019
Construction Date: 1992
Cost: $1,000,000
Eligibility Findings: Yes

2. North Tahoe 129 kv Tie

Description and Need: Construct a 120 kv line from Incline to Kings Beach Substations to provide for addition load transfer capability.

Applicant: Sierra Pacific Power
Location: PAS 019
Construction Date: 1992
Cost: $1,500,000
Eligibility Findings: Yes
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3. **Stateline to Meyers Line Conversion**  
Description and Need: Replace existing 640 line with a 120 kv line to provide additional load transfer capability.  
Applicant: Sierra Pacific Power  
Location: PAS 095  
Construction Date: 1992  
Cost: $1,000,000  
Eligibility Findings: Yes

VIII. POWER GENERATING - No request.

IX. PUBLIC UTILITY CENTERS

A. Sewer

1. **STPUD Plant Expansion**  
Description and Need: Expansion of the sewer treatment plant from 7.5 mgd to 8.7 mgd treatment capacity to meet future TRPA Plan growth.  
Applicant: STPUD  
Location: PAS 098  
Construction Date: 1989  
Cost: $5,000,000  
Eligibility Findings: Yes

2. **STPUD Emergency Retention Basin #2**  
Description and Need: A 18 million gallon pond with wash down facilities to prevent spills to Lake Tahoe.  
Applicant: STPUD  
Location: PAS 101  
Construction Date: 1989  
Cost: $2,500,000  
Eligibility Findings: Yes

3. **Storage Facility**  
Description and Need: Construct a storage building to house the equipment used for maintenance.  
Applicant: NTFUD  
Location: PAS 024A  
Construction Date: 1992  
Cost: Unknown  
Eligibility Findings: Yes

B. Water - No request.

C. Electrical - No request.
D. Telephone

1. Homewood Central Office
   Description and Need: Replace existing central building with smaller modular building and replace equipment with modern equipment.
   Applicant: Pacific Bell
   Location: PAS 159
   Construction Date: 1990
   Cost: $250,000
   Eligibility Findings: Yes

E. Gas - No request.

F. TV Cable - No request.

X. REGIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY FACILITIES

A. Police

1. Placer County Criminal Justice Facility/DPW Relocation
   Description and Need: Demolition of existing DPW yard, construction of new jail, and remodel of old County offices.
   Applicant: Placer County
   Location: PAS 006
   Construction Date: 1988
   Cost: $3,500,000
   Eligibility Findings: Yes

B. Fire - See local public health and safety facilities.

C. Transportation - No request.

D. Water and Sewer

1. Echo View Estates/Angora Intertie
   Description and Need: Pipeline to connect Echo View Estates to the Angora water system to provide backup water supply.
   Applicant: STPUD
   Location: PAS 118, 134, and 132
   Cost: $60,000

2. STPUD Water Well
   Description and Need: New water well to meet future growth.
   Applicant: STPUD
   Location: Unknown
   Construction Date: 1991
   Cost: $400,000
   Eligibility Findings: Need more information
3. **STPUD Stateline Storage Tank**  
**Description and Need:** A new storage tank adjacent to the Stateline Reservoir to provide additional storage to meet fire flow and peak water demands.  
**Applicant:** STPUD  
**Location:** PAS 080  
**Construction Date:** 1991  
**Cost:** Unknown  
**Eligibility Findings:** Yes

4. **Tahoe Hills Tank**  
**Description and Need:** Replace existing tank with a larger 175,000 gallon tank to meet fire flow requirements.  
**Applicant:** TCPUD  
**Location:** PAS 149  
**Construction Date:** 1988  
**Cost:** $110,000  
**Eligibility Findings:** Yes

5. **Tahoe City Well**  
**Description and Need:** New domestic water well and connecting pipeline to meet peak demand and fire flows.  
**Applicant:** TCPUD  
**Location:** PAS 001  
**Construction Date:** 1989  
**Cost:** $150,000  
**Eligibility Findings:** Yes

6. **McKinney Well and Tank**  
**Description and Need:** A new well and 150,000 gallon tank to meet peak demand and fire flows.  
**Applicant:** TCPUD  
**Location:** PAS 158  
**Construction Date:** 1989  
**Cost:** $210,000  
**Eligibility Findings:** Yes

7. **West Shore Main**  
**Description and Need:** Upgrade existing line 6,336 feet of new 12 inch water main to meet fire flow requirements.  
**Applicant:** TCPUD  
**Location:** PAS 171  
**Construction Date:** 1989  
**Cost:** $253,400  
**Eligibility Findings:** Yes

8. **Tahoe City Storage Tank**  
**Description and Need:** New 500,000 gallon water tank to meet peak demand and fire flow requirements.  
**Applicant:** TCPUD  
**Location:** PAS 002  
**Construction Date:** 1991  
**Cost:** $600,000  
**Eligibility Findings:** Yes
9. Carnelian Heights #3 Tie In
   Description and Need: A new 6 inch water main to alter pressure zones.
   Applicant: Fulton Water Company
   Location: PAS 013, 014
   Construction Date: 1990
   Cost: $15,000
   Eligibility Findings: Yes

10. National Water Storage Project
    Description and Need: Construct a 500,000 gallon water storage tank and transmission line to replace open reservoirs.
    Applicant: NTPUD
    Location: PAS 024A
    Construction Date: 1989
    Cost: $350,000
    Eligibility Findings: Yes

11. Dollar Force Main
    Description and Need: Install a 3,300 feet force main from an existing pump station to the top of Dollar Hill.
    Applicant: NTPUD
    Location: PAS 010
    Construction Date: 1990
    Cost: $500,000
    Eligibility Findings: Yes

12. New Lake Level Water Pump Station
    Description and Need: Replacement of existing unreliable and inadequate pump station with reliable station having increased capacity.
    Applicant: KGRID
    Location: PAS 070A
    Construction Date: 1989
    Cost: $1,500,000
    Eligibility Findings: Yes

13. Quail Lake Storage Tank And Treatment Improvements
    Description and Need: Construct a new water tank to meet peak demand and fire flow requirements and construct a water treatment plant required by California Department of Health Services.
    Applicant: Quail Lake Water Company
    Location: PAS 157
    Construction Date: 1988
    Cost: $500,000
    Eligibility Findings: Yes
XI. SCHOOLS - COLLEGE

A. Lake Tahoe Community College - See TRPA approved master plan.

B. Sierra Nevada College - Will prepare a master plan.

XII. Transit Stations and Terminals - See TRPA Regional Transportation Plan, Action Element.

XIII. Transportation Routes - As noted below and in the attached TRPA Regional Transportation Plan, Action Element.

A. Highways and Roads

1. Edgewood Circle Access
   Description and Need: Construct a short access road into and out of the Edgewood Subdivision into a signaled intersection.
   Applicant: City of South Lake Tahoe
   Location: PAS 099
   Construction Date: 1988
   Cost: $35,000
   Eligibility Findings: Yes

B. Bikeways

1. Herbert to Glenwood Pioneer Bike Trail
   Description and Need: Construct a class II bike trail consistent with the SLT Bike Trail Master Plan.
   Applicant: City of South Lake Tahoe
   Location: PAS 094
   Construction Date: 1988
   Cost: $53,000
   Eligibility Findings: Yes
ACTION ELEMENT

TRPA has developed a list of programs and capital improvements to carry out the goals and policies. The Action Element also contains a financial strategy for each capital improvement. The financial strategy identifies annualized costs and primary and secondary funding sources.

Community plans which are to be developed for approximately 20 commercial areas around the lake in the next two to three years are expected to assist in implementing the Goals and Policies set forth in this document. Each community plan is required to have a transportation, traffic circulation and parking element.

Mass Transit Improvements

Short Range Transit Plan

In the short term (First Five Years), transit improvements shall be consistent with the adopted Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP). On the south shore, there shall be six fixed routes. These routes will act as collectors in the major neighborhoods in both Nevada and California. Each of the six routes shall have a major portion of the route along Highway 50 in the visitor core. Twenty-four hour service should be provided on four of the six routes. In the visitor core, the combined routes would have ten minute headways throughout the major portion of the day. Fifteen minute headways should be provided in the midnight to early morning period. During the summer periods, service should be provided to the beaches. In addition, demand-responsive zones should be serviced beyond the fixed route areas in both California and Nevada. Figure 48 shows the South Shore Short Range Transit Plan.

On the north shore, regularly scheduled fixed route service would be operated between Tahoma California and Incline Village, Nevada. Thirty minute headways should be provided during most of the day, with 60 minute headways in the evening. During the summer, service would be extended to serve the beaches. Demand responsive zones also should be serviced on the north shore. Figure 49 shows the North Shore Short Range Transit Plan.

Ski Shuttles

Ski shuttle service, in the short term, should continue as is presently provided. Increased coordination between ski areas and additional public and private transportation providers should be developed in the area of scheduling to promote usage.

Additional Mass Transit Improvements

As the SRTP is developed and ridership builds, additional mass transit improvements shall be incorporated. Whereas the SRTP sets the priority for increased transit service, the additional improvements include:

1. Improved headways along beach bus routes during the summer months;
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2. An extension of fixed route service into the Kingsbury Grade residential and commercial neighborhoods;

3. An extension of fixed route service to Zephyr Cove during the summer months;

4. Improved headways between Tahoe Keys and the casino core specifically to serve recreation and work trips;

5. Improved headways between the Roundhill/Nevada Beach area and the casino core during the summer months;

6. An intrazonal shuttle in the Tahoe City Highway 28 corridor during the summer months. This should be a short headway, minimal fare service which traverses the corridor;

7. An intrazonal shuttle in the Kings Beach/Tahoe Vista Highway 28 corridor during the summer months. This should be a short headway, minimal fare service which traverses the corridor;

8. A North Star to Kings Beach service during the peak visitor months. This service should be either a fixed route extension or shuttle service;

9. A Heavenly Valley to Stateline fixed guideway "people mover";

10. An extension of the TART system to Truckee with stops near River Ranch, Squaw Valley, and the campgrounds along Highway 89;

11. An expansion of fixed route service on the south shore into the unincorporated portions of El Dorado County. These routes would run primarily along Pioneer Trail, Highway 50, and Lake Tahoe Boulevard. These routes shall be evaluated for benefits resulting from neighborhood penetration;

12. In the long term, a fixed guideway or rail system along the Highway 50 corridor on the south shore shall be given consideration.

13. Evaluation of a tramway between Tahoe City and Alpine Meadows.

Streets and Highways

The following list of street and highway improvements and studies has been identified through a coordinated analysis with state and local governments, appointed advisory committees and the public. These improvements are intended to alleviate congestion "hot spots" in the region. The improvements and studies listed, are prioritized for each area of the Basin.

South Shore

1. A right turn lane on Route 50 West to Tahoe Keys Boulevard;

2. A free right turn lane and signal timing on Route 50 in the City of South Lake Tahoe from Pioneer Trail to Park Avenue. This project shall be delayed for a period of one year based upon the outcome of the South Shore Redevelopment Plan and EIS;
3. Operational improvements and highway alignments consistent with the circulation element of the South Shore Redevelopment Plan. These improvements must also help to achieve the transportation and air quality environmental thresholds. The circulation element shall consider an extension of Montreal Road to Pioneer Trail near Needle Peak, rerouting of U.S. 50 from around the casino core, and reducing from five lanes to three lanes on Route 50 between Pioneer Trail and the Nevada Loop Road;

4. Evaluation of an alternative route between Meyers and stateline;

5. Evaluation of an alternative route between the South Shore Wye and Roundhill;

6. Evaluation of an alternative route between Al Tahoe Blvd and the Montreal Extension;

7. Evaluation of improving traffic flow and safety on Route 50 from Echo Summit to Meyers;

8. Realignment of the Kingsbury Grade/Route 50 intersection including a free right turn lane from Kingsbury Grade onto Route 50 and two left lanes from Kingsbury onto Route 50;

9. Evaluation of a neighborhood connector road between Eloise Avenue and Ponderosa Avenue, provided environmental impacts can be mitigated;

10. Evaluation of a neighborhood connector road between Ponderosa Avenue and Sussex Avenue, provided environmental impacts can be mitigated;

11. Evaluation of a neighborhood connector road between Sussex Avenue and Freel Peak Avenue, provided environmental impacts can be mitigated;

12. A right turn lane on Route 89 South to Lake Tahoe Boulevard;

13. A right turn lane on Lake Tahoe Boulevard North to Route 50;

14. Improvements to the U.S. 50 corridor between Kingsbury Grade and the Loop Road.

**Tahoe City**

1. Highway 28 corridor improvements which include a parking reconfiguration from angled to parallel parking (a net reduction of 84 parking spaces), a service road behind the business district between Grove Street and Fairway Drive serving as a parking lot connector, a parking lot adjacent to Grove Street accommodating approximately 100 parking spaces, a parking lot near Fairway Drive or the 64 Acre Tract accommodating approximately 50 parking spaces (see Figure 51);

2. A traffic control device and intersection reconfiguration at Route 28 and Grove Street;

3. Route 89 realignment South of Fanny Bridge crossing the U.S. Forest Service 64 acre parcel to Route 89 near the Caltrans maintenance yard.
Kings Beach and North Stateline

1. Improvement at the intersection of Routes 28/267, including a left turn storage lane on Route 28 to Route 267, and a free right turn lane on Route 28 to Route 267;

2. A Route 28 corridor study to determine parking needs, capacity restraints and ingress/egress improvements.

Incline Village

1. Expansion from two lanes to three lanes on (one travel lane in each direction with a middle turn lane) Route 28 between the intersection of Lakeshore on the east and Lakeshore on the west (see Figure 52);

2. Analysis shall be completed to determine the need for a traffic control light at the intersection of Route 431 and Route 28.

Figures 50 through 53 show proposed operational improvements.

Transportation System Management

Transportation System Management (TSM) measures have been identified as additional means for reducing VMT and traffic congestion in the Lake Tahoe Basin. These measures are considered to have equal prioritization.

1. Educational programs utilizing local media to inform the local and visitor populations about the transportation services available in the Tahoe Basin;

2. Ridership incentives which include reduced employee and student transit fares, free fare days during peak periods or anticipated high carbon monoxide (CO) episodes;

3. Casino employee van pools which serve employee housing and identified high work trip interchange zones;

4. Transit improvements which include bus shelters and turn-outs;

5. Automobile metering from ski area parking lots to reduce peak period highway congestion;

6. Synchronization of Nevada and California traffic signals along Route 50.

7. The U.S. Postal Service will continue to implement the preferred alternative identified in the Postal Service Action Plan. The following service area locations will be studied for suitable NDC locations:
South Shore
Tahoe Sierra Tract
Tahoe Keys
Tamarack Subdivision
Gardner Mountain
Barton Tract
North Upper Truckee Area
Meyers
Ski Run and Pioneer Trail Area
Glenwood Area
Eastern Tahoe Paradise Area (Pioneer Trail)

Tahoe City
Lake Forest
Tahoe Park

Crystal Bay
Incline Village (Subject to the Community Plan in Item 10)

8. If upon evaluation of the Action Plan's established success criteria, the NDCs do not experience a 75 percent box use and a notable reduction in box rental demand at existing post offices and general delivery offices, the TRPA shall work with the U.S. Postal Service to establish alternative means to reduce VMT associated with delivery and for pickup of mail;

9. Community Plan Areas will be developed throughout the Basin. Community plans will enhance pedestrian movement, access control, parking, and integrate existing and future transit systems. Figure 53 shows the proposed community plan areas in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

10. The Incline Village Community Plan shall include an evaluation and recommendation for improvements in the current postal service so as to decrease VMT to the extent feasible.

Social Services Transportation

Because the population of elderly and handicapped persons requiring specialized transportation services is small in the Lake Tahoe Basin, the scope of necessary improvements is also somewhat limited. However, these improvements are very important to the people that need these services. A relatively small amount of increased funding can have a dramatic effect on the quality and level of service that can be provided to the elderly and handicapped.

Recommended improvements to the transportation services currently being provided to the elderly and handicapped residents of the Lake Tahoe Basin include increased funding for operating transportation services, developing service plans for improving transportation services, purchasing needed equipment and constructing necessary pedestrian facilities to improve the accessibility of the transit systems to the elderly and handicapped.

It is recommended that the following actions and improvements be funded. All of these improvements have equally high priorities. Primary revenue sources for these improvements include TDA, UMTA and general funds.
1. Increased revenues and funds to be allocated to service providers for the expansion of transportation services for the elderly and handicapped;

2. Funding for the development of service plans for improving transportation services for the elderly and handicapped;

3. Increased funding for specialized transportation service equipment (wheelchair lift equipped vans) for the elderly and handicapped;

4. Funding for the construction or reconstruction of pedestrian and transit facilities to increase the accessibility of fixed-route transit systems to the elderly and handicapped.

Aviation

An Airport Master Plan and Noise Compatibility Study is being completed by the City of South Lake Tahoe for the South Tahoe Airport. This plan will identify all needed capital improvement projects and levels of general aviation, commercial jet and commuter service utilizing the airport. The plan is subject to the approval by TRPA upon completion. Until that time, the action element of the RTP is to support all general operations, rehabilitation, maintenance, and safety projects proposed by the City of South Lake Tahoe for the South Tahoe Airport, so long as they do not result in an expansion, other than for test or study purposes.

Facility improvements at the South Lake Tahoe Airport shall be set forth in the adopted master plan.

Waterborne

Existing waterborne services primarily satisfy visitor recreation trip purposes. The RTP supports this mode of transportation and encourages implementation of the following waterborne services.

1. Continuation and expansion of waterborne excursion transportation, which includes scenic tours and excursions to areas of historical interest.

2. The initiation of a point-to-point waterborne transportation service between Tahoe City, Kings Beach, Incline Village and the South Shore.
Non-Motorized

Bikeways

Bikeways within the Tahoe Basin shall be expanded to improve circulation, reduce conflicts between motorists and bicyclists and provide an alternative to the private automobile. Map number 2 shows the existing and proposed bicycle facilities in the Tahoe Basin. In addition to these identified facility improvements, the South Shore Redevelopment Plan and the Tahoe City and Kings Beach Community Plans shall identify additional bikeway facilities which integrate with the bikeway plan.

The major bikeway improvements needed in the Tahoe Basin include:

1. Completion of the class I bikeway from Kingsbury Grade to Roundhill;
2. Completion of a class I or II bikeway from Roundhill to Cave Rock;
3. A class I and III bikeway connecting Park Avenue and the Loop Roads in the South Shore;
4. Completion of a class II bikeway along Pioneer Trail to Meyers;
5. A class I bikeway parallel to Route 50 between Pioneer Trail and the Route 50/89 intersection in Meyers;
6. Completion of a class II bikeway along Lake Tahoe Boulevard and Upper Truckee River Road to Route 50;
7. A class III bikeway along Route 89 between the junction of Route 50 and Luther Pass;
8. A class I bikeway along Route 89 serving the Meeks Bay recreational area;
9. Completion of a class I bikeway along Route 89 North of Tahoe City to Squaw Valley;
10. A class I bikeway from Dollar Hill to Incline Village;
11. A class I bikeway along Route 28 through Incline Village to Marlette Creek;
12. Class I, II and III bikeways along identified local streets of Incline Village.

Pedestrian

Pedestrian movement shall be enhanced in the urban areas of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The following needed pedestrian improvements have been identified by the TRPA and local governments:

1. A separate pedestrian facility parallel to Route 28 through the Tahoe City Urban Area;
2. Separate pedestrian facilities parallel to and on both sides of Route 28 through the Kings Beach Urban Area;
3. Evaluation of a pedestrian separation between the casinos in Crystal Bay.

4. A complete and separate pedestrian facility parallel to Route 50 within the boundaries of the redevelopment area;

5. An elevated or underground pedestrian separation between the High Sierra and Caesar's casinos. This is a control measure identified in the 1982 Air Quality Plan. This control strategy would eliminate the traffic signal at mid block in the casino core and is consistent with the redevelopment plan for the south shore.

6. A pedestrian facility parallel to Route 50 from the casino core to the Kingsbury Grade area.

7. A pedestrian facility parallel to Pioneer Trail from Needle Peak to Route 50.
MEMORANDUM

February 3, 1988

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: TRPA List of Additional Developed Recreation 1988-1992

The TRPA Governing Board is required by Chapter 33 of the Code to adopt the subject list and to update it at the beginning of each calendar year. In November, the staff sent a memo (Attachment 1) to the public agencies who provide recreation facilities in the Basin and to private parties who currently operate or had indicated an interest in developing recreational facilities. Also in November, staff scheduled a workshop to answer questions on the recreation list.

The list (Attachment 2) was compiled based on the information received from recreation project proponents.

The information was reviewed with respect to 33.6 A (2) Definition of Additional Recreation and 33.6 A (4) Eligibility For Inclusion On List (Attachment 3) and for consistency with the respective Plan Area Statements in order to make the findings as noted.

The draft list was recirculated in January and, as a result, a number of new projects have been added to the list. The list has been formatted to correspond with the ordinances and Plan Area Statements. The list will be revised after the policies recommended by the recreation committee and the APC and approved by the Governing Board have been implemented in the ordinances and Plan Area Statements.

The list is for the screening and coordination of recreation projects and does not constitute project approval or denial. Projects may be added to the list at a later date (see Attachment 3.) Approval of this list is not considered to have a substantial impact on the environment.

Action Requested

The staff requests that the APC review and comment on the list. Based on the comments and recommendations from the APC, staff will prepare a final list for the Governing Board to review and approve in February.

JS:jf
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AGENDA ITEM V.D.
Memo to the APC
Recreation List 1988-1992
February 3, 1988
Page Two

Recommendation

Staff recommends a positive APC recommendation on the TRPA list of additional developed recreation.

Attachments
(1) Memo to Recreation Providers
(2) List of Additional Developed Recreation
(3) Section 33.6 of the Code of Ordinances

2/3/88

AGENDA ITEM V D.
MEMORANDUM

November 20, 1987

To: Providers of Public Recreation

From: Jean Shaffer

Subject: TRPA List of Additional Recreation Facilities 1989-1992

Chapter 33 of the recently adopted Code (see Section 33.6, attached) requires TRPA to prepare a list of proposed public recreation facilities which are to be constructed or expanded in the next five years. In order for TRPA to approve a facility as specified by Section 33.6, the recreation project must be on the list. This requirement applies to both privately and publicly developed facilities. The list will be updated every year in January.

What kind of facilities must be on the list? Projects meeting the definition of "Additional Developed Recreation" in Subsection 33.6.A. are required to be on the five year list.

Recreation projects having TRPA approved master plans do not need to be listed. For the purpose of tracking and coordinating recreation development in the Basin, however, an informational list will be kept of projects having approved master plans and projects which are otherwise exempt from the five year list.

What if your project is not on the list? If an unforeseen project or a change arises that needs to be on the list, there are provisions for adding a project to the list. This may happen at any time, subject to the TRPA Governing Board making the findings in subparagraph (4).

How do you get on the list? Fill the attached form for each individual project you are proposing which is required to be listed. Mail the forms to Attention: Jean Shaffer, TRPA, P.O. Box 1038, Zephyr Cove, NV 89448. These forms should be submitted before December 15, 1987 to be assured inclusion on the January list. On December 2, there will be a recreation list workshop from 9:00-11:30 in the TRPA conference room to answer your questions, or you may call me at (702) 588-4547.

Please share this information with others you know who may have an interest in recreation development but may not have indicated their interest to TRPA.

Attachment 1
1988-1992

Recreation Facility Project List Form

1. Agency or Company ___________________________ Phone No. ________

2. Address __________________________________________

3. Department ________________________________________

4. Name of Project _________________________________

5. Location __________________________________________ Plan Area ______

6. Description of Facility or Addition __________________________

7. Type of Use: Overnight ____ Day Use ____ , Season ________________

8. Design Capacity of New Facility or Addition ________________

9. Design Capacity of Existing Facility, (if any) ________________

10. Statement of Need ______________________________________

11. Estimated Date of Implementation _________________________
### Five Year List of Recreation Projects

1/28/88

|-----------|---------------------|----------|------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|

### I. Recreation Projects Requiring PAOTS

#### A. Summer Day Uses

1. Visitor Information Centers

| 057 | Spooner Visitor Information Center | NSF/USFS | DOR | 150 | A,P,C | YES |
| 125 | Interagency Visitor Information Center | PRIVATE | DOR | 100 | A,P,C | YES |
| 174 | Tahoe City "Y" Visitor Information Center | USFS/CSP/TCPUD | DOR | 60 | /2 | YES |

2. Intensive Beach Use

| 017 | Carneilian Bay Park | CTC /1 | URBAN | 100 | A,P,C | YES |
| 024B | Moon Dunes Preservation, Access | CTC /1 | URBAN | 200 | A,P,C | YES |
| 029 | Kings Beach, Coon Street Lake Access | CTC /1 | URBAN | 300 | A,P,C | YES |
| 037 | Burnt Cedar Beach Parking Expansion | IVGID | URBAN | 100 | A,P,C | YES |
| 040 | Incline Beach/Ski Beach and Paved Parking Area | IVGID | URBAN | 100 | A,P,C | YES |
| 066 | Zephyr Cove Resort Day Use Facilities | USFS/PERMITTEE | DOR | 160/2 | /2 | YES |
| 099 | Regan Beach Access and Vista | CSLT | URBAN | | A,P,C | /4 |
| 102 | Cove East Lake Access, Day Use, Parking | CTC /1 | URBAN | 200 | A,P,C | YES |

3. Boat Launching Ramps

| 017 | Carneilian Bay Park Boat Ramp | CTC /1 | DOR | 100 | A,P,C | YES |
| 098 | El Dorado Beach Boat Ramp Overflow Parking, Phase I | CSLT | DOR | | A,P,C | /4 |
| 129 | Fallen Leaf Lake Boat Launching Facility | USFS | DOR | 50 | A,P,C | YES |

### Attachment 2

41
B. OVERNIGHT USES

1. GROUP FACILITIES
   024A NORTH TAHOE REGIONAL PARK
   SCOUT CAMP

2. RECREATION VEHICLE PARKS
   076 KAHLE PARK SITE
   RECREATIONAL VEHICLE PARK

3. CAMPGROUNDS
   097 SPOONER CAMPGROUND
   109 TAHOE VALLEY CAMPGROUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>DPR</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTFUD</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td></td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSF</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1995-1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td>/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## II. NON-PUBLIC RECREATION USES

### A. Day Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site/Description</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Skylandia Park</td>
<td>TCFUD</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking to replace on-street parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop picnic area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stream restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pave trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024B</td>
<td>Snow Creek Access, Parking, Trails</td>
<td>CTC /1</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>Build Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>IVOID</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Incline Village #2 Subdivision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>062</td>
<td>Cave Rock State Park</td>
<td>NSP</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add Picnic Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>095</td>
<td>Sierra Blvd/Golden Bear Park Master Plan Preparation</td>
<td>EDC</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Bijou Regional Park</td>
<td>CSLT</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Tallac Lagoon Natural Area Trails and Trailhead</td>
<td>CSLT</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Washoe Valley State Park Day Use, Open Space, Trailhead</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Kiva Picnic Area</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase Picnic Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Vikingsholm Vista</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expand and Pave Parking Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pave Path to Vikingsholm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Eagle Falls/Bayview Vista</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconfigure and Expand Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erosion Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Eagle Rock Vista</td>
<td>CTC /1</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking, Trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Tahoe City &quot;Y&quot; (64 Acres)</td>
<td>USFS/CSP/TCFUD</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master Plan in Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probable Phase 1</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park Entry, Foot Bridge, Restrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Recreation Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site/Description</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>024A</td>
<td>North Tahoe Park Recreation Center</td>
<td>NTPUD</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Participant Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site/Description</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>IVOID Tennis Complex</td>
<td>IVOID</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>A,P,C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXPAND TENNIS COURT CAPACITIES
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D. SPORT ASSEMBLY
E. CROSS COUNTRY SKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td>ZEPHYR COVE PARK SPORT FIELD</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>A, F, C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>074</td>
<td>EXACT LOCATION TO BE DECIDED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. GOLF COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>BIJOU GOLF COURSE</td>
<td>CSLT</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>A, F, C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. OFF ROAD VEHICLE COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>095</td>
<td>FIONEER TRAIL OHV COURSE</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>A, F, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>MC KINNEY OHV STAGING AREA</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>A, F, C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. OUTDOOR RECREATION CONCESSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>SAND HARBOR BEACH CONCESSION</td>
<td>NSP</td>
<td>ACCESSORY</td>
<td>A, F, C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. RIDING AND HIKING TRAILS, TRAILHEADS, RAID TAKEOUTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>INCLINE VILLAGE TRAILHEAD</td>
<td>NSP</td>
<td>DISPERSED</td>
<td>A, F, C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>TUNNEL CREEK TRAILHEAD WITH INFORMATION KIOSK</td>
<td>NSP</td>
<td>DISPERSED</td>
<td>A, F, C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>EAST SHORE TRAIL SYSTEM</td>
<td>USFS/NSP</td>
<td>DISPERSED</td>
<td>A, F, C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>EQUESTRIAN TRAILHEAD</td>
<td>NSP</td>
<td>DISPERSED</td>
<td>A, F, C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>HIGHLAND WOODS RAID TAKEOUT</td>
<td>CSLT</td>
<td>DISPERSED</td>
<td>A, F, C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>RIVERSIDE TRAILHEAD/STAGING AREA</td>
<td>CSLT/EDC</td>
<td>DISPERSED</td>
<td>A, F, C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>GOLDEN BEAR TRAILHEAD</td>
<td>CSLT</td>
<td>DISPERSED</td>
<td>A, F, C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>ELKS CLUB RAID TAKEOUT</td>
<td>CTC/1</td>
<td>DISPERSED</td>
<td>A, F, C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible Agency</td>
<td>Management Plan</td>
<td>Other Uses</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Meeks Trail Bridge</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>DISPERSED</td>
<td>A,F,C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Rayview Trailhead Expansion</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>DISPERSED</td>
<td>A,F,C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Meeks Bay Trailhead Parking Area</td>
<td>USFS/permittee</td>
<td>DISPERSED</td>
<td>A,F,C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152, 157</td>
<td>Quail Creek Trailhead</td>
<td>TCPUD</td>
<td>DISPERSED</td>
<td>A,F,C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Tahoe City &quot;Y&quot; (64 acres) RAFTING/HIKING TRAILHEAD</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>DISPERSED</td>
<td>A,F,C</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various Tahoe Rim Trail</td>
<td>USFS/Private</td>
<td>DISPERSED</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. Rural Sports

K. Snowmobile Courses

L. Undeveloped Campgrounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Management Plan</th>
<th>Other Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td>3 Undeveloped Campgrounds</td>
<td>NSP</td>
<td>DISPERSED</td>
<td>A,F,C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. PROJECTS REQUIRING PERMITS, BUT REQUIRING MASTER PLANS SO EXEMPT FROM LIST

A. DOWNHILL SKI AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKI INCLINE EXPANSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MASTER PLAN APPROVED 1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. MARINAS

| LIGHOUSE CENTER WHARF/MARINA |
| MASTER PLAN TO BE PREPARED 1988-89 |

| ZEPHYR COVE MARINA |
| MASTER PLAN TO BE PREPARED 1988-89 |

| TAHOE KEYS MARINA |
| MASTER PLAN TO BE PREPARED 1988-89 |

| HOMERWOOD MARINA |
| MASTER PLAN TO BE PREPARED 1988-89 |

| GREZER'S MARINA |
| MASTER PLAN TO BE PREPARED |

/1 PROPOSED TO BE /2 DEPENDS ON /3 NEEDS DETERMINATION /4 REQUIRES IMPLEMENTATION OF OPERATED BY A MASTER PLAN OF STATUS RECOMMENDED RECREATION POLICY CHANGES LOCAL GOVERNMENT

KEY TO ACRONYMS:

TCPUD, TAHOE CITY PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT
USFS, U.S. FOREST SERVICE
TC, CALIFORNIA TAHOE CONSERVANCY
NIPUD, NORTH TAHOE PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT
IVVID, INCLINE VILLAGE GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
NSP, NEVADA STATE PARKS
CSLT, CITY OF SOUTH LAKE TAHOE
CS, CALIFORNIA STATE PARKS
EDC, EL DORADO COUNTY
LC, LASSEN COUNTY
DC, DOUGLAS COUNTY

KEY TO PROJECT TYPES

URBAN: URBAN RECREATION
DOR: DEVELOPED OUTDOOR RECREATION
DISP: DISPERSED RECREATION
33.6 Regulation Of Additional Developed Recreation: TRPA shall regulate the rate and distribution of additional developed recreation as follows:

33.6.A Requirement For Appearance On List Of Additional Developed Recreation: No person shall construct a project or commence a use, which creates additional developed recreation, unless the project, or use appears on the list of additional developed recreation prescribed by this Subsection. In order to construct the developed recreation project or commence the developed recreation use, the person proposing same shall comply with all other applicable provisions of this Code. Projects, which are required by TRPA to prepare specific or master plans, such as marinas and ski areas, are exempt from inclusion on the list, provided any expansion in capacity for such projects shall be pursuant to the adopted specific or master plans.

(1) Applicable Recreation Uses: The recreation uses set forth in Chapter 18 for urban and developed outdoor recreation are eligible for inclusion on the list of additional recreation.

(2) Definition Of "Additional Developed Recreation": Developed recreation is considered "additional" if it is to be created pursuant to a TRPA approval issued on or after January 1, 1987 and results in an increase in vehicle trips that requires a traffic analysis pursuant to Subsection 93.3.B, or increased floor space of five percent, or 500 square feet, or would increase capacity by 25 or more PACT in the case of outdoor recreation. (See Subsection 13.5.L.) The conversion of an existing nondeveloped-recreation use to a use constituting developed recreation is additional developed recreation subject to this chapter. The following are not "additional" outdoor recreation development:

(a) The reconstruction or replacement, on the same parcel, of recreation facilities legally existing on, or approved before, January 1, 1987;
(b) Modifications to legally existing recreation and accessory uses thereto, that do not create additional service capacity;
(c) Relocation of legally existing recreation development through a transfer approved by TRPA pursuant to Chapter 34; or
(d) Dispersed recreation.
(3) **Preparation Of List:** TRPA, in consultation with all appropriate recreation entities, shall prepare a list, including a description, of all additional recreation facilities anticipated for construction during the first five-year period of the Regional Plan. The list shall be updated, and amended accordingly, at the beginning of each calendar year. The Governing Board shall adopt and amend said list, provided the proposed projects meet the criteria in subparagraph (4) below.

(4) **Eligibility For Inclusion On List:** Projects included on the list shall be projects, for which the sponsoring entity demonstrates and TRPA finds that:

(a) There is a need for the project;

(b) The project complies with the Goals and Policies, the applicable plan area statements, and this Code;

(c) The project is consistent with TRPA 20-year targets for outdoor recreation, which are 6,114 persons at one time ("PAOT") in overnight facilities, 6,761 PAOT in summer day-use facilities, and 12,400 PAOT in winter day-use facilities, as well as the allocations set forth in the plan area statements;

(d) The project meets the findings adopted pursuant to Article V(g) of the Compact as set forth in Chapter 6 as they are applicable to the project's recreational service capacity; and

(e) Where the project was unforeseen and action is required before the next annual update, or the project relates to an emergency involving the public health, safety and general welfare, the project must be placed upon the list immediately.

(5) **Priority:** Projects included on the list generally shall be given priority over those not on the list.
MEMORANDUM

February 2, 1988

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Chapter 7 (Temporary Uses, Structures and Activities)

Consideration of Chapter 7 (Temporary Uses, Structures and Activities) and related amendments to Chapters 2 and 4 is being continued to the next APC meeting so that additional staff and committee work can be done.
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MEMORANDUM

February 3, 1988

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Discussion of Draft Chapter 15 (Redevelopment)

Attached is the most recent draft (at the time of mailing) of Chapter 15 and a Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Background

The litigation settlement agreement of July, 1987, required the TRPA to prepare a draft Chapter 15 (Redevelopment) for Governing Board consideration as soon as possible. TRPA has been working with a drafting group which was formed originally to help with the South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Plan. The drafting group is nearing completion of its task and a meeting is scheduled for February 3 to agree on a final draft ordinance.

Schedule

The TRPA hopes to have a draft Chapter 15 for public review and comment by March 1. TRPA has also determined that an EIS will be required and the draft EIS will begin circulation by March 1. Scoping and drafting of this supplement to the 1987 Code and Plan Area Statement EIS will occur during February. After 60 days of circulation, the APC and the Governing Board will consider certification of the EIS and adoption of the draft ordinance. Adoption of Chapter 15 is targeted for June, 1988.

On a parallel track, the South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Plan will be proceeding with its EIS. According to TRPA rules, TRPA may take action on the South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Plan and EIS 60 days after Chapter 15 adoption.
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Chapter 15 Summary

This ordinance will have the following features:

* Only redevelopment agencies eligible by state law may undertake redevelopment.

* Redevelopment may occur only in areas with adopted community plans and designated Plan Area Statements.

* Community Plan rules shall apply for development standards, allocations, etc.

* Basements are allowed in redevelopment areas in some situations.

* Redevelopment plans may create special redevelopment project areas which include noncontiguous parcels.

* Redevelopment project areas have special land coverage and density rules.

* South Lake Tahoe has a special demonstration community plan/redevelopment plan area that has special procedural provisions, target requirements, and height allowances.

Requested APC Action

Staff requests the APC review the draft Chapter 15 and the Notice of Preparation and provide staff with comments.
MEMORANDUM

February 2, 1988

To: Distribution List

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will be the Lead Agency and will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the project identified below. We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information which is germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency may need to use the EIS prepared by our agency when considering your permit or other approval for the project.

The project description, location, and the probable environmental effects are contained in the attached materials (Attachment A). A copy of the Initial Study is, X is not attached.

Due to the time constraints, please send your response at the earliest possible date but not later than 14 days after receipt of this notice.

Please send your response to Andrew Strain at the address shown above and provide the name of a contact person in your agency.

Project Title: Code of Ordinances Chapter 15, Redevelopment Plans

Project Applicant: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Date: February 1, 1988

Signature: ________________________________

Title: ________________________________

Telephone: (702) 588-4547

Attachments
ATTACHMENT A

A. Project Description

The proposed project is the adoption of TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 15, Redevelopment Plans (attached). This is a new chapter in TRPA's Code which sets forth rules and regulations regarding the preparation and adoption of redevelopment plans.

The following alternatives, including the proposed action, will be evaluated:

1. Preferred Alternative: proposed Chapter 15;
2. Alternative #1: Section 15.11 of the Preferred Alternative, South Lake Tahoe Demonstration Plan rules and procedures, would be allowed in all areas eligible for redevelopment; and
3. Alternative #2: No action alternative, where existing community plan rules adopted in the TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 14, would apply to all areas eligible for redevelopment.

B. Location

Adoption of this ordinance would allow redevelopment plans to be prepared for any predominantly urbanized areas within the Region which are eligible for community plans and which qualify for redevelopment under State laws. This could be the urbanized areas of Tahoe City, Kings Beach, Tahoe Vista, North Stateline, Incline Village, and the City of South Lake Tahoe.

C. Probable Environmental Effects

The TRPA anticipates the scope of the EIS on Chapter 15, Redevelopment Plans, will address at least the following environmental issues:

1. Additional Building Height/Scenic Resource Thresholds
2. Attainment of Other Threshold-Related Targets
3. Excavations for Basements - Groundwater Interference
4. Impacts of Designation of a Redevelopment Project Area
5. Economic Feasibility of Redevelopment Plans
CHAPTER 15
REDEVELOPMENT PLANS

Chapter Contents
15.0 Purpose
15.1 Applicability
15.2 Definitions
15.3 Establishment Of Redevelopment Plans
15.4 Eligibility
15.5 Time Limits
15.6 Relationship To Plan Area Statements And Community Plans
15.7 Relationship To Goals And Policies And The Code
15.8 Special Redevelopment Plan Requirements
15.9 Special Redevelopment Project Standards
15.10 Redevelopment Plan Process
15.11 South Lake Tahoe Demonstration Plan

15.0 Purpose: In accordance with the Goals and Policies, TRPA may adopt redevelopment plans within adopted community plan areas designated for redevelopment by a plan area statement. Redevelopment projects are appropriate where necessary in blighted areas for the attainment and maintenance of environmental thresholds and improvement of community character through the relocation and redevelopment of existing structures and uses. Redevelopment plans shall provide for phasing of redevelopment, systematic environmental and project review, and implementation of environmental protection and enhancement measures.

15.1 Applicability: This chapter authorizes and shall apply only to redevelopment plans for adopted community plan areas which are predominantly urbanized, as defined in Subsection 15.2.A, blighted, as defined in Subsection 15.2.B, and designated in the applicable Plan Area Statement as being eligible for redevelopment plans. Following adoption of a redevelopment plan, all projects within the redevelopment plan boundaries shall be consistent with the provisions of the redevelopment plan. Approval of a redevelopment plan is not approval of any project included in the redevelopment plan.

15.2 Definitions: The following terms are defined as set forth below.

15.2.A Predominantly Urbanized Area: A predominantly urbanized area is one in which not less than 80 percent of the privately owned property in the redevelopment plan area has been or is developed for urban uses.
15.2.B Blighted Area: A blighted area is characterized by properties which suffer from economic dislocation, deterioration, or disuse because of one or more of the following factors which cause a reduction of or lack of proper utilization of the area to such an extent that it constitutes a serious physical, social, environmental, or economic burden on the community which cannot reasonably be expected to be reversed or alleviated by private enterprise acting alone:

(1) The subdividing and sale of lots of irregular form and shape and inadequate size for proper usefulness and development.

(2) The laying out of lots in disregard of the contours and other topography or physical characteristics of the ground and surrounding conditions.

(3) The existence of inadequate public improvements, public facilities, open spaces, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment.

(4) A prevalence of depreciated values, impaired investments, and social and economic maladjustment.

(5) The existence of substandard public or private facilities and improvements, insufficient open space, poor scenic quality, insufficient transportation systems, air quality problems, or insufficient water quality protection systems, such that there is non-compliance with the applicable environmental threshold carrying capacities.

15.2.C Urban Uses: Urban uses are the uses classified in Chapter 18 as residential, tourist accommodation, commercial, public service, urban recreation or other similar uses commonly found in urban areas.

15.2.D Redevelopment Project Area: A designated project area within a redevelopment plan boundary which is established through land assembly with public assistance and which projects receive substantial public assistance. Parcels not contiguous to the main project area may be considered in the redevelopment project area if:

(1) The public benefits related to the noncontiguous parcels are integrated throughout the redevelopment project area,

(2) the noncontiguous parcels are within the same watershed,

(3) the noncontiguous parcels are occupied with structures,

(4) the noncontiguous parcels are deed restricted or otherwise permanently restricted to be part of the redevelopment project area.
15.3 Establishment Of Redevelopment Plans: Redevelopment plans, upon adoption, shall be established on the TRPA Plan Overlay Maps pursuant to Chapter 12, and in the document entitled, Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, Special Plans.

15.4 Eligibility: Only public entities empowered by applicable state law to engage in redevelopment may propose redevelopment plans and projects. Areas eligible for redevelopment plans are the South Lake Tahoe Demonstration Plan area and other adopted community plan areas wherein which predominantly urbanized and blighted areas exist, and with respect to which the Governing Board makes the following findings prior to amending the plan area statement to make it eligible for redevelopment projects:

15.4.A A redevelopment plan in the additional plan area would be consistent with the Goals and Policies.

15.4.B An adopted community plan designates a predominantly urbanized and blighted area or areas within the plan area for redevelopment.

15.4.C Redevelopment is the most effective way to eliminate blight in the designated area or areas, and has been demonstrated by professionally prepared economic studies to be financially feasible.

15.4.D Redevelopment will relieve conditions of economic, social, or environmental dislocation or maladjustment without creating new unmitigatable economic, social, or environmental impacts.

15.4.E Redevelopment will not cause any net loss of affordable housing units without replacement of such units with equally or more affordable units, in equally or better structural condition, and located no further than one half of a mile from the redevelopment plan boundary.

15.5 Time Limits: Redevelopment plans shall take effect upon adoption and shall remain in effect until amended or revoked by the Governing Board.

15.6 Relationship To Plan Area Statements And Community Plans: Redevelopment plans shall be consistent with plan area statements and community plans as follows:

15.6.A Plan Area Statements: Except as otherwise provided in the provisions for community plans, redevelopment plans shall be consistent with applicable plan area statements as they may be amended from time to time. Based on the recommendations of a redevelopment plan, TRPA may amend plan area statements to conform with the adopted redevelopment plan.
15.6.B Community Plans: Except for the demonstration project provided for in this Chapter, no redevelopment plan shall be adopted for an area within a community plan unless the community plan is adopted. A redevelopment plan located within a community plan shall be consistent with the adopted community plan.

15.7 Relationship To Goals And Policies And The Code: Redevelopment plans shall be consistent with the Goals and Policies and with the Code, as they may be amended from time to time.

15.8 Special Redevelopment Plan Requirements: The following additional requirements shall apply to all redevelopment plans:

15.8.A Affordable Housing: Affordable housing shall be provided as part of a redevelopment plan to the extent required by applicable state law. In the case where required affordable housing is located outside a redevelopment plan, the affordable housing shall be located no further than one-half mile from the redevelopment plan boundary.

15.8.B No Net Increase In Land Coverage: Redevelopment plans shall not result in a net increase in the amount of land coverage existing within the redevelopment plan area prior to adoption of the redevelopment plan.

15.9 Special Redevelopment Project Area Standards: In addition to other provisions of the Code, the following site development standards apply to projects within redevelopment project areas:

15.9.A Land Coverage Relocation: A redevelopment project area shall be considered the the "project area" for purposes of relocation of land coverage.

15.9.B Land Coverage Limitations: A redevelopment project area shall be considered the "project area" for purposes of implementing the land coverage requirements of Chapter 20 and the tables below. In place of limitations in Section 20.3 for land coverage in community plan areas, the land coverage permissible within redevelopment project areas shall be calculated as per the tables below:

(1) Commercial/Public Service Uses: In redevelopment project areas to be redeveloped for primarily commercial or public service use, total existing coverage to be reduced by 15% if existing coverage is 70% or less, plus additional reduction of 1% for each 2% of coverage exceeding 70%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Coverage</th>
<th>Required Reduction</th>
<th>Net Coverage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% or less</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>59.5% or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Net coverage is not intended to be more restrictive than Bailey standards.

(2) **Tourist/Multiple Residential Uses:** In redevelopment project areas to be redeveloped primarily for tourist accommodation or multiple residential use, total existing coverage to be reduced by 25% if existing coverage is 50% or less, plus additional reduction of 1% for each 2% of coverage exceeding 50%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Coverage</th>
<th>Required Reduction</th>
<th>Net Coverage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% or less</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37.5% or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Net coverage is not intended to be more restrictive than Bailey standards.

(3) **Mixed Uses:** Mixed uses (i.e. commercial and residential) coverage removal standard shall be adjusted based on proportion of floor area utilized for (1) and (2) above. Uses not included in (1) and (2) shall not be included in the calculations.

15.9.C **Density:** For purpose of calculation of maximum permissible densities, an entire redevelopment project area may be considered the "project area" pursuant to Chapter 21.
15.9.D Grading Standards: An additional exception to the basement excavation provisions of 64.7.B, may be permitted in redevelopment project areas if TRPA finds that (1) a soils or hydraulic report by a qualified professional shows that there will be no groundwater interference or (2) measures are included in the project to prevent groundwater from leaving the project area as surface flow and groundwater, if any is interfered with, is rerouted in the groundwater flow to avoid adverse impacts to riparian vegetation, if any would be so affected.

15.9.E Transfer of Development Rights: Relocation of development existing within a redevelopment project area shall not be considered as transfer of development rights pursuant to Chapter 34.

15.9.F Best Management Practices: Redevelopment project areas shall require complete application of BMPs to the entire project area.

15.10 Redevelopment Plan Process: Public entities eligible to prepare redevelopment plans pursuant to applicable state statues, if any, shall develop redevelopment plans in accordance with the following procedures:

15.10.A Selection Of Redevelopment Plan Area: The public entity, in cooperation with TRPA, shall select a proposed redevelopment area consistent with applicable state law, if any, and the provisions of this Chapter. The applicant shall submit studies, or such other information as TRPA may reasonably require, to demonstrate the economic feasibility of proceeding with a preliminary redevelopment plan for the area, and the economic and environmental benefits which may be obtained from the proposed redevelopment.

15.10.B Preparation Of Preliminary Redevelopment Plans: Upon selection of a redevelopment area in accordance with Subsection 15.10.A and a determination by TRPA and the applicant that the area is suitable for redevelopment, the applicant shall prepare, in cooperation with TRPA, a preliminary redevelopment plan. Preliminary redevelopment plans shall contain the following information:

(1) An environment assessment (EA) prepared in accordance with Subsection 5.3.A, and containing sufficient information, as may be required by TRPA, to allow TRPA to evaluate the proposed changes in land use and the environmental impacts that may result.

(2) A description of the redevelopment plan area boundaries and project area boundaries.
(3) A general statement of the proposed land uses, layout of the principal streets and transportation patterns, existing population and development densities, standards and patterns, and a general description of the standards to be used for redevelopment of the area.

(4) A general statement of how the proposed redevelopment plan conforms to the provisions of the Goals and Policies, the applicable plan area statements, the adopted community plan, the Code, and the environmental threshold carrying capacities.

(5) A general description of the expected impact of the proposed redevelopment plan on the residents of the redevelopment area and surrounding neighborhoods.

(6) Such other information as TRPA may reasonably require to evaluate the proposed redevelopment plan.

(7) Reasonable provisions for notice to, and comment by, property owners and residents of the redevelopment area.

15.10.C Review Of, And Action On Preliminary Redevelopment Plans: The Advisory Planning Commission shall review preliminary redevelopment plans and make recommendations to the Governing Board. The Governing Board shall review and either approve, approve with modification or deny preliminary redevelopment plans. Upon approval of a preliminary redevelopment plan, the applicant shall have five years to submit a final redevelopment plan in accordance with Subsection 15.10.D. If a final plan is not submitted within five years a new preliminary plan shall be prepared in accordance with Subsection 15.9.B.

15.10.D Preparation Of Final Redevelopment Plans: In addition to being prepared as prescribed in any applicable state statutes, redevelopment plans shall be consistent with the approved preliminary redevelopment plan, shall comply with Subsections 14.6.C(1) through (7), inclusive, and shall include the following:

(1) A program for bringing all scenic roadway and shoreline units located with the boundaries of the redevelopment plan into compliance with the Scenic Resources Threshold.

(2) A description of the proposed methods of financing the redevelopment projects that are part of the final redevelopment plan.

(3) Such other information as TRPA may reasonably require to facilitate adequate review and approval of the final redevelopment plan.
15.10.E Review Of, And Action On Final Redevelopment Plans:
Review of, and action on final redevelopment plans shall be in accordance with the following provisions:

(1) Referral To Advisory Planning Commission: Prior to adoption of a final redevelopment plan, the plan shall be referred to the Advisory Planning Commission, which shall review the proposed plan and make recommendations to the Governing Board. The Advisory Planning Commission shall obtain and consider the recommendations and comments of the local government, other responsible public agencies and the public. The review, to the extent possible, shall be coordinated with the processes of local government.

(2) Governing Board Action: After a public hearing, the Governing Board shall consider the final redevelopment plan, including any recommendations of the Advisory Planning Commission. The final redevelopment plan shall be considered as a Regional Plan amendment, and the Governing board shall approve, deny or modify the final redevelopment plan based on all applicable factors, including consistency with the Goals and Policies, the Code, the plan area statements, the adopted community plan (except for the demonstration project provided for pursuant to Section 15.11), attainment of the targets and requirements of Subsection 15.10.D, and whether the redevelopment plan will attain and maintain adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities. The Governing Board shall also consider the effects, if any, on portions of the community plan area and plan area outside of the redevelopment plan boundaries.

The Governing Board may consider appropriate amendments to those community plans and plan area statements pursuant to Chapter 13.

15.10.F Findings For Adoption: Before adopting a redevelopment plan, the Governing shall find:

(1) The plan is consistent with the Goals and Policies.
(2) The plan is consistent with the Code.
(3) The plan is consistent with the applicable plan area statements and community plan.
(4) The plan does not propose the development of residential units, tourist accommodation units, commercial floor area, recreational PAOTs or other projects in excess of applicable limits set forth in the Regional Plan.
(5) The plan is consistent with the attainment and maintenance of adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities.
15.11 South Lake Tahoe Demonstration Plan: As a demonstration redevelopment plan, the TRPA may adopt a joint community plan/redevelopment plan for the Stateline to Ski Run areas of South Lake Tahoe.

15.11.A Eligible Areas for Demonstration Plan: Those areas of Plan Areas 089B (California South Stateline Resort Area), 091 (Ski Run), and 092 (Pioneer/Ski Run) deemed to be eligible by criteria set forth in Section 15.4. and 14.3 may be included in the demonstration plan.

15.11.B Special Process: The City of South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Agency may elect to process the demonstration plan as set forth in this Chapter or as follows:

(1) Preparation of a Preliminary Demonstration Plan: The City of South Lake Tahoe redevelopment Agency working with TRPA and other interested parties shall prepare a preliminary demonstration plan which is consistent with the content requirements of Subsection 15.10.B and 14.6.B. This plan shall be included as the preferred alternative in the EIS for the plan.

(2) Preliminary Plan Approval: Prior to approval of a final redevelopment plan, the preliminary demonstration plan shall be reviewed pursuant to Subsection 15.10.C.

(3) Preparation of Final Plan: The final plan shall be prepared by the South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Agency consistent with the requirements of Subsection 15.10.D and the requirements of this section.

(4) Final Plan Approval: The final plan shall be reviewed and approved pursuant of Subsection 15.10.E. Before adopting the demonstration plan the Governing Board shall make all the required findings of a plan amendment, a community plan adoption, redevelopment plan adoption and the findings in Subsection 15.11.E.

15.11.C Completion of Community Plan: Within 18 months of the adoption of the demonstration plan, the remaining community plan area not covered by the demonstration plan shall be processed and included in a community plan.

15.11.D Additional Height For The South Lake Tahoe Demonstration Project: In addition to the heights permitted in Chapter 22, the TRPA may approve additional heights within the South Lake Tahoe Demonstration Project Area as follows:
(1) **Areas Eligible for Additional Height:** Tourist accommodation projects located within the portion of Bijou Park Subdivision containing lots 14 through 85 (Ski Run Site) or located on lands containing or contiguous to the TRPA approved Harrah's project site located in South Lake Tahoe (Stateline Site).

(2) **Additional Height for Tourist Accommodation:** The TRPA may approve additional building heights above the base height limit of 24 ft, not withstanding the height limitations of Sections 22.0, 1, 2, 6 and 7 for buildings whose primary use is tourist accommodation, if the project is located in an eligible area; findings (1), (3), and (7) of Section 22.7 are made; the additional height is achieved through the project providing any of the benefits listed in (3) below, and substantial contributions shall have been made by the project proponents to achieve these benefits.

(a) **Addition of Benefits:** The additional height permissible under this subsection shall be calculated by identifying the benefits provided by the demonstration project. Then the number feet attributable to the benefits shall be totalled. The additional height shall be added to the base height of 24 feet and assigned to the subject building(s).

(b) **Maximum Height Limits:** The maximum height of a tourist accommodation building shall not exceed 75 feet at the Ski Run Site and not exceed 95 feet at the Stateline Site.

(c) **Timing:** The improvements related to granting additional height shall be ensured prior to construction of any building relying on such additional height.

(3) **Benefit List for Additional Height:** The following is the list of benefits which are utilized to calculate additional height for tourist accommodation buildings pursuant to (2) above.

(a) **Additional Height For Stream Environment Zone Restoration Or Creation Of Artificial Wetland:** For each one acre of previously-disturbed stream environment zone restored or for the creation of each one acre of artificial wetland, TRPA may approve an additional ten feet of maximum building height provided:
(i) The artificial wetland is capable of water quality treatment functionally equivalent to a stream environment zone of a similar size.

(ii) The restored stream environment zone or artificial wetland is within the boundaries of the redevelopment plan or is within the watershed that is partially within the boundaries of the redevelopment plan.

(iii) TRPA conditions of approval ensure completion and permanent maintenance of the required stream environment zone restoration or artificial wetland prior to or simultaneous with commencement of construction of the building.

(iv) The credit shall not include SEZ restoration otherwise required by Subsection 20.4.B.

(b) Additional Height For View Corridors: For providing a minimum 150 foot wide open space corridor, excluding existing road right a way, that provides views of Lake Tahoe from a scenic roadway unit, TRPA may approve an additional 10 feet of maximum building height. For providing view corridors in excess of 150 feet, TRPA may approve 1 foot of additional height, up to 10 feet maximum, for each additional 15 feet of roadway length where the lake is visible.

(c) Additional Height For Setbacks: For each 100 feet of building set back along the entire lake front of the redevelopment project area, TRPA may approve an additional 10 feet of maximum building height. The set back is to be measured from high water line and the set back shall be clear of buildings.

(d) Additional Height for Public Access to Lake Tahoe: For each 50 feet wide (measured landward from the high water line) by 200 feet long area of additional public beach, TRPA may approve an additional 30 feet in maximum building height.

(e) Additional Height for Roof Design: If the building has 40% all facades in sloping roof, TRPA may approve an additional 5 feet of maximum building height for the building with such a roof.
15.11.E Findings for Demonstration Plan: In order to qualify as a demonstration plan and additional height, the TRPA must make the following findings:

(1) The project is providing more open space than would be required for redevelopment projects.

(2) The project at Stateline provides a transition from high rise to low rise and is 50% less in height than the adjacent high rise building.

(3) The projects are providing a reduction in land coverage from 81% to 46% within the redevelopment project area.

(4) The projects are consolidating development through design and room retirement.

(5) The projects are providing public access to Lake Tahoe through beach and marina facilities.

15.11.F Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity Targets: The Demonstration plan shall in addition to the requirements of community plans and redevelopment plans demonstrate achievement of the following targets by January 1, 1999.

(1) Air Quality - CO - attain 6 ppm
   Hwy 50 vehicle trips - 7% reduction
   Vehicle Trip Ends - 10% reduction

(2) Water Quality - Turbidity - TRPA discharge std.s
   runoff - " "
   ground water -" "

(3) SEZ Restoration - (SLT to supply #)

(4) Coverage Reduction - (SLT to supply #)

(5) Scenic - attain threshold rating of 16

(6) Recreation - (SLT to supply target)
MEMORANDUM

February 2, 1988

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: Susan E. Scholley, Agency Counsel

Subject: Amendments to Chapter 11 for Commercial and Multi-Residential Foundations

Attached is a draft ordinance amendment prepared under the direction of the Governing Board Legal Committee. Also attached is a copy of Chapter 11 for easy cross-reference.

The Legal Committee has been considering an amendment to Chapter 11 to resolve the remaining foundation projects. Specifically, TRPA has identified the following foundations which may not have current TRPA approval:

**Washoe County**

- Tahoe Mariner (hotel, 140 rooms), APN 123-055-01
- Northwood Office (commercial, 8,000 sq. ft.), APN 124-163-06
- Country Club Mall (30 residential units), APN 130-180-31 through 60
- Seacap Villas (9 residential units), APN 127-080-01 through 10

**Placer County**

- Pineland Building (commercial, 6,000 sq. ft.), APN 84-140-26
- Tahoe Vista Building (commercial, 3,400 sq. ft.), APN 117-150-34

**Douglas County**

- Palisades Building (commercial, 42,000 sq. ft.), APN 07-292-20

There are other foundations in the Basin but those projects either have TRPA approval (e.g. King Arthur's Palace, Placer County, APN 90-304-14) by litigation settlement; Elk Point Building, Douglas County, by injunction stipulation) or will probably not be eligible for a permit under Chapter 11 due to the exemptions in Subsection 11.11.A. The above list is only an approximation to use to gauge the scope of the amendment and is not a substitute for review of individual applications or situations.

The amendment addresses the problem of vested rights for affected projects by providing an alternative method of completing construction. The ordinance amendment provides an administrative remedy in lieu of litigation on a case-by-case basis.
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It must be noted that TRPA will avoid creation of this problem in future years by defining "diligent pursuit" in the Code and by advising project proponents of the need to pursue construction each building season after a foundation is constructed.

The Governing Board will hold a public hearing on this amendment at its February 24 and 25, 1988 meeting. The Legal Committee and TRPA staff request APC consideration of the draft ordinance and, if appropriate, a recommendation.

If you have any questions, please contact Susan Scholley, Agency Counsel.

SES:mlm
Enclosure
DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 11: FOUNDATIONS
Redraft 2/2/88 (amend 11 - L17)

Add new definitions:

11.2.D Duplex, Triplex or Fourplex Foundation: A duplex, triplex or fourplex foundation is a foundation for a residential project of two, three or four attached residential units, respectively.

11.2.E Multi-residential Foundation: A multi-residential foundation is a foundation for a residential project of five or more attached residential units.

11.2.F Commercial Foundation: A commercial foundation, for purposes of this chapter only, shall be deemed a foundation for a commercial or tourist accommodation project.

Add new provision:

11.11 Provision for Commercial and Multi-residential Foundations: Beginning on the effective date of this section, which date is __________, 1988, and ending one year from that date, owners of commercial or multi-residential foundations without current TRPA approval, which foundations were built on or after January 1, 1976, may apply to TRPA to continue and complete construction on the project without new allocations subject to the conditions set forth below.

11.11.A Exemptions: This section shall not apply to:

(1) Commercial or multi-residential foundations approved on or after the effective date of this section; or

(2) Commercial or multi-residential foundations whose TRPA approval had not expired as of the effective date of this section; or

(3) Commercial or multi-residential foundations whose owners had knowledge of TRPA’s interpretation of diligent pursuit requiring substantial construction each building season once construction commenced.

11.11.B Hearing and Findings: Prior to approval of permits under this section, the Governing Board shall hold a hearing with notice to affected property owners in accordance with TRPA’s Rules of Procedure. TRPA shall not approve a permit unless TRPA finds, and subject to the conditions that:

(1) The project has received all required discretionary approvals; and

(2) The county or city permits for the project were valid or renewed through at least May 1, 1984; and
(3) The project substantially complies with Chapters 22 and 24;

(4) The project substantially complies with the interim standards of Section 4.20 of Ordinance 87-8; and

(5) The proposed uses are in compliance with Chapter 18 and the applicable plan area statement; and

(6) In the case of commercial projects, the project area coverage complies with the Bailey coefficients or, if the project was previously approved in excess of the Bailey coefficients, that excess coverage shall be mitigated by a transfer of coverage in conformance with Chapter 20 and that in no event shall coverage exceed 70 percent; and

(7) In the case of multi-residential projects, the project area coverage complies with the Bailey coefficients or, if the project was previously approved in excess of the Bailey coefficients, that excess coverage shall be mitigated by a transfer of coverage in conformance with Chapter 20 and that in no event will coverage exceed 50 percent; and

(8) The project is located in land capability district 4, 5, 6 or 7 or that, if the project is not located in land capability district 4, 5, 6 or 7, the project shall be deemed existing development pursuant to Chapter 34 and shall be transferred to a project area in land capability district 4, 5, 6 or 7 and that the transfer shall be in compliance with Chapter 34 and the application for the new project shall be in compliance with the Regional Plan and ordinances.

11.11.C Notice and Procedure: Notice of the provisions of this section shall be given as set forth below. The procedure for application and permit issuance shall be as set forth below.

(1) Notice: Notice shall be given to owners of property that may be affected by this section pursuant to Section 11.4.

(2) Procedure: The applicant shall file a complete application with TRPA no later than 5:00 p.m. on __________, 1989, the date one year from the effective date of this section. A complete application shall include a completed TRPA commercial/multi-residential exemption form as devised by the Executive Director, proof of a construction date of the foundation, a filing fee of $500.00 plus ten cents (10¢) per square foot of commercial floor area over 4,000 square feet, and final construction plans or, if modifications to the project are necessary to comply with Subsection 11.11.B, preliminary plans in conformance with the requirements for new multi-residential and commercial projects, as applicable.
(a) The provisions of Subsections 11.5.B, 11.5.C, 11.5.D, 11.5.E, 11.5.F and 11.5.G shall apply except that the date for filing a complete application in Subsection 11.5.C shall be ____, 1989, the date one year from the effective date of this section.

(b) The provisions of Section 11.6 shall apply except as set forth below:

(i) If original plans are not available, the previously-approved coverage shall be deemed to be the foundation perimeter plus the coverage necessary to provide access, parking and related improvements for the project, or the Bailey coefficients, whichever is greater.

(ii) Construction shall be complete, as defined by Subsection 11.2.C, within three years from the date of issuance of the permit.

(iii) Extensions of the three-year construction period may be granted provided the request is made in writing prior to the expiration of the three-year period and the Executive Director makes either of the two findings set forth in Subsection 11.6.H.

(c) Modification to original plans may be permitted as set forth in Section 11.7.

(d) A complete application for transfer of existing development pursuant to Subparagraph 11.11.B(8) shall be filed no later than one year from the date of Governing Board approval pursuant to said subsection.

(3) Abatement of Foundations: Abatement of foundations shall be pursuant to Section 11.8.

(4) Appeals: Appeals shall be pursuant to Section 11.9.

(5) Applications: Applications may be lodged with TRPA prior to the effective date of this section. Lodging an application shall be at the risk of the applicant and shall not be construed to estop TRPA from amendment or revocation of this section prior to the effective date.