TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
NOTICE OF MEETING

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 November 13, 1991, at the TRPA Office, 195 U.S. Highway 50,
Zephyr Cove, Nevada. The agenda for said meeting is attached hereto and made
a part of this notice.

November 4, 1991

David S. Ziegler
Executive Director

This agenda has been posted at the TRPA office and at the following post
offices: Zephyr Cove and Stateline, Nevada, and Al Tahoe, Tahoe Valley,
and Tahoe City, California.
All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted.

AGENDA

I  CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
II  APPROVAL OF AGENDA
III  DISPOSITION OF MINUTES
IV  PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION
   A. Certification of Final EIR/EIS for the South Lake Tahoe Loop Road Project
   C. Further Amendment of Chapter 4 Relating to Streamlining and Clarification of Existing Provisions

V  PLANNING MATTERS
   A. Amendment of Maps Delineating Water Quality Improvements in the Vicinity of the Parcel (IPES Working Map)
   B. Presentation on the Regional Transportation Plan/Air Quality Plan Update

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

VII  PENDING MATTERS

VIII  RESOLUTION
   A. For Former APC Member Vivian Roberts

IX  ADJOURNMENT
MEMORANDUM

November 5, 1991

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Certification of the Final EIR/EIS for the South Lake Tahoe
        Loop Road Project

Proposed Action: The City of South Lake Tahoe is requesting the Advisory
Planning Commission to find the Final EIR/EIS for the South Lake Tahoe Loop Road
Project technically adequate and direct staff to forward a recommendation to
the Governing board for certification.

Recommendation: TRPA staff is recommending that the APC find the South Lake
Tahoe Loop Road Project EIR/EIS technically adequate and recommend certification
of the final document to the Governing Board.

Discussion: Following the October APC meeting, TRPA staff, the City of South
Lake Tahoe, and the consultants for the preparation of the South Lake Tahoe Loop
Road Project EIR/EIS have met several times to resolve outstanding issues raised
during the public hearing before the APC and the concerns raised by the APC
members. An errata has been completed which, in conjunction with the draft
Final EIR/EIS document, comprises the Final EIR/EIS.

The errata and a cover letter summarizing the errata is attached for your
review. A summary of the errata will be presented by staff at the November 13
meeting of the APC.

If you have any questions in regard to this agenda item, please contact Leif
Anderson at (702) 588-6782.

/lk
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November 5, 1991

Ms. Teri Jamin, Planning Director
City of South Lake Tahoe
Post Office Box 1210
South Lake Tahoe, California 95705

Mr. David S. Ziegler, Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Post Office Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448-1038

Dear Ms. Jamin and Mr. Ziegler:

Since submittal of the Loop Road Project Final EIR/EIS the City of South Lake Tahoe (City), the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), and numerous other organizations have been working toward the clarification of specific issues. Also, the presentation before the TRPA Advisory Planning Committee on October 9, 1991, brought additional topics to light which require clarification. The information contained in the present letter was developed to address these issues and topics. In some cases, clarification will suffice and changes to the Draft and Final EIR/EIS are not necessary. In other cases, changes are required. The discussion herein of each issue and topic will conclude with a statement as to which condition prevails.

ISSUE ONE: The Pedestrian Crossing at the West Intersection.

As designed, the West Intersection will have two free right turn lanes from eastbound Lake Tahoe Boulevard onto the South Loop. A pedestrian walkway crosses these free right turn lanes. If the level of pedestrian use becomes high enough, signalization of the right turn lanes may become necessary. At issue is whether or not such a signalization would adversely impact performance of the intersection or results of the air quality and noise analyses as contained in the EIR/EIS.

A need for positive pedestrian protection at the West Intersection may develop in stages, depending on demonstrated levels of demand. Initially, gaps in eastbound Lake Tahoe
Boulevard traffic flow may allow adequate opportunity for pedestrian crossings. Signal phasing at the intersection of Lake Tahoe Boulevard with Wildwood Avenue and Ski Run Boulevard will regularly stop eastbound Lake Tahoe Boulevard traffic to serve other turning movements at those intersections. This signal phasing can be expected to cause gaps in traffic movement through the right-turn lanes from eastbound Lake Tahoe Boulevard onto the South Loop Road. Also, "PED XING" symbol signs and pavement legends should be placed in the two eastbound right-turn lanes at the West Intersections.

As pedestrian needs and/or traffic levels increase, signalization may be necessary. This has raised the concern that if the right turn lanes were signalized, then some number of roadway users would be discouraged from turning off of Lake Tahoe Boulevard and onto the South Loop Road and that the intersection's level of service might be affected. Recalculation based on signalization of the right-turn lanes indicates that the traffic level of service would remain the same as reported in the EIR/EIS. No additional signal time would be required since the eastbound Lake Tahoe Boulevard right-turn movement would be phased to operate concurrently with the north bound left-turn movement from the South Loop Road (this will require prohibiting northbound U-turn movements). The eastbound Lake Tahoe Boulevard right-turn movement would also operate concurrently with the eastbound through movement. The pedestrian movement across the dual eastbound right-turn lanes is not a separate signal phase but would be concurrent with the North Loop Road southbound through movement, stopping the eastbound Lake Tahoe Boulevard right turns. A secondary advantage of signalizing the right-turn lanes is that the southbound North Loop Road through movement would not have to merge with the heavier eastbound-to southbound movement from Lake Tahoe Boulevard to the South Loop Road. The pedestrian signal would be actuated, which means that if there is no pedestrian demand, or demand for other conflicting vehicle movements, the eastbound right-turn movement can remain green.

In summary, it is anticipated that the peak-hour traffic volumes for the various movements will be the same for the West Intersection, with or without signalization. Also, signalization of the right-turn lanes would not disrupt the manner of use as anticipated for the West Intersection in the EIR/EIS; pedestrian movement through the intersection would not reduce the amount of available "green time" and the intersection's level of service would not be affected. Thus, the traffic data presented in the EIR/EIS are adequate to project likely air quality and noise impacts. It is proposed that signal conduit be installed beneath the right-turn lanes during construction. Then, if monitoring of the crossing after completion of the Loop Road indicates signalization is necessary, poles, pedestrian signal heads, and push buttons can be added.

Provision of clarification hopefully addresses this issue, making modification of the Draft and Final EIR/EIS unnecessary.
ISSUE TWO: South Loop Roadway Cross Section.

Specific measures are identified in the Draft EIR/EIS intended to mitigate visual impacts associated with the South Loop Road. Comments received from CALTRANS and NDOT during public review of the Draft EIR/EIS indicated, however, that some of those measures were not likely to be acceptable. As a result, a revised cross section has been adopted for the South Loop Road. The proposed cross section will include a four-foot wide paved shoulder and a seven-foot wide unpaved, vegetated shoulder on either side of the roadway. A figure showing the proposed roadway cross section is attached to this letter. Various alternative curb treatments along the medians are also shown. The "L"-shaped curb provides greater definition, restricts vehicle access onto the median, and provides greater vegetative protection during snow removal. In contrast, the rolled curb allows vehicles to move off of the roadway in emergencies, is less abrupt visually, and is more capable of withstanding normal wear and tear. A final decision as to which curb treatment will be employed will be addressed during final project design.

For a majority of its length, the two travel ways along the South Loop Road will be separated by a ten-foot wide landscaped median. Locations of the proposed medians are depicted on a revised version of Figure 4.28 as originally presented in the Draft EIR/EIS (a replacement page for Figure 4.28 is attached). Two alternate vegetative treatments were considered for the medians, each of which is described below.

**Alternative 4A**

The first alternative, referred to as Alternative 4A, would see native grasses planted in the median; shrubs and trees would not be present. Inclusion of a median vegetated with native grasses increase the South Loop Road’s travel route rating score as compared to the originally proposed unmitigated Alternative 4. The 8 foot reduction in pavement surface and the 10 foot wide grass medians would positively affect the variety of scenery criterion due to increased variety within the roadway’s landscape scene and the visual unity created within the view corridor (native grasses on the cut and fill slopes and in the medians).

In comparison to the travel route rating, the scenic quality rating was unaffected. None of the proposed changes were significant enough to justify increasing any of the rating criteria (Refer to 4.10 Visual Quality Tables 3 and 6 <Errata> and Worksheet 6 <Errata>) above those of the unmitigated Alternative 4.
Alternative 4B

The second alternative, referred to as Alternative 4B, would see native grasses, large and small shrubs, and ground covers placed in the medians. Other mitigation measures incorporated into this alternative include:

1. The project shall include one of the following measures:
   a. Install approximately 300 feet of shrub plantings along the north side of the South Loop Road, along the back of Caesar's Tahoe (see the attached Figure 4.28 replacement page for location). The plantings shall consist of a mixture of evergreen and deciduous plant materials which provide an effective, year-round screening effect. This material is intended to screen the surface parking, parking structure, and rear service area at Caesar's. The final landscape planting plan shall be reviewed and approved by TRPA during project review.
   
   b. Install a landscaped median along the South Loop Road in the general area between Montreal Road and Park Avenue (see the attached Figure 4.28 replacement page for location), recognizing that certain deceleration and stacking space will be required at both intersection approaches.
   
   c. Install a landscaped median in the gap presently being left open to facilitate the proposed Kingsbury Connector Project (see the attached Figure 4.28 replacement page for location).
   
   d. Install an alternate mitigation measure, should one be identified prior to project review but after certification of the EIR/EIS. Any such mitigation must achieve the goal of maintaining the South Loop road's visual quality rating at 15 and must be reviewed and approved by TRPA as part of project review.

2. Shift the roadway alignment toward the south side of the construction right of way area.

3. No construction impacts or vegetation removal along the roadway's north side from Park Avenue east to Highway 50.

4. Landscape the medians with native species of large shrubs (mixed, multi-stemmed evergreen and deciduous species), small shrubs, and ground covers. The landscaped medians shall be designed with large massings of vertical multi-stem plant material to visually break up the large expanse of roadway and to provide a visual barrier
between the east and west traffic corridors. All native or adapted plant species selected for landscaping along the roadway and within the medians will be from TRPA's Recommended Grass, Shrub, Tree, Flower, and Legume Species List, Volume II. Examples of vertical multi-stem plant material would include but not be limited to Mountain Maple (Acer glabrum), Creek Dogwood (Cornus stolonifera), Amur Maple (Acer ginnla), Western Serviceberry (Amelanchier alnifolia), and Willow (Salix spp.).

5. All landscaped medians will be consistent vegetation found within zones naturally occurring along roadway corridor.

6. Landscaping consistent with the roadway medians to be installed within 30 feet of the travel lane.

7. Vegetation buffer between roadway and Crescent "V" Shopping Center to provide year-round evergreen screen consistent with landscaping in the adjacent roadway medians.

8. Planting pockets in retaining walls for evergreen trees to be located a minimum of 125 feet o.c. (dependent upon final retaining wall locations and elevations).

9. Landscaping between terraced concrete retaining walls to be consistent with the landscaping within the roadway medians.

10. Irrigate (temporarily) and maintain the seven-foot wide unpaved vegetated shoulders.

11. Irrigate and maintain all roadway landscaped medians, landscaping between terraced concrete retaining walls, and all new landscape plant materials along the roadway corridor.

12. Add additional vegetation to north side of roadway from Park Avenue to Highway 50. Spot plant evergreen and deciduous trees and shrubs along roadway including interseeding existing slopes with native grasses.

13. Underground or otherwise remove from view existing overhead utility poles and lines running parallel to and crossing the Loop Road (near Montreal Road) and terminating east of Park Avenue at the Forest Inn property.

Inclusion of these mitigative measures will increase the South Loop Road's travel route rating score, as compared to the originally proposed unmitigated Alternative 4. As proposed, the mitigation measures will positively affect the rating criterion of man-made features, roadway characteristics, and variety of scenery. This increase in individual travel
route criteria is due to no construction impacts on the north side of the roadway, the undergrounding of existing utility lines, and the addition of extensive roadside landscaping.

In comparison, scenic mitigation measures associated with Alternative 4B are expected to increase the unit-wide scenic quality rating to where it matches the mitigated unit-wide scenic quality rating associated with Alternative 4. However, while individual resource ratings may vary slightly from their existing ratings, overall the unit rating will remain the same as the existing rating. Ratings for two identified resources are expected to be reduced from their existing values while one resource is expected to increase its rating (Refer to 4.10 Visual Quality Tables 3 and 6 <Errata> and Worksheet 6 <Errata>.

Summary

In summary, neither Alternative 4A or 4B mitigates the proposed construction impacts along the South Loop Road as well as mitigation measures associated with Alternative 4 as described in the Draft EIR/EIS (The Preferred Alternative). Alternative 4A would not substantially improve the visual or scenic quality of the unmitigated Preferred Alternative. Impacts resulting therefrom would still be considered significant. However, Alternative 4B’s mitigation measures would substantially improve the visual and scenic quality of the South Loop Road when compared with unmitigated alternative 4 and mitigated Alternative 4A. As evaluated the travel route rating score would be 15 for Alternative 4B. This score would be 1 point below the mitigated Alternative 4. As evaluated, the scenic quality rating for Alternative 4B would be nearly equal to that of Alternative 4, resulting in the mitigation of impacts to a less than significant level.

Discussions relating to modification of the South Loop Road cross section, installation of vegetated medians, and their visual quality scorings represent information generated since issuance of the Draft and Final EIR/EIS. As a result, Section 4.10.4 and 4.10.5 of the Draft EIR/EIS and response to comments 131 and 132 must be viewed in light of this additional information.

ISSUE THREE: Roadway Signage.

At issue is the comparative visual impact of the two alternate signage programs outlined by Lumos & Associates in the Amendment to the Preliminary Design Report. One program made use of an overhead, cantilevered sign and a limited number of roadside signs, while the second program called for the exclusive use of roadside signs. TRPA, in cooperation with the City, has conducted balloon tests to assist in determining the relative visual impact of these programs. The result of that test is that the proposed roadside sign program will meet visual quality standards whereas use of the proposed overhead, cantilevered sign
program will not due to blockage of identified scenic resources. As a result, a ground-mounted directional signage program is proposed for implementation which conforms to MUTCD safety standards, maintains TRPA’s Community Design thresholds, and maintains scenic quality ratings for the scenic resources affected by the project.

TRPA may approve an alternative signage configuration if it mitigates the identified scenic impacts to a less than significant level. Possible alternative solutions may include reducing the size and/or relocating the cantilevered signs, or using a mixture of roadside and overhead signs to reduce the impacts on scenic quality to a less than significant level. Monitoring to be conducted with regard to the reduction of Lake Tahoe Boulevard to three lanes will also assist in determining the efficiency of roadside signage. If assessment at the conclusion of the one-year trial period indicates that the desired rate of traffic dispersal is not occurring, then a variety of alternate measures may be considered, including but not limited to the following: placement of approved alternative signage, the development of marketing programs such as maps and travel directions to be included in promotional literature, or installation of a radio information channel with recorded messages relating to routing and casino access.

This discussion regarding alternate signage programs and their possible implementation represents a clarification of information presented in the Draft and Final EIR/EIS. As a result, Section 4.10.4 and 4.10.5 of the Draft EIR/EIS and response to comments 131 and 132 must be viewed in light of this additional information.

ISSUE FOUR: Summary of Mitigation Measures.

The Summary of Mitigation Measures table contained at the end of Chapter 3 in the Final EIR/EIS has been updated to reflect any required changes. This table is provided at the conclusion of this memo and is intended to replace the table provided in the Final EIR/EIS.

ISSUES DISCUSSED AT THE APC MEETING

The Loop Road Project and the technical adequacy of the project EIR/EIS were discussed at the October 9, 1991, meeting of TRPA’s Advisory Planning Committee (APC). Several questions were raised at that meeting, both by Committee members and public representatives. These questions were reviewed and are responded to below to ensure that a thorough presentation of the material is available during future meetings.
Ms. Teri Jamin, Planning Director  
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**Topic One: Bicycle Paths and Pedestrian Use**

A comment raised at the October 9, 1991, APC meeting was that the EIR/EIS addressed bicycle travel in the recreation section rather than the transportation section and that the design of the South Loop Road precluded pedestrian and bicycle use.

The South Loop Road is proposed to be designated as Highway 50 under all four action alternatives (see Chapter 2 of the DEIS and Section 2.1.8 of the FEIS). As discussed at numerous steps along the planning process, from the initial TAC meetings through discussions leading to the preliminary design, the preferred approach was to segregate Highway 50 traffic from other traffic related functions such as bicycle and pedestrian uses. With this in mind, a decision was made to encourage bicycle and pedestrian traffic on other roadways within the loop road system, specifically the North Loop Road and along Lake Tahoe Boulevard. The preliminary design plan includes a bicycle/pedestrian path along the North Loop Road, while long range City plans call for Lake Tahoe Boulevard to be converted into a pedestrian oriented thoroughfare. These routes will provide for a majority of the east/west pedestrian and bicycle traffic through the general Loop Road Project area.

Although bicycle and pedestrian traffic will be encouraged to use other routes, the proposed South Loop roadway section can accommodate such uses. The seven foot wide, unpaved shoulder on either side of the roadway provides the opportunity to construct a paved sidewalk at some time in the future. In the interim, bicycle use can be accommodated within the four foot wide paved shoulder on either side of the roadway. It may be possible to designate these shoulders as Class III bike routes. As such, they would be signed but otherwise unmarked.

Provision of clarification hopefully addresses this topic, making modification of the Draft and Final EIR/EIS unnecessary.

**Topic Two: Sound Wall**

A commentor questioned why the design of the noise wall located along that portion of the north loop that adjoins the Tahoe Meadows was not disclosed in the EIR/EIS and evaluated in the visual quality analysis.

As disclosed on pages 4-62 to 4-64 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the noise analysis concludes that predicted noise levels under the worst case will exceed CNEL thresholds by 0.1 to 3.7 dBA and that it was likely that these exceedences could be reduced to a less than significant level through the placement of a landscaped vegetative screen and a six-foot high, solid wooden fence. As components of the original project design, these features were also fully analyzed in the visual quality analysis. Furthermore, the Draft EIR/EIS (see Figure 4.26) calls for the
relocation of detention basin 4 which will enhance roadway noise attenuation by allowing for the retention of many of the larger trees presently in this area and providing additional space for vegetative screening. The Draft EIR/EIS further notes that actual, post-project noise conditions may vary somewhat from the modeled results. Based on this possibility, the EIR/EIS proposes that monitoring be conducted to determine if additional mitigation measures are required. The Draft EIR/EIS further discloses that any additional mitigation measures must be considered with regard to their impact on scenic quality standards.

Provision of clarification hopefully addresses this topic, making modification of the Draft and Final EIR/EIS unnecessary.

Topic Three: Drainage

A commentor questioned the use of the North Street ditch as an outfall to Lake Tahoe in the Loop Road drainage plan. This comment was made in the context that a right-of-way does not exist for this use and that the proposal may not be consistent with a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City of South Lake Tahoe and the Tahoe Meadows Homeowners Association.

As disclosed on page 2-17 and in Section 4.6 of the Draft EIR/EIS and as further clarified in response to comment 92 in the Final EIR/EIS, the North Street ditch represents the low point for the A-2 drainage area and is the historic area of stormwater outfall to Lake Tahoe. As described in Section 2.3.2 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the Loop Road drainage plan will provide sufficient stormwater detention to contain a one-hour, 20-year storm event within the project area, meaning that stormwater from such a storm event will not overflow into the North Street ditch. Thus, the Loop Road Project will improve the existing situation in which runoff from lesser storm events often does flow into the North Street ditch. The direct discharge of Loop Road runoff into the North Street ditch will only occur under storm events that exceed the one-hour, 20-year design standard. In these situations, some portion of the Loop Road and A-2 drainage area runoff will necessarily discharge to the North Street ditch. Given its history of flooding, the North Street ditch will be upgraded as part of the Loop Road Project, in order to reduce flood hazards and safely convey anticipated stormwater flows.

Provision of clarification hopefully addresses this topic, making modification of the Draft and Final EIR/EIS unnecessary.
Topic Four: Air Quality

One commentor questioned why total suspended particulate (TSP) were reported in Figure 3.5 of the Draft EIR/EIS rather than PM10, since California standards no longer includes TSP, only PM10.

The purpose of Figure 3.5 and Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR/EIS was to describe existing air quality conditions in the general Loop Road Project area. As such, this figure represents a summary of available air quality data, including both TSP and PM10. While California may no longer collect or consider TSP data, this information is relevant since it represents the best long-term data available for describing air quality conditions. TSP still represents an applicable standard employed by the State of Nevada and the Federal government.

Provision of clarification hopefully addresses this topic, making modification of the Draft and Final EIR/EIS unnecessary.

Topic Five: Stream Environment Zones Impact

One commentor questioned where SEZ restoration would occur to off-set encroachment of the project alternatives into previous undisturbed SEZ within the Loop Road project area.

The amount of SEZ to be disturbed in the Loop Road project area is more than offset by the amount of SEZ from which existing coverage will be removed. Given definitions contained in the TRPA Code, this constitutes an example of SEZ coverage relocation and not new disturbance. Of importance to the Loop Road project, coverage reductions are not subject to the 1.5 to 1.0 restoration requirement or findings relating to the "no feasible alternative" language. Review of Section 20.5.C of the TRPA Code requires that the proposed relocated coverage meets the following findings:

- the relocation is to an equal or superior portion of the parcel or project area, as determined by reference to the following factors:
  
a.) whether the area of relocation already has been disturbed;
  
b.) the slope of and the natural vegetation on the area of relocation;
  
c.) the fragility of the soil on the area of relocation;
  
d.) whether the area of relocation appropriately fits the scheme of use of the property;
e.) the relocation does not further encroach into a stream environment zone, backshore, or the setbacks established in the Code for the protection of stream environment zones or backshores;

f.) the project otherwise complies with the land coverage mitigation program as set forth in Section 20.5; and,

g.) if the relocation is from one portion of a stream environment zone to another portion, there is a net environmental benefit.

- the area from which the land coverage was removed for relocation is restored in accordance with Section 20.4.C.

- the relocation is not to Land Capability Districts 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, or 3, from any higher numbered Land Capability District.

These findings are satisfied with regard to the Loop Road Project. Specific factors of relevance are that portions of the area of relocation already have been disturbed; the areas of relocation and the project area are similar with regard to slope, natural vegetation, and soil fragility; that there will be a net environmental benefit; the project complies with land coverage mitigation programs and restoration requirements identified in Sections 20.5 and 20.4.C of the Code; and that the relocation is not from a higher to a lower Land Capability District.

This discussion regarding SEZ relocation represents a clarification of information presented in the Draft and Final EIR/EIS. As a result, Section 4.7.5 of the Draft EIR/EIS and response to comments 106, 108, 114, and 117 must be viewed in light of this additional information.

**Topic Six: Linear Parkway**

Citing the memorandum of understanding between the City and the Tahoe Meadows Homeowners Association which stipulates that the linear park and the Loop Road be considered in a coordinated manner, the Tahoe Meadows Homeowners Association questioned when this coordination would occur.

The linear parkway was disclosed as a "reasonably foreseeable project" on page 1-6 of the Draft EIR/EIS. In addition, comment 149 in the Final EIR/EIS (page 4-44) also responds to this very same question. These citations note that the initial park plan has been considered and incorporated into the preliminary design of the Loop Road, but that further coordination between the two projects will have to wait until the north Loop Road alignment...
has been selected through the certification process. Once final design of the Loop Road is underway, then further coordination between the two projects can occur.

Provision of clarification hopefully addresses this topic, making modification of the Draft and Final EIR/EIS unnecessary.

**Topic Seven: Housing**

A commentor questioned whether or not sufficient housing would be available to accommodate residents physically relocated as a result of the Loop Road Project.

As discussed in Section 4.13 of the Draft EIR/EIS (pages 4-172 through 4-179) and in response to comments 153 and 155 in the Final EIR/EIS, the California Redevelopment Act requires that the City have in-place a relocation plan sufficient to provide relocation housing prior to the eviction of residents or the demolition of purchased properties. Based on these requirements and the City’s recent success at relocating residents displaced due to Redevelopment Project No. 1, the Draft EIR/EIS concluded that resident relocation could be accomplished effectively.

Provision of clarification hopefully addresses this topic, making modification of the Draft and Final EIR/EIS unnecessary.

**Topic Eight: The Proposal Precludes Transit Considerations**

A commentor stated that the loop road is over-built, thereby detracting from the potential for future alternate transit options, such as the light rail system.

The loop road system, as proposed, will not change the amount of roadway laneage in the immediate project area. At present, the project area contains five lanes along Lake Tahoe Boulevard, three along the South Loop road (two lanes in California), and two lanes along the North Loop road. As proposed, the preferred alternative will consist of five lanes along the South Loop road, three lanes along Lake Tahoe Boulevard, and three lanes along the North Loop road. In comparison, then, the preferred alternative will contain only two more lanes than are present in Nevada and three more lanes than are present in California; all the new lanes are continuous left turn lanes. Also, should a alternate transit system be proposed, it may be possible to site that system within some part of the Loop Road system (a center turn lane, for example). In summary, the Loop Road system does not represent a significant increase in capacity, nor does it preclude future transit options.
The potential for future transit systems in the South Tahoe area is identified as a "reasonably foreseeable project" on page 1-8 of the Draft EIR/EIS, and potential conflicts between the Loop Road alternatives and future transit options are disclosed on pages 4-36 and 4-37 of the same document. In addition, responses to comments 9 and 57 in the Final EIR/EIS address this same comment.

Provision of clarification hopefully addresses this topic, making modification of the Draft and Final EIR/EIS unnecessary.

**Topic Nine: Well Contamination**

South Tahoe Public Utility District (STPUD) stated that the EIR/EIS does not fully evaluate the potential for contamination at two domestic production wells located near the intersection of Pine Boulevard and Park Avenue. STPUD also objected to the sending of contaminated surface runoff to the South Tahoe Wastewater Treatment Plant for treatment.

As illustrated in Figures 5-12 and 5-38 of the Design Report and as depicted in Figure 3-9 of the Draft EIR/EIS, realignment of Pine Boulevard will require the North Loop Road to encroach on STPUD property, but not to the point where existing STPUD facilities will have to be relocated. With regard to groundwater contamination, the response to comment 94 in the Final EIR/EIS states that drilling and infiltration testing will be conducted during final design of the proposed detention basins to insure they function properly. Should this testing indicate that treated stormwaters are likely to contaminate groundwater supplies, then the ponds will be sealed and converted to vegetation treatment, or relocated to a more aptly suited site. Based on these factors, the EIR/EIS concludes that the proposed project will not adversely affect the STPUD wells. In addition, the roadway improvements associated with this realignment (i.e., curb and gutters) will be an improvement over existing conditions in terms of controlling and safely conveying runoff within the area of the wells. Thus, it is anticipated that the potential for contamination will be reduced rather than enhanced by the Loop Road Project. Finally, careful review of the Draft and Final EIR/EIS failed to identify any reference to the conveyance of stormwater runoff to the South Tahoe Wastewater Plant for treatment.

Provision of clarification hopefully addresses this topic, making modification of the Draft and Final EIR/EIS unnecessary.
Topic Ten: Historical Values

A commentor stated that project-related impacts to cultural resources, particularly those within Tahoe Meadows, had not been adequately discussed. The possible need for compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act was also raised.

Matters regarding cultural resource impacts are contained in Section 4.11 of the Draft EIR/EIS. That discussion identifies inventory work accomplished to identify significant cultural resources that may be affected by the Loop Road Project, determines which specific cultural resources would be so affected, and arrives at mitigation conclusions based on specific standards. Procedurally, cultural resources are addressed in Chapter 29 of the TRPA Code. This chapter states that prior to approving a project, TRPA must find that a project will not be detrimental to cultural resources, that an approved recovery plan is in place, or that the project is the only feasible alternative. The second finding applies to the Loop Road project; preparation of a recovery plan is identified as a specific mitigation measure on page 4-157 of the Draft EIR/EIS. A plan was not presented as part of the Draft EIR/EIS since a specific roadway alignment had not been selected. The recovery plan will be reviewed and approved by TRPA as part of project review.

Finally, compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act will be necessary when, and if, the project comes under federal scrutiny. The most likely opportunity for such consideration is when the Corps of Engineers reviews the project for compliance with laws and regulations dealing with impacts to wetlands. While not formatted with the Historic Preservation Act in mind, the Draft EIR/EIS contains sufficient information to allow the Corps of Engineers and the State Historic Preservation Officers of California and Nevada to determine project-specific effects to cultural resources. This issue will be addressed further by the City during application proceedings with the Corps of Engineers.

Provision of clarification hopefully addresses this topic, making modification of the Draft and Final EIR/EIS unnecessary.

Sincerely,

Charles D. Zeier
Assistant Project Manager
ATTACHMENTS
"S" LINE—OPTIONAL SECTION I
(AT GRADE MEDIAN—CALTRANS BARRIER CURB)

"S" LINE—OPTIONAL SECTION II
(raised median—Caltrans barrier curb)

"S" LINE—OPTIONAL SECTION III
(raised median—Caltrans mountable curb)
Center landscaped medians (1-z [5], 1-ee [6], 13-d [2], and 21-m [4]): As discussed in the Loop Road Draft EIR/EIS, eliminating the center turn lane along the South Loop Road, except at intersections and driveways (where it is necessary to accommodate left turns), was seen as a means of reducing project related coverage and visual impacts. The median would be 10 feet wide; associated paved shoulders and curbs would add an additional 5 to 6 feet, depending on the type of curb employed. Vegetation in the medians would be native species of mixed evergreen and deciduous, multi-stem, large shrubs; smaller shrubs; and ground covers. Caltrans indicates that such a median may not be permissible if the roadway is to be designated Highway 50 (1-aa [5] and 1-ee [6]).

Landscaping adjacent to roadways (1-x [5] and 6-o [3]): Caltrans and NDOT have agreed that recessed containers with plant materials (primarily shrubs but also trees less than 4 inches in diameter at maturity) can be placed within 30-feet of the roadway shoulder along designated Highway 50, if the trees and shrubs do not create sight distance problems. Also, existing trees that exceed the 4 inches diameter limit may be retained in the unpaved clear zone, on a case by case basis. Greater latitude exists along other roadways since they will be city/county roads and not a part of Highway 50. For example, it may be possible to retain a majority of the existing vegetation along the North Loop Road (see AMENDMENT 8 regarding removal of the Highway 50 designation for the North Loop Road under Alternative 2 - the One-Way alternative), greatly reducing potential impacts to the Tahoe Meadows area.

COMMENT 132: Negotiation is required regarding possible reductions in the width of paved and unpaved roadway shoulders (1-cc [6], 1-dd [6], and 1-ij [6]); elimination of shoulders is not possible (6-w [4]).

RESPONSE: The ability to reduce lane and shoulder widths along the South Loop Road is limited due to its proposed designation as Highway 50. Originally, an eight-foot wide paved shoulder and a seven-foot wide unpaved vegetated shoulder were proposed to accommodate disabled vehicles. It is proposed that the paved shoulder be reduced to four feet: reduction of the unpaved shoulder is unlikely since this area is used for snow storage during the winter. Greater latitude exists along other roadways since they will be city/county roads and not a part of Highway 50. For example, it may be possible to reduce the width of shoulders and travel lanes along the North Loop Road (see AMENDMENT 8 regarding removal of the Highway 50 designation for the North Loop Road under Alternative 2 - the one way alternative). Decisions regarding this matter have yet to be made by the CSLT and Douglas County since they remain items of discussion with Caltrans, NDOT, and TRPA. Their resolution will be reflected in the final project design and will be subject to
Table 3

Existing and Projected Roadway Route Ratings for the Loop Road Project Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Route Rating Criteria</th>
<th>Alt. #1 (Existing)</th>
<th>Alt. #2</th>
<th>Alt. #3</th>
<th>Alt. #4 (Unmitigated)</th>
<th>Alt. #2</th>
<th>Alt. #3</th>
<th>Alt. #4 (Mitigated)</th>
<th>Alt. #5 (Unmitigated)</th>
<th>Alt. #5 (Mitigated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man-made Features</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Distractions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Characteristics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of the Lake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Landscape Views</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of Scenery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Score</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Route Rating Criteria</th>
<th>Alt. #1 (Existing)</th>
<th>Alt. #2</th>
<th>Alt. #3</th>
<th>Alt. #4</th>
<th>Alt. #5 (Unmitigated)</th>
<th>Alt. #2</th>
<th>Alt. #3</th>
<th>Alt. #4</th>
<th>Alt. #5</th>
<th>Alt. #4A</th>
<th>Alt. #4B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man-made Features</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Distractions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Characteristics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of the Lake</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Landscape Views</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of Scenery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Score</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Scoring is rated on an overall scenic quality scale: (1=low through 5=very high)
### Table 6

Existing and Projected Roadway Scenic Quality Ratings for the Loop Road Project Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenic Quality Rating Criteria</th>
<th>Alt.#1 (Existing)</th>
<th>Alt.#2</th>
<th>Alt.#3</th>
<th>Alt.#4 (Unmitigated)</th>
<th>Alt.#2</th>
<th>Alt.#3</th>
<th>Alt.#4 (Mitigated)</th>
<th>Alt.#5 (Unmitigated)</th>
<th>Alt.#5 (Mitigated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vividness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intactness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>6 (mod)</td>
<td>5 (low)</td>
<td>7 (mod)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (mod)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenic Quality Rating Criteria</th>
<th>Alt.#1 (Existing)</th>
<th>Alt.#2</th>
<th>Alt.#3</th>
<th>Alt.#4 (Unmitigated)</th>
<th>Alt.#2</th>
<th>Alt.#3</th>
<th>Alt.#4 (Mitigated)</th>
<th>Alt.#1 (Existing)</th>
<th>Alt.#2</th>
<th>Alt.#3</th>
<th>Alt.#4 (Unmitigated)</th>
<th>Alt.#2</th>
<th>Alt.#3</th>
<th>Alt.#4 (Mitigated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vividness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intactness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>8 (mod)</td>
<td>6 (mod)</td>
<td>8 (mod)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (mod)</td>
<td>8 (mod)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (low)</td>
<td>6 (mod)</td>
<td>7 (mod)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Scoring is rated on an overall scenic quality scale: (1=low through 3+=very high)
### 4.10 Visual Quality Worksheet #6 (Errata)

Visual Analysis - South Loop Visual Corridor

1 - Views of Natural Landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unity 1-3</th>
<th>Var 1-3</th>
<th>Vivid 1-3</th>
<th>Intact 1-3</th>
<th>Total - Comp. 1-12</th>
<th>Comp. 1-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ALTERNATIVE 4:**
| Existing | 2       | 3         | 2          | 3                 | (high)    |
| Unmitigated | 1       | 2         | 1          | 1                 | (low)     |
| Mitigated | 2       | 2         | 2          | 8                 | (mod)     |

#### Narrative - South Loop Visual Corridor

- **ALTERNATIVE 4:**
  - **Existing:** Linear view looking west.
  - **Unmitigated:** Change - roadway expansion, cut and fill slopes, removal of mature roadside vegetation and terraced concrete retaining walls.
  - **Mitigated:** Mitigated Change - Retention of some mature roadside vegetation outside of paved surface areas; landscaped median and landscaping within 30 ft. of travel lane; vegetation buffer between roadway and Crescent "V" Shopping Center; Reduction in paved surface; Planting pockets in retaining walls for landscaping; Landscaping between terraced concrete retaining walls.

- **ALTERNATIVE 4A:** Mitigated change-8' reduction in roadway expansion; 10' wide medians* from Park Avenue to Highway 50 landscaped with native grasses.

- **ALTERNATIVE 4B:** Mitigated change-Minor roadway realignment; No construction impacts or vegetation removal along north side of roadway from Park Avenue to Highway 50; Retention of 7' wide unpaved shoulders; 8' reduction of roadway expansion; 10' wide medians from Park Avenue along the South Loop Road to Highway 50 intersection (with break at South Loop Road, Kingsbury connector intersection); Landscaped with native species of shrubs and ground covers; Removal or undergrounding of the existing overhead utility lines and poles running parallel to the Loop Road and terminating east of Park Avenue at the Forest Inn property; Landscaped medians* to reflect vegetation zones naturally occurring along roadway corridor; landscaping within 30' of travel lane; vegetation buffer between roadway and Crescent "V" Shopping Center; Planting pockets in retaining walls for evergreen trees; Landscaping between terraced concrete retaining walls; Irrigate and maintain all new landscaping; Revegetate north side of roadway from Park Avenue to Highway 50 with spot plantings of evergreen and deciduous trees and shrubs and intersecting existing slopes with native grasses. One alternative mitigation measure would be the installation of a landscaped median between Park Avenue and Montreal Road as shown in Figure 4.28.

---

*Note: Further details and specifications are provided in the subsequent sections of the EIR/EIS.
### 4.10 Visual Quality Worksheet #6 (Errata)

#### 2 - Views of the Lake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Unity 1-3</th>
<th>Var 1-3</th>
<th>Vivid 1-3</th>
<th>Intact 1-3</th>
<th>Total 1-3</th>
<th>Comp. 1-3</th>
<th>Narrative - South Loop Visual Corridor</th>
<th>Photos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALTERNATIVE 4</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Point view looking north at Loop Road's east intersection.</td>
<td>Subcomponent #1 Viewpoint #1 Figure 3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change - new roadway intersection, overhead directional assembly and expanded roadway surface.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmitigated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mitigated Change - Landscaped median; Reduction in paved surface; Removal of overhead directional signage and replacement with smaller ground-mounted directional signage which conforms to NDOT's safety standards and TRPA regional plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mitigated change-8' reduction in roadway expansion; 10' wide medians* from Park Avenue to Highway 50 landscaped with native grasses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALTERNATIVE 4A</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mitigated change-Minor roadway realignment; No construction impacts or vegetation removal along north side of roadway from Park Avenue to Highway 50; Retention of 7' wide unpaved shoulders; 8' reduction in roadway expansion; 10' wide medians from Highway's east intersection, along the South Loop Road to Park Avenue (with a break at South Loop Road/Kingsbury connector intersection) landscaped with native species of shrubs and groundcover; Landscaped medians* to reflect vegetation zones naturally occurring along roadway corridor; Landscaping within 30' of travel lane; Irrigate and maintain all new landscaping; Revegetate north side of roadway from Park Avenue to Highway 50 with spot plantings of evergreen and deciduous trees and shrubs and interseed existing slopes with native grasses; Replace overhead directional signage with smaller ground-mounted directional signage which conforms to M.U.T.C.D. safety standards, maintains TRPA's Community Design thresholds. On alternative mitigation measure would be installation of approximately 300 feet of low-growing shrubs along the north side of the South Loop Road from station 61+60 to station 64+60 using the same plant palette as proposed for medians and roadside vegetation. The screen should use a mixture of evergreen and deciduous plant materials which provide an effective year-round screen. It is intended to screen the surface parking, parking structure, and rear service area at Caesars. If this mitigation measure is selected, the scenic quality rating subcomponent score would be expected to improve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.10 Visual Quality Worksheet #6 (Errata)

#### 3 - Visual Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
<th>Unity 1-3</th>
<th>Var 1-3</th>
<th>Vivid 1-3</th>
<th>Intact 1-3</th>
<th>Total 1-12</th>
<th>Comp. 1-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 (mod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmitigated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 (mod)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative - South Loop Visual Corridor**

- **Linear view looking east.**
- **Change - roadway expansion, cut and fill slopes, removal of mature roadside vegetation and terraced concrete retaining walls.**
- **Mitigated Change - Retention of some mature roadside vegetation outside of paved surface areas; Landscaped median and landscaping within 30 ft. of travel lane; Reduction in paved surface; Planting pockets in retaining walls for landscaping; Landscaping between terraced concrete retaining walls.**
- **Mitigated change-8' reduction in roadway expansion; 10' wide medians* from Park Avenue to Highway 50 landscaped with native grasses.**

**Alternative 4A**

- | Unity 1-3 | Var 1-3 | Vivid 1-3 | Intact 1-3 | Total 1-12 | Comp. 1-3 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (low)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternative 4B**

- | Unity 1-3 | Var 1-3 | Vivid 1-3 | Intact 1-3 | Total 1-12 | Comp. 1-3 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 (mod)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigated change-Minor roadway realignment; No construction impacts on vegetation removal along north side of roadway from Park Avenue to Highway 50; Retention of 7' wide unpaved shoulders; 8' reduction of roadway expansion; 10' wide medians from Highway's east intersection, along the South Loop Road to Park Avenue (with a break at South Loop Road/Kingsbury connector intersection) landscaped with native species of shrubs and groundcover; Landscaped medians* to reflect vegetation zones naturally occurring along roadway corridor, Landscaping within 30' of travel lane; Planting pockets in retaining walls for evergreen trees; Landscaping between terraced concrete retaining walls; Irrigate and maintain all new landscaping; Revegetate north side of roadway from Park Avenue to Highway 50 with spot plantings of evergreen and deciduous trees and shrubs and interseed existing slopes with native grasses. One alternative mitigation measure would be installation of the landscape median previously provided through the area associated with the South Loop Road/Kingsbury Connector intersection if the Kingsbury Connector project has not been approved by TRPA at the time of Loop Road permit issuance.
### 4.10 Visual Quality Worksheet #6 (Errata)
#### 4 - Visual Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unity 1-3</th>
<th>Var 1-3</th>
<th>Vivid 1-3</th>
<th>Intact 1-3</th>
<th>Total - Comp. 1-12</th>
<th>Comp. 1-3</th>
<th>Narrative - South Loop Visual Corridor</th>
<th>Photos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 (mod)</td>
<td>Point view looking south along Echo Road...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmitigated 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 (mod)</td>
<td>Change - removal of low income housing and apartment buildings and evergreen trees. New roadway construction, landscaped detention basins and open views to south.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigated 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 (mod)</td>
<td>Mitigated Change - same as for unmitigated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE 4A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 (mod)</td>
<td>Mitigated change - 8' reduction in roadway expansion; 10' wide medians from west intersection @ Highway 50 to Montclair Road landscaped with native grasses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE 4B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 (mod)</td>
<td>Mitigated change - 8' Reduction in Roadway expansion; retention of 7' wide unpaved vegetation shoulders; 10' wide medians from Highway 50 (west intersection) to Montclair Road landscaped with native species of shrubs and ground cover; Removal or undergrounding of the existing overhead utility lines and poles running parallel to the Loop Road and terminating east of Park Avenue at the Forest Inn property landscaping within 30' of travel lane; irrigate and maintain all new landscaping. One alternative mitigation measure would be the installation of a landscaped median between Park Avenue and Montclair Road as shown in Figure 4.28</td>
<td>Figure 3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Scenic Analysis Viewpoints in South Loop Visual Corridor impacted as part of the proposed Loop Road project.
2. This specific visual resource is not mitigated to less than a significant level. However, the South Loop Road is not an adopted Threshold Roadway and overall the visual corridor's scenic character is expected to remain the same.

Unmitigated Summary: The negative impact of the South Loop Road project would significantly change the scenic quality composite total in three criterion; NL-1, VL-2 and VF-3. In NL-1 the change would be a decrease from 10 to 5 or from 3 (high) to 1 (low). VL-2 would decrease from 10 to 9 or from 3 (high) to 2 (mod). Also, in VF-3 the change would be from 9 to 4 or from 2 (mod) to 1 (low). The only visual analysis point to improve would be VF-4, Visual Features. The score would increase from 7 to 8 but the composite score would remain unaffected. The final result is a decrease in this roadway's scenic quality rating from 8 to 6.

*Landscape medians shall be located along the South Loop Road. Depending on final design requirements for speed deceleration and traffic storage capacities in left turn pockets the landscape medians shall be located approximately at the following roadway stationing points (Refer to Lamos & Assoc., 1990 c; Preliminary Design Report).*

#1. 13+00 to 21+25
#2. 33+50 to 41+45
#3. 47+00 to 59+50
#4. 63+45 to 64+35
#5. 70+10 to 72+70

* (Refer to attached map and Lamos & Associates revised "S" line-optional Sections I, II, and III and roadway cross sections of landscaped medians along the South Loop Road)
## South Lake Tahoe Loop Road Project
### Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures
For the Preferred Alternative

### TRANSPORTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic modelling projects a diminished level of service at four intersections in 2005 and five intersections in 2015.</td>
<td>By 2005, the CSLT and CALTRANS shall evaluate the requirements for signalizing Pine Boulevard and Stateline Avenue, South Loop Road and Park Avenue, Pioneer Trail and Glen Road, and South Loop Road and Montreal Road. Evaluate the need to signalize the North Loop Road and Park Avenue intersection by the year 2015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The state and TRPA standard for CO will be exceeded at 4 receptors in 1993, 3 receptors in 1995, and 1 receptors in 2005. Federal standards and TRPA goals (as per Section 15.11.F of the Code) for CO will be met in all three years.</td>
<td>TRPA to continue monitoring air quality and traffic patterns as a means of assessing actual versus modelled exceedences. Relocate existing receptor(s) as needed. As needed, CSLT and TRPA implement mitigation as specified in the Redevelopment Plan EIR/EIS (Brady &amp; Assoc. 1988b) and implement mitigation to direct planned traffic patterns (i.e., signage, marketing plans, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx emissions will be 0.153 tons/day with a deposition rate of 26 metric tons per year.</td>
<td>Through TRPA’s regional and community planning efforts, reduce VMTs through alternate modes of public transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone, particulate, and visibility levels will be impacted, based on projected VMT increases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*South Lake Tahoe Loop Road*

*Final EIR/EIS*
## NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway noise will exceed the CNEL thresholds.</td>
<td>Relocate detention basin 4 and retain as many large trees as possible in this area, construct a solid wood fence along Tahoe Meadows; maximize vegetation screens between roadway and adjacent lands uses. Implement a noise monitoring program to determine the need for additional noise mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction-related activities will generate short-term noise impacts to adjacent land uses.</td>
<td>The project proponents shall implement best management practices and limit construction to the hours between 8:00 am and 6:30 pm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site clearing and grading will impact approximately 34 acres.</td>
<td>As part of the Construction plan, the project proponents shall prepare and implement a temporary erosion control plan which includes provisions to prevent unnecessary intrusions into areas beyond the limit of disturbance; stabilize disturbed soils as soon as possible, but no later than October 15; prohibit grading during periods of precipitation; minimize the time and extent of disturbance; and ensure compliance with Chapters 25 and 29 of the TRPA Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased erosion during construction activities.</td>
<td>As part of the Construction Plan, the project proponents shall prepare and implement temporary erosion control measures in accordance with TRPA Best Management Practices; protect SEZs from siltation due to soil disturbance; limit construction disturbance activities to between May 1 and October 15 of each year. Preparation and implementation of a three year construction schedule.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil disposal will occur.</td>
<td>Location of the soil disposal site will be identified in the Construction Plan by the project proponents and approved by TRPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for erosion during operation of the roadway system.</td>
<td>During final design, the project proponents shall prepare a permanent erosion control plan which includes provisions to install permanent erosion control devices, especially in SEZ's. Revegetate all areas disturbed but not covered (approximately 18 acres).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# HYDROLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impacts may occur to surface drainage waters during construction.</td>
<td>As part of the Construction Plan, the project proponents shall define construction limits, install silt fences where and as necessary, control disposal of debris, and utilize BMPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation along the South Loop Road may intercept groundwater.</td>
<td>As part of final project design, plans shall be developed by the project proponents to minimize disturbance in areas of proposed cut banks; design for stability in saturated conditions; install french drains to collect and redistribute groundwater; stabilize disturbed areas adjacent to any retaining wall structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland flows may increase.</td>
<td>The project proponents shall revegetate all areas within the right-of-way not otherwise covered by roadway features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant improvements in the quality of surface waters discharged to Lake Tahoe from the California project area would occur.</td>
<td>The project proponents shall construct stormwater treatment and drainage facilities as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential threat of groundwater contamination to Tahoe Meadow’s properties from Proposed Basin No. 4.</td>
<td>Elimination of Basin No. 4 from project design and construction of new treatment basin near Pine Boulevard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusion of North Loop into the Stateline Erosion Control Project.</td>
<td>Final design shall be modified by the project proponents to reduce roadway width to avoid encroachment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased pollutant loadings to Pond No. 6 at Edgewood Golf Course. Potential land use conflicts with surrounding properties concerning areas for stormwater treatment.</td>
<td>Douglas County and NDOT shall coordinate the final design of the Loop Road project with the implementation of an area-wide stormwater treatment plan on Nevada side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for groundwater contamination from proposed treatment Basins Nos. 1, 2, and 3.</td>
<td>CSLT shall design basins for site specific conditions. Working in coordination with Lahontan WQCB and TRPA, CSLT shall develop and implement a groundwater monitoring plan. Should degradation occur, basins could be sealed by the CSLT and/or affected user’s connected to STPUD system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overflow of Basin Nos. 2 and 3 caused by stormwaters outside of project area.</td>
<td>Final design will include provisions for construction of a bypass stormdrain for off-site waters above south west loop road area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LAND COVERAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net coverage reduction of 111,174 SF across project area.</td>
<td>None required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247,649 SF net decrease in California, including a 66,110 SF SEZ decrease.</td>
<td>Relocation of existing coverage pursuant to Section 20.5.C. Construct landscaped medians along the South Loop and reduce the 8-foot paved shoulders to 4 feet. Use retaining wall structures below the roadway in areas of new construction in SEZ to minimize disturbance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131,475 SF net increase in Nevada, including a 61,672 SF SEZ increase.</td>
<td>Construct landscaped medians along the South Loop and reduce the paved shoulders to 4 feet. Use retaining wall structures below the roadway in areas of new construction in SEZ to minimize disturbance. Coverage shall be relocated in compliance with Section 20.5.C of TRPA Code.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 10.5 acres of SEZ and 23.3 acres of upland vegetation types will be impacted, including over 100 live trees. Some 5.4 acres of SEZ and 12.4 acres of upland will be revegetated.</td>
<td>Prior to project approval, the project proponents shall prepare a tree harvest plan pursuant to Chapter 71 of the Code. As part of the Construction Plan, include provisions which ensure that vegetation outside limits of disturbance will be protected (temporary fencing), that intrusions outside the limits of disturbance will be limited; that the removal of vegetative debris will occur prior to October 15 of each year. Develop a revegetation plan which will be implemented in all areas disturbed but not covered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive plant species may be impacted.</td>
<td>Prior to the commencement of construction, the project proponents shall conduct a sensitive plant survey within potential <em>Rorippa subumbellata</em> habitat and mitigate accordingly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VISUAL QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed overhead directional signage at either end of the Loop Road blocks views of mapped scenic resources and other intermediate ridgeline views seen from within the travel corridor, and is inconsistent with TRPA’s Community Design threshold.</td>
<td>Install ground mounted directional signage which conforms to the Manual On Uniform Traffic Control Devices, as shown on the signage plan sheets identified as C-4 and S-8 dated 9/23/91, and the sign assembly detail sheets 1 through 7, dated 9/23/91 prepared by Lumos &amp; Associates; or an approved alternative sign configuration which mitigates the identified scenic impacts to a less than significant level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed design and revegetation plans for the west loop road intersection are not consistent with the CSLT redevelopment plan.</td>
<td>As part of final project design, CSLT shall plan an irrigated, maintained, urban style landscape area with planting islands. The planting islands will be maintained by the CSLT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The North Loop Visual Corridor will be impacted negatively due to the increased width of the roadway and removal of vegetation in the Tahoe Meadows area.</td>
<td>Relocate detention basin 4; minimize tree removal along the edge of Tahoe Meadows; remove center turn lane along the North Loop Road from Park Avenue to the Highway 50 intersection or replace with vegetated median.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South Loop Visual Corridor will be impacted negatively due to the increased width of the roadway, and the installation of concrete retaining walls.</td>
<td>The project proponents shall reduce the paved shoulder to four feet; install a ten-foot wide landscaped median along selected portions of the South Loop; install a vegetation buffer between the roadway and the Crescent &quot;V&quot; Shopping Center; install plant spotings in selected areas; install planting pockets at the base of retaining walls; use terraced retaining walls; relocate the Sierra Pacific access road; relocated or underground local overhead utility lines running parallel to and crossing the South Loop road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designations of selected properties as Historic must be approved by TRPA and in the case of Tahoe Meadows properties, the National Register of Historic Places.</td>
<td>Project proponents shall consult with the California SHPO and the keeper of the National Register regarding properties in Tahoe Meadows. As part of project review, TRPA must assess property significance as per Subsection 25.5 of the Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If deemed historic, the Elizabeth Lodge will be impacted due to the loss of selected landscape features.</td>
<td>The project proponents shall prepare limited resource documentation and submit it for review and curation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If deemed historic, four properties in Tahoe Meadows will be impacted, two directly (3961 Cedar and 3966 Pine) the other two indirectly (3949 and 3960 Cedar).</td>
<td>Full documentation of the historic property at 3691 Cedar and 3966 Pine; attempt to relocate structures elsewhere in Tahoe Meadows or the CSLT. Prepare limited documentation of the remaining properties; submitted for review and curation by the project proponents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LAND USE/POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removes 26 single family homes, 66 multiple family housing units, 336 rental units, 13 manager’s residences, 27,354 square feet of commercial floor space, and 8 garages or sheds.</td>
<td>The project proponents shall review, amend (as necessary), and implement all redevelopment programs intended to assist impacted residents, landowners, and businesses. Prior to project approval, develop a plan that addresses the phased retirement of residential units and commercial floor space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces existing open space in selected areas and removes landscaping amenities.</td>
<td>During final design, the project proponents shall develop screening and/or buffer areas between the project and adjacent land owners. Also, develop land uses and revegetation/landscape plans for newly created open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realignment of utility pipes and lines; copying and/or abandonment of existing water and wastewater pipes.</td>
<td>Coordination between project and utility authorities is required. Results of coordination will be included in the construction plan and approved by TRPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit retirements will free water and sewer hook-ups for use in conjunction with the overall redevelopment program.</td>
<td>None required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste will be generated during the removal of retired units.</td>
<td>Solid waste will need to be disposed of outside the basin. A disposal site must be identified by the project proponents during final design and approved by TRPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient pedestrian crossing time while maintaining satisfactory level of service at the intersection of Highway 50 and Ski Run Blvd.</td>
<td>CSLT shall restrict pedestrian and bicycle use along the west leg of this intersection and consider construction of a pedestrian overpass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and bicycle traffic along and across the loop road system may conflict.</td>
<td>Measures to lessen this impact include implementation of intersection signalizations as called for in the transportation section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENERGY</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT’s increase, therefore more energy will be used by those using the Loop Road.</td>
<td>Increase emphasis on other modes of transportation-public transport, bikeways, and walkways through TRPA’s regional and community planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit retirement would result in an energy saving.</td>
<td>The project proponents shall require that new and/or refurbished units incorporate energy conservation devices meeting TRPA standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECREATION</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space - day use recreation elements and urban plazas at key modes proposed in the Redevelopment Plan are not included in the project design.</td>
<td>These impacts are being currently addressed by the project proponents through the community planning process. Open space, day use recreation, and urban plazas are all elements discussed in the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed bikeways are incomplete. As such, the limited bikeway system proposed in the project design is not consistent with planning goals.</td>
<td>These impacts are being currently addressed by the project proponents through the community planning process. Specific objectives regarding bikeways are identified in the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

November 4, 1991

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Report on 1991 Evaluation of the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and the Regional Plan Package

The 1991 Evaluation was sent to all Advisory Planning Commission members under separate cover and will be discussed in more detail at the meeting.

If you have any questions, please contact Dave Ziegler at (702) 588-4547.
MEMORANDUM

November 4, 1991

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Further Amendment of Chapter 4 Relating to Streamlining and Clarification of Existing Provisions

Proposed Action: To amend Chapter 4 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances as set forth in the attached draft ordinance. Additional provisions are underlined and deletions are shown with strikeovers.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC conduct a public hearing and, if appropriate, recommend adoption of the Chapter 4 amendments to the Governing Board.

Background/Discussion: When adopting the most recent amendments to Chapter 4 (September 26, 1991), the Governing Board directed staff to return with additional amendments to further their desire to simplify current regulations. Proposed amendments contained herein reflect the staff's response to the Board's direction. To provide a brief explanation of the most significant Code amendments being proposed please refer to the following overview.

1. Subsection 4.3.A.(1): This section has been amended to increase the structural repair limit from $5,000 to $10,000 and to limit the repairs to only those which do not increase the dimensions of the existing structure. This provision is aimed at exempting those repair activities which primarily involve replacement of existing structural members with no increase in size. No excess coverage mitigation or BMP retrofitting is required.
2. **Subsection 4.3.A(2):** This section has been added to allow certain structural modifications to existing structures as required to comply with the Uniform Building Code without a requirement for excess coverage mitigation or BMP retrofitting. An example would be replacing a flat roofed structure with a sloping roof to comply with snow loading requirements. Subsection 4.3.A(3) remains as written and is aimed at those other activities that involve structural remodeling or additions which do not comply with either subsections 4.3.A(1) or (2). For these activities excess coverage mitigation and retrofitting is required.

3. **Other Subsections:** All other sections involving changes are designed to simplify, clarify and streamline current regulations.

The Governing Board also directed staff to explore the possibility of using an average excess coverage mitigation fee rather than requiring a detailed excess coverage calculation for those exempt activities under subsection 4.3.A(3). It was stated at the Governing Board meeting that the cost of having a professional land surveyor, architect or engineer perform these calculations more often than not would exceed the excess coverage mitigation fee itself. Upon further review staff has determined that a rather significant amendment of Chapter 20, Land Coverage, of the Code would be required to allow the use of an average fee, and by using an average fee, the ability to accurately track excess coverage mitigation would be impaired. However, an alternative solution exists. The excess coverage mitigation fee can be calculated by the property owner with the assistance of an informational and educational quality exempt activity packet prepared by TRPA. The packet will be designed to provide step by step assistance in completing this calculation, alleviating the need for these calculations completed by a trained professional. In addition, TRPA staff will be conducting ongoing public workshops to better educate property owners on the quality exempt activity process. It is staff's recommendation to pursue this alternative solution at this time, and if determined to be ineffective over time consider an amendment of Chapter 20 at a later date.

**Findings:** Prior to amending the Code, TRPA must make certain findings.

**Chapter 6 Findings:** The required Chapter 6 findings and brief rationales are set forth below:

1. **Finding:** The project is consistent with, and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and Maps, the Code, and other TRPA plans and programs.
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Rationale: The amendments are procedural in nature and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan. Staff will continue to perform random field checks on these exempt activities, and monitor all BMP retrofit requirements in accordance with the submitted BMP plans and installation schedules.

2. Finding: The project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.

Rationale: The amendments are procedural in nature and will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded. BMP and excess coverage mitigation requirements have been increased by these amendments.

3. Finding: Wherever federal, state, and local air and water quality standards applicable to the Region, whichever are stricter, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

Rationale: See Findings 1 and 2 above.

4. Finding: The Regional Plan and all its elements, as implemented through the Code, Rules, and other TRPA plans and programs, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

Rationale: For the reasons set forth above in the rationale for finding #1, these amendments to the Code will better implement the Regional Plan and will assist in the achievement and maintenance of the environmental thresholds.

Ordinance 87-8: The required Ordinance 87-8 findings and brief rationales are set forth below:

1. That the amendment is consistent with the Compact and with the attainment or maintenance of the thresholds.

Rationale: See Findings 1 and 2 above.

2. One or more of the following:

a) There is demonstrated conflict between provisions of the Regional Plan Package and the conflict threatens to preclude attainment or maintenance of thresholds;
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b) That legal constraints, such as court orders, decisions or Compact amendments, require amendment of the Goals and Policies or Code;

c) That technical or scientific information demonstrates the need for modification of a provision of the Goals and Policies or Code;

d) That the provision to be amended has been shown, through experience and time, to be counter-productive to or ineffective in attainment or maintenance of the thresholds;

e) That implementation of the provision sought to be amended has been demonstrated to be impracticable or impossible because of one or more of the following reasons:

1) The cost of implementation outweighs the environmental gain to be achieved;
2) Implementation will result in unacceptable impacts on public health and safety; or
3) Fiscal support for implementation is insufficient and such insufficiency is expected to be a long-term problem.

f) That the provision to be amended has been shown through experience to be counter-productive or ineffective and the amendment is designed to correct the demonstrated problem and is an equal or better means of implementing the Regional Plan Package and complying with the Compact.

Rationale: Findings (d) and (f) is recommended for the reason that current provisions appear to be counter-productive to the implementation and maintenance of thresholds due to the level of unnecessary governmental procedures and duplication. See Chapter 6 Finding, #1 above.

Compact Article VI(a): The following finding is required prior to amending Chapter 4 (exempting activities from TRPA review):

The Agency may exempt from its review and approval those activities which it has determined will not have a substantial effect on the land, water, air, spaces or any other natural resources in the Region.
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**Rationale:** TRPA's environmental analysis has concluded that exempting routine and minor activities, as proposed, will not have a substantial effect on the land, water, air, space, or any other natural resources in the Region.

**Environmental Analysis:** Based on the review of the IEC, staff proposes a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) connected with these proposed amendments.

If you have any questions on this agenda item, please contact Jerry Wells or John Hoole at (702) 588-4547.
(iii) if located within a scenic highway corridor pursuant to Section 30.13, is colored using dark shades of earthen colors and matte finish.

(b) One set of cluster boxes where the number of boxes is equal to the number of parcels or project areas being served which:

(i) meets the design and scenic standards listed in 4.2.B(2)(a)(i) through (iii), above.

4.2.C Temporary Activities: The following temporary activities are exempt.

(1) A temporary activity which:

(a) Does not cause parking on unpaved areas;
(b) Does not create or relocate land coverage or disturbance;
(c) Does not require closure of a traffic lane or intersection of a state or federal highway for more than one hour, or the closure of U.S. 50 at any point between the South Wye and Kingsbury Grade for any period of time;
(d) Does not create noise in excess of the limits in Chapter 23;
(e) Does not exceed fourteen consecutive days in duration and will not occur more than four times in a calendar year; and
(f) If the temporary activity, other than the parking, is located on unpaved areas, the temporary activity does not occur on an unpaved area which has been used for temporary projects more than four times in the past calendar year.

(2) Temporary activities in TRPA-approved special event areas in accordance with the TRPA approval.

(3) Temporary activities which are reviewed and approved by a local government, the Forest Service, or a state agency pursuant to a memorandum of understanding with TRPA consistent with Chapter 7.

4.3 List of Qualified Exempt Activities: The following activities are not subject to review and approval by TRPA provided the applicant certifies on a TRPA qualified exempt form that the activity fits within one or more of the following categories and the activity
does not result in the creation of additional land coverage or relocation of existing land coverage and complies with all restrictions set forth below. The statement shall be filed with TRPA at least one working day before the activity commences, except as required for demolition activities in Subsection 4.3.F below, and shall be made under penalty of perjury.

4.3.A General Activities: The following activities are qualified exempt provided the activity complies with the criteria set forth below:

1) Structural repair of existing structures, less than $5,000 10,000 per year provided there is no excavation, filling or backfilling in excess of that exempted by paragraph (4) (5) below, no increase in the dimensions of a structure, visible from any TRPA-designated scenic threshold travel route, no height created greater than that allowed by Table A of Chapter 22 of the TRPA Code, no intensification or change in use, no increase in commercial floor area, and no increase in density.

(2) Structural modifications to existing structures required to comply with local building department and/or Uniform Building Code (UBC) standards, provided documentation by the local building department is submitted to TRPA, the modification is the minimum necessary, there is no excavation, filling or backfilling in excess of that exempted by paragraph (5) below, no increase in the dimensions of a structure visible from any TRPA-designated scenic threshold travel route, no height created greater than that allowed by Table A of Chapter 22 of the TRPA Code, no intensification or change in use, no increase in commercial floor area, and no increase in density.

(3) Structural remodeling or additions to existing structures provided there is, no excavation and backfilling in excess of that exempted by paragraph (4) below, no increase in the dimensions of a structure visible from any TRPA-designated scenic threshold travel route, no height created greater than that allowed by Table A of Chapter 22 of the TRPA Code, no intensification or change in use, no increase in commercial floor area, no increase in density, no increase in existing hard coverage, a BMP retrofit plan and compliance schedule as set forth in Chapter 25 is submitted to TRPA, all excess coverage mitigation requirements, if any, are satisfied in accordance with Chapter 20, and there is existing paved access and parking.
Replacement of an existing mobile home in a legally-established mobile home space, which does not result in a change in use or additional land coverage.

Excavation, filling or backfilling for an area not in excess of seven cubic yards is exempt provided the activity occurs during the grading season (May 1 to October 15) in Land Capability Districts 4, 5, 6, or 7, or on parcels with IPES scores above the line, and the excavation site is stabilized within 48 hours to prevent erosion. This exemption shall not be construed to exempt a series of excavations which, when viewed as a whole, would constitute a project.

Cutting, moving, removing, killing or materially damaging a live tree six inches d.b.h. or larger, or the removal of dead trees on parcels greater than five acres, provided the tree is approved and marked by the appropriate state forestry agency pursuant to a memorandum of understanding between the state agency and TRPA, and the tree removal does not constitute substantial tree removal as defined in Subsection 71.3.1. The memorandum of understanding shall be consistent with the standards in Chapter 71.

Demolition of structures, improvements or facilities, 50 years or greater in age, provided the structure, improvement, or facility is not designated, or pending for designation, on the Historic Resource Map, and a statement is filed pursuant to Section 4.3 at least three working days in advance of the activity. To obtain credit for coverage or existing development, TRPA approval is required.

Changes in operation resulting in generation of less than 100 additional vehicle trips, in connection with a commercial, recreation or public service use, provided there is no change from one major use classification to another and the resulting use is an allowed use.

An outdoor retail sales use associated with a state or federal holiday, such as Christmas tree and pumpkin patch sales, provided the use does not cause parking on unpaved areas, does not operate for more than six consecutive weeks in a twelve month period and is located in a plan area designated commercial, public service or tourist.
4.4 Activities Reviewed By Local Government: The following activities are reviewed and approved in accordance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code of Ordinances by a local government pursuant to a memorandum of understanding and are therefore exempt from TRPA review and approval:

4.4.A. New Single Family Dwelling Activities Within the City of South Lake Tahoe (CSLT): As set forth in Appendix L to this Chapter.

4.4.B Temporary Activities Within the City of South Lake Tahoe (CSLT): As set forth in the Memorandum of Understanding regarding exemption of temporary activities from TRPA review and approval between the CSLT and TRPA dated June 30, 1988, as may be amended by resolution of the Governing Board.

4.4.C Sign Activities Within the City of South Lake Tahoe (CSLT): As set forth in the Memorandum of Understanding regarding exemption of sign activities from TRPA review and approval between the CSLT and TRPA dated March 13, 1990, as may be amended by resolution of the Governing Board.

4.5 Memoranda of Understanding: Those activities of public and quasi-public entities as set forth in the following memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between TRPA and such entities are exempt:

4.5.A MOU with California Tahoe Conservancy: As set forth in Appendix B to this Chapter.

4.5.B MOU with Nevada Division of State Parks: As set forth in Appendix C to this Chapter.

4.5.C MOU with California Department of Parks and Recreation: As set forth in Appendix D to this Chapter.

4.5.D MOU with the United States Forest Service: As set forth in Appendix E to this Chapter.

4.5.E MOU with Pacific Bell: As set forth in Appendix F of this Chapter.

4.5.F MOU with California Department of Transportation: As set forth in Appendix G of this chapter.

4.5.G MOU with Nevada Department of Transportation: As set forth in Appendix H of this Chapter.
4.5.H MOU with Tahoe City Public Utility District: As set forth in Appendix I of this Chapter.

4.5.I MOU with South Tahoe Public Utility District: As set forth in Appendix J of this chapter.

4.5.J MOU with Incline Village General Improvement District: As set forth in Appendix K of this Chapter.

4.5.K MOU with Sierra Pacific Power Company: As set forth in Appendix M of this Chapter.

4.5.L MOU with Douglas County: As set forth in Appendix N of this Chapter.

4.6 Loss Of Exemption: An exempt activity shall be considered a project if TRPA finds that the activity may have a substantial effect on the land, air, water, space, or any other natural resources in the Region.

4.7 Projects: An activity which is not exempt from TRPA review and approval pursuant to Sections 4.2 through 4.9, inclusive, is a project subject to TRPA review and approval.

4.7.A Project Review: Projects shall be reviewed by TRPA in accordance with TRPA's Rules of Procedure and pursuant to the applicable Code provisions. Projects approved by TRPA shall be issued permits in accordance with the Rules of Procedure.

4.7.B Governing Board Action: Categories of projects and matters listed in Appendix A or as otherwise required by law shall require Governing Board approval. The Governing Board hereby delegates to the Executive Director review and final action on the projects and matters not listed in Appendix A requiring Governing Board approval.

4.7.C Unusual Circumstances: The Executive Director may determine that a project or matter not listed on Appendix A, because of unusual circumstances, warrants Governing Board review and action and may schedule the project for Governing Board consideration.

4.7.D Appeals: The final action of the Executive Director may be appealed to either the Governing Board pursuant to TRPA's Rules of Procedure or to a court of competent jurisdiction pursuant to Article VI (j) of the Compact.

4.8 Special Provisions: The following special provisions apply to certain projects:
4.8.A Emergency Projects: Emergency projects shall be reviewed and acted upon in accordance with the Rules of Procedure.

4.8.B Structures That Do Not Comply With Site Development Provisions: Repair or remodeling, and reconstruction, modification or expansion, of structures that do not comply with site development provisions, may be approved provided TRPA finds that:

1. The structure is not subject to a specific program of removal or modification pursuant to the site development provisions or other implementing programs of TRPA, or that the structure shall comply with the requirements of the applicable programs;

2. The repair or remodeling, reconstruction, modification, or expansion does not increase the extent to which the structure does not comply with the site development provisions; and

3. Any expansion complies with all applicable site development provisions.

4.8.C Buildings Damaged Or Destroyed By Fire Or Other Similar Calamity: Buildings damaged or destroyed by fire or other similar calamity may be repaired or rebuilt, except as prescribed by Chapter 28 in areas of identified avalanche or mass instability danger, and except as set forth in Chapters 50-56, inclusive, in the shorezone, with no requirement for excess coverage mitigation or height reduction, by fee or otherwise. Repair or reconstruction shall be in substantial conformance with the original structure, with no increase in floor area, land coverage, height, or volume.

1. Application: A complete application, as defined in the Rules of Procedure, shall be submitted to TRPA within eighteen months of the damage or destruction resulting from the calamity. Structures for which applications are not timely filed shall be considered derelict and not as existing structures.

2. Findings: TRPA may approve such projects provided TRPA finds that:

   a. The repair or reconstruction does not increase the extent to which the structure does not comply with the site development provisions;

   b. There is no increase in height, floor area, land coverage, or volume of the structure; and
(c) A written statement and application were filed in accordance with Subparagraph 4.11.C.(1).

4.9 Expiration Of TRPA Approvals: Approval by TRPA of any project expires three years after the date the approval is granted by TRPA, as defined in TRPA's Rules of Procedure, or December 19, 1980, whichever is later, unless construction is begun within that time and diligently pursued thereafter, or the use or activity has commenced.

4.9.A Operation Of Law: Expiration of TRPA approvals shall be by operation of law. Failure to give notice of expiration shall not affect the applicability of this provision.

4.9.B Commencement Of Construction: Commencement of construction shall be the pouring of concrete for a foundation, or work of a similar nature upon the permitted structure. Commencement of construction does not include grading, plan preparation, installation of utilities or landscaping.

4.9.C Diligent Pursuit: Diligent pursuit is defined as follows:

(1) Diligent pursuit shall be defined by the condition of approval relating to completion of the project. Project approvals shall state the time for completion of the project.

(2) For projects approved without a condition of approval relating to completion of the project, diligent pursuit shall be defined as reasonable onsite progress toward completion of the project each building season beginning with the building season in which construction is commenced. Failure to accomplish onsite progress toward completion in any building season after construction has commenced and the three year approval period has passed shall result in expiration of the approval for failure to diligently pursue construction. Failure to give notice of such expiration shall not affect the applicability of this section.

4.9.D Single Family Homes: Construction of new single family homes shall be completed within two years from the date of the TRPA pregrading inspection. The two year period may be extended once for up to one year provided the request is made in writing prior to the expiration of the two year period, a security is posted to ensure completion or abatement of the project and TRPA makes either of the following findings:
(1) The project was diligently pursued, as defined in subparagraph 4.12.C(2), during each building season (May 1 - October 15) since commencement of construction.

(2) That events beyond the control of the permittee, which may include engineering problems, labor disputes, natural disasters or weather problems, have prevented diligent pursuit of the project.

4.9.E Other Projects: Construction of projects other than new single family homes shall be complete by the date set forth in the conditions of approval. Extension of a completion schedule for a project other than a single family home may be granted provided the request is made in writing prior to the expiration of the completion schedule, a security is posted to ensure completion or abatement of the project and TRPA makes either of the following findings:

(1) The project was diligently pursued, as defined in subparagraph 4.12.C(2), during each building season (May 1 - October 15) since commencement of construction.

(2) That events beyond the control of the permittee, which may include engineering problems, labor disputes, natural disasters or weather problems, have prevented diligent pursuit of the project.

4.9.F Completion Of Project: Completion of a building shall be defined as a fully enclosed structure with all permanent drainage improvements, slope stabilization, and revegetation installed. Completion of projects which do not consist of a building or buildings, shall be defined as commencement of the use or activity permitted and installation of all permanent drainage improvements, slope stabilization and revegetation.
MEMORANDUM

October 31, 1991

To: The Advisory Planning Commission
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Amendment to the Map Delineating Water Quality Improvements in Vicinity of the Parcel, an IPES Evaluation Criteria

Proposed Action: To amend the existing map delineating water quality improvements in vicinity of parcel as set forth below.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and, if appropriate, recommend that the Governing Board adopt the attached map amendments and their respective scores.

Background: At the October 1987 meeting, the Governing Board adopted the map delineating water quality improvements in vicinity of parcel. Preparation of this map was based upon field data collected during the summer of 1987 pursuant to Section 37.2.G of the Code of Ordinances:

37.2.G Need for Water Quality Improvements In Vicinity of Parcel: The maximum score for need for water quality improvements in vicinity of parcel is 50 points.

1) Preparation of Map: TRPA shall prepare a map identifying areas within which the need for the water quality improvements listed in Table G-1 of the Technical Appendices is the same. The Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Management Plan (208 Plan) maps shall be used as a guideline for determining the level of improvements needed. Areas shall be assigned point values in accordance with Table G-1 of the Technical Appendices. The points assigned shall be equal to the mathematical difference between 50 points and the total of the negative points received due to the combination of water quality improvements needed.

2) Assigning Scores To Parcels: Each parcel shall receive the score assigned to the area, established under Subparagraph (1), above, in which the parcel is located.
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G. Need For Water Quality Improvements in Vicinity of Parcel

TABLE G-1

NEEDED WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needed Improvement</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revegetation</td>
<td>- 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock-lined or vegetated ditches</td>
<td>- 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb gutter or paved swales</td>
<td>- 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm drain pipes</td>
<td>- 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining walls</td>
<td>- 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock slope protection</td>
<td>- 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved roads</td>
<td>- 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediments basins</td>
<td>- 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since adoption of this map, numerous water quality improvement projects have been implemented within the Basin. As anticipated within the IPES system, one of the ways that a parcel's IPES score may be increased is if (37.10.A) "water quality improvements of the type considered in subsection 37.2.G. are installed in an area subsequent to TRPA preparing the maps in accordance with Subparagraph 37.2.G(1)."

Upon implementation of these projects: "TRPA shall amend the map by increasing the point values identified in Table G-1 for the improvements installed. The scores received by parcels located in areas where point values are increased in this subsection shall be increased to reflect the new point value."

Amendments proposed by staff are intended to:

1. account for water quality improvement projects implemented since 1987; and
2. increase the point scores for those parcels affected by these projects pursuant to 37.10.A. of the Code of Ordinances.
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Discussion: The proposed amendments are based upon field data collected during the fall of 1991. Point values were assigned according to the scoring criteria in Table G-1. Properties affected by the score increases were restricted to only those parcels immediately within the vicinity of the water quality improvement project.

To maintain the original intention of identifying and scoring areas within which the need for improvements are the same, the proposed amendments delineated several areas that are smaller than those identified on the original map. This reflects the fact that quite often improvements addressed only portions of the originally mapped areas.

Findings: Prior to amending the Code, TRPA must make certain findings:

Chapter 6 Findings: The required Chapter 6 findings and brief rationales are set forth below:

1) Finding: The project is consistent with, and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and Maps, the Code, and other TRPA plans and programs.

Rationale: The amendments are consistent with Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances. Subsection 37.10.A anticipated the need for amendments and established the criteria for the related IPES parcel score increases.

2) Finding: The project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.

Rationale: The amendments are consistent with the Regional Plan and will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.

3) Finding: Whenever federal, state, and local air and water quality standards applicable to the Region, whichever are stricter, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

Rationale: See findings 1 and 2 above.
4) Finding: The Regional Plan and all its elements, as implemented through the Code, Rules, and other TRPA plans and programs, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

Rationale: For the reason set forth in the rationale for finding 1 above, these amendments better implement the Code and Regional Plan and will assist in the achievement and maintenance of the environmental thresholds.

Environmental Documentation: Staff proposes a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) for these proposed amendments. These amendments implement the Regional Plan.

If you have any questions on this agenda item, please contact Dan Greenlee at (702) 588-4547.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Water Quality Improvement</th>
<th>Proposed New Score</th>
<th>Existing Score</th>
<th>Map Exhibit(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kingsbury Highlands</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hubbard Road</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingsbury Summit</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>APN 07-244-05</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cave Rock</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Incline Village II</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28, 34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Crystal Bay</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20, 42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Regency Way</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Estates/Tamarack Dr.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Carnelian Woods</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Carnelian Drive</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alpine Peaks (Ward Valley)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Skyland I and II</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kailua Park</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tahoma</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rubicon</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tahoe Mountain</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Echo View</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>North Upper Truckee</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pioneer Trail</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12, 16, 24, 20-25</td>
<td>28, 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Country Club</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28, 32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Marshall Trail</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Montgomery Estates</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12, 32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. Lake Tahoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Bijou/Wildwood</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26, 34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MEMORANDUM

November 5, 1991

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Presentation on the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan Update

Proposed Action: No action by the Advisory Planning Commission is being proposed at this time. The draft Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan is being presented to the APC as an information item only.

Recommendation: Staff is not recommending any action by the APC at this time.

Discussion: The Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan is comprised of five volumes: Volume I - Executive Summary, Volume II - Introduction and Problem Assessment, Volume III - Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan, Volume IV - Capital Improvement Program, and Volume V - Environmental Analysis. Copies of the first four volumes of the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan were provided to the members of the APC in September.

A summary of the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan will be presented by staff at the November APC meeting.

If you have any questions or comments in regard to the RTP-AQP, please contact Leif Anderson at (702) 588-6782.
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CHAPTER 4

PROJECT REVIEW AND EXEMPT ACTIVITIES

Chapter Contents

4.0 Purpose
4.1 Applicability
4.2 List Of Exempt Activities
4.3 List Of Qualified Exempt Activities
4.4 Activities Reviewed By Local Government
4.5 Memoranda of Understanding
4.6 Loss Of Exemption
4.7 Projects
4.8 Special Provisions
4.9 Expiration Of TRPA Approvals

4.0 Purpose: This chapter implements Article VI(a) of the Compact requires TRPA to prescribe, by ordinance, those activities which it has determined will not have substantial effect on the land, water, air, space or any other natural resources in the Tahoe Region and therefore will be exempt from its review and approval. This chapter also implements Compact provisions relating to projects and permits.

4.1 Applicability: Special provisions for activities in the shorezone and for signs are set forth in Chapters 26 and 52. This chapter sets forth which activities may have a substantial effect on the land, air, water, space or any other natural resources and therefore are projects subject to TRPA review and approval. This chapter also sets forth which activities will not have a substantial effect on the land, air, water, space and any other natural resource in the Region and therefore are exempt from TRPA review and approval. Exemption of activities from TRPA review and approval shall not be construed to exempt such activities from applicable provisions of the Code.

4.2 List Of Exempt Activities: The following activities are not subject to review and approval by TRPA provided they do not result in the creation of additional land coverage or relocation of land coverage, and comply with all restrictions set forth below.

4.2.A General Activities: The following general activities are exempt:

(1) Interior remodeling provided there is no change or intensification of use and no increase in density; and for commercial or tourist accommodation structures no structural remodeling in excess of $20,000.
(2) Ordinary maintenance and repair, which is the upkeep, or preservation of the condition of property and includes: painting; reroofing; replacement of windows, siding, doors, construction of overlays upon existing paved surfaces, air conditioning, sewer, water and electrical equipment, and other fixtures.

(3) Repair or replacement of existing fences not located in SEZs or bodies of water.

(4) Excavation filling or and backfilling for a volume not in excess of three cubic yards provided the activity is completed within a 48 hour period and the excavation site is stabilized to prevent erosion. This exemption shall not be construed to exempt a series of excavations, which, when viewed as a whole, would constitute a project.

(5) Removal of dead trees on parcels of five acres or less, and removal of dead limbs, and removal of live limbs not resulting in material damage to a tree.

(6) Seasonal lighting displays which are displayed between Thanksgiving and March 1 of the following year.

(7) Demolition of structures, improvements, or facilities, less than 50 years of age, provided any associated excavation and backfill is exempt pursuant to Subparagraph 4 above. To obtain credit for coverage or existing development TRPA approval is required.

(8) Landscaping and gardening provided any associated excavation or backfill, if any, is exempt pursuant to subparagraph 4 above.

(9) A home occupation customarily conducted entirely within a dwelling by the residents thereof, provided the occupation is clearly incidental and secondary to the use of the dwelling for residential purposes, and provided there is or are:

(a) No sales of products not produced on the premises, unless the sales are done by written order with no commodities or displays on the premises.

(b) No employment of more than one person other than the residents of the dwelling;
(c) No signs or structures advertising the occupation;
(d) No outside storage of materials or supplies incidental to the home occupation; and
(e) No more than one home occupation is carried on in a dwelling.

For guidance, the following uses are examples of home occupations: consultative professional occupations, whose function is one of rendering a service; a secondary business office; the making of clothing; the giving of music lessons; the creation of crafts.

(10) Construction of new residential fences, provided the fence is not more than six feet high, does not obstruct the public's view of Lake Tahoe and is not located in an SEZ or body of water.

(11) Parcel consolidations, provided deed restrictions permanently consolidating the parcels are recorded by the affected owners.

(12) Replacement of combustion heaters (water or space) and woodstoves with units on TRPA's list of approved combustion heaters.

4.2.B Mail Delivery Activities: The following mail delivery activities are exempt:

(1) Mail delivery receptacles which are designed and installed in accordance with design standards which are part of a TRPA-approved area wide mail delivery program.

(2) Mail delivery receptacles and support structures which comply with the following standards:

(a) One mail box for each parcel or project area which:

   (i) complies with all U.S. Postal Service standards;

   (ii) is located in such a manner and place that can be accessed by mail delivery vehicles such that the vehicles will not cause compaction or disturbance of previously uncompacted or undisturbed road or driveway shoulders or aprons; and