TRPA
GOVERNING BOARD PACKETS

OCTOBER 1993
NOTICE OF MEETINGS
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on October 27 and 28, 1993, the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting. The October 27 session will commence at 9:30 a.m. at the North Tahoe Conference Center, 8218 North Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, California. The October 28 session will commence at 8:30 a.m. at the TRPA office, 208 Dorla Court, Elko Point, Nevada. The official agenda is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on October 27, 1993, at 8:30 a.m. at the same location, the Finance Committee will discuss the following: 1) receipt of the September financial statement and check register; 2) quarterly status report on project securities; 3) mitigation fund MOU with Douglas County; and 4) revised operating budget FY 93-94. (Finance Committee: Klein, Neft, Lau, Kanoff, Chairman Bennett)

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on October 27, 1993, at 8:30 a.m. in the same location, the Legal Committee will discuss 1) reallocation of Bitterbrush mitigation fund and replacement of securities; and 2) JRB Enterprise, resolution of enforcement, Placer County. (Legal Committee: Upton, Westergard, Waldie, Cronk, Chairman DeLany)

Date: October 18, 1993

David S. Siegler
Executive Director

NOTE: Items on the agenda without a time designation may not necessarily be considered in the order in which they appear on the agenda.

This agenda has been posted at the TRPA office and at the following post offices: Zephyr Cove and Stateline, Nevada, and Tahoe Valley and Al Tahoe, California. The agenda has also been posted at the North Tahoe Conference Center in Kings Beach, the Incline Village GID office, and the North Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

North Tahoe Conference Center
8318 North Lake Boulevard
Kings Beach, California

TRPA Office, 308 Dorla Court
Elks Point, Nevada

October 27, 1993
9:30 a.m.

October 28, 1993
8:30 a.m.

All items are action items unless otherwise noted.

OFFICIAL AGENDA

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

V. CONSENT CALENDAR (see page 3)

VI. PROJECT REVIEW

A. North Tahoe Cruises/Judith Topol, New Tour Boat Operation, Placer County APN 94-110-19

VII. PUBLIC HEARING AND ADOPTION OF ORDINANCES/RESOLUTIONS

A. Meyers Community Plan Relative to the Following:

1. Adoption of Community Plan

2. Amendment of Plan Area Statement (PAS) 125 and Plan Area Overlays to Delete PAS 125 and to Substitute Community Plan

3. Amendment of Land Capability Overlay Maps F-21 and F-22 Within the Community Plan Area

4. Amendment of Chapter 26, Signs, to Include Substitute Sign Standards

5. Amendment of Chapter 30, Design Standards to Include Substitute Design Review Guidelines

6. Amendment of Plan Area Boundaries Between PAS 125, Meyers Commercial, and PAS 121, Freal Peak
B. Plummer Application to Amend the Regional Plan Geomorphic Unit Map, Washoe County APN 123-021-02 (This item must be acted on prior to action on Consent Calendar item 1.)

C. Application by Placer County to Amend the Regional Plan Land Capability Overlay Map Pursuant to Man-Modified Determination, Placer County APNs 94-190-22 and -26, Payless Drug Stores Northwest (continue to the November meeting)

D. Setting of Numerical Performance Standards Relative to the Compliance Finding, and Making Findings Required to Lower the Individual Parcel Evaluation System Line

E. Douglas County Community Plan Relative to the Following: (Wednesday, October 27, 1:30 p.m.)

1. Certification of the Douglas County Plan EIS

2. Adoption of Community Plans for Round Hill, Kingsbury and Stateline

3. Amendment of Plan Area Statements (PAS) and Plan Area Overlays to Delete PAS 071, 076, 089A and to Substitute Community Plans

4. Amendment of PAS 070A and Plan Area Overlays to Expand the Boundaries and to Permit Tourist Accommodation and Residential Uses in Special Areas

5. Amendment of Land Capability Overlays H-15 and H-16 for the Areas of the Community Plans

6. Amendment of Chapter 30, Design Standards, to Include Substitute Standards and Guidelines for the Douglas County Community Plans

7. Amendment of Chapter 26, Signs, to Include Substitute Standards and Specific Standards for the Douglas County Community Plans

8. Amendment of Chapter 24, Parking and Driveway Standards, to Include Substitute Standards for the Douglas County Community Plans

9. Amendment of PAS 072, 074, and 077 to Remove Residential Bonus Units

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Quarterly Status Report on Priority Milestones in the FY 93-94 Work Program
IX. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND BOARD ACTION

A. Finance Committee

1. Receipt of September Financial Statement and Check Register
2. Mitigation Fund MOU With Douglas County
3. Revised Operating Budget FY 93-94

B. Legal Committee

A. Reallocation of Bitterbrush Mitigation Fund and Replacement of Securities

X. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

1. Status Report on Processed Projects
3. Quarterly Status Report on Project Securities
4. Other

B. Agency Counsel

C. Governing Board Members (No Action)

XI. RESOLUTIONS

XII. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS (No Action)

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

I. MEETING OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (RTPA)

A. Amendment of the Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP)

CONSENT CALENDAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Carol Plummer, Land Capability Challenge, Washoe County APN 123-021-02 (This item will be acted on after action on agenda item VI.B.)</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. JRB Enterprise, Resolution of Enforcement, Placer County APNs 83-263-02 and 83-263-10</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nobriga, Resolution of Enforcement, El Dorado County APN 25-782-03</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Tahoe Cedars Water Company, Emergency Permit,  
   Well and Building, El Dorado County APN 015-301-25  
   Approval 18-23

5. Lopez, Amendment of Enforcement Settlement,  
   El Dorado County APN 22-241-26  
   Approval 24-25

These consent calendar items are expected to be routine and noncontroversial. 
They will be acted upon by the Board at one time without discussion. The 
special use determinations will be removed from the calendar at the request of 
any member of the public and taken up separately. If any Board member or 
noticed affected property owner requests that any item be removed from the 
calendar, it will be taken up separately under the appropriate agenda 
category.

Four of the members of the governing body from each State constitute a quorum 
for the transaction of the business of the agency. The voting procedure shall 
be as follows:

(1) For adopting, amending or repealing environmental threshold 
carrying capacities, the regional plan, and ordinances, rules and 
regulations, and for granting variances from the ordinances, rules and 
regulations, the vote of at least four of the members of each State agreeing 
with the vote of at least four members of the other State shall be required 
to take action. If there is no vote of at least four of the members from 
one State agreeing with the vote of at least four of the members of the 
other State on the actions specified in this paragraph, an action of 
rejection shall be deemed to have been taken.

(2) For approving a project, the affirmative vote of at least five 
members from the State in which the project is located and the affirmative 
vote of at least nine members of the governing body are required. If at 
least five members of the governing body from the State in which the project 
is located and at least nine members of the entire governing body do not 
vote in favor of the project, upon a motion for approval, an action of 
rejection shall be deemed to have been taken. A decision by the agency to 
approve a project shall be supported by a statement of findings, adopted by 
the agency, which indicates that the project complies with the regional plan 
and with applicable ordinances, rules and regulations of the agency.

(3) For routine business and for directing the agency’s staff on 
litigation and enforcement actions, at least eight members of the governing 
body must agree to take action. If at least eight votes in favor of such 
action are not cast, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been 
taken.

- Article III (g) Public Law 96-551
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MEMORANDUM

October 14, 1993

To: TRPA Governing Board
From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Land Capability Challenge; Carol Plummer, APN 123-021-02
53 Somers Drive, Stateline Point, Washoe County, Nevada

-----------------------------------

Staff Recommendation

The staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the land capability challenge changing the land capability class from 1a to 1a, 1b, and 4.

Background

The subject parcel is shown as Land Capability Class 1a on the TRPA Land Capability Overlay maps. The Soil Survey for the Lake Tahoe Basin Area places this parcel within the RtF (Rockoutcrop-Toem complex, 30 to 50 percent slopes) soil map unit. A land capability challenge was begun on this parcel in 1982, but was never taken to the Governing Board. A new land capability challenge request was filed in 1993 to change the land capability of the parcel.

The parcel is a developed residential parcel in the Nevada Vista Subdivision of Washoe County, Nevada. The parcel is approximately 357,170 square feet (8.4 acres) in size and has a natural slope of 5 to 60 percent.

Findings

This parcel is mapped within geomorphic unit C-3 (Steep strongly dissected lands, high hazard lands) on the TRPA Bailey Geomorphic Analysis Map of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

The soils investigation was completed by Joseph Pepi, Certified Professional Soil Scientist, and a report was prepared. Based on six soil pits, two representative soil profiles were described (see attached Soils Investigation). The soils were found to have physical characteristics most similar to three soil map units identified in the Tahoe Basin Soil Survey: RtF (Rockoutcrop-Toem complex, 30 to 50 percent slopes), and the CaD (Cagwin-Rockoutcrop complex, 5 to 15 percent slopes, and Be (Beaches). The RtF map unit is assigned land capability 1a, allowing 1 percent land coverage, the CaD map unit is assigned land capability class 4, allowing 20 percent coverage, and the Be map unit is in land capability class 1b and is allowed 1 percent land coverage.

/jp
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CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM 1

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
If you have any questions on this agenda item, please contact Joe Pepi, at (702) 588-4547.
October 14, 1993

SOIL INVESTIGATION
FOR
WASHOE COUNTY APN 123-021-02
53 SOMERS DRIVE

INTRODUCTION

This parcel is 357,170 square feet (8.4 acres) in size and is located in Nevada Vista Subdivision at 53 Somers Loop, Stateline Point, Nevada (see map, Exhibit 1). The field work for the determination of the land capability was conducted beginning in October, 1982 by the Land Capability Review Team. This review team, consisting of a soil scientist, an ecologist, a geomorphologist, and a hydrologist, conducted all land capability reviews during the period from the early to the middle 1980’s. In their Land Capability Review Report of December 1982, the team determined that the designation of this parcel in Geomorphic Unit C-3 (Steep strongly dissected lands, high hazard lands) as shown on the TRPA Geomorphic Unit map, was correct. This team also determined the land capability classes on the parcel as 1a, 1b, and 4. A copy of their report is attached. Because this parcel is mapped within a high hazard geomorphic unit, the challenge was not taken to the TRPA Governing Board at that time.

In March 1993 a new request for a land capability challenge was filed with TRPA. A soil investigation was conducted on APN 123-021-02, Washoe County, on June 29, 1993.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

This parcel is shown as land capability class 1a on the TRPA Land Capability Overlay Maps. The Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey for the Lake Tahoe Basin places this parcel within the RfF (Rock outcrop-Toem complex, 30 to 50 percent slopes) map unit. The parcel is mapped within geomorphic unit C-3 (Steep strongly dissected lands, high hazard lands) on the TRPA Geomorphic Analysis Map of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The RfF soil map unit is consistent with this geomorphic unit classification. The Toem soil formed in granitic residuum on mountainous uplands.

This parcel is on a south facing slope. The natural slope is 5 to 60 percent. The natural vegetation is Jeffrey pine, white fir, manzanita, whitethorn, antelope bitterbrush, and mules ear wyethia.

PROCEDURES

Six soil pits were dug on these parcels using hand tools. After examination of these pits, two were chosen as representative of the soils on the parcel.
The soils in these pits were examined and described in detail. A copy of these descriptions are included in this report. Slopes were measured with a clinometer.

**FINDINGS**

Two soil series and three soil map units were identified on this parcel. The soil on the majority of this parcel is shallow over granite bedrock. This soil is excessively well drained and is characterized as having a dark brown loamy coarse sand surface layer over a dark brown and light yellowish brown coarse sand and gravely coarse sand underlying material. Weathered granitic bedrock was found at a depth of 18 inches. These soils have a moderately high runoff potential and the surface soils have a high relative erosion hazard.

This soil is representative of the Toem soil series. There is one Toem soil map unit on this parcel, the RTF (Rockoutcrop-Toem complex, 30 to 50 percent slopes) map unit.

The soil series found on approximately 35 percent of these parcels is moderately deep and well drained. A granitic bedrock is found at a depth of 20 to 40 inches. This soil is characterized as having a dark brown loamy coarse sand surface layer over a dark brown to light yellowish brown coarse sand underlying material. This soil would fit the Cagwin series and the Cag (Cagwin-Rockoutcrop complex, 5 to 15 percent slopes) map unit. These soils have a moderately high runoff potential and the surface soils have a slight relative erosion hazard.

The western portion of the parcel, covering 20 percent of the area, consists of wind blown sand dunes. The dunes consist of coarse and moderately coarse sand and are most similar to the Be (Beach) map unit.

These findings are consistent with the determinations made by the TRPA Land Capability Review Team in 1982.

**CONCLUSION**

The soils on APN 123-021-02 were determined to be consistent with land capability classes 1a, 1b, and 4, in accordance with the Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin (Bailey, 1974). These findings are based on the physical characteristics of the soil being most similar to the RTF (Rockoutcrop-Toem complex, 30 to 50 percent slopes), the Cag (Cagwin-Rockoutcrop complex, 5 to 15 percent slopes) and the Be (Beach) map units.

The RTF map unit is within geomorphic unit C-3 (Steep strongly dissected lands, high hazard lands), the Cag map unit within unit C-1 (Granitic foothills, moderate low hazard lands). A map showing the boundaries of these land capability classes is on file at TRPA.

Joseph Pepi
Certified Professional Soil Scientist
ARCPACS No. 2372
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Representative Soil Profile No. 1:

Soil Classification: frigid, shallow, Dystric Xeropsamment

Soil Series: Toem

Oi    --  2 to 0 inches; Jeffrey pine needles and twigs

A1    0 to 4 inches; dark brown (10YR 3/3) loamy coarse sand, very dark grayish brown (10YR 3/2) moist; single grain structure; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few very fine and fine roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; 5 percent gravel; medium acid; clear wavy boundary.

A2    4 to 12 inches; dark brown (10YR 4/3) loamy coarse sand, dark brown (10YR 3/3) moist; single grain structure; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common very fine and fine roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 5 percent gravel; medium acid; clear smooth boundary.

C    12 to 18 inches; yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) loamy coarse sand, dark brown (10YR 3/3) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few very fine and fine roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; medium acid; abrupt smooth boundary.

R    18 inches; Hard granodiorite bedrock.
Representative Soil Profile No. 2:

Soil Classification: mixed, frigid, Dystric Xeropsamment

Soil Series: Cagwin

Oi  1 to 0 inches; Jeffrey pine needles and twigs

A  0 to 5 inches; dark brown (10YR 3/3) loamy coarse sand, very dark grayish brown (10YR 3/2) moist; single grain structure; loose, loose, nonsticky and nonplastic; few very fine and fine roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; 5 percent gravels; medium acid; clear smooth boundary.

AC  5 to 14 inches; dark brown (10YR 4/3) loamy coarse sand, dark brown (10YR 3/3) moist; single grain structure; loose, loose, nonsticky and nonplastic; common very fine and fine roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; 5 percent gravel; medium acid; clear wavy boundary.

C1  14 to 25 inches; dark brown (10YR 4/3) coarse sand, dark yellowish brown (10YR 3/4) moist; massive; loose, loose, nonsticky and nonplastic; common very fine and fine roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 10 percent gravel; medium acid; clear wavy boundary.

C2  25 to 30 inches; pale brown (10YR 6/3) gravelly coarse sand, brown (10YR 5/3) moist; massive; loose, loose, nonsticky and nonplastic; few very fine and fine roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; 20 percent gravel; medium acid; abrupt smooth boundary.

Cr  30 inches; grus, weathered granodiorite bedrock
INTRODUCTION

The Sells parcel was inspected by the interdisciplinary team on December 8, 1981. The purpose of the review was to determine the land capability classification of the parcel.

The parcel area is presently assigned to geomorphic group C3, which is composed of steep, strongly dissected lands and is classed as high hazard (Bailey, 1974). The soil unit mapped in this area by the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey (Rogers, et al., 1974) is a Rock outcrop-Toem complex, 30 to 50 percent slopes (map symbol RtF), which has been assigned to land capability class 1a with an allowable surface cover of 1 percent. According to the soil survey, this map unit is found on granitic uplands and consists of about 25 to 50 percent granitic rock outcrop and 50 to 75 percent coarse textured soils with undeveloped profiles. About 85 percent of the soil area is occupied by the shallow Toem series, about 15 percent is the moderately deep Cagwin series.

The RtF soil classification of the Sells parcel is disputed in a report by soil scientist Grant Kennedy, who concludes that the central and western portion
of the parcel should be mapped as a Cagwin-Rock outcrop complex, 5 to 15 percent slopes (map unit symbol CaD). This map unit is assigned to land capability Class 4, which allows up to 20 percent impervious cover.

SITE DESCRIPTION

Soils and Geomorphology

Field inspection by the interdisciplinary team revealed that the Sells parcel is located on a complex landform and is occupied by several soils. Soil and landform boundaries were identified by stereoscopic inspection of 1:12,000 scale black and white photographs and then transferred to an overlay on a reduced copy of the parcel topographic survey (Figure 1).

The eastern 40 percent of the parcel is a steeply sloping area of granitic bedrock outcrops with shallow to moderately deep, undeveloped soils located between the outcrops. This terrain is typical of the RtF soil unit mapped in this area by the Tahoe Basin Soil Survey.

The central 35 percent of the parcel is a gently sloping ground moraine that is dominantly composed of granitic materials. Slope steepness is generally less than 10 percent. The soil observed in this area is more than 40 inches deep, with loamy coarse sand or coarser textures, and minimal horizon development. This soil is similar in depth, texture, profile development, and slope to the CaD soil unit described by Mr. Kennedy. The CaD soil begins along a bluff overlooking Lake Tahoe, extends northward across Somers Drive, and encompasses an area large enough to constitute a separate map unit delineation.

The western 20 percent of the parcel is composed of wind-blown sand dunes that overlie the ground moraine deposits. These dunes extend north and west beyond the parcel boundary and cover an area large enough to delineate
as an individual map unit. This creates a classification dilemma because the sand dune land type is not described by an existing map unit of the Tahoe Basin Soil Survey, and it is unlikely that sufficient acreage of similar lands is present in the Tahoe Basin to justify establishing a new map unit. The dune topography is rolling or hummocky with slope steepness ranging from 0 to 20 percent over short distances. Surface runoff from the dunes is likely to be slight due to the high porosity of wind-winnowed sands, and this leads to a low potential for water erosion. However, the absence or weak expression of surface horizon development on the dunes suggests that they are actively shifting or only recently stabilized so, the wind erosion potential of the dunes is high. Also, the minimal nutrient storage capacity of the dune sand and underlying moraine deposits results in a direct pathway to the adjacent lake for nutrients released by surface disturbance or residential development.

The remaining 5 percent of the parcel is occupied by the steeply sloping, eroded banks of the bluff overlooking and adjacent to Lake Tahoe. This area is not large enough to constitute a separate map unit delineation and is similar in composition to the adjacent Rtf soil unit.

The present designation of the parcel area as geomorphic unit C3 is correct. The CaD and sand dune areas are surrounded by the steeply sloping bluffs above Lake Tahoe on one sided and dissected, granitic hills with slope steepness greater than 30 percent and highly erodible soils on the other side. These surrounding slopes are typical of unit C3 lands, and the combined CaD and sand dune area is only about 8 to 10 acres, which is much smaller than the 1 square mile (640 acres) required for delineation of individual geomorphic units. Therefore, the CaD soils and sand dune lands are inclusions within a larger area of geomorphic unit C3.
Hydrology

The Sells parcel occupies a low-lying bench at the margin of the north shore of Lake Tahoe. It serves as the drainage outlet for a small watershed of no more than a few acres in area which contains minimal low density development.

Surface runoff reaches the parcel primarily as roadway drainage from Somers Loop, situated along the northern property boundary, and from one of the interior driveway sections, which leads to a residence located just outside the southeast corner of the lot. A rock outcrop which forms the eastern parcel boundary can also be expected to contribute surface runoff during rainstorms.

Runoff received from Somers Loop drainage and from the outcrop area concentrates near the center of the parcel and flows in a minor drainageway toward the southwest. It combines en route with driveway runoff, while traversing the driveways via two 18-inch culverts. Flow then proceeds overland to the Lake shoreline, where it enters the highly permeable beach sediments.

The dispersion of the alluvium along the poorly incised drainage course suggests that the channel is ephemeral and, as a result, flows only in response to rainstorms. Although the drainageway flows irregularly, it does fit the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's classification of a stream environment zone (TRPA, 1978). It is, therefore, recommended that the drainageway be designated a first order stream and an appropriate setback be applied.

Vegetation

The parcel is adjacent to the lake and contains sand dunes that are well-stabilized by shrub and tree vegetation. Brush species include manzanita,

---

1The vegetation section was prepared by Dr. Robert Leonard prior to his recent move to New Zealand. Dr. Leonard was not available to review or sign the final draft of this report.
huckleberry oak and rabbit brush with some scattered bitterbrush and buck brush. Mature and over-mature jeffrey pine are scattered over the parcel. Some alder occurs along the steep bank that drops to the beach. The area that is delineated as CaD is well-covered with brush. The entire parcel is stable and well-vegetated thus providing efficient nutrient cycling and good erosion protection. The dune area on the western portion of the parcel is particularly susceptible to damage by disturbance or development since the production of a stabilizing cover of brush and trees on dune sand is a slow process under conditions of low nutrients and frequent moisture stress.

CONCLUSIONS

The present designation of the Sells parcel area as geomorphic unit C3 is correct. This geomorphic unit is a member of geomorphic hazard group I, which is classed as high hazard lands. The land capability rating system does not allow parcels in areas of geomorphic group I lands to be processed as land capability challenges unless the geomorphic group designation is also modified or unless the parcels are within areas eligible for case-by-case review. The Sells parcel is not presently within an area designated for case-by-case review, and, therefore, does not qualify for modification of surface coverage limits by use of the land capability challenge process.

If, in the future, the Sells parcel does become eligible for review of surface coverage limits, the interdisciplinary team offers the following site-specific interpretations based on land capability system criteria:

1. The eastern 40 percent of the parcel is correctly mapped by the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey as a Rock outcrop-Toem complex, 30 to 50 percent slopes (map unit symbol RtF). The RtF soil unit is assigned to land capability class 1a which allows a maximum of 1 percent impervious surface coverage.
2. The central 35 percent of the parcel should be mapped as Cagwin-Rock outcrop complex, 5 to 15 percent slopes (map unit symbol CaD). The CaD soil unit is assigned to land capability class 4, which allows up to 20 percent impervious surface coverage.

The western 20% of the parcel is composed of wind blown sand dunes. This land type was not identified as a map unit in the Tahoe Basin area soil survey; and no existing map unit describes the unique combination of variable depth, sandy texture, & minimal horizon of development of the dunes along with the characteristics of good drainage, high infiltration rates, but low nutrient storage capacity, & slopes that range from 0-50% over short distances. The map unit that most closely resembles the composition of the dunes is the Beaches (Be) miscellaneous land type, but this unit is characterized by poor drainage, while the dunes are well drained but present extreme revegetation difficulties and have a high wind erosion hazard, which makes the dunes very sensitive to disturbance. For these reasons, the TRPA interdisciplinary team recommends that the dunes area be mapped as a variant of the Beaches (Be) miscellaneous land type and suggests that the appropriate land capability classification is 1A which allows a maximum of 1% impervious coverage. The total area of the dunes is approximately 3 acres.

4. The remaining 5 percent of the parcel consists of the steep, eroded slopes adjacent to Lake Tahoe. This area is too small to delineate as a separate map unit, and the characteristics of the site are typical of lands assigned to land capability class 1a. Therefore, the interdisciplinary review team recommends that this portion of the parcel remain within the original RTF map unit delineation.
5. The drainage course flowing across the center of the parcel should be designated as a first order stream, and an appropriate development setback should be applied.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Munn, Jr., Soil Scientist

Paul Seidelman, Geomorphologist

William B. Vandivere, Hydrologist
REFERENCES


Figure 1: Sells Parcel Soil Boundaries

Parcel boundaries traced from a site map in the soils report by Grant Kennedy.

- Sand Dunes
- CaD
- Steep Slopes adjacent to Lake Tahoe
- R+F

JRM
5/31/82
October 8, 1993

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: JRB New Single Family Dwelling,
Resolution of Enforcement Action,
1010 Big Pine, Placer County, APNs 83-263-02 and 83-263-10

Based upon this staff summary, TRPA staff recommends the Governing Board approve a negotiated settlement between JRB Enterprise, the California Tahoe Conservancy ("CTC"), and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency ("TRPA").

The proposed settlement represents full and complete settlement of the violations alleged by TRPA as described below:

Removing without a permit two live trees greater than six inches diameter at breast height, located on the lakeside of the house at 1010 Big Pine Drive, Talmont Estates, Placer County, APN 83-263-02: one tree located on property owned by JRB enterprise, APN 83-263-02; and the second tree located on property owned by CTC, APN 83-263-10.

During settlement negotiations, JRB Enterprise agreed to the following:

1. JRB Enterprise agrees to pay TRPA a total fine of $8,000. The fine shall be paid in three installments: Forfeiture of the $2,500 security posted on August 8, 1992 following TRPA Governing Board approval, payment of $2,500 cash on or before March 1, 1994, and payment of $3,000 cash on or before May 30, 1994.

2. CTC agrees not to pursue any enforcement action related to the above tree removals.

TRPA staff believes the proposed settlement is appropriate to the violations and consistent with past settlements.

If you have any questions in regard to this agenda item, please contact Steve Chilton at (702) 588-4547.

10-8-93
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MEMORANDUM

October 14, 1993

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Nobriga, Resolution of Enforcement Action, 869 Lapham, City of South Lake Tahoe, APN 34-291-21.

Based upon this staff summary, TRPA staff recommends the Governing Board approve a negotiated settlement between the property owner, Mr. Tom Nobriga (Nobriga) and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA).

The proposed settlement represents full and complete settlement of the violation alleged by TRPA as described below:

1. Unauthorized removal of one lodgepole pine, 20 inches in diameter at stump height, located at 869 Lapham, in the City of South Lake Tahoe, APN 34-291-21.

During settlement negotiations, Nobriga agreed to the following:

1. To remit to TRPA the total sum of $750 for tree removal without authorization. Payment to be remitted within 30 (thirty) days from ratification of the settlement agreement by the TRPA Governing Board.

TRPA staff believes the proposed settlement is appropriate to the violation and consistent with past settlements. The relatively modest settlement figure of $750.00 for one tree is due to staff's belief that Mr. Nobriga, while negligent in his actions, was not openly attempting to circumvent the tree removal permitting process or to obtain a benefit. He did not obtain or improve a view from his house, and the property is not in a scenic corridor or visible from Lake Tahoe. There was no identified negative scenic impact and other trees remain on the property. He did have a tree removal permit for five trees for thinning and disease, but chose to remove a healthy sixth tree (the one in question) without approval.

If you have any questions in regard to this agenda item, please contact Steve Chilton at (702) 588-4547.

10-14-93
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CONSENT CALENDER ITEM 3

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY

Project Name: Tahoe Cedars Water Company, New Well and Building

Application Type: Public Service, Special Use Determination

Applicant: Tahoe Cedars Water Company

Applicant’s Representative: Earl Marr, President, Tahoe Cedars Water Company

Agency Planner: Vivica B. Orsi, Associate Planner

Location: 7299 10th Avenue, Tahoma, Placer County

Assessor’s Parcel Number: APN 015-301-25

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the Governing Board make the special use findings as outlined in Section C of this staff summary.

Project Description: On September 24, 1993, staff issued an emergency permit to Tahoe Cedars Water Company to allow the construction of a 300 to 500 gallon per minute (gpm) well and building during the 1993 grading season. The well replaces a water storage tank (supplied by a Lake Tahoe surface water intake), at the same location. On August 3, 1993, the California Department of Health Services mandated that Tahoe Cedars Water Company abandon the current Lake Tahoe surface water supply. The emergency permit contained conditions of approval relating to land coverage and Best Management Practices (BMPs). Emergency permits may be issued by the Executive Director in accordance with Article 5.20 of the TRPA Rules of Procedure.

Site Description: This parcel is situated at the southwest edge of Tahoma adjacent to Sugar Pine Point State Park. The site has an average slope of seventeen percent and vegetation consisting of mixed conifers with native shrub and willow understory.

Issue: The project involves the modification of a special use and therefore requires Governing Board action in accordance with Appendix A, Chapter 4, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Staff Analysis:

A. Environmental Documentation: The applicant has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) in order to assess the potential environmental impacts of the project. No significant environmental impacts were identified and staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. A copy of the completed IEC will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.
B. Plan Area Statement: The project is located within Plan Area 154,Tahoma. The Land Use Classification is Residential and the Management Strategy is Mitigation. Agency staff has reviewed the subject Plan Area and has determined that the project is consistent with the applicable planning statement, planning considerations and special policies. Local public health and safety facilities are listed as a special use.

C. Required Findings: The following is a list of the required special use findings as set forth in Chapter 18 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, Agency staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the finding can be made.

1. The project, to which the use pertains, is of such a nature, scale, density, intensity and type to be an appropriate use for the parcel on which, and surrounding area in which, it will be located.

The new well is replacing the current surface water supply. The new well is located at the same location as the water storage tank, and will be connected to the existing water distribution lines.

2. The project, to which the use pertains, will not be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood, or general welfare of the region, and the applicant has taken reasonable steps to protect against any such injury and to protect the land, water and air resources of both the applicant’s property and that of surrounding property owners.

The new well is necessary for the health and safety of the residents of Tahoma. The California Department of Health Services has mandated the abandonment of the existing surface water supply due to inadequate filtration.

The applicant shall be required to install Best Management Practices (BMPs) on the subject parcel to protect the land, water and air resources of both the applicant’s property and the surrounding area.

3. The project, to which the use pertains, will not change the character of the neighborhood, detrimentally affect or alter the purpose of the applicable planning area statement, community plan and specific or master plan, as the case may be.

This project involves the construction of a 300 to 500 gpm well and building to replace the existing water storage tank supplied by surface water intake. The existing and proposed uses are permissible uses in the affected plan area. This project is not within an adopted community, specific or master plan area.
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D. **Required Actions:** Agency staff recommends the Governing Board make the following motion based on this staff summary and the evidence contained in the record:

I. A motion based on this staff summary, for the findings contained in Section C above, and a finding of no significant environmental effect.
MEMORANDUM

October 14, 1993

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment to Settlement Agreement Between Lopez and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, 1947 Marconi, City of South Lake Tahoe, APN 22-241-26

Based upon this staff summary, TRPA staff recommends the Governing Board approve an amendment (attachment A) to a settlement agreed to by Robert and Connie Lopez (Lopez) and TRPA on August 12, 1992. The settlement was a result of Lopez constructing a single-family residence in Tahoe Keys that was overheight by two feet. The settlement amendment substitutes an additional $5,000.00 penalty for construction of a mansard roof.

The settlement agreed to in 1992 (attachment B) included a penalty of $10,000, a requirement to deed restrict the first floor to non-living space, and the construction of a mansard roof. The penalty and the deed restriction were complied with in 1992. TRPA allowed construction of the mansard roof to be delayed to the end of this building season.

Recent correspondence, including a petition expressing an aversion to the mansard roof architectural treatment and requesting an alternative form of resolution, signed by 40 neighbors of the Lopez’s and a letter from the Tahoe Keys Property Owner’s Association stating that they will not require a mansard be constructed, demonstrate that neither the property owner’s association nor the neighbors desire a mansard roof on the residence. After a review of the completed residence, TRPA staff concludes that a mansard will not substantially reduce the adverse impacts caused by the non-conforming height of the residence, provided the existing architectural treatments are maintained.

Due to the fact that construction of the mansard was an integral part of the settlement of this matter, in addition to the $10,000 penalty already paid, the additional penalty is commensurate with the cost of constructing the mansard. Staff obtained three estimates from licensed general contractors and the cost ranged from $4,650.00 to $5,000.00.
SECOND AMENDMENT TO SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN LOPEZ AND TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

The settlement agreement, previously amended by an addendum dated August 12, 1992, shall be further amended as follows:

LOPEZ shall have until December 1, 1993 to pay an additional penalty of $5,000.00 in lieu of construction of the previously agreed upon mansard roof on the home located at 1947 Marconi (APN 22-241-26) within the City of South Lake Tahoe.

Recent correspondence, including a petition expressing an aversion to the mansard roof architectural treatment and requesting an alternative form of resolution, signed by 40 neighbors of the Lopez's, and a letter from the Tahoe Keys Property Owner's Association stating that they will not require a mansard be constructed, demonstrate that neither the property owner's association nor the neighbors desire a mansard roof on the residence. After a review of the completed residence, TRPA staff concludes that a mansard will not substantially reduce the adverse impacts caused by the non-conforming height of the residence, provided the existing architectural treatments (e.g. contrasting trim and railings and horizontal siding) are maintained.

Due to the fact that construction of the mansard was an integral part of the settlement of this matter, in addition to the $10,000 penalty already paid, the additional penalty has been set commensurate with the cost of constructing the mansard which, after estimates were provided by Lopez, is determined to be $5,000.00.

Signed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>David S. Ziegler</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRPA Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robert Lopez</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connie Lopez</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ATTACHMENT "A"
SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This agreement is made by and between ROBERT LOPEZ and CONNIE LOPEZ (hereinafter LOPEZ) and the TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY (hereinafter TRPA) regarding that certain property with improvements situate at 1947 Marconi, South Lake Tahoe, California, El Dorado County APN 22-241-26 (hereinafter the property).

This settlement represents full and complete compromise and settlement of the certain violations alleged by TRPA, that the single family dwelling as constructed by LOPEZ on their property exceeds the maximum height standards of TRPA.

Execution of this agreement is for purposes of resolving a disputed claim and avoiding litigation and shall not be construed as an admission of the above allegations.

This settlement has been approved by the TRPA Governing Board at its February 26, 1992 regularly scheduled meeting.

To fully resolve this matter, the parties hereby agree as follows:

1. LOPEZ shall so modify the single-family dwelling to conform with the TRPA Code of Ordinances. The necessary modification to so conform shall be to construct a mansard roof on the single-family dwelling as depicted on Exhibit A (plans) hereto. The mansard roof shall be completed by August 31, 1992.

2. LOPEZ shall not cause the garage and workshop area of the single-family dwelling to be converted to living space. To that end, LOPEZ shall execute and cause to be recorded that certain Covenant Running With the Land attached as Exhibit B hereto.

3. LOPEZ shall pay to the TRPA a total sum of $10,000 as a penalty in lieu of litigation by July 15, 1992.

4. TRPA agrees to release LOPEZ from any and all claims which it may have as a result of the alleged violations.

5. Approval of this compromise by TRPA shall not exempt other agencies, under separate regulatory authority, from imposing different more stringent requirements or be binding on TRPA regarding other compliance or review actions.

Signed:

David Ziegler 8-12-92
TRPA Executive Director

Robert Lopez 6-29-92

Connie Lopez 6-24-92

"ATTACHMENT "B"
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY

Project Name: North Tahoe Cruises

Application Type: Shorezone, Tour Boat Operation

Applicant: North Tahoe Cruises/Judith Topol

Applicant's Representative: Leah Kaufman

Agency Planner: Jim Lawrence, Associate Planner

Location: 950 North Lake Boulevard, Placer County

Assessor's Parcel Number: APN 94-110-19

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the project. The required actions and recommended conditions are outlined in Section 2 of this staff summary.

Project Description: The applicant is proposing a new tour boat operation. The tour boat will be operated from the pier located at the Lighthouse Shopping Center in Tahoe City. The proposed boat has a maximum capacity of 165 passengers and will be in operation year round. The state park (Tahoe State Recreation Area) adjacent to the Lighthouse Shopping Center will provide primary parking and the Lighthouse Center will provide overflow parking.

Site Description: The project area includes the Lighthouse Shopping Center and the state park located immediately east of the shopping center. The proposed tour boat will use the existing pier at the shopping center for docking and the loading and unloading of passengers. North Tahoe Cruises has entered into an agreement with California State Parks for the availability of 54 parking spaces at the Tahoe State Recreation Area. The agreement is for one year and may be renewed. All state park contracts for concessions are for a one year period. Adjacent uses are primarily commercial and recreation.

Issue: The proposed project involves a new tour boat operation and therefore requires Governing Board review in accordance with Chapter 4, Appendix A, of the TRPA Code. The proposed project is listed as a special use in the lakezone. The primary project related issue is:

Traffic:

* Vehicle Trip Generation: The applicant has submitted a traffic and parking analysis which concludes that the project, as mitigated, will provide no significant impacts at the new site while providing a significantly beneficial impact at the adjacent site to the west. The proposed tour boat operation will result in 124 daily vehicle trip ends which is defined by the TRPA Code as a minor increase. The applicant will be assessed an air quality mitigation fee for the increase in daily vehicle trip ends.

AGENDA ITEM VI A.
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Parking: Oftentimes during peak summer months, there is little parking available at the Lighthouse Shopping Center. To provide necessary parking, North Tahoe Cruises is proposing to lease a portion of the Tahoe State Recreation Area's parking immediately east of the Lighthouse Center lot. The traffic and parking analysis submitted by the applicant concludes that there will be adequate parking to support the proposed tour boat operation.

Staff Analysis:

A. Environmental Documentation: The applicant has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) in order to assess the potential environmental impacts of the project. No significant environmental impacts were identified and staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. A copy of the completed IEC will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.

B. Plan Area Statement: The project is located within Plan Area Statement 001A (Tahoe City). The Land Use Classification is Commercial/Public Service and the Management Strategy is Redirection. TRPA staff has reviewed the subject Plan Area and has determined that the project is consistent with the applicable planning statement, planning considerations and special policies. The proposed tour boat operation is listed as an allowed use.

C. Shorezone Tolerance District: The subject parcel is located within Shorezone Tolerance District 4. The project, as conditioned, complies with the shorezone tolerance district standards.

D. Required Findings: The following is a list of the required findings as set forth in Chapters 6, 18 and 50 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, Agency staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the finding can be made.

1. 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.

(a) Land Use: Tour boat operations are an allowed use within the applicable plan area statement and shorezone tolerance district. The existing use on the parcel is commercial and adjacent uses are commercial and recreation.

(b) Transportation: No significant impacts to transportation have been identified. The project will result in an increase of 124 daily vehicle trip ends which is defined by the TRPA Code as a minor increase. The applicant has submitted a traffic and parking analysis which concludes that the project, as mitigated, will not have an adverse impact on parking or traffic circulation. The applicant will be assessed an air quality mitigation fee to mitigate the increase of daily vehicle trip ends.
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(c) Conservation: The project is consistent with the fisheries, shorezone, and scenic subelements of the Conservation Element of the Regional Plan. The project does not involve any additional structures or expansions and therefore will not have any adverse impacts to fisheries, the shorezone, or scenic thresholds.

(d) Recreation: The proposed project will provide recreation to Lake Tahoe and is consistent with the Recreational Element of the Regional Plan.

(e) Public Service and Facilities: The applicant has made arrangements with North Tahoe Marina for fueling and pump-out facilities. There is no evidence that the project will adversely affect implementation of the Public Services and Facilities Element of the Regional Plan.

(f) Implementation: The proposed project does not require any allocations. There is no evidence that the project will adversely affect the Implementation Element of the Regional Plan.

2. The project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.

The basis for this finding is provided on the checklist entitled "Project Review Conformance Checklist and Article V(g) Findings" in accordance with Chapter 6, Subsection 6.3.8 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All responses contained on said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. A copy of the completed checklist will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.

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

(Refer to paragraph 2, above.)

4. The project, to which the use pertains, is of such a nature, scale, density, intensity and type to be an appropriate use for the parcel on which, and surrounding area in which, it will be located.

Tour boat operations are an allowed use in the applicable plan area statement, but is designated as a special use in the lakezone. The applicant had previously operated a tour operation, of the same scale from a nearby parcel and is relocating the operation to the Lighthouse Shopping Center. The applicant has arranged for adequate parking, restrooms, pump-out facilities, and fueling facilities.
5. The project, to which the use pertains, will not be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood, or general welfare of the region, and the applicant has taken reasonable steps to protect against any such injury and to protect the land, water and air resources of both the applicant's property and that of surrounding property owners.

The applicant will be required to submit documentation that the proposed tour boat will be consistent with TRPA noise standards. The new boat must also meet Coast Guard standards for safety. The applicant has arranged for adequate pump-out and fuel facilities. There is no evidence that the proposed use will be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or the general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood or region.

6. The project, to which the use pertains, will not change the character of the neighborhood, detrimentally affect or alter the purpose of the applicable planning area statement, community plan and specific or master plan, as the case may be.

Tour boat operations are an allowed use within the applicable planning area statement. The project is not within an adopted community, specific or master plan.

7. The proposed project will not adversely impact: (1) littoral processes; (2) fish spawning; (3) backshore stability; and (4) on-shore wildlife habitat, including wildfowl nesting areas.

The proposed project will not have an impact on littoral processes because the project does not involve the construction of a structure that is less than 90 percent open. The proposed project is not located within an area that is mapped as on-shore wildlife habitat. The proposed project is not located within an area that is mapped as spawning habitat. The new tour boat operation does not involve the construction of any structures in the backshore, and as such, will not affect backshore stability. Based on the IEC, staff has determined that the project will not impact spawning habitat, littoral processes, backshore stability, or on-shore wildlife habitat.

8. There are sufficient accessory facilities to accommodate the project.

The proposed tour boat operation will use the existing pier at the Lighthouse Shopping Center for docking and the loading and unloading of passengers. The proposed boat will have a draft of 12 inches at the bow, 15 inches at midship, and 28 inches at the stern. The boat will dock with its bow to the end of the pier and the stern will be 70 feet beyond the pier. Water depth at the pier is 38 inches and is 83 inches 30 feet lakeward of the pier. The applicant has submitted a traffic and parking analysis which concludes that there is adequate parking facilities. Public restrooms are available at
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the state park and at the shopping center. There are sufficient accessory facilities to accommodate the project.

9. The project is compatible with existing shorezone and lakezone uses or structures on, or in the immediate vicinity of, the littoral parcel, or that modifications of such existing uses or structures will be undertaken to assure compatibility.

The project is compatible with other accessory uses (piers and marinas) in the vicinity.

10. The use proposed in the foreshore or nearshore is water-dependent.

The proposed tour boat will utilize the nearshore or foreshore of Lake Tahoe and is water-dependent.

11. Measures will be taken to prevent spills or discharges of hazardous materials.

This approval prohibits the use of spray painting, the use of tributyltin (TBT), and the discharge of any hazardous materials into the lake.

12. Construction and access techniques will be used to minimize disturbance to ground and vegetation.

The proposed project does not involve any construction.

13. The project will not adversely impact navigation or create a threat to public safety as determined by those agencies with jurisdiction over a lake's navigable waters.

The proposed project does not involve additional structures. There is no evidence that the project will adversely impact navigation or create a threat to public safety. This project must also be reviewed by the California State Lands Commission, U.S. Coast Guard, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. These agencies make their own public safety findings.

14. TRPA has solicited comments from those public agencies having jurisdiction over the nearshore and foreshore and all such comments received were considered by TRPA prior to action being taken on this project.

Comments were solicited from the California State Lands Commission, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Lahontan, and the California Department of Fish and Game. No adverse comments were received from any of the above agencies.

E. **Required Actions:** Agency staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the project by making the following motions based on this staff summary and the evidence contained in the record.
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I. A motion based on this staff summary, for the findings contained in Section D above, and a finding of no significant environmental effect.

II. A motion to approve the project, based on the staff summary, subject to the following conditions of approval.

A. This approval is for the operation of one tour boat with a maximum capacity of 165 passengers. The boat may tour the west shore of Lake Tahoe with round-trip cruises from Tahoe City to Chambers Landing. The boat may operate Monday through Saturday, from October 1 through March 20, at 11:00 am. Beginning March 21, the permittee may operate four to six trips daily until September 30, beginning at 9:00 am and ending at 9:00 pm. Any change in operation must be authorized by TRPA.

B. The Standard Conditions of Approval listed in Attachment S.

C. Prior to commencement of operation the following special conditions of approval must be satisfied:

(1) The applicant shall submit a $2,480 air quality mitigation fee based on 124 daily vehicle trip ends at a rate of $20 per trip end.

(2) The applicant shall submit to TRPA documentation demonstrating that the proposed tour boat will meet the TRPA Community Noise Equivalent Levels (CNELs) for Plan Area 001A and the lakezone, and the maximum dBA for marine craft (82.0 dBA).

D. This approval is based on utilizing the public restrooms at the Lighthouse Shopping Center and the Tahoe State Recreation Area, and 54 parking spaces located at the Tahoe State Recreation Area. If in any event these facilities are not available, or alternative parking is not made available, the permittee shall notify TRPA immediately and the tour boat operation permit will expire. A copy of the lease shall be provided to TRPA prior to operation.

E. This approval is based on the permittee's representation that all plans and information contained in the subject application are true and correct. Should any information or representation submitted in connection with the project application be incorrect or untrue, TRPA may rescind this approval, or take other appropriate action.

F. The discharge of petroleum products, waste, sewage, and litter, or earthen materials to the surface water of the Lake Tahoe Basin is prohibited.

G. The applicant shall implement all mitigation measures for parking recommended in the traffic and parking analysis submitted to TRPA.

/SL
10/13/93
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Section I

INTRODUCTION

North Tahoe Cruises, Inc. operates a public excursion boat service on the North Shore of Lake Tahoe. A water taxi service (with a capacity of 40 passengers) is operated year-round, providing a daily excursion to Emerald Bay during the summer months. During the spring, summer, and fall months, the M.V. Sunrunner (with a capacity of 125 passengers) also provides up to five excursions per day. The firm is currently preparing plans to relocate from a pier adjacent to the Boatworks Mall and Tahoe City Marina to a pier adjacent to the Lighthouse Center, several hundred yards to the northeast.

This report presents an analysis of the transportation impacts associated with the proposed plans. First, existing conditions regarding transportation are discussed. The cruise operation is then evaluated to assess the traffic changes of the proposed relocation. In addition, parking demand is evaluated and the impact on parking availability identified. Finally, mitigation measures needed to address transportation impacts are identified.
Section II

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Roadway Characteristics

State Route 28 provides the link between Nevada and Tahoe City, California along the north shore of Lake Tahoe. It has a terminus at the Wye, approximately 0.66 miles southwest of the project site, where it meets State Route 89. Within Tahoe City, State Route 28 consists of three travel lanes: one through lane in each direction, with a central double-left-turn lane.

This highway experiences large seasonal fluctuations in traffic volumes due to changing levels of visitor traffic. State Route 28 operates near or at capacity during winter hours travelling westbound on State Route 28 during the A.M. skier travel period, and in the opposite direction during the P.M. skier return period. In addition, conditions are at or near capacity during the peak summer tourist season over a substantial portion of the mid-day period in both directions.

Access to both the existing and the proposed new boat dock consists of private driveways through commercial centers. Access into the existing site consists of two driveways: a southerly extension of Jackpine Street that provides the most convenient access to the Boatworks Shopping Center, and a second driveway approximately 100 feet to the southwest that provides the most direct access to the North Tahoe Marina and the Boatworks Shopping Center. Both of these driveways intersect with a number of parking aisles allowing circulation between the two driveways off of State Route 28.

Access to the Lighthouse Center is provided by a total of four driveways. The western-most three of these drives allow full movement, while the eastern-most is right-turn-out only. Within the site, parking aisles and driveways provide full circulation around the shopping center. As the proposed relocation dock is located at the southeastern edge of the development’s shoreline, the most convenient access to and from the dock area is provided by the two eastern access drives.

Traffic Volumes

Average Daily Traffic (ADT) for the section of State Route 89 between the Wye and Fairway Drive during the peak month of the year is 16,200. (1991 Traffic Volumes, Caltrans) Hourly volumes during this peak month reach as high as 1,600 vehicles. Peak traffic counts conducted by Leigh, Scott & Cleary, Inc. during August, 1991, modified to reflect 1992 Caltrans total daily traffic volumes, indicate the peak-hour volumes presented in the top portion of Figure 1.

Existing Transportation Standards

The Regional Transportation Plan: Lake Tahoe Basin (TRPA) assists in the decision-making process for transportation facilities in the Lake Tahoe Region. The Transportation Element also establishes traffic capacity and levels of service criteria for various types of highways, and an operational level of service for signalized intersections. To meet the goals of the Transportation Element, peak-period traffic flow should not exceed:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S.R. 28/Jackpine Street</th>
<th>S.R. 28/Lighthouse Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Summer Peak-Hour Volumes</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>684</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>802</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Future Summer Peak-Hour Volumes with Dock Relocation</strong></th>
<th>39</th>
<th>841</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>682</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>822</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leigh & Scott
Cleary, Inc.

Existing and Future Summer Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes with Relocation of Boat Dock

NOT TO SCALE
- Level of Service "C" on rural scenic/recreational roads,
- Level of Service "D" in rural developed areas,
- Level of Service "D" on urban roads, or
- Level of Service "D" for signalized intersections. Level of Service "E" may be acceptable
during peak periods not to exceed four hours per day.

There is currently no defined standards for LOS at unsignalized intersections.

Existing Intersection Level of Service

Methodology

Level of Service (LOS) is a quantitative and qualitative measure of traffic conditions on isolated sections of roadway or at intersections (see Appendix A). LOS ranges from "A" (with no congestion) to "F" (where the system fails with gridlock or stop-and-go conditions prevailing). Intersection LOS was conducted using the "Highway Capacity Software" package, based upon the procedures presented in the Highway Capacity Manual (Federal Highways Administration, 1989). At present, State Route 28 through both the Jackpine Street and the Lighthouse Center intersections operates at an adequate LOS. Side street movements left onto the highway or straight across the highway are at LOS "C" to "F," indicating long delays for drivers wishing to make these movements. Right turn movements onto SR 28, however, are provided with a good LOS level of "C".

Transit Services

Tahoe City is currently served by the Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART) system. This service is the only regularly-scheduled public transit system provided on the North and West Shores. TART currently operates six days a week from 6:30 A.M. to 6:30 P.M., serving State Routes 28 and 89 (south of State Route 28) on 60 minute headways. In addition, a limited service is provided between Tahoe City and Truckee along State Route 89, consisting of five trips per day during the peak summer and winter seasons, and three trips per day during the spring and fall. The major transit stops in the Tahoe City area are located adjacent to the Lighthouse Center and immediately east of the State Route 28/State Route 89 intersection.

The other public transit system available within the plan area is a demand-responsive social service system provided by the Volunteer Center of Placer County. This service is available to clients over 60 years of age, the handicapped, and low income residents.

Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities

Pedestrian facilities in the Tahoe City area are limited to the five-hundred-foot stretch of boardwalk on the south side of State Route 28, the sidewalk on Fanny Bridge and a few designated crosswalk areas. There are no pedestrian facilities in the vicinity of the proposed site.

Designated bicycle facilities are provided from the south end of the Tahoe City area along State Route 89 to the Wye, at the west end of the area along a portion of the Truckee River, and at the east end of the area at the State Recreation Area. The Truckee River trail is located immediately south of State Route 89. The proposed new site is located near the present terminus of the Tahoe City – Dollar Hill bicycle path.
Parking Conditions

Both the present and the proposed dock locations are adjacent to large parking lots. All of these lots operate at or near capacity during peak summer months. The lots serving the Lighthouse Center (the proposed new site) were observed in a parking accumulation count conducted on Saturday, August 17, 1992 to reach a peak utilization of 90 percent at 1:00 P.M. Casual observation, however, indicates full utilization of the lot is a common occurrence during the peak summer months, particularly in the eastern lot closest to the proposed boat dock. Lots near the existing dock location which also serve the Roundhouse and Boatworks shopping centers, were observed to reach a peak utilization of 110 percent (indicating illegally parked cars) at 8:00 P.M. Due to the presence of a number of restaurants in these shopping areas, this parking area differs from the Lighthouse area in that high parking demand occurs over a long portion of the day: full utilization of this parking lot was observed over the entire span of the parking survey, between 11:30 A.M. and 8:00 P.M. In comparison, utilization of the Lighthouse Center lots was observed at 80 percent at 11:30 A.M., 68 percent at 5:00 P.M. and 63 percent at 8:00 P.M.
Section III

TRAFFIC GENERATION

An evaluation of the traffic generation characteristics of North Tahoe Cruises' operations must consider the strong variation in patronage by season, by day of the week, and by time of day. Figure 2 presents a summary of total Sunrunner passengers by month in 1992. As indicated, the bulk of the passengers are carried in July and, in particular, August. Even within a particular month, daily ridership varies greatly. As shown in Figure 3, total passengers per day in August, 1992, ranged from a low of 115 to a high of 315.

During the peak season, five runs of the Sunrunner are operated over the day, departing at 9:15 A.M., 11:00 A.M., 1:30 P.M., 3:30 P.M. and 6:00 P.M. As shown in Figure 4, the most popular departure time is 1:30 P.M. when an average of 51 passengers per day were carried in August, 1992. Other popular departures are at 11:00 A.M. (45 passengers) and 3:30 P.M. (42 passengers).

Figure 4 also provides a summary of the extensive information collected regarding the number of cars in which passengers arrive. As indicated, the departure time on an average day in August, 1992, that generated the greatest number of car trips was the 1:30 P.M. departure when the passengers arrived in 17 cars. Average vehicle occupancy equalled 3.06 persons per car.

This information can be used to assess parking accumulation and traffic flow generated by North Tahoe Cruises' operation over a peak day. First, the information depicted in Figure 4 was factored by the ratio of peak day patronage over average daily patronage to estimate peak day conditions. Next, traffic and parking generation by the time of day were allocated, using the following assumptions:

- Each of the eight employees arrives in their own car and is at work from 8:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M. (a conservative assumption).

- Half of the passengers arrive between 30 and 15 minutes of departure time; the remainder arrive within 15 minutes of departure.

- Current scheduling allows a 15 minute interval before the next departure on 3 cruises, and a 30 minute interval before the 1:30 and 6:00 P.M. cruises.

- Emerald Bay passengers arrive at an equal vehicle occupancy ratio to Sunrunner passengers.

As indicated in Figure 5, estimated peak-day parking demand reaches a maximum of 63 cars for a short period around 1:00 P.M. when cars from both the 11:00 A.M. and 1:30 P.M. Sunrunner departures are in the area. Over the bulk of the day (other than roughly 11:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M.), parking demand for North Tahoe Cruises' operations does not exceed 31 spaces.

This information can also be used to evaluate total and peak-hour traffic generation. Using the assumptions presented above, total traffic generation on a peak day can be estimated to equal 124 one-way vehicle-trips (62 trips to the site and 62 trips away from the site). The peak hour occurs between 12:00 noon and 1:00 P.M., when 30 cars arrive at the site and 27 exit the site.
Figure 3: 1992 August Ridership by Day

Passengers per Day
Section IV

TRAFFIC DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT

The next step in the analysis is the distribution of the traffic generation changes to the roadway network.

Surveys conducted at the Lighthouse Center in August of 1991 indicate that approximately 65 percent of visitors approach the area from the southwest on SR 28; the remaining 35 percent approach the area from the northeast on SR 28.

Using this estimation distribution, the lower portion of Figure 1 depicts total peak-hour traffic volumes with the relocation of the boat dock. As shown, turning traffic movement volumes are increased slightly at the northeastern Lighthouse access points, but reduced at the Jackpine Street intersection.
Section V

TRAFFIC AND PARKING IMPACT ANALYSIS

Adding the existing traffic volumes to those modified by the relocation yields the total future traffic volumes presented in Figure 3. Comparison with the existing volumes depicted in Figure 1 indicates the proposed project will yield only slight increases in traffic activity on nearby roadways.

The Highway Capacity Software package was used to assess the level of service provided by the design volumes increased by this traffic impact. As indicated in Table 1, the proposed project would not affect the intersection level of service at State Route 28 and Jackpine Street, or at State Route 28 and the Lighthouse Center access.

Impact on Pedestrian and Bicycle Travel

The proposed relocation will have little material effect on pedestrian or bicycle travel, as both the existing and proposed sites are in high pedestrian activity areas. The location of the proposed site adjacent to the Tahoe State Recreation Area campground may generate a small increase in pedestrian access to the boat dock.

Impact on Regional Vehicle-Miles of Travel

Total trip length will be increased for approximately 80 daily vehicle-trips arriving and departing to the southwest by roughly 0.2 miles, but will be reduced by this same length for the 44 vehicle-trips per day arriving and departing to the northeast. In total, VMT on SR 28 will be increased by approximately 7 VMT. This increase, however, may be more than offset by reduced circulation in parking lots, as parking for these trips will be improved. Overall, therefore, no significant impact on VMT is forecast.

Impact on Parking Availability

During the mid-day period in the peak summer season, there is often little or no parking in the Lighthouse Center available for North Tahoe Cruises' parking.

To provide the necessary parking, North Tahoe Cruises proposes to lease a portion of the Tahoe State Recreation Area's parking area immediately east of the Lighthouse Center lot. This leased lot could provide 53 parking spaces and still provide adequate circulation for SRA vehicles. Comparing this figure of 53 spaces with the peak parking demand of 63 vehicles indicates that this peak demand, if unmitigated, cannot be accommodated in this new lot.

A significant benefit of the proposal is that it would substantially improve parking availability in the Boatworks/Roundhouse parking lots. This will reduce the excessive searching for an available parking space in this "tight" parking area.
## TABLE 1: Level of Service Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Future Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jackpine Street</td>
<td>Lighthouse Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB Left</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB Through</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB Right</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Left</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Through</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Right</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB Left</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB Through</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB Right</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Left</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Through</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Right</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommended Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are recommended to reduce the traffic and parking impacts of the proposed project:

- The use of the State Recreation Area parking lot for cruise passenger parking should be pursued.

- The Tahoe Area Rapid Transit system provides nearby service to Tahoe’s North and West Shores. In addition, Placer County (with funding assistance from the Town of Truckee) will soon begin year-round service of "The Bus," providing service between Truckee and Tahoe City. To promote transit use and reduce traffic activity, North Tahoe Cruises should provide free monthly transit passes to employees who request the pass and use it for commuting on a regular basis. In addition, passengers arriving by bus should be rebated the cost of their transit fare.

- Employees should be required to park at the Jackpine Street or the SRA lots during June, July, August and September. During peak periods when the SRA lot may fill with passenger’s cars, employee parking should be limited to the Jackpine Street lot. Placer County is currently finalizing plans to purchase and improve this lot as a public facility.

- During at least the peak months of July and August, cruises should be scheduled to provide a minimum of 45 minutes between the end of the 11:00 A.M. cruise and the start of the 1:30 P.M. cruise. This will ensure adequate time for the 11:00 A.M. cruise passengers to exit the lot before the arrival of the 1:30 P.M. cruise passengers.

With the implementation of these mitigation measures, total parking demand for North Tahoe Cruises during the peak time of the peak day in the Lighthouse Center area will equal 49 cars -- within the capacity of the leased lot. Overall, therefore, the proposed dock relocation will provide no significant impacts at the new site, while providing a significantly beneficial impact at the present site.
Section VI

AIR QUALITY IMPACT ANALYSIS

An important consideration in the assessment of any transportation-related improvement is the potential impact on air quality. In many areas of the Tahoe Basin, vehicular traffic generates the bulk of many pollutants. The impact of changes in vehicular activity therefore must be carefully evaluated.

The relocation of North Tahoe Cruises’ activities will have a negligible effect on total air pollutant emissions or ambient air quality. No additional vehicle-trips will be generated. While there will be a slight increase in total travel, reduction in congestion resulting from an easing in parking problems may well result in a slight decrease in total pollutant emissions.
Appendix A

Descriptions of Levels of Service

The concept of levels of service is defined as a qualitative measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, and their perception by motorists and/or passengers. A level-of-service definition generally describes these conditions in terms of such factors as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort and convenience, and safety. Six levels of service are defined for each type of facility for which analysis procedures are available. They are given letter designations, from A to F, with level-of-service A representing the best operating conditions and level-of-service F the worst.

Level-Of-Service Definitions

In general, the various levels of service are defined as follows for uninterrupted flow facilities:

- **Level-of-service A** represents free flow. Individual users are virtually unaffected by the presence of others in the traffic stream. Freedom to select desired speeds and to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely high. The general level of comfort and convenience provided to the motorist, passenger, or pedestrian is excellent.

- **Level-of-service B** is in the range of stable flow, but the presence of other users in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable. Freedom to select desired speeds is relatively unaffected, but there is a slight decline in the freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream from LOS A. The level of comfort and convenience provided is somewhat less than at LOS A, because the presence of others in the traffic stream begins to affect individual behavior.

- **Level-of-service C** is in the range of stable flow, but marks the beginning of the range of flow in which the operation of individual users becomes significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream. The selection of speed is now affected by the presence of others, and maneuvering within the traffic stream requires substantial vigilance on the part of the user. The general level of comfort and convenience declines noticeably at this level.

- **Level-of-service D** represents high-density, but stable, flow. Speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted, and the driver or pedestrian experiences a generally poor level of comfort and convenience. Small increases in traffic flow will generally cause operational problems at this level.

- **Level-of-service E** represents operating conditions at or near the capacity level. All speeds are reduced to a low, but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely difficult, and it is generally accomplished by forcing a vehicle or pedestrian to "give way" to accommodate such maneuvers. Comfort and convenience levels are extremely poor, and driver or pedestrian frustration is generally high. Operations at this level are usually unstable, because small increases in flow or minor perturbations within the traffic stream will cause breakdowns.

- **Level-of-service F** is used to define forced or breakdown flow. This condition exists wherever the amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the amount which can traverse the point. Queues form behind such locations. Operations within the queue are characterized by stop-and-go waves, and they are extremely unstable. Vehicles may progress at reasonable speeds for several hundred feet or more, then be required to stop in a cyclic fashion. Level-of-service F is used to describe the operating conditions within the queue, as well as the point of the breakdown. It should be noted, however, that in many cases operating conditions of vehicles or pedestrians discharged from the queue may be quite good. Nevertheless, it is the point at which arrival flow exceeds discharge flow which causes the queue to form, and level-of-service F is an appropriate designation for such points.
Appendix B

Level of Service Calculations
1985 HCM: UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

AVERAGE RUNNING SPEED, MAJOR STREET.. 30
PEAK HOUR FACTOR................. 1
AREA POPULATION.................. 10000
NAME OF THE EAST/WEST STREET....... SR 28
NAME OF THE NORTH/SOUTH STREET..... Lighthouse Access
NAME OF THE ANALYST............... KK
DATE OF THE ANALYSIS (mm/dd/yy)..... 06-23-1999
TIME PERIOD ANALYZED............... Future S. Peak Hour
OTHER INFORMATION.... With Dock Relocation

INTERSECTION TYPE AND CONTROL

INTERSECTION TYPE: T-INTERSECTION
MAJOR STREET DIRECTION: EAST/WEST
CONTROL TYPE NORTHBOUND: STOP SIGN

TRAFFIC VOLUMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THRU</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>841</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIGHT</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUMBER OF LANES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LANES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADJUSTMENT FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENT GRADE</th>
<th>RIGHT TURN ANGLE</th>
<th>CURB RADIUS (ft) FOR RIGHT TURNS</th>
<th>ACCELERATION LANE FOR RIGHT TURNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EASTBOUND</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTBOUND</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHBOUND</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHBOUND</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VEHICLE COMPOSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% SU TRUCKS AND RV'S</th>
<th>% COMBINATION VEHICLES</th>
<th>% MOTORCYCLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EASTBOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTBOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHBOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHBOUND</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CRITICAL GAPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABULAR VALUES (Table 10-2)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED VALUE</th>
<th>SIGHT DIST. ADJUSTMENT</th>
<th>FINAL CRITICAL GAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINOR RIGHTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR LEFTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR LEFTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

NAME OF THE EAST/WEST STREET..... SR 28
NAME OF THE NORTH/SOUTH STREET..... Lighthouse Access
DATE AND TIME OF THE ANALYSIS..... 06-23-199 ; Existing Summer
OTHER INFORMATION..... Peak-Hour Volumes
### CAPACITY AND LEVEL-OF-SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOVEMENT</th>
<th>POTENTIAL RATE v (pcph)</th>
<th>POTENTIAL CAPACITY c (pcph)</th>
<th>ACTUAL MOVEMENT CAPACITY c (pcph)</th>
<th>SHARED CAPACITY c (pcph)</th>
<th>RESERVE CAPACITY c = c - v</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINOR STREET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB LEFT</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIGHT</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR STREET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB LEFT</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

- NAME OF THE EAST/WEST STREET: SR 28
- NAME OF THE NORTH/SOUTH STREET: Lighthouse Access
- DATE AND TIME OF THE ANALYSIS: 06-23-199 ; Future S. Peak Hour
- OTHER INFORMATION: With Dock Relocation
ZACHARY M. REYNOLDS
naval architect
29 W. Ri Rose Dr. Petaluma CA 94952
(707) 763-2307
October 15, 1993

Merle Lawrence
North Tahoe Cruises
P.O. Box 7913
Tahoe City, CA 96148
fax: 815-563-3743

Subject: New Excursion Boat

Dear Merle:

In response to your inquiry concerning safety and environmental features of the proposed new vessel, I can assure you that the vessel, as designed, meets all US Coast Guard regulations regarding safety and construction and EPA regulations regarding noise reduction and air pollution. We will be installing up to date silencers on the vessel's main and auxiliary engines. All engines will be supplied with the latest factory preparation to reduce and minimize pollutants.

The proposed landing for the vessel, Judy Topol's Lighthouse Marina, provides a safe and adequate site for passenger loading operations and vessel mooring. I surveyed this site in 1990. At that time I advised that the vessel use a bow landing. The existing pier was sound at the time of my inspection.

Recent soundings indicate a water depth of 38 inches at the pier and 43 inches depth at a distance of 30 feet from the pier. These soundings are more than adequate for the proposed bow landing of the new vessel. The anticipated keel draft is 32 inches. With the bow landing, the vessel will stand off the face of the pier 8 to 10 feet. This will place the vessel in water deeper that 38 inches and be quite adequate for the draft of the vessel.

Please let me know if you need further details.

Very truly yours,

Zachary M. Reynolds

58
August 22, 1993

Mr. Merle Lawrence
President
North Tahoe Cruises
Box 7913
Tahoe City, California 96145

Dear Merle,

This letter is to confirm our discussion relative to North Tahoe Marina providing services to your cruise boat operations. NTM is pleased to offer you gasoline at a commercial discount and the use of our pump out facility at no cost. In addition, we will provide mechanical and electrical service work at a commercial discount rate.

I hope that some day the waterborne transportation system we have often discussed becomes a reality. The tour boat operation plus the waterborne transport concept visiting the north shore ports of Kings Beach, North Tahoe Marina, Garwoods, Tahoe City and somewhere on the West Shore would make a substantial reduction in VMT's.

Sincerely,

NORTH TAHOE MARINA, INC.

[Signature]

James R. Walsh
President
September 21, 1993

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

Dear Dave:

Within the past few months we have been approached by Merle Lawrence of North Shore Cruises, pertaining to the use of the parking lot at Tahoe State Recreation Area for parking associated with his operations.

The preliminary traffic analysis shows a possible 7,000 mile daily reduction in vehicle trip miles in the Tahoe Basin. This reduction is possible if 100 cars daily use his commercial vessel to visit Emerald Bay instead of driving to the Emerald Bay area.

The present paved parking lot at Tahoe State Recreation Area normally has less than 6 cars using the parking lot. The parking lot can accommodate over 60 cars. This proposal seems to be a “win - win” situation for all concerned. The VTM’s are reduced, the State secures additional concession revenue, and the public is offered a unique recreational experience.

Subject to appropriate control agency approval (including TRPA), we are prepared to enter into a one year concession agreement with North Shore Cruises. If we can offer any additional information, please feel free to give me a call at the above phone number.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert G. Macomber
District Superintendent

cc: Merle Lawrence
October 5, 1993

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

Dear Dave:

I have recently learned that Merle Lawrence of North Shore Cruises has successfully negotiated a one year concession agreement with the Department of Parks and Recreation for the use of the parking lot at the Tahoe State Recreation Area subject to approval of the various control agencies.

As you recall, the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) at their September 17th meeting, authorized submitting a $60,000 (50% local match required) Transit Capital Improvement (TCI) application to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for preliminary design and analysis of existing and proposed docking facilities and parking needs to accommodate Waterborne Transit at Lake Tahoe.

Mr. Lawrence has been very supportive of TTD’s efforts in pursuing Waterborne Transit and the agreement with the Department of Parks and Recreation is both timely and exciting because the parking lot at the Tahoe State Recreation area can accommodate approximately 60 cars and may be an excellent location for Waterborne Transit at the North Shore. I will keep you informed of TTD’s progress with the TCI Grant Application and if you should need additional information, please feel free to call.

Sincerely,

[Signature]  
Roger Imsdahl  
Chairman

RI/sdc  
cc: Merle Lawrence

P.O. Box 10630  Zephyr Cove, NV 89448-2830
October 4, 1993

Mr. Merle Lawrence
North Tahoe Cruises
P. O. Box 7913
Tahoe City, CA 96145

Dear Merle:

I know how hard that you have work for the past many years to make full scale waterborne transportation a reality for Lake Tahoe. The positive impact that this could have on an environment that is so dependent on the automobile, and so in need of alternative solutions to this stubborn problem, is truly exciting.

Your success in negotiating the sixty extra parking places, spaces that were not available for use in the past, goes a long way toward relieving the localized traffic congestion for that area. In addition, your plan to move North Tahoe Cruises to the Lighthouse Shopping Center pier and the proximity of the new parking certainly enhances the overall experience for the user.

As you move through the regulatory process, please let us know if there is anything that we can do to assist you.

Very truly yours,

Marty Cohen
President
August 26, 1993

Mr. Merle Lawrence
North Tahoe Cruises
P.O. Box 7913
Tahoe City, CA 96145

Dear Merle:

Thank you for keeping us informed about the progress you have made in your plan to move North Tahoe Cruises to the Lighthouse Shopping Center Pier. It is great news to know that you have been successful in negotiating sixty extra parking places.

The extra parking, in conjunction with the new location, should be a great help in relieving traffic congestion in town. Maybe this is a first step in our dream to have full fledged waterborne transportation for the area.

Please let us know when your plans are finalized and if there is anything we can do to assist you in making the move.

Very truly yours,

Kay Williams
Director
October 7, 1993

Mr. Wayne Chimarusti, Chairman
Members, Governing Board
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
PO Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448-1038

Dear Chairman Chimarusti and Members:

The TNT/TMA would like to state our support for the application of North Tahoe Cruises to commence a new waterborne tour boat operation based at the Lighthouse Pier in Tahoe City.

Merle and Judy Lawrence, the operators of this long-time local business, have worked in partnership with the TNT/TMA and other local and regional entities in preparing this proposal so that it provides the maximum responsiveness to transportation and related community issues and concerns.

We have reviewed documentation submitted as part of the application which demonstrates that approximately 60 parking spaces in the downtown Tahoe City area will be more available for members of the general public once North Tahoe Cruises is established to operate from the Lighthouse Pier and activates its parking agreement with the California State Parks Department at the Tahoe State Recreation Area. Various other community and transportation-related benefits are also clearly demonstrated in the application.

Additionally, we note that North Tahoe Cruises, Inc., is a supporter of potential improvements to waterborne transit at Lake Tahoe. As you are aware, the TNT/TMA is involved in exploring the greater utilization of waterborne transit, in partnership with the Tahoe Transportation Coalition, the Tahoe Transportation District, TRPA and various other entities within the private sector.
Thank you for your favorable consideration and action on the application from North Tahoe Cruises.

Sincerely,

Carol Hester
Executive Director

cc: Placer County DPW
Placer County Transportation Commission
TNT/TMA Board & Steering Committee
Dave Ziegler, TRPA
Bob Macomber, California State Parks Department
Merle & Judy Lawrence, North Tahoe Cruises
MEMORANDUM

October 15, 1993

To: The TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Adoption of Meyers Community Plan

Proposed Action: Adopt the Meyers Community Plan and the following related amendments to the Regional Plan:

1. Deletion of Plan Area Statement 125, Meyers Commercial, and replacement with the community plan area statement.

2. Amendment of Land Capability Overlay Maps P-21 and P-22 within the community plan area.

3. Amendment of Chapter 26, Signs, to include substitute sign standards.

4. Amendment of Chapter 30, Design Standards to include substitute design review guidelines.

5. Amendment of plan area boundary between Plan Area 125, Meyers Commercial and Plan Area 121, Freel Peak Conservation, to remove a 10 acre parcel owned by the USDA Forest Service from the community plan area.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Governing Board adopt the Meyers Community Plan and related Regional Plan amendments identified above.

Advisory Planning Commission Recommendation: The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) considered this matter at its October 13, 1993, meeting. The APC unanimously recommends that the Governing Board adopt the Meyers Community Plan and related Regional Plan amendments. The El Dorado County Planning Commission considered the matter at its October 14, 1993, meeting. It unanimously recommended adoption of the plan to the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors.

Background: The final plan and Environmental Assessment (EA) have been circulated for 30 days for public review and comment. The EA is a joint environmental document which satisfies the substantive and procedural requirements of both TRPA and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). El Dorado County is the lead CEQA agency. The CEQA portion of the document is known as a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). CEQA requires MNDs to be circulated for a minimum of 30 days. It was circulated during August and early
September, 1993. TRPA’s EA, however, has no public circulation requirements. Because it was a joint document on the cooperative community plan effort, TRPA circulated the EA together with the County’s MND.

During August, noticed public hearings on the plan were held before the APC and Governing Board. In addition, a public meeting was held to seek community review and input. As a result, several changes have been incorporated into the Plan. Minor editorial changes have been incorporated into different sections of the Plan. Substantive changes made during the review period have also been incorporated into the Plan and are described below in more detail. The changes are shown using the cross-out/underline format. Plan replacement pages are provided at the end of the staff report and are identified by the cover sheet entitled, REPLACEMENT PAGES ONLY, and dated October, 1993. They should be reviewed in the context of the original plan (mauve-colored cover), dated July, 1993. The layout of Chapter 1 has been slightly reordered, however, none of the information has been deleted. The Discussion section below summarizes plan changes.

The Final EA also has a series of replacement pages together with the public comment letters received and related responses. The Final EA replacement pages are located at the end of this staff report.

Discussion: The following changes have been made to the Plan as a result of completing the EA/MND and comments made during the public comment period.

A. COMMUNITY PLAN CHANGES

1. Community Plan Boundary Adjustment

In late 1992, during final plan preparation, the USDA Forest Service acquired a vacant, 10 acre parcel in Special Area #4, Industrial Tract APN (35-030-08). Prior to acquisition, it was privately owned. It is located east of the existing Caltrans maintenance station and north of the El Dorado County maintenance facility where Shakori Street dead ends. Please refer to Attachment A, Land Use Districts map, for its location.

Approximately three-quarters of the site is low capability lands (class 1a and class 3). The Plan envisions no improvements on the parcel and, after a request for deletion of the parcel from the League to Save Lake Tahoe, the team consulted with the Forest Service. The Plan now recommends the parcel’s deletion. If adopted with the amended boundary, all plan maps will be amended to show the change.

The parcel would be placed in the adjoining PAS 121, Freel Peak Conservation. PAS 121 consists primarily of national forest land and is managed for conservation and outdoor recreation land uses.

The League made additional requests to remove certain lands from the plan area, including the northern portion of Special Area #1, and all of Special Areas #2 and #5. The team considered the requests and concluded that they
should remain in the Plan because it would retain more localized control over land uses and better address site design considerations than if left out.

2. Amendments to Community Plan Area Statement (Chapter 2)

a. Page 2-4. Designated TDR Receiving Area. The West Meyers land use district (Special Area #3) has been designated as a receiving area for multi-residential units. This means projects within it can retire vacant residential parcels and transfer the potential development right thereon as a source of development rights. El Dorado County designates the Navahoe Street area within West Meyers for multiple family residential uses. Without the TDR receiving area designation, multi-residential projects would have to retire and transfer existing residential units at a much higher cost.

b. Pages 2-8 through 2-13. Changes to Permissible Use List. Minor changes have been made to the permissible use lists for four of the five land use districts created by the plan. They are shown on pages 2-8 through 2-13 in the replacement packet. The changes were made in response to comments received regarding the need to clearly distinguish the theme and land use direction for each district. Generally, some of the public service uses in Yank's Station and West Meyers were made special uses, local post offices were deleted from the Industrial tract and made a special use in the Lake Valley district. Group facilities (Recreation use) were deleted from the Lake Valley district.

c. Page 2-14. Addition of Short Term Noise Performance Standards. Based on information presented in the EA/MND two new short-term noise performance standards for stationary and industrial sources were required to be added to the Plan. The standards are shown on page 2-14 (Community Plan Area Statement). They will not apply to transportation routes. Refer to Section 10.0 of the EA/MND. The one hour average and maximum allowable standard will be implemented in addition to the 24 hour Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). The standards will prevent adverse noise impacts commonly found in industrial uses like wood-splitting and machining operations (Special Area #4) which do not operate 24 hours from impacting noise-sensitive uses (overwhelmingly residential) surrounding the plan area or existing residential uses within the plan area.

The existing 65 dBA CNEL standard does not effectively mitigate short-term noise irritations caused by the land uses expected in several districts within the plan area. Based on information provided by the noise consultant, projects which meet the short-term performance standards are generally expected to be able to attain and maintain the 24 hour CNEL standard for the plan area.

3. Amended Implementation Strategies (Chapter 7)

Changes to the Plan’s implementation strategy include:
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a. Page 7-4. The Plan’s funding philosophy has been revised to indicate formation of a redevelopment district provided under state redevelopment law as an implementation option. It is not the recommended course of action, however, it is identified as a contingency measure to implement the Plan should the other methods not prove successful.

b. Pages 7-7,8. The Plan’s schedule of public improvements has been revised to show quicker implementation of utility undergrounding. The schedule identifies the general timing of installing Best Management Practices (BMPs) on private and public parcels by 1997. This date is established by TRPA’s Code of Ordinances (Chapter 25). It identifies that installation of BMPs on public rights-of-way within the plan area will be completed by 2007. This is based on schedules established by Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board NPDES permits for El Dorado County and Caltrans.

The revised schedule of improvements includes quicker undergrounding of overhead utility lines along U.S. 50 (years 1-5). It adds a target for completion of the designated chain-up area along U.S. 50 (years 6-10).

c. Page 7-8. Clarification of the general roles and responsibilities of the Meyers Town Council has been added in terms of design review approval authority and project review recommendation responsibilities. This is essentially a county issue which will be addressed as part of the county’s adoption process.


a. Page 6. The conceptual design of the designated chain-up area has been revised to reflect safety concerns relative to snow storage.

b. Page 7. The conceptual design of the U.S. 50 center landscaped median has been revised to remove design details which are better left for the project’s design development process.

c. Page 13. Based on a comment received from the California Department of Fish and Game, designs for simple bear-proof garbage facilities have been added.

d. Page 18. Examples of additional exterior light fixtures which represent the historic design theme have been added.

5. Changes to Community Plan Substitute Sign Standards (Appendix B)

a. Page B-2. One additional standard has been added to the substitute sign standards which prohibits use of reflective materials on signs or sign structures.
6. Changes to Community Plan Commercial Floor Area Allocation Procedures (Appendix C)

a. Pages C-1, 2. Allocation procedure B.1 has been revised to state that the priority locations for receiving the additional commercial floor area may not be revised for two years rather than one. The Plan states that Yank's Station and West Meyers land use districts are the highest priority locations for additional commercial development, followed by the Industrial Tract. A companion policy has been added to Chapter 2, Land Use to reflect the change in timing.

B. AMENDED LAND CAPABILITY MAPPING (CHAPTER 4)

The following discussion is provided based on a request for additional information by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board staff. As part of the plan, an area-wide land capability verification was prepared for the plan area. It is shown and described on pages 4-10, 11 of the plan. Table 4-1 on pages 4-10 shows the changes in land capability districts by acres.

In 1991, the verification of the land capability classes and the soil map units for the Meyers Community Plan Area was completed. The work was done using standard soil survey mapping procedures described below.

Field work was done by Mr. Russel Almaraz, Certified Professional Soil Scientist and Mr. John Cobourn, Hydrologist. Soils were examined at close intervals using soil pits dug with shovels and a hand auger. The soils at the pit sites were examined with enough detail to determine the soil classification and the appropriate soil series. Slope measurements were also taken at these sites using a clinometer, to determine the appropriate soil map unit of that series (which includes the slope range) in which the soil found at that pit should be placed. The field notes on soil characteristics and slope were recorded on the field maps which had a scale of 1 inch equals 400 feet.

To assist in the identification of soil series and map units from which the land capability classes were determined and the boundaries between them, aerial photographs of several types were utilized. These included U-2 infrared photos developed by the U.S. Forest Service and enlarged to a scale of 1 inch equals 400 feet, and color photos with a scale of 1 inch equals 2000 feet.

The identification of areas classified as stream environment zone (SEZ) and land capability class 1b, was done jointly by Mr. Almaraz and Mr. Cobourn. Working together, they determined the presence of any soil, vegetative, or hydrologic SEZ indicators and the boundaries between the SEZs and the other land capability classes.

The land capability class and soil map unit delineations were depicted on a copy of the TRPA 1 inch equals 400 foot base map series for the Meyers area. A field check of these maps was conducted by Mr. Almaraz with Joe Pepi, TRPA
staff soil scientists to review the work. The mapping was determined by staff
to be an accurate representation of soils and land capability within the
Meyers Community Plan Area.

The Community Plan mapping identified a 13 acre reduction in the area iden-
tified as SEZ and land capability class 1b. The 1987 TRPA Land Capability
Overlay Maps were based on soil map unit boundaries from the U.S. Soil Con-
servation Service, Soil Survey of the Lake Tahoe Basin done in 1972. This
work was done on a significantly smaller scale and with less detailed observ-
ation of soil, vegetation, and hydrologic features than was done for the
community plan mapping. During the course of the land capability mapping done
for the community plan, areas previously mapped as SEZ were not found to have
sufficient indicators to qualify as SEZ and were given a different land cap-
ability class. See the existing and proposed land capability maps shown in
Attachments B and C to the staff report.

C. FINAL EA/MND REVISIONS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

The Final EA/MND is included in the packet. It contains changes made to the
Plan as a result of the analysis, and includes comment letter received and
related responses. The majority of substantive changes are discussed above.

Overall, very few comment letters were received. Those that were, however,
generally contained numerous comments.

Additional mitigation requirements identified in the Final EA/MND which are
not part of the community plan include:

1. Use of the minor boundary line adjustment process to amend parcel
   boundaries for property owners who acquire excess U.S. 50 right-of-way.

2. Specific design-level considerations for the U.S. 50 center landscaped
   median, improvements to U.S. 50 and Pioneer trail intersection, and
   establishing the process for studying improvements to the U.S. 50 and
   California 89 intersection in West Meyers.

3. Project development mitigation measures to mitigate impacts of fugitive
dust at construction sites, disturbance of cultural resources and
avoidance of existing utility lines. These measures are project-level
mitigations which will be implemented through the project review process.
For the most part, these measures are already in place in either TRPA's
or El Dorado County's project review process.

Conclusion: The Final EA/MND concluded that the proposed action will not
result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts to the environment. Mitiga-
tion measures identified by the EA/MND have been incorporated into the Meyers
Community Plan or will be incorporated into the individual projects approved
within the Community Plan Area.
Required Findings: Prior to adopting the Meyers Community Plan and related Regional Plan amendments, the following findings must be made. The findings and the rationales on which the findings may be made are listed below:

A. Chapter 6 Findings for Community Plan adoption and adoption of related Code and PAS Amendments: The following findings must be made prior to adopting the proposed plan and amendments:

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:** Community plans are addressed in the Land Use Element of the Goals and Policies Plan and the TRPA Code. The Regional Transportation Plan/Air Quality Plan, the Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, and the Scenic Quality Improvement Plan consider Community Plans as part of their implementation strategies.

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

   **Rationale:** The Community Plan sets forth environmental threshold related targets with strategies to achieve those targets. The Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared for this plan did not find any threshold to be exceeded.

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

   **Rationale:** The Community Plan sets forth environmental threshold related targets (for air quality and water quality, the threshold targets are the applicable standards) and strategies to achieve those targets. The EA for this plan did not find any standard to be exceeded.

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

   **Rationale:** See 2 above.

5. **Finding:** The Regional Plan, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

   **Rationale:** See 1 and 2 above.
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B. **Ordinance 87-8 Findings for Code Amendments:** Section 2.40 of Ordinance 87-8 requires the following findings prior to Code amendments. The proposed amendment provides for an equal or better means of attainment or maintenance of the thresholds. The required findings and their rationales are:

1. **The amendments are consistent with the Compact and with attainment or maintenance of the thresholds.**
   
   **Rationale:** The Code amendments are technical amendments needed to implement the community plan and its substitute "equal or superior" standards as permitted by the Regional Plan.

2. **That the amendment provides for an equal or better means of attainment or maintenance of the thresholds.**
   
   **Rationale:** The substitute standards have been found by the Environmental Assessment prepared for this plan to be an equal or superior set of standards.

3. **One of the following findings:**
   
   a. There is a demonstrated conflict between provisions of the Regional Plan package, and the conflict threatens to preclude attainment or maintenance of thresholds; or
   
   b. 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; or
   
   c. Legal constraints, such as court orders, decisions or Compact amendments, require amendment of the Goals and Policies or Code; or
   
   d. Technical or scientific information demonstrates the need for modification of a provision of the Goals and Policies or Code; or
   
   e. 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; or
   
   f. 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.

Staff proposes to make Finding b.

Rationale and Evidence: The substitute sign standards are more responsive to the physical setting and design constraints found in Meyers. Implementing these standards is expected to result in increased compliance and quicker removal of non-conforming signs, both of which directly influence threshold attainment and maintenance.

C. Special Findings and Considerations Related to Community Plan Adoption

1. Chapter 14 Community Plans Findings and Considerations
   a. Section 14.3 Boundary Findings - No additions to the community plan boundaries are proposed by the community plan.
   b. Section 14.5.C Equal or Superior Standards for Density, Noise, Driveways, Parking, Outdoor Advertising, Historic and Design - The Final EA documents that the proposed substitute standards and guidelines are equal or superior to the existing TRPA standards and guidelines.
   c. Subsection 14.6.D Approval of the Community Plan -
      i. The APC has obtained and considered the recommendations of local government and other responsible public agencies and has made a recommendation to the Governing Board.
      ii. The Governing Board has determined that the plan is consistent with the Goals and Policies, the Code, the attainment of the targets and the requirements of 14.6.B(1).
      iii. The Governing Board determined the effect on other plan areas and determined no Plan Area amendments outside the Community Plan boundary are appropriate.
      iv. The Governing Board established the initial allocations set forth in Chapter 2 of the Community Plan.

2. Chapter 33 Commercial Allocation Required Considerations
   a. Subsection 33.3.C Initial Allocations - TRPA has considered the demonstrated need, the expected ability to achieve or maintain environmental thresholds, the reasonableness of
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projected time schedules, the degree of certainty for obtaining needed funds for implementation, and compatibility with other community plans.

b. **Subsection 33.3.C Allocation of Reserve** - TRPA has reviewed a sufficient number of proposed community plans (18) to determine which community plans best demonstrate the ability to maintain environmental thresholds, and have a clearly demonstrated need for the additional allocation.

3. **Chapter 26 Substitute Sign Standards**

a. **Subsection 26.5.B Community Plan Standards** - Section 11.0 of the Final EA provides TRPA the basis for finding the community plan scenic quality improvement program and substitute sign standards are equal or superior to the existing ordinances.

4. **Chapter 30 Substitute Design Review Guidelines**

a. **Subsection 30.4.B Substitution of Design Review Guidelines** - Section 11.0 of the Final EA provides TRPA the basis for finding the substitute design review guidelines are equal or superior to the existing guidelines.

**Recommended Actions:**

Staff recommends that the Governing Board conduct the public hearing and, based on its outcome, take the following actions:

1. **Make a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the proposed action based on the Final Environmental Assessment;**

2. **Make the Required Findings from Chapter 6, Ordinance 87-8 and Chapter 14, which are set forth in the staff report (listed above);**

3. **Adopt the attached implementing ordinance which adopts the Meyers Community Plan and the related Regional Plan amendments.**

Staff will begin this item with a presentation. Please contact Andrew Strain at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this matter.
Meyers Community Plan
COMMUNITY PLAN LAND CAPABILITY

Figure 4-3. Community Plan Land Capability
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SIGNS

Chapter Contents

26.0 Purpose
26.1 Applicability
26.2 Sign Package Review
26.3 List of Exempt Activities
26.4 List of Qualified Exempt Activities
26.5 Substitution of Standards
26.6 General Sign Standards
26.7 Signs in Conservation Plan Areas
26.8 Signs in Recreation Plan Areas
26.9 Signs in Residential Plan Areas
26.10 Signs in Commercial/Public Service Plan Areas
26.11 Signs in Tourist Plan Areas
26.12 Gasoline Price Signs
26.13 Temporary Signs
26.14 Existing Signs

26.0 Purpose: The purpose of this chapter is to promote and protect the public health, welfare, and safety of the general public by implementing regional outdoor advertising regulations pursuant to Article VI of the Compact, to protect property values, create a more attractive economic and business climate, enhance the aesthetic appearance of the physical community, preserve the scenic and natural beauty and provide an enjoyable and pleasing community in accordance with Community Design Subelement of the Land Use Element and related elements of the Goals and Policies. It is further intended to reduce signs or advertising distractions and obstructions that may contribute to traffic accidents.

26.1 Applicability: All signs shall comply with the applicable standards set forth in this Chapter. Except as exempted in Section 26.3, installation, modification or replacement of signs requires review and approval as a project in accordance with this Chapter and other applicable provisions of the Code. In addition, sign projects also may have imposed, as conditions of approval, appropriate provisions of the Design Review Guidelines and the Scenic Quality Improvement Program. Signs within the Meyers Community Plan shall comply with the applicable standards set forth in this Chapter except where the standards have been replaced by substitute community plan standards, in which case the substitute standards shall apply.

26.2 Sign Package Review: As an integral part of TRPA's review of a proposed new facility or development, or expansion of an existing use, or change in use not exempted under Chapter 4, or any sign project application, all locations and areas
The substitute ordinance, in combination with the applicable elements of TRPA's Scenic Resource Management Plan and adopted community plans, redevelopment plans or other TRPA-approved master plans, results in a threshold travel route rating for applicable threshold travel routes of at least 16 for roadway travel routes, or a shoreline travel route rating of at least 8, by July 1, 2007, and does not result in a decline of applicable roadway or shoreline scenic quality ratings.

26.6 General Sign Standards: The following sign standards shall apply to all signs except where specifically provided otherwise:

26.6.A Opaque Background for Internally Illuminated Signs: The background of all internally illuminated signs shall either be of an opaque material which does not transmit light, or shall be of a dark color. This standard shall not apply to signs constructed entirely of neon tubing. Dark colors which meet this standard are listed in Chapter 8 of the Design Review Guidelines Manual.

26.6.B Off-Premise Signs: No sign shall be erected or maintained on a parcel or project area other than the parcel or project area on which the use or activity advertised by the sign is located.

26.6.C Sign Illumination: No sign shall be illuminated by or contain blinking, flashing, intermittent, or moving light or lights, except the time and temperature portion of a sign.

26.6.D Diffuse Lighting: All signs which are illuminated shall be illuminated using indirect or diffuse lighting. No sign shall contain copy which consists of illuminated bulbs or individual lights or light sources. This standard shall not apply to signs constructed entirely of neon tubing.

26.6.E Roof Signs: No sign shall be mounted on the roof of a building or other structure, except for signs mounted on mansard roofs and which do not extend vertically above the top of the mansard.

26.6.F Prohibited Devices: Strings of pennants, banners, ribbons, streamers, balloons, spinners, or other similar moving or fluttering devices, and searchlights shall be prohibited. Signs within the Meyers Community Plan shall not use or include reflective materials on any part of the sign or sign structure.
26.6.G  **Signs Imitating Official Traffic Signs:** No sign shall imitate the color and shape of, or directions given in, an official traffic sign or signal, or use such words as "stop," "caution," "yield," "danger," or "warning."

26.6.H  **Signs Obscuring Vision:** No sign shall be placed such that it unsafely obscures the vision of a motorist upon entering or leaving a street.

26.6.I  **Signs on Natural Features and Other Structures:** No sign shall be affixed to or painted on trees, rocks, or other natural features, utility poles, street sign poles, traffic signal equipment and poles, garbage receptacles, benches, and other types of street furniture, and fences.

26.6.J  **Rotating Signs:** No sign shall rotate or have a rotating or moving part, or parts, except barber poles to the extent required by state law, and clocks and thermometers.

26.6.K  **Signs Attached to Motor Vehicles:** No sign shall be attached to or located on stationary motor vehicles, equipment, trailers and related devices, when used in a manner to augment approved signage for a business as opposed to normal operation or parking of the vehicle, equipment, trailer and related device. This subsection shall not apply to business, company, or government identification signs, or nonstationary motor vehicles.

26.6.L  **Portable Signs:** No sign shall be permitted which is not permanently affixed to the ground or a building, except for the following temporary sign standards for signs within the Meyers Community Plan.

(1) **Temporary Signs for Winter.** Until such time as Caltrans provides a snow haul for plowed snow stored along U.S. 50, businesses located adjacent to U.S. 50 may install temporary signs which meet the design criteria for temporary winter signs listed below provided a permit for the sign is obtained each year. Once the snow haul has begun, no temporary signs will be permitted and the temporary sign provision will be deleted from the Community Plan and substitute sign standards.

**Design Criteria for Temporary Winter Signs:**

a. Each business located adjacent to U.S. 50 may install one temporary sign when plowed
snow along U. S. 50 obscures the visibility of a legally existing freestanding or building sign:
b. The sign shall be placed on private property and may be placed in such a manner as to be visible from U. S. 50;
c. The sign shall be a maximum of 12 square feet in area;
d. The sign shall be constructed of sign board, plywood or sign foam only. No other materials are permitted including, but not limited to, such materials as cloth, banners, pennants, or flags;
e. The sign face shall have a dark background;
f. The sign shall not be internally illuminated;
g. No other temporary signs shall be in place; and
h. The temporary sign shall be removed once the permanent sign face is completely visible from U. S. 50.

26.6.M State of Repair: All signs and components thereof, including supports, braces, and anchors, shall be kept in a state of good repair.

26.6.N Removal of Sign Message: Any sign for which the sign message or face has been removed, leaving only the supporting frame, can, braces, anchors, or similar components, shall, within 30 days of the removal of the message or face, have the message or face replaced with a blank face or new message or face, or shall have the remaining components of the sign removed. This subsection shall not be construed to alter the effect of Section 26.14, which prohibits the replacement of a nonconforming sign.

26.6.O Noncommercial Copy: No provision of this or any related chapter shall be construed as regulating or restricting the use of noncommercial copy or message on any sign which is permitted under this chapter. "Noncommercial copy or message" for purposes of this provision means copy or other message that does not advertise a business or similar economic means for the production of income.

26.6.P Highway Signs: Highway signs, street signs and other regulatory and directional signs which are located on public rights-of-way shall conform to the applicable sign standards set forth in the Manual On Uniform Traffic Control Devices, 1978, or other standards which may be contained in a memorandum of understanding between TRPA and a public agency with jurisdiction over the travel way.
26.6.Q Increases in Maximum Allowed Sign Area: Sign area for building and freestanding signs, which are visible from highways with a posted speed limit of 45 miles per hour or greater, may be allowed up to 20 percent additional sign area over the maximum allowable area for each sign as calculated based on the applicable provisions of this ordinance. Sign area for building and freestanding signs within the Meyers Community Plan which are visible from highways with a posted speed limit of 40 miles per hour or greater, may be allowed up to 20 percent additional sign area over the maximum allowable area for each sign as calculated based on the applicable provisions of this ordinance.

26.6.R Window Signs: Any window sign which exceeds five percent of the window area of any window shall be included in the maximum allowable square footage calculations for building signs. Permanent signs printed on windows are considered to be building signs and shall be included in the maximum allowable square footage calculations under this chapter.

26.10 Signs in Commercial and Public Service Plan Areas: The following standards shall apply to signs located in Commercial and Public Service plan areas, except for certain signs within the Meyers Community Plan. The Meyers Community Plan substitute sign standards are listed below.

26.10.A Building Signs: Each primary use may be allowed one square foot of building sign area for each one linear foot of building frontage up to a maximum of 40 square feet of sign area per building frontage. Maximum height of building signs shall be 15 feet above grade, with a maximum of four building signs permitted per primary use. In instances where the primary use has no building frontage as defined in Chapter 2, but does have a frontage without a public entrance on what is defined as a street, TRPA may allow building signage to be erected upon that alternate frontage. The sign area shall be calculated based upon that alternate frontage. Up to fifty percent of the maximum allowable sign area for building signs may be used in a projecting sign. Projecting signs are defined in Chapter 2.

For building signs within the Meyers Community Plan, the following increase in maximum allowable building sign height may be permitted. Maximum height of building signs which are painted on the building or appear to be painted on the building may be equal to a line formed by the top of the second floor windows or 20 feet above grade, whichever is lower, when the building is determined to conform to the Meyers
historic architectural design theme. This includes signs which are vertically oriented. This provision is not permitted for signs which are internally illuminated, including illumination by neon.

26.10.D Directional Signs: Directional signs which are no greater than four square feet in area, no greater than six feet in height, contain no advertising copy, and are not located within the yard setbacks required by the applicable local jurisdiction, may be allowed, and shall not be included in the total allowable sign area for each use. Directional signs which do not meet these standards may be allowed provided they are counted as part of the total sign area allowed for building signs or freestanding signs, as applicable.

20.10.E Transfer of Certain Building Sign Area Within the Meyers Community Plan. Building sign area for building signs within the Meyers Community Plan which may otherwise be permitted under this chapter may be transferred from the building frontage against which the permissible sign area is determined to another side of the same building which does not have a building frontage as defined by Chapter 2 provided the following conditions are met.

a. The building on which the signage is to be transferred is determined to conform to the Meyers historic architectural design theme;

b. The sign area is completely transferred such that no signage remains or is installed on the frontage from which the sign area was transferred;

c. The building side receiving the transferred sign area is the side adjacent to the building frontage from which the sign area is transferred;

d. The transfer may occur one time per primary use;

e. The transferred sign area is not internally illuminated, is not used in a projecting sign and is found to be consistent with the Meyers Community Plan Design Review Guidelines for Building Signs on Historic Theme Buildings; and

f. The transfer to the building side receiving the transferred area does not result in a total building sign area greater than 27 square feet, regardless of sign ownership or arrangement of uses within the building.

26.14 Existing Signs: An existing sign is a sign that is legally existing or approved on November 27, 1989.

26.14.A Conforming Sign: A sign that is existing as of the effective date of this Chapter, which complies with the standards set forth in this Chapter is a conforming sign.
26.14.B Nonconforming Sign: A sign that is existing as of the effective date of this Chapter, which does not comply with the applicable standards set forth in this Chapter is a nonconforming sign.

26.14.C Removal of Nonconforming Signs: Nonconforming signs shall be conformed, if conformity is possible, or removed as follows, including substitute standards for non-conforming signs within the Meyers Community Plan.

1) This subparagraph--shall--become--effective--on October--27--1990--r Where the cost of conforming the sign is less than one hundred dollars or where the sign is valued at less than one hundred dollars, such sign shall be conformed or removed within one year after the effective date of this subparagraph.

2) If a nonconforming sign is destroyed or damaged to an extent in excess of 50 percent of the sign value.

3) If the sign is relocated.

4) This subparagraph--shall--become--effective--on October--27--1990--r If the sign is altered structurally, or if more than 50 percent of the copy as measured by the sign area is altered, except for changeable copy signs and maintenance. Existing non-conforming signs within the Meyers Community Plan shall be brought into conformance with the sign standards, as amended by the Meyers Community Plan, if a sign is altered structurally, or if the sign face is altered, except for maintenance.

5) This subparagraph--shall--become--effective--on October--27--1990--r If the business or use for which the nonconforming sign(s) was installed is expanded or modified, and if the value of the expansion or modification exceeds 50 percent of the value of the existing improvements. All improvements to a single business or use within any 12-month period shall be treated cumulatively in the administration of this subparagraph.

6) This subparagraph--shall--become--effective--on October--27--1990--r Nonconforming signs which are visible in whole, or in part, from any scenic threshold roadway or shoreline travel route shall be made to conform to the standards set forth in this Chapter or shall be removed, in accordance with the following schedule:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of Sign</th>
<th>Time In Which Sign Shall Conform or Be Removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not over $5,000</td>
<td>October 1, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,001 - $10,000</td>
<td>October 1, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than $10,000</td>
<td>October 1, 1997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7) On the happening of any of the events described in Subparagraphs (2) and (3) above, the sign or signs shall be immediately brought into compliance with this chapter with a new permit secured therefor, or shall be removed.

(8) This paragraph shall become effective on October 1, 1993. On the happening of the events described in Subparagraphs (4) and (5), above, the sign or signs shall be immediately brought into compliance with this chapter with a new permit secured therefor, or shall be removed.

(9) Sign value shall be determined based on an actual sales receipt for the sign, a cost estimate for the replacement cost provided by a qualified professional, or the replacement cost as determined in the current edition of the Signwriters Guide to Easier Pricing, whichever is greater.

(10) Exceptions to subparagraphs (1) through (8) of this subsection may be approved for existing signs provided the following findings can be made:

   (a) The exception is in harmony with the purpose and intent of the sign ordinance;
   
   (b) There are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved, or to the intended use of the property that are not contemplated or provided for by this ordinance;
   
   (c) The approval of the exception will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare;
   
   (d) Alternative signage concepts that comply with the provision to which the exception is requested have been evaluated, and undue hardship would result if the strict adherence to the provision is required;
   
   (e) A scenic quality analysis demonstrates that the exception, if approved, will be consistent with the threshold attainment findings listed in the Scenic Resources Management Package Final Environmental Impact Statement, 1989;
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE NO. 93--

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 87-9, AS AMENDED, BY AMENDING THE REGIONAL PLAN OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY, AS AMENDED; ADOPTING THE MEYERS COMMUNITY PLAN; AMENDING PLAN AREA STATEMENT 125 AND PLAN AREA OVERLAY MAPS RELATING TO THE COMMUNITY PLAN; AMENDING LAND CAPABILITY OVERLAY MAPS F-21 AND F-22; AMENDING PLAN AREA BOUNDARIES BETWEEN PLAN AREA 125 AND PLAN AREA 121; AMENDING CHAPTERS 26 AND 30 TO PROVIDE SUBSTITUTE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES; AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO.

The Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency does ordain as follows:

Section 1.00   Findings

1.10   It is necessary and desirable to amend TRPA Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, which ordinance relates to the Regional Plan, by adopting the Meyers Community Plan, amending Plan Area Statement 125 and the associated plan area overlays relating to the community plan, amending land capability overlay maps F-21 and F-22, amending the boundary between Plan Area Statements 121 and 125, and amending Chapters 26 and 30 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances to include substitute standards and guidelines for the Meyers Community Plan, to further implement the Regional Plan pursuant to the Land Use Subelement of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies, Chapter 14 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and Article VI(a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact and Regional Plan.

1.20   The Advisory Planning Commission ("APC") held a public hearing on the adoption of the Meyers Community Plan and related plan area statement, overlay map and Code amendments and recommended adoption. The Governing Board has also conducted a noticed public hearing on the adoption of the Meyers Community Plan and related amendments. Oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and considered at those public hearings.

1.30   Based on the preparation of an environmental assessment pursuant to Chapter 5 of the TRPA Code, these amendments have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and are therefore exempt from the requirement of an environmental impact statement pursuant to Article VII of the Compact.

1.40   The Governing Board finds that, prior to the adoption of this ordinance, the Board made the findings required by Sections 6.4 and 6.5 of the Code and Article V(g) of the Compact. With respect to the Code amendments, the Board further finds that, prior to the adoption of the amendments, it made the findings required by Section 2.40 of Ordinance 87-8 and that such findings were supported by a preponderance of the evidence.
The Governing Board finds that the amendments adopted hereby will continue to implement the Regional Plan, as amended, in a manner that achieves and maintains the environmental thresholds as required by Article V(c) of the Compact.

Each of the foregoing findings is supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Section 2.00 Adoption of the Meyers Community Plan

Subsection 6.10 of Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, is hereby further amended to add subparagraph (25) as follows:

"(25) Meyers Community Plan, October 27, 1993."

Section 3.00 Amendment of Plan Area Statement 125

Subsection 6.10(2) of Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, is hereby further amended to add subparagraph (bb) as follows:

(bb) As amended by the deletion of Plan Area Statement 125 and the substitution of the Meyers Community Plan, October 27, 1993.

Section 4.00 Amendment of Plan Area Overlay Maps

Subsection 6.20 (1) of TRPA Ordinance 87-9, as amended, is hereby further amended to add subparagraph (q) as follows:

(q) Relocate the boundary between Plan Areas 121 and 125 as shown on Attachment A, dated October 15, 1993, and redesignate Plan Area 125 as the Meyers Community Plan, which amendments shall be incorporated into the Plan Area Overlays, dated January 1987.

Section 5.00 Amendment of Regional Plan Land Capability Overlay Maps

Subsection 6.20(2) of Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, is hereby further amended to add subparagraph (i) as follows:


Section 6.00 Amendment of Chapters 26 and 30 of the Code of Ordinances

6.10 Chapter 26 is hereby amended as set forth in Attachment D, October 18, 1993, to add the underlined language as shown for Sections 26.1, 26.6., 26.10 and 26.14.

6.20 Chapter 30, Section 30.2 is hereby amended to add the underlined language as follows:
30.2 Design Review Guidelines: Design and site planning methods and techniques shall be set forth in a handbook called Design Review Guidelines except that design review guidelines for the Meyers Community Plan are set forth in the adopted community plan.

Section 7.00 Interpretation and Severability

The provisions of this ordinance and the amendments to the Regional Plan Package adopted hereby shall be liberally construed to effect their purposes. If any section, clause, provision or portion of this ordinance or the amendments adopted hereby is declared unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this ordinance, or the amendments to the Regional Plan Package, shall not be affected thereby. For this purpose, the provisions of this ordinance and the amendments are hereby declared respectively severable.

Section 8.00 Effective Date

Sections 2.00, 3.00, 4.00 and 5.00 of this ordinance shall be effective immediately. Section 6.00 of this ordinance shall be effective 60 days after the date of its adoption.

PASSED and ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held __________, 1993, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent:

John E. Upton, Vice Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin

Meyers Community Plan

REPLACEMENT PAGES ONLY

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

October 27, 1993
CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

Meyers was first established in the 1850's as a way station near its present location in the lower Lake Valley along the Upper Truckee River. In 1859, Martin Smith, Meyers' original developer, sold the station to Yank Clement, who renamed it Yank's Station. The station provided food, lodging, water and pasture to the thousands of travelers and their animals travelling over Echo Summit along the Great Bonanza Road. Yank's Station included a hotel, two saloons, a general store, a blacksmith shop, a cooperage, private homes and stables and barns. From 1860 to 1881 it served as a remount station for the Pony Express and is listed as a California Historical Landmark. In 1873, Clement sold the establishment to George Meyers who owned it for thirty years before selling it to the Celio family.

During the 1960's, the area around Meyers was part of a grand residential subdivision plan originally developed by two corporations, Tahoe Paradise Homes and Tahoe Paradise Properties, Inc. The new neighborhoods were to be called Tahoe Paradise. Since then the entire area is referred to as either Meyers or Tahoe Paradise, although the commercial district is generally identified as Meyers. Today, Meyers still functions as a way station for visitors and the gateway to the Lake Tahoe area. The commercial area along Highways 50 and 89 still retains the name of Meyers while the surrounding residential neighborhoods are generally known as Tahoe Paradise. In addition to its gateway function, Meyers also serves several thousand surrounding residents by providing variety of retail goods and services. Unlike other communities in the Tahoe Basin which are located along the lake's shore, Meyers is separated from intense commercialization. It retains its own character while providing a variety of land uses.

This document represents the future land use and development plan for the existing Meyers commercial district and includes all lands within TRPA Plan Area 125, Meyers Commercial (Figure 1-1). The plan area is roughly 15 acres in size, approximately 50 of which are located in the Meyers Industrial Tract located south of the U.S. 50 and California 89 intersection in the Upper Lake Valley (Highway 97). The remaining 105 acres are generally devoted to commercial retail, service and light industrial uses. Meyers also contains several local, state and federal public service land uses and serves as a hub for public services in unincorporated El Dorado County including: U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, California Department of Transportation, California Department of Parks and Recreation, California State Department of Parks and Recreation, and U.S. Forest Service.
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Meyers is surrounded by spectacular mountain peaks, mature pine and fir forests. The Upper Truckee River forms the southern edge of the plan area. Other edges of Meyers are bounded by the Tahoe Paradise Golf Course, residential neighborhoods, Washoe Meadows State Park and national forest lands (Figure 1-2). Perhaps the most dominant element within the Meyers landscape is the U.S. Highway 50 right-of-way. Originally planned to contain a high speed freeway, the right of way is up to 240 feet wide in places and contains only two and three lanes of actual roadway. The result is a large area of disturbed and undeveloped public "no man's land" which adversely impacts the sense of community. The freeway concept has been discarded as inappropriate for the Tahoe Region, however, the right-of-way remains. Future use of the right of way provides the community plan with opportunities as well as constraints.
B. PURPOSE OF THE COMMUNITY PLAN

The community plan for Meyers is intended to serve as the comprehensive land use and development plan through the year 1997. The plan establishes goals and objectives, special policies, programs, and strategies for funding and implementation. It provides an important opportunity to improve the form and function of the commercial neighborhood and help establish a sense of place.

The Community Plan contains a new Community Plan Area Statement which replaces the existing TRPA Plan Area Statement 125, Meyers Commercial. It also amends the El Dorado County General Plan and designates land uses within the boundaries of the Community Plan area. The Community Plan will be incorporated into the County’s 2010 General Plan upon adoption. Following 1997, the plan will be updated regularly to provide a blueprint for continued prosperity and improvement of the community.

C. COMMUNITY PLAN SITE ANALYSIS

The planning process began with a general site analysis of the plan area (Figure 1-3). The analysis identifies existing conditions, both positive and negative, within the plan area. It also identifies opportunities and constraints to the development of future land uses and the redevelopment of existing uses. A summary is listed below.

Site Analysis Opportunities

* Location: Gateway to the Tahoe Basin, first stop for visitors entering over Echo Summit and Luther Pass; historic Pony Express stop/way station.

* Setting: Surrounded by spectacular mountain vistas; many opportunities to access nearby outdoor recreation; Upper Truckee River is an under used resource.

* Sense of Community: Many business operators and nearby residents identify with the community of Meyers.

* Surrounding Neighborhoods: Convenience retail and service needs create a market niche to serve residential neighborhoods.

* Vacant Land: An adequate supply of privately owned, vacant, high capability land exists within the plan area for future development.

Site Analysis Constraints

* Existing Land Use Pattern: Commercial strip, much of it in a filled SEZ.

* U.S. 50 Right-Of-Way: Large, apparently abandoned area of land; existing businesses set too far back; too many public directional and private business signs in the ROW; through traffic travels too fast.

* Appearance of Neglect: Many business in need of renovation; County and TRPA do not enforce existing land use and site development regulations.

* Winter Snows: Plowed snow in front of businesses blocks visibility; queues.
The plan's land use element will discourage perpetuating the strip commercial land use pattern along U.S. 50 by consolidating most additional commercial development into three land use districts. A total of five land use districts are created to replace the existing Plan Area Statement and County zoning. Each district is described in Chapter 2 and contains a specific development theme and list of permissible land uses.

The Plan advocates implementing several environmental improvement projects in the areas of water quality, stream environment zone restoration, visual and scenic quality, transportation and circulation. They are highlighted on the Land Use Concept Plan and described in subsequent chapters of the plan.

The Land Use Concept Plan illustrates generalized land use patterns and identifies needed community-wide improvements. Improvements come in two forms: public improvements paid for collectively for all to enjoy; and private improvements funded by private resources intended to produce a more attractive (and profitable) business setting. Specific plan policies and standards are implemented (enforced) as part of each project, public or private.

Please note that the Land Use Concept Plan is for illustration purposes only. It does not require nor approve any specific projects.
F. SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY PLAN PROGRAMS AND ACTIONS

Transportation and Circulation

Highway 50 Improvements. Improvements include constructing the Pat Lowe Memorial Bike Trail with future connections to surrounding recreation opportunities, addition of a center landscaped median with turn pockets along U.S. 50 through most of Meyers, better organization and some elimination of chain up areas along U.S. 50 and reduction/consolidation of existing directional signage which is cluttered and poorly located. Sale of portions of the existing non-operational right-of-way to adjacent property owners is an important land use improvement to reduce the corridor's dominance.

Transit and Parking Improvements. Improvements include using shared driveways and parking to encourage people to get out of their cars and reduce highway friction, increased transit service and stops by STAGE and other service providers, a new community park & ride facility and transit shelters at all transit stops.

Community Design

Community Design Program. Improvements recommended by the plan include implementing a comprehensive community design program to improve the appearance of new and existing structures. Add landscaping, reduce signage and outdoor advertising displays, create a public gateway into the community using public design features.

Environmental Improvements


Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) Restoration. Restore existing disturbed SEZ lands in conjunction with the Pat Lowe Bike Trail along U.S. 50, restore SEZ lands behind Yank's Station and at the end of Minal Street cul-de-sac.

Protection of Western Juniper Trees. Conservation of all existing Western juniper trees as part of project development.

Scenic Quality Improvements. Implement site planning and signage improvements identified in TRPA's 1989 Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) and the Community Design Program to attain a travel route threshold rating of at least 16 for portions of travel route unit #36 within the community plan area. Preserve existing views from Meyers to the surrounding background landscape.
Recreation Facilities

Meyers Visitors Center. The interagency visitors center will serve as a primary source of information for visitors entering the Tahoe basin. The visitors center will open in 1992 with a temporary display near the Little Switzerland site while planning and environmental analysis for the permanent site is completed. Include access and interpretive opportunities to the adjacent Upper Truckee River.

Tahoe Paradise Golf Course. Although not within the community plan, the existing Tahoe Paradise golf is close enough to the Yank's Station land use district to be an important attraction in terms of bringing people to the area. Redeveloping either or both uses should recognize and improve the connection.

Public Service Facilities

Meyers is home to several local and regional public service uses. Many of the existing uses have expressed a desire to expand or upgrade their facilities. In particular, development of a new, full service post office is proposed to be located in either the Yanks Station or the West Meyers district. Architectural and site planning improvements to the existing state agricultural inspection station are recommended.
C. MEYERS COMMUNITY PLAN AREA STATEMENT

The Community Plan Area Statement supersedes TRPA's existing Plan Area Statement 125, Meyers Commercial and amends El Dorado County's 1969 General Plan.

PLAN DESIGNATION:

- Land Use Classification: COMMERCIAL/PUBLIC SERVICE
- Management Strategy: MITIGATION
- Special Designations: TDR RECEIVING AREA FOR:
  1. Existing Development
  2. Multi-Residential Units (Special Area #3 only)
  SCENIC RESTORATION AREA

DESCRIPTION:

Location: The community plan area includes the commercial and public service uses along U.S. Highway 50 and the Industrial Tract area along California 89. It is located on TRPA maps F-21 and F-22.

Existing Uses: Meyers was developed during the 1960s and 1970s and today typifies a traditional strip commercial land use pattern. It presently contains convenience retail/gas markets, Yank's Station, small restaurants, miscellaneous office and retail uses, and an industrial park. The Industrial Tract contains storage and warehouses and state highway maintenance facilities. Several local, state and federal public services facilities are located throughout the plan area.

Existing Environment: The plan area is approximately 1,565 acres in size. The majority of it lies in a relatively flat, alpine meadow known as the Lake Valley, bordered on one side by the Upper Truckee River. The Industrial Tract is located in the adjacent Upper Lake Valley, drained by the Upper Truckee River. The area's geomorphology consists of alluvial lands and outwash deposits. Land capability mapping is shown in Chapter 4.

PLANNING STATEMENT: Meyers serves as the gateway to the southern end of the Lake Tahoe Basin. It should continue to serve as a commercial and public service center for El Dorado County. It should serve as an access point to surrounding recreational opportunities on public and private lands.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. As the gateway to the Lake Tahoe basin, Meyers provides a clear sense of entry and arrival to one of the nation's premier resort areas.
2. The extremely wide U.S. 50 right-of-way has acted as a constraint to the establishment of appropriate and compatible commercial land uses and to the attainment and maintenance of environmental values. There
are numerous illegal encroachments into the right-of-way by adjacent businesses. This has perpetuated the strip commercial appearance.

3. A community design program will foster architectural, site planning and signage improvements. The improvements will assist in improving the travel route rating scenic threshold for Roadway Unit 36.

4. Improved transit service between Meyers and other destinations around the south shore is needed.

5. A land use pattern which concentrates commercial uses is needed to eliminate the existing strip commercial appearance and function.

6. U.S. 50 and California 89 are designated State Scenic Highways and TRPA Regional Scenic Highway Corridors.

7. Recognize the adjacent Tahoe Paradise Golf Course and club house as an integral part of the Yank's Station commercial core.

COMMUNITY PLAN OBJECTIVES AND SPECIAL POLICIES:

Utilizing the community plan goals established in Chapter 1, the following objectives and special policies shall be implemented as part of the community plan. Objectives represent desired ends or results. Policies are to be implemented as the means to achieve objectives. Chapter 7 identifies specific means to implement the policies.

Land Use and Economic Development Goal: Maintain the long term economic health and stability of the plan area by providing a diverse mix of commercial, recreational and public service land uses in five separate land use districts which serve both residents and tourists.

Land Use Objectives:

1. Discourage perpetuating the strip commercial land use pattern and appearance. Designate % specific land use districts within the community plan as priority areas to accommodate additional commercial development. Provide appropriate land use opportunities to realize the intent and theme of each district.

2. Encourage the following uses to locate or remain within the community plan: indoor and outdoor recreation, a full-service community market, a community meeting facility, California Highway Patrol offices, day care or preschool facility, a full-service post office and a bed and breakfast inn.

3. Discourage additional service stations, convenience retail stores, car sales lots and outdoor retail sales along U.S. 50.

4. Encourage the USDA Forest Service and other participating partners to develop a permanent visitors center in the community plan area.

5. Provide opportunities to improve the connections between the community plan area and the adjacent Tahoe Paradise Golf Course.

6. Provide opportunities to transfer existing commercial land uses which are located near the community plan area to relocate into the community plan area.
Economic Development Objectives:

1. From plan adoption until December 31, 1996, an additional 15,400 square feet of commercial floor may be allocated within the Community Plan Area. Incentive programs should assign priority to commercial development projects which meet community plan objectives.

   Policy: Projects seeking allocations of additional commercial floor area within the plan area shall be subject to the plan's Commercial Floor Area Allocation Procedures (Appendix C). TRPA and El Dorado County shall only consider for approval projects recommended by the Meyers Town Council.

   Policy: Allocation procedure B.1 (Location Within Priority Land Use Districts) established by the Commercial Floor Area Allocation Procedures shall not be revised or amended for at least two years from the date of plan adoption.

   Policy: In the event that additional commercial floor area is allocated to the plan area, it shall be distributed to each priority group identified in Appendix C in the same proportions as the existing allocation.

2. From Community Plan adoption until December 31, 1996, provide other incentives such as 10 tourist accommodation bonus units and additional land coverage to encourage area-wide improvements. Incentive programs should assign priority to commercial development projects which meet community plan objectives.

   Policy: Projects seeking allocations of additional tourist accommodation units within the plan area shall be designed consistent with the Community Design Review Guidelines (Appendix A).

3. Encourage land uses, development projects and activities that will enhance the "year round" economy.

4. A special events area for arts and crafts shows, seasonal sales, and other similar events should be established.

   Policy: The preferred temporary events site is the proposed community park and ride facility. It should be designed in such a manner that it can accommodate both uses.

Community Design Goal: Implement a comprehensive community design program which will improve the visual quality of the commercial area and help Meyers establish a sense of permanence.

Objectives:

1. Improve the physical appearance of all areas within the plan area. Encourage rehabilitation through the remodeling, upgrading, landscaping, and aesthetic improvement of buildings, other structures and signage.
Policy: All projects which expand or relocate units of use, including land coverage, shall implement or commit to a five year schedule to implement, the landscape improvements fronting its project area. The improvements are described in the Community Design Review Guidelines (Appendix A) and are generally shown in Figure 4-2, Community Design Plan. This policy may be waived if the project is in an assessment district already committed to the improvements.

Policy. Outdoor retail sales and displays visible from U.S. 50 or California 89 shall be consistent with the outdoor display guidelines contained in the Design Review Guidelines. Outdoor storage of items to be sold or rented (not sales displays) shall not be visible from U.S. 50 or California 89.

Policy: Land uses in the U.S. 50 non-operational right-of-way which may be acquired by adjoining property owners shall be limited to parking, decks, paths, signage, landscaping, lighting and water quality control facilities.

2. Develop and implement design review guidelines unique to the Meyers area which reinforce the community design goal and establish the "historic Meyers" architectural design theme.

Policy: All projects shall be consistent with applicable sections of the Community Design Plan and Design Review Guidelines (Appendix A). Appropriate guidelines may be added as conditions of approval.

3. Develop and implement substitute signs standards to TRPA and El Dorado County sign standards which provide opportunities for visible signage for all uses. Include recommendations for appropriate media and materials. Recognize and respond to the constraints created by the unusually wide U.S. 50 right-of-way and potential snow depths.

Policy: Signage shall be subject to the standards established in the Community Plan Substitute Sign Standards (Appendix B).

4. Implement a cooperative sign reduction and consolidation program with Caltrans for signs located within U.S. 50 and California 89 rights-of-way. Remove, reduce and consolidate highway informational and directional signage wherever possible.

5. Participate in the south shore’s Art in Public Places program. Encourage placement of public art within the community plan area.

6. Encourage scenic resource and related community design improvements within the U.S. 50 corridor through implementation of the Pat Lowe Bike Trail.

7. In consultation with Caltrans, revise current snow plowing and storage operations to improve visibility of adjacent businesses, reduce signage needs and maintain landscape plantings.
PERMISSIBLE USES: Pursuant to Chapter 18 PERMISSIBLE USES, the following primary uses may be permitted within all or a portion of the Community Plan Area. The list indicates if the use is allowed (A) or must be considered under the provisions for a special use (S). Existing uses not listed shall be considered nonconforming uses within the Community Plan Area. The establishment of new uses not listed shall be prohibited within the Community Plan Area.

Yank's Station Land Use District (Special Area #1): The following list of permissible uses is applicable in the Yank's Station land use district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Employee housing (A) and multiple person dwelling (S).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>Bed and breakfast facilities (A), and hotel, motel and other transient dwelling units (S).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>A. Retail Building materials and hardware (A), eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (A), furniture, home furnishings and equipment (A), general merchandise stores (A), mail order and vending (S), nursery (A), outdoor retail sales (S), and service stations (S).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Entertainment Amusements and recreation services (A), privately owned assembly and entertainment (S), and outdoor amusements (S).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Services Animal husbandry services (A), auto repair and service (S), broadcasting studios (A), business support services (A), contract construction services (S), financial services (A), health care services (A), personal services (A), professional offices (A), repair services (S), and schools - business and vocational (S).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Light Industrial Printing and publishing (S) and small scale manufacturing (S).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Wholesale/Storage Wholesale and distribution (S).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>A. General Churches (S A), collection stations (S), cultural facilities (A), day care centers and pre-schools (A), government offices (A), hospitals (S), local assembly and entertainment (S), local post office (A), local public health and safety facilities (S A), membership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
organizations (A), publicly owned assembly and entertainment (S), public utility centers (S), regional public health and safety facilities (S), and social service organizations (A).

B. Linear Public Facilities
- Pipelines and power transmission (S), transit stations and terminals (A), transportation routes (S), and transmission and receiving facilities (S).

Recreation
- Cross country ski courses (A), day use areas (A), outdoor recreation concessions (S), participant sport facilities (S), recreation centers (S), riding and hiking trails (A), sport assembly (S), and visitor information centers (A).

Resource Management
- A. Timber Management
  - Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), and timber stand improvement (A).

- B. Wildlife and Fish
  - Early successional stage vegetation management (A), nonstructural fish habitat management (A), nonstructural wildlife habitat management (A), structural fish habitat management (A), and structural wildlife habitat management (A).

- C. Open Space
  - Allowed in all areas of the region.

- D. Vegetation Protection
  - Fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment/management (A), insect and disease suppression (A), sensitive plant management (A), and uncommon plant community management (A).

- E. Watershed Improvements
  - Erosion control (A), runoff control (A), and stream environment zone restoration (A).

Lake Valley Land Use District (Special Area #2): The following list of permissible uses is applicable in the Lake Valley land use district.

Residential
- Employee housing (A) and single family dwelling (S).

Tourist Accommodation
- Bed and breakfast facilities (A).
Commercial

Amusements and recreation services (S), outdoor retail sales (S), personal services (A), privately owned assembly and entertainment (S), and outdoor amusements (S).

Public Service

A. General
Churches (S), cultural facilities (A), day care centers and pre-schools (A), government offices (A), hospitals (S), local assembly and entertainment (A), local post office (S), local public health and safety facilities (S), membership organizations (A), publicly owned assembly and entertainment (S), public utility centers (S), regional public health and safety facilities (S), and social service organizations (A).

B. Linear Public Facilities
Pipelines and power transmission (S), transit stations and terminals (A), transportation routes (S), and transmission and receiving facilities (S).

Recreation

Cross country ski courses (A), day use areas (A), outdoor recreation concessions (A), participant sports facilities (S), recreation centers (A), riding and hiking trails (A), and visitor information centers (A).

Resource Management

Same as Special Area #1.

West Meyers Land Use District (Special Area #3): The following list of permissible uses is applicable in the West Meyers land use district.

Residential

Employee housing (S), multiple family dwelling (S), and single family dwelling (A).

Tourist Accommodation

Bed and breakfast facilities (A).

Commercial

A. Retail
Building materials and hardware (S), eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (A), furniture, home furnishings and equipment (A), general merchandise stores (A), nursery (S), and service stations (S).

B. Entertainment
Amusements and recreation services (A), privately owned assembly and entertainment (S), and outdoor amusements (S).
C. **Services**
Animal husbandry services (S), broadcasting studios (A), business support services (A), financial services (A), health care services (A), personal services (A), professional offices (A), and repair services (S).

D. **Light Industrial**
Printing and publishing (S).

E. **Wholesale/Storage**
Warehousing (S) and wholesale and distribution (S).

Public Service

A. **General**
Churches (S), collection stations (S), cultural facilities (A), day care centers and pre-schools (A), government offices (A), local assembly and entertainment (S), local post office (A), local public health and safety facilities (S), membership organizations (A), publicly owned assembly and entertainment (S), public utility centers (S), regional public health and safety facilities (S), and social service organizations (A).

B. **Linear Public Facilities**
Pipelines and power transmission (S), transit stations and terminals (A), transportation routes (S), and transmission and receiving facilities (S).

Recreation

Cross country ski courses (A), day use areas (A), outdoor recreation concessions (A), participant sports facilities (A), recreation centers (A), riding and hiking trails (A), and visitor information centers (A).

Resource Management

Same as Special Area #1.

**Industrial Tract Land Use District (Special Area #4):** The following list of permissible uses is applicable in the Industrial Tract land use district.

Commercial

A. **Retail**
Auto, mobile home and vehicle dealers (S), building materials and hardware (A), eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (S), furniture, home furnishings and equipment (A) general merchandise stores (S), mail order and vending (A), nursery (A), and outdoor retail sales (A).
B. **Services**
Animal husbandry services (A), auto repair and service (S), broadcasting studios (A), business support services (A), contract construction services (A), financial services (S), health care services (S), laundries and dry cleaning plants (S), personal services (A), professional offices (S), repair services (A), sales lots (S), and secondary storage (S).

C. **Light Industrial**
Food and kindred products (A), fuel and ice dealers (A), industrial services (S), printing and publishing (A), recycling and scrap (S), and small scale manufacturing (S).

D. **Wholesale/Storage**
Storage yards (S), vehicle and freight terminals (S), vehicle storage and parking (A), warehousing (A), and wholesale and distribution (A).

**Public Service**

A. **General**
Collection stations (A), cultural facilities (S), day care centers and pre-schools (S), government offices (S), local assembly and entertainment (S), local public health and safety facilities (A), public utility centers (S), and regional public health and safety facilities (S), and special/special organizations (A).

B. **Linear Public Facilities**
Pipelines and power transmission (S), transit stations and terminals (A), transportation routes (S), and transmission and receiving facilities (S).

**Recreation**
Cross country ski courses (A), outdoor recreation concessions (S), participant sports facilities (S), riding and hiking trails (A), and rural sports (S).

**Resource Management**
Same as Special Area #1.

**Upper Truckee River Land Use District (Special Area #5):** The following list of permissible uses is applicable in the Upper Truckee River land use district.

**Residential**
Single family dwelling (A).

**Tourist**
Bed and breakfast facilities (S).
Public Service - A. General
Cultural facilities (S), day care centers and
preschools (S), and local public health and
safety facilities (S).

B. Linear Public Facilities
Pipelines and power transmission (S), transit
stations and terminals (A), transportation
routes (S), and transmission and receiving
facilities (S).

Recreation - Cross country ski courses (S), day use areas (S),
riding and hiking trails (A), and visitor
information centers (A).

Resource Management - Same as Special Area #1.

MAXIMUM DENSITIES: Pursuant to Chapter 21 DENSITY, the following list establishes the maximum allowable densities that may be permitted for any parcel located within the Community Plan Area. The actual development permitted may be further limited by transfer of development rights limitations, residential density incentive programs, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Dwelling</td>
<td>15 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Person Dwelling</td>
<td>25 people per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Tourist Accommodation   |                 |
| Bed and Breakfast       | 10 units per acre |
| Hotel, Motel and other  |                 |
| Transient Units         | 40 units per acre |
| -with less than 10%     |                 |
| of units with kitchens  | 15 units per acre |
| -with 10% or more units |                 |
| with kitchens           |                 |

RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS: Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of residential bonus units which may be permitted for this Community Plan Area is 0 units.

TOURIST ACCOMMODATION BONUS UNITS: Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of tourist accommodation bonus units which may be permitted for this Community Plan Area is 10 units.

ADDITIONAL DEVELOPED OUTDOOR RECREATION: The following are the PAOT targets and limits for additional developed outdoor recreation facilities specified in Chapter 13 to be located within this Community Plan Area. These and other recreation target projects are addressed in the TRPA Five-Year Recreation Program pursuant to Chapter 33 Allocation of Development. The following additional capacities allowed are measured in persons at one time:
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COMMERCIAL FLOOR AREA ALLOCATION: Pursuant to Chapter 33, the maximum amount of commercial floor area which may be allocated for additional development in the Community Plan Area until December 31, 1996, is 15,400 square feet.

MAXIMUM CUMULATIVE NOISE LEVEL: The maximum cumulative noise equivalent level for the Community Plan Area is 65 CNEL. The following noise performance standards shall also be met.

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR STATIONARY OR INDUSTRIAL NOISE SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daytime</th>
<th>Nighttime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7 a.m. - 7 p.m.)</td>
<td>(7 p.m. - 7 a.m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptor</td>
<td>$1,2,3,5</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,2,3,5</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Leg dB</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Level, dB</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. The hourly Leg and the maximum level noise standards specified above shall be lowered by 5 dB for simple tone noises, noises consisting primarily of speech or music, or for recurring impulsive noises.

2. The standards shall be applied at the plan area boundary and at the property line of any residential use within the community plan area.

3. In addition to the performance standards, stationary or industrial noise sources which may impact land uses in adjacent plan area(s) must comply with the Plan Area Statement CNEL standards of the adjacent plan area(s).
3. Encourage El Dorado County, transit providers and recreation area shuttles to increase transit service to and from Meyers. Provide high quality transit stops and facilities which encourage ridership and are designed consistent with the Community Plan Design Review Guidelines.

Policy: Strategically locate transit stops in each land use district as the need and demand is demonstrated.

Policy: Transit shelters shall be provided at all transit stops. Transit shelters shall be designed consistent with the Community Plan Design Review Guidelines.

4. Provide park and ride opportunities in Meyers. Encourage the use of shared community parking areas which can serve the land use districts.

Policy: Develop a community park and ride facility within the community plan area which can be served by transit and recreation area shuttles. The preferred site is the vacant State of California parcel 02/27404/07/AGRICULTURE/SITE adjacent to the Agricultural Inspection Station.

5. In consultation with El Dorado Caltrans, TRPA and the California Highway Patrol 32/23000/25000/14 cooperatively redesign the chain-up areas and modify chain-up procedures including short term truck parking, along U.S. 50. Consider using the park and ride facility 32/25000/14 adjacent to the Agricultural Inspection Station as an alternate chain-up area. Provide community input and assistance in developing and implementing the improvements.

Policy: Caltrans, the California Highway Patrol, 32/23000/25000/14 TRPA and other interested parties shall develop an action plan to improve chain control operations which minimize adverse impacts to circulation and traffic flow and provide safe and efficient chain-up opportunities. This may include developing a designated chain-up area(s) along U.S. 50.

6. Encourage pedestrian and bicycle linkages between land uses. Accommodate pedestrians throughout the community plan area by providing safe, functional pathways.

Policy: Support development of the Pat Lowe Memorial Bike Trail.

7. Reduce the number of vehicular access points and other points of conflict along U.S. 50. Encourage the use of shared driveways along U.S. 50. Coordinate the access locations with the planned U.S. 50 center median.

Policy: As a condition of project approval, reduce or consolidate the number of access points along U.S. 50 to improve traffic flow and eliminate vehicle conflicts with pedestrians and bicyclists. This policy shall apply to uses with more than one U.S. 50 access and to adjoining uses with access points less than 100 feet apart where the site layouts will accommodate the combined access without major modification.
8. Recognize the status of U.S. 50 and California 89 as state and regionally-designated scenic highway corridors. Maintain and improve the scenic quality of the corridors and their viewsheds.

Policy: Transportation projects shall be designed consistent with the Community Design Plan and Design Review Guidelines.

Policy: Request Caltrans to implement a snow removal and snow haul program to remove plowed snow from in front of U.S. 50 businesses. Assist in developing alternate snow storage sites and funding sources.

9. Reduce the visual dominance of the U.S. 50 highway corridor through Meyers.

Policy: Request Caltrans to make available for sale or other means of transfer, excess right-of-way along U.S. 50 to adjacent property owners.

Policy: Develop a center lane landscaped median along U.S. 50 through the community plan area which provides access and visibility to adjoining land uses, and permits turn movements at cross street intersections.

C. COMMUNITY PLAN TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION IMPROVEMENTS

The following improvements are necessary to implement the policies listed above. The improvements generally reflect or refine items listed in Volume III of the RTP/AQP. They are shown in Figure 3-1. Additional discussion of improvements, estimated costs and methods of implementation is located in Chapter 7, Implementation.

Streets and Highways

1. Consolidate Existing Driveways Along U.S. 50. Reduce and/or consolidate existing access points along U.S. 50 consistent with the access policy listed above under Objective #7. The policy establishes criteria to determine which driveways will be affected. Targeted areas of highest priority for consolidation are indicated on Figure 3-1. Construction of the Pat Lowe Memorial Bike Trail and individual projects will be the primary means of implementation.

2. Develop and Implement a Chain Control Operations Plan. In consultation with Caltrans and the Highway Patrol, prepare an action plan which improves chain control procedures along U.S. 50. The plan may include operational changes as well as site improvements to facilitate chain-up while maintaining traffic flow and turning movements. Figure 3-1 identifies the plan's preferred location for a designated chain-up area located west of the U.S. 50/California 89 intersection.

3. Develop and Implement U.S. 50/California 89 Intersection Improvements. Caltrans and the Meyers Town Council should cooperatively study the opportunities for intersection improvements to maintain or improve the level of service consistent with the level of service policy listed above under Objective #2. Possible improvements could include a traffic circle
or traffic signal. Improvements should be installed when warranted.

4. Construct a Center Landscaped Median Along U.S. 50. In consultation with Caltrans, develop and construct an intermittent landscaped median in the existing, continuous two-way left turn lane of U.S. 50. The median will reduce the apparent width of the highway and reduce overall traffic speeds thereby improving vehicle and pedestrian safety. Vehicle turning pockets and associated stacking space are to be included as part of the project to serve cross street intersections and major driveways. The median should be planted with low maintenance native or adapted shrubs and groundcover. The plant palette should be selected in part to provide for necessary vehicle sight distances and visibility of roadside businesses. Snow storage and drainage facilities will be included to prevent roadway icing during winter. The project should include pedestrian crossings in certain locations to improve pedestrian safety. See Figure 4-2, Community Design Plan for approximate median locations.

Transit Service

1. Expand El Dorado County Transit Service. Fixed route transit service should be provided to each land use district including the community park and ride facility, and the City of South Lake Tahoe/Stateline. On demand service to the outlying residential and recreational uses should connect to the community plan area, preferably at the park and ride facility. Construct transit shelters at each transit stop throughout the plan area, including the park and ride facility.

Parking Facilities

1. Develop the Meyers Community Park and Ride. Develop a community park and ride facility within the plan area. The preferred site is the State of California parcel # 066539/6654146/2269/61359 adjacent to the Agricultural Inspection Station. The facility's program of uses includes park and ride lot, transit and recreation shuttle stop, chain-up and rest area. Based on land coverage limitations and other site design factors, it is estimated to accommodate up to 150 vehicles. It can be designed to prohibit vehicles avoiding the nearby Agricultural Inspection Station by accessing off Hopi Street. If the preferred site is developed, the Department of Agriculture may decide to transfer control of the site to another agency such as the California Tahoe Conservancy.

Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities

1. Complete the Pat Lowe Memorial Bike Trail. Complete the trail as planned on both sides of U.S. 50. Although located outside the plan area, the plan recommends extending the Pat Lowe Trail along U.S. 50 toward the Lake Valley State Recreation Area (Lake Tahoe Country Club) and South Lake Tahoe.

2. Develop Recreation Access Trailheads. Construct recreational trailheads as part of developing the Meyers Visitors Center and Washoe Meadows State Park. The trailheads would access public lands near the Upper Truckee River bridge.
CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION ELEMENT

The environmental conservation element is a supplement to the Conservation Element of the TRPA Goal and Policies Plan. It contains the plan's environmental conservation and management strategy. It lists the required environmental improvement targets which the community plan will achieve. The plan recognizes and includes all environmental improvements implemented in the plan area since July 1, 1987. The conservation element contains updated land capability and stream environment zone mapping which is adopted as part of the community plan.

A. COMMUNITY PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES AND SPECIAL POLICIES

Utilizing the community plan goals established in Chapter 1, the following objectives and special policies shall be implemented as part of the plan. Objectives represent desired ends or results. Policies are implemented as the means to achieve objectives.

Environmental Conservation Goal: Improve environmental values in Meyers as part of implementing the community plan.

Objectives and Special Policies:

1. Attain and maintain the environmental threshold carrying capacity targets and other environmental targets contained in the plan.

   Policy: The plan recognizes and incorporates environmental improvement projects implemented in the plan area since July 1, 1987. Such projects include, but are not limited to, placing overhead utility lines underground along U.S. 50 and constructing one half of the Pat Lowe Memorial Bike Trail and related water quality improvements.

   Policy: All projects, whether the proponent is a private or public entity, shall implement the applicable improvement projects identified herein.

   Policy: Public agencies having jurisdiction within the plan area are requested to implement public improvement projects identified in the plan. The policy shall apply to plans and programs which may be contained in an agency's capital improvements program.

2. Identify and protect the unique Western juniper tree. Consider its potential as an interpretive resource.

   Policy: All live Western juniper trees within the plan area which are not diseased shall be preserved.

3. Protect and enhance existing scenic views and vistas from the plan area.
4. Protect and enhance buffer/stream/stream environment zones. Encourage property owners with natural drainage channels in closed conduits to restore them to an open system. Including trees/shrubs/foliage/birds/insects.

5. Through the Meyers Town Council, take an active role in the planning and review of nearby projects which may impact Meyers.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT TARGETS

The following key environmental improvement targets shall be implemented as part of the community plan. Achieving the targets is an important consideration for approving community plans, including levels of additional growth. Development opportunities are directly tied to implementing the targets. See Chapter 7, Implementation for further discussion and project cost estimates.

Water Quality Targets

1. Install and maintain Best Management Practices (BMPs) on all developed or disturbed parcels consistent with the adopted Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region and TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 25.

Program Description: Install and maintain on-site Best Management Practices for storm water runoff and erosion control. BMPs may include, but not be limited to, rock-lined or other conveyance channels, detention/retention basins, catch basins and drop inlets, infiltration wells, paving and revegetation. Public rights-of-way where BMPs are needed are shown in Figure 4-1.

Implementation Strategy: As part of project construction; existing retrofit schedules are generally based on a previous project approval; implementing future BMPs shall be based on a schedule in accordance with terms of state or federal storm water discharge permit, or a TRPA-issued remedial action plan.

2. Restore approximately 1.5 acres of disturbed Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) within and adjacent to the plan area.

Program Description: Restore disturbed SEZ sites shown in Figure 4-1. Targeted sites generally include: Minal Street cul-de-sac (0.25 acres in area); Shell, Supply One and Chevron silo parcels adjacent to U.S. 50 (total area 1.1 acres); and existing SEZ and channel behind Yank's Station (0.15 acres).

Implementation Strategy: El Dorado County, USDA Forest Service and private property owners will take a lead role depending on the project. Several public funding sources are available to implement projects. Conditions of project approval, including man-modified land capability challenge approvals may also be used to achieve the target. At least 50% of the targeted areas should be restored by 1997, with the remaining 50% completed by 2007.
Soil Conservation Targets

1. Reduce existing land coverage within the plan area.

Program Description: Remove approximately 5,000 square feet of existing excess hard and soft land coverage from lands within the plan area. Permanently restore the lands from which the coverage was removed. Based on the estimated value of future construction associated with the plan, restore a minimum of 5,000 square feet of either hard or soft land coverage. Priority target sites include SEZ lands within the plan area which are overcovered. Secondary priority sites include lands of other capability class which are overcovered.

Implementation Strategy: Conditions of project approval on individual projects. Restoration of SEZ lands containing land coverage.

2. Restore disturbed lands within the plan area.

Program Description: Restore approximately 5 acres of existing disturbed lands within the plan area. Priority target sites include areas within the U.S. 50 right of way which are associated with the Pat Lowe Memorial Bike Trail. Other priority sites include disturbed SEZ lands.

Implementation Strategy: Disturbed lands will be restored as part of constructing the bike trail project.

Noise Target

Target: Attain and maintain applicable noise standards established for the plan area and listed in the Plan Area Statement.\texttt{THE/DL/DC/FR/71/164/5/1011/83/BR/2112/}

Program Description: Identify noise sources which exceed the threshold standard and/or are producing significant adverse impacts. Attain and maintain noise standards through application of mitigation measures.

Implementation Strategy: Implement Chapter 23 of TRPA Code of Ordinances. Additional short-term noise performance standards are \texttt{SH/SH} established for certain uses and are implemented as conditions of project approval. Noise mitigation techniques include, but are not limited to, relocation of use, incorporating site design factors such as noise barriers, landscaping and setback of structures or noise-generating uses.

Vegetation Preservation Target

Target: Preserve unique vegetation.

Program Description: Preserve all existing live Western juniper trees in the plan area. Use the image as a symbol of the Meyers area.

Implementation Strategy: Identify existing tree locations. Site development away from the trees. Incorporate trees into the overall site design. Avoid damage during operation and maintenance activities.
Outdoor Recreation Target

Target: Provide high quality recreational opportunities.

Program Description: Develop permanent Meyers Visitors Center. Instantaneous capacity is expected to be approximately 150 persons at one time (PAOTS). The preferred site is near the corner of U.S. 50 and California 89.

Implementation Strategy: Develop and operate the visitors center through the interagency steering committee.

C. LAND CAPABILITY MAPPING

A revised Bailey land capability map has been prepared by TRPA and is adopted as part of the community plan. See Figure 4-3. It will replace the existing 1987 TRPA land capability map for all lands within the community plan area boundary, and will become the official TRPA land capability overlay map. The revised map is essentially an area-wide land capability verification. The extent and location of existing soil map units were field verified. Soil map unit boundaries were revised where field data indicated differences from the adopted maps. No new soil map units were found. The revised mapping also includes revised stream environment zone (SEZ) delineations based on SEZ criteria established by the Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region.

Generally, the 1987 map and the revised map are similar in terms of the relative acreage and areal distribution of each capability class. The revised map indicates approximately 13 acres less of class 1b (SEZ) lands than the 1987 adopted map (located in the vicinity of Yanks Station and the eastern edge of the Industrial Tract). It indicates a new area of class 3 near Yanks Station (previously mapped as class 1b), and additional area of class 6 near the Industrial Tract (previously mapped as class 5). Individual projects which are developed within the community plan area will have land capability verified as part of the project review process. The following table compares the approximate acreage of each capability class for both maps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability Class</th>
<th>1987 Adopted Map</th>
<th>1993 Community Plan Map</th>
<th>Difference (+/- acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1a</td>
<td>8 acres</td>
<td>7 acres</td>
<td>- 1 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1b (SEZ)</td>
<td>29 acres</td>
<td>16 acres</td>
<td>-13 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1c</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
<td>0 acres</td>
<td>- 1 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>0 acres</td>
<td>10 acres</td>
<td>+10 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 5</td>
<td>102 acres</td>
<td>92 acres</td>
<td>-10 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 6</td>
<td>25 acres</td>
<td>40 acres</td>
<td>+15 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165 acres</td>
<td>165 acres</td>
<td>0 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Discourage unscreened outdoor storage of recreational equipment which is visible from U.S. 50 or California 89.

Policy: Recreation projects shall be designed consistent with the Community Design Plan and Design Review Guidelines.

5. Provide parking and access to recreational opportunities in and around the plan area.

Policy: Improve transit opportunities that access recreation facilities on a year round basis. Examples include: extending summer beach bus service (S.T.A.G.E./Bus Plus) and winter ski shuttles to the plan area (Heavenly, Kirkwood and Sierra Ski Ranch). Coordinate transit service with the community park and ride facility.

C. COMMUNITY PLAN RECREATION IMPROVEMENTS

The plan envisions the following recreation improvements to implement the goal and objectives.

1. USDA Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit. Developing the permanent Meyers Visitors Center is a goal. Its estimated capacity is 150 persons at one time (PAOTs). The project is on TRPA's Five Year List of Additional Recreation Facilities. It requires an allocation from TRPA of Summer day use PAOTs which are allocated from an overall pool established by the Regional Plan. [Link to source information]

No specific projects are proposed by LTBMU's Land and Resource Management Plan for areas surrounding the plan area.

LTBMU's general management prescriptions include continuing developed recreation at the existing recreation residence tracts along the Upper Truckee River and timber stand maintenance along the eastern edge of the Industrial Tract. The existing Work Center is expected to remain in its present capacity.

2. California Park Service. The Park Service is expected to continue as a partner in developing the permanent Meyers Visitors Center. They intend to prepare a general plan for the Washoe Meadows State Park. The plan will recommend developing a trail connection from their boundary near U.S. 50 and the Upper Truckee River into the park. It may investigate the potential to add an undercrossing of U.S. 50 to reach the Visitors Center.

3. California Tahoe Conservancy. The Conservancy is expected to continue as a partner in developing the permanent Meyers Visitors Center. Conservancy land within the plan area is a potential site for the community park and ride facility. It may also provide land acquisition assistance if the facility is developed on the vacant parcel owned by the State's Department of Agriculture adjacent to the existing Meyers Agricultural Inspection Station.

4. Tahoe Paradise Golf Course. The Tahoe Paradise golf course and winter snowmobile course is expected to remain in its present form.
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opportunity exists to provide a small outdoor retail/cafe area at the edge of the golf course at the rear of Yanks Station. A portion of the project could be developed as an accessory use to the golf course and not require a commercial floor area allocation. The Yank’s Station complex could be redeveloped to provide access to the rear of the site. Regardless of the manner in which it is developed, the edge between the uses and plan areas could become an asset to the area. An SEZ restoration project of an existing channel which drains part of the golf course is recommended by the plan. The channel is on the boundary between Yank’s Station and the golf course. See Chapters 4 and 7.

5. **El Dorado County Service Area.** No improvements identified at this time within the plan area.

6. **Tahoe Paradise Resort Improvement District.** No improvements identified at this time within the plan area.

7. **Other Providers.** The plan recommends expanding winter ski shuttle and summer beach bus service to the community park and ride facility. Heavenly Valley, Kirkwood and Sierra Ski Ranch will be requested to provide regular shuttle service. S.T.A.G.E. will be requested to provide connecting summer beach bus service. Bicycle racks or lockers should be provided at the park and ride facility.
5. **California Conservation Corps (CCC).** The CCC is presently housed in an existing thirty-seven unit motel behind Yank's Station on Apache Avenue. The site is used as a residential dormitory for up to eighty-five members and includes food service and administrative offices in the nearby Yank's Station complex. The Corps' mission is to develop California's youth between the ages of 18 and 23 and enhance the state's natural resources. It engages in erosion control and timber stand maintenance projects on a year-round basis.

6. **Lake Valley Fire Protection District.** The district maintains the Lake Valley fire station and training center on a one and one-half acre site located on Keetak Street near California 89. The site houses a three bay fire station, living quarters, a practice burn tower and district administrative offices.

7. **El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT).** El Dorado County's road maintenance and snow removal facility is located on a two-acre site on Shakori Street in the Industrial Tract. The facility also houses erosion control engineering, vehicle storage and repair and storage of construction materials. DOT recently developed the first phase of the Pat Lowe Memorial Bike Trail along the south side of U.S. 50. The trail is a Class I facility meaning it is physically separated from the nearby highway, and has a certain minimum width.

8. **El Dorado County Department of Animal Control.** El Dorado County's animal control facility and shelter is located on Shakori Street in the Industrial Tract. The facility provides animal control, pet adoption and shelter services. It formerly shared space there with the South Lake Tahoe Humane Society which now is located in the West Meyers area.

9. **South Lake Tahoe Humane Society.** The society operates out of a recently acquired site on Magua Street in West Meyers.

10. **South Tahoe Public Utility District (STPUD).** STPUD's main sewage export transmission pipeline serving the shore runs along U.S. 50 and California 89 through the plan area. STPUD provides water and sewer service to developed uses in the plan area. In 1989 the District purchased the Tahoe Paradise Water Company including two parcels of land and two older buildings on Santa Fe Street. One parcel contains the two structures one of which $\text{building}$ is leased to Simmons Cable Television, while the second serves as a lunchroom and materials storage. The second $\text{building}$ is vacant.

11. **Pacific Bell Telephone.** Pacific Bell operates the Meyers Central Office, an unmanned switching station at a site near the intersection of U.S. 50 and Apache Avenue.

12. **Simmons Cable Television.** Business offices and receiving/transmitting facilities for the Simmons cable television system are located on Santa Fe Street at a site presently owned by the South Tahoe Public Utility District.

13. **USDA Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU).** The LTBMU operates the existing Meyers Work Center located along U.S. 50 in the
Lake Valley land use district. It provides several services and facilities to the LTRMU throughout the Region. It contains dormitory space to house temporary or detail staff, a maintenance shop and laboratory.

143. Other Public Service Providers. Natural gas service is provided in the plan area by Washington Power Natural Gas (WPNG). Electrical service is provided by Sierra Pacific Power Company (SPP). In 1986 and 87, overhead electrical lines located along U.S. 50 through portions of the plan area were converted to underground facilities. Telephone and cable television lines which were on SPP's overhead poles were also converted to underground service at the same time. Existing overhead utility lines run along U.S. 50 west of the California 89 intersection and along Keetak Street near the Industrial Tract.

B. COMMUNITY PLAN PUBLIC SERVICE OBJECTIVES AND SPECIAL POLICIES

Utilizing the community plan goals established in Chapter 1, the following objectives and special policies shall be implemented as part of the plan. Objectives represent desired ends or results. Policies are implemented as the means to achieve objectives.

Public Service Goal: Support development of public service projects within the plan area which support the community.

Objectives and Special Policies:

1. Ensure all public service projects implement the Community Design program.

    Policy: Public service projects shall be designed consistent with the Community Design Plan and Design Review Guidelines.

    Policy: The California Department of Transportation is requested to remove and consolidate existing highway directional signs within the plan area wherever feasible.

    Policy: Sierra Pacific Power Company and other utility providers with overhead utility lines along designated scenic highway corridors are requested to convert the lines to underground facilities within the plan area.

2. Incorporate the post office as an anchor in one of the commercial land use districts.

    Policy: The U.S. Postal Service is requested to develop its new facility as one which does not require the allocation of additional commercial floor area in either the Yank's Station or West Meyers land use cluster. It is further requested use the name of Meyers for the new facility.

3. Encourage the Department of Food and Agriculture to consider, in its long range facilities planning, to relocate the existing inspection station outside of the community plan area. Until such relocation, encourage it to
retrofit the existing station consistent with the Community Plan Design Review Guidelines.

Policy: The Department of Food and Agriculture is requested to implement Community Design improvements at its existing inspection station. The department is further requested to work with the California Tahoe Conservancy, El Dorado County, TRPA, transit service providers and the Meyers Town Council to develop the site adjacent to the existing inspection station into a community facility including park and ride and community events uses.

4. Encourage the California Highway Patrol to remain within the community plan area.

Policy: The plan supports development of new or expanded California Highway Patrol offices in the plan area.

5. Identify a building or site for a Meyers Town Hall. The Meyers Town Council should work with the property owner(s) to use the site for town meetings and other community functions.

Policy: The South Tahoe Public Utility District is requested to consider providing shared public meeting space at its existing Santa Fe Street site.

6. Encourage new and expanding public service uses to be developed in such a manner as to not need additional commercial floor area which may be allocated through the community plan.

Policy: New and expanding public service uses shall not utilize additional commercial floor area allocated by the community plan.

7. Support development of a preschool/day care facility in or adjacent to the community plan in a location which is safe and would not conflict with residential uses.

8. Encourage the California Conservation Corps to retrofit its existing facilities consistent with the Community Plan Design Review Guidelines.

9. Encourage new and relocated public service corporation yards and storage facilities to locate in the Industrial Tract land use district.

C. COMMUNITY PLAN PUBLIC SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS

The plan envisions the following public service improvements to implement the goal and objectives and to maintain or improve service capacities. Several of the identified improvements appear on TRPA’s Five Year List of Additional Public Services. See Figure 6-1.

1. U.S. Postal Service. The Postal Service is planning to occupy a new facility within the community plan area FY/1991. The proposed facility is expected to be larger and offer more services, including home mail delivery, than the existing station located in West Meyers
2. **California Highway Patrol.** The CHP has identified the need for larger offices. It is considering moving out of the plan area to accommodate its needs. It may be possible to expand the existing site to meet space needs. If they move, the existing site may be a potential public meeting space.

3. **California Department of Food and Agriculture, Division of Pest Exclusion.** The Department of Food and Agriculture has no immediate plans to change the existing Meyers Inspection Station. Its long range objectives include the possibility of relocating the inspection station to a point further west past the intersection of U.S. 50 and California 89. The community plan envisions the state-owned parcels adjacent to the station to be developed with the department's assistance to a community park and ride and temporary events site.

4. **California Conservation Corps.** The Corps plans to maintain its presence in the Tahoe Basin and may seek to develop a more permanent facility in the future outside of Meyers. This may have secondary or spin-off benefits to Meyers by returning the site to its original motel use.

5. **Lake Valley Fire Protection District.** The district proposes to expand the existing station cooperatively with the USDA Forest Service. Their proposal includes additional vehicle bays and barracks. Additionally, it proposes to add a new storage building for firefighting and snow removal equipment and construct a physical agility course on the existing site.

6. **El Dorado County Department of Transportation.** DOT has recently completed the addition of a meeting room and additional office space. The second phase of the Pat Lowe Memorial Bike Trail is planned for construction in 1994.

7. **Underground Overhead Utility Lines.** Sierra Pacific Power Company and other utility providers using overhead facilities which are located along U.S. 50 (a state and regional designated scenic highway corridor) are requested to convert those systems to underground facilities within the plan area. Statewide undergrounding conversion funds are available to make the conversion. See Chapter 4 for additional discussion.

8. **USDA Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU).** The LTBMU has identified no specific changes to the Work Center, although the site may be considered as a potential site for a relocated supervisor's office.

No other planned public service improvements are known at this time.
CHAPTER 7 - IMPLEMENTATION ELEMENT

While the plan sets forth the framework for achieving the desired goals and objectives, it is the day to day actions of government which truly shape the community plan area. Thus, the manner in which government implements a plan is the real test of commitment to the goals and objectives of the plan. The implementation element is a supplement to the Implementation Element of the TRPA Goals and Policies Plan and the El Dorado County General Plan.

The Meyers Community Plan must respond to and be consistent with the goals, objectives and requirements of both El Dorado County and TRPA. The requirement to prepare and implement a Meyers Community Plan arises from the Regional Plan Goals and Policies and is authorized by the California State Government Code. The plan, in the context of California state planning law, serves as the General Plan for the geographic area defined by the Meyers community plan.

The plan is adopted by the County Board of Supervisors as an amendment to the El Dorado County General Plan. It is adopted by the TRPA Governing Board as a Regional Plan amendment which replaces the existing Plan Area Statement for Plan Area 125, Meyers Commercial. As a result of plan adoption, projects proposed within the plan area must be consistent with not only the community plan itself, but also with the El Dorado County General Plan and TRPA’s Regional Plan.

This chapter sets forth the mechanisms and actions necessary to carry out the goals and objectives of the Community Plan.

A. COMMUNITY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION OBJECTIVES AND SPECIAL POLICIES

Utilizing the community plan goals established in Chapter 1, the following objectives and special policies shall be implemented as part of the plan. Objectives represent desired ends or results. Policies are implemented as the means to achieve objectives.

Implementation Goal: Develop realistic implementation methods to ensure the community plan’s long term success.

Objectives and Special Policies:

1. In cooperation with El Dorado County, establish a Meyers Town Council to guide the plan’s implementation.

Policy: Land coverage, commercial floor area, tourist accommodation units and other units of use regulated by TRPA shall not be transferred out of the plan area unless the Meyers Town Council finds that such transfer will result in a substantial community benefit in terms of implementing the community plan and its programs.

2. Identify appropriate entities to take responsibility for implementing and monitoring the plan’s improvement programs.
Public improvements will seek state and federal funds for highway-related projects. State grants and regional mitigation fees will be sought to construct the balance of public projects which can be shown to implement the program's objectives. Other publicly oriented projects such as the Meyers Visitors Center will be funded through programs of the individual agencies involved. Based on the perceived or actual success or failure of funding and implementing plan improvements, El Dorado County may pursue creation of a redevelopment district and agency provided by California state law. It could be created during any part of the plan's life, however, in general the earlier it is implemented, the greater the chance for its success.

3. **Improve the Visual and Scenic Quality of Meyers.** Central to the plan's implementation is the Community Design Plan, Design Review Guidelines and substitute sign standards. Their purpose is to improve the appearance and function of the built environment in Meyers and create a visually memorable gateway to Lake Tahoe. U.S. 50 and California 89 are state-designated scenic highways and TRPA-designated regional scenic corridors. Physical improvements to the built environment are needed to meet perceptual expectations of persons travelling the scenic corridors. Both elements will be a positive catalyst for future development and redevelopment in Meyers. They apply to all projects in the plan area regardless of ownership. Specific program policies are listed in Chapter 2. The Community Design Plan is located in Chapter 4. Design Review Guidelines are located in Appendix A. Substitute sign standards are found in Appendix B. They will replace certain sections of existing County and TRPA standards and guidelines within the plan area.

Community design elements are implemented as part of the project review and approval process. The Town Council will first review project proposals within the plan area boundaries. They will make recommendations to El Dorado County and TRPA regarding the consistency with the design program goals, objectives and specific design criteria.

Substitute sign standards recognize the unique environment in Meyers and will replace specific sections of existing TRPA and County standards. Certain sections of the Region-wide ordinance will continue to be in effect (e.g., amortization on non-conforming signs), however, the determination of non-conformity will be based on the substitute standards wherever they apply.

4. **Eliminate Inconsistencies Between El Dorado County Zoning and TRPA's List of Permissible Uses in the Plan Area.** Several inconsistencies exist between the two sets of regulations pertaining to allowable uses and their definitions within the plan area. Adoption of the plan and its implementing ordinances will achieve consistency between the El Dorado County zoning ordinance and TRPA's list of permissible land uses.

TRPA will adopt the Community Plan Area Statement (Chapter 2) as part of adopting the plan and replace the existing Plan Area Statement 125, Meyers Commercial. El Dorado County will incorporate the community plan as adopted verbatim and in toto into the 2010 General Plan when it is adopted. In the interim, it will amend the County's existing 1969 General Plan and 1981 Long Range Land Use Plan.
landscaping, building facade changes, signage, parking and access, exterior lighting, bicycle racks and outdoor displays. The Community Design Plan indicates the general location and nature of planned improvements. It serves as the long range vision for the plan area. All projects should be consistent with the map. The Town Council should review projects and find them to be consistent with applicable portions of the map prior to recommending their approval.

6. **Adopt A Unified Set of Permissible Land Uses.** A major constraint to orderly land use and development in Meyers is the existing County zoning. In several instances, it does not permit certain land uses otherwise allowed by TRPA. To receive approval, a project must be a permissible use by both the County and TRPA. An important plan objective, therefore, is to remove the inconsistency between the two jurisdictions. As part of adopting the community plan and implementing their General Plan, El Dorado County will revise the County zoning to be consistent with permissible uses listed in the Community Plan Area Statement (Chapter 2).

**D. SCHEDULE OF PLAN IMPLEMENTATION**

Implementing the plan will take several years. It is unreasonable to assume that all improvements and all additional development included in the plan will occur immediately following the plan's adoption. Plan implementation can be broken down into three types of activities: development of additional commercial floor area and tourist accommodation units; rehabilitation of private land uses; and installation of public benefits and improvements. Implementation of the plan should begin with enforcement of existing County and TRPA land use and development ordinances. Lack of consistent enforcement of existing codes and ordinances, especially along the U.S. 50 corridor, is a contributing cause to significant negative visual quality impacts.

While the initial plan contains commercial floor area allocations only through 1997, it should be viewed as an on-going plan for the development of Meyers. The plan is reviewed and adjusted every five years. It advocates the following implementation schedule using five year increments.

**Year 1-5**

* Commercial floor area allocation distributed and constructed (includes installation of community design, signage and water quality improvements on parcels receiving allocation)
* Pat Lowe Memorial Bike Trail completed (includes removal and restoration of excess land coverage and disturbed lands, and restoration of associated SEZ areas)
* Transfer and acquisition of U.S. 50 excess right-of-way
* Non-conforming signs replaced and/or removed
* Excess highway signage consolidated and/or removed
* Expanded transit and recreation shuttle service on-line
* Park and Ride facility developed
* Community gateway entry features constructed
* Overhead utility lines converted to underground service along U.S. 50
* Water quality Best Management Practices installed on all parcels
Year 6-10

* Additional tourist accommodation units distributed and constructed
* Remaining SEZ areas restored
* Meyers Visitors Center developed (permanent facility)
* Agricultural Inspection Station architectural improvements installed
* Architectural improvements completed on all uses with U.S. 50 frontage

Year 11-15

* Landscaping improvements completed on all uses with U.S. 50 frontage
* Recreational access trailheads developed
* U.S. 50/California 89 intersection improvements installed
* Water quality Best Management Practices installed on public rights-of-way

Year 16-20

* U.S. Highway 50 landscape medians and turn pockets installed

E. ROLE OF THE MEYERS TOWN COUNCIL

To implement and administer the goals, policies and standards of the plan, El Dorado County will create and support the Meyers Town Council. The County’s Board of Supervisors should invest the Council with design review approval authority and project review and recommendation responsibilities. The plan recommends that the County establish the Council and appoint its members at the time it adopts the community plan. Specific recommendations regarding procedural and substantive aspects of the Council’s duties are identified below. In addition, the Council should operate on an informal capacity where possible to influence local actions and decisions affecting the community and the plan.

1. Procedure. The Council should meet on an as-needed basis when it has business properly before it. El Dorado County Planning Department will provide the primary staff and technical support. TRPA will provide technical support upon request of the Council and/or County. The County’s enabling action should specify an operating budget, membership, duties and responsibilities, project review procedures, voting and appeals, and other similar matters. The plan recommends a five member Council. The two County supervisors representing areas within the Tahoe Basin should each make two appointments. The four appointed persons together should select the fifth person, who could be from either district.

2. Duties. The Council should review any land use proposal within the community plan area which involves the allocation of additional commercial floor area, additional tourist accommodation units, change in use, transfer of existing or potential development, site plan review by the County or any exterior modification requiring a permit from either the County or TRPA.
El Dorado County, TRPA and the Meyers Town Council will annually review the schedule of plan improvements to ensure the plan is implemented according to schedule. Minor adjustments to the implementation schedule may result from the annual review.

Table 7-1
Community Plan Threshold Target Monitoring Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sample Period</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality &amp; BMP Effectiveness</td>
<td>Representative Projects</td>
<td>Spring runoff &amp; Representative Storm Events</td>
<td>Project Proponents, TRPA/FAHMANFROEBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Coverage Reduction</td>
<td>Target Restoration Sites &amp; Projects</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>TRPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream Envt. Zone Restoration</td>
<td>Target Restoration Sites</td>
<td>Project Completion Date</td>
<td>TRPA, Tahoe Conservancy, USDA Forest Svc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Resources</td>
<td>Roadway Units #36, #37 and #38; Resource #36-1</td>
<td>5 Year Threshold Review/Evaluation</td>
<td>TRPA, Meyers Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise (CNEL)</td>
<td>Selected Sites in Plan Area</td>
<td>5 Year Threshold Review/Evaluation</td>
<td>TRPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Level of Service (LOS)</td>
<td>Key Intersections (U.S. 50/Cal 89, U.S. 50/Pioneer)</td>
<td>5 Year Threshold Review/Evaluation</td>
<td>TRPA, Caltrans El Dorado County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Juniper Trees</td>
<td>Existing Locations</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>TRPA, Meyers Town Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX A
Community Plan Design Review Guidelines
f. **Historic Markers and Displays.** In recognition of Meyers' cultural and natural history, historic displays or markers may be erected along the corridor. This includes interpreting the Western juniper tree. They may be combined with other street furniture located at transit shelters, the park and ride facility or along the bike trail. Appropriate media along the corridor include markers, plaques, interpretive panels or signs. The Meyers Town Council shall approve placement of all historic markers and displays. Refer to Section 2. Site Planning for historic displays on private property.

g. **Highway 50 Chain-Up Area.** A dedicated chain up area should be provided for westbound traffic along U.S. 50 west of the California 89 intersection. The area will provide a place to safely pull off the highway to install tire chains. It should include a snow storage area to store snow from the adjacent highway travel lane, a parking lane, an access lane, drainage, lighting and signage. Chain installers could be provided a reserved space within the area. The Community Park and Ride area may also serve as a chain up area. Signage should be temporary in nature and could be attached similar to snow poles on existing stakes. Signage should be removed after each chain-up season or no later than May 1.

![Diagram of U.S. 50 Chain-up Lane Layout]

---

*Recommended U.S. 50 Chain-up Lane Layout*
h. **Landscaped Median.** A continuous landscape median **approximately ten feet wide** should be installed in place of the center turn lane along U.S. 50 through both commercial clusters. Approximate locations are shown on the Meyers Community Design Plan. The median should be planted with a mix of low maintenance native or adapted shrubs and groundcover **small deciduous trees and large deciduous shrubs** which break up the highway corridor's apparent width. Left turn pockets and associated vehicle stacking and deceleration space should be provided at key cross street intersections and where combined driveways serve multiple parcels. Larger plant materials used in the median should compliment neighboring tree plantings along parcels fronting U.S. 50. The median should include a drainage system to prevent melting snow from running onto the highway and freezing at night.

![Diagram of U.S. 50 Landscaped Median]

i. **Right-of-Way Directional Signage.** Directional signage located in the public right-of-way-way should be reduced to an absolute minimum. Non-essential signage should use the Regional off-highway attraction sign face shown below. It may reference another information source such as a radio message or the Visitors Center. Wherever possible, signage should be combined onto a single standard or post. This is especially critical at the entrances to Meyers (two along U.S. 50, one along California 89). In cooperation with Caltrans, the California Highway Patrol, TRPA and El Dorado County, the Meyers Town Council should identify excess signage to be removed as soon as possible after it is established.

![Diagram of Off-Highway Attraction Sign]
b. **Protection of Western Juniper Trees.** Protect and maintain all existing Western junipers through careful site design. Where a juniper appears to be in the way of a proposed building, structure, parking area or other improvement, relocate the improvement in order to save the tree. Do not site improvements in such a manner that a juniper or its root system will be damaged or destroyed. This may result in building a sign, deck or other portion of a building around the tree or incorporating the tree into the structure. Maintain the existing grade around each juniper to a minimum of at least the edge of the tree’s dripline. Do not build structures inside the dripline. **Standing dead Western Junipers which are not a safety hazard should be considered for retention as wildlife habitat.**

c. **Fencing.** Fencing should be constructed of wood, wooden-framed wire, or woodcrete products. Where fencing is used to mark property boundaries, low rail, log or plank fences should be used. Fencing which simply marks property boundaries should not exceed four feet in height. Cyclone or chain link fences which are visible from U.S. 50 or California 89 are not appropriate.

Any fence greater than four feet in height regardless of its purpose should not be located within the twenty foot (20') yard setback on parcels abutting U.S. 50 or California 89. Any fence greater than four feet in height and fifty feet (50') in length should incorporate trees and/or shrubs along it to break up the linear appearance.

d. **Screening Outdoor Storage and Service Areas.** Where fencing is needed to screen or enclose an outdoor storage area or service area, a solid wooden fence no greater than six feet in height should be used. Screening is especially important where commercial or light industrial uses border residential uses. Fences taller than six feet should only be used when they are not visible from U.S. 50 or California 89. Fencing greater than fifty feet (50') in length should incorporate trees and/or shrubs along it to break up the linear appearance. When located along U.S. 50 or California 89 solid fencing which is used as a screen should be set back from the property line a minimum of twenty feet to avoid creating the appearance of a walled-off compound.

e. **Landscape Screening.** Screening objectionable views using landscape plant materials can be a cost-effective and aesthetically pleasing technique. Landscape screening should generally consist of a mix of trees, shrubs and ground covers which will be effective on a year-round basis (i.e., deciduous trees and shrubs will lose their screening abilities during times they are not in leaf). Landscape screening should be used to screen parking areas, service and storage areas. The size of all plant materials at the time of planting should be such that the screening is effective no later than two years from planting.

Small berms and other minor landforms can be incorporated into the design to provide a visual sense of variety. They can hide an on-site storm water detention basin or trash enclosure. Due to the flat topography found in Meyers (i.e., the Lake Valley landform), berms and other created landforms should generally not exceed three to four feet in height.
k. **Provide Bicycle Racks.** Bicycle racks should be provided at all uses which attract bicyclists. Racks or other secure facilities for bicycle storage should be provided within each land use district. Retail and service commercial uses, transit and park and ride facilities and recreation uses are the primary uses in Meyers which generally attract bicyclists. Shared racks or other storage methods are appropriate for multiple uses within a single project or development.

l. **Provide Bear-Proof Trash Facilities.** Trash and garbage facilities on all uses should be secure from bears. For residential uses, garbage should be cleaned up and made unavailable to bears. For all other uses, garbage cans and dumpsters should be "bear-proofed" with metal lids that are latched with a minimum of two latches. Examples are shown below.

![Diagram of Bear-Proof Trash Facilities](image)

---

3. **Building Design**

a. **Architectural Theme.** A consistent architectural theme is a powerful means to create and convey a sense of place. This does not mean that all buildings will or should look alike. It is the use of variations on a theme which can be an asset to the community. Historically, the commercial area was used as a way station. The historic architectural design theme which uses modern building technology is the preferred theme for both new and redeveloping buildings. The following architectural elements should be used to convey the historic theme.

b. **Building Form.** Buildings should generally use steeply-sloping gable end or gambrel roofs with pitches of 6:12 or greater. Buildings with hip roofs are also appropriate. Second story dormers are generally consistent with the historic theme and may be used. Flat-roofed buildings are not appropriate. Buildings should have a clear sense of entry. Avoid excessive ornamentation.
i. Locate building entrances under the gable end of pitched roofs.

ii. Avoid locating entrances and walkways under roof eaves or other surfaces which can be expected to unload snow on unsuspecting persons below.

iii. Provide cover for stairways and other entrances. Porches can be a successful form of cover.

iv. Avoid locating stairs under the drip line of roof eaves.

v. Avoid extending balconies beyond roof eaves.

vi. Provide covered walkways between buildings using a compatible architectural style.

4. Exterior Lighting

a. Use of Exterior Lighting. Exterior lighting should be used selectively to provide light for functional needs such as transit stops, building entries, walkways, paths, building signage, public art, grade changes and safety. Human-scaled lighting for outdoor gathering spaces may occur, provided the lighting is of low intensity and does not cast light off-site. General area lighting of landscaped or other outdoor areas where people are not expected to gather or traverse should not be done. All lighting should generally be directed downward and should not cast light off the property. All light sources should be concealed from view. Exterior lighting should not be used to illuminate entire buildings.

b. Light Fixture Styles. Exterior light fixtures should be of a common design style(s) throughout Meyers. Recommended styles for freestanding lights are shown below. The Idaho Wood model is found at the existing Meyers Visitors Center. The recommended wall-mounted fixture is used at Carlos Murphy's Restaurant in South Lake Tahoe. Both are shown below. Additional designs using forms or materials form other design elements which represent the historic theme may also be acceptable.

Light Standard
Specifications:
- Idaho Wood Model #296/296D or equal.
- Steel super structure the entire length.
- Head: Boxed with 3/4" cedar.
- Post: Lock mitered octagon cedar.
- Finish clear.
- Luminaire: 150 watts high pressure sodium
- Initial lamp lumens: 16,000

Wall Mount Light Fixture
Specifications:
- Benjamin Exterior Lamp Shade
- Model # V-7642 or equal.
- Pendant mount
- 150 Watts incandescent
- 12" high by 14" diameter
- Forest green finish
c. **Low-Level Bollards.** Low-level bollards may be used instead of overhead lighting for pedestrian paths or along the bike trail. Two bollard designs are recommended. Idaho Wood Products models R276, 277 or 279, or equals provide a design consistent with the recommended overhead fixtures. An alternative is a custom-fabricated bollard which consists of approximately five logs standing on end and banded together with steel straps. The light source is concealed inside the center of the logs.

![](image)

Low-Level Bollard Light

d. **Landscape Lighting.** Exterior landscape lighting should be used selectively to highlight pathways or special landscape plantings. It should not illuminate an entire landscape bed or planting area (especially turfgrass). Where lighting of plant materials is desired, the light source should be concealed from view, produce a low level of illumination and used on only a small number (one to three) of displays.
e. **Light Fixture Height.** Maximum heights for parking area light standards should not exceed 15 feet. For walkways, including the biketrail, the maximum height should not exceed 10-12 feet. When used as bollards, the height should not exceed 4-5 feet. Building-mounted fixtures should not exceed 8-10 feet in height, except when lighting a building sign. Building sign lighting should not be located any higher than one to two feet from the top of the sign.

5. **Signage**

a. **Freestanding Signs.** Freestanding signs should be set on a monument base which is stone or has a natural stone veneer. The sign face should be constructed of metal, concrete, wood, or sign foam. Plastic or plex faced signs should not be used. Neon tubing should be used sparingly as an accent, or not at all.

Freestanding signs should not be placed in areas which will be obscured from vision by stored or plowed snow. If necessary, locate or relocate the sign in places where any accumulated snow can easily be cleared. A snow storage plan may be needed to optimize snow plowing operations, snow storage areas and sign visibility.

![Freestanding Sign Diagram](image)

b. **Building Signs.** Building signs should be constructed of metal, concrete, wood, or sign foam. Individual or channel-lume letters may be used. Plastic or plex faced signs should not be used. Neon tubing should be used sparingly as an accent, or not at all. Building signs should compliment the building’s architecture and should be integrated into its design. Reflective surfaces on signs are inappropriate and not permitted by the substitute standards.

c. **Building Signs on Historic Theme Buildings.** Historically, building signs were often painted directly on the wall surface. This is an appropriate technique only when using the historical building design forms and materials (buildings utilizing Building Design guidelines 3.b through 3.f inclusive). Similarly, the Meyers substitute sign standards provide for wall signs on the historical theme buildings to be located above a line formed by the top of the second floor windows or twenty feet. Refer to the substitute sign standards.
d. Freestanding Sign Location and Snow Removal. Given the amount of snow which falls in Meyers, special attention should be paid to the location of freestanding signs. Generally, freestanding signs should be located in places where they can easily be cleared of snow. Recommended locations include adjacent to driveways, within driveway landscaped medians or near walkways. They should be placed near an area which is regularly shovelled so area around the sign can also be shovelled. Two additional recommended locations are: on an island within a storm water detention basin (use negative space to ensure visibility); or set far enough away from snow storage areas to remain visible (e.g., Tahoe Paradise Winter Sports Center sign). If used, detention basins should be adequately sized to account for the change in storage volume taken up by the island. Snow storage areas should not be located in front of freestanding sign’s where the sign’s visibility would be impaired.
e. **Sign Lighting.** Signs should generally be externally lit from above the top of the sign. External light sources should light the sign only and should incorporate a cone or other cutoff-type shield to direct the light beam at the sign.

Internally illuminated signs are not recommended. When used, only the lettering should be illuminated using backlighting in a manner similar to the Inn By The Lake sign in South Lake Tahoe.

f. **Sign Face Layout.** Signs should have no more than 60% of the sign area in copy. Sign copy includes all letters, numbers, characters, symbols and other graphics which are part of the sign. Avoid billboard-style layouts which generally try to provide too much text to be easily read. This guideline generally does not apply to signs which consist of individual letters, characters, or other symbols and which have no perimeter or border.

\[
\text{Sign Area} = (X*Y) \\
\text{Sign Copy} = (A*B) + (C*D) \\
\text{Sign Copy} < 60(X*Y)
\]

Recommendaed Sign Face Layout

g. **Develop a Coordinated Sign Plan for Multiple-Tenant Complexes.** Multiple-tenant buildings and complexes should develop a coordinated sign program that minimizes the potential visual conflicts and competition among tenant signs, yet insures adequate identification for each tenant. Freestanding signs used to identify such complexes which are seen by motorists on U.S. 50 should strive for simple wording and layout rather than too much small text which cannot be read. Tenant identification should be provided by building or projecting signs within the complex.
APPENDIX B
Community Plan Substitute Sign Standards
MEYERS COMMUNITY PLAN SUBSTITUTE SIGN STANDARDS

The following sign standards replace certain sections of El Dorado County's Ordinance Code, Chapter 17 and TRPA's Code of Ordinances, Chapter 26, Signs. The substitute standards recognize and respond to unique situations in Meyers including, but not limited to, the unusually wide public highway right-of-way, existing building setbacks from U.S. 50, heavy snowfall and snow storage practices.

Existing provisions of Chapter 26 which are replaced by the substitute standards are identified in brackets. All other applicable El Dorado County and TRPA sign standards will remain in effect within the community plan area. Refer to Chapter 2, Definitions, and Chapter 26 of TRPA's Code for definitions of specific terms used in herein.

COMMUNITY PLAN SUBSTITUTE SIGN STANDARDS

1. **Increase in Maximum Allowed Sign Area.** Sign area for building and freestanding signs, which are visible from highways with a posted speed limit of 40 miles per hour or greater, may be allowed up to 20 percent additional sign area over the maximum allowable area for each sign as calculated based on the applicable provisions of Chapter 26 as amended by the Meyers Community Plan [replaces subsection 26.6.Q, Increases in Maximum Allowed Sign Area].

2. **Increases in Maximum Allowable Building Sign Height.** Maximum height of building signs which are painted on the building or appear to be painted on the building may be equal to a line formed by the top of the the second floor windows or twenty feet when the building is determined to conform to the Meyers historic architectural design theme. This includes signs which are vertically oriented. This provision does not include signs which are internally illuminated, including neon [amends subsection 26.10.A, Building Signs in Commercial/Public Service Plan Areas].

3. **Temporary Signs for Winter.** Until such time as Caltrans provides a snow haul for plowed snow stored along U.S. 50, businesses located adjacent to U.S. 50 may install temporary signs which meet the design criteria listed below provided an annual permit for the sign is obtained. Once the snow haul has begun, no temporary signs will be permitted and the temporary sign provision will be deleted from the Community Plan and substitute sign standards [replaces subsection 26.6.L, Portable Sign Prohibition].

Design Criteria for Temporary Winter Signs:

a. Each business located adjacent to U.S. 50 may install one temporary sign when plowed snow along U.S. 50 obscures the visibility of a legally existing freestanding or building sign;

b. The sign shall be placed on private property and may be placed in such a manner as to be visible to motorists on U.S. 50;

c. The sign shall be a maximum of 12 square feet in area;
d. The sign shall be constructed of sign board, plywood or sign foam only. No other materials are permitted including, but not limited to, such materials as cloth, banners or flags;

e. The sign shall have a dark background;

f. The sign shall not be internally illuminated;

g. No other temporary signs shall be in place; and

h. The temporary sign shall be removed once the permanent sign face is completely visible from U.S. 50.

4. Replacement of Existing Non-Conforming Signs. Existing non-conforming signs shall be brought into conformance with the sign standards, as amended by the Meyers Community Plan, if a sign is altered structurally, or if the sign face is altered, except for maintenance [amends subsection 26.14.C(4), Removal of Non-Conforming Signs].

5. Transfer of Certain Building Sign Area. Building sign area which may otherwise be permitted under this chapter may be transferred from the building frontage against which the permissible sign area is determined to another side of the same building which does not have a building frontage as defined by TRPA’s Code of Ordinances provided the following conditions are met [amends subsection 26.10.A]:

a. The building on which the signage is to be transferred is determined to conform to the Meyers historic architectural design theme;

b. The sign area is completely transferred such that no signage remains or is installed on the frontage from which the sign area was transferred;

c. The building side receiving the transferred sign area is the side adjacent to the building frontage from which the sign area is transferred;

d. The transfer may occur one time per primary use;

e. The transferred sign area is not internally illuminated, is not used in a projecting sign and is found to be consistent with the Meyers Community Plan Design Review Guidelines for Building Signs on Historic Theme Buildings; and

f. The transfer to the building side receiving the transferred area does not result in a total building sign area greater than 72 square feet, regardless of sign ownership or arrangement of uses within the building.

6. Prohibition of Reflective Materials. No sign shall use or include reflective materials on any part of the sign or sign structure. [amends subsection 26.6.F, Prohibited Devices].
APPENDIX C
Community Plan Commercial Floor Area Allocation Procedures
COMMUNITY PLAN COMMERCIAL FLOOR AREA ALLOCATION PROCEDURES

A. INTRODUCTION

The Meyers Community Plan contains specific procedures by which additional commercial floor area will be allocated. Chapter 2, Land Use, contains economic development policies which states:

Policy: Projects seeking allocations of additional commercial floor area within the plan area shall be subject to the plan's Commercial Floor Area Allocation Procedures. TRPA and El Dorado County shall only consider for approval projects recommended by the Meyers Town Council.

Policy: Allocation procedure B.1 (Location Within Priority Land Use Districts) established by the Commercial Floor Area Allocation Procedures shall not be revised or amended for at least two years from the date of plan adoption.

The allocation procedures listed below identify how to acquire and use the additional 15,400 square feet of commercial floor area allocated to the community plan area. The allocation is derived from two sources: 10,000 square feet from the initial allocation; and 5,400 square feet of bonus commercial floor area. The allocations are intended to support additional development through 1996. At that time, the community plan will be reviewed and, based on amendments to the Regional Plan, may provide additional allocations of commercial floor area.

B. ALLOCATION PROCEDURES

The allocation procedures provide opportunities for all lands within the community plan area on which commercial uses are permitted to compete for an allocation of additional commercial floor area. To receive an allocation, project applicants must satisfy all of the following criteria.

1. Location Within Priority Land Use Districts. The community plan designates the Yank's Station and the West Meyers land use districts as the priority areas (nodes) for additional commercial development. This includes additions to existing commercial uses as well as new development. The districts have relative advantages for increased development over the remainder of the plan area. Advantages include, but are not limited to, containing the majority of existing commercial uses, preferred locations for new retail commercial uses, containing additional area to expand and the ability to cluster development thereby reducing vehicle trips. Refer to the community plan map in Chapter 2 for the exact boundaries of each district.

Establishing priorities clearly states the plan's intentions as to which geographic areas are most important for implementing the plan. Each priority contains a separate transfer ratio required to use the allocation. Any of the priorities may be used at any time. In other words, it is not necessary to first build out all the commercial square footage provided.
under Priority #1 before moving on to Priority #2. Following the first two years of implementation, any or all of the priorities may be amended to better suit the needs of the community. The following priorities are established to guide the initial distribution of the additional floor area:

Priority #1. Existing development or new development located within either Yank's Station or West Meyers land use districts. 10,000 square feet allocated. Match allocation using transfer ratio shown below.

Priority #2. Existing development located outside of the Yank's Station and West Meyers land use districts. 4,000 square feet allocated. Match allocation using transfer ratio shown below.

Priority #3. New development located outside of the Yank's Station and West Meyers land use districts. 1,400 square feet allocated. Match allocation using transfer ratio shown below.

New development is development which occurs on a vacant parcel. A vacant parcel as defined by TRPA is undeveloped or unimproved and has no established use. Existing development is development which is legally present or approved on the effective date of the community plan. Chapter 33 of TRPA's Code of Ordinances permits, under certain conditions, the expansion of legally existing commercial floor area by 5% or 500 square feet, whichever is less, without first receiving an allocation of new commercial floor area. The 5%/500 expansion may not be applied for or built in conjunction with any other addition or expansion. All commercial uses which can qualify for this expansion are encouraged to use it. Refer to TRPA Code Section 33.3 for the exact specifications for use.

In the event the additional commercial floor area previously allocated to El Dorado County outside of community plan areas is reallocated to the Meyers community plan (approximately 4,500 square feet), the allocation to each of the three priorities would be increased based on their relative proportions of the initial allocation of 15,400 square feet.

2. **Matching Commercial Floor Area.** Allocation priorities identified above require each project applicant to transfer or otherwise bring to the project a certain amount of the project's total commercial square footage. It is possible to bring in more than the minimum required match, however, the maximum allocation of additional commercial floor area will not increase. The following matching ratios are established for each allocation priority:

- Priority #1. 75% allocation, 25% project match (3 to 1)
- Priority #2. 50% allocation, 50% project match (1 to 1)
- Priority #3. 25% allocation, 75% project match (1 to 3)

For the purposes of transferring matching floor area for a project, existing development (Priorities #1 and #2), may use legally created existing or banked commercial floor area which is on the parcel (or banked therefrom) as a source of match. New development on a vacant parcel(s) must transfer matching floor area including banked floor area, from outside either the Yank's Station or West Meyers districts.
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List of Mitigation Measures

The following list contains the final mitigation measures for the Meyers Community Plan. The list includes only those measures which are not already a requirement of the Community Plan.

Chapter 5 - Land Use

5.1 If property owners purchase resinded right-of-way from Caltrans, they will be required to process a boundary line adjustment application with El Dorado County and TRPA to make it part of their legal lot.

Chapter 6 - Soils/Land Coverage

No additional mitigation is necessary.

Chapter 7 - Water Quality/SEZ

No additional mitigation is required for the Community Plan.

Chapter 8 - Transportation/Circulation

8.1 The median should not be located in Special Area #1 in the immediate vicinity of the Santa Fe Road/Apache Avenue intersection, where relatively intense development currently exists.

8.2 Construction of auxiliary through lanes on Highway 50 through the intersection with Pioneer Trail should be added to a future RTP-AQP, with subsequent environmental analysis.

8.3 A project study report should be prepared for the intersection of Highway 50 and Highway 89. This document will evaluate the feasibility of signalization or a roundabout. Future traffic volume levels will be monitored by CalTrans and improvements should be installed when warranted.

8.4 Where practical, the parking areas of adjacent properties should be connected to reduce access impacts created by the median.

8.5 Specific design details of the proposed median will be developed in cooperation with Caltrans according to CalTrans standards.

8.6 The traffic signal at Highway 50/Pioneer Trail shall be modified to include pedestrian/bicycle actuation, indications, and push buttons subject to CalTrans approval.
Chapter 9 - Air Quality

9.1 To mitigate fugitive dust impacts, dust control through BMPs shall be incorporated into project planning and permitting.

Chapter 10 - Noise

10.1 The County and TRPA shall adopt hourly noise level performance standards for the Meyers Community Plan. These noise level standards would be expressed in terms of daytime and nighttime hourly average (Lₜₐₜ) and maximum (Lₚₗₜ) performance standards as a means of evaluating stationary noise sources. These standards are proposed in addition to the 24-hour CNEL criteria. Table 10.5 of the EA shows the proposed hourly performance standards. The noise level performance criteria contained in Table 10.5 allow for an individual site which operates continuously for 24 hours to produce noise levels which are equivalent to 65 dB CNEL in Special Area #4, and 58 dB CNEL in the remainder of the Community Plan area.

Chapter 11 - Scenic Resources

No additional mitigation is required.

Chapter 12 - Biological Resources

12.1 As a condition of approval for commercial and industrial projects within the Plan Area, garbage dumpsters shall be "bear-proofed" with metal lids that are latched (with a minimum of two latches).

Chapter 13 - Cultural Resources

13.1 On projects which will involve ground disturbance, the designated Lead Agency under CEQA shall evaluate impacts to cultural resources. This evaluation shall include, but is not limited to, a record search through the North Central Information Center, archaeological survey, and, when there is the potential for disturbance to cultural resources, on-site monitoring of ground disturbance activities by a qualified archaeologist.

Chapter 14 - Natural Hazards

No additional mitigation required.

Chapter 15 - Recreation

No additional mitigation required.
Chapter 16 - Public Services

16.1 Prior to excavation, grading, or trenching within the Plan area, STPUD and the Sierra Pacific Power Company shall be contacted to ensure that underground utility lines are not inadvertently damaged.

Chapter 17 - Housing and Population

No additional mitigation required.
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Letter A

League to Save Lake Tahoe
989 Tahoe Keys Boulevard, Suite 6
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
(916) 541-5388

September 10, 1993

Dear Ms. Eddins:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment upon the Meyers Community Plan and the Environmental Assessment/Negative Declaration.

The community plan was thoughtfully prepared to set the stage for correcting many of the deficiencies in the community. We are generally impressed with the plan and support its adoption.

I have enclosed specific comments regarding the Community Plan and environmental document. If you have questions about our comments, please contact me or League consultant Jon Hoefer at 541-5388.

Sincerely,

Rochelle Nason
Executive Director

Enclosure

cc: Andrew Strain, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

G.eddins
LEAGUE TO SAVE LAKE TAHOE
COMMENTS ON THE MEYERS COMMUNITY PLAN
and ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

I - QUALITY POINTS OF THE COMMUNITY PLAN

There are many proposals in the community plan to which the League to Save Lake Tahoe ascribe as paramount to the improvement of the Meyers area. Some of those are:

- Improvements, some of which have commenced to take shape, to the Highway 50 corridor through town.
- Reduction, consolidation, organizing and standardizing signs which currently add to the visual blight as well as being a barrage on the senses of a tired traveler;
- Consolidated, shared parking for businesses and reduced number of access points along the highway;
- Park and ride facility and transit connection point;
- Stream zone and disturbed area restoration.

II - COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT CONCENTRATION

The Meyers Community Plan relies upon adherence to a list of permissible uses that would place commercial activity within three of five districts. Since each parcel within a community plan area is eligible for commercial development, and because the permissible use list can be changed, the plan may fail to concentrate the commercial.

Boundary adjustments that would actually remove districts (special areas) that are not planned for commercial development from the community plan area is a preferable method for control of the location of commercial development. Although the code of ordinances does not require such adjustments, it does not prohibit or limit them. Removing the two districts that do not have a commercial theme would be consistent with the purposes of community plan areas.

To adjust the community plan boundaries, the Upper Truckee River District that has a residential and recreation land use theme could be added to the Christmas Valley Residential PAS #137 or to the KOA/Rainbow Recreation PAS # 136 which have compatible land use themes. The Lake Valley district could be added to the Meyers or Mandan Residential Plan Areas probably as a special area.

Other boundary adjustments that could assist in preventing the spread of commercial would be to transfer the northern vacant parcels along Highway 50 in the Yanks Station District into the Meyers Forest PAS # 123, and the 10 acre vacant parcel at the north end of Shakon Street in the Industrial Tract District could be transfer into the Freel Peak PAS #121 which has a conservation theme.
III - PERMISSIBLE USE LIST

Several concerns exist with the permissible use list.

Yank's Station and West Meyers Districts (pages 2-8 and 2-10) included many Public Service uses as both allowed and special use. The final plan list should consider fewer of these uses as allowed to favor their development in the Lake Valley District having a community service theme.

The permissible use lists is not consistent with the policy of the plan regarding local post office. Local post office is an allowed permissible use in Yank's Station, Lake Valley, and West Meyers Districts and a special use in the Industrial Tract (pages 2-8: 2-11; 2-12). Public service policy 2 (page 6-3) is to locate the post office in the Yank's Station or West Meyers District. The permissible use list should be revised for consistency with the plan policy.

IV - ALLOCATION OF COMMERCIAL FLOOR AREA

There is inconsistency in the plan regarding location priority for commercial development.

Appendix C, Commercial Floor Area Allocation Procedures, page C-1 states that the community plan designates the Yank's Station and the West Meyers land use districts as the priority areas for additional commercial development. No such statement was noted in the plan.

Limitation of commercial floor area allocation for the first year to new development in the Yank's Station and the West Meyers Districts (page C-2) is insufficient time to assure that these areas receive priority. The requirements for matching transfers may not suffice as deterrents to the second and third priority allocations.

Add a land use objective (page 2-5) that clearly makes the Yank's Station and the West Meyers Land Use Districts the priority location for new commercial floor area allocation. Change the allocation procedures to require at least three years before second and third priority allocations are implemented.

V - SALE OF HIGHWAY RIGHT OF WAY TO ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS.

Sales of State Highway right of way land to private property owners has the potential to increase the amount of excessive land coverage.

It is not clear in the plan what is to happen in regard to land coverage when right of way land is sold. Land coverage is assumed in excess of allowed within the right of way. The EA discloses the amount of land coverage and land disturbance (page 6.4) but not the amount in relation to allowed for public rights of way. Only for stream environment zone (page 7.7) is there data on actual land coverage in relation to allowed.

Add direction to the plan that any land coverage that may be available for transfer with the sale of highway right of way land to private property owners will be retained for public use by the State.

VI - CONSTRUCTION OF A VEGETATED MEDIAN STRIP IN HIGHWAY 50

The planned median strip would add greatly to the appearance of the community. Problems associated with highway maintenance and snow removal around a median strip resulted in recommendations in the EA to change the plan to have a no median or a non-landscaped median.
It is appropriate for the EA to indicate the kind of difficulties that occur with a median strip. To recommend that the median, if retained as an improvement, not be landscaped concludes that there are no other solutions to the problem. This is not so.

A landscaped median should not be removed as an objective and proposed improvement in the Highway 50 corridor. Recommended mitigation measures in the EA should include finding solution to snow removal and landscape management in the median.

VII - ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MEYERS TOWN COUNCIL

The requirement in the Community Plan for action by the currently non-existent Meyers Town Council is a concern.

Establishment of a town council could have numerous benefits especially that of local interest in insuring that the goals, objectives, and policies of the community plan are carried out or enforced. Past neglect in enforcing ordinances of El Dorado County and TRPA have led to many of the aesthetic distractions found currently in Meyers. However, establishment of the town council should not be conditioned upon or linked to approval of the community plan.

Reference to the Town Council should be removed from the community plan. Establishment of the town council should be sought through the County Board of Supervisors as a separate process.

OTHER COMMENTS TO THE DRAFT PLAN:

Transportation Objective 7, page 3-4 -- the objective is to reduce the number of vehicular access points along Hwy 50, but contains the clause "whenever possible". This clause should be removed from the objective.

Conservation Policy 2, page 4-1 -- the policy to preserve live juniper trees should be expanded to include dead juniper as well. Dead juniper are resistant to rot and because of their form will remain standing for decades after dying. As a dead tree, they are visually attractive and are also important wildlife habitat. Consider adding the following sentence to the policy, "Retain dead juniper unless they become a safety hazard as determined by the California Dept. of Forestry and Fire Protection".

Conservation Objective 4, page 4-2 -- Protection and enhancement of stream environment zone is required, therefore the word "encourage" should be changed to "require". The objective is vague in its direction regarding SEZ in closed conduit. If there is SEZ within closed conduit that can be brought to the surface of the ground and made to function naturally, the objective should so state.

Program Description for Vegetation Preservation, page 4-9 -- reword this statement to include preservation of dead juniper as well as live trees.

Recreation Improvements for the Tahoe Paradise Golf Course, page 5-3 -- the description of improvements implies that a small outdoor retail/cafe to serve the golf course could not be constructed without a community plan boundary adjustment or a plan area amendment. This is not true. Such services are accessory to the golf course. Reference to a boundary adjustment must be removed as not meeting the conditions specified in TRPA Code chapter 14.
Inventory of Public Service Facilities, page 6-1 -- the list should include the U.S. Forest Service work center.

Second policy, Public Service Objective 1, page 6-3 -- Strengthen this policy on reducing and consolidating highway directional signage by omitting "whenever feasible".

Public Service Objective 2, page 6-3 -- This objective and policy calls for the post office to be an anchor use in the Yanks Station or West Meyers District. However, the plan has local post office as an allowed permissible use in the Lake Valley District and a special permissible use in the Industrial Tract. To be consistent with the objective, prohibit a local post office in the Lake Valley and Industrial Tract Districts.

Public Service Objective 9, page 6-4 -- This objective should be changed to "require" new public service corporation yards and storage facilities to be located in the Industrial Tract district. Consider adding to the objective as follows, "Encourage existing public service corporation yards and storage facilities to relocate to the Industrial Tract District.

Public Service Improvement #1, page 6-4 -- The size of the proposed local post office, and the number of postal boxes, should be removed from the community plan. We question whether the information is consistent with plans for home delivery which would be a matter for project level planning.

Implementation Policy, Objective 1, page 7-1 -- The policy directs that land coverage, commercial floor area, tourist accommodation units and other units regulated by the TRPA shall not be transferred from the community plan area unless there are substantial community benefits. No means of measuring those community benefits are suggested in the policy. Until and unless a basis for measuring the benefits is provided, the policy lacks adequate direction.

Appendix B, Substitute Sign Standards, page B-1 -- Provisions for temporary signs when permanent business signs are obscured by snow piled along the highway is a concern. Though it is important to regulate this type of sign, it could be a serious visual distraction if enforced with the same laxity as other activities in the Meyers area. Who will enforce the erection and removal of the signs in a timely manner?
August 30, 1993

Ms. Elizabeth Eddins, Project Planner
El Dorado County Planning Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, California 95667

Dear Ms. Eddins:

The Department of Fish and Game (DFG) has reviewed the Meyers Community Plan, a proposal to direct development in the Meyers area of El Dorado County (SCH# 92122039).

The proposed project is located in the Meyers area of The Lake Tahoe Basin, El Dorado County. Highway 50 and Highway 89 intersect in the approximate center of the project area. Vegetation consists of highly modified Jeffrey Pine Forest with some riparian area along the Upper Truckee River that flows through the project area.

The DFG has the following concerns and recommendations that should be incorporated into the final Community Plan:

1. The DFG supports policy direction to restore and maintain disturbed areas of the Stream Environment Zone.

2. The potential for increased bear/garbage incidences should be considered during development planning. Development in the Community Planning area will result in increased summer use (i.e., visitors and residents). The project area is within the black bear's summer range, and they can be expected to occasionally wander through the area. Most recreational areas and summer home sites in the adjacent areas have experienced bear disturbances of garbage cans. It is the responsibility of residents to keep garbage cleaned up and unavailable to bears. The DFG policy is not to trap and relocate "garbage can bears". Therefore, we recommend any permit issued require the following:

   **Residential**
   Garbage be cleaned up and made unavailable to bears.

   **Business/commercial**
   Garbage dumpsters be "bear-proofed" with metal lids that are latched (with a minimum of two latches).
Ms. Elizabeth Eddins
August 30, 1993
Page Two

If we can be of further assistance, please contact Mr. Bob Mapes, Associate Wildlife Biologist, at (916) 355-7010 or Mr. Jerry Mensch, Environmental Services Supervisor, at (916) 355-7030.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
L. Ryan Broddrick
Regional Manager

cc: Mr. Bob Mapes
Department of Fish and Game
Rancho Cordova, California

Mr. Jerry Mensch
Department of Fish and Game
Rancho Cordova, California
Memorandum

To: William Shafroth
Resources Agency
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attention: Nadel Gayou

Ranjit S. Gill, Ph.D., Chief, Planning and Toxics Section

From: California Regional Water Quality Control Board
La Cienega Region
2092 Lake Tahoe Boulevard, Suite 2
South Lake Tahoe, California  96150
(916) 544-3481  FAX (916) 544-2271

Date: September 2, 1993

Subject: REVIEW OF DRAFT MEYERS COMMUNITY PLAN AND DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION, SCH # 92122539

Regional Board staff have reviewed the draft Meyers Community Plan (CP) and associated draft Environmental Assessment/Negative Declaration (EA/ND) which are being circulated jointly by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and El Dorado County. The CP would provide for the allocation of new commercial floor space and for environmental improvements, and designate permissible uses. The EA/ND is considered a programmatic environmental document. Future projects which could be constructed in the CP area include a new visitor center, a "full service community market", a 150-space "park and ride" lot, and expanded bicycle and recreational trails. Approval of the CP is expected to include revision of the land capability map for the area; approximately 13 acres previously mapped as Class 1b (Stream Environment Zone or SEZ) would be changed to other land capability classes.

The Regional Board will not be issuing any permits as a direct result of CP adoption. New or revised permits, or placement of projects under existing general permits, could be required for specific projects carried out under the CP. We have the following comments as a "trustee agency" under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the waters of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

General Comments

1. The EA/ND does not include a detailed soils report justifying the proposed SEZ reclassification. We assume that this will be provided to TRPA Advisory Planning Commission members, including the Regional Board's Executive Officer, before a vote is considered. "Before" and "after" land capability maps would also be useful in evaluating the impacts of the proposed remapping.
2. Retrofit of Best Management Practices (BMPs) for erosion and stormwater control to existing development is mentioned several times in both the CP and the EA/ND (e.g., page 6.9) as an environmental benefit of the CP. However, BMP retrofit is currently required under state and TRPA water quality control plans, the County's stormwater NPDES permit, and TRPA ordinances. (Implementation of BMPs for new projects, cited as another CP benefit, is also currently required by the Regional Board and TRPA.) Neither the CP nor the EA/ND discusses an organized CP program (e.g., to accelerate BMP retrofit beyond the level which could be expected on a parcel-by-parcel basis under current implementation programs). If a special CP retrofit program is proposed, it should be included in the implementation element (page 7-6, check). If no such CP program is planned, the CP should not receive special credit for the environmental benefit.

3. The Executive Summary of the EA/ND (page 2.2) states that no water quality mitigation measures are needed. As the specific comments below indicate, additional clarification, if not mitigation, is needed on a number of water quality related issues.

4. A number of changes in state and federal water quality regulations have occurred since circulation of the Notice of Preparation for the EA/ND, and may affect implementation of the CP:

a. The State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) amended the statewide Inland Surface Waters Plan in November, 1992 to add and revise water quality objectives for a number of toxic substances. The changes took effect following review by the state Office of Administrative Law. In January 1993, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency promulgated the National Toxics Rule, which further changed toxics objectives for surface waters.

b. The Lahontan Regional Board has adopted a municipal stormwater NPDES permit for El Dorado County, and a separate stormwater NPDES permit for the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Statewide stormwater NPDES permits now apply to existing and future industrial projects and to some larger construction projects. The Regional Board has the option of issuing individual or areawide general stormwater NPDES permits where necessary to protect water quality. In early 1993, statewide Best Management Practices Handbooks for stormwater NPDES permits were developed.

c. The Lahontan Regional Board is in the process of combining and updating its water quality control plans (Basin Plans) as a single Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region. The new plan is scheduled for Regional Board adoption on September 9, 1993, and following other necessary state and federal approvals, could take effect by mid-1994. The draft Basin Plan includes revisions in regionwide water quality objectives and the Tahoe Basin stormwater effluent limitations, a new suspended sediment objective for Tahoe Basin streams, additional Regional Board findings for man-modified determinations and 100-year flood plain exemptions, and an updated discussion of the Regional Board's BMP retrofit program.
Recent amendments to CEQA (Section 21092.6) require lead agencies to disclose whether a project site is on the "Cortese List" of hazardous waste sites maintained by the California Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

e. The State Water Resources Control Board has denied, without prejudice, state water quality certification for all U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide Section 404 Permits statewide, pending the adoption of a state wetlands policy. Although the Resources Agency has recently announced a proposed policy, the State Board's schedule for reconsideration of the Nationwide Permits is uncertain. This means that any proposed disturbance of "jurisdictional wetlands" in the CP area will, at least in the short term, require an individual Corps permit with state water quality certification.

Specific Comments on Community Plan

1. The CP (page 3-2) identifies "informal" pedestrian trails, including at least one in a Stream Environment Zone. Such trails should either be stabilized and mitigated as part of a formal bicycle/pedestrian trail system, or eliminated and revegetated. Public education on the need not to create trails through SEZs in the future should be considered as part of the proposed interpretive signs in the CP area.

2. On page 4-2, the CP mentions the use of man-modified determinations as a vehicle for funding SEZ restoration. Given the small area of SEZ which would remain within CP boundaries if the remapping is approved, how many additional man-modified determinations can actually be expected to occur?

3. The CP (page 5-3) proposes a pedestrian undercrossing of Highway 50 between the new visitor center and Washoe Meadows State Park, at the Truckee River bridge. Potential impacts of this crossing on the river (e.g., in terms of new coverage, and potential for additional SEZ disturbance or streambank erosion) should be recognized in the EA/ND.

4. On page 7-2, the CP states that SEZ restoration as mitigation for any "man-modified" reclassifications should be carried out within CP boundaries. Assuming that the remapping is approved, will there be enough remaining restorable SEZ left in the CP to allow this provision to be implemented?

5. The schedule on page 7-8 of the CP should include a schedule for BMP retrofit, reflecting either the current TRPA ordinance deadlines, or an "equal or superior" CP schedule.

6. On page 7-10 of the CP, Section 319 nonpoint source grant funding is mentioned as a probable source of funding for the proposed bicycle trail/drainage system on the north side of Highway 50. This source should not necessarily be relied upon. Such funding was provided for the facilities on the south side of the highway, but the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and State Water Resource Control Board have historically been reluctant to provide grant funding for "Phase II" of a previous grant
project. Also, if the land capability map is amended, portions of this project may not be justifiable as "SEZ restoration".

Page 7-14 of the CP mentions the Regional Board as a "responsible party" for water quality monitoring. Although the Regional Board may require discharger monitoring as a condition of any permit approvals, and staff may take occasional "compliance monitoring" samples, we have no plans for a separate long term monitoring program in the CP area.

The Meyers Community Plan Design Review Guidelines, page 5, paragraph 1a contain an apparent typographical error: is "stormyrite" meant to read "stormwater"?

The Design Review Guidelines, page 20 propose that freestanding signs be placed on islands within stormwater detention basins to facilitate clearance of snow. The presence of such islands could effect the efficiency of stormwater treatment, and a basin with an island would need to be sized larger in order to provide the same degree of treatment as a basin without an island.

Specific Comments on Environmental Assessment/Negative Declaration

1. What is meant by the "entitlement process for potential biological impacts" cited as mitigation on page 2.3 of the EA/ND?

2. In addition to its enforcement authority (page 4.2) the Lahontan Regional Board also sets state water quality standards and waste discharge prohibitions. The Regional Board also has a much broader authority than TRPA in the area of toxic substances control.

3. Our review copy of the EA/ND did not contain Table 6.1-c which is cited on page 6.5. This table apparently documents the extent of existing excess impervious surface coverage on a parcel by parcel basis, and is thus important for understanding the potential impacts of the CP.

4. The discussion of compliance with Soils/Land Coverage Evaluation Guidelines (Table 6.4, page 6-5) does not include Regional Board waste discharge prohibitions related to land coverage. Regional Board exemption criteria for these prohibitions are similar to those of TRPA for its land use restrictions; however, separate Regional Board findings must be made.

5. The mitigation measures for coverage impacts discussed on page 6-7 (BMPs, excess coverage mitigation fees, soft coverage restoration) would be required whether or not a CP is approved. What special CP-related water quality improvements are being proposed to offset the additional new coverage allowable within CP boundaries?

6. The runoff guidelines shown on page 7.2 of the EA/ND as Regional Board and TRPA guidelines are inaccurate. Regional Board guidelines, as contained in the 1980 Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Plan, do not currently include the 250 mg/l suspended
Meyers Community Plan
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sediment limitation. Regional Board staff are proposing some changes in the 1980 guidelines as part of the 1993 Basin Plan update.

In addition to the runoff guidelines (which the Regional Board considers to be effluent limitations, water quality "evaluation criteria" should include compliance with all state ambient water quality standards for surface and ground waters, and with discharge prohibitions. The spelling "phosphorous" should be corrected to "phosphorus" in Table 7.1.

On page 7.3, the EA/ND states that Table 7.2-B "comparres the quality of stormwater runoff to an undeveloped forest". The table actually compares runoff from two former TRPA "Land Use District" or "zoning" categories. Although runoff quality from "General Forest" lands has been used in the past to estimate natural runoff quality, such lands were not necessarily completely undisturbed.

The SEZ discussion beginning on page 7.6 should include the need for Regional Board exemption findings from waste discharge prohibitions for recreational and public works projects in the CP area.

Page 7.7 states that the objective of the TRPA water quality thresholds is to restore the clarity of Lake Tahoe to pre-1970 conditions. The California clarity objective is based on 1968-71 conditions.

Page 7.7 states that drainage improvements may use "stream channels" ...to collect and treat stormwater prior to discharge". We hope that this is a reference to artificial rather than natural channels; natural streams should not be used as stormwater treatment facilities.

The paragraph on Plan Area Statements on page 7.9 states that "the Community Plan proposes that BMPs be installed on all disturbed or developed parcels". As noted in our general comments above, BMPs are required to be installed on all parcels, whether or not the CP "proposes" them.

State water quality certification under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act will be required for any Corps of Engineers permits issued for SEZ disturbance in the CP area (page 7.9).

The transportation section of the EA/ND (page 8.13) notes potential snow removal problems and recommends that Caltrans remove snow from the CP area rather than storing it on the roadside as is currently the case. Potential water quality impacts of snow storage in an alternative area (runoff or percolation to groundwater of contaminated stormwater) should be recognized.

On page 8.19, the EA/ND discusses potential snow removal problems associated with the proposed landscaped Highway 50 median, and recommends that it not be landscaped as mitigation. This contradicts assumptions about the median, and its environmental benefits, made elsewhere throughout the EA/ND and CP. (We assume that coverage reductions and scenic benefits from the landscaping are part of the CP's offset package for additional impervious surface coverage under CP incentives.) If a
non-landscaped median is proposed for traffic control reasons, it should be stabilized to prevent erosion, and may need to be considered as coverage. Additional coverage reduction opportunities should be sought.

15. The EA/ND (page 13.7) states that the Lahontan Regional Board will be responsible for field archaeological/historical surveys and cultural resource mitigation for SEZ restoration projects. The Regional Board does not generally function as CEQA lead agency for SEZ restoration projects. Cultural resources mitigation is the responsibility of the lead agency, which in the Meyers CP area will presumably be El Dorado County, the California Tahoe Conservancy, CalTrans, or the Department of Food and Agriculture. Regional Board staff do not have the technical expertise or funding to address cultural resources impacts. In rare cases where no other state or local agency is issuing a permit (i.e., U.S. Forest Service SEZ restoration projects), the Regional Board does act as CEQA lead agency, but relies on cultural resource surveys and mitigation by qualified Forest Service staff.

16. The discussion of 100-year floodplain development (pages 14.2-14.3) should mention the Regional Board’s 100 year floodplain discharge prohibition for the Lake Tahoe Basin. Although new exemption criteria are being proposed in the revised Basin Plan, the Board cannot currently grant exemptions for 100 year flood plain projects which are not also SEZs.

17. The discussion of public services and utilities (page 16.4) should recognize the need to protect any existing utility lines in the current Caltrans right-of-way (which is proposed to be sold to individual businesses) to prevent spills during construction, and to provide continuing access for maintenance.

Please contact Judith Unisicker at (916) 542-5417 if you wish to discuss these comments.

Enclosure

cc: Regional Board members
    Greg Frantz, Division of Water Quality, SWRCB
    TRPA
    Liz Eddins, El-Dorado County Planning Department
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Ms. Elizabeth Eddins  
Associate Planner  
El Dorado County Planning Department  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667

Dear Ms. Eddins:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the above referenced document.

**COMMENTS:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-1</strong></td>
<td>The Apache Avenue Intersection, just east of the Agricultural Inspection Station, will need analyzed and included in the traffic study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-2</strong></td>
<td>Caltrans supports Objective 7 on page 3-4. Reducing the number of driveways and spacing them correctly minimizes the number of conflict points for vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists. Further analysis may be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-3</strong></td>
<td>Caltrans has not received any proposals for the Meyers Post Office relocation. This facility could have significant traffic impacts on State Route (SR) 50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-4</strong></td>
<td>The proposed traffic circle will not be allowed on SR 50. However, a traffic signal in this area would be considered when warrants are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-5</strong></td>
<td>The Pioneer Trail Intersection is operating over capacity at peak hour times. The provision for a longer eastbound right-turn lane, along with a right-turn overlap phase, should be listed as a high priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-6</strong></td>
<td>The proposed gateways would require encroachment permits and would not be allowed if they create a safety hazard as a fixed object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-7</strong></td>
<td>Right-of-way width should not be reduced unless allowances are made for four (4) through lanes, right-turn lanes, a possible light rail corridor and snow storage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-8</strong></td>
<td>The sale of non-operational right of way to adjoining property owners would be the responsibility of the Caltrans Right of Way Department (page 7-5 item 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-9</strong></td>
<td>Confirm that the Stream Environment Zone restoration plan qualifies for funding under the Transportation Enhancement Act (TEA). (page 7-9 item 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-10</strong></td>
<td>The proposed Park-n-Ride lot will require further study to determine its viability and would not be practical as a chain-installation area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caltrans would like to see the left-turn warrant calculations for Shakori Drive (page 8-11).

A raised median will not be allowed on SR 50. A depressed median could be considered and would have to be at least 22 feet wide with enough slope and drainage capacity to prevent the snow melt from running onto the travel way and freezing at night. The reconstruction and drainage work would require local funding. The responsible agency for maintenance of the additional drains will need to be identified.

Chain-up areas must be long enough to accommodate 150 vehicles parked in a single line, with open access back to SR 50. A 5-foot snow berm would be difficult to maintain and would create sight distance problems for vehicles attempting to enter or exit the main traffic flow of SR 50. (page 6 item g). Any snow berms would need to be removed after storms to eliminate water and ice problems from snow melt.

Caltrans will not assume financial responsibility for increased coverage credits with respect to Excess Coverage Mitigation Fees or Land Coverage Transfer Fees for “Approximately 6 feet of additional paving width of compacted shoulder will be necessary”. Confirm with Caltrans Local Programs that this type of work qualifies for TEA program funding (page 7-11 item d).

Any changes proposed for chain control facilities or operations are subject to approval by Caltrans.

Page 7, Design Review Guidelines, h. Landscaped Median:
Landscaping may not be practical as sight distance for cross traffic will be severely limited by the proposed plantings within the landscaped median. Blocking left-turn movements at existing driveways would concentrate movements at the remaining locations, which could create the need for traffic signals.

The Guidelines are in conflict with the Transportation and Circulation Element section regarding the construction of the Center Landscaped Median (page 3-6) which states “the median will be planted with low growing, low maintenance native or adapted shrubs and ground cover”. The Design Review Guidelines states, “The median should be planted with a mix of small deciduous trees and large deciduous shrubs which break up the highway corridor’s apparent width.”

It would be impossible to remove snow from a raised or landscaped median. Snow accumulation in the median would result in a large snow berm, which would decrease and/or block the sight distances for vehicles making turning movements.

Snow is currently blown onto the shoulder areas, to melt off in the spring (page 8 item k). Snow blown into the landscaped area will damage plantings. Who will pay for damages, repairs and maintenance of landscaping on the median and shoulder areas?
Snow hauling is expensive ($30,000 a day) and would be locally funded.

If you have any questions or need assistance please contact Terri Pencovic, Inter Governmental Review/CEQA Coordinator, at (916) 741-4199 or FAX (916) 741-5346.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

E. A. "LIB" HARAUGHTY
Chief, Planning Branch B

RNE:me/la
A. League to Save Lake Tahoe

Comments A1 through A5, A7, and A8: These comments deal with the text of the Meyers Community Plan itself, and do not address the content of the environmental assessment.

Comment A6: On page 8.19, the EA states, "The median area should not be raised, and unless special provisions are made for manual snow removal, the median should not be landscaped." The EA does not totally remove the median as an option for Highway 50, but points out the need for alternative snow removal practices if the median is landscaped. More specific analysis of the practicality of constructing a median will be done during the project design phase. Installation of the median is projected by the Community Plan to occur in the next 20 years. Given the long-term nature of this program and conceptual nature of the existing proposal, it would be speculative to develop specific mitigation measures for snow removal and landscape management in this EA. The proposed mitigation measure for median design on page 8.19 is hereby replaced with the following: "Specific design details of the median will be developed in cooperation with Caltrans."

B. California Department of Fish and Game

Comment B1: Comment noted.

Comment B2: The EA will include the following mitigation measure:

As a condition of approval for commercial and industrial projects within the plan area, garbage dumpsters shall be "bear-proofed" with metal lids that are latched (with a minimum of two latches).

C. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region

C-1: Information further detailing the proposed SEZ reclassification will be provided to the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission and the Regional Board's Executive Officer before a vote is considered. Field verification of the soil types in the reclassification areas has been conducted by TRPA staff.

C-2: Comment noted. BMP retrofit is not a benefit of the Community Plan, but is currently required under State and TRPA water quality control plans, the County's stormwater NPDES permit, and TRPA ordinances. The Community Plan does not propose credit for a special CP retrofit program.

C-3: Additional clarification is provided in the following responses to specific comments.
C-4 through C-6: Comments noted. This updated information is hereby incorporated into the EA.

C-7: There are no properties within the Plan Area which area on the "Cortese List" of hazardous waste sites maintained by the CalEPA.

C-8: Comment noted. The wetlands within the plan area are largely confined to the existing SEZ areas.

C-9 through C-17: These comments deal with the text of the Meyers Community Plan itself, and do not address the content of the environmental assessment.

C-18: The biological impacts of specific projects will be more fully analyzed during the individual project review process.

C-19: Comment noted. This corrected information is hereby incorporated into the EA.

C-20: Table 6.1-c, referred to on page 6.5 of the EA, should be Table 6.3.

C-21: Comment noted. This additional information is hereby incorporated into the EA.

C-22: The land coverage reduction program discussed on page 6.6, and the disturbed soil restoration program discussed on page 6.8, are the water quality improvements being proposed to offset the additional new coverage available within the CP boundaries.

C-23: Comment noted. The corrected information is hereby incorporated into the EA.

C-24: The statement "compares the quality of stormwater runoff to an undeveloped forest" in Table 7.2-B is hereby changed to, "compares the quality of stormwater runoff to TRPA's former general forest land use district."

C-25: Comment noted. This additional information is hereby incorporated into the EA.

C-26: Page 7.7 is hereby changed to state that the objective of the TRPA water quality thresholds is to restore the clarity of Lake Tahoe to pre-1971 conditions.

C-27: Page 7.7 is hereby changed to state that drainage improvements may use man-made conveyances... to collect and treat stormwater prior to discharge.

C-28: Comment noted. See response #C-2.

C-29: Comment noted. The additional information is hereby incorporated into the EA.
C-30: Indirect impacts to water quality could result from snow storage. Potential locations within the Plan area for snow storage include the Caltrans Yard and the County DOT yard, which are well outside of SEZ areas. Snow storage areas require a permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board - Lahontan.

C-31: Refer to response A-6. Methods to reduce erosion from a non-landscaped median will be more fully evaluated during the project planning and design phase.

C-32: The mitigations on page 13.7 are hereby changed to read: "On all projects which will involve ground disturbance, the lead agency under CEQA shall evaluate potential impacts to cultural resources..."

C-33: Comment noted. This additional information is hereby incorporated into the EA.

C-34: The following mitigation measure is added under item 16.4 on page 16.4: Prior to excavation, grading, or trenching within the plan area, STPUD and the Sierra Pacific Power Company shall be contacted to ensure that underground utility lines are not inadvertently damaged.

D - Caltrans

D-1: The intersections included in the traffic study were selected based on the location of anticipated development within the Community Plan area. The Plan area does not include residential properties fronting Apache Avenue North, and does not anticipate changes to current land uses on Apache Avenue South. Therefore, while it may be necessary to investigate this location further if specific development proposals affecting Apache Avenue do occur, at this time the inclusion of this intersection in the traffic analysis is not warranted.

D-2: Comment noted.

D-3: The project specific impacts of the Meyers Post Office will be more fully analyzed during the project planning and design process.

D-4 through D-6: Comments noted.

D-7: The Community Plan does not advocate reducing the Operational Right of Way (ORW) along Highway 50. Currently, the ORW is 240 feet wide, with approximately 60 feet on each side devoted to the Pat Lowe Bike Trail project. There is an additional 40 feet of Non-Operational Right of Way outside the ORW on both sides of the Highway. The 120 feet of remaining ORW dedicated to the Highway can accommodate four travel lanes, although the Community Plan does not envision four lanes on Highway 50. While the limits of the light rail corridor have yet to be defined, on the Sacramento Light Rail system, such a line requires an operating right of way of 40 feet, with 60 feet required to accommodate a track and a light rail
station. The traffic study for the Community Plan noted that if both the light rail corridor and the north-side bicycle path were developed, additional ORW may be needed. However, it is more logical to expect that the north side bicycle path area could be converted to a light rail corridor and all bicycle travel could be accommodated on the remaining south-side path. Such issues are somewhat speculative since a light rail corridor is not yet in the planning stage for the Tahoe Basin.

D-8: Comment noted. This is a comment on the Community Plan and not the EA.

D-9: This is a comment on the Community Plan and not the EA.

D-10: Comment noted. Project specific impacts of the proposed Park and Ride lot will be fully analyzed during the project planning and design process.

D-11: These calculations have been forwarded to Caltrans.

D-12 through D-15: Comments noted. The median is a conceptual proposal at this point. Design details of the median and chain up areas will be worked out with Caltrans during the project planning phase.

D-16: The traffic impacts with and without a median have been evaluated in Chapter 8 of the EA.

D-17 through D-18: Comments noted. See response to comments D-12 through D-15.

D-19: This is a comment on the design guidelines of the Community Plan and not the EA.

D-20: Comment noted.
SUPPLEMENTAL NOISE INFORMATION FOR THE MEYERS COMMUNITY PLAN

The stationary source noise standards required by the Environmental Assessment are necessary for a number of reasons:

1. There is a potential that future commercial and industrial land uses within the Plan area could generate noise levels which would adversely affect nearby residential properties both in and out of the plan area. Potential sources include a batch plant, expanded maintenance yards, wood splitting operations, and machine shops.

2. The existing TRPA CNEL noise standard for the community plan area is expressed in terms of a 24-hour average. However, stationary noise sources typically do not occur over a period of 24 hours, but over a much shorter period of time. To express stationary noise levels as a 24 hour average would not be reflective of the true "annoyance level" generated. Therefore, stationary source noise standards are expressed in terms of a one-hour average and a momentary maximum noise level. Based on information provided by the noise consultant, projects which meet the short-term performance standards will generally attain and maintain the 24-hour CNEL standard for the plan area.

3. The proposed stationary source noise standards are based on the measured ambient noise levels within the plan area, and on the standards established in the California Model Noise Control Ordinance. Similar short-term noise standards are proposed in the Draft El Dorado County General Plan, and are in effect in a number of jurisdictions throughout California.

4. The standards are intended to apply to discretionary projects subject to the Meyers Community Plan. The standards will be applied at the lot lines of residential properties within the Community Plan area, and at the Plan area boundaries.
MEMORANDUM

October 14, 1993

To: TPRA Governing Board
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Amendment of Regional Plan; Geomorphic Unit Map; APN 123-021-02, 53 Somers Drive, Stateline Point, Crystal Bay, Washoe County, Nevada

PROPOSED ACTION

To amend the Geomorphic Unit Map by taking the following actions:

1. A finding of no significant environmental effect and the findings required by Chapter 6, as set forth in this staff summary.

2. Adopt the attached ordinance amending the Geomorphic Unit Map.

STAFF/APC RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the plan amendment which changes the Geomorphic Unit from C-3 (Steep strongly dissected lands, high hazard lands) to C-1 (Granitic foothills, moderate hazard lands). The Advisory Planning Commission recommended approval of this plan amendment on October 13, 1993, by a unanimous vote.

Background: This parcel is 357,170 square feet (8.4 acres) in size and is located at 53 Somers Loop, Stateline Point, Nevada (see map, Exhibit 1). The field work for the determination of the geomorphic unit was conducted beginning in October, 1982 by the Land Capability Review Team. This review team, consisting of a soil scientist, an ecologist, a geomorphologist, and a hydrologist, conducted all land capability reviews during the period from the early to the middle 1980's. In their Land Capability Review Report of December 1982, the team determined that the designation of this parcel in Geomorphic Unit C-3 (Steep strongly dissected lands, high hazard lands) as shown on the TRPA Geomorphic Unit map (Attachment A), was correct. In August 1982 a geomorphic unit report prepared by Mr. Grant Kennedy was submitted to TRPA (Attachment B). In his report, Mr. Kennedy stated that a portion of this parcel was incorrectly placed in Geomorphic Unit C-3, and should be placed instead in Geomorphic Unit C-1 (Granitic foothills, moderate hazard lands).
Amendment of Geomorphic Unit Map, Crystal Bay
APN 123-021-02
Page 2

In January 1984, after reviewing the Kennedy report and conducting additional field work to gather further data on soils and slopes, John R. Munn Jr., soil scientist for the review team, concurred that a portion (35 percent) of this parcel should be included in a larger area of Geomorphic Unit C-1 (Granitic foothills, moderate hazard lands). A copy of the letter from Mr. Munn is included (Attachment C).

The proposed change in the Geomorphic Unit was not taken to the TRPA Governing Board for approval at that time due to the imposition of a building moratorium in the Tahoe Basin.

In March 1993 the property owner filed a land capability challenge to complete the process of changing the land capability class on a portion of this parcel, that was begun in 1981. Since the change in Geomorphic Unit was not completed previously, this process must be completed before any change in the land capability class can be made. An application to amend the Geomorphic Unit Map was made on September 7, 1993.

In June of this year TRPA staff completed the field work on this parcel and reviewed the information in the file. Staff has determined that there is an area of moderate hazard lands associated with the C-1 Geomorphic Unit in the vicinity of Crystal Bay, Nevada. This parcel is included in this area.

Analysis: The following analyses are provided to support the Regional Plan Amendment:

(a) Geomorphic characteristics - The Geomorphic Analysis of the Lake Tahoe Basin (Bailey, 1974) maps this area within geomorphic units, C-3 (Steep, strongly dissected lands, high hazard lands). The soils mapped on the parcel (see item c) are consistent with the mapped geomorphic hazard rating.

(b) Surface and subsurface hydrology - There is no evidence of near surface groundwater.

(c) Physical/chemical soil characteristics - TRPA Land Capability Map F-4 shows this parcel in one land capability district and soil map unit. The land capability is Class 1a - associated with the RtP (Rock outcrop-Toem complex 30 to 50 percent slopes) map unit. The native vegetation on the parcel consists of a scattered stand of Jeffrey pine, with an understory of manzanita, bitterbrush and chinquapin. The soils on the parcel are coarse textured and derived from granitic parent material.

(d) Erosion hazard - The slope on this parcel is flat and the majority of the parcel is paved. The soils on this site have low runoff potential and a slight relative erosion hazard.

Required Findings: The following is a list of required findings as set forth in Chapter 6 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, TRPA staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the required finding may be made.

JAP:rd
10/14/93

AGENDA ITEM VII.B
A. Chapter 6 Findings:

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 proposed amendment of the Regional Plan to amend TRPA Geomorphic Unit Map is consistent with the procedures set forth in Chapter 6 and 20 of the Code. No significant impacts on the Regional Plan, Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements, the Code and other TRPA plans and programs are anticipated. An Initial Environmental Checklist has been completed for this amendment and no significant impacts have been identified.

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

   **Rationale:** The amendment is consistent with the Regional Plan and will help attain the environmental thresholds. This amendment will not allow additional land coverage in excess of that allowed under the verified land capability class and the geomorphic unit.

3. **Finding:** Wherever federal, state and local air and water quality standards applicable for the Region, whichever are strictest, 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 stated in support of findings 1, and 2, above, the proposed amendment will result in the Regional Plan Package continuing to achieve and maintain thresholds.

**Conclusion:**

Agency staff has determined that there is sufficient information to support an amendment of the Geomorphic Unit Map in the vicinity of this parcel from C-3 (Steep, strongly dissected lands, high hazard lands) to C-1 (Granitic foothills, moderate hazard lands).

Please contact Joe Pepi at (702) 588-4547 for questions relating to this action.

JAP:rd
10/14/93
ATTACHMENT A

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GEOMORPHIC UNIT MAP F-4

MAPPED GEOMORPHIC UNITS AS DEPICTED ON EXISTING TRPA MAPS (1971).
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GEOMORPHIC UNIT MAP F-4

MAPPED GEOMORPHIC UNITS AS AMENDED
BY TRPA OCTOBER 18, 1993
August 9, 1982

Mr. Arthur Parr, AIA
Jeffrey Lundahl Architect, Ltd.
P.O. Box 4975
Incline Village, Nevada 89450

Dear Mr. Parr:

This is in regard to the Sells Land Capability Challenge. The following are my comments on the TRPA Land Capability Review Report which you requested. The two points of most concern are the designation of the Geomorphic Unit as C3 and the dune area as a variant of Beaches.

Geomorphic Unit C3

Geomorphic units are broadly defined concepts used to enable people to learn features of large areas. They are defined in general by a name (C3 - Steep strongly dissected land). They are not site specific and lack criteria for classification and delineation, so they can be consistently identified and mapped. Bailey set the minimum size for a delineated Geomorphic Unit as one square mile. The C3 Geomorphic Unit is in a major grouping of granitic soils that are described as consisting of "thin or shallow soils".

The Sells parcel and surrounding areas do not conform to the broadly defined characteristics of the Geomorphic Unit C3. This Unit is less than the specified minimum size of 640 acres. An analysis of the unit shows it is only about 470 acres in size. This acreage would be reduced if areas of non-granitic soils along the fringes of the delineation were accurately mapped. Much of this unit is shown as consisting of Rock outcrops and the shallow Toem soils. This appears to be incorrect. The soils in these delineations are mostly deeper than the 8 to 20 inches described for the Toem soils. This conclusion was reached based on observations on the Sells parcel, at Brockway Springs and along Highway 28. About 110 acres of the Geomorphic Unit are currently shown as the deeper Cagwin soils.

It is concluded that the C3 Geomorphic Unit would be an inclusion within the larger adjacent volcanic area to the west, shown as D2 (Headlands) on the TRPA Geomorphic map. If a smaller unit than the 640 acre minimum size were permissible the Sells
parcel could be included in Geomorphic Unit C1 (Granitic foothills).

Windblown Sand Dunes:

The dune topography was recognized in a review of the site in June 1981. Portions of the Cagwin soils are overblown with fine sands resulting in the dune topography. These dunes are well stabilized as the team report indicates. The soils of the dunes would be classified similar to the Cagwin soils and their characteristics are quite close to those of the Elmira soils. The nutrient status of the dunes is expected to be about the same as the Cagwin soils since portions of the fine sand are re-worked Cagwin soil materials. Their well stabilized condition is indicative that these soils will support plant growth and can be vegetated as well as the Cagwin and Elmira soils.

The team recommended that the dune area be considered a variant of Beaches a miscellaneous land type and placed it in Land Capability subclass 1A. Beaches infers non-soil incapable of supporting vegetation. Subclass 1A is described as consisting of "steep mountainous land with very shallow soils".

Soils like the dune area are not defined in the Tahoe Basin. On this parcel they are best related to the Cagwin soils with which they are associated. They are deeper, have a lower run-off and water erosion potential than the Cagwin soils. Their overall hazard in use would be about the level of Land Capability Class 4 in which part of the Cagwin soils on the property are placed.

Conclusions:

In summary, it appears that the Sells parcel is not properly placed in Geomorphic Unit C3 and could be included in Geomorphic Unit D2 or C1. The designation of a dune area as a variant of Beaches and placement within Land Capability Subclass 1A is inconsistent with the Capability definitions and soil characteristics on the site. This area could be placed in Capability Level 4.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

GRANT M. KENNEDY
Certified Professional Soil Scientist No. 855

GMK: mv
Enclosure
August 12, 1982

Mr. John Munn
2811 Almeria St.
Davis, CA 95616

Subject: Sells/Lundahl Land Capability Challenge Comments
TRPA File #81-1048

Dear John:

The Agency has received the enclosed comments regarding the subject proposal from Grant Kennedy. The comments are in response to the determination reached by the Agency regarding the geomorphic unit classification of the property. Also enclosed is an overlay identifying the subject and adjacent geomorphic units. I would appreciate your review of these materials and your attendance at the Agency Governing Board meeting on August 26, 1982 to assist in the presentation of this proposal to the Board. One question we may anticipate is can this area be included in the D2 or C1 geomorphic units adjacent to the subject geomorphic unit.

Your assistance is appreciated. If you have any questions, please contact this office.

Sincerely,

James Dana
Associate Planner

JD: bl
Enclosure
January 30, 1984

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Attn: Steve Chilton
P.O. Box 8896
South Lake Tahoe, CA 95731

Subject: Stateline Point Area Soil Unit Boundaries

Dear Steve:

Enclosed is a map showing revised soil unit boundaries for the Stateline Point area. The boundaries on this map were located by stereo interpretation of aerial photographs. This work was guided by the slope measurements and soil observations I made during my recent field review of the area and by Grant Kennedy’s previous comments regarding the distribution of Tomn and Cagwin soils in the area.

There are substantial differences between the slopes shown on the enclosed map and the map prepared by Mr. Lundahl. In some cases this may result from my interpretation of the soils, which can be reflected in Mr. Lundahl’s slope map. Also, keep in mind that the delineated soil units may contain inclusions of different soils or soils that are too small to map separately.

It does appear, however, that the Bell’s parcel area can be connected to the moderate geomorphic hazard lands adjacent to Highway 28 by a narrow strip of dune sands located between the shore of Lake Tahoe and the steep slopes west of the Bowers Drive loop. But please note that this interpretation will also greatly decrease the area of high geomorphic hazard lands west of the Bell’s property.

I am now sending a memo to the other members of the Review Team to determine their opinions on modifying the Team’s previous geomorphic hazard rating for the Bell’s property.

Sincerely,

John R. Munn, Jr.
Soil Scientist
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE NO. 93-_____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 87-9, AS AMENDED, OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY RELATING TO THE REGIONAL PLAN; AMENDING THE GEOMORPHIC UNIT MAP IN THE VICINITY OF SOMERS DRIVE, STATELINE POINT, WASHOE COUNTY; AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATED THERETO.

The Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency does ordain as follows:

Section 1.00 Findings

1.10 It is necessary and desirable to amend TRPA Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, relating to the Regional Plan of TRPA, by amending the geomorphic unit map for APN 123-021-02, in the vicinity of Somers Drive, Stateline Point, Washoe County, in order to further implement the Regional Plan pursuant to Article VI(a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

1.20 The provisions of this ordinance are hereby determined not to have a significant effect on the environment, and thus are exempt from the requirement of an environmental impact statement pursuant to Article VII of the Compact.

1.30 The Governing Board, prior to adoption of this ordinance, conducted a noticed public hearing, at which hearing oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and considered by the Board. Notice to the affected property owners was given in accordance with TRPA's Rules of Procedure. The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) also conducted a noticed public hearing at which oral testimony and documentary evidence were received. The APC has recommended amendment of the geomorphic unit map.

1.40 The Governing Board finds that, prior to the adoption of this ordinance, the Board made the findings required by Section 6.4 of the Code of Ordinances and Article V(g) of the Compact.

1.50 The Board further finds that the amendments adopted hereby continue to implement the Regional Plan, as amended, in a manner that achieves and maintains the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities as required by Article V(c) of the Compact.

1.60 Each of the foregoing findings is supported by substantial evidence in the record.
Section 2.00 Amendment to Geomorphic Unit Reference Map

Subsection 6.40(2) of TRPA Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, is hereby amended to add subparagraph (a) as follows:

(2) **Geomorphic Unit Map:** The geomorphic unit map indicates the type and location of geomorphic units (Scales 2"=1 mile)

**Added**
(a) As amended by Attachment "A-1" dated October 18, 1993, amending the geomorphic unit boundaries for, and in the vicinity of, APN 123-021-02.

Section 3.00 Interpretation and Severability

The provisions of this ordinance and the amendments to the maps adopted hereby shall be liberally construed to effect their purposes. If any section, clause, provision or portion of this ordinance or the amendments adopted hereby is declared unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this ordinance, or the amendments to the maps, shall not be affected. For this purpose, the provisions of this ordinance and the amendments are hereby declared respectively severable.

Section 4.00 Effective Date

This ordinance shall become effective 60 days after the date of adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held , 1993 by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent:

John E. Upton, Vice Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
October 18, 1993

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Setting Numerical Performance Standards for the Compliance Finding and Making the Findings Required to Lower the IPES Line

PROPOSED ACTION: The proposed action is the setting of the numerical performance standards for the subparts of the compliance finding and making the findings for lowering the IPES line.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the numerical performance standard for the compliance finding subparts (1) Security Returns and (2) BMP Retrofit Schedules be set at 30 percent, so that compliance levels could not fall below 70 percent. The recommended standard for subparts (3) Cease & Desist Postings and (4) Unresolved Violations is 20 percent, so that compliance levels could not fall below 80 percent. Staff further recommends that the findings for lowering the IPES line be made for Douglas County and that the line be lowered by the number of parcels equal to the number of allocations used in Douglas County in 1992.

BACKGROUND: Chapter 37 of the Code sets forth the criteria and process for lowering the IPES line. There are five findings which must be made for a jurisdiction before the IPES line can be lowered. Those findings are:

1. All parcels included in the top rank are otherwise eligible for development under the applicable state water quality management plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin (208 plans) and other legal limitations;

2. For any jurisdiction, the number of parcels having scores below the level defining the top ranked parcels, divided by the number of parcels in that jurisdiction that were identified as sensitive by TRPA on January 1, 1986, does not exceed the following percentages:

   (i) El Dorado County - 20 percent
   (ii) Placer County - 20 percent
   (iii) Douglas County - 33 percent
   (iv) Washoe County - 33 percent
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3. The monitoring program for that jurisdiction is in place pursuant to Chapter 32 and the TRPA monitoring plan;

4. Demonstrable progress is being made on capital improvement programs for water quality within that jurisdiction; and

5. The level of compliance with conditions of project approvals within any jurisdiction is satisfactory.

The above findings are further defined in Volume I of the 1988 TRPA 208 Plan (see pages 118-120, attached as Exhibit A).

DISCUSSION: At the September APC and Governing Board meetings, TRPA staff presented the supporting data for the findings and answered questions regarding the data and the findings. There was very little public input at either hearing except for a suggestion by the Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council attorney, Gregg Lien, that TRPA consider making the findings for previous years (1990-1992). TRPA staff does not believe that findings can be made for previous years for a variety of reasons, primarily because the 208 Plan required collection of water samples for one "representative" water year and none of the years cited were normal water years.

Based on the data for the vacant lot equation, TRPA staff has narrowed the focus to Washoe and Douglas Counties, since the vacant lot finding cannot be made for the California counties. Prior to making the compliance finding, numerical performance standards must be adopted for the four subparts. The staff recommendations for the numerical performance standards will be addressed in the discussion on the compliance finding.

**FINDING 1. ELIGIBILITY UNDER 208 PLAN**

Staff recommends making the first finding regarding eligibility and legality of IPES parcels below the IPES line for development under the applicable 208 plans because the TRPA 208 Plan, which includes implementation of the IPES and the potential for lowering the line, was certified by both states and approved by U.S.E.P.A. in 1989. The 1990 TRPA amendment to the 208 Plan redefining "in place" monitoring, was certified by Nevada in 1990, by California in 1992, and approved by U.S.E.P.A. in August 1993.

**FINDING 2. VACANT LOT EQUATION**

The so-called "vacant lot equation" is the requirement that the number of parcels with IPES scores below the line (725 and less), divided by the number of parcels deemed sensitive (i.e., land capability districts 1, 2 and 3) on January 1, 1986, cannot exceed 20 percent in the California counties and 33 percent in the Nevada counties.
The vacant lot equations for the Nevada counties are:

Douglas County  \( \frac{225}{1067} = 21\% \)

Washoe County  \( \frac{393}{2350} = 17\% \)

Staff recommends making the finding with respect to both Washoe and Douglas County based on numerator data from the March 1, 1993 IPES Vacant Parcel Inventory memorandum to which has been added unscorched vacant parcels which are mapped predominantly land capability district 1-3. The denominators are taken from a September 1986 memorandum to the Governing Board from William Morgan.

**FINDING 3. MONITORING FINDING**

The monitoring finding requires a monitoring program pursuant to Chapter 32 and the TRPA monitoring plan to be in place in a given jurisdiction. "In place" is defined in the 208 Plan, Volume I, p.119, as amended, as:

"... This monitoring program shall be in place in a local jurisdiction, and shall characterize water quality conditions, before the numerical level defining the top rank for the jurisdiction is lowered. (Goals and Policies, p.VII-25). The term "in place" means that a TRPA-approved monitoring system, with established procedures and responsibilities, is physically located on the selected tributaries, and samples have been collected and analyzed for the previous water year. The monitoring program, to be effective, should remain in place on a continuing and long term basis. It is the intent of TRPA to collect, on a long term basis pursuant to stringent QA/QC procedures, improved tributary water quality data which will be used to better assess average and existing conditions and to understand water quality trends and compliance with state and federal water quality standards."

Additional detail and description of the IPES-related monitoring program is found in Volume I, pp.118-119 of the 208 Plan (Exhibit A.).

An explanation of the current TRPA tributary monitoring program is attached as Exhibit B. In summary, the program consists of permanent monitoring stations at the mouths of ten streams, stream flow gauges and monitoring at upstream locations on five of the ten streams (Incline, Trout, Ward and Edgewood Creeks and the Upper Truckee River), and eleven additional upstream sites in Nevada on both the monitored streams and in other watersheds (developed and undeveloped). The sampling frequency and site selection methodologies are discussed in Exhibit B and a map of the monitoring locations is also included.
Staff recommends making the finding that the monitoring program is in place in Washoe and Douglas County. The monitoring programs in both Nevada counties meet the requirements of the 208 Plan and the Monitoring Subelement in the Goals and Policies. The expanded tributary monitoring program has been in place in Nevada since the spring of 1991 so samples have been collected for at least two previous water years (WY 91-92 and WY 92-93).

**FINDING 4. CIP PROGRESS**

The CIP finding requires that a jurisdiction make demonstrable progress on capital improvement programs for water quality within that jurisdiction. The 208 Plan defines demonstrable progress as requiring one of the two following findings to be made:

1. Funding is committed and there is a strong likelihood that construction will commence on one or more high priority watershed improvement projects in the current or upcoming year and construction of one or more high priority projects has taken place in the previous or current year. (High priority projects are projects with substantial water quality benefit.); OR

2. The performance of the local jurisdiction on implementation of SEZ restoration and capital improvement projects is consistent with progress necessary to meet the benchmarks established on pp.183-184.

--- THREE-YEAR PERIOD ALTERNATE CIP FINDING: Following are the lists of CIP projects for Washoe and Douglas Counties for the applicable three year period of 1992 - 1994:

**Douglas County:**
- 1994 (Upcoming Year) - None.
- 1993 (Current Year) - None.
- 1992 (Previous Year) - Four high priority projects completed:
  1. Summit Village, $1.4 million
  2. Kingsbury Village, $1 million
  3. Lower Kingsbury, $1.5 million
  4. Kahle Drive, $.5 million

It should be noted that Douglas County has completed all its CIP projects in the Priority 1 and 2 categories as listed in Volume IV of the 208 Plan.

**Washoe County:**
- 1994 (Upcoming Year) - Second & Third Creek Improvement Project, $.25 million.
- 1993 (Current Year) - One priority project: Knotty Pine (Incline Village #4), $.8 million
- 1992 (Previous Year) - None.
Staff met with Washoe County representatives to review the proposed $2.5 million water quality improvement project in the vicinity of Country Club Drive between Second and Third Creeks. TRPA staff is withholding a recommendation on this finding with respect to Washoe County pending further review of the proposed project.

--CIP/SEZ BENCHMARK ALTERNATE FINDING: Following are the 1991 benchmarks as established on pp. 183-184 of the 208 Plan for CIP expenditures and acres of restored SEZ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>$2.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>$3.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>$7.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>$7.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of SLT</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interim SEZ restoration target for December 1991 was 400 acres regionally.

As set forth in the 1992 Financing Plan for the 208 Plan, the 1987-1991 totals for the counties are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>$4.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>$4.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>$4.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>$12.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of SLT</td>
<td>$6.7 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amount of restored SEZ acreage up to 1991 was approximately 80 acres. Douglas County accounted for 5.3 acres, Washoe County for none, Placer County for 3.8 acres, El Dorado County for 23.5 acres, and the City of SLT for 47.7 acres.

TRPA staff recommends making the first finding for Douglas County even though it does not have a high priority project scheduled for 1994. Given the extraordinary progress made by Douglas County in implementing the CIP in 1992, the four high priority projects completed in 1992 should satisfy the two projects in three years standard set in the 208 Plan. To conclude otherwise would penalize Douglas County for doing four projects in one year rather than spreading them out over a three year period. Such a result is not only counter-productive but it ignores the water quality benefits obtained by completing projects sooner.

TRPA staff is withholding a recommendation on Washoe County until after it has reviewed the proposed 1994 project.
FINDING 5. COMPLIANCE WITH PROJECT CONDITIONS

The compliance finding requires satisfactory levels of compliance with project conditions. The 208 Plan requires that the Governing Board evaluate and set numerical performance standards for four subparts. The 208 Plan also states that the numerical standards shall reflect "TRPA's goal of achieving a high level of compliance. The four subparts are:

1. The percentage of projects which commenced construction three or more years earlier but which have not had their securities returned for water quality-related practices;

2. The number of projects which are behind approved schedules in project approvals for BMP retrofit, compared to those on schedule;

3. The number of projects which required TRPA issuance of cease and desist orders for failure to observe conditions of approval within the previous fiscal year, as compared to the number of projects inspected; and

4. The number of projects on which violations remain unresolved, compared to the number resolved.

Although the 208 Plan called for the setting of numerical standards after a review of compliance data at the end of the 1989 building season, the Governing Board postponed the setting of numerical standards in its 1990-1991 deliberations on the movement of the IPES line and the resultant 208 Plan amendment to the monitoring finding. Thus, instead of just one or two years of data, we now have up to five years of data in most categories.

The APC expressed concern about the small data sets for the subparts relating to BMP retrofit schedules and unresolved violations. These data sets can be expanded but doing so may cause distorted results. Staff considered weighting the subparts but chose not to recommend a more complicated system. Staff also considered recommending a lower numerical standard or using subjective criteria if the data set was less than 7-10 but is not recommending any of the above approaches at this time.

Attached as Exhibit C is an updated memorandum from the Environmental Compliance Division setting forth the current data for the four categories. The Compliance staff has inspected nearly all the parcels in Washoe and Douglas Counties with unreleased securities. The revised numbers for subpart (1) reflect the results of that effort. Compliance staff will report orally on the composition of the remaining unreleased securities in Nevada.

Staff recommends setting the numerical performance standard for subparts (1) Security Returns and (2) BMP Retrofit Schedules at 30 percent. Since all the subparts are stated in terms of non-compliance, a standard of 30 percent requires a compliance level of 70 percent or better. Staff recommends setting the numerical performance standard for subparts (3) Cease & Desist Postings...
and (4) Unresolved Violations at 20 percent. A numerical standard of 20 percent requires a compliance level of 80 percent or better. Finally, with respect to subpart (4) Unresolved Violations, staff recommends deleting violations from the unresolved category if they are resolved within a 90 day period. This recommendation will avoid the inaccuracy caused by including violations which occur late in the fiscal year but which are promptly resolved. Staff recommends a higher standard for subparts (3) and (4) because they tend to represent more serious infractions of the Code.

Based on the above numerical performance standards, staff recommends making the compliance finding for Douglas and Washoe Counties since they meet the recommended numerical standards for each of the four subparts.

MOVING THE LINE: The new eligible score in Douglas County will be set by moving the line down by the number of parcels equal to the number of residential allocations used in Douglas County in 1992. TRPA staff has researched the exact number of allocations used in Douglas County in 1992. Used residential allocations are defined as allocations for which complete applications were filed, or transfers completed, by December 31, 1992.

The number of used residential allocations in 1992 was 20. Based on the 1993 rankings and counting down 20 parcels, the new eligible score in Douglas County would be 709 (a reduction of 17 points).

APC RECOMMENDATION: The APC conducted two public hearings on the IPES line findings. At the October APC meeting the APC unanimously recommended setting the numerical performance standards as recommended by TRPA staff. The APC also unanimously recommended making the findings for lowering the line in Douglas County as recommended by TRPA staff. The APC withheld a recommendation on Washoe County on the understanding that TRPA staff would bring the Washoe County findings back to the APC in November with more information on the 1994 water quality project.

ACTION REQUESTED: In order to implement the above recommendations, the Governing Board should take the following actions:

1. Adopt the attached resolution setting the numerical performance standards for the four subparts of the compliance finding; and

2. Adopt the attached resolution making the findings for lowering the line in Douglas County and setting the new eligible score at 709.
Property owners may appeal their parcel's rating to an independent body of qualified experts not involved in the initial field evaluation of that parcel. These independent experts shall apply the IPES criteria, and their decision shall be final unless the property owner appeals to the TRPA Governing Board. The Board may change a rating only upon finding that the IPES criteria were not applied correctly.

TRPA shall rate all vacant residential parcels numerically and rank them from most suitable to least suitable, by jurisdiction. TRPA shall also establish a level in the ranking immediately above the most sensitive parcels, based on recommendations from the IPES technical committee. Only parcels above this level, as it may be subsequently adjusted, comprise the "top rank" and may pursue a building permit (Goals and Policies, p. VII-6).

The numerical level defining the top rank for any jurisdiction shall be lowered annually by the number of allocations utilized in that jurisdiction during the previous year, provided that the following conditions are met (Goals and Policies, pp. VII-6, -7):

1. all parcels in the top rank are otherwise eligible for development under state water quality plans and other legal limitations,
2. a monitoring program for that jurisdiction is in place as set forth in the Monitoring and Evaluation Subelement of the TRPA Goals and Policies,
3. demonstrable progress is being made on the Capital Improvements Program for water quality within that jurisdiction,
4. there is a satisfactory rate of reduction in the inventory of vacant parcels; the IPES line shall not move down in any jurisdiction unless the number of parcels below the line in that jurisdiction, compared to the number deemed sensitive on January 1, 1986, does not exceed 20 percent in El Dorado and Placer Counties, or 33 percent in Washoe and Douglas Counties, and
5. the level of compliance with conditions of project approvals within that jurisdiction is satisfactory.

With respect to the requirement that a monitoring program be in place in a given jurisdiction, the Goals and Policies require TRPA to monitor representative tributaries to provide a basis for evaluating the relative health of the watershed within which development is contemplated and progress toward meeting thresholds. The monitoring program will monitor stream flows and...
concentrations of sediments and dissolved nutrients to determine annual pollutant loads. This monitoring program shall be in place in a local jurisdiction, and shall establish baseline water quality conditions, before the numerical level defining the top rank for the jurisdiction is lowered (Goals and Policies, p. VII-25). The term "in place" means that a TRPA-approved monitoring system, with established procedures and responsibilities, is physically located on the selected tributaries, and samples have been collected and analyzed for at least one representative water year.

The location of sampling sites, frequency of sampling, and financial responsibilities for monitoring will be set forth in TRPA's Monitoring Program pursuant to the Goals and Policies (p. VII-25) and the TRPA Code of Ordinances (section 32.10), based on the recommendations of the TRPA Monitoring Committee. The objectives of the monitoring program are to:

1. Characterize the water quality of streams draining affected residential areas in relationship to the overall water quality observed in the watershed,

2. Identify short-term changes in water quality from affected residential areas, and

3. Ensure that TRPA and state water quality standards are being attained and maintained.

The monitoring program will include quality control and quality assurance (QA/QC) procedures to ensure that the data accurately represent the actual water quality conditions.

Monitoring will normally occur not only at the mouths of streams, but also at locations in closer proximity to residential subdivisions. While the stream mouth monitoring will generally cover the entire year, monitoring at other locations higher in the watershed will be geared toward the spring snowmelt period and the fall storm season to contain costs. In addition to the presently established monitoring stations, TRPA estimates that 30 to 40 additional stations will be required throughout the Region to support the IPES conditions.

With regard to the requirement that demonstrable progress is being made on the Capital Improvements Program within a given jurisdiction, TRPA's evaluation will be based on the programs adopted in Volumes III and IV of the 208 plan, including lists of SEZ restoration and capital improvement projects for erosion and runoff control, with priority designations, for each jurisdiction. Pursuant to the Goals and Policies, TRPA has established benchmarks against which the progress can be evaluated (Goals and Policies, p. VII-26). These benchmarks are found in Section I, Chapter VII of this volume, Plan Evaluation and Revision.
To make a finding of demonstrable progress in a local jurisdiction, TRPA will review the progress of that jurisdiction over a three-year period covering the previous year, the current year, and the upcoming year. For the demonstrable progress criteria to be met, TRPA must make one of the following findings: (1) funding is committed and there is a strong likelihood that construction will commence on one or more high priority watershed improvement projects in the current or upcoming year and construction of one or more high priority projects has taken place in the previous or current year, or (2) the performance of the local jurisdiction on implementation of SEZ restoration and capital improvement projects is consistent with progress necessary to meet the benchmarks established on pp. 183 and 184. In this context, the term "high priority project" means a project with a substantial water quality benefit.

To determine whether the level of compliance in a jurisdiction is satisfactory, TRPA will evaluate: (1) the percentage of projects which commenced construction three or more years earlier but which have not had their securities returned for water quality-related practices, (2) the number of projects which are behind approved schedules in project approvals for BMP retrofit, compared to those on schedule, (3) the number of projects which required TRPA issuance of cease and desist orders for failure to observe conditions of approval within the previous fiscal year, as compared to the number of projects inspected, and (4) the number of projects on which violations remain unresolved, compared to the number resolved. TRPA will review compliance data at the end of the 1989 building season, and will then set specific numerical performance standards for the four criteria above. The specific numerical performance standard shall reflect TRPA’s goal of achieving a very high level of compliance with conditions of project approval.

Since it is possible (though unlikely) that individual appeals of IPES scores may result in a significant shift in the number of single-family parcels eligible to pursue construction permits by virtue of being in the top rank, TRPA shall, in a given local jurisdiction, and provided that IPES appeals increase the size of the top rank in that jurisdiction by three percent or more, subtract the number of parcels added to the top rank by appeals during the first year from the number of parcels which would be added to the top rank any year that the IPES line is lowered, until the number of parcels added to the top rank by appeals equals the number of parcels which would have been added to the top rank due to the lowering of the IPES line.

For TRPA to approve a project on a parcel rated and ranked by IPES, the parcel must be served by a paved road, water service, sewer service, and electric utility. However, Chapter 27 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances sets forth provisions for waiver of the paved road requirement, as provided for in the Goals and Policies (p. VII-8).
**IPES-RELATED MONITORING PROGRAM**

**Introduction:**

Implementation of The Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES) began in 1989. An important element of IPES is the establishment of the numerical score delineating those parcels eligible to receive a building allocation from those that are ineligible. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) may lower this score provided certain conditions are met as outlined in TRPA's Regional Plan.

One of those conditions is the establishment of an IPES-related tributary monitoring program in each of the five jurisdictions (Washoe, Douglas, El Dorado and Placer Counties, and the City of South Lake Tahoe). Pursuant to the Monitoring and Evaluation Subelement of the Goals and Policies (pp. VII-6, 7 and 25) and TRPA's Water Quality Management Plan (Volume I, p. 119), this program is designed to meet the following objectives:

1. Evaluate the relative health of the watersheds within which development is contemplated;
2. Monitor progress made toward meeting the thresholds;
3. Characterize the water quality of streams draining affected residential areas in relationship to the overall water quality observed in the watershed;
4. Identify short-term changes in water quality from affected residential areas;
5. Determine if TRPA thresholds and Nevada and California water quality standards are being attained and maintained; and
6. Incorporate adequate quality assurance and quality control procedures to ensure accurate water quality data.

**Site Selection:**

The tributary monitoring sites selected are designed to satisfy a number of objectives. The data collected from the sites is integrated into and complements the existing water quality monitoring program.

The United States Geological Survey and the Tahoe Research Group (USGS/TRG) operate the existing tributary monitoring program. Stations are located at the mouths of ten tributaries. These monitoring locations are listed in Table 1 and provide data to estimate annual sediment and nutrient loads to Lake Tahoe. Table 2 lists the parameters sampled for and analytical techniques used by the USGS and TRG. The IPES related monitoring program supplements the existing tributary monitoring program to help meet the objectives listed above.
To meet the six objectives, and evaluate the effect of development on tributary water quality, TRPA has incorporated the following three concepts into the IPES-related monitoring program:

(1) Before and after sampling;

(2) Above and below sampling; and

(3) Paired watershed analysis.

Additional monitoring locations have been established in five of the watersheds monitored by USGS and TRG (Incline, Trout, Ward and Edgewood Creeks, plus the Upper Truckee River). Table 3 lists the locations of these additional stations. Sampling at the Ward Creek sites began in January, 1991, while sampling at the remaining sites began in Fall, 1989. Year-round stream flow is recorded at these additional sites by the installation of permanent recording stream flow gages.

These sites were selected to: (1) complement the existing tributary monitoring; (2) provide a clean tributary site located above development for background comparisons; and (3) provide data midway through the developed portion of the watershed. Development in the monitored watersheds is variable and is comprised of different types of commercial and residential development. In addition, several other types of development are represented in the selected watersheds such as ski areas, golf courses, and grazing activities.

Sampling at these sites is coordinated with the sampling performed at the stream mouths. Sampling frequency is greater during spring runoff and large storm events with less frequent sampling performed during low, steady flow conditions. Samples collected are analyzed for the "Sample A" parameters listed in Table 2.

In the Spring of 1991, this program was supplemented by the selection of an additional 11 tributary monitoring sites. Seven of those sites are located on tributaries already monitored. These sites were chosen to provide additional monitoring of developed areas, relatively undisturbed watersheds, and large watersheds in the Tahoe Basin. Monitoring of these sites is conducted each year during spring runoff and storm event flows. TRPA has identified eight additional sites in California which will be monitored in the future. The USGS and TRG perform the monitoring tasks for these additional sites as well as those listed above.

Table 4 lists the locations of these 11 sites. To the extent possible, these sites are co-located with previously established stations monitored by the USGS. The USGS selected their sites to provide for relatively clean monitoring locations above development and to monitor additional tributaries of Lake Tahoe. Their objectives were very similar to those of TRPA.

Sampling:

Sampling frequency is designed with two main concerns in mind.

1. To provide adequate data for estimating annual loads of sediments and nutrients; and
2. to provide adequate data to characterize the nutrient and sediment components of the various hydrologic events encountered.

Frequency sampling for the tributary mouth stations is designed to answer both 1 and 2 above. Sampling frequency at the additional 11 non-gaged stations will primarily focus on number 2 above, and will only infrequently sample during the low flow periods that are typically characterized by low nutrient and sediment loads. Water samples collected from the 11 additional sites will be analyzed for the "Sample A" nutrient parameters listed in Table 2.

**Data Management:**

Data collected from this program will be entered into the data bases of the USGS National Water Information System and into the US EPA STORET data base where appropriate. The data is included in TRPA's Annual Water Quality Report, TRG's Annual Report, and the USGS Water Resources Data Report.

**Data Analysis:**

Other agencies in the Tahoe Region require monitoring of some project sites as a condition of permit approval. To the extent a project monitoring condition can be related to tributary stream monitoring, TRPA will seek inter-agency cooperation to integrate project monitoring with TRPA's monitoring program.

The collected data will be used for a variety of purposes. The data collected at the newly established stream mouth stations (Table 4) will be used to better define the nutrient contributions from the tributary network and assess compliance with tributary standards.

The combination of above and below sampling and paired watershed samples will enable analysis to be done to better determine cause/effect relationships of development activities on tributary water quality. Data at the clean sites and from undeveloped tributaries and the stations within and at the bottom of the developed portion of the watersheds will document changes in water quality as a result of flow through the subdivisions, and other developed areas. Before development and after development analysis will require a long period of analysis to be useful for data interpretation.

The data collected is included in the 1991 Threshold Report and TRPA's Annual Water Quality Report. The additional data will be used to determine water quality trends, compliance with thresholds and standards, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the Regional Plan and its effect on water quality.

**Quality Assurance/Quality Control:**

The USGS and TRG have a detailed Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) program to assure proper data collection, lab analysis, and reporting procedures. Rigorous field procedures ensure proper collection techniques are employed. Lab analysis includes appropriate QA/QC procedures including split samples, spikes, and blanks for data control. The reporting of data is carefully controlled to assure the reader that reported results are accurate and reliable.
Conclusion:

The current monitoring program meets the requirements of both the Goals and Policies and TRPA’s Water Quality Management Plan for IPES-related tributary monitoring. The collected data will provide for a better understanding of tributary nutrient and sediment contributions to Lake Tahoe. In addition, statistical analysis of the collected data will allow for interpretation of developmental impacts on water quality, assess compliance with water quality standards, and identify water quality trends.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stream Site</th>
<th>Drainage Area (sq mi)</th>
<th>Channel Length (mi)</th>
<th>% of Stream Basin Monitored</th>
<th>Operating Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Trout C Basin, total at Highway 50</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>USGS TRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>at Black Bart Road</td>
<td>40.40</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>USGS TRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heavenly Valley Creek tributary inflow</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>USGS TRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>U, Truckee R. Basin, total at Highway 50</td>
<td>56.64</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>USGS TRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>at Highway 89</td>
<td>54.80</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>USGS TRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>General Crk. Basin, total at Highway 89</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>USGS TRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>at Highway 89</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>USGS TRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Blackwood Crk. Basin, total at Highway 89</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>USGS TRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>at Highway 89</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>USGS TRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Ward Crk. Basin, total at Highway 89</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>USGS TRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>at Highway 89</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>USGS TRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Third Crk. Basin, total below Highway 28</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>USGS USGS USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe</td>
<td>at Highway 28</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>USGS USGS USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Incline Crk. Basin, total below Highway 28</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>USGS USGS USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe</td>
<td>at Highway 28</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>USGS USGS USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Glenbrook Crk. Basin below Highway 50</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>USGS USGS USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>at Highway 50</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>USGS USGS USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Logan House Crk. Basin above Highway 50</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>USGS USGS USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>near Stateline</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>USGS USGS USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Edgewood Crk. Basin</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>USGS USGS USGS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lake Tahoe Stream Monitoring Sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lake Tahoe Basin</th>
<th>Sq. Mi.</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Operating Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Tahoe Drainage</td>
<td>506.69</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Surface</td>
<td>192.14</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tributary Basins</td>
<td>314.55</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>77.91</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>USGS USGS USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>236.64</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>USGS USGS USGS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monitored in 1989**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lake Tahoe Basin</th>
<th>Sq. Mi.</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Operating Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>142.45</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.51</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123.50</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2. --SAMPLE ANALYSES:

LAKE TAHOE TRIBUTARY MONITORING STUDY

USGS California/Nevada Districts

A) ROUTINE SAMPLE:

1) TRG Labs -
   Total organic + ammonium nitrogen (TNK)
   Dissolved ammonium nitrogen (DNH4)
   Dissolved nitrite + nitrate nitrogen (DNO3)
   Total phosphorus (TP)
   Dissolved orthophosphate phosphorus (DOP)
   Total biologically reactive iron (TFe)

2) Sediment lab -
   Suspended sediment concentration

3) Field -
   Water temperature
   Air temperature
   Gage-height
   Discharge (rated or measured)
   Specific conductance
   Hydrologic condition and event
   Weather

B) EXPANDED SAMPLE:

1) TRG Labs -
   Total organic + ammonium nitrogen (TNK)
   Total ammonium nitrogen (TNH4)
   Total nitrite + nitrate nitrogen (TNO3)
   Total phosphorus (TP)
   Total orthophosphate phosphorus (TOP)
   Total biologically reactive iron (TFe)
   Total Hydrolyzable + orthophosphate (THP)
   Dissolved hydrolyzable + orthophosphate (DHP)
   Dissolved organic + ammonium nitrogen (DKN)
   Dissolved ammonium nitrogen (DNH4)
   Dissolved nitrite + nitrate nitrogen (DNO3)
   Dissolved phosphorus (DP)
   Dissolved orthophosphate phosphorus (DOP)
   Dissolved biologically reactive iron (DFe)

2) Sediment lab -
   Suspended sediment concentration
   Sand break (% finer than 0.062mm)

3) Field -
   Water temperature
   Air temperature
   Gage-height
   Discharge (rated or measured)
   Specific conductance
   Hydrologic condition and event
   Weather
   pH
   Dissolved oxygen
   Barometric pressure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Tributary</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>East Fork</td>
<td>Just above Tyroliam Village and below Highway 28 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incline Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>Edgewood Creek</td>
<td>Two locations, one on the North Fork (a) and one on the South Fork (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>just above their confluence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of South Lake</td>
<td>Trout Creek</td>
<td>Upstream from where it crosses Pioneer Trail (a) and where USFS road 8189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe</td>
<td></td>
<td>crosses it (b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>Upper Truckee</td>
<td>At Alpine Campground (b) and where it first crosses Highway 50 in Meyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>Ward Creek</td>
<td>Where Ward Creek Boulevard begins to diverge away from Ward Creek (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and below the confluence of the main north and south tributaries (b).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Site located midway through development
(b) Relatively clean sites with little upstream disturbance or development
Table 4. IPES-Related Monitoring Locations in Nevada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tributary</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood Creek</td>
<td>At Andria Drive(^d), a tributary near Daggett Pass, and below South Benjamin Drive near Daggett Pass (^d).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan House Creek</td>
<td>At north Logan House Creek above Highway 50 near Glenbrook (^b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbrook Creek</td>
<td>At the old Highway 50 crossing above the meadow(^a) and at old Highway 50 near Glenbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incline Creek</td>
<td>Incline Creek tributary at Country Club near Incline Village(^a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Creek</td>
<td>Near Crystal Bay(^c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Creek</td>
<td>Lakeshore Drive near Incline Village(^c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Creek</td>
<td>Above Mount Rose Highway(^d) and Village Boulevard at Incline Village(^a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Creek</td>
<td>One at Lake Shore Drive(^c) and one above Jennifer Street(^b).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Site located midway through development.
(b) Relatively clean site with little upstream disturbance or development.
(c) Site located near stream mouth.
(d) Additional site located in the upper portion of the watershed, but still influenced by upgradient disturbance or development.
Lake Tahoe
Tributary Monitoring Locations

Lake
Tahoe

- USGS/TRG Monitoring Sites

1 inch equals 4.5 miles
October 18, 1993

To: Dave Ziegler, Executive Director  
    Susan Scholley, Special Projects Attorney

From: Mike Solt, Senior Environmental Specialist

Subject: Compliance Data Associated With Lowering of the Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES) Line.

The following compliance data, which pertains to the lowering of the IPES line, is being submitted for your review. The type and sources of data were discussed with Susan Scholley and Steve Chilton, to determine the most suitable set for use in the four criteria evaluation of the level of compliance. The four criteria listed in The Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region are to be evaluated as indicators of the level of compliance within a jurisdiction. A "satisfactory level of compliance" with conditions of project approvals, within any jurisdiction, is one of the required findings for lowering the line. The data must still be reviewed for the purpose of setting specific numerical performance standards for the four criteria.

Please note that for Criteria #3 and #4, four years (fiscal years) of data are being submitted: '89-'90, '90-'91, '91-'92, and '92-'93. The security release data for Criteria #1 is for projects started three or more years ago, going back to 1985.

The sources utilized in compiling this data include: TRPA computer database, project files, reading files, compliance personnel's inspection records and daily logs, previous compliance activity summaries, TRPA securities receipt books, and TRPA securities index card tracking system.

Criteria #1: The percentage of projects which commenced construction three or more years earlier, but which have not had their securities returned for water quality-related practices.

The set of data is based on all projects which posted a security within the specified calendar year. Data is presented for the years 1985 through 1989.

1985 Security Returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total Posted</th>
<th>Released</th>
<th>Percentage of Securities Released</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land

EXHIBIT C
1986 Security Returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total Posted</th>
<th>Released</th>
<th>Percentage of Securities Released</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1987 Security Returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total Posted</th>
<th>Released</th>
<th>Percentage of Securities Released</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1988 Security Returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total Posted</th>
<th>Released</th>
<th>Percentage of Securities Released</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1989 Security Returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total Posted</th>
<th>Released</th>
<th>Percentage of Securities Released</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data included in Criteria #1 have been updated as a result of recent inspections of unreleased securities and may be updated again if additional inspections are completed prior to final action by the Governing Board.

Criteria #2: The number of projects which are behind approved schedules in project approvals for BMP retrofit, compared to those on schedule.

The Code requires 50% completion within five years and 100% completion within ten years. A total of 20 projects have reached the five year date for completion of phase 1 of the BMP retrofit as of June 30, 1993.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>On Schedule</th>
<th>Behind Schedule</th>
<th>% Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criteria #3: The number of projects which required TRPA issuance of CEASE AND DESIST ORDERS for failure to observe conditions of approval during the previous fiscal year as compared to the number of projects inspected.

The data for the number of projects inspected is based on the number of pre-grade inspections completed.

**Fiscal year 89/90, July 1, 1989 through June 30, 1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th># of Projects Inspected</th>
<th># of Projects Issued Cease and Desist Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th># of Projects Inspected</th>
<th># of Projects Issued Cease and Desist Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th># of Projects Inspected</th>
<th># of Projects Issued Cease and Desist Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th># of Projects Inspected</th>
<th># of Projects Issued Cease and Desist Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Criteria #4 The number of projects on which violations remain unresolved compared to the number resolved.

The data includes the number of Notices of Violations, and pre-notice of violation settlements requiring governing board approval, issued during the particular fiscal year. Violations which are unresolved at year end are quite often resolved early in the next fiscal year. The data does not include violations in which lawsuits have been filed.

Fiscal year 89/90, July 1, 1989 through June 30, 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th># of Violations Resolved</th>
<th># of Violations Unresolved</th>
<th>% of Violations Unresolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fiscal year 90/91, July 1, 1990 through June 30, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th># of Violations Resolved</th>
<th># of Violations Unresolved</th>
<th>% of Violations Unresolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fiscal year 91/92, July 1, 1991 through June 30, 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th># of Violations Resolved</th>
<th># of Violations Unresolved</th>
<th>% of Violations Unresolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fiscal year 92/93, July 1, 1992 through June 30, 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th># of Violations Resolved</th>
<th># of Violations Unresolved</th>
<th>% of Violations Unresolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unresolved 1993 violation in Washoe County was the Schumacher boatlift violation. A Notice of Violation was issued in May 1993 and a complaint was filed July 7, 1993 in federal district court.

Please let me know if you need any clarification or further information regarding the contents of this memo.

Ms/SS: ses
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TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RESOLUTION NO. 93-

RESOLUTION SETTING NUMERICAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
FOR DETERMINING A SATISFACTORY LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
WITH PROJECT CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS RELATED TO IPES

WHEREAS, the 1987 Regional Plan and Code of Ordinances adopted a new
system for evaluating and determining eligibility for development of vacant
residential parcels, which system is titled Individual Parcel Evaluation System
("IPES"); and

WHEREAS, a key component of IPES is the potential for annually lowering
the numerical level defining the top ranked parcels (IPES line) in a given
jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, the numerical level defining the top rank in a given
jurisdiction cannot be lowered unless TRPA makes five certain findings as set
forth in Chapter 37 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances; and

WHEREAS, one of the five required findings is a finding that the level of
compliance with conditions of project approval is satisfactory; and

WHEREAS, the 1988 Water Quality Management Plan for Lake Tahoe Region
(1988 TRPA 208 Plan) adopted by TRPA, certified by California and Nevada and
approved by U.S. EPA, mandated the evaluation of four criteria and the setting
of numerical performance standards as a precursor to making the compliance
finding; and

WHEREAS, the numerical standards are to reflect TRPA's goal of achieving
a high level of compliance and will be the standards used by each
jurisdiction in the annual consideration of lowering the IPES line; and

WHEREAS, instead of two years of compliance data for the four criteria,
as contemplated by the 1988 TRPA 208 Plan, TRPA has now collected four to five
years of compliance data; and

WHEREAS, TRPA has conducted several noticed public hearings in both 1990
and 1993 on the setting of the numerical performance standards; and

WHEREAS, the APC has recommended the setting of the numerical performance
standards as set forth in the minutes of their October 13, 1993 meeting; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board of the Tahoe
Regional Planning Agency hereby sets the numerical performance standards for
the four criteria in Volume I, of the 1988 TRPA 208 Plan, page 120, as
follows:

(1) The percentage of project securities which were posted within a
calendar year at least three years earlier and which are currently
not being returned for water quality reasons shall not exceed 30
percent of the number of project securities which were posted within
that calendar year.
(2) The percentage of BMP retrofit plans behind approved schedules shall not exceed 30 percent of the number of projects which have BMP retrofit schedules as a condition of project approval and which have reached either the five-year or ten-year deadlines set in Chapter 25.

(3) The percentage of projects which had Cease & Desist orders posted during the previous fiscal year for failure to observe conditions of approval shall not exceed 20 percent of the number of projects which were inspected the previous fiscal year.

(4) The percentage of projects which were issued notices of violation or were identified as alleged violations, and which are unresolved at the end of the fiscal year, shall not exceed 20 percent of the number of projects which were issued notices of violation or were identified as alleged violations within the fiscal year. Noticed or alleged violations which are resolved within 90 days of being noticed or identified shall not be counted as unresolved, even if the resolution occurs in the next fiscal year. Filing litigation shall be deemed a resolution of a violation for purposes of this finding.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Governing Board shall reconsider the foregoing numerical standards at such time as reconsideration may be appropriate or required, including but not limited to, reconsideration based on the 1992 amendments to Chapter 25 requiring mandatory BMP retrofit by certain dates.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this __________ day of October 1993, by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent:

John E. Upton, Vice Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
RESOLUTION LOWERING THE NUMERICAL LEVEL DEFINING THE TOP RANKED PARCELS IN DOUGLAS COUNTY

WHEREAS, the 1987 Regional Plan and Code of Ordinances implemented a new system for evaluating and determining eligibility for development of vacant residential parcels, which system is titled the Individual Parcel Evaluation System ("IPES"); and

WHEREAS, a key component of IPES is the potential for annually lowering the numerical level defining the top ranked parcels ("IPES line") in a given jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, the IPES line cannot be lowered unless TRPA makes five certain findings as set forth in Chapter 37; and

WHEREAS, the five findings are further defined in the 1988 Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region ("208 Plan") in Volume I, thereof; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board and Advisory Planning Commission ("APC") have conducted several noticed public hearings on the five required findings; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board has set numerical performance standards for the four criteria used to determine the level of compliance with conditions of project approval; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that:

(1) all parcels in Douglas County included in the top rank, as defined below, are otherwise eligible for development under the applicable state water quality management plans for the Lake Tahoe Basin (208 plans) and other legal limitations;

(2) the monitoring program for Douglas County is in place pursuant to Chapter 32 and the TRPA monitoring program, and that water quality samples have been collected and analyzed for at least the previous water year;

(3) demonstrable progress is being made on capital improvement programs for water quality within Douglas County as evidenced by their funding and construction of four high priority water quality projects in 1992 and their accelerated completion of all Priority 1 and 2 water quality projects in Volume IV, of the 208 Plan for Douglas County and, on that basis, the Board further finds that the extraordinary progress made is sufficient to make the first finding with respect to capital improvement program progress on page 120, Volume I, 1988 TRPA 208 Plan, despite the lack of a high priority project in 1994;

(4) in Douglas County, the number of vacant parcels below the current level defining the top ranked parcels, which is 225, divided by the number of vacant parcels deemed sensitive on January 1, 1986, which is 1067, equates to 21 percent and therefore does not exceed 33 percent; and
(5) that Douglas County has satisfactory levels of compliance with project conditions of approval as evidenced by their meeting and exceeding the numerical performance standards set for the four criteria listed on page 120, Volume I, 1988 TRPA 208 Plan.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, by applying the standard set forth in Subsection 37.8.C lowering the numerical level defining the top rank by the number of parcels equal to the number of residential allocations used the previous year, and defining "used allocation" as one for which a complete application was filed, or allocation transfer completed, by December 31 of the previous year, the Governing Board hereby lowers the numerical value defining the top rank in Douglas County by 20 parcels to 708, such that parcels scored 709 or better are now within the top rank of parcels in Douglas County.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that, if residential allocations are not distributed in Douglas County by random selection, then, by operation of Subsection 37.8.D, the percentage of allocations distributed to parcels at or below the initial line of 725 cannot exceed 4.7 percent.

Passed and Adopted this ____ day of October, 1993, by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

[Signature]
John E. Upton, Vice Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
STAFF RECOMMENDED CHANGES FOR THE DOUGLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY PLANS

The following staff recommended changes to the DCCP package will be presented to the APC and Governing Board. The recommendations are based on TRPA staff’s review of the final EIS. The actual proposed text changes are attached and can be inserted into your binder.

1. **Boundaries:** For CP boundary adjustments, amend the CPs to comply with the Chapter 14 findings:

   Round Hill - Delete Lawyers Title property from the Round Hill Community Plan by amending the Illustrative Plan Map and the Land Use Map.

   **Rationale:** Based on the evidence in the EIS, the findings cannot be made for the Round Hill addition.

2. **TRPA Adoption Only:** Delete references to Douglas County adopting the CPs and related standards and guidelines. Upon adoption of the CPs by Douglas County the references may be reinserted in a joint plan document.

   **Rationale:** TRPA Legal Counsel indicates TRPA cannot take action for Douglas County.

3. **Sign Package:** Add scenic mitigation measures to Chapter 12 Signs, Attachment B, and Chapter IVs as follows:

   Amend Attachment B, Exhibit 2, of the Design Standards and Guidelines to show corrected improvements, Horizon sidewalk, and crosswalk.

   Amend Attachment B Improvement List and Chapter VII CIP to add:
   - a. Move Golf Course Fence back 20 feet, landscape, meander sidewalk
   - b. Expanded median in Kingsbury (create a Kingsbury list)
   - c. Relocate/ setback Lakeside reader board under the roofline
   - d. Relocate a provisionally conforming Caesar’s freestanding sign 250 feet toward Stateline

   Amend Attachment B Improvement list to include 2003 projected scenic ratings and improvements and amend Chapter IV Scenic Targets.

   Add amendment provision to the Improvement List to allow for substitutions.

   **Rationale:** The scenic analysis indicates that additional improvements are needed to reach the required score of 16. There is a need to establish a 2003 benchmark for evaluation purposes.

4. **Water Quality Fee Incentive:** Add water quality mitigation fee substitution section to Chapter 82 like is found in the Air Quality Mitigation Chapter 92.

**Attachment B**
82.4.A Limited Exception for Additional or Transferred Development Within Adopted Community Plans: Additional or transferred development located within an adopted community plan, the water quality impacts of which were evaluated in the EIS and mitigated for the community plan, shall be exempt from the requirements of Section 82.2 provided TRPA finds that the implementation element of the community plan as a whole meets the standards of Section 82.2.

Add limitations to the Chapter VII water quality mitigation program that prevents crediting funds spent to meet on-site BMP requirements for off-site mitigation.

Rationale: This type of incentive is recommended by the EIS as an incentive and a Code amendment is required to permit it in a CP.

5. Design Standards and Guidelines: Amend the following sections:

Tighten up the exception section in Introduction.

1. change to more than 10 percent of project cost, TRPA approved schedule.
2. add where assessments have been levied.
3. add finding that results must be equal or superior to standard excepted.

Add an on-site pedestrian facilities requirement in Chapter 5.

Add cross walk detail to Chapter 18.

No Stateline exceptions for lighting, but allow up lighting to 26 feet in all community plans provided the light source is shielded form public view.

Rationale: EIS analysis of equal or superior standards require the above modifications.

6. PAS 070A Amendments:

Create a Special Area #3 for the Park Ranch area, allow PAS 080 uses or less, and protect scenic values.

Special Area #1 reduce the number of permissible uses which would have adverse impacts.

Special Area #2 reduce the number of permissible uses which would have adverse impacts.

Rationale: The EIS identifies impacts that need to be mitigated as a result of PAS amendments.

7. Allocation System: Amend allocation system to be more specific on credit for joint use parking, i.e., 100 sq. ft. for each space reduced, and delete the credits for health and safety improvements.
Rationale: EIS indicates the linkage between CIP improvements and new commercial development needs to be strengthened.

8. **CP Purpose:** In Chapter I of the CPs, add Compact quote "...to adopt and enforce a regional plan and implementing ordinances which achieve and maintain such capacities while providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent with such capacities."

Rationale: TRPA Legal Counsel indicates that the quote is needed to clarify the role of the CP and TRPA.

9. **CP Time Frame:** Fix CP Chapter Is to indicate CPs go to 2007 and allocations to 1997.

10. **Land Use Conflicts:** Reduce land use conflicts by eliminating the following permissible uses:

Delete the following uses (with clarifying footnote) from Stateline CP—business support services, business and vocational schools, repair services, government offices, health care services, professional offices, and hospitals.

Delete the following uses from Kingsbury Special Areas—rural sports and snowmobiles

Create an industrial SA #4 for Shady Lane area and Market Street area, matching the Illustrative Plan, remove industrial elsewhere in SA #2.

Rationale: EIS identified land use conflicts and recommends removal of uses inconsistent with the planning theme.

11. **Water Quality Goal:** Amend Water Quality Target Section of Chapter IV of the CPs to indicate that projects may substitute contributions to area wide drainage solutions for payment of offsite mitigation. Also, projects may utilize proven area wide drainage solutions to meet the infiltration requirements of Chapter 25, but are not otherwise exempt from Chapter 25.

Rationale: The EIS pointed out that exempting projects from offsite mitigation requirements was less of a requirement than the current TRPA standard.

12. **Parking Program:** Amend Policy 6A in the Transportation Element of Stateline CP to require the study and program to be adopted prior to the 1997 CP update and distribution of new allocations.

Rationale: The EIS indicates that the CP should increase its emphasis on the comprehensive parking study because of its importance in meeting 2007 targets.

13. **Noise:** Amend Kingsbury SA #3 noise limitation from 55 CNEL back to 65 CNEL.
Rationale: The EIS notes that by lowering the PAS CNEL of 65 to 55 for this area, State Highway 207 will exceed the standard and will require mitigation at Kahle Park. TRPA staff suggests not lowering the standard to 55 because of the overall commercial nature of the area.

14. **Improve Linkage:** Amend Policy 1A in Chapter IVs to improve the linkage between development and CIP improvements.

Change irrevocable commitment to all required funding and approvals.

Require Douglas County to adopt Chapter VII CIP list of projects and submit the applicable projects to NDOT for inclusion in the State STIP before development is permitted to use the incentives.

Rationale: The EIS indicates that the funding sources that come from development falls short of the funding needed for the CIP improvements. The EIS suggests a stronger public and private commitment is needed to provide the mitigation.
October 10, 1993

To: Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Community Plans and Related Plan Area Statements for Round Hill, Kingsbury, and Stateline

Proposed Action: The Governing Board is requested to review and to take action on the following items in regard to approving the three Douglas County Community Plans.

1. The certification of the Final EIS Evaluating Three Community Plans in Douglas County (handout delivered at the September Governing Board meeting) with errata (Attachment A).

2. The adoption of the Team recommended community plans, related PAS amendments, and Design Standards and Guidelines for Round Hill, Kingsbury, and Stateline with the staff recommended changes. (Team recommended Plan binder mailed with September Governing Board packet - the staff recommended changes and text inserts are attached as Attachment B).

3. The adoption of technical amendments to implement the CPs.
   a. Delete PAS 071, 076, and 089A to be replaced by CPs (Attachment C).
   c. Amend Chapter 30, Design Standards to reference new standards for the Douglas County CPs (Attachment E).
   d. Amend Chapter 26 to reference the new standards for the Douglas County CPs (Attachment F).
   e. Amend Chapter 24 to reference the new standards for the Douglas County CPs (Attachment G).
   f. Amend PAS 072, 074, and 077 to remove residential bonus units for relocation in PAS 070A (Attachment H).

Staff and APC Recommendation: Staff and APC recommend certification of the EIS, adoption of the Community Plans, and approval of the above-referenced PAS and Code amendments with the staff and APC recommended changes noted in Attachment B contained in this packet.
Issues/Presentation: Because of the size and complexity of the documents, the staff presentation involves two Governing Board meetings. Staff presented the Team recommended plans at the September APC meeting. The focus of the October meeting will be on staff and APC’s recommendation, and the key issues involving the three Community Plans.

At this time, it is staff’s opinion that there is a consensus on a majority of the content of the community plans; however, there are some issues for which consensus has not been reached. Based on the testimony at the September APC meeting, the September Governing Board meeting, the October Community Plan Team meeting, the October APC meeting, and the special October 14 concerned parties meeting, the following list of issues requiring additional discussion have been identified.

It is staff’s intent to focus the presentation on these issues.

1. Should TRPA plan for the expansion of development potential outside the Loop Road in the Stateline area? The amendments to PAS 070A permit consideration of a 250 unit hotel on the Edgewood Golf Course and 155 residential units on the Park Cattle Company Ranch.

Staff, APC, the Team, and Douglas County recommend the PAS amendments to add the hotel and residential areas for the planning and environmental benefits of which some, like the affordable housing and beach access, are linked to the development. The League to Save Lake Tahoe objects to the basic concept of allowing hotel and residential development in these areas.

2. Does the Stateline Community Plan allow development that is not consistent with the limitations on gaming found in the Compact? The Compact contains provisions for limiting the relocation of uses in structures housing gaming and other provisions allowing nonrelated commercial uses on sites containing structures housing gaming.

Staff, APC, the Team, and the gaming representatives have included Compact language (Appendix C) in the CPs to insure that the provisions of the Compact will be followed. The League would like to have more specific language in the Community Plans limiting the gaming linked commercial uses in the core.

3. Does the Stateline CP do enough to de-emphasize the automobile? The CP calls for numerous transportation improvements which are consistent with the TRPA Regional Transportation Plan. There are no improvements recommended that are inconsistent with the RTP.

Staff, APC, and the Team recommend construction of the Loop Road (required by RTP), reducing the Kingsbury Connector to an option (RTP calls for a connector), freezing approvals of new parking until a study is done (more restrictive than RTP), reductions in VMT (not required by
RTP), and all transit and pedestrian improvements listed in the RTP. The League does not favor any more road construction and is concerned that the parking study is not completed. Douglas County staff and Commissioners favor the construction of the Kingsbury Connector and published a study in support of its construction.

4. **Are environmental improvements linked with the possible increases in commercial development?** The three CPs provide allocation systems and CIPs, but other than a few key projects there is no absolute assurance that the required CIP projects will be implemented.

Staff, APC, and the Team recommend the Plans as proposed with the additional language requiring Douglas County to adopt the CIP list and to submit the list of Nevada Department of Transportation projects to NDOT for inclusion on the State STIP. The League would prefer to have all projects funded ahead of time or rules requiring development and the CIP to proceed at the same pace.

5. **Is the scenic evaluation analysis for the casino sign ordinance correct?** The scenic consultant’s scoring of the casino sign standards/improvement package was 15.5; therefore, additional improvements are required to reach 16.

The staff supports the consultants’ (Wayne Iverson and Sue Irlean) analysis and scoring as documented in the Final EIS. The gaming properties feel that the scoring should follow numerical rounding procedures and the four additional improvements should not be required.

6. **Can the findings be made for adding the additional area for Round Hill?** The findings for CP additions require a finding of need for commercial which, in staff’s opinion, cannot be made for Round Hill.

As discussed in the EIS, there is no need for additional vacant commercial land in Round Hill based on the needs assessment, other vacant parcels, no allocations for this CP, and vacant floor area in the CP. The Team and the property owner disagree. At the APC meeting, it was recommended that the property owner do a new needs assessment and, if appropriate, process a Community Plan amendment.

7. **Is the development allowed by the CPs consistent with the water rights allocation for Nevada?** At the September Governing Board meeting discussion indicated that the Nevada State Engineer had more water rights permitted and certified than the Bistate Water Compact allows (11,000 acre feet). The State Engineers office estimates that there are 12,105 acre feet permitted and certified, including 1,965 acre feet for the U.S. Forest Service. The 1991 estimate of water usage in Nevada is 9,330 acre feet. TRPA’s most recent EIS on the subject (1988 Water Quality Management Plan EIS) estimates build-out for the Nevada side will total 11,400 acre feet, but this includes U.S. Forest Service water rights that probably won’t be used (use in 1991 = 710 acre feet). It should be noted that the community plans do not add any additional development to the Regional Plan.
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**Background:** The Douglas County Community Planning Team has completed its review and has recommended a plan package for the three community plans. This document is contained in the white binder that was presented at the September Governing Board meeting.

The Final EIS (blue cover) on the recommended package of community plans, plan area statements, and design standards and guidelines was handed out to the Governing Board on September 22, 1993.

TRPA staff reviewed the team recommendations and the Final EIS and made its own recommendation (Attachment B). The staff recommendation was presented to the Planning Team on October 1, 1993. Although there was no quorum or vote at this team meeting, those team members in attendance generally concurred with the staff recommendation except for the Round Hill boundary issue and the signs/scenic issues for Stateline.

The Douglas County Planning Commission reviewed the Team recommended package on September 23, 1993, and recommended approval.

At the Governing Board Chairman's request, TRPA staff met with concerned parties on October 14, 1993, to resolve as many issues as possible before the Governing Board meeting. Progress was made and is reflected in the recommendations and issues.

**Required Findings:** Findings must be made prior to adopting the proposed community plans. Attachment I has all the findings related to the Round Hill Community Plan, Attachment J has all the findings related to the Kingsbury Community Plan, and Attachment K has all the findings related to the Stateline Community Plans. The Governing Board will have to make the findings to adopt the Community Plans.

**Environmental Documentation:** These community plans were determined to require an Environmental Impact Statement. An EIS was prepared pursuant to the requirements of TRPA. With the staff recommended amendments, all identified impacts are mitigated.

The Final EIS Evaluating Three Community Plans in Douglas County, Nevada (September, 1993) is now before the APC for a recommendation for certification. Certification is defined as finding that the final EIS is in compliance, procedurally and substantively, with Article VII of the compact, Chapter 5 of the Code and the Rules of Procedure.

Also, the Compact and the TRPA Code require that prior to approving a plan for which and EIS was prepared, TRPA Governing Board shall make findings for each significant adverse effect identified in the EIS. For Governing Board reference, the required findings are found in Attachment I, J, and K.

**Recommended Actions:** To adopt the Community Plan package, the Governing Board must take the following actions:
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1. A motion to certify that the final EIS evaluating three community plans in Douglas County, Nevada (September 1993) with the October 12, 1993 errata is in compliance procedurally and substantively with Article VII of the Compact, Chapter 5 of the Code, and the Rules of Procedure.

2. A motion to make all the findings on Attachment I related to Round Hill Community Plan amendment package, on Attachment J related to the Kingsbury Community Plan amendment package, and on Attachment K related to the Stateline Community Plan amendment package.

3. A motion to adopt the three community plans and related amendments (title to be read by Legal Counsel) as shown in the adopting ordinance in Attachment L.

There will be a presentation on this item at the meeting. Please contact Gordon Barrett at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this matter.
ERRATA FOR FINAL EIS

1. On page 4-22 delete last sentence which indicates that TRPA legal staff do not support the Team's conclusion in making the findings to add Lawyer's Title. On page 4-27 under the Mitigation heading, change "...Chapter 14 Findings cannot be made..." to "...are unlikely to be made..." On page 4-195 bottom paragraph change "...recreation proposals does not meet the findings...," to "...appear not to meet the findings..." On page 7-20, Table 7.2-C, Alt. 2 use wording "does not appear to meet the findings." In Gordon DePaoli's response to comment #4, do not use "TRPA concludes...", but use "evidence indicates...".

2. On page 4-27 delete mitigation measure #2.

3. On page 7-3 Stream Zones/Water Quality/Shorezone, Alternative 2, mitigation #2, add wording that "analysis/modelling would be sufficient proof of meeting standards."

4. On page 4-19, Gaming Properties, change second sentence in second paragraph to read, "The Compact prevents relocation of public areas within structures housing gaming to exterior areas in order to increase gaming area or related activities within those structures." On page 4-20, Gaming Properties, same paragraph, last sentence, change sentence to read, "No replacement of public uses from within the structures housing gaming is proposed by the Stateline Community Plan."
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CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE

The Round Hill Community Plan is designed and proposed to serve as the guiding doctrine for commercial allocations until 1997 and the planning rehabilitation of the community until 2007. The Plan establishes goals and objectives, special policies, programs, and strategies for funding and implementation. Elements of the Plan address land use, transportation, conservation, recreation, public service and implementation. The TRPA purpose for planning according to the Compact is "...to adopt and enforce a regional plan and implementing ordinances which achieve and maintain such capacities while proving opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent with such capacities."

Pursuant to Chapter 14 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the Round Hill Community Plan supersedes certain plans and regulations established by the TRPA Plan Area Statements (PAS) and the TRPA Code for the area within the Round Hill Community Plan boundaries. Per purposes of Douglas-County-land-use-regulation, the Community-Plan-and-the-Douglas-County-General-Plan-and-implementing-ordinances shall become one and the same. Upon adoption by TRPA and Douglas County, the Community Plan (CP) is intended to serve as the mutual plan for Douglas County and TRPA and an advisory plan for other government agencies. This does not alter the provisions of Article 6 of the Compact relating to gaming.

B. BACKGROUND

The overall planning concept which guides future development in the three Douglas County Community Plan Areas is to create separate, distinct and vital commercial areas. Each area will establish and build upon an identifiable character which reinforces the area's location, setting, economy and commercial theme. Land uses complement the desired character of the areas, as well as respond to market conditions and regulatory objectives. Transportation and trail systems will provide more efficient links between the three areas and encourage both residents and visitors to use alternative modes of transportation, such as bicycles, walking paths and public transit facilities. New recreational amenities will broaden opportunities for outdoor recreation and family activities. Programs for stream zone and land coverage restoration will not only enhance the quality of the environment, but will contribute to basin-wide goals for preservation of Lake Tahoe.

The three community plan areas currently each serve different, but related, markets and provide services which are distinct from one another. As a result, each area now has a different feeling or character which, to varying degrees, complements the land uses of each area. Round Hill is primarily a neighborhood shopping area with some small ancillary professional offices. It is surrounded by year-round and recreational residences and several hundred acres of un-
developed land owned by the U.S. Forest Service. Kingsbury Grade can be divided into two sub-areas: 1) along U.S. Highway 50, and 2) along Kingsbury Grade. U.S. Highway 50 currently has a mix of small casinos (the Nugget and Lakeside Inn and Casino), small office and retail uses and the Douglas County Administrative Building. The sub-area along Kingsbury Grade is comprised of light industrial, service and warehousing uses. Stateline is the casino core area of South Lake Tahoe and the primary visitor attraction of the Lake. The demands of the casino visitor industry do, however, contribute to the viability and markets of many businesses in Round Hill and Kingsbury Grade.

Presently, the three community plan areas are linked by U.S. Highway 50, which provides the only through route from one area to the next. Most visitors to Stateline travel from the west along U.S. Highway 50, through the City of South Lake Tahoe and several miles of unbroken strip motel and retail development. Both the visual clutter and the seasonal roadway congestion along this route are considered, by the market assessment, to be significant factors which are limiting the economic viability of the visitor industry.

The Community Plans are based upon three primary influences:

1. Goals for the ultimate "character" of the area.
2. Economic trends and market considerations.
3. Environmental goals and regulatory framework.

These three influences are balanced as well as possible, given actual conditions and limitations, to make the best achievable land use program. In some cases, goals for the character of an area have been tempered by the reality of a limited economy. In other cases, the regulatory framework has influenced the amount and location of land uses. The preferred land use plan has considered these three influences and confidently proposes a program which will be economically viable, adhere to TRPA and Douglas County land use regulations, contribute to basin-wide environmental thresholds, and establish an urban character that makes each area a unique and memorable place.

C. ROUND HILL COMMUNITY PLAN GOALS

A fundamental cornerstone of this Community Plan is the conviction that Round Hill should continue as a local serving retail commercial node, and tourist center. To accomplish this goal, policies must stimulate the rehabilitation of the existing commercial to the high quality expected in a destination resort community. The plan will still retain the character of the existing community.

Destination tourism demands a full complement of goods, services, and recreational opportunities located within an easily accessible area. The destination tourist travels further, stays longer, is more likely to utilize transportation systems, and spends more in the local economy than the short-term or day-use visitor. Efforts must focus on developing transportation systems that will tie the many opportunities found in Douglas County together.
CHAPTER II LAND USE ELEMENT

This Land Use Element is a supplement to the Land Use Element of the TRPA Goals and Policies Plan—the-Douglas-County-General-Plan. Consistent with the Regional Plan, this Element sets forth the land use regulations for the Community Plan and provides a Community Plan Area Statement which replaces the existing Plan Area Statement.

A. ROUND HILL COMMUNITY PLAN LAND USE REGULATIONS

Community planning is an option in which the local community in partnership with TRPA and local government may prepare their own plans and to some extent their own standards.

Chapter 14 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances sets forth the provisions for community planning. This section indicates what provisions of the TRPA Regional Plan are applicable and what standards are replaced with equal or superior standards.

This is a brief summary of standards applicable to the Round Hill Community Plan. In general the standards of the TRPA Code apply except as noted by:

1. the Policies of the six Elements of this plan, replace Plan Area Statement policies;
2. the mitigation fee program of Chapter VII, supplements TRPA programs;
3. the Community Plan Sign Ordinance (Appendix B), replaces Chapter 26;
4. the Community Plan Parking Ordinance (Appendix B), replaces Chapter 24; and
5. the Community Plan Design Review Standards and Guidelines (Appendix B), replaces Chapter 30.

Pursuant to Subsection 14.5.B of the Code the following Community Plan Statement replaces the TRPA Plan Area Statements' regulations for this area.


The detailed check list of applicable standards in Appendix A is provided to assist in the review of projects within the Round Hill Community Plan. The check list also indicates which regulations are special to the Community Plan.
B. ROUND HILL COMMERCIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AREA STATEMENT

This Community Plan Area Statement supersedes TRPA Plan Area Statements and Douglas-County-zoning within the Community Plan boundaries.

PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification - COMMERCIAL/PUBLIC SERVICE
Management Strategy - MITIGATION
Special Designation - TDR RECEIVING AREA FOR:
1. Existing Development
2. Scenic Restoration Area

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This is the commercial area at the intersection of U.S. Highway 50 and Elks Point Road and is located on TRPA map H-15.

Existing Uses: This area has the Round Hill Shopping Mall and other surrounding commercial and residential uses. This area serves the northern portion of Douglas County. The area is 65 percent built out.

Existing Environment: The area is 50 percent moderate hazard, 5 percent SEZ, 27 percent low hazard, and 18 percent high hazard. The land coverage is 38 percent and the disturbance is 10 percent.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should continue to serve as a local retail and service commercial node. Opportunities for recreation and tourist accommodations should be provided in this area.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Scenic Roadway Unit 30 is within this Plan Area and is targeted for restoration as required by the scenic threshold.

2. An economic needs assessment was completed for this area.

3. There is an area-wide land capability challenge for this Community Plan Area.

4. The potential exists for multi-family housing, which could support the shopping center and provide housing opportunities for employees in Douglas County.

5. Landscape improvements and design guidelines for signage, could improve the scenic quality of the area.
CHAPTER III TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

This Transportation Element is a supplement to the TRPA Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Douglas-County-Transportation-Plan. Consistent with these plans, this element lists the specific objectives and policies applicable to the Round Hill Community Plan and describes the improvements needed to implement the plan. Specific capital improvements and schedules are found in Chapter VII, Implementation Element.

A. EXISTING TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Streets and Highways

The private automobile serves as the primary mode of transportation in the Lake Tahoe Basin. One main vehicle route through the Round Hill community Plan area exists with a local street intersecting this highway. U.S. Highway 50 bisects the community plan area and links Nevada and California through the Tahoe Region. In Nevada, this highway enters the Tahoe Basin at Spooner Summit. From that point, travellers can take State Route 28 to Tahoe's North Shore or continue on U.S. Highway 50 to the south Stateline area. U.S. Highway 50 enters California and the City of South Lake Tahoe just beyond the Stateline Community Plan area. It then continues through the southern portion of the Basin, exiting toward Sacramento at Echo Summit.

U.S. Highway 50 is the only connection between the Round Hill and Kingsbury Community Plan areas and carries both local and regional traffic volume. Within this community plan area, the highway includes four through travel lanes and left turn pockets at road intersections and an entrance to the Round Hill Mall.

Elks Point Road is the primary local street in the area. To the west it accesses the Dorla Court commercial area, the USFS Nevada Beach recreational area and the Elks Point Country Club subdivision. East of its intersection with U.S. Highway 50, it provides access to the Round Hill Mall and adjacent office buildings and the Round Hill subdivision.

Parking Facilities

Parking within the Round Hill Community Plan area consists of a series of parking lots on private property serving commercial facilities. Existing parking seems to be sufficient for the mix of commercial uses. Currently, the community plan area contains approximately 812 vehicle spaces.
Transit Facilities

No transit facilities currently serve the Round Hill Community Plan area.

Pedestrian Facilities

A 15' stretch of sidewalk runs along the Elks Point Road entrance to the American Federal Savings Bank. This represents the only pedestrian facility within the community plan boundary. Frequent pedestrian travel occurs along Elks Point Road during the summer between the campgrounds at Nevada Beach and the shopping areas at Round Hill. However, as Elks Point Road carries only light volumes, safety conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians are minimized.

Bicycle Facilities

No designated bicycle facilities exist within the community plan area. Road shoulders along U.S. Highway 50 are two to three feet wide and provide a poor bicycle route. Thus, bicyclists throughout the area share the same right-of-way as the highway traffic which presents safety problems.

Existing Traffic Conditions

Evaluation of existing traffic conditions generally relies on a level-of-service analysis. Level of service (LOS) is a quantitative and qualitative measure of traffic conditions on isolated sections of roadway or intersections. LOS ranges from level A, with no congestion, to level F where the system fails with gridlock or stop-and-go conditions prevailing. The quantitative basis for determining LOS is the ratio between existing traffic volume (V) and the calculated capacity (C), the V/C ratio.

In order to determine the existing LOS within the community plan area, turning movement counts were taken at the U.S. Highway 50/Elks Point Road intersection. These counts occurred on a Saturday between 11:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. during July, 1988. Peak hour traffic volumes for tourist and recreational areas are considered highest at noon Saturdays, during the late summer months. This contrasts to non-recreational areas which display peak volumes during weekday commuting hours. These counts formed the basis of the V/C and LOS analysis. The existing peak-hour LOS at this intersection is shown in Table T-1.

<p>| TABLE T-1 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| EXISTING PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION LEVELS-OF-SERVICE |
| SUMMER |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>V/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 50/Elks Point Road</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: TKJM October, 1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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B. TRANSPORTATION OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The following numbered objectives relate to the transportation goal found in the Community Plan Goals section of Chapter I. To meet the Objectives, the following specific policies are adopted as standards.

1. TRPA, Douglas County, NDOT, other transportation related agencies, and the business community shall take appropriate action to implement the Community Plan related measures listed in the Action Element of the TRPA Regional Transportation Plan.

   A. Policy: The improvements listed in the Proposed Transportation Improvement section below, shall be implemented as conditions of project review pursuant to Policy 1.B of the Conservation Element or as part of the implementation of the CIP of Chapter VII.

   B. Policy: A first priority for available funds shall be for projects listed in the Chapter VII CIP, because they maintain existing LOS to a Level D or better within the CP area and help achieve the Threshold Related Targets.

2. Reduce dependency on the automobile by making more effective use of existing transportation modes and of public transit to move people and goods.

   A. Policy: Implement strategies to increase ridership of mass transit to encourage less reliance on private automobiles. This includes:

   1) Extension of STAGE service to Kingsbury residential and commercial areas and to Round Hill;
   2) Increased use and coordination of private shuttle services; and
   3) Provisions for transit facilities.

   B. Policy: Bus turn-outs, shelters, park and ride lots, and other related facilities or programs listed in TRPA, Douglas County, or STAGE CIPs may be required as conditions of approval for projects pursuant to Conservation Element Policy 1.B.

3. Provide a safe and efficient highway transportation system for the users of the Kingsbury area and the others passing through.

   A. Policy: The level of service on major roadways (i.e., arterial and collector routes) shall be LOS D and signalized intersections shall be no lower than LOS D. (Level of Service "E" may be acceptable during peak periods, not to exceed 4 hours per day).
B. Policy: All projects shall analyze and mitigate their traffic quality impacts pursuant to Chapter 93 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. The improvements listed in this element shall be added to the list of mitigation measures in subsection 93.3.C(2) and (3). Traffic/air quality impacts can be mitigated by the project or through an areawide assessment district or other plan CIP measures.

C. Policy: As a condition of project approval or as part of implementing the CIP, consideration should be given to reducing the number of ingress/egress points along Elks Point Road and U.S. Highway 50 by combining and realigning driveways to improve traffic flow and eliminate pedestrian conflicts.

4. The transportation system shall be an integral part of the Community Plan and will be consistent with other objectives such as scenic restoration, community design, SEZ restoration, and open space.

A. Policy: All transportation related projects shall be subject to mitigation programs, the Douglas County Design Standards and Guidelines (Appendix B).

B. Policy: The highway improvement projects shall be designed to help maintain the strong sense of the natural environment that is key to the attraction of the Lake Tahoe area. The U.S. Highway 50/Elks Point Intersection should not be dominated by views of large expanses of highway, and signage.

5. Identify and provide sufficient funding to finance the projects in the capital improvement program (CIP).

A. Policy: Douglas-County-and TRPA shall continue to implement and refine the existing mitigation fee program (Chapter 93 of the Code) for funding transportation capital improvements.

B. Policy: Projects may be exempt from Policy A. above, if the projects meet the requirements of the incentive program described in Section C of Chapter VII.

C. Policy: Contributions to the implementation of improvements listed in the Chapter IV Matrix as eligible for substitute mitigation fees may be credited for the requirements of Policy A above.

6. To improve circulation, reduce vehicle trips, and to improve access to the public recreational areas, a network of recreation trails and sidewalks shall be constructed.

A. Policy: Develop pedestrian linkages between parking lots throughout the CP area to allow free access and reduce VMT.
topography and only minor openings in it, but derives much of its character from its generally undeveloped, natural condition. The 1988 travel route rating and scenic resource threshold for the unit are as follows:

- Travel Route Rating: 14
- Scenic Resource Threshold: 3

This unit is in the unusual situation of having the areas that detract most from its scenic quality all being located outside the unit rather than within it. The commercial and residential development adjacent to the unit on the south, the highrise casino development at Stateline, and the commercial development just north of the unit all impact the unit's natural character and reduce the overall scenic quality.

The shopping center that is located just north of Elks Point Road is much more sensitively handled than the development at the south end of the unit, but additional landscaping of the gas stations and other structures (e.g. furniture store near the intersection with Elks Point Road) would improve the transition from natural forest to commercial center.

TRPA Threshold: TRPA Thresholds require TRPA to attain and maintain Scenic Route Ratings at 15+ for Highway Units and 7+ for Shoreline Units.

Regional Plan Requirements: The Regional Plan requires implementation of the Scenic Quality Improvement Program or an equal or superior program of the CP (including the Restoration Program, Design Review Guidelines, Design Standards and Outdoor Advertising Standards). For 1997, the SQIP requires a 27 percent improvement in roadway unit scores and a 33 percent increase in shoreline unit scores for nonattainment units.

Round Hill Target: The CP shall attain its share of SQIP threshold targets for 1997 and 2007 through implementation of the CP Scenic Quality Improvement Program. The basis of this share is explained in the EIS.

Key Implementation Strategies: The Round Hill Community Plan responds to the SQIP recommendations by providing design improvements and regulations related to a series of design theme/activity zones in the Illustrative Plan. The urban character is established by upgrading of the overall architectural quality, by providing variety, by improving character, and by providing environmental improvements. The following recommendations are made with the intent to simplify and upgrade the character and quality of the area:

a. Architectural Style. Scenic and visual quality is not a question of style and no specific architectural style or design theme is being recommended. The goal should be for design solutions that
are compatible with the natural environment and contribute to the character and quality of the built environment. Lack of variety (sameness) is not a goal and should be discouraged as an end result. The linkage should be in the common street improvements as noted in Chapter 20 of the Design Standards and Guidelines.

b. Building Materials. Building materials should be predominantly natural or natural appearing. Aluminum, steel, plastic and plain plywood board siding should be discouraged. See Design Standards and Guidelines.

c. Building Colors. Exterior building colors should be compatible with the surrounding natural and man-made environment, and not compete with surrounding elements for attention (i.e. the building color should not in any way become "signing" for the site). Generally, building colors should be subdued with natural colors being preferable. Primary or other bright colors, should be used only as accents and then sparingly such as upon trim. See Design Standards and Guidelines.

d. Building Height. From the standpoint of scenic quality, it is important that building heights not exceed the height of existing forest cover. Even when taller buildings are not a visual problem from within the commercial district, when they rise above the natural screening provided by the forest they become visible from viewpoints at great distances around the lake and thus detract from the natural character of the environment. See Design Standards and Guidelines.

e. Access Drives. Commercial developments should provide limited and clearly defined access drives rather than permitting unrestricted vehicle access along the entire property frontage. See Design Standards and Guidelines.

f. Parking. Parking areas should be placed in the rear or side yards of commercial properties whenever possible rather than in front yard setbacks. When parking areas are located along the building frontage a landscaped buffer strip should be provided between the roadway and the parking area. Landscaping pursuant to the Design Review Standards and Guidelines should be utilized around the perimeter and within all parking areas to provide definition and to screen views of parked cars. See the Design Standards and Guidelines for possible solutions.

g. Lighting. Lighting along the main roadway and in many of the larger parking areas utilizes tall light standards that result in the light sources (lamps) being visible from areas quite distant from the area being illuminated. The elevated lamps also result in a bright, even quality of light that covers large areas. Both
(2) Users and Contributors to the areawide solutions may substitute those contributions for the TRPA mitigation fee requirement. While not exempt from Chapter 25 requirements, users may meet their will-be-exempt-from BMP onsite infiltration requirements related to storm water storage and treatment, in whole or in part, through proven areawide systems.

(3) Implementation and maintenance by one responsible entity is preferred. Where feasible the system should be designed to be implemented in phases consistent with these design principles. The systems shall provide proof through modelling and/or testing that they meet TRPA standards. However, upon completion it must operate as one unified system.

The areawide system concept is shown in Figure 7 (also see Chapter VII for CIP description). The drainage concept of the Round Hill Community Plan is to use the existing drainage ways which come together at the lower end of the plan area (west side). At the lower end, all the drainages dissipate into the ground and there are no channels continuing to the lake. The area-wide concept would be to build on the natural system by stabilizing the drainage ways, protecting the drainage ways and percolation areas.

b. **Onsite Solutions:** In addition to the areawide solutions identified above, each project within the Community Plan Area shall be subject to TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 25 requirements for paving parking and drives, slope stabilization, revegetation, and providing snow storage areas.

In cases where the property is not considered part of the areawide system, drainage improvements will be required pursuant to Chapter 25.

In cases were the property is part of the areawide drainage system, but the areawide drainage system requires onsite improvements or recommends onsite retention systems to reduce loadings, mitigation funds should be made available.

c. The following 2.4 acres of CIPs are listed as possible areas for restoration. Restoration and some paving of these areas may occur in conjunction with implementation of the CIP and with project approvals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) West Bourne</td>
<td>1.0 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) North Bourne</td>
<td>0.5 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Carson Furniture</td>
<td>0.2 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0.2 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7

PROPOSED DRAINAGE / SEZ RESTORATION
Douglas County Community Plans EIS

NOTE: Project locations are schematic. See the text for location descriptions.
b. Extended season - Nevada Beach to be open early Spring and late Fall.

Estimated Cost: $10,000

Funding:
U.S. Forest Service

Recreation Trails
See Recreation Trails

Recreation Trail
A trail head will be constructed near Elk Point on USFS land. It will provide 10+ parking spaces and connect/provide access to the Kingsbury and Lake Trails

Estimated Cost: $25,000

Funding:
U.S. Forest Service $25,000

Schedule:
The following schedule is subject to change (based on changes in funding, project limitations, construction schedules, and redesign) and may be revised yearly by TRPA resolution.

1993-96 - Beach Access
1994 - Trail Head

Responsible Jurisdiction: Douglas County, USFS, Private

C. MITIGATION PER PROGRAMS

1. Excess Land Coverage Program

Purpose: The purpose of this program is to reduce excess land coverage and achieve targets in the Community Plan area and the related hydrologic area. This is the Community Plan program that is described in subparagraph 20.5.A(2)(e) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Description of Program: Pursuant to subparagraph 20.5.A(2)(e), a land bank accounting system will be established to bank land coverage reductions with an agency such as Nevada State Lands. TRPA will credit to the Community Plan land coverage removed and lands restored as noted below. Eligible projects may utilize these option fees when they demonstrate that they have contributed to coverage removal projects such as:

a. Public works restoration projects listed in Chapter VII Land Coverage (e.g., the area wide drainage system restoration work) may be credited to the Round Hill Community Plan account.
b. Projects, both private and public, providing the 5% landscaping requirements of the Urban Design and Development Special Policy 6.A. may be credited to the Round Hill Community Plan account.

Eligibility: Projects contributing to the implementation of the coverage reduction project credited to the Round Hill account may use the contributions as credit based on the coverage reduction schedule set forth in Section 20.5.

2. Water Quality Fee Program

Purpose: The purpose of this program is to provide an option to the TRPA Code of Ordinances Water Quality Mitigation Fund (subsection 82.2.B) for implementing water quality improvements in the Round Hill Community Plan area. Participants in this program could credit contributions to the water quality CIP projects to the TRPA Water Quality Mitigation Fee requirement.

Description of Program: The Community Plan describes needed water quality improvement projects. Generally, these projects will be implemented through assessment districts, private projects, and public works' projects. Property owners that contribute to such area-wide projects may credit such contributions to the water quality fee requirements on their future projects. TRPA and Douglas County shall create a special Community Plan account under the requirements of Chapter 82 for the Round Hill Community Plan to keep track of such contributions. Credits shall be calculated at the mitigation fee rates established in Chapter 82. Money spent to satisfy on-site BMP requirement through off-site facilities shall not be credited as off-site mitigation.

Eligibility: Properties, both public and private, which contribute to water quality improvements listed for this Community Plan may credit such contributions to the Douglas County-Round Hill Community Plan Water Quality Mitigation fund.

3. Traffic and Air Quality Fee Program

Purpose: The purpose of this program is to implement the transportation improvements listed for the Round Hill Community Plan and to provide a substitute to the TRPA Code program (subsection 93.3.E) for collection of fees of off-site traffic and air quality mitigation.

Description of Program: Chapter VII lists the projects needed to meet the Community Plan's Transportation/Air Quality targets and mitigation requirements. These projects shall qualify as regional and cumulative mitigation measures under subsection 93.3.C(2). As an option, properties, both public and private, contributing to these projects may credit such contributions to the air quality mitigation requirements of Chapter 93.
D. INCENTIVE PROGRAM

The incentive program is created to link required improvements with new
development to ensure the Goals and Objectives of the Community Plan are
achieved. The concept is to link future development to a list of miti-
gation measures in the immediate area of the project (i.e., the incentive
zone). There are 2 mapped Special Areas with listed mitigation measures
which must be approved and funded prior to project approval. To encourage
this concept, Douglas-County and TRPA may provide following incentives to
projects in these areas:

1. Land coverage: CP projects are eligible for the transfer coverage
program pursuant to TRPA Code Section 20.3.

2. Commercial floor area allocation: CP projects are eligible for com-
mercial floor area allocations pursuant to Commercial Development
Policy 1.A. Douglas County may make special provisions for reserving
allocations for projects in assessment districts. (No allocations
assigned to Round Hill)

3. Tourist accommodation bonus units: Projects are eligible to receive
bonus units based on the criteria in Code Chapter 35 and the
Implementation Element Commercial Development, Policy 2.A. (No bonus
units assigned to Round Hill)

4. Residential bonus units: Projects are eligible to receive bonus units
based on the criteria in Code Chapter 35 and Implementation Element
Commercial Development Policy 2.A. (No bonus units assigned to Round
Hill)

5. PAOTTs: Projects are eligible for the listed PAOT allocations based on
the criteria in Implementation Element Commercial Development Policy
2.A.

6. Program Substitutions/Mitigation Fee Waivers: Projects in the incen-
tive areas shall be subject to the following special regulations:

   Excess coverage fee - TRPA excess coverage fees shall not apply if the
findings of Subparagraph 20.5.A(2)(e) are made.

   Water quality fee - TRPA water quality fees shall not apply if there
has been an irrevocable commitment to construct the water quality
improvements listed below for the specific incentive area.

   Air quality fee - TRPA traffic/air quality fees shall not apply if
there has been an irrevocable commitment to construct the transpor-
tation improvements listed below for the specific incentive area.

7. Change in use - Commercial changes in use are exempt from project
review if the following criteria is met:

   a. The change in use is within the commercial land use classifica-
tion,
b. The change is to an allowed use,

c. The property is a member of an approved parking assessment district,

d. The change does not increase the parking requirement to a greater requirement than 1 space for 200 sq. ft., or the number established upon creating the district, and

e. The proposed activity is consistent with the Plan, is not a project by other requirements of Chapter 4 of the Code.

8. **Offsite parking** - Use of offsite parking may be permissible pursuant to the parking analysis in Appendix B of this Plan.

9. **TDR retirement 4-7 lands** - Land capability 4-7 parcels from which development is transferred need not be permanently retired pursuant to Chapter 34.

10. **Height Bonus** - Additional height pursuant to Subsection 22.4.8 for tourist accommodation buildings.

11. **Environmental documentation** - Projects consistent with the plan description may tier off the Community Plan EIS.

12. **Sign replacement** - Arrangements shall be made through the County or assessment districts to give financial assistance for sign replacement for conformance.

E. **MONITORING PROGRAM**

The TRPA Code requires monitoring and periodic review of each community plan. Section 14.7 requires that community plans be reviewed on five year intervals to determine conformance with approved schedules, and to check the adequacy of programs, standards, mitigation and monitoring.

The Community Plan Monitoring Program relies upon the existing TRPA Monitoring Program. The monitoring provisions of the community plan rely on certain key indicators listed in Chapter 32. The program is to measure progress in relationship to the targets established in the Conservation Element.

1. **Target Monitoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element Monitored</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sample Period</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Counts</td>
<td>U.S. Hwy 50/</td>
<td>1 day/month</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTE, LOS</td>
<td>Elks Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor SEZ</td>
<td>CP area</td>
<td>yearly</td>
<td>TRPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE

The Kingsbury Community Plan is designed and proposed to serve as the guiding doctrine for commercial allocations until 1995 and the planning rehabilitation of the community until 2007. The Plan establishes goals and objectives, special policies, programs, and strategies for funding and implementation. Elements of the Plan address land use, transportation, conservation, recreation, public service and implementation. The TRPA purpose for planning according to the Compact is "...to adopt and enforce a regional plan and implementing ordinances which achieve and maintain such capacities while providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent with such capacities."

Pursuant to Chapter 14 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the Kingsbury Community Plan supersedes certain plans and regulations established by the TRPA Plan Area Statements (PAS) and the TRPA Code for the area within the Kingsbury Community Plan boundaries. For purposes of Douglas County land use regulation, the Community Plan and the Douglas County General Plan and implementing ordinances shall become one and the same. Upon adoption by TRPA and Douglas County, the Community Plan (CP) is intended to serve as the mutual plan for Douglas County and TRPA and an advisory plan for other government agencies. This does not alter the provisions of Article VI of the Compact relating to gaming.

B. BACKGROUND

The overall planning concept which guides future development in the three Douglas County Community Plan Areas is to create separate, distinct and vital commercial areas. Each area will establish and build upon an identifiable character which reinforces the areas’ location, setting, economy and commercial theme. Land uses complement the desired character of the areas, as well as respond to market conditions and regulatory objectives. Transportation and trail systems will provide more efficient links between the three areas and encourage both residents and visitors to use alternative modes of transportation, such as bicycles, walking paths and public transit facilities. New recreational amenities will broaden opportunities for outdoor recreation and family activities. Programs for stream zone and land coverage restoration will not only enhance the quality of the environment, but will contribute to basin-wide goals for preservation of Lake Tahoe.
The three community plan areas currently each serve different, but related, markets and provide services which are distinct from one another. As a result, each area now has a different feeling or character which, to varying degrees, complements the land uses of each area. Round Hill is primarily a neighborhood shopping area with some small ancillary professional offices. It is surrounded by year-round and recreational residences and several hundred acres of undeveloped land owned by the U.S. Forest Service. Kingsbury Grade can be divided into two sub-areas: 1) along U.S. Highway 50, and 2) along Kingsbury Grade. U.S. Highway 50 currently has a mix of small casinos (the Nugget and Lakeside Inn and Casino), small office and retail uses and the Douglas County Administrative Building. The sub-area along Kingsbury Grade is comprised of light industrial, service and warehousing uses. Stateline is the casino core area of South Lake Tahoe and the primary visitor attraction of the Lake. The demands of the casino visitor industry do, however, contribute to the viability and markets of many businesses in Round Hill and Kingsbury Grade.

Presently, the three community plan areas are linked by U.S. Highway 50, which provides the only through route from one area to the next. Most visitors to Stateline travel from the west along U.S. Highway 50, through the City of South Lake Tahoe and several miles of unbroken strip motel and retail development. Both the visual clutter and the seasonal roadway congestion along this route are considered, by the market assessment, to be significant factors which are limiting the economic viability of the visitor industry.

The Community Plans are based upon three primary influences:

1. Goals for the ultimate "character" of the area.
2. Economic trends and market considerations.
3. Environmental goals and regulatory framework.

These three influences are balanced as well as possible, given actual conditions and limitations, to make the best achievable land use program. In some cases, goals for the character of an area have been tempered by the reality of a limited economy. In other cases, the regulatory framework has influenced the amount and location of land uses. The preferred land use plan has considered these three influences and confidently proposes a program which will be economically viable, adhere to TRPA and Douglas County land use regulations, contribute to basin-wide environmental thresholds, and establish an urban character that makes each area a unique and memorable place.

C. KINGSBURY COMMUNITY PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

A fundamental cornerstone of this Community Plan is the conviction that Kingsbury should continue as a regional commercial area. To accomplish this goal, policies must encourage diversification of recreational and commercial attractions to create the high quality development expected in a destination resort community. The plan will still retain the character of the existing community.
CHAPTER II LAND USE ELEMENT

This Land Use Element is a supplement to the Land Use Element of the TRPA Goals and Policies Plan and the Deeglas-County-General-Plan. Consistent with the Regional Plan, this Element sets forth the land use regulations for the Community Plan and provides a Community Plan Area Statement which replaces the existing Plan Area Statement.

A. KINGSBURY COMMERCIAL COMMUNITY PLAN LAND USE REGULATIONS

Community planning is an option in which the local community in partnership with TRPA and local government may prepare their own plans and to some extent their own standards.

Chapter 14 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances sets forth the provisions for community planning. This section indicates what provisions of the TRPA Regional Plan are applicable and what standards are replaced with equal or superior standards.

This is a brief summary of standards applicable to the Kingsbury Commercial Community Plan. In general the standards of the TRPA Code apply except as noted by:

1. the Policies of the six Elements of this plan, replace Plan Area Statement policies;
2. the mitigation fee program of Chapter VII, supplements TRPA programs;
3. the Community Plan Sign Ordinance (Appendix B), replaces Chapter 26;
4. the Community Plan Parking Ordinance (Appendix B), replaces Chapter 24; and
5. the Community Plan Design Review Standards and Guidelines (Appendix B), replaces Chapter 30.

Pursuant to Subsection 14.5.B of the Code the following Community Plan Statement replaces the TRPA Plan Area Statements' regulations for this area.

This document is both a Deeglas-County-General-Plan-document-andy-to-some extenty-a-Deeglas-County-land-use-regulatory-document--in-the-case-of-the-hand Use-Elementy-the-Plan-Area-Statements-(PAS)-included-herein-will-serve-as-the functional-equivalent-of-zoning-for-those-areas.
The detailed check list of applicable standards in Appendix A is provided to assist in the review of projects within the Kingsbury Commercial Community Plan. The check list also indicates which regulations are special to the Community Plan.

B. KINGSBURY COMMERCIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AREA STATEMENT

This Community Plan Area Statement supersedes TRPA Plan Area Statements and Douglas County zoning within the Community Plan boundaries.

PLAN DESIGNATION:

- Land Use Classification: COMMERCIAL/PUBLIC SERVICE
- Management Strategy: MITIGATION
- Special Designation: TDR RECEIVING AREA FOR:
  1. Existing Development
  2. Multi-Residential Units
SCENIC RESTORATION AREA
PREFERRED AFFORDABLE HOUSING AREA
MULTI-RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This area includes the commercial uses found at the U.S. Highway 50 and lower Kingsbury Grade area. This area is located on TRPA map H-16.

Existing Uses: This area contains two casinos, two small shopping centers, an industrial service area, the Douglas County Administration Center and other miscellaneous commercial uses. The area is 45 percent built out.

Existing Environment: This area is 7 percent high hazard, 46 percent moderate hazard, 8 percent SEZ and 39 percent low hazard. The land coverage is 50 percent plus an additional 6 percent disturbed.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should continue to serve as a commercial, tourist, and public service node for Douglas County.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Rehabilitation of the Kahle Casino site as a park is necessary.

2. Traffic congestion occurs at the intersection of U.S. Highway 50 and Kingsbury Grade.

3. The Transportation Element calls for a study of a highway bypass through this area.
4. The structure that carries Burke Creek under U.S. Highway 50 is a barrier to fish migration.

5. Scenic Roadway Units 32 and 44 are in this area which is targeted for restoration as required by the scenic threshold.

6. Article VI Compact provisions related to gaming apply to the structures housing gaming in Special Area #1.

OBJECTIVES AND SPECIAL POLICIES:

Urban Design and Development: (see the Illustrative Plan, Chapter I for a description of the Plan's overall design framework)

1. Recognize the differences in character between the lower part of the Kingsbury CP along U.S. Highway 50 and upper part along Kingsbury Grade. Land uses and landscaping improvements along the U.S. Highway 50 frontage should emphasize a tourist-commercial and government center theme. Continue to treat the upper portion of the Kingsbury CP as a low-intensity residential retail, service commercial, and light industrial area.

A. Policy: In Special Area 1 (Retail/Tourist/Public Service Area), tourist oriented uses and government center uses are encouraged by the permissible use list. Priority should be given to locating tourist retail uses on the lake side of U.S. Highway 50 with sidewalk frontages. The other side should have large set backs for the government and transit facilities.

B. Policy: In Special Area 2 (Commercial Service/Industrial Area), mixed uses residential, retail, and primary service commercial and light-industrial services are encouraged by the permissible use list. The service commercial latter-two uses should not be visible or shall be screened from view from the scenic corridors. Light-industrially-wholesale/storage-and-other-similar-uses-should-be-located-in-the-area-of-Shady-Lane-and-Market-Street.

C. Policy: In Special Area 3 (Recreation Area), public outdoor recreation uses are encouraged by the permissible use list. This area's focus should be for public recreation and environmental restoration.

D. Policy: In Special Area 4 (Commercial Industrial Area), light industrial, wholesale/storage and other similar uses should be located in the area of Shady Lane and Market Street.
2. On a human scale, provide unity and continuity of the U.S. Highway 50 commercial area and the upper Kingsbury commercial area through development of uniform sidewalk (trail) improvements, signing, landscaping, and street lighting program. Supplemental landscaping, sidewalks, special paving and street furnishing along U.S. Highway 50 should encourage pedestrians to walk between uses. Such a system would also unify the visual character and create a recognizable identity for the area. The character of the lower Kingsbury commercial area should reflect the character established by the Lakeside Inn and the Douglas County Administrative Center. Landscaping improvements along Kingsbury Grade should screen "out-of-character" buildings and industrial uses.

A. Policy: All projects expanding units of use, or adding or relocating land coverage shall implement or commit to a five year schedule to implement, the sidewalk/landscaping improvements fronting its project area. Typical improvements are described in Chapter 19 of the Design Standards and Guidelines. This condition may be waived if the project is in an assessment district already committed to the improvements.

3. Encourage rehabilitation by the remodeling, upgrading, and aesthetic improvement of buildings and structures in need of such improvements.

A. Policy: All projects shall be reviewed pursuant to the Design Standards and Guidelines for Douglas County (Appendix B). Appropriate guidelines may be added as conditions of approval.

B. Policy: Projects which provide substantial rehabilitation by remodeling, upgrading, or other aesthetic improvements shall be eligible for the incentives listed in Subelement D of the Implementation Element.

4. Encourage the upgrading or replacement of commercial advertising signs that detract from the aesthetic appearance of the community.

A. Policy: Outdoor advertising shall be subject to the standards and guidelines established in the Community Plan Sign Ordinance, Appendix B.

B. Policy: Nonconforming signs shall be subject to an amortization plan and incentive program to provide for the eventual elimination or replacement of such signs. (See Sign Ordinance).

5. Complete the undergrounding of overhead utilities for Kingsbury.

A. Policy: Pursuant to Chapter IV, all projects within the scenic corridor shall be responsible for removing, relocating or screening overhead utilities as a condition of project approval. TRPA may waive this requirement if the project is part of an undergrounding program or the undergrounding has been determined by TRPA not to be necessary to meet the scenic targets of this Plan.
6. Integrate more landscaping into both private development and public projects.

   A. Policy: Projects with existing coverage in excess of 75% of their project area, shall be required to provide an increase in landscaping equal to 5% of the project area. The landscaping requirement shall be met within the project area or, if not feasible, off site in a related area. This condition may be waived by Douglas County and TRPA, if the project is part of an assessment district which is providing the required increase in landscaping or the landscaping requirement has been met by a previous approval.

7. Implement the recommendations described in the Conservation Element, Scenic Improvements Subelement, for improving overall scenic quality.

   A. Policy: The TRPA and Douglas County shall consider the recommendations of Chapter IV when reviewing projects and where appropriate incorporate conditions of approval to implement the recommendations.

8. Preserve and enhance scenic views to Lake Tahoe and to other prominent areas of special interest.

   A. Policy: Projects located between the scenic corridors and Lake Tahoe shall not cause a reduction of the views of Lake Tahoe from the corridors. TRPA may consider as an alternative, offsite improvements if it is determined there is a net increase in the lake views within the scenic unit.

9. The plan should provide a gateway entrance to Lake Tahoe by providing visitor information services, implementing scenic improvements, and providing intermodal transportation facilities near the U.S. Highway 50/Kingsbury Grade intersection.

Commercial Development:

1. Encourage development and/or activities that will enhance the "year round" economy.

2. Special event area for arts and crafts shows, seasonal sales, and other similar events shall be established.

   A. Policy: Special event area for arts and crafts shows, seasonal sales, and other similar events shall be established as part of the Lakeside Inn/Douglas County Park area. The design and regulation of the area should allow such events to occur as activities not subject to TRPA review.
Traffic Circulation and Parking: (See Chapter III Transportation Element for transportation related objectives and policies)

Recreation: (See Chapter V Recreation Element for recreation related objectives and policies)

Public Service Facilities: (See Chapter VI Public Service Element for other public service related objectives and policies)

PERMISSIBLE USES: Pursuant to Chapter 18 PERMISSIBLE USES and if applicable, Chapter 51 PERMISSIBLE USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES IN THE SHOREZONE AND LAKEZONE, the following primary uses may be permitted within all or a portion of the Community Plan Area. The list indicates if the use is allowed (A) or must be considered under the provisions for a special use (S). Existing uses not listed shall be considered nonconforming uses within this Community Plan Area. The establishment of new uses not listed shall be prohibited within this Community Plan Area.

Special Area #1 (Retail/Tourist/Public Service Area): The following list of permissible uses is applicable in Special Area #1.

Tourist Accommodation - Bed and breakfast facilities (A), hotel, motel, and other transient dwelling units (A), time sharing (hotel/motel design) (S), and time sharing (residential design) (S).

Commercial

A. Retail
   Eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (A), furniture, home furnishings and equipment (S), general merchandise stores (S), mail order and vending (S), and service stations (S).

B. Entertainment
   Amusements and recreation services (A), gaming-nonrestricted (Nevada only) (A), privately owned assembly and entertainment (S), and outdoor amusements (S).

C. Services
   Broadcasting studios (A), financial services (A), health care services (A), personal services (A), professional offices (A), repair services (S), schools - business and vocational (S).

D. Wholesale/Storage
   Vehicle storage and parking (S)
A. General
Churches (A), collection stations (S),
cultural facilities (A), day care
centers/pre-school (A), government offices
(A), hospitals (S), local assembly and
entertainment (S), local post office (A),
local public health and safety facilities
(A), membership organizations (S), publicly
owned assembly and entertainment (S),
regional public health and safety facilities
(S), and social service organizations (S).

B. Linear Public Facilities
 Pipelines and power transmission (S), transit
stations and terminals (A), transportation
routes (S), and transmission and receiving
facilities (S).

Recreation
Cross country ski courses (S), day use areas (A),
group facilities (S), outdoor recreation concessions (S),
recreation centers (S), recreational vehicle parks (S), riding and hiking trails (A),
rural-sports-t-gl-snowmobile-courses-t and
visitor information centers (A).

Resource Management
A. Timber Management
Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut
(A), thinning (A), and timber stand
improvement (A).

B. Wildlife and Fishes
Early successional stage vegetation manage-
ment (A), nonstructural fish habitat manage-
ment (A), nonstructural wildlife habitat
management (A), structural fish habitat
management (A), and structural wildlife
habitat management (A).

C. Open Space
Allowed in all areas of the region.

D. Vegetation Protection
Fire detection and suppression (A), fuels
treatment/management (A), insect and disease
suppression (A), sensitive plant management
(A), and uncommon plant community management
(A).
E. Watershed Improvements
   Erosion control (A), runoff control (A), and stream environment zone restoration (A).

Special Area #2 (Commercial Service/Industrial Area): The following list of permissible uses is applicable in Special Area #2.

Residential
- Employee housing (A), multiple family dwelling (S), nursing and personal care (S), residential care (S), and single family dwelling (S).

Tourist Accommodation
- Bed and breakfast facilities (A), hotel, motel, and other transient dwelling units (S), time sharing (hotel/motel design) (S), and time sharing (residential design) (S).

Commercial
- A. Retail
   Auto, mobile home and vehicle dealers (A), building materials and hardware (A), eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (A), furniture, home furnishings and equipment (A), general merchandise stores (A), mail order and vending (A), nursery (A), outdoor retail sales (A), and service stations (A).

- B. Entertainment
   Amusements and recreation services (A), privately owned assembly and entertainment (S), and outdoor amusements (S).

- C. Services
   Animal husbandry services (A), auto-repair and-service-(S) broadcasting studios (A), business support services (A), contract construction services (S), financial services (A), health care services (A), laundries-and dry-cleaning-plant-(S) personal services (A), professional offices (A), repair services (S) (A), schools - business and vocational (A), and secondary schools (S).

B.---light-industrial
   Food-and-kindred-products-(S) fuel-and-ice dealers-(S) industrial-services-(S) printing and publishing-(S) and small-scale manufacturing-(A)
E. Wholesale/Storage
  Storage-yards (S), vehicle and freight terminals (A), vehicle storage and parking (S), warehousing (A), wholesale and distribution (A).

Public Service
  A. General
  Cemeteries (S), churches (A), collection stations (S), cultural facilities (A), day care centers/pre-schools (A), government offices (A), hospitals (S), local assembly and entertainment (A), local post office (A), local public health and safety facilities (A), membership organizations (A), publicly owned assembly and entertainment (S), public utility centers (S), regional public health and safety facilities (S), schools - college (S), schools - kindergarten through secondary (S), and social service organizations (A).

B. Linear Public Facilities
  Pipelines and power transmission (S), transit stations and terminals (A), transportation routes (S), and transmission and receiving facilities (S).

Recreation
  Cross country ski courses (S), day use areas (A), group facilities (S), outdoor recreation concessions (A), recreation centers (A), riding and hiking trails (A), sports-snowmobile courses (S), and visitor information centers (A).

Resource Management
  Same as Special Area #1.

Special Area #3 (Recreation Area): The following list of permissible uses is applicable in Special Area #3.

Residential
  Employee housing (S), and multiple family dwelling (S).

Commercial
  A. Services
     Secondary storage (S).

B. Wholesale/Storage
   Vehicle storage and parking (S).

Public Service
  A. General
     Collection stations (S), cultural facilities (A), day care centers/pre-schools (A), government offices
(S), local assembly and entertainment (S), local post office (S), local public health and safety facilities (S), membership organizations (S), publicly owned assembly and entertainment (S), regional public health and safety facilities (S), and social service organizations (S).

B. Linear Public Facilities
   Pipelines and power transmission (S), transit stations and terminals (S), transportation routes (S), and transmission and receiving facilities (S).

Recreation
   Cross country ski courses (S), day use areas (A), developed campgrounds (S), outdoor recreation concessions (S), participant sports facilities (A), recreation centers (A), recreational vehicle parks (S), riding and hiking trails (A), rural sports-terrestrial-snowmobile-courses-(S) and visitor information centers (A).

Resource Management
   Same as Special Area #1.

Special Area #4 (Commercial Industrial Area): The following list of permissible uses is applicable in Special Area #4.

Residential
   Employee housing (S) and multi-family dwelling(S).

Commercial
   A. Retail
      Auto, mobile home and vehicle dealers (A), building materials and hardware (A), eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (A), furniture, home furnishings and equipment (A), general merchandise stores (A), mail order and vending (A), nursery (A), outdoor retail sales (A), and service stations (A).

   B. Entertainment
      Amusements and recreation services (A), privately owned assembly and entertainment (S), and outdoor amusements (S).

   C. Services
      Animal husbandry services (A), auto repair and service (S), broadcasting studios (A), business support services (A), contract construction services (S), financial services
(A), health care services (A), laundries and dry cleaning plant (S), personal services (A), professional offices (A), repair services (A), schools - business and vocational (A), and secondary schools (S).

D. Light Industrial
Food and kindred products (S), fuel and ice dealers (S), industrial services (S), printing and publishing (S), and small scale manufacturing (A).

E. Wholesale/Storage
Storage yards (S), vehicle and freight terminals (S), vehicle storage and parking (S), warehousing (A), wholesale and distribution (A).

Public Service

A. General
Churches (A), collection stations (S), cultural facilities (A), day care centers/pre-schools (A), government offices (A), local assembly and entertainment (A), local post office (A), local public health and safety facilities (A), membership organizations (A), public utility centers (S), regional public health and safety facilities (S), and social service organizations (A).

B. Linear Public Facilities
Pipelines and power transmission (S), transit stations and terminals (A), transportation routes (S), and transmission and receiving facilities (S).

Recreation

Day use areas (A), outdoor recreation concessions (A), recreation centers (A), and riding and hiking trails (A).

Resource Management

Same as Special Area #1.

MAXIMUM DENSITIES: Pursuant to Chapter 21 DENSITY, the following list establishes the maximum allowable densities that may be permitted for any parcel located within the Community Plan Area. The actual development permitted may be further limited by transfer of development rights limitations, residential density incentive programs, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Dwelling</td>
<td>15 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Person Dwelling</td>
<td>25 people per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Personal Care</td>
<td>25 people per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Care</td>
<td>25 people per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Housing</td>
<td>As per the limitation above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and Breakfast</td>
<td>10 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel, Motel and other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-with less than 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of units with kitchens</td>
<td>40 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-with 10% or more units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with kitchens</td>
<td>15 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeshare</td>
<td>15 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Vehicle Parks</td>
<td>10 sites per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Campground</td>
<td>8 sites per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residential Bonus Units:** Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of residential bonus units which may be permitted for this Community Plan Area is 0 units.

**Tourist Accommodation Bonus Units:** Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of tourist accommodation bonus units which may be permitted for this Community Plan Area is 25 units.

**Additional Developed Outdoor Recreation:** The following are the PAOT targets and limits for additional developed outdoor recreation facilities specified in Chapter 13 to be located within this Community Plan Area. These and other recreation target projects are addressed in the TRPA Five-Year Recreation Program pursuant to Chapter 33 Allocation of Development. The following additional capacities allowed are measured in persons at one time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMER DAY USES</th>
<th>000 PAOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERNIGHT USES</td>
<td>000 PAOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commercial Floor Area Allocation:** Pursuant to Chapter 33, the maximum amount of commercial floor area which may be allocated for additional development in the Community Plan Area until December 31, 1996, is 14,050 square feet.
MAXIMUM CUMULATIVE NOISE LEVEL: The maximum cumulative noise equivalent levels for this Community Plan Area is as follows:

1. Where applicable, a maximum 65 CNEL override for the U.S. Highway 50 corridor and a maximum 55 CNEL for the Highway 207 corridor is permissible.
2. The maximum CNEL for Special Area #3 is 60 55 CNEL.
3. The maximum CNEL for all areas of the community plan except as noted in 1 and 2 above is 65 CNEL.
C. Policy: As a condition of project approval or as part of implementing the CIP, consideration should be given to reducing the number of ingress/egress points along the Kingsbury Grade and U.S. Highway 50 by combining and realigning driveways to improve traffic flow and eliminate pedestrian conflicts.

D. Policy: When warranted implement a connector road from upper Loop Road to Kingsbury.

4. The transportation system shall be an integral part of the Community Plan and will be consistent with other objectives such as scenic restoration, community design, SEZ restoration, and open space.

A. Policy: All transportation related projects shall be subject to mitigation programs and the Douglas County Design Standards and Guidelines (Appendix B).

B. Policy: The highway improvement projects shall be designed to help maintain the strong sense of the natural environment that is key to the attraction of the Lake Tahoe area. The U.S. Highway 50/Kingsbury Grade interchange should not be dominated by views of large expanses of highways, interchanges, and signage.

5. Identify and provide sufficient funding to finance the projects in the capital improvement program (CIP).

A. Policy: Douglas-County and TRPA shall continue to implement and refine the existing mitigation fee program (Chapter 93 of the Code) for funding transportation capital improvements.

B. Policy: Projects may be exempt from Policy A. above, if the projects meet the requirements of the incentive program described in Section D of Chapter VII.

C. Policy: Contributions to the implementation of improvements listed in the Chapter IV Matrix as eligible for substitute mitigation fees may be credited for the requirements of Policy A above.

6. To improve circulation, reduce vehicle trips, and to improve access to the public recreational areas, a network of recreation trails and sidewalks shall be constructed.

A. Policy: Develop pedestrian linkages between parking lots throughout the CP area to allow free access and reduce VMT.

B. Policy: Develop a parking program throughout the CP area. The program shall consider employee parking and shared parking.
C. Policy: Pedestrian and recreation trail (bicycle) facilities identified in Figure 3 shall be constructed as part of the CIP of Chapter VII or pursuant to Conservation Element Policy 1C.

7. Transportation systems management (TSM) strategies shall be encouraged to reduce peak-period traffic and total vehicle miles traveled.

A. Policy: All transportation entities servicing the Community Plan area should become members of a Southshore transportation management association (TMA).

B. Policy: Encourage consolidation of existing shuttle buses through the TMA.

C. Policy: Implement transportation demand management (TDM) strategies such as an employer-based trip reduction program, transit incentives, directional signing, ride sharing program, and postal delivery system improvements.

c. PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS

The following improvements are needed to implement the policies listed above. These listed improvements represent a refinement of the Action Element of the TRPA Regional Transportation Plan and the improvements of the Douglas County Transportation Plan. A further description of the transportation CIPs, including cost and scheduling of the improvements described below, may be found in the Implementation Element.

q Streets and Highways

1. Intersection Improvements - Following or during the completion of the Loop Road Improvements (est. 2000), the intersection improvements at the U.S. Highway 50/Kingsbury Grade should be constructed as required by the TRPA RTP. These improvements will include more left turn storage onto U.S. Highway 50 and a longer, separate free right turn lane. To create the desired intersection improvements, the design will consider relocation of the wedding chapel at the corner, a change in grade, and access limitations. In addition, the signal must be timed to give greater preference for Kingsbury Grade travel during peak use in the winter.

2. Traffic Flow Improvements - To facilitate better traffic flow on Kingsbury Grade existing businesses need to share driveways and limit direct roadway access parking. This action will also reduce coverage, improve scenic quality and promote pedestrian travel between businesses. The properties northeast of U.S. Highway 50 should use a common access at the Kahle intersection.
CHAPTER IV CONSERVATION ELEMENT

This Conservation Element is a supplement to the Conservation Element of the TRPA Goals and Policies Plan. This element lists the required environmental targets which the Community Plan must achieve. Also, this element describes the area-wide drainage system, scenic improvements, and a land capability and stream zone analysis updating the TRPA Land Capability Overlay Maps for this area.

A. CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The following numbered objective relates to the Conservation Goal found in the Community Plan Goals section of Chapter I. To meet the objective, the following specific policies are adopted as standards.

1. Ensure the attainment and maintenance of the environmental threshold related targets established for the Community Plan.

A. Policy: Community Plan projects may rely on the incentives listed in Subelement D of Chapter VII once an entity (Douglas County, property owners, or an assessment district) makes an irrevocable commitment to implement the lower Kingsbury area-wide improvements as noted in the Kingsbury Requirement List described in Chapter VII, Douglas County adopts the CIP in Chapter VII, and Douglas County submits the list of appropriate CIP projects to NDOT to be added to its STIP.

B. Policy: TRPA may review progress on target attainment periodically and make adjustments to the targets and implementation schedules. However, once the irrevocable commitment in Policy A above has been made, the incentives (except for substitute mitigation fees) shall be in effect until December 31, 1996.

C. Policy: The implementation of requirements listed in the Environmental Targets Subelement shall be required as conditions of approval on projects relying on CP incentives where appropriate. Environmental mitigation required as conditions of approval shall be commensurate with the magnitude and impact of the proposed project.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL TARGETS

The following identifies opportunities for environmental improvement associated with the Kingsbury Community Plan. Achievement of the environmental targets is an important consideration for approving CPs and any development bonuses and is linked to key implementation strategies. Chapter VII provides further details on the implementation programs.
KINGSBURY CP REQUIREMENT LIST
FOR ACHIEVEMENT OF TARGETS

(Symbols are explained in the text following the matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury CP Requirements 8/15/93</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CP MEASURES

9. Land Use
- Rec. Facilities
  N X X X
- Comm/Tourist
  E X

B. SEZ RESTORATION

1. SEZ Target (3 ac.)
   - Burke Ck Nugget (.25 ac.)
     N X X X X 208 X X X
   - Edgewood Ck. (1.5 ac.)
     N X X X X
   - Burke Creek Out (2 ac.)
     M X X X
   - Burke Ck Meadow (15 ac.)
     O X X X X 208

C. SCENIC IMPROVEMENT

1. Design Stds. & Guide.
   N X X X X PLN X

2. Sign Standards
   N X X X X PLN X

3. Sign Program
   N X X X

4. SQIP Policy
   N X X X CDE

5. View Policy
   N X X X

6. Underground Policy
   N X X X X

7. Hwy 50 Improvements
   M X X X X SQP X X

8. Kingsbury Improvements
   N X X X X SQP X X

D. LAND COVERAGE REDUCTIONS

1. L.C. Target [2.3 ac.]
   - Hwy 50 Imp. (.1 ac.)
     N X X X X
   - Upper Kng Imp. (.6 ac.)
     O X X X X
   - NDOT Site (.5 ac.)
     N X X X
   - Private (1.5 ac.)
     N X X
KINGSBURY CP REQUIREMENT LIST
FOR ACHIEVEMENT OF TARGETS

(Symbols are explained in the text following the matrix)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury CP</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/93</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP MEASURES</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. TRAFFIC/AIR QUALITY

1. LOS Policy
   N X X X RTP

2. Highway Improv.
   - Hwy 50/Kng Inter. Imp.
     N X X X RTP X X
   - Hwy 50 Flow Improv.
     E X X X X
   - Kingsby Flow Improv.
     E X X X
   - Kingsbury Connector
     O X

3. Parking Program
   - Parking Ord.
     N X X X PLN
   - Facil. & Manage. Plan
     E

4. Transit Improv.
   - STAGE Extension
     N X X X RTP X
     N X X X X
   - Casino Shuttles
     N X X X RTP X
   - Ski/Tour Shuttles
     N X X X
   - Airporter(s)
     N X X X RTP X
   - Transit Facilites
     N X X X RTP X

5. Pedestrian Improv.
   - Loop/Kingsbury
     N X X X RTP X X
   - Hwy 50 Area
     M X X X X
   - Upper Kingsbury
     N X X X X

   - Kingsbury/Lake Trail
     N X X X X
   - Kinsbury/R.H. Trail
     N X X X RTP X
   - Casino/Kingsbury Trail
     N X X X X

7. Mitigation Fee
   N X X X CDE

8. TSM Policy
   - Membership
     O
   - Ridership Incentives
     N X X X RTP X
   - Van Pools
     N X X X RTP X
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# KINGSBURY CP REQUIREMENT LIST
FOR ACHIEVEMENT OF TARGETS

(Symbol are explained in the text following the matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP MEASURES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury CP Requirements</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/93</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## E. WATER QUALITY

1. BMP Req.  
   N X X 208

2. 80% Rest. Tar.[2.55ac.]  
   - Hwy 50 Shidler.(.1 ac.)  
     M X X X CDE X X
   - Kngby Shoulder(.5 ac.)  
     N X X X CDE X X
   - NDOT Site (.5 ac.)  
     N X X X CDE X X
   - DC Park (1 ac.)  
     N X X CDE
   - Private (2.7 ac.)  
     E X X CDE

3. Area-wide Drainage Sys.  
   - Lower System  
     M X X X X X X
   - Upper System  
     N X X X 208 X X
   - Edgewood Sys.  
     N X X X X

## F. NOISE

1. Noise Limits  
   N X X X

## G. FISHERIES

1. Burke Creek  
   N X X X PLN

## H. RECREATION TARGET

1. Beach Access Policy  
   N X X

2. Rec. Targets [650 DCP]  
   - Stn. Area Beach (500)  
     E X X X X
   - Rec. Trails (50)  
     N X X X RTP X
   - DC Park (100)  
     N

*X This applies to the Douglas County and the NDOT properties fronting Kingsbury Grade
The matrix indicates the projects and regulations considered for the achievement of environmental and recreational targets. The matrix indicates if the measure is (N) needed, (E) encouraged, or (O) optional for a target achievement. A (M) indicates that the measure is needed and must have an irrevocable commitment prior utilizing the incentive program. The (X) indicates the measure is considered for threshold findings, is considered as a condition of project approval, is an EIS assumption or mitigation measure, is linked to the allocation of units of use, or is linked to the substitute mitigation fees. The matrix also notes if the improvement is required by other plans, e.g. 208 Plan (208), Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), TRPA Code (CDE), or TRPA/Douglas County Plans (PLN).

The accompanying text in this Subelement and Chapter V further explain the matrix. Chapter VII provides further details on the key implementation strategies.

1. **TRAFFIC** - Traffic problems identified in the Kingsbury area and throughout the region present numerous opportunities for air, water and traffic improvements.

   **Baseline:** There were 1,700,000 vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the region in 1981. Approximately 12,536 of those vehicle miles had origins or destinations in the Kingsbury Community Plan Area.

   The TKJM Report indicates that in 1987, the U.S. Highway 50/Kingsbury Grade (S.R. 207) intersection operated at level-of-service C/D during the summer; but during the winter, there were some backups on Kingsbury Grade because of skiers returning from Heavenly Valley. The U.S. Highway 50/Kahle intersection and the Kingsbury Grade/Market Street intersection operated at LOS A. See the Transportation Element for more detail.

   There are no observed or modelled violations of air quality standards in this area.

   **TRPA Threshold:** The TRPA Water Quality Threshold requires a 10% reduction in Region-wide VMT by 2007. The Air Quality Thresholds require a 7 percent reduction in traffic volumes on U.S. Highway 50 and also require attainment and maintenance of state and federal water and air quality standards.

   **Regional Plan Requirement:** The TRPA Regional Transportation Plan (1992) requires Kingsbury to attain service level D on urban roads, attain service level D for intersections (four hours may be LOS E), implement parking restrictions on congested roadways, and to reduce dependency on the auto. The RTP requires implementation of improvements in the Action Element and the VMT control measures listed in the RTP EIS. The following LOS and VMT measures directly relate to Kingsbury:
LOS Measures

a. Kingsbury Grade/U.S. Highway 50 Intersection Improvements
b. Traffic Flow Improvements (pedestrian and vehicle access control)

VMT Measures

a. Community Plans - 40,000 to 60,000 VMT.
b. Casino Employee Van Pools - 20,000 to 25,000 VMT Basin-wide.
c. Bus extensions from Stateline to Round Hill, up Kingsbury Grade, and to Zephyr Cove - 3,000 to 6,000 VMT
d. Ridership Incentives - 5,000 to 10,000 VMT Basin-wide
e. Airport/Shuttle - 5,000 to 9,000 VMT

Kingsbury Target: The CP targets are as follows:

a. Attain Kingsbury’s fairshare of the CP target and provide assistance in implementation of improvements in b. through e. above. Kingsbury’s estimated fairshare of the a. above is 2.8 percent (based on 1981 Kingsbury VMT/Total 1981 CP VMT). The actual reduction for 2007 should be 1,672 VMT or 836 VMT for 1997.

b. Implementation of the improvements which modelling shall indicate attain TRPA service level requirements at the EIS selected monitoring points by 2007.

(1) U.S. Highway 50/Kingsbury Grade

c. Maintain TRPA air quality thresholds.

Key Implementation Strategies: The following improvements are key strategies to achieving the above targets:

a. Besides the 1,670 to 3,140 VMT reductions for land use changes, the key non-land use strategies are:

(1) Parking Program - Estimate unknown until program is adopted.
(2) Casino Shuttle - Share of Kingsbury CP VMT for CP credit.
(3) Sidewalk/Rec. Trails System - Estimate 205 VMT for CP credit.
(4) Long Distance Bus Service Prog. - Share of Kingsbury CP VMT for CP credit.

CP Target Total 205 VMT

(5) Where appropriate assist the implementation of the other programs listed in b. through e. above.
b. For LOS targets, the key strategies are the construction of the Loop Road project and the Kingsbury intersection improvements listed in the Transportation Element. Optional measures that may be considered are:

(1) Construction of the Kingsbury Connector and associated improvements.

c. For the carbon monoxide air quality target of 6.9 ppm and the U.S. Highway 50 traffic reduction target, the strategies are the construction of the Loop Road project, the Kingsbury intersection improvements, and if adopted, the parking program.

2. **STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONES** - There has been extensive disturbance of stream environment zones (SEZ) throughout the Region and Kingsbury. The identification and mapping of SEZs in Kingsbury indicates there are restoration opportunities.

**Baseline:** There are approximately 6.8 acres of SEZ in the Kingsbury CP, of which, about 2.8 acres are covered or disturbed.

**TRPA Threshold:** TRPA thresholds require restoration of 25% of disturbed SEZ in the Region within the 20 year life of the Regional Plan. According to Volume III of the 208 Plan, urban areas are targeted for 1,153 acres of restoration. Of this amount, 600 acres are required to be restored by the land acquisition agencies.

**Regional Plan Requirement:** The TRPA 208 SEZ Restoration Program initially targets 15 acres of SEZ restoration for the Kingsbury area. This is project PA 076 which calls for the restoration of the meadow along Burke Creek east of U.S. Highway 50.

**Kingsbury Target:** The CP Stream Zone Restoration Program targets approximately 25 percent or 0.7 acres for restoration in the next 20 years. The ten year CP target is 3 acres which is in excess of the 208 Plan target for this area.

**Key Implementation Strategies:** The following 20.5 acres are listed as possible areas for restoration. Restoration may occur in conjunction with implementation of the CIP and other proposed projects. Volume III, SEZ Protection and Restoration Program and this list may be updated as new information becomes available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Burke Creek Nugget</td>
<td>0.5 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Edgewood Creek/NDOT</td>
<td>1.5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Burke Creek Outlet</td>
<td>2 acres*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Burke Creek Meadow</td>
<td>15 acres*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* some or all outside CP
3. **SCENIC** - TRPA Scenic Thresholds identify opportunities for scenic restoration throughout the Region. The TRPA Scenic Implementation Program targets the Casino Area and Kingsbury Grade roadway units for specific scenic improvements to meet the thresholds.

**Base Line:** The scenic resources identified in the 1982 Inventory for Roadway Unit #32: Casino Area include focussed views of the lake across the golf course plus views of the mountain slopes across the meadow area (Subcomponent #3 as shown on the Roadway Unit map, Figure 4). Another identified resource, and the one with the highest quality rating is the wide stream zone of Edgewood Creek with its light cover of mixed riparian vegetation and pines (Subcomponent #4 on the Roadway Unit map). Both of these resources are located in the area just north of the casinos. Two subcomponents with much lower scenic quality are views from the commercial strip and casino area (Subcomponents #1 and #2 on the Roadway Unit map). The 1988 travel route rating and scenic resource threshold for the unit are as follows:

- Travel Route Rating: 11
- Scenic Resource Threshold: 2

The area of concern is the commercial development along U.S. Highway 50/Kingsbury area. The area extends from Kingsbury Grade north to Burke Creek (i.e. just beyond the Nugget). Some of the more recent development in this area (e.g. Douglas Co. Administration Building and Lakeside Inn) has introduced higher architectural and site development standards which tend to improve the overall quality of the area. Also development is not so dense or tall in this area so views of the natural surroundings are still available.

The 1982 Inventory also identified a number of scenic resources related to Kingsbury Grade. The roadway's steep grade and frequent changes in direction provide numerous viewpoints with different perspectives of the surrounding landscape. These views include: long distance views of the lake with mountain backdrop (Subcomponents #2, 5 and 11 as shown on the Roadway Unit map, Figure 5); mid-distance and foreground views of small ravines, coniferous forest, and steep slopes (Subcomponents #1, 4 and 8 on the Roadway Unit map); foreground views of unusual rock formations and outcroppings (Subcomponents #3 and 6 on the Roadway Unit map); and mid-distance views of Round Hill as seen against the lake (Subcomponent #10 on the Roadway Unit map). Two subcomponents identified by the Inventory which contribute significantly less to the scenic character of the unit include views of commercial and residential development (Subcomponents #4 and #9 on the Roadway Unit Map). The 1988 travel route rating and scenic resource threshold for this unit is as follows:

- Travel Route Rating: 13
- Scenic Resource Threshold: 5

IV - 8
The main area of concern is the western portion of the unit below Meadow Lane where the commercial development exists. This development ranges from densely developed good quality shopping center development (Kingsbury Square, Kingsbury Center, et al.) along the north side of the road to less dense and less well-designed development along both sides of the road as one descends toward U.S. Highway 50. The quality of the commercial development varies widely and with it the visual quality of the area. Because of the distant lake views that are available from this area, the condition of the development in the foreground has a direct effect on the scenic quality of the more distant scenic elements. The commercial development suffers from many of the same problems that affect other urban/commercial areas as the result of the lack of consistent standards and planning. These problems include an uncoordinated array of signs, the presence of overhead utility lines, inadequate landscaping around structures, and poorly defined parking areas with little or no landscaping or separation from the roadway.

**TRPA Threshold:** TRPA Thresholds require TRPA to attain and maintain Scenic Route Ratings at 15+ for Highway Units and 7+ for Shoreline Units.

**Regional Plan Requirements:** The Regional Plan requires implementation of the Scenic Quality Improvement Program or an equal or superior program of the CP (including the Restoration Program, Design Review Guidelines, Design Standards and Outdoor Advertising Standards). The SQIP requires a 30-27 percent improvement in roadway unit scores by 1997, and a 60 percent improvement by 2003, and a 33 percent increase in shoreline-unit scores.

**Kingsbury Target:** The CP shall attain its share of the SQIP threshold targets for 1997 and a score of 15+- for 2007. The basis of this share is documented in the EIS. The target scores for Unit 32 are 12.5 by 1997, 14 by 2003, and 16 by 2007. The target scores for Unit 44 are 14 by 1997, 15 by 2003, and 16 by 2007.

**Key Implementation Strategies:** The Kingsbury Community Plan responds to the SQIP recommendations by providing design improvements and regulations related to a series of design theme/activity zones (see Chapter 19 of the Design Standards and Guidelines). The urban character is established by upgrading of the overall architectural quality, by providing variety, by improving character, and by providing environmental improvements. The following recommendations are made with the intent to simplify and upgrade the character and quality of the area:
a. **Architectural Style.** Scenic and visual quality is not a question of style and no specific architectural style or design theme is being recommended. The goal should be for well-thought out design solutions that are compatible with the natural environment and contribute to the character and quality of the built environment. Lack of variety (sameness) is not a goal and should be discouraged as an end result. The linkage should be in the common street improvements as noted in the Design Review Standards and Guidelines.

b. **Building Materials.** Building materials should be predominantly natural or natural appearing. Aluminum, steel, plastic and plywood board and batten type) siding should be discouraged. See Design Standards and Guidelines.

c. **Building Colors.** Exterior building colors should be compatible with the surrounding natural and man-made environment, and not compete with surrounding elements for attention (i.e. the building color should not in any way become "signing" for the site). Generally, building colors should be subdued with natural colors being preferable. Primary or other bright colors, should be used only as accents and then sparingly such as upon trim. See Design Standards and Guidelines.

d. **Building Height.** From the standpoint of scenic quality, it is important that building heights not exceed the height of existing forest cover. Even when taller buildings are not a visual problem from within the commercial district, when they rise above the natural screening provided by the forest they become visible from viewpoints at great distances around the lake and thus detract from the natural character of the environment. See Design Standards and Guidelines.

e. **Access Drives.** Commercial developments should provide limited and clearly defined access drives rather than permitting unrestricted vehicle access along the entire property frontage. See Design Standards and Guidelines.

f. **Parking.** Parking areas should be placed in the rear or side yards of commercial properties whenever possible rather than in front yard setbacks (as done in Kingsbury Square). When parking areas are located along the building frontage a landscaped buffer strip should be provided between the roadway and the parking area. Landscaping pursuant to the Design Review Standards and Guidelines should be utilized around the perimeter and within all parking areas to provide definition and to screen views of parked cars. See the Design Standards and Guidelines for possible solutions.
g. Lighting. Lighting along the main roadway and in many of the larger parking areas utilizes tall light standards that result in the light sources (lamps) being visible from areas quite distant from the area being illuminated. The elevated lamps also result in a bright, even quality of light that covers large areas. Both these lighting characteristics detract from the scenic character of the area. Generally, night lighting should be done in a selective fashion and not exceed the amount of light actually required by users and viewers. See the Design Standards and Guidelines.

h. Landscaping. Landscape treatments should be encouraged around all structures as a means of creating more attractive and better integrated developments. Landscaping should be utilized to soften building contours, mitigate building scale, reduce the amount of paved or dirt areas, and provide a visual transition between building, site, and surrounding setting.

i. Signs. Signs should be brought into compliance with the Sign Ordinance, Appendix B. The goal should be to provide a coordinated system of signs that clearly identifies individual enterprises yet minimizes the competition between signs and their contrast with the natural environment. Although the shopping centers at the east end of the commercial area have provided their own coordinated system of signs, the scale of the signage structures is quite imposing and should be reduced. It is usually not effective to put the name of every tenant in a shopping center on a sign figure adjacent to the roadway because travel speeds do not permit time to read them.

j. Utility Lines. Overhead utility lines should be placed underground whenever possible. Any utility lines which must be maintained above ground should be located away from the main corridor or screened so as not to detract from views or the overall visual quality of the area. See Urban Design Policy in Chapter II and CIP in Chapter VII.

4. LAND COVERAGE - Numerous opportunities to mitigate excess land coverage exist throughout Kingsbury.

Base Line: Based on the updated Land Capability Map (Figure 6), the allowable land coverage is estimated to be 9.9 acres; the disturbed and soft coverage areas are estimated to be 6.4 acres; and the hard coverage is estimated to be 43.5 acres. The estimated land coverage in the area is 49.8 percent.

TRPA Threshold: TRPA Thresholds limit new land coverage to the Bailey coefficients (1% TO 30%).

Regional Plan Requirement: For the next 20 years, the Regional Plan requires the implementation of an excess coverage mitigation program.
Kingsbury Target: The twenty year CP target is 4.6 acres. The ten year target is one half of the 20 year target. The ten year target for the excess coverage is 2.3 acres of hard coverage.

Key Implementation Strategies: The following 2.3 acres are listed as possible areas for restoration and landscaping. Restoration may occur in conjunction with implementation of the CIP and other proposed projects. This list may be updated as new information becomes available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Hard Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. U.S. Hwy 50 Improvements</td>
<td>0.1 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Upper Kingsbury Impro.</td>
<td>0.6 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NDOT Site</td>
<td>0.5 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Douglas County Park</td>
<td>1.0 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Private</td>
<td>1.5 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. WATER QUALITY - The opportunities to improve areawide BMPs, such as drainage systems, and increase landscaping are numerous throughout the area.

Base Line: Currently fewer than 15% of the private parcels are up to BMP standards. The part of the upper area of Special Area 2 is connected to an area-wide drainage facility. The lower area in Special Area 1 is planned to be connected to a drainage system.

TRPA Threshold: TRPA Discharge Standards found in Chapter 81 of the TRPA Code must be attained.

Regional Plan Requirement: The Regional Plan requires the application of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to all properties within 20 years. The Plan also requires the restoration of 80 percent of the disturbed lands within the Region. The TRPA CIP indicates the Kingsbury area needs at least $500,000 for curb and drainage improvements.

Kingsbury Target: The CP shall complete its areawide drainage systems by 1997. The CP 1997 target for restoration is 2.55 acres.

Key Implementation Strategies: The following programs and improvements are key strategies to achieving the above targets:

a. Areawide Solutions: To implement areawide solutions, the Plan proposes to construct a series of detention basins and wetlands, interconnected by pipes and stream channels. This is to be implemented by one or more improvement districts. The basic design principles of this plan are as follows:

   (1) Use of existing or restored wetlands is the preferred method for retention and treatment of storm runoff. Artificial wetlands and engineered solutions may be considered as alternatives.
(2) Users-and Contributors to the areawide solutions may substitute those contributions for the TRPA mitigation fee requirement. While not exempt from Chapter 25 requirements, users may meet their will-be-exempt-from BMP onsite infiltration requirements related to storm water storage and treatment, in whole or in part, through proven areawide systems.

(3) Implementation and maintenance by one responsible entity is preferred. Where feasible the system should be designed to be implemented in phases consistent with these design principles. The proponents of the systems shall submit proof through modelling and/or testing that the proposed systems meet TRPA standards. However, upon completion it must operate as one unified system.

The areawide system concept is shown in Figure 8 (also see Chapter VII for CIP description). The areawide drainage system concept is described as follows:

S.A. #1 System - The lower area of the Kingsbury Community Plan area shall develop a drainage collection system that includes the casinos, the government center, the highways and other impervious surface areas. This storm water will be treated, ponded, and discharged into the Rabe Meadow.

S.A. #2/3 System - A needed component of the Kingsbury Community Plan is the installation of a storm runoff treatment system. This treatment system will be composed of collector pipes and drainageways running from the upper Kingsbury properties to the Kingsbury Park pond. Runoff waters will be collected in drop inlets placed throughout the commercial area and channeled through the collector pipes and drainageways. Runoff will be discharged into the detention pond and wetlands treatment areas. After treatment, the runoff waters will then be discharged into the waterways of Burke and Edgewood Creek and discharged into the Lake. The major parts of this now exist as part of previous approvals.

b. On-site Solutions: In addition to the areawide solutions identified above, each project within the Community Plan Area shall be subject to Chapter 25 requirements for paving parking and drives, slope stabilization, revegetation, and providing snow storage areas.

In cases where the property is not considered part of the areawide system, drainage improvements will be required pursuant to Chapter 25.
In cases were the property is part of the area wide drainage system, but the area wide drainage system requires onsite improvements or recommends onsite retention systems to reduce loadings, mitigation funds should be made available.

c. The following 2.75 acres are listed as possible areas for restoration. Restoration and some paving of these areas may occur in conjunction with implementation of the CIP and with project approvals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. U.S. Hwy 50 Improvements</td>
<td>0.5 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Upper Kingsbury Impr.</td>
<td>0.25 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NDOT Site</td>
<td>1.0 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Douglas County Park</td>
<td>1.0 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Private</td>
<td>3.0 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **NOISE** - TRPA identifies noise standards through use of community noise equivalent levels (CNEL), measured in dBA over a 24 hour period. TRPA thresholds establish different limits for different uses.

**Base Line:** The TRPA staff measured CNEL for the NDOT site in Special Area #2 in 1990 as follows:

- Special Area #2 50.9 CNEL

**TRPA Threshold:** TRPA thresholds set the following limits: 65 CNEL for commercial areas, 55 CNEL for residential, tourist, and urban recreation, and up to 65 CNEL for highway corridors (300 ft. each side).

**Regional Plan Requirement:** The Regional Plan pursuant to the Compact, requires TRPA to attain and maintain the thresholds.

**Kingsbury Target:** The CP shall stay within the designated noise limits set in the CP Statement which are as follows:

- Special Area #1 65 CNEL
- Special Area #2 65 CNEL
- Special Area #3 65 55 CNEL
- U.S. Highway 50 65 CNEL
- Kingsbury Grade 55 CNEL

**Key Implementation Strategies:** The following programs and improvements are key strategies to achieving the above targets:
7. **FISHERIES** - TRPA has identified streams in the Region and has rated them as to habitat quality.

**Base Line:** The existing Stream Habitat Quality rating for Burke Creek is marginal (28 points for migratory and 33 points for resident). Edgewood Creek is considered part of the Stateline CP area.

**TRPA Threshold:** TRPA thresholds require the maintenance of 75 miles of excellent, 105 miles of good and 38 miles of marginal stream habitat. Burke Creek is designated to be improved to a status of good.

**Regional Plan Requirement:** The Regional Plan pursuant to the Compact, requires TRPA to attain and maintain the thresholds.

**Kingsbury Target:** The CP shall attain a stream habitat status of good for migratory fish habitat (35 to 50 points) and a status of good for resident fish habitat (55 to 68 points).

**Key Implementation Strategies:** The following programs and improvements are key strategies to achieving the above targets:

1. Improve substrate - 5 point increase
2. Stabilize channel - 3 point increase
3. Remove barriers - 5 to 10 point increase
4. Provide cover/overhead canopies/barrier to human intrusion - 5 point increase
5. Fish abundance - 10 point increase
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Hwy 50/Kingsbury Intersection</td>
<td>Intersection and highway upgrades are required as part of a follow up to the Loop Road project. The following intersection improvements at the Highway 50/Kingsbury Grade intersection will be constructed. The project will include more left turn storage onto Hwy 50 and a longer, separate free right turn lane onto Hwy 50. Also, the project will create the desired four-way intersection with the 4-H Club Road. The design will consider relocation of the wedding chapel at the corner, a change in grade, and access limitations. In addition, the signal must be timed to give greater preference for Kingsbury Grade travel during peak use in the winter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost:</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding:</td>
<td>Douglas County NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 50 Traffic Flow Improv.</td>
<td>As part of the Hwy 50 traffic flow improvements existing businesses will improve their site access by providing left and right turn lanes, by defining driveways, and by considering shared drives. The existing Hwy 50 road section will include: five lanes (two each direction with a center turn lane with medians); Class II Bikeways on each side; longer merge lanes; and curb and gutter. In addition, sidewalks shall be constructed as described under Pedestrian Facilities in this section. These improvements will be continuous on both sides of Highway 50 from Kahle Drive to Kingsbury Grade. The properties northeast of Highway 50 will use a common access at the Kahle intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost:</td>
<td>$68,888 $105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding:</td>
<td>Douglas County NDOT Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury Traffic Flow Improv.</td>
<td>As part of the Kingsbury Grade street improvements existing businesses will improve their site access by providing left and right turn lanes, by defining driveways, and by considering shared drives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also, the construction of the Hwy 50 and the Connector intersections will cause additional lanes and reduced access. The existing three lanes will be maintained with four feet wide bike lanes and no parking. This action in conjunction with the pedestrian improvements will also reduce coverage, improve scenic quality, and promote pedestrian travel between businesses. Phase I project for county and state properties will be completed as part of the recreation center project.

Estimated cost: $600,000

Funding:
Douglas County
NDOT
Private

Kingsbury Connector

After completion of the Loop Road and Kingsbury Grade intersection improvements and if traffic counts warrant, construct a new local road linking Kingsbury Grade (S.R. 207) to the mountainside Loop Road. This two lane route will cross the Park Cattle Company Ranch screened by trees and will have limited access. The proposed alignment for this route is shown in Figure 5. The connector road will terminate in a four-way intersection at Kingsbury Grade along Market Street if a study shows no future connection to the Round Hill area is needed. The roadway specifications will be detailed upon project design. The existing Highway 50 alignment and lanes will remain for Southshore/Eastshore traffic.

Estimated cost: $4,000,000

Funding:
Douglas County
NDOT
Private

Schedule:

The following schedule is subject to change (based on changes in funding, project limitations, construction schedules, and redesign) and may be revised yearly by TRPA resolution.

1997  - Kingsbury Intersection Improvements
1995  - Kingsbury Grade Improvements (Phase I)
1997  - Highway 50 Improvements
2000+ - Connector Road Improvements
Program Description: In order to meet the recreation targets of Chapter V, a series of improvements are required to be implemented.

**Improvement** | **Description**
--- | ---
Impr. Lake Access | The improved lake access program includes increasing capacity by 500 PAOTs by:

  a. Improved transit service - see Ski/Tour Shuttles, Casino Shuttles, STAGE, Recreation Trails
  b. Extended season - Nevada Beach to be open in the early Spring and late Fall.

  Estimated Cost: $10,000

  Funding:
  U.S. Forest Service

  c. Additional beach - Within the target area increase the amount of beach open to the public. Future development in PAS 070A is linked to the creation a 250 PAOT size public beach.

  Estimated Cost: $400,000

  Funding:
  Park Cattle Co.

Recreation Trails | See Recreation Trails

Winter/Summer Use | In Special Area #3 (D.C. Kahle Park) create a year around day use recreation area that would include playfields, recreation building, a picnic area, a play area, a snow play area, trail heads, and cross-country skiing.

  Estimated Cost: $3,500,000

  Funding:
  Douglas County

Schedule:
The following schedule is subject to change (based on changes in funding, project limitations, construction schedules, and redesign) and may be revised yearly by TRPA resolution.

1994-95 - Beach Access
1995 - Summer/Winter Day Use
Mitigation Fee Programs

1. Excess Land Coverage Program

Purpose: The purpose of this program is to reduce excess land coverage and achieve targets in the Community Plan area and the related hydrologic area. This is the Community Plan program that is described in subparagraph 20.5.A(2)(e) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Description of Program: Pursuant to subparagraph 20.5.A(2)(e), a land bank accounting system will be established to bank land coverage reductions with an agency such as Nevada State Lands. TRPA will credit to the Community Plan land coverage removed and lands restored as noted below. Eligible projects may utilize these option fees when they demonstrate that they have contributed to coverage removal projects such as:

a. Public works restoration projects listed in Chapter VII Land Coverage (e.g., the areawide drainage system restoration work) may be credited to the Kingsbury Community Plan account.

b. Projects, both private and public, providing the 5% landscaping requirements of the Urban Design and Development Special Policy 6.A may be credited to the Kingsbury Community Plan account.

Eligibility: Projects contributing to the implementation of the coverage reduction project credited to the Douglas County account may use the contributions as credit based on the coverage reduction schedule set forth in Section 20.5.

2. Water Quality Fee Program

Purpose: The purpose of this program is to provide an option to the TRPA Code of Ordinances Water Quality Mitigation Fund (subsection 82.2.B) for implementing water quality improvements in the Kingsbury Community Plan area. Participants in this program could credit contributions to the water quality CIP projects to the TRPA Water Quality Mitigation Fee requirement.

Description of Program: The Community Plan describes needed water quality improvement projects. Generally, these projects will be implemented through assessment districts, private projects, and public works projects. Property owners that contribute to such areawide projects may credit such contributions to the water quality fee requirements on their future projects. TRPA and Douglas County shall create a special Community Plan account under the requirements of Chapter 82 for the Kingsbury Community Plan to keep track of such contributions. Credits shall be calculated at the mitigation fee rates established in Chapter 82. Money spent to satisfy on-site BMP requirements through off-site facilities shall not be credited to off-site mitigation.
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CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE

The Stateline Community Plan is designed and proposed to serve as the guiding doctrine for commercial allocations until 1997 and the planning rehabilitation of the community until 2007 and 1997. The Plan establishes goals and objectives, special policies, programs, and strategies for funding and implementation. Elements of the Plan address land use, transportation, conservation, recreation, and public service. The TRPA purpose for planning according to the Compact is "...to adopt and enforce a regional plan and implementing ordinances which achieve and maintain such capacities while providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent with such capacities."

Pursuant to Chapter 14 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the Stateline Community Plan supersedes certain plans and regulations established by the TRPA Plan Area Statements (PAS) and the TRPA Code for the area within the Stateline Community Plan boundaries. For purposes of Douglas County land use regulations, the Community Plan and the Douglas County General Plan and implementing ordinances shall become one and the same. Upon adoption by TRPA and Douglas County, the Community Plan (CP) is intended to serve as the mutual plan for Douglas County and TRPA and an advisory plan for other government agencies. This does not alter the provisions of Article 6 of the Compact relating to gaming.

The Community Plan process addresses land use issues and opportunities for the general Stateline area, including land in adjoining plan area statements. Pursuant to Chapter 14 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, this community plan is accompanied by recommendations for amendment to PAS 070A and 080.

The Community Plan presents general land use goals and objectives, as well as specific plans and programs for both the Community Plan and adjoining PAS 070A. The amended plan area statements do reference the Community Plan, but generally do not repeat the goals and objectives or specific policies and programs covered in the Community Plan. They are limited to narrower descriptions and regulation of permissible uses and planned development in the plan area statement. For a comprehensive understanding of land use policy in the Stateline area, the reader should review both the Community Plan and the proposed plan area statements for PAS 070A and 080.
B. BACKGROUND

The overall planning concept which guides future development in the three Douglas County Community Plan Areas is to create separate, distinct and vital commercial areas. Each area will establish and build upon an identifiable character which reinforces the area's location, setting, economy and commercial theme. Land uses complement the desired character of the areas, as well as respond to market conditions and regulatory objectives. Transportation and trail systems will provide more efficient links between the three areas and encourage both residents and visitors to use alternative modes of transportation, such as bicycles, walking paths and public transit facilities. New recreational amenities will broaden opportunities for outdoor recreation and family activities. Programs for stream zone and land coverage restoration will not only enhance the quality of the environment, but will contribute to basin-wide goals for preservation of Lake Tahoe.

The three community plan areas currently each serve different, but related, markets and provide services which are distinct from one another. As a result, each area now has a different feeling or character which, to varying degrees, complements the land uses of each area. Round Hill is primarily a neighborhood shopping area with some small ancillary professional offices. It is surrounded by year-round and recreational residences and several hundred acres of undeveloped land owned by the U.S. Forest Service. Kingsbury Grade can be divided into two sub-areas: 1) along U.S. Highway 50, and 2) along Kingsbury Grade. U.S. Highway 50 currently has a mix of small casinos (the Nugget and Lakeside Inn and Casino), small office and retail uses and the Douglas County Administrative Building. The sub-area along Kingsbury Grade is comprised of light industrial, service and warehousing uses. Stateline is the casino core area of South Lake Tahoe and the primary visitor attraction of the Lake. The demands of the casino visitor industry do, however, contribute to the viability and markets of many businesses in Round Hill and Kingsbury Grade.

Presently, the three community plan areas are linked by U.S. Highway 50, which provides the only through route from one area to the next. Most visitors to Stateline travel from the west along U.S. Highway 50, through the City of South Lake Tahoe and several miles of unbroken strip motel and retail development. Both the visual clutter and the seasonal roadway congestion along this route are considered, by the market assessment, to be significant factors which are limiting the economic viability of the visitor industry.

The Community Plans are based upon three primary influences:

1. Goals for the ultimate "character" of the area.
2. Economic trends and market considerations.
3. Environmental goals and regulatory framework.
CHAPTER II  LAND USE ELEMENT

This Land Use Element is a supplement to the Land Use Element of the TRPA Goals and Policies Plan and the Douglas-County-General-Plan. Consistent with the Regional Plan, this Element sets forth the land use regulations for the Community Plan and provides a Community Plan Area Statement which replaces the existing Plan Area Statement.

A. STATELINE COMMUNITY PLAN LAND USE REGULATIONS

Community planning is an option in which the local community in partnership with TRPA and local government may prepare their own plans and to some extent their own standards.

Chapter 14 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances sets forth the provisions for community planning. This section indicates what provisions of the TRPA Regional Plan are applicable and what standards are replaced with equal or superior standards. Article 6 of the Compact applies special provisions for structures housing gaming.

This is a brief summary of standards applicable to the Stateline Community Plan. In general the standards of the TRPA Code and the Douglas County Code apply except as noted by:

1. the Policies of the six Elements of this plan, replace Plan Area Statement policies;
2. the mitigation fee program of Chapter VII, supplements TRPA programs;
3. the Community Plan Sign Ordinance (Appendix B), replaces Chapter 26;
4. the Community Plan Parking Ordinance (Appendix B), replaces Chapter 24; and
5. the Community Plan Design Review Standards and Guidelines (Appendix B), replaces Chapter 30.

Pursuant to Subsection 14.5.B of the Code the following Community Plan Statement replaces the TRPA Plan Area Statements' regulations for this area.
This document is both a Douglas County General Plan document and, to some extent, a Douglas County land-use regulatory document—in the case of the Land-Use Element—the Plan Area Statements (PAS) included herein will serve as the functional equivalent of zoning for those areas.

The detailed check list of applicable standards in Appendix A is provided to assist in the review of projects within the Stateline Community Plan. The check list also indicates which regulations are special to the Community Plan.

B. STATELINE COMMUNITY PLAN AREA STATEMENT

This Community Plan Area Statement supersedes TRPA Plan Area Statements and Douglas County zoning within the Community Plan boundaries.

PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification - TOURIST

Management Strategy - MITIGATION

Special Designation - TDR RECEIVING AREA FOR:
1. Existing Development
2. Multi-Residential Units
    SCENIC RESTORATION AREA

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This is the hotel and gaming area of South Stateline, Nevada and is located on TRPA map H-16.

Existing Uses: This area includes four major hotel casinos and one smaller casino, some miscellaneous uses.

Existing Environment: The lands are classified as 68 percent low hazard, 12 percent land capability 1-3, and 20 percent SEZ. The land coverage is approximately 72 percent with 5 percent disturbed.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should continue as a gaming area with surrounding support facilities. Stateline should become better integrated with the surrounding natural environment and offer improved access to the lake and the mountains. The facilities devoted to nonrestricted gaming activities should be allowed uses and may continue pursuant to the limitations set forth in Article VI of the TRPA Compact as amended.
6. The Community Plan shall establish a design framework for Stateline so that building renovation and new development will enhance the overall attractiveness of Stateline, as well as serve the needs of the individual owners.

   A. Policy: Douglas County and TRPA shall consider in their review of projects, implementation of the design themes described in scenic targets of the Conservation Element, the Community Design Framework/Activity Areas of Chapter I, and the Design Guidelines and Standards.

Commercial Development:

1. Encourage development and/or activities that will enhance the "year round" economy.

   A. Policy: Uses, such as retail shopping, conference facilities, ice skating rinks, indoor/outdoor amphitheater, performing arts facilities, and theaters which facilitate additional use during the spring and fall as opposed to only summer and winter, are preferred uses.

2. Special event area for arts and crafts shows, entertainment, seasonal sales, and other similar events should be established.

   A. Policy: Special event area for arts and crafts shows, seasonal sales, and other similar events should be established within the pedestrian area of the casino core. The design and regulation of the area should allow such events to occur as activities not subject to TRPA review.

Traffic Circulation and Parking: (See Chapter III Transportation Element for transportation related objectives and policies)

Recreation: (See Chapter V Recreation Element for other recreation related objectives and policies)

Public Service Facilities: (See Chapter VI Public Service Element for other public service related objectives and policies)

PERMISSIBLE USES: Pursuant to Chapter 18 PERMISSIBLE USES and if applicable, Chapter 51 PERMISSIBLE USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES IN THE SHOREZONE AND LAKEZONE, the following primary uses may be permitted within all or a portion of the Community Plan Area. The list indicates if the use is allowed (A) or must be considered under the provisions for a special use (S). Existing uses not listed shall be considered nonconforming uses within this Community Plan Area. The establishment of new uses not listed shall be prohibited within this Community Plan Area, unless the list is amended.
**General List:** The following list of permissible uses is applicable throughout the Community Plan area.

- **Residential**
  - Employee housing (S).

- **Tourist Accommodation**
  - Bed and breakfast facilities (S), hotel, motel, and other transient dwelling units (A), time sharing (hotel/motel design) (S), and time sharing (residential design) (S).

- **Commercial**
  - A. **Retail**
    - Eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (A), general merchandise stores (A), outdoor retail sales (S), and service stations (S).

  - B. **Entertainment**
    - Amusements and recreation services (A), Gaming-nonrestricted (Nevada only) (A), privately owned assembly and entertainment (S), and outdoor amusements (A).

  - C. **Services**
    - Broadcasting studios (A), business-support services-{S} financial services (A), health care-services-{S} personal services (S), professional-offices-{A} repair-services-{S} schools---business-and-vocational-{S} and secondary storage (S).

  - D. **Wholesale/Storage**
    - Vehicle storage and parking (A).

- **Public Service**
  - A. **General**
    - Churches (S), collection stations (S), cultural facilities (A), day care centers/preschools (A), government-offices-{S} hospitals-{S} local assembly and entertainment (A), local post office (A), local public health and safety facilities (A), publicly owned assembly and entertainment (S), regional public health and safety facilities (S).

  - B. **Linear Public Facilities**
    - Pipelines and power transmission (S), transit stations and terminals (A), transportation routes (S), and transmission and receiving facilities (S).

*For a more complete description of the type of commercial uses proposed by the Plan, refer to the Community Design Framework/Activity areas in Chapter I.*
3. Provide a safe and efficient highway transportation system for the users of the Stateline area and the others passing through.

A. Policy: The level of service on major roadways (i.e., arterial and collector routes) shall be LOS D, and signalized intersections shall be at no less than LOS D. (Level of Service "E" may be acceptable during peak periods, not to exceed 4 hours per day).

B. Policy: All projects shall analyze and mitigate their traffic/air quality impacts pursuant to Chapter 93 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. The improvements listed in this element shall be added to the list of mitigation measures in subsection 93.3.C(2) and (3). Traffic/air quality impacts can be mitigated by constructing individual projects or through participation in an area-wide assessment district implementing the Plan CIP measures.

C. Policy: As a condition of project approval or as part of implementing the CIP, consideration should be given to reducing the number of ingress/egress points along the Loop Road and U.S. Highway 50 by combining and realigning driveways to improve traffic flow and eliminate pedestrian conflicts. Improved entries to the casino/hotels from the Loop Road shall be encouraged with continued vehicle entry from U.S. Highway 50.

D. Policy: Signing associated with the Loop Road shall direct visitors to casino/hotels located along both arms of the Loop Road system. These signs shall distinguish parking areas from the pedestrian core.

E. Policy: The Loop Road's function is to provide the primary access through the Stateline area and to provide access to the facilities within the Stateline area. Consideration should be given to designating the Loop Road a transportation corridor after it is in full use.

F. Policy: Reconfigure the existing Loop Roads to provide an alternate route around the congested Lake Tahoe Blvd. (existing U.S. Highway 50) core in the Stateline area.

G. Policy: If warranted and feasible implement a connector road from upper Loop Road to Kingsbury. Access to PAS 070A shall be coordinated with the connector road to use a common intersection on the Loop Road and common roadway alignments.

4. The transportation system shall be an integral part of the Community Plan and will be consistent with other objectives such as scenic restoration, community design, SEZ restoration, and open space.

A. Policy: All transportation related projects shall be subject to mitigation programs, the Design Standards and Guidelines (Appendix B) and the Community Plan Sign Ordinance (Appendix B).
B. Policy: The Loop Road and other highway improvement projects shall be designed to help maintain the strong sense of the natural environment that is key to the attraction of the Lake Tahoe area. The U.S. Highway 50/Loop Road interchange should not be dominated by views of large expanses of highways, interchanges, and signage.

5. Identify and provide sufficient funding to finance the projects in the capital improvement program (CIP).

A. Policy: Douglas County and TRPA shall continue to implement and refine the existing mitigation fee program (Chapter 93 of the Code) for funding transportation capital improvements.

B. Policy: Projects may be exempt from Policy A. above, if the projects meet the requirements of the incentive program described in Section C of Chapter VII.

C. Policy: Contributions to the implementation of improvements listed in the Chapter IV Requirement Matrix as eligible for substitute mitigation fees may be credited for the requirements of Policy A above.

6. To improve circulation, reduce vehicle trips, and to improve access to the public recreational areas, a network of recreation trails and sidewalks shall be constructed.

A. Policy: Develop a parking program throughout the CP area. The program shall consider employee parking and shared parking. Total additional parking spaces for the facilities in the CP shall be limited to the number of spaces approved upon the adoption of the CP or that approved under the adopted parking program. The parking program shall be adopted no later than the 1997 review and update of the Stateline CP.

B. Policy: Pedestrian and recreation trail (bicycle) facilities identified in Figure 3 shall be constructed as part of the CIP of Chapter VII or pursuant to Conservation Element Policy 1C.

C. Policy: Consider the implementation of a gondola linking the Stateline area with Heavenly Valley.

D. Policy: Provide pedestrian access linking new uses in PAS 070A, Special Areas 1 and 2, to the casino core.

7. Transportation systems management (TSM) strategies shall be encouraged to reduce peak-period traffic and total vehicle miles traveled.

A. Policy: All transportation entities servicing the Community Plan area should become members of a Southshore transportation management association (TMA).
CHAPTER IV CONSERVATION ELEMENT

This Conservation Element is a supplement to the Conservation Element of the TRPA Goals and Policies Plan. This element lists the required environmental targets which the Community Plan must achieve. Also, this element describes the area-wide drainage system, scenic improvements, and a land capability and stream zone analysis updating the TRPA Land Capability Overlay Maps for this area.

A. CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The following numbered objective relates to the Conservation Goal found in the Community Plan Goals section of Chapter I. To meet the Objective, the following specific policies are adopted as standards.

1. Ensure the attainment and maintenance of the environmental threshold related targets established for the Community Plan.

A. Policy: Community Plan projects may rely on the incentives listed in Section D of Chapter VII once an entity (Douglas County, property owners, or an assessment district) makes an irrevocable commitment to implement the area-wide drainage improvements as described in the Chapter VII CIP and the Water Quality Target of Chapter IV. Douglas County adopts the CIP, and Douglas County submits the appropriate CIP projects to NDOT to be added to its STIP.

B. Policy: TRPA may review progress on target attainment periodically and make adjustments to the targets and implementation schedules. However, once the irrevocable commitment in Policy A above has been made, the incentives (except for substitute mitigation fees) shall be in effect until December 31, 1996.

C. Policy: The implementation of requirements listed in the Environmental Target Section shall be required as conditions of approval on projects relying on CP incentives where appropriate. Environmental mitigation required as conditions of approval shall be commensurate with the magnitude and impact of the proposed project.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL TARGETS

The following identifies opportunities for environmental improvement associated with the Stateline Community Plan. Achievement of the environmental targets is an important consideration for approving CPs (and development bonuses) and is linked to key implementation strategies. Chapter VII provides further details on the implementation programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP MEASURES</th>
<th>A. TRAFFIC/AIR QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. LOS Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N X X X X RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Highway Improv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N X X X X RTP X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Parking Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N X X X X PLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Transit Improv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N X X X X RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Pedestrian Improv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N X X X X RTP X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N X X X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Symbol are explained in the text following the matrix)
### STATELINE CP REQUIREMENT LIST
FOR ACHIEVEMENT OF TARGETS

(Symbols are explained in the text following the matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP MEASURES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stateline CP Requirements</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/93</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Mitigation Fee

8. TSM Policy
   - Membership TMA
   - Direction Signing
   - Ridership Incentives
   - Van Pools

9. Land Use
   - Housing
   - Rec. Facilities
   - Comm/Tourist

B. SEZ RESTORATION

1. SEZ Target (2.25 ac.)
   - Stn. Drain. Sys. (.5ac.)
   - Golf Course (1.5 ac.)
   - Park Ranch (.25 ac.)
   - Mount/Lake Cor (.25 ac.)

C. SCENIC IMPROVEMENT

1. Design Stds. & Guide.
2. Sign Standards
3. Sign Program
4. Hwy 50 Improv. I & II
5. View Policy
6. Underground Policy
7. Mt./Lake Improvements.

D. LAND COVERAGE REDUCTIONS
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STATELINE CP REQUIRMENT LIST
FOR ACHIEVEMENT OF TARGETS

(Symbols are explained in the text following the matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stateline CP Requirements</th>
<th>CP MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/15/93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NECP</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>SU</th>
<th>BB</th>
<th>ARL</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>AL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRE</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJP</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRM</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EII</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTvPT</td>
<td>DQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. L.C. Target [0.75 ac.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Hwy 50 Imp. (.25 ac.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mount/Lake (.5 ac.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. 80% Rest. Tar.[2.25ac.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Hwy 50/Loop Rd.(.25ac.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mount/Lake (.25 ac.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Park Ranch (.75 ac.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Golf Course (1 ac.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Area-wide Drainage Sys.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. WATER QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. BMP Req.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. NOISE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Noise Limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. FISHERIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Edgewood Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H. RECREATION TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rec. Targets [900 DCP]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Imp. Beach (500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rec. Trails (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Day/Winter Play (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ped. Facil. (200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undev. Land (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The matrix indicates the projects and regulations considered for the achievement of environmental and recreational targets. The matrix indicates if the measure is (N) needed, (E) encouraged, or (O) optional for a target achievement. A (M) indicates that the measure is needed and must have an irrevocable commitment prior to utilizing the incentive program. The (X) indicates the measure is considered for threshold findings, is an EIS assumption or mitigation measure, is linked to the allocation of units of use, or is linked to the substitute mitigation fees. The matrix also notes if the improvement is required by other plans, e.g. 208 Plan (208), Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), TRPA Code (CDE), or TRPA/Douglas County Plans (PLN).

The accompanying text in this Section and Chapter V further explains the measures. Chapter VII provides further details on the key implementation strategies.

1. TRAFFIC - Traffic problems identified in the Stateline area and throughout the region present numerous opportunities for air, water and traffic improvements.

   Base Line: There were 1,700,000 vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the Region in 1981. Approximately 91,570 of those vehicle miles had origins or destinations in the Stateline Community Plan Area.

   The RTP indicates that in 1985, most intersections operated at level-of-service (LOS) A and B during the summer. However, the U.S. Highway 50/Lake Parkway intersection operated at LOS D during the summer.

   Preliminary data indicates that eight hour carbon monoxide levels in Stateline can achieve 0.0 2 ppm which does not exceed the 0.9 ppm standard. There are no other recorded violations of other standards such as ozone or visibility.

   TRPA Threshold: TRPA Water Quality Threshold requires a 10% reduction in Region-wide VMT by 2007. The Air Quality Thresholds require a 7 percent reduction in traffic volumes on U.S. Highway 50 and also require attainment and maintenance of state and federal water and air quality standards.

   Regional Plan Requirement: The TRPA Regional Transportation Plan (1988) requires Stateline to attain service level D on urban roads, attain service level D for intersections (four hours may be LOS E), implement parking restrictions on congested roadways, and to reduce dependency on the auto. The RTP requires implementation of improvements in the Action Element and the VMT control measures of the RTP EIS. The following LOS and VMT measures directly relate to Stateline:

   LOS Measures

   a. Loop Road Improvements (two way/5-3 lanes)
   b. U.S. Highway 50 (two way/3 lanes)
   c. Traffic Flow Improvements (pedestrian and vehicle access control)
VMT Measures

a. Community Plans - 40,000 to 60,000 VMT.
b. Casino Employee Van Pools - 20,000 to 25,000 VMT Basin-wide.
c. Heavenly Valley Fixed Guideway - 4,000 to 8,000 VMT
d. Bus extensions from Stateline to Round Hill, up Kingsbury Grade, and to Zephyr Cove - 3,000 to 6,000 VMT
e. Ridership Incentives - 5,000 to 10,000 VMT Basin-wide
f. Airport/Shuttle - 6,000 to 9,000 VMT

Stateline Target: The CP targets are as follows:

a. Attain Stateline’s fairshare of the CP target and provide assistance in implementation of improvements in b. through f. above. Stateline’s estimated fairshare of the a. above is 20.4 percent (based on 1981 Stateline VMT/Total 1981 CP VMT). The actual reduction for 2007 should be 12,215 VMT or 6,108 VMT by 1997.

b. Implementation of the improvements which modelling shall indicate attain the TRPA service level by 2007 at the EIS selected monitoring points:

(1) U.S. Highway 50/Loop Road (Lake Parkway)
(2) Loop Road/Kingsbury Connector (optional)

c. Maintain TRPA air quality thresholds

Key Implementation Strategies: The following improvements are key strategies to achieving the above targets:

a. Besides the 10,900 to 12,200 VMT reductions for land use changes, the key non-land use strategies are:

(1) Parking Program - Estimate unknown until program is adopted, may be needed for 2007 target.
(2) Casino Shuttle - Est. 960 VMT for CP credit.
(3) Sidewalk/Rec. Trails System - Est. 125 VMT for CP credit.
(4) Long Distance Bus Service Prog. - Est. 1,040 VMT for CP credit.
(5) Stateline mini-shuttle - Est. 1,390 VMT for CP credit

Total 3,515 VMT

(6) Where appropriate assist the implementation of the other programs listed in b. through e. above.

b. For LOS targets, the key strategies are the construction of the Loop Road project and the intersection improvements listed in the Transportation Element. Optional measures that may be considered are:
(1) Construction of the Kingsbury Connector and associated improvements;
(2) Design and implementation of a casino access program that improves traffic flow e.g., controls access, acceleration lanes, signalization, etc.; and
(3) Construction of a tram/gondola in the Stateline area.

c. For the carbon monoxide air quality target of ≤ 9 ppm and the U.S. Highway 50 traffic reduction target, the strategies are the construction of the Loop Road project, the intersection improvements, the tram/gondola project, and the parking program. The construction by 1997 of the pedestrian separation between Caesar’s and Horizon will be required as per the TRPA condition of approval unless an alternative solution is provided such as the three lane U.S. Highway 50 plan, and an associated reduction in traffic and a signalized cross walk.

2. **STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONES** - There has been extensive disturbance of stream environment zones (SEZ) throughout the Region and Stateline. The identification and mapping of SEZs in Stateline indicates there are restoration opportunities.

**Base Line:** Based on revised Land Capability Overlay Maps (Figure 4) there are approximately 23.2 acres of SEZ in the Stateline CP, of which, about 13.1 acres are covered or disturbed.

**TRPA Threshold:** TRPA thresholds require restoration of 25% of disturbed SEZ in the Region within the 20 year life of the Regional Plan. According to Volume III of the 208 Plan, urban areas are targeted for 1,153 acres of restoration. Of this amount, 600 acres are required to be restored by the land acquisition agencies.

**Regional Plan Requirement:** TRPA 208 SEZ Restoration Program initially does not target any acres of SEZ restoration by nonacquisition agencies for the Stateline area.

**Stateline Target:** The CP Stream Zone Restoration Program targets approximately 25 percent or 3.3 acres for restoration by 2007. The 1997 CP target is 2.25 acres which is in excess of the 208 Plan target for this area.

**Key Implementation Strategies:** The following 2.25 acres are listed as possible areas for restoration. Restoration may occur in conjunction with implementation of the CIP and other proposed projects. Volume III, SEZ Protection and Restoration Program and this list may be updated as new information becomes available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Edgewood 8th Fairway</td>
<td>0.5 acre*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Golf Course</td>
<td>1.0 acre*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Park Cattle Co. Ranch</td>
<td>0.25 acre*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mount/Lake Park.</td>
<td>0.25 acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some or all of the restoration is outside the CP. The restoration may need to consider upper areas of Edgewood Creek above 070A if the target acreage is not obtainable.

3. **SCENIC** - TRPA Scenic Thresholds identify opportunities for scenic restoration throughout the Region. The TRPA Scenic Implementation Program targets the Casino Area Roadway Unit for specific scenic improvements to meet the thresholds. These improvements are further described in Appendix B.

**Baseline:** The Travel Route Rating for Scenic Roadway Unit #32, Casino Area, is 11 and the rating for Shoreline Unit #30, Edgewood is 11. The scenic resources identified in the 1982 Inventory for the Stateline Community Plan portion of Roadway Unit #32 includes focussed views of the lake across the golf course plus views of the mountain slopes across the meadow area (Subcomponent #3 as shown on the Roadway Unit map, Figure 5). Another identified resource, and the one with the highest quality rating is the wide stream zone of Edgewood Creek with its light cover of mixed riparian vegetation and pines (Subcomponent #4 on the Roadway Unit map). Both of these resources are located in the area just north of the casinos. Two subcomponents with much lower scenic quality are views from the commercial strip and casino area (Subcomponents #1 and #2 on the Roadway Unit map). The 1988 travel route rating and scenic resource threshold for the unit are as follows:

- Travel Route Rating: 11
- Scenic Resource Threshold: 2

The areas of greatest concern with respect to the unit’s scenic quality are the two existing concentrations of commercial development, which comprise the majority of the unit. The largest and most intensely developed area consists of the entire southern half of the unit, extending from the casinos south to the junction of U.S. Highway 50 with Pioneer Trail. The intensity of development in this area screens out evidence of the natural setting that surrounds the area. The visual problems are those typical of strip development: sign proliferation, inadequate building setbacks, poor quality architecture, inadequate landscaping, and the visual prominence of the automobile. The overall effect is a visually cluttered and confusing environment that fails to take advantage of the scenic value of its natural setting.
That portion of the unit between Kingsbury Grade and Loop Road has generally acceptable levels of scenic quality. To the west, the golf course provides a pleasing open area with focussed views of the lake beyond, and to the east are attractive foreground views of the open meadow and Edgewood Creek stream zone and mid-distance views of the mountain backdrop. Due to the density of development on either side of this area it will be important to maintain its open and natural qualities for visual relief.

TRPA Threshold: TRPA Thresholds require TRPA to attain and maintain Scenic Route Ratings at 15+ for Roadway Units and 7+ for Shoreline Units.

Regional Plan Requirements: The Regional Plan requires implementation of the Scenic Quality Improvement Program or an equal or superior program of the CP (including the Restoration Program, Design Review Guidelines, Design Standards and Outdoor Advertising Standards). For nonattainment areas, the SQIP requires a 30 percent improvement in roadway unit scores by 1997 and a 60 percent improvement for 2002.

Stateline Target: The CP shall attain its share of the SQIP thresholds targets by 1997 through implementation of the CP Scenic Quality Improvement Program recommendations. The basis of this share is documented in the EIS. The target score for 1997 is 12.5 and 14 for 2003 30-percent-increase-in-the-Roadway-Unit. The target for 2007 is a score of 16 for the roadway unit.

Key Implementation Strategies: The Stateline Community Plan responds to the following SQIP recommendations by providing design improvements and regulations related to a series of design theme/activity zones described in Chapter I. The urban character is established by upgrading of the overall architectural quality, by providing variety, by improving character, and by providing environmental improvements. The following strategies' intent is to simplify and upgrade the character and quality of the area:

a. Architectural Style. Scenic and visual quality is not a question of style and no specific architectural style or design theme is being recommended. The goal should be for well-thought out design solutions that are compatible with the natural environment and contribute to the character and quality of the built environment. Lack of variety (sameness) is not a goal and should be discouraged as an end result. The linkage should be in the common street improvements as noted in the Stateline Chapter of the Design Standards and Guidelines.

b. Building Materials. Building materials should be predominantly natural or natural appearing. Aluminum, steel, plastic and plain plywood board siding should be discouraged. See Design Standards and Guidelines.
c. **Building Colors.** Exterior building colors should be compatible with the surrounding natural and man-made environment, and not compete with surrounding elements for attention (i.e., the building color should not in any way become "signing" for the site). Generally, building colors should be subdued with natural colors being preferable. Primary or other bright colors, should be used only as accents and then sparingly such as upon trim. See Design Standards and Guidelines.

d. **Building Height.** From the standpoint of scenic quality, it is important that building heights not exceed the height of existing forest cover. High rise development should be sensitively designed with respect to form, line, colors and material to avoid visual impacts. Even when taller buildings are not a visual problem from within the commercial district, when they rise above the natural screening provided by the forest they become visible from viewpoints at great distances around the lake and thus detract from the natural character of the environment. See Design Standards and Guidelines.

e. **Access Drives.** Commercial developments should provide limited and clearly defined access drives rather than permitting unrestricted vehicle access along the entire property frontage. See Design Standards and Guidelines.

f. **Parking.** Parking areas should be placed in the rear or side yards of commercial properties whenever possible rather than in front yard setbacks. When parking areas are located along the building frontage a landscaped buffer strip should be provided between the roadway and the parking area. Landscaping pursuant to the Design Standards and Guidelines should be utilized around the perimeter and within all parking areas to provide definition and to screen views of parked cars. See the Design Standards and Guidelines for possible solutions.

g. **Lighting.** Lighting along the main roadway and in many of the larger parking areas utilizes tall light standards that result in the light sources (lamps) being visible from areas quite distant from the area being illuminated. The elevated lamps also result in a bright, even quality of light that covers large areas. Both these lighting characteristics detract from the scenic character of the area. Generally, night lighting should be done in a selective fashion and not exceed the amount of light actually required by users and viewers. See the Design Standards and Guidelines.

h. **Landscaping.** Landscape treatments should be encouraged around all structures as a means of creating more attractive and better integrated developments. Landscaping should be utilized to
soften building contours, mitigate building scale, reduce the amount of paved or dirt areas, and provide a visual transition between building, site, and surrounding setting.

1. **Signs.** Signs should be brought into compliance with the Sign Standards, Appendix B. The goal should be to provide a coordinated system of signs that clearly identifies individual enterprises yet minimizes the competition between signs and their contrast with the natural environment. Although the casinos have provided their own coordinated system of signs, the scale of the signage structures is quite imposing and should be reduced.

2. **Utility Lines.** Overhead utility lines should be placed underground whenever possible. Any utility lines which must be maintained above ground should be located away from the main corridor or screened so as not to detract from views or the overall visual quality of the area. See Urban Design Policy in Chapter II and CIP in Chapter VII.

4. **Land Coverage** - Numerous opportunities to mitigate excess land coverage exist throughout Stateline.

**Base Line:** Based on revised Land Capability Maps (Figure 4) the allowable land coverage is estimated to be 20.5 acres; the disturbed and soft coverage areas are estimated to be 3.7 acres; and the hard coverage is estimated to be 85.3 acres. The estimated land coverage in the main community plan area is 73 percent.

**TRPA Threshold:** TRPA Thresholds limit new land coverage to the Bailey coefficients (1% TO 30%).

**Regional Plan Requirement:** For the next 20 years, the Regional Plan requires the implementation of an excess coverage mitigation program.

**Stateline Target:** The opportunity for land coverage reductions in Stateline, beyond the 4 acre reduction required by previous garage approvals, is very limited. The 2007 CP target is 3.0 acres based solely on an estimate of how much coverage the excess coverage program might achieve. The 1997 estimate for reductions to meet the excess coverage mitigation requirement is 1.5 acres of hard coverage. Because it appears there is limited opportunity for coverage reduction the 1997 target is 0.75 acres.

**Key Implementation Strategies:** The following projects are listed as possible areas for restoration and landscaping. Restoration may occur in conjunction with implementation of the CIP and other proposed projects. This list may be updated as new information becomes available.
Site | Hard Cov.
---|---
1. U.S. Hwy 50 Improve. | 0.25 acre
2. Mount/Lake Park | 0.5 acre

* It should be noted that if the approved parking garages are not constructed, some or all of the 7.7 acres of coverage reduction attributed to these projects could be assumed by the Mountain/Lake Park.

5. **WATER QUALITY** - The opportunities to improve areawide BMPs, such as drainage systems, and increase landscaping are numerous throughout the area.

**Baseline:** Some major casinos have NDEP waste discharge permits; and, they are all conditioned by TRPA to apply BMPs. Drainage pond systems currently serve three of the privately owned parcels in the CP. Additional ponding capacity (holding ponds) to supplement the three drainage systems is a condition of approval for Edgewood Golf and Park Cattle Company. There are 7.6 acres of land that is disturbed or qualifies as soft coverage.

**TRPA Threshold:** TRPA Discharge Standards found in Chapter 81 of the TRPA Code must be attained.

**Regional Plan Requirement:** The Regional Plan requires the application of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to all properties within 20 years. The Plan also requires the restoration of 80 percent of the disturbed lands within the Region. The TRPA 208 Plan CIP indicates the State-Line area needs at least $910,000 (1978 dollars) for curb and drainage improvements.

**State-Line Target:** The CP shall complete its areawide drainage system(s) by 1997. The CP target is for all the properties including State and county roads to have completed implementation of BMPs. The ten year restoration target is 2.25 acres.

**Key Implementation Strategies:** The following programs and improvements are key strategies to achieving the above targets:

a. **Areawide Solutions:** To implement areawide solutions, the Plan proposes to construct a series of detention basins and wetlands, interconnected by pipes and stream channels. This is to be implemented by one or more improvement districts, or an association of users. The basic design principles of this plan are as follows:

   (1) Use of existing or restored wetlands is the preferred method for retention and treatment of storm runoff. Artificial wetlands, storage ponds, and engineered solutions may be considered as alternatives.
(2) Users-and Contributors to the areawide solutions may substitute those contributions for the TRPA mitigation fee requirement. While not exempt from Chapter 25 requirements, users may meet their will-be-exempt-from BMP onsite infiltration requirements related to storm water storage and treatment, in whole or in part, through proven areawide systems.

(3) Implementation and maintenance by one responsible entity is preferred. Where feasible the system should be designed to be implemented in phases consistent with these design principles. The proponents of the systems shall submit proof through modelling and/or testing that the proposed systems meet TRPA standards. However, upon completion it must operate as one unified system.

(4) The design will enhance and protect the fishery in Edgewood Creek.

The areawide system concept is shown in Figure 7 (also see Chapter VII CIP). The areawide drainage system concept is described as follows:

**Areawide System** - The system should build on the existing drainage and pond systems. Harrah's site and the road drainage system should be added to the area-wide system. Most of storm drainage could be collected at the collector box and ponds on the north end of the community plan. The drainage will be delivered to a ponding and stream system located on the Edgewood Golf Course.

b. **On-site Solutions**: In addition to the areawide solutions identified above, each project within the Community Plan Area shall be subject to Chapter 25 requirements for paving parking and drives, slope stabilization, revegetation, and providing snow storage areas.

In cases where the property is not considered part of the area wide system drainage, improvements will be required pursuant to TRPA Code Chapter 25.

In cases were the property is part of the area wide drainage system, but the area wide drainage system requires onsite improvements or recommends onsite retention systems to reduce loadings, mitigation funds should be made available.

c. **Restoration**: The following 3.15 acres are listed as possible areas for restoration. Restoration or paving of these areas may occur in conjunction with implementation of the CIP and with project approvals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>BMPa</th>
<th>Paving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. U.S. Hwy 50/Loop Shoulders</td>
<td>0.20 acre*</td>
<td>0.8 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Golf Course</td>
<td>1.00 acre*</td>
<td>0.5 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Park Cattle Ranch</td>
<td>0.20 acre*</td>
<td>0.4 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mount/Lake Park</td>
<td>0.25 acre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some or all outside CP

6. **NOISE** - TRPA identifies noise standards through use of community noise equivalent levels (CNEL), measured in dBA over a 24 hour period. TRPA thresholds establish different limits for different uses.

**Base Line**: The South Lake Tahoe Loop Road EIS measured CNEL for Stateline in 1989 as follows:

- Caesar's - South: 56.3 CNEL
- Caesar's - North: 58.7 CNEL

**TRPA Threshold**: TRPA thresholds set the following limits: 65 CNEL for commercial areas, 55 CNEL for residential, tourist, and urban recreation, and up to 65 CNEL for highway corridors (300 ft. each side).

**Regional Plan Requirement**: The Regional Plan pursuant to the Compact, requires TRPA to attain and maintain the thresholds.

**Stateline Target**: The CP shall stay within the designated noise limits set in the CP Statement which are as follows:

- Community Plan Area: 65 CNEL
- Loop Road/U.S. Hwy 50: 65 CNEL
- Corridor

**Key Implementation Strategies**: The following programs and improvements are key strategies to achieving or maintaining the above targets:

a. TRPA shall require application of techniques for noise control such as use of set backs, use of barriers, site design, use of vegetation, use of sound absorbing materials, and building design.

b. TRPA shall implement the requirements of Chapter 23 of the Code.

7. **FISHERIES** - TRPA has identified streams in the Region and has rated them as to habitat quality.

**Base Line**: The existing Stream Habitat Quality rating for Edgewood Creek is marginal (30 points for migratory and 29 points for resident). There are no other rated streams in the CP area.
**TRPA Threshold:** TRPA thresholds require the maintenance of 75 miles of excellent, 105 miles of good and 38 miles of marginal stream habitat. Edgewood Creek is designated to be improved to a status of good.

**Regional Plan Requirement:** The Regional Plan pursuant to the Compact, requires TRPA to attain and maintain the thresholds.

**Stateline Target:** The CP shall attain a stream habitat status of good for migratory fish habitat (35 to 50 points) and a status of good for resident fish habitat (55 to 68 points).

**Key Implementation Strategies:** The following programs and improvements (see TRPA restoration program for details) are key strategies to achieving the above targets:

1. Improve substrate - 2 point increase
2. Stabilize channel - 5 point increase
3. Remove barriers - 10 point increase
4. Remove or modify diversions - 10 point increase
5. Provide cover/overhead canopies/barrier to human intrusion - 3 point increase
6. Improve fish abundance - 5 to 10 point increase
CHAPTER VII IMPLEMENTATION ELEMENT

This Element is a supplement to the Implementation Element of the TRPA Goals and Policies Plan and the Douglas-County-Capital-Improvement-Program. This Element details the Capital Improvement Program, Mitigation Fee Programs, Incentive Programs and Monitoring Programs to implement the Community Plan and to achieve the environmental targets.

A. IMPLEMENTATION OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES:

1. From Community Plan adoption until December 31, 1996, an additional 35,000 sq. ft. of commercial floor may be allocated within the State-line Community Plan Area. Incentive programs should assign priority to commercial development projects which emphasize area-wide improvements or rehabilitation of substandard development. The distribution of allocations between the Stateline Community Plan and the Kingsbury Community Plan may be reconsidered two years after the adoption of this plan.

a. Policy: Within the 35,000 square foot limitation, allocations of commercial floor area shall be issued by TRPA upon project approval pursuant to Chapter 33. However, TRPA shall only consider for approval, projects recommended by Douglas County. On a first come first serve basis, Douglas County shall review proposed projects based on the following criteria and make an appropriate recommendation. The County’s recommendation shall expire two years after its action. To be eligible for receiving a commercial allocation, a project and mitigation must contribute to improvements that provide benefits to the entire core area. Eligibility and amount of allocation shall be established by the Douglas County Community Plan Allocation Guidelines and (Appendix D) consistent with one or more of the following criteria:

(1) The project includes major rehabilitation of existing structures within the project area.

(2) The project makes substantial progress toward meeting the desired area wide improvements noted for allocation in the Chapter IV Requirement Matrix. Substantial progress shall be calculated based on one square foot of allocation equals $5 worth of listed improvements or contributions to an improvement district implementing any of the listed projects.
The project will match the allocation requested for the project on an appropriate ratio with transferred commercial square footage.

2. From Community Plan adoption until December 31, 1996 provide other incentives such as 25 tourist accommodation bonus units to encourage area-wide improvements. Incentive programs should assign priority to projects which emphasize area-wide improvements or remodeling of substandard or inefficient development.

a. Policy: Projects are eligible for the incentives listed in Chapter VII, except as noted above for commercial allocations. When considering projects relying on CP incentives, TRPA shall only consider projects recommended by Douglas County. On a first come first serve basis, Douglas County shall review proposed projects based on the following criteria and make appropriate recommendation. The County’s recommendation shall expire two year after its action. To be eligible for receiving community plan incentives, a project must contribute to improvements that provide benefits to the entire core area and mitigation must contribute to improvements that provide benefits to the entire core area. Improvements eligible for consideration are noted on the Chapter 4 Requirement Matrix under allocation.

B. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

The following is a list of CIP projects that could be implemented to achieve the Goals and Objectives of this Plan. The Requirement Matrix in Chapter IV presents the ranking of the relative importance of the CIP projects. Funding for these projects comes from Douglas County funds, Nevada Bond Act funds, Burton-Santini funds, NDOT funds, TRPA mitigation funds, assessment district funds, USFS funds, private funding, and state and federal grants. For purposes of this CIP it is generally assumed Douglas County will be the recipient of grants and mitigation fees.

Project schedules and cost figures are preliminary and are subject to change. Project costs are estimated midrange costs. Question marks indicate the source or amount is unresolved.

1. Traffic/Air Quality

a. Highway Improvements

Purpose: In order to achieve the level of service targets and the VMT target, certain road improvements need to be implemented.

Program Description: The road system as described in the Transportation Element will be implemented through special assessment districts, through the State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP), Douglas County, or as project conditions of approval. The key improvements are the Loop Road improvements and the U.S. Highway 50 improvements.
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Estimated Cost: $20,000

Funding:
Douglas County

U.S. Hwy 50 Core Phase I

The first phase of the U.S. Highway 50 improvements requires (as part of sign approvals) the construction of landscaping, transit, and pedestrian improvements while maintaining four five lanes on U.S. Highway 50. See Stateline Design Standards and Guidelines, and Attachment B Horizon project-approval.

Estimated Cost: $500,000

Funding:
Private

U.S. Hwy 50 Core Phase II

Pursuant to the TRPA RTP, the SLT Redevelopment Plan, and the SLT/TRPA/Douglas County redevelopment agreements, a test of the three lane proposal shall be held. Following the test, and based on success of the test, (unless plans are amended, environmental documents are prepared, and the required parties agree to design changes) the three lanes will be made permanent by constructing the Phase II improvements at the locations shown in Figure 5 and described in the Stateline Design Review Standards and Guidelines. The proposed improvements include sidewalks approximately 10-20' wide, landscaped areas, pedestrian lighting, seating, trash receptacles, and other pedestrian amenities.

Estimated cost: $1,000,000

Funding:
Assessment Dist.
NDOT/Douglas County

U.S. Hwy 50/Ped. Separation

Construct a pedestrian separation between Caesar's and Horizon as required by conditions of approval for Park Tahoe. The size and extent of this separation may be reduced (or replaced with a cross walk) if it is determined not to be necessary due to reduced traffic speeds and volumes resulting from the redesign of U.S. Highway 50.
Mountain/Lake Park

Construct a pedestrian activity corridor perpendicular to U.S. Highway 50 between Harvey's and Horizon and between Caesar's and Harrah's as described in Chapter IV. The proposed corridor shall incorporate landscaping, attractive walking areas, lighting, and a variety of commercial, recreational and entertainment opportunities.

Estimated cost: $2,500,000
Funding: Private
NDOT

Schedule:
The following schedule is subject to change (based on changes in funding, project limitations, construction schedules, and redesign) and may be revised yearly by TRPA resolution.

1992 - Loop Road to Kingsbury Sidewalk
1997 - Phase I Casino Core Improvements
2000 - Phase II Casino Core Improvements (after construction of Loop Road improvements)
1997 - Pedestrian Separation if Required

Responsible Jurisdiction: Douglas County, Assessment District, NDOT

e. Recreational Trail System

Purpose: To implement a bike and pedestrian trail system to promote access to the key recreation areas and to encourage non-auto trips.

Program Description: Construct a series of trails described in the Transportation Element. These trails are multi-use and connect the Lake, recreation facilities, and the other community plan areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casino/Lake Trail</td>
<td>Construct approximately a half mile of multi-use sidewalks and trails from the casino core area to the lake front public beaches and facilities in PAS 070A. The trails will be constructed of durable material (e.g. asphalt, concrete, stone) and be of sufficient width to accommodate pedestrians, and small vehicles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mountain/Lake

The Mountain/Lake Corridor will include recreation facilities and concessions (see Chapter I).

Estimated Cost: Unknown until designed.

Funding:
Private Assessment Dist.

Schedule:
The following schedule is subject to change (based on changes in funding, project limitations, construction schedules, and redesign) and may be revised yearly by TRPA resolution.

1994-96 - Lake Access
- Summer/Winter Day Use

Responsible Jurisdiction: TRPA, Douglas County, Casinos, Park Cattle Company, USFS, Nevada State Parks, Assessment District

C. MITIGATION FEE PROGRAMS

1. Excess Land Coverage Program

Purpose: The purpose of this program is to reduce excess land coverage and achieve targets in the Community Plan area and the related hydrologic area. This is the Community Plan program that is described in subparagraph 20.5.A(2)(a) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Description of Program: Pursuant to subparagraph 20.5.A(2)(a), a land bank accounting system will be established to bank land coverage reductions with an agency such as Nevada State Lands. TRPA will credit to the Community Plan land coverage removed and land restored as noted below. Eligible projects may utilize these option fees when they demonstrate that they have contributed to coverage removal projects such as:

a. Public works restoration projects listed in Chapter VII Land Coverage (e.g., the areawide drainage system restoration work) may be credited to the Stateline Community Plan account.

b. Projects, both private and public, providing the 50% landscaping requirements of the Urban Design and Development Special Policy 6.A. may be credited to the Stateline Community Plan account.

Eligibility: Projects contributing to the implementation of the coverage reduction project credited to the Stateline account, may use the contributions as credit based on the coverage reduction schedule set forth in Section 20.5.
2. **Water Quality Fee Program**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this program is to provide an option to the TRPA Code of Ordinances Water Quality Mitigation Fund (subsection 82.2.B) for implementing water quality improvements in the Stateline Community Plan area. Participants in this program could credit contributions to the water quality CIP projects to the TRPA water quality mitigation fee requirement.

**Description of Program:** The Community Plan describes needed water quality improvement projects. Generally, these projects will be implemented through assessment districts and public works projects. Property owners that contribute to such areawide projects may credit such contributions to the water quality fee requirements on their future projects. TRPA and Douglas County shall create a special community plan account under the requirements of Chapter 82 for the Stateline Community Plan to keep track of such contributions. Credits shall be calculated at the mitigation fee rates established in Chapter 82. Money spent to satisfy on-site BMP requirements through off-site facilities shall not be credited as off-site mitigation.

**Eligibility:** Properties, both public and private, which contribute to water quality improvements listed for this community plan may credit such contributions to Douglas County-Stateline Community Plan Water Quality Mitigation fund.

3. **Traffic and Air Quality Fee Program**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this program is to implement the transportation improvements listed for the Stateline Community Plan and to provide a substitute to the TRPA Code program (subsection 93.3.B) for collection of fees of offsite traffic and air quality mitigation.

**Description of Program:** Chapter VII lists the projects needed to meet the Community Plan’s Transportation/Air Quality targets and mitigation requirements. These projects shall qualify as regional and cumulative mitigation measures under subsection 93.3.C(2). As an option, properties, both public and private, contributing to these projects may credit such contributions to the air quality mitigation requirements of Chapter 93.

**Eligibility:** Projects contributing to the projects reducing coverage may use the reductions as credit based on the coverage reduction schedule set forth in TRPA Code Section 20.5.

D. **Incentive Program**

The incentive program is created to link required improvements with new development to ensure the Goals and Objectives of the Community Plan are achieved. The concept is to link future development to a list of miti-
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DOUGLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY PLAN

APPLICABLE STANDARDS CHECKLIST

The following is a summary of TRPA Code standards applicable to the three Douglas County Community Plans. The checklist is provided to assist in the review of projects within the community plans and is not intended to be all inclusive. The list indicates which regulations are applicable to review of projects and activities within the Community Plan. The asterisk (*) notes which standards are substitute standards.

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS - For TRPA Chapters 1 through 11 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances are applicable in the Round Hill, Kingsbury, and Stateline Community Plan areas.

   a. REVIEWING BODY

      TRPA
      (Exempt Activities) (Sec. 4.2 and 4.3
      (Staff/GB Review)  (Sec. 4.10

      DOUGLAS-COUNTY

      {Requires-Permit}
      *{Staff}

      b. PROCESSING

      TRPA Rules of Procedure
      Douglas County Rules (?)

   c. SPECIAL CODE PROVISIONS

      TRPA
      (Emergency) (Sec. 4.11.A
      (Burn-Downs)  (Sec. 4.11.B

      DOUGLAS-COUNTY

      {Re-Be-Added}

   d. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

      TRPA Documents

      IEC
      EIS

      EA
      FONSI
2. LAND USE - The Community Plan Area Statement (CPS) determines a land use within a community plan area. Within the context of Chapter 18, the CPS determines which uses are permissible within the area. For TRPA community plan area statements replace the adopted plan area statements.

a. *COMMUNITY PLAN AREA STATEMENT (See CP Land Use Element)
   
   ____ *CPS Special Designations
   ____ *CPS Special Objectives and Policies
   ____ *CPS Permissible Uses
   ____ *CPS Maximum Densities
   ____ *CPS Maximum CNEL
   ____ *CPS Commercial Floor Area Allocation
   ____ *CPS Tourist Accommodation Bonus Units
   ____ *CPS Residential Bonus Units
   ____ *CPS Additional Outdoor Recreation

b. GENERAL LAND USE RULES (see Chapter 18)
   
   (Primary Uses) ___________ Sec. 18.1
   (Accessory Uses) ___________ Sec. 18.2
   (Definition of Use) ___________ Sec. 18.4
   (Existing Uses) ___________ Sec. 18.5

3. LAND COVERAGE - For TRPA chapter 20 land coverage regulations for community plan areas apply. Land coverage regulations include land coverage limits, transfer requirements, prohibitions in sensitive lands, excess coverage mitigation, and relocation rules. For community plan properties, land coverage limits (with transfer) for CPs are increased up to 50% for most uses and 70% for vacant commercial properties.

a. LAND COVERAGE
   
   (Land Capability Sys.) ___________ Sec. 20.2
   (Base Coverage) ___________ Sec. 20.3.A
   (Transfers) ___________ Sec. 20.3.B(3)-(7)
   (Transfers) ___________ Sec. 20.3.C
   (Coverage Calcs.) ___________ Sec. 20.3.D
   (Coverage Prohibitions) ___________ Sec. 20.4
   (Coverage Mitigation) ___________ Sec. 20.5.A
   (Mitigation Exemptions) ___________ *CP Mitigation Program
   (Coverage Relocation) ___________ Sec. 20.5.B
   ___________ Sec. 20.5.C

4. DENSITY - Within the maximum limits for the Region as set forth in Chapter 21 (i.e. 15 units per acre for multi-residential and 40 units per acre for tourist accommodation), the community plan area statements establishes CP density limitations.
INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

The scenic beauty of the Lake Tahoe Region has been recognized as a national treasure through many eyes, including those of the U.S. Congress. The visual quality of the natural landscape is the primary contributor. National treasure status has afforded the Region unparalleled stewardship. The concept of stewardship carries through to the design and development of the built environment and the way it fits into the natural setting becomes critical. This Manual of Design Standards and Guidelines represents a concerted effort to keep this area a national treasure while accommodating the sensitive development and use of land.

INTENT OF THIS MANUAL:

Design guidelines and standards of this manual are intended to aid in the development and approval of a project design, for the benefit of the patron, the businessman and the community at large. The adopted design guidelines and standards are not intended to inhibit innovative design. Nothing herein alters the provisions of Article VI of the Compact related to gaming. This manual relates to aesthetic consideration of project development. Other codes, i.e., the Douglas County Zoning Code or the TRPA Code, outline the parameters which you are entitled to use in developing your property. This manual will tell you how to aesthetically and sensitively refine those parameters into a project that will fit into the natural setting. For example, there are codes that set parameters for height and coverage, however, they do not tell you how to aesthetically and sensitively apply them to your site. This manual will give you the guidance, through standards and guidelines, to accomplish this.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS MANUAL:

This manual is laid out to identify what is required (the Standard) and, if appropriate, provide design solutions (the Guidelines) to meet that Standard.

Design Standards are ordinance requirements, usually fixed amounts or percentages for certain aspects of a project design. They are intended to ensure a minimum level of design quality.

Design Guidelines are recommended design approaches to certain design problems. They are meant to provide direction, not to dictate the actual design requirements of the project.

Because TRPA and Douglas County have the potential to create different standards and guidelines for the Community Plans, this manual is composed into two parts:

1. General standards and guidelines for all projects within the Community Plans, and

2. Special Community Plan standards and guidelines for projects within each community plan.
The General Standards and Guidelines for the Community Plan Areas are listed first and are organized by the design subject, i.e., Site Design, Building Design, Setbacks, etc. (see Table of Contents). Each design subject is divided into Standards and Guidelines.

The Special Community Plan Standards and Guidelines applicable only to Stateline, Kingsbury or Round Hill are listed in chapters 18, 19, and 20 respectively. In some instances, the community plan-specific guidelines and standards replace those presented in Chapters 1 through 17. In the event of a conflict between the terms of Chapters 1 through 17 and Chapters 18, 19 or 20, the latter 3 chapters shall control with regard to the respective plan area.

HOW TO USE THIS MANUAL:

To use this manual the following steps should be taken:

1. Besides this joint set of regulations review all TRPA and Douglas County codes applicable to your property. If there are questions, you should contact the Douglas County Planning Department or the TRPA.

2. Once all the code parameters are known, review the General Standards and Guidelines for Community Plan projects.

3. When the General Standards and Guidelines are known, review the Community Plan Standards and Guidelines for that specific Community Plan. Should a conflict occur within the General Standards and Guidelines, the Community Plan Standards and Guidelines would take precedence.

4. Begin the design process. Informal consultation with the two Planning staffs is encouraged early in the process.

APPROVAL PROCESS:

Applicability

For the Community Plan Areas in Douglas County, the standards and guidelines presented in this document replace Chapters 24, 26 and 30 of the TRPA Code and TRPA Design Review Guidelines, Douglas County Design Review Standards and Guidelines, and Douglas County Code provisions relating to parking and signs. If there is a conflict with other adopted standards of TRPA, Douglas County, or Article VI of the Compact, such as those regarding land coverage, height, project definition, UBC, etc., the standards of those ordinances shall apply.

In general, the standards and guidelines in this document govern new construction activities subject to ordinance standards rather than retroactive changes to existing structures. New construction includes but is not limited to, construction of new buildings, remodeling and improvements to exterior spaces such as sidewalks and surface parking which require permits. All activities shall comply with the following design standards except:
1. Projects, for which the cost of the required improvements exceed 10% of the project cost may be prohibitive, may submit schedules for compliance, within 10 years.

2. Projects which are in assessment districts (wherein the assessments have been levied or are contained in approved funded public works projects) which are committed to implement the improvements,

3. Projects for which TRPA and Douglas County have found the standard not to be applicable due to unique circumstances arising from or regarding the project, and if applicable, all required findings have been made, or including the finding that the waiver of standards will result in equal or superior result.

4. Activities whose primary purpose is to remodel existing structures to come into compliance with these standards and guidelines shall only be required to conform in areas directly altered by construction.

In no case will any project modification or expansion be approved that preempts future compliance with applicable standards. For structures housing gaming under Article VI of the Compact, all activities except external modifications requiring local government permit are subject only to Douglas County review.

Criteria

Each project is reviewed for compliance with the applicable codes and these design standards and guidelines. In considering a project, the staffs may consider items such as:

- Zoning
- Yard setbacks
- Building height
- Parking needs
- Landscaping
- Signs
- Lighting
- Traffic
- Fire
- Emergency vehicle access
- Service needs
- Building materials and color
- Covenants, codes and restrictions on the deed
- Such other features as may affect the project and its setting

Conditions of Approval

All projects approved under design review are subject to standard conditions of approval. The County or TRPA may impose additional conditions of approval for a project as needed. For minor projects, such as remodelling or signs, the County or TRPA may ask for minor improvements in
order to gradually upgrade the appearance of existing buildings or properties. In such cases, each project will be considered individually and the staffs will work with the applicant to arrive at a plan that will make the property more attractive and still be economically feasible for the owner or tenant.

Decision Authority

Design review is conducted by the Public Works Department and TRPA staff. Action on a project is taken by the Chief Planning Officer for Douglas County. In the event of an appeal or the referral of a project by the CPO, the project is heard by the Board of County Commissioners. For TRPA, action on projects is taken by TRPA staff or by the TRPA Governing Board pursuant to Chapter 4 of the TRPA Code.

Permit Coordination

In order to save time and effort, a project which requires both Douglas County and TRPA action, joint design review may occur or TRPA may delegate design review authority to Douglas County or vice versa through a Memorandum of Understanding.

THE DESIGN PROCESS: ADVOCATING A DESIGN HOLISM

At first glance, this manual may seem to address design of the built environment in a segmented approach. What is intended, however, is to advocate a holistic approach to design, that is where the whole is greater than the sum of the individual parts. As an example, the parts of a development project might include the building style, landscaping, signage, parking, interior floor plan and so forth. The whole is the complete site, from end to end, and from top floor to ground level.

The holistic approach to design begins with a strong design concept. Once a design concept is formulated each design decision can then be made within the concept's framework. It is believed that this approach can provide a more complete, more coordinated final product than an approach which designs each project element as an isolated piece.

While there is no one universally-accepted theory on how to produce good design, there exists an identifiable set of steps which are followed in almost everyone's design process:

1. Looking at what exists on the site;
2. Analyzing what you see in terms of constraints and opportunities relative to the intended use; and
3. Synthesizing a design or arrangement of spaces which matches the program of elements to the existing conditions of the land.

Although it appears straight-forward, there are many complex and subtle decisions made during the design process which only experienced and "open eyes" can foresee. Based on these intricacies and the Basin's complex regulations, the County and TRPA would strongly suggest that you retain
design and engineering professionals (architects, landscape architects, interior designers, civil engineers and the like) to help prepare your plans.
CIRCULATION

Circulation is the pattern of movement of pedestrian, bicyclists, trucks and automobiles. The design of the circulation system on a site can be critical in terms of safety. The success of a project can hinge upon the ease of access and use.

Standards

A. Driveways may exceed 10% slope for single family houses, including secondary residences and 5% slope for all other uses, if Douglas County and TRPA find that a steeper driveway would minimize the amount of grading and site disturbance that would result from construction of a driveway of lesser slope. In no case shall a driveway exceed 14% for residential use or 8% for all other uses. Driveway widths shall conform to the following standards:

(1) Single family houses, including secondary residences, require driveways of a minimum width of 10 feet. Where the house includes a garage, the driveway shall be at least as wide as the garage door opening for a distance of 20 feet and shall taper to the appropriate width, but no less than 10 feet.

(2) Other residential uses: Two-way driveways serving residential uses other than single family houses shall be 24 feet. One-way driveways serving residential uses other than single family houses shall be 12 feet.

(3) Tourist Accommodation, Commercial, Public Service and Recreation Uses: Two-way driveways serving these uses shall have a minimum width of 20 feet and a maximum width of 30 feet. One-way driveways serving such uses shall have a minimum width of 10 feet and maximum of 15 feet. For two-way driveways with median dividers serving such development, each direction shall have a minimum width of 10 feet and a maximum of 17 feet.

B. Pedestrian circulation systems shall be required for Commercial, Tourist Accommodation, Public Service and Multi-residential projects. Sidewalks shall be a minimum 48" wide, with gradients less than 5%. Ramps for use by the handicapped shall not exceed a 1:12 slope and shall be provided with landings as specified in the Uniform Building Code. Ramps exceeding a 1:15 slope shall be fitted with handrails, 30-34" in height above the stair tread. Sidewalk dimensional standards are applicable to public and right-of-way easement walkways only, and not to pedestrian facilities and structures within the private property (unless otherwise required by safety and fire codes).

C. Adequate provision shall be made for the access and movement of emergency vehicles.

D. The minimum aisle widths and turning radii are as shown:
Guidelines

A. The circulation pattern should be logical and easily comprehended by the user.

B. Vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems should be separated or made compatible to reduce conflicts between pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists. Separation can be effected through the use of changes in grade, materials, screens, and structures. Compatibility can be achieved through slowing and/or reducing vehicular traffic in areas of heavy pedestrian use, creation of well-defined crosswalks or other means.
C. Layout of sidewalks should follow the anticipated movement of pedestrians.

D. Loading activity should not interfere with other site circulation patterns.

E. Building entries should be clearly visible from the parking areas and should be kept clear of parking.

F. Paving materials should be compatible with other site materials. Sidewalk surfaces should be smooth and non-slippery.
LIGHTING

Outside lighting increases the operational efficiency of a site, provides a measure of site security, and can enhance the aesthetics of the site and the architectural qualities of its structure. In determining the lighting for a project, the source, intensity, and type of illumination should be appropriate for the lighting needs.

Standards

A. Exterior lights shall not blink, flash or change intensity. String lights, building or roofline tube lighting, reflective or luminescent wall surfaces are prohibited.

B. Exterior lighting shall not be attached to trees except for the Christmas season.

C. Parking lot, walkway, and building lights shall be directed downward.

D. Fixture mounting height shall be appropriate to the purpose. The height shall not exceed the limitations set forth in Chapter 22.

E. Outdoor lighting shall be used for purposes of illumination only, and shall not be designed for, or used as, an advertising display. Illumination for aesthetic or dramatic purposes of any building or surrounding landscape utilizing exterior light fixtures is authorized provided the illuminated area does not exceed projected above the horizontal or 26 feet above grade on a vertical wall, and the light source is shielded from public view is prohibited.

F. The Commercial operation of searchlights for advertising or any other purpose is prohibited.

G. Seasonal lighting displays and lighting for special events which conflict with other provisions of this section may be permitted on a temporary basis pursuant to Chapter 7.
Guidelines

A. Exterior lighting should be designed as part of the architectural and site design of a project. Fixture style and location should be compatible with the building's architecture and landscaping. Projects should display a compatibility in lighting-fixture style throughout the project.

Fixture mounting height should be appropriate to the use, the project, and the setting. Light standards should be as short as possible, and in no case, higher than 35 feet. Where low-level lighting (under 5') is used, fixtures should be placed and directed so as to prevent glare. Where there may be a chance of breakage, shatterproof coverings should be used on low-level lights.

B. Overall lighting levels should be compatible with the neighborhood ambient light level. The lighting system should be energy efficient, based upon the amount of light actually needed by users and viewers. A few well-placed low-intensity lights may be able to provide all the illumination needed for visibility, safety, and security. As a general rule, one foot candle per square foot over the entire project area is adequate.

C. Posts and standards along thoroughfares and in parking lots should be placed so that they do not present hazards to pedestrians or vehicles.

D. Night lighting of building exteriors should be done in a selective fashion: highlight special recognizable features; keynote repeated features; or use the play of light and shadow to articulate the facade. The purpose of illuminating the building should be to add visual interest and support building identification. Harsh overall lighting of a facade tends to flatten features and diminish visual interest.
SHOREZONE (TRPA Only)

The shorezone of Lake Tahoe is a resource of regional significance. Site planning in the shorezone requires added levels of sensitivity on the part of the designer for many reasons, including visual interest in the land/water edge, sensitive ecological processes at work, and the visual vulnerability of shore lines. These guidelines focus on considering the design of man-made development as seen from the Lake.

Standard: TRPA code Design Standards within the shorezone are provided for the readers reference:

DESIGN STANDARDS WITHIN THE SHOREZONE ARE AS FOLLOWS:

A. 53.10.A COLOR: THE COLOR OF STRUCTURES, INCLUDING FENCES, SHALL BE COMPATIBLE WITH ITS SURROUNDINGS. SUBDUED COLORS IN THE EARTH-TONE AND WOODTONE RANGES SHALL BE USED FOR THE PRIMARY COLOR OF THE STRUCTURE. HUES SHALL BE WITHIN A RANGE OF NATURAL COLORS THAT BLEND, RATHER THAN CONTRAST, WITH THE EXISTING VEGETATION AND EARTH HUES. EARTHTONE COLORS ARE CONSIDERED TO BE SHADES OF REDISH-BROWN, BROWN, TAN, OCRE, UMBER, SAND AND DARK GREEN.

B. 53.10.B ROOFS: ROOFS SHALL BE COMPOSED OF NONGLARE EARTHTONE OR WOODTONE MATERIALS THAT MINIMIZE REFLECTIVITY.

C. 53.10.C FENCES: WOODEN FENCES SHALL BE USED WHENEVER POSSIBLE. IF CYCLONE FENCE MUST BE USED, IT SHALL BE COATED WITH BROWN OR DARK GREEN VINYL, INCLUDING FENCE POLES.

Guidelines

A. Site Structures Away From Open Prospects: Use vegetation and landform to conceal structures from view of the Lake. There are many historical precedents for this at Lake Tahoe such as the Ehrman Mansion and the Tallac Estate. Siting structures at the ecotone (forest/shoreline edge) or further into the forest landscape can help minimize visibility and soften the structure’s appearance. View corridors to the Lake can still be incorporated into the building and site design by careful siting of and by selective tree pruning or thinning. This can produce more dramatic framed views.
B. Use Colors Which Blend Or Recede: Use dark colors and flat finishes which blend rather than contrast with surrounding landscape to help minimize the apparent visibility structure.

C. Use Vegetation To Screen Structures: Using existing or planted vegetation to screen and soften the structure’s appearance from the lake will help “fit” the structure into the landscape.

D. Compatible Scale: The scale of new development should be proportional with the scale of the surrounding vegetation and the screening ability of the vegetation.

E. Minimize Reflectivity Of All Structures And Surfaces Visible From The Lake Or Adjacent Scenic Highway Corridors:

(1) Use flat or matte finishes on all visible surfaces including walls and roofs.

(2) Articulate large glass surfaces, avoid large flat surfaces which face the lake.

(3) Use non-glare glass.

F. Protect Shorezone Vegetation: Protect existing shorezone (backshore and foreshore) vegetation against disturbance of mechanical injury during construction activities by using temporary fencing of other barriers. See also the Handbook of Best Management Practices for additional measures.
This chapter presents design standards and guidelines specific to the casino core area of the Stateline Community Plan. See Chapter I of the Stateline Community Plan for a planning overview.

The Stateline Community Plan is divided into two primary districts the Highway 50 Promenade and the Mountain Lake Park. The Mountain Lake Park includes three sub-areas: The Mountain Lake Park Corridor, The Mountain Lake Park Activity Areas and the Entry Areas. The goals, design and implementation principles, standards and guidelines in this Chapter are initially presented for the whole casino core, followed by policies specific to each of these districts.
HIGHWAY 50 PROMENADE

The goal of the community plan is to establish an attractive outdoor area along Highway 50 for strolling, street events and to encourage use and enjoyment of the outdoors in the casino area. The promenade envisioned to accomplish this goal should link the casino core with South Lake Tahoe, and its design should emphasize pedestrian comfort and safety.

Design and implementation principles to realize the goal include building improvements along public and private property within the Promenade area, coordinated to create an integrated, cohesive whole, while still encouraging individual sections of the street to express the character and image of individual casinos. A series of plazas should be established where the Mountain Lake Park crosses Highway 50.

Improvements should be designed to mesh with existing and planned uses in South Lake Tahoe to create a unified destination straddling the state line. Such improvement programs should be phased to match the timing of proposed improvements on the Loop Road and Highway 50. Should the proposed Highway 50 lane reduction prove permanent, the area created should be used to expand sidewalks and provide landscaping, seating and other pedestrian amenities.

MOUNTAIN LAKE PARK

The goal of the community plan is to establish a pedestrian oriented park and activity area throughout the casino core and crossing Highway 50 (the "Mountain Lake Park"). The Mountain Lake Park should blend natural and man-made elements to create a strong opportunity to experience the Lake Tahoe natural environment; to improve environmental quality within the casino core; and to provide space for new recreation, entertainment and commercial activities.

The plan calls for specific design and implementation principles, such as providing for an integrated resort environment designed so pedestrians can walk safely, comfortably and enjoyably throughout the entire area. Improvements to the core should focus around the theme of juxtaposition between Lake Tahoe's natural environment and the more active, "urban" qualities of the casino/hotels.

Desired results can be created by extensive use of elements that characterize the local environment, such as large boulders, water, and native vegetation such as conifers and aspens; by creating a range of comfortable, attractive outdoor spaces for walking, dining, window shopping and otherwise enjoying the out-of-doors; and by carefully siting and designing new recreation and commercial uses to complement and blend with environmental improvements.

Improvements within the Mountain Lake Park should be located where they create greatest benefits for the entire casino core and should be designed to meet existing and planned uses in South Lake Tahoe to create a unified destination. New uses should be located to create areas of concentrated activity, separated by less-developed or natural areas through which it is pleasant to walk.
The physical character of the Mountain Lake Park will be designed to create a unified experience, but, this guideline will not prevent the design of individual sections of the Mountain Lake Park to express the character and image of individual casinos.

Design standards and guidelines focus on four general goals: bringing the natural environment into the casino core; creating attractive, comfortable outdoor spaces; establishing a safe, comfortable and enjoyable-to-use circulation system for vehicles and pedestrians; and ensuring the consistent quality of physical design details.

Standards

A. Landscaping. Special standards govern landscaping within the casino core. In this area, pre-existing, approved landscape and coverage plans, parking requirements, and the special objectives of the Mountain Lake Park all create the need for a more flexible, holistic approach to landscaping. Consequently the area-wide standards in Chapter 8 dealing with the subjects below shall have the status of guidelines.

5% of entire site and 15% of parking and driveway area landscaped standard (Section 8.B.)
Planting bed size standard (Section 8.D.(1))
Concrete/masonry enclosures for planting beds standard (Section 8.D.(2))
1 tree per 400 sq. ft. of planting area standard (Section 8.D.(3))
15% minimum of parking lot landscaped standard (Section 8.F.(2))

In place of the Chapter 8 standards, landscape plans and implementation schedules for the entire project area shall be required on a project-by-project basis, reflecting the strongly stated goals of the Community Plan and Guidelines to bring the elements of the natural environment to the core, as well as the constraints of the area.

B. Lighting. Special standards govern lighting within the casino core. This area, because of its unique land uses, its focus on tourism, and the intensity and magnitude of use, requires greater flexibility in the functions lighting serves and the type and location of permitted lighting. Specifically, the three standards below replace the three equivalent standards in Chapter 9.

1. Street, parking lot, walkway and building lights should be directed downward to prevent spill-over onto neighboring properties. If directed upward, light should be directed to an element which stops the light such as a building eave, or glazed pedestrian shelter or arcade. Light sources (bulbs) should be diffused.

2. Outdoor lighting shall be used primarily for purposes of illumination and shall not be designed for or used as an advertising display. Decorative uses are permitted where they do not spill over into neighboring residential or undeveloped areas, and where such uses are part of pedestrian walkways, plazas, or other such outdoor activity areas.
Aesthetic or dramatic lighting of buildings or landscape above 26' from grade using exterior light fixtures is not permitted.

C. Building Front Setbacks. New buildings and additions would fall under the Stateline setback requirements (see Figure 18-1 for details). Exceptions to the general setback requirement may be permitted if:

1. Setbacks on Highway 50 may be reduced to 10' upon the completion of Phase II; or

2. Pedestrian shelters, and other elements of primary casino pedestrian entries and the planned Highway 50 plazas may be allowed to extend to within 10' of the property line in order to establish a more attractive, comfortable and animated pedestrian environment; or

3. Entry structures (e.g., towers or covered walkways) shall be permitted to extend to within 10' of property lines at the northern entry area of the casino core (near the Loop Road junction) in order to help define and announce the northern boundary of the casino core; and

4. The findings of section 30.5.D of the TRPA Code are made for the scenic corridor.

D. Frontage Improvements. Projects subject to the requirements of this Chapter shall be conditioned to meet the following standards where applicable. For purposes of this Chapter, the frontage is the area between the curbline and the required setback. Specifications for the improvements shall be established by Douglas County Public Works or approved improvement plans consistent with this Chapter.

1. Highway 50 Promenade: Projects fronting U.S. Highway 50 shall provide the following improvements or commit to a schedule to implement the improvements on the frontage consistent with Appendix B:

(a) Ten feet minimum wide sidewalks measured from the curbline or as specified in Appendix B.

(b) Six inch vertical concrete curbs or as specified by NDOT

(c) Street trees planted 50 feet on center or pockets of shrubs planted 25 feet on center or a combination, or as specified in Appendix B.

(d) Pedestrian street lights 12' high, 50 feet on center, or low level lights 25 feet on center, or as specified in Appendix B.

(e) Building setbacks a minimum of 20' from the property line or as set forth in Section 18.C. above.
(2) **Entry Areas:** Projects fronting U.S. Highway 50 in the Entry Area or the Loop Road shall provide the following improvements or commit to a schedule to implement the improvements on the frontage. Projects fronting U.S. Highway 50 in the Entry Area shall be consistent with Appendix B:

(a) Eight feet wide sidewalks. A 3’ minimum landscaped separation is required on the Loop Road.

(b) Six inch vertical concrete curbs or as specified by NDOT

(c) Street trees planted irregularly (maximum 50’ on center) or pockets of shrubs (maximum 25’ on center) or a combination.

(d) Pedestrian street lighting (maximum 12’ height) as needed.

(e) Building setbacks a minimum of 20’ from the property line.

(f) Vehicle barrier as needed.

(3) **Stateline Avenue:** Projects fronting Stateline Avenue shall provide the following improvements on the frontage:

(a) Six feet wide minimum concrete sidewalks measured from the curbline.

(b) Pedestrian street lights 12’ high 50 feet on center or low level lights 25 feet on center.

(c) Building setbacks a minimum 10’ from the property line.

(d) 6” rolled concrete curbs or as specified by Douglas County or the City of South Lake Tahoe.

(e) Street trees planted 50 feet on center or pockets of shrubs planted 25 feet on center or a combination, both subject to an approved landscape plan.
Guidelines

A. Right-of-way/Frontage Improvements: The following typical cross sections display the design guidelines which are to be applied to the Stateline Community Plan.

(1) **Highway 50 Promenaded.** Consistent with Appendix B, projects in/or fronting Highway 50 should include these basic elements:

**Phase I (1993-1997)**
Four travel lanes, 80' right-of-way, 20' building and parking setbacks from the property line for new development, 10' minimum sidewalks, (if possible) landscaped median (subject to stacking and NDOT/snow removal needs), pedestrian crossings, street lighting and landscaping.
Phase II (1997-2007)
The Phase I improvements except with two travel lanes, 80' right-of-way, bikelanes, 10' setback, 15' minimum sidewalks with a 5' furniture zone and reserved transit right-of-way.
(2) **Loop Road/Lake Parkway.** Projects in/or fronting the loop road in the entry areas should include these basic elements.

**Lakeside Loop Road**
Three lanes, 60' right-of-way, no parking in right-of-way, 20' building and parking setbacks, 8' recreational trail on inside of loop road, barriers, lighting and landscaping.

---

**Diagram:**
- 60' R.O.W.
- 20' setback
- 14', 11', 14' widths
- Golf course
- Casino core
Mountain Side Loop Road
Four lanes, 84' minimum right-of-way, no parking in right-of-way, 20' building and parking setbacks, 8' recreation trail on the inside of the loop road, pedestrian crossings, landscaped median, lighting and landscaping.
(3) **Stateline Avenue Typical Cross Section.** Projects in/or fronting Stateline Avenue should include these basic elements:

Two travel lanes, 50' right-of-way, 10' setbacks, 6' sidewalks, parallel parking, lighting and landscaping.
(4) **Stateline Pedestrian Crossing.** The central pedestrian crossing should set the example for the Stateline Highway 50 improvements.

Median, pedestrian lighting, landscaping, special surface materials and special signals.
B. Casino Core - General

(1) **Primary Vegetation.** Emphasize use of native plant materials: Ponderosa and Jeffrey pine, red and white fir, aspen, willows, alders, manzanita, sage and local grasses (see Chapter 8 for details). Vegetation showing attractive seasonal change (such as aspens or mountain ash) is encouraged.

(2) **Accent Vegetation.** Use abundant flowering plants, in particular commercially available native wild flowers, as strong accents in primary activity areas, entry areas and other focal points (see Chapter 8 for details). Both primary and accent vegetation should be planted in a sufficiently dense and massive manner to create a strong visual impact against the backdrop of the large casino hotels and parking facilities.

(3) **Boulders.** Large boulders and rock outcroppings are one of the most memorable visual landmarks of the Tahoe area. Similar features, including quite large individual boulders and collections of boulders, should be used throughout the casino core. Care should be taken to “plant” stones in configurations like those found in nature. (Exceptions to this natural style may be made for deliberate effect within the Highway 50 promenade). Wherever possible, local native granite should be used. Use of artificial stone is permitted if it matches the look and feel of local stone. Larger boulders should be placed to reduce potential liability problems.

(4) **Water Features.** To echo the presence of Lake Tahoe, water and the evidence of water is encouraged throughout the core. Water features can include “linear fountains/artificial streams (similar to the existing feature under the Harvey’s porte cochere), traditional fountains, simulated natural water features (such as ponds with boulders and falling water), ponds and lakes (for swimming or as visual amenities), drinking fountains and wetlands. Portions of the stormwater runoff system in the core (such as storage/infiltration ponds) might be made more visible and aesthetically pleasing. Wherever possible, water features should be designed to allow human contact and play.

(5) **Building Style.** To help express the sense of the natural environment in the core, most new structures should be of modest scale, use materials with a “natural character” such as wood, stone or textured concrete and be built in a mountain/rustic architectural style. Exceptions to this rule may be made for structures such as performing arts buildings that require different forms, and for a limited number of structures deliberately designed for contrast and featuring glass, metal or other “high tech” finishes.

(6) **Protection and Enhancement of Views.** Identify and enhance key views of mountain ridgelines, the golf course and other attractive natural features. In particular, improve and protect views outward from Highway 50 along the Mountain Lake Corridor.
Create Attractive, Comfortable Outdoor Spaces. Make the casino core a pleasant place to be year-round and also during both day and night. Create an environment that invites and rewards walking and provides animated, comfortable, visible outdoor activity areas.

Create Defined Outdoor Spaces. Outdoor spaces should provide a sense of definition and enclosure. Outdoor spaces should not be amorphous, “leftover” spaces. Spatial definition can be achieved using buildings, vegetation, and landscape features such as walls, bollards or boulders. Changes in paving materials should be used to define space and add character to expanses of hardscape in parking lots or plazas. Definition is important both horizontally, as when a cluster of buildings helps define the limits of a square, and also vertically, as when a building cornice or arcade provides a sense of enclosure from above.

Activate Outdoor Spaces. Carefully concentrate active uses such as shopping, dining or gaming around the edges of squares and other outdoor gathering spaces. The portions of buildings facing onto squares or pedestrian pathways must have articulated entries, attractive windows and signs, and other features that give life to the adjoining space.

Create Comfortable Outdoor Spaces.

(a) Create “sun pockets”, evocative of the Eldon Beck quote: “Sun is magic in mountain communities.” A plaza will be alive even on cold winter days if it is protected from the wind and designed to let in the winter sun. Outdoor spaces, big and small, should be oriented to be open to the winter sun and sheltered on the north and at least one other side. Buildings and tree location, height and massing should be controlled to preserve sun. For example, buildings on the south side of the Mountain Lake Corridor should be generally lower and less massive than those on the north side.

(b) Provide abundant seating through expansion of both formal and informal outdoor seating. Formal seating includes traditional benches and chairs; informal seating includes a wide array of low walls, stairs, building edges, boulders, and other features that suffice as a seat. To be most useful, seating should be located at the edge of active areas and should be sheltered from the elements. A seat in the sun with a view is a great pleasure.

(c) The Mountain Lake Park and Highway 50 Promenade should incorporate elements that protect pedestrians from inclement weather. Such improvements could include arcades and overhangs along buildings, awnings, freestanding overhead shelters in open areas, outdoor heaters and covered walkways. Use of glass or other transparent/translucent materials is encouraged on larger covered walkways to maintain a sense of contact with the out-of-doors and allow penetration of warmth and light from the sun.
(d) Streetscape materials for railings, seating and other street elements that pedestrians may directly touch should be those, such as wood, that are comfortable in cold weather.

(11) **Establish a Variety of Outdoor Spaces.** Provide a variety of defined, attractive outdoor spaces including those listed below. Such spaces should range in character from large, busy and formal to small and quiet.

(a) Central squares at the crossing of Highway 50 and Mountain/Lake Activity Areas, including a primary square at Bill's/Caesar's/Horizon and other squares at the state line, the northern entries of Harrah's and Harvey's, and the northern entries to Horizon/Caesar's.

(b) Secondary squares on both sides of Mountain Lake Park.

(c) Various smaller spaces, including building entries, spaces connecting primary and secondary plazas, informal gathering spots within natural “parks” at outside edges of Mountain Lake Corridor.

(12) **Establish a Safe, Comfortable and Enjoyable-to-use Circulation System for Pedestrians and Vehicles.**

(a) **Staging.** To minimize pedestrian fatigue and boredom, establish visual/activity “punctuation points” at least every 300-400 feet along pedestrian routes. Such points encourage walking and reward people for exploring on foot and help people move through areas where they otherwise might not be inclined to go. These punctuation points can be composed of natural elements such as a clear transition from one type of planting to another (e.g., from narrow, enclosed conifers to open flowers), particularly striking emplacements of boulders, water features, or special planting areas. Alternatively, or in addition to such features, punctuation points can be man-made elements such as clusters of active uses, a plaza, tower, interpretations of natural features, or other landmarks.

(b) **Pedestrian Connections/Linkage to Activities Outside the Casino Core.** In addition to the Highway 50 Promenade, pedestrian pathways should be built to provide a variety of pleasant, attractive routes through and then beyond the casino core. Wandering is a key part of the pleasure of resort communities. New access ways promoting exploration by foot should be developed to link additional sides of the casino/hotels. Likewise paths should be constructed to offer pleasant pedestrian links into South Lake Tahoe from behind the casino/hotels.
C. Casino Core - Highway 50 Promenade

1. **Juxtaposition of Natural and Man-made Elements.** The Highway 50 Promenade should feature a deliberate, artful juxtaposition of natural and man-made forms and materials. Express the combination at a number of design levels, from the overall framework to the form of the elements to detailed design and use of materials. Unlike the Activity Areas, where the goal is creation of a strong experience of Lake Tahoe’s natural environment, the goal along Highway 50 is deliberate contrast:

   - Texture: high tech vs. natural; smooth vs. textural
   - Color: colorful/glossy vs. subdued/natural
   - Form: angular/geometric vs. natural/sinuous
   - Structure: regular sidewalk grid vs. deconstruction with natural elements

Design elements should include actual trees, rocks and water and also features which echo or suggest natural elements, for example, glass block to suggest ice, concrete imprinted with patterns from leaves and pine cones, or a pattern of paving, low walls or abstract sculpture inspired by elements found in nature.

2. **Landscaped Areas.** Planting along the street should occur in regularly spaced planters to establish a more formal pattern and rhythm than will occur in the Mountain Lake Park. The current plan (which may change) calls for regularly sized planters at regular intervals in the street, but with each planter including varied species.

3. **Landscape Style.** Plantings in this more urbanized portion of the core should be designed to not excessively obscure buildings and signs. At most, new planting should create filtered views of building facades, taking care to frame views of primary pedestrian building entries. New planting that may occur in the former traffic lanes on Highway 50 should harmonize with existing planting (e.g., new aspens to work with existing pines along the front of Horizon). Where casinos present blank walls to the sidewalk (i.e., there are no windows or doors), planters are encouraged along the building wall.

4. **Casino Entries.** Improve the articulation of entries to the Casinos. Create more defined, attractive transition areas between indoors and outdoors. Specific elements of such entries include platforms reached by stairs midway between the elevation of the entry door and the sidewalk, overhead enclosures, special paving, signage, lighting and planting materials.

5. **Casino Exteriors.** The casino buildings and the activity within should help activate Highway 50 Promenade. This can be done through improved entries and windows, improved lighting and signage, and by bringing non-gaming uses to the exterior of the buildings, e.g., a restaurant or sports bar.

6. **Street Treatment.** Provide consistent, high quality street improvements as illustrated below. Where buildings are set back from property lines, encourage...

---
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uation of street and sidewalk treatment - special paving, landscaping, lighting, etc., onto private property.

(7) **Existing Parking Structures.** Within the limits of structures housing gaming rules and the availability of commercial development rights, consider locating new pedestrian oriented services (e.g., transit) or retail shops within the existing Harvey’s and Harrah’s garages. Such uses would help add interest and life to the street.

(8) **Pedestrian Safety/Traffic Reduction.** Consider permanent reduction of traffic lanes on Highway 50 from the existing five to three lanes. Slow the speed of traffic through the core to increase pedestrian safety and reduce traffic noise. Add well defined crosswalks at areas of concentrated pedestrian activities, including primary casino access drives. Consider emphasizing these crosswalks with use of special paving. In general, strive for a more equal footing with the automobile than exists today.

(9) **Add Pedestrian Amenities.** If permanent lane reduction occurs, use the space created to establish a more comfortable, attractive pedestrian environment. Activities and uses that could occur within the expanded sidewalk include shelters, landscaping, water features, vendors, seating, theme lighting, attractive signage, art and transit facilities.

D. Casino Core - Mountain/Lake Park

(1) **Linkage to Landscaped Areas Outside the Casino Core.** Landscape design in the Mountain/Lake Park should be designed to create the sense that the natural environment is sweeping through and crossing Highway 50. Landscaping should strive to extend the species and patterns of vegetation currently and/or previously found at the edge of the casino core.

(2) **Landscaped Areas.** Planted areas should be sized sufficiently to create a sense that the natural landscape extended into the casino core, relying less on small, more obviously manufactured planters.

(3) **Landscape Style.** Planting should emphasize a natural, informal style. Use different size specimens of the same species, cluster plantings in informal, natural patterns. Maintenance should allow thickets and leaf/needle accumulation. A degree of clutter suggests a pleasant hint of wildness.

(4) **Emphasize Topography.** The casino core drops over 60 feet from the mountain-side Loop Road to the lake-side Loop. The Mountain Lake Park should make this change in elevation apparent, through use of stairs, waterfalls, retaining walls, and other features that articulate changing elevations. (Primary pedestrian routes should provide wheel chair access where feasible.)
(5) **Scale and Form of New Buildings.** Most new buildings should be of modest sizes (approximately 2000-4000 sq. ft.), or, if larger, should be articulated so as to appear of modest-sized, separate structures. New buildings should provide a distinct, pleasant contrast to the scale of casino/hotels. The character, human scale, and unity within diversity found along traditional American main streets should provide the design model for new construction in the core. In such settings, most buildings are small, and while individual structures offer great variety of detail, they blend into a unified whole. Buildings should emphasize vertical lines and forms. Exceptions may be made for structures such as performing arts facilities that require larger forms.

(6) **Building Design.** Certain styles of architecture, for example steeply roofed, wooden structures with steps to porches and balconies, both evoke and fit well into mountain environments. Such styles should be used in the new buildings constructed in the Mountain Lake Park. Examples of appropriate wood details include exposed trusses, diagonal braces, heavy timber exposed sections, round section timbers, exposed galvanized bolts, and connections. Because relatively few new buildings are expected as part of planned casino core improvements, an overall unity of design is necessary for these new structures to not be visually overwhelmed by the much larger casino/hotel structures.

(7) **Building Materials.** Wood, stone/brick, concrete and stucco are recommended exterior materials for new buildings. Reflective glass is discouraged on ground floors.

(8) **Front/Back of Buildings: Service Areas.** Screening of service areas should be achieved through placement of new buildings, landscaping and pathways associated with the Mountain Lake Park. It is much preferred to design pedestrian and vehicular circulation to avoid such areas, or to shield them behind new structures, than to locate service areas adjacent to activity areas and attempt to hide them behind walls.

(9) **Visitor Arrival Experience.** The visual character of parking lots, parking garages and entry drives should be improved. For most visitors, these areas are the first features seen in the casino core, and landscaping, walkways and other improvements should be made to ensure these areas are attractive.

(a) At the time new parking and/or new buildings are planned, the intended pedestrian circulation routes from parking to likely destinations should be reviewed to ensure they are safe and attractive.

(b) New structures visible from parking areas (e.g., buildings planned in the mountain/lake corridor) should be designed to be attractive as seen from parking areas. Service areas should be screened and visitors should not have the strong sense they are seeing the undorned backside of the building.

(c) Where practical, increase planting in surface parking areas.
The following is a list of improvements needed to improve the TRPA scenic threshold rating for Unit 32 to 16 by the year 2007. The basis for this analysis is contained in the Final Environmental Impact Statement Evaluating Three Community Plans in Douglas County, Nevada (September, 1993). TRPA may approve revisions to the list for substitutions of equal or superior improvements at anytime. TRPA shall review this list and schedule at each of its five year threshold evaluations and make necessary adjustments to assure threshold attainment.

I. Sign Reduction - All signs shall become provisionally conforming by January 1, 2003. Exhibit 1 indicates major sign changes that were considered in the evaluation. Upon review of any sign project relying on the provisions of 12.8, a schedule for compliance for the entire project area shall be submitted consistent with this paragraph.

II. Scenic Improvements -

A. Phase I Improvements - The following is a list of improvements that the Douglas County Community Plan EIS indicated are required to be completed by January 1, 1997, to meet the interim scenic target score of 12.5. Exhibit 2 represents the major improvements that were considered in the evaluation.

1. Improvements Within the Right-of-Way
   a. Expand and Improve Bills/Caesars/Horizon Crosswalk
      - 100' wide
      - Landscaped median
      - Demonstration lighting, pavement, and landscaping for future Highway 50 improvements
      - Improved signals
   b. Replace/improve street lighting in Stateline
   c. Landscape median between Horizon and Caesars in the entry area
   d. Improve/relocate sidewalk fencing in Stateline
   e. Sidewalks, lighting, and landscaping in Kingsbury
   f. Underground utilities

2. Caesars
   a. Improve entry/add water feature - complete 1993
   b. Intensify planting to screen parking
   c. Replace existing fencing along entry drive - complete 1993
   d. Add planting along entry drive

3. Harrahs/Bills
   a. Simplify color scheme and building facade on Bills
   b. Improve California entrance - completed 1992
   c. Add planting in existing planters along building
   d. Intensify planting in front of garage
   e. Add continuation of rock wall
   f. Add planter boxes in front of Bills
4. Harveys
   a. Modify building facade/color
      - improve California entry to match Nevada
      - match lower tower to upper tower
   b. Add planters along building
   c. Put in landscaping at Nevada-side entry
   d. Improve Nevada-side entry - completed 1993
   e. Widen primary sidewalk in front of garage
   f. Add planting in front of garage

5. Horizon
   a. Modify building exterior according to approved plans
   b. Modify both SE and NE porte cochere
   c. Create a pedestrian plaza in SE porte cochere area
   d. Replace asphalt drive with landscaping and sidewalk - completed 1993
   e. Improve mid-building entry - completed 1993
   f. Add landscaping in front and side of garage

6. Bank
   a. Darken building
   b. Lower and darken fencing
   c. Add landscaping and parking screening

7. Lakeside
   a. Sidewalks and landscaping

8. Nugget
   a. Landscape front
   b. Reduce driveways

B. Phase II Improvements - The following is a list of improvements that the Douglas County Community Plan EIS indicated are required to be completed by January 1, 2003, to meet the scenic target score of 14.

1. Improvements Within the Right-of Way
   a. Completion of the Loop Road Improvements
      - narrowing of Highway 50 to two travel lanes in Stateline
      - major frontage landscaping including trees in former travel lanes in Stateline
      - substantial landscaped medians in Stateline
      - pedestrian plaza areas in Stateline
   b. Kingsbury intersection and Kahle intersection improvements

2. Edgewood
   a. Move fence back 20 feet, add landscaping, provide separation of road from sidewalk, match street lights to core

C. Phase III Improvements - The following is a list of improvements that the Douglas County Community Plan EIS indicated are required to be completed by January 1, 2007, to meet the scenic target score of 16. Exhibit 3 represents the major improvements that were considered in the evaluation.
1. Improvements Within the Right-of-Way
   a. Completion of the Old Highway 50 Improvements
      - completion of all sidewalks, landscaping, and lighting
      - major frontage landscaping established as per the
        simulation
      - substantial landscaped medians in Stateline
      - pedestrian plaza areas in Stateline
   b. Full median with turn lanes

2. Caesars
   - move freestanding sign 250 feet toward the state line

3. Lakeside
   a. move freestanding sign under or next to the porte
      cochere

4. Harrahs
   a. Improve Nevada side entry/reverse flow of traffic
   b. Reduce exit lanes from three to two
   c. Shift sidewalk to location in front of garage/add covered
      walkway
   d. Improve Bills California-side entry
construction of no more than one-third the amount of that square footage may be issued by each such city or county.

The legislatures find the respective square footages of commercial buildings authorized within the region during calendar year 1978 to be as follows:

1. City of South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County (combined) ............................................. 64,324
2. Placer County .................................................................................................................. 23,000
3. Carson City ................................................................................................................. 0
4. Douglas County ........................................................................................................... 57,354
5. Washoe County .......................................................................................................... 50,600

(5) No structure may be erected to house gaming under a nonrestricted license.

(6) No facility for the treatment of sewage may be constructed or enlarged except:

(A) To comply, as ordered by the appropriate State agency for the control of water pollution, with existing limitations of effluent under the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. §1251 et seq., and the applicable State law for control of water pollution;

(B) To accommodate development which is not prohibited or limited by this subdivision; or

(C) In the case of Douglas County Sewer District #1, to modify or otherwise alter sewage treatment facilities existing on the effective date of the amendments to this compact so that such facilities will be able to treat the total volume of effluent for which they were originally designed, which is 3.0 million gallons per day. Such modification or alteration is not a "project"; is not subject to the requirements of article VII; and does not require a permit from the agency. Before commencing such modification or alteration, however, the district shall submit to the agency its report identifying any significant soil erosion problems which may be caused by such modifications or alterations and the measures which the district proposes to take to mitigate or avoid such problems.

The moratorium imposed by this subdivision does not apply to work done pursuant to a right vested before the effective date of the amendments to this compact. Notwithstanding the expiration date of the moratorium imposed by this subdivision, no new highway may be built or existing highway widened to accommodate additional continuous lanes for automobiles until the regional transportation plan is revised and adopted.

The moratorium imposed by this subdivision does not apply to the construction of any parking garage which has been approved by the agency prior to May 4, 1979, whether that approval was affirmative or by default. The provisions of this paragraph are not an expression of legislative intent that any such parking garage, the approval of which is the subject of litigation which was pending on the effective date of the amendments to this compact, should or should not be constructed. The provisions of this paragraph are intended solely to permit construction of such a parking garage if a judgment sustaining the agency's approval to construct that parking garage has become final and no appeal is pending or may lawfully be taken to a higher court.

(d) Subject to the final order of any court of competent jurisdiction entered in litigation contesting the validity of an approval by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, whether that approval was affirmative or by default, if that litigation was pending on May 4, 1979, the
enumerated in subparagraphs (A) through (C), it is prohibited. If an external modification is determined to have any of the effects enumerated in subparagraph (D) or (E), it is subject to the applicable provisions of this compact. If an external modification is determined to have no such effect, it is not subject to the provisions of this compact.

(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), internal modification, remodeling, change in use or repair of a structure housing gaming under a nonrestricted license is not a project and does not require the review or approval of the agency.

(3) Internal modification, remodeling, change in use or repair of areas open to public use within a structure housing gaming under a nonrestricted license which alone or in combination with any other such modification, remodeling, change in use or repair will increase the total portion of those areas which is actually used for gaming by more than the product of the total base area, as defined below, in square feet existing on or approved before August 4, 1980, multiplied by 15 percent constitutes a project and is subject to all of the provisions of this compact relating to projects. For purposes of this paragraph and the determination required by article VII(g), base area means all of the area within a structure housing gaming under a nonrestricted license which may be open to public use, whether or not gaming is actually conducted or carried on in that area, except retail stores, convention centers and meeting rooms, administrative offices, kitchens, maintenance and storage areas, rest rooms, engineering and mechanical rooms, accounting rooms and counting rooms.

(g) In order to administer and enforce the provisions of paragraphs (d), (e) and (f), the State of Nevada, through its appropriate planning or regulatory agency, shall require the owner or licensees of a structure housing gaming under a nonrestricted license to provide:

1. Documents containing sufficient information for the Nevada agency to establish the following relative to the structure:
   (A) The location of its external walls;
   (B) Its total cubic volume;
   (C) Within its external walls, the area in square feet open or approved for public use and the area in square feet devoted to or approved for the private use of guests on May 4, 1979;
   (D) The amount of surface area of land under the structure; and
   (E) The base area as defined in paragraph (f)(3) in square feet existing on or approved before August 4, 1980.

2. An informational report whenever any internal modification, remodeling, change in use, or repair will increase the total portion of the areas open to public use which is used for gaming. The Nevada agency shall transmit this information to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

(h) Gaming conducted pursuant to a restricted gaming license is exempt from review by the agency if it is incidental to the primary use of the premises.

(i) The provisions of subdivisions (d) and (e) are intended only to limit gaming and related activities as conducted within a gaming establishment, or construction designed to permit the enlargement of such activities, and not to limit any other use of property zoned for commercial use or the accommodation of tourists, as approved by the agency.
agency and the States of California and Nevada shall recognize as a permitted and conforming use:

(1) Every structure housing gaming under a nonrestricted license which existed as a licensed gaming establishment on May 4, 1979, or whose construction was approved by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency affirmatively or deemed approved before that date. The construction or use of any structure to house gaming under a nonrestricted license not so existing or approved, or the enlargement in cubic volume of any such existing or approved structure is prohibited.

(2) Every other nonrestricted gaming establishment whose use was seasonal and whose license was issued before May 4, 1979, for the same season and for the number and type of games and slot machines on which taxes or fees were paid in the calendar year 1978.

(3) Gaming conducted pursuant to a restricted gaming license issued before May 4, 1979, to the extent permitted by that license on that date.

The area within any structure housing gaming under a nonrestricted license which may be open to public use (as distinct from that devoted to the private use of guests and exclusive of any parking area) is limited to the area existing or approved for public use on May 4, 1979. Within these limits, any external modification of the structure which requires a permit from a local government also requires approval from the agency. The agency shall not permit restaurants, convention facilities, showrooms or other public areas to be constructed elsewhere in the region outside the structure in order to replace areas existing or approved for public use on May 4, 1979.

(e) Any structure housing licensed gaming may be rebuilt or replaced to a size not to exceed the cubic volume, height and land coverage existing or approved on May 4, 1979, without the review or approval of the agency or any planning or regulatory authority of the State of Nevada whose review or approval would be required for a new structure.

(f) The following provisions apply to any internal or external modification, remodeling, change in use, or repair of a structure housing gaming under a nonrestricted license which is not prohibited by article VII(d):

(1) The agency's review of an external modification of the structure which requires a permit from a local government is limited to determining whether the external modification will do any of the following:

(A) Enlarge the cubic volume of the structure;
(B) Increase the total square footage of area open to one approved for public use on May 4, 1979;
(C) Convert an area devoted to the private use of guests to an area open to public use;
(D) Increase the public area open to public use which is used for gaming beyond the limits contained in paragraph (3); and
(E) Conflict with or be subject to the provisions of any of the agency's ordinances that are generally applicable throughout the region.

The agency shall make this determination within 60 days after the proposal is delivered to the agency in compliance with the agency's rules or regulations governing such delivery unless the applicant has agreed to an extension of this time limit. If an external modification is determined to have any of the effects...
APPENDIX D

DOUGLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY PLAN

ALLOCATION GUIDELINES

I. Procedure: Distribution of commercial floor area allocations shall be as follows:

A. Application: Periodically Douglas County shall provide appropriate notice as to the availability of commercial allocation. Applicants shall then submit applications to the reviewing authority. (Douglas County staff). The application shall include preliminary site plans, cost estimates relating to the criteria, description of work relating to the criteria, and elevations along with the evaluation form.

B. Evaluation: Based on the information submitted and the order of submittal, the reviewing authority shall review projects pursuant to the criteria in II below. Within the allocation limits, a preliminary allocation for the project shall be established for the proposed project. The preliminary allocation will expire pursuant to the time limit set forth in the applicable Community Plan.

C. Issuance of Allocation: Projects given a preliminary allocation shall be reviewed by TRPA and the local government. Pursuant to Chapter 33, the approval of the project by TRPA shall be considered issuance of the allocation.

D. Improvement Credit: Projects shall be scored based on improvements proposed as part of the project and those projects approved and completed by the applicant after July 1, 1987. Improvements that were used to obtain previous allocations do not qualify. If a project does not use the total allocation it has qualified for, then future projects within the project area may utilize the unused allocations if they are still available. Allocations related to unused credits are not reserved for or assigned to a project area not is it transferable.

E. Guideline Amendment: These guidelines may be revised by local government staff consistent with development allocation policy in the Community Plan if the Zoning Administrator, the Planning Commission, or the Commissioners approve the changes at a noticed hearing in the Tahoe area.
II. **EVALUATION:** The reviewing authority shall assign preliminary allocations based on the following criteria.

- For two years from the adoption of the Community Plan, the maximum allocation per project area is:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury</td>
<td>10,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateline</td>
<td>10,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Hill</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A preliminary allocation expires two years after it is established by reviewing authority unless renewed annually by the authority.

- The authority may proportion allocation assessments for partial achievements.

- Total allocation established may be adjusted because of unique circumstances plus or minus 10% of the score if the variance findings of Douglas County can be made and the variance is consistent with Community Plan Land Use Element.

- **Evaluation criteria**

  Criteria based on applicant providing improvement **beyond** that required by current and proposed development standards.

    
    1. Fire-prevention-(sprinklers-for-all-buildings---200-sq-f)|
    2. Electrical-(all-buildings-to-code---200-sq-ft)|
    3. Plumbing-(all-buildings-to-code---200-sq-ft)|
    4. Energy-efficiency-(all-buildings-to-code---200-sq-ft)|
    5. Structural-(all-buildings-to-code---200-sq-ft)|

- **B. Traffic/Circulation improvements **beyond** Community Plan requirements.

  1. Eliminate driveway(s) (one driveway eliminated or use of multi-use driveway - 500 sq. ft.)
  2. Community parking system (for participation in shared parking system that reduces overall parking requirement - 1000-sq-ft; 100 sq. ft. for each space reduced and credited to the project).
  3. Transit improvements (transit stop or equivalent operational contribution to Community Plan shuttle system = 600 sq. ft. each)

- **C. Overall community planning improvements**

  1. Correct off-site problems through transfer/retirement. The match per transferred floor area is as follows:
    
    - 1 sq. ft. retired = 1 sq. ft. allocation; or
    - 1 sq. ft. retired in SEZ or retired nonconforming use = 2 sq. ft. allocation
PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification: RECREATION
Management Strategy: MITIGATION
Special Designation: TDR RECEIVING AREA FOR:

1. Existing Development (Special Area 1 & 2 Only)
2. Multi-Residential Units (Special Area 1 Only)

SCENIC RESTORATION AREA
MULTI-RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM
(Special Area 1 Only)
PREFERRED AFFORDABLE HOUSING AREA
(Special Area 1 Only)

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This area includes the Edgewood Golf course and parts of the Park Cattle Company ranch area at south Stateline. The boundaries of this area are depicted on TRPA map H-16.

Existing Uses: The area contains the Edgewood Golf Course, the Park Cattle Company ranch, the 4-H camp area, and some miscellaneous private uses.

Existing Environment: Approximately 60 percent of the area is classified SEZ, and 40 percent is low hazard. The shorezone is tolerance districts 1 and 7. The land coverage and disturbance are low. Habitats for Rorippa subumbellata are found on the beach.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This entire area should provide a range of visitor and local serving outdoor-oriented recreation opportunities, integrated with the existing and planned improvements within the casino core. In addition special areas should provide accommodations for tourists and residents.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Concerns associated with the golf course include fertilizer application in close proximity to surface water.

2. Edgewood Creek, which has been diverted, ponded, placed in culverts and generally rerouted through the golf course, receives major sediment loads and may receive major nutrient loads. The ponds function as siltation basins and have resulted in reduced sediment loads and have resulted in reduced sediment loads to Lake Tahoe.

3. The golf course provides a useful recreational service for visitors and the community.
4. Scenic Roadway Unit 32 and Scenic Shoreline Unit 30 are within this Plan Area. The presentation of the views in the area are critical to attaining thresholds.

5. Caesars Tahoe open space (Parcel 1) located in this Plan Area and recorded in Book 1078, Page 634, of the Official Records of Douglas County, should continue to be maintained as open space. Any and all activities taking place on the Caesars Tahoe property should be viewed in light of said open space.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. A fertilizer management program should be initiated at the golf course and the course redesigned to provide for natural buffers of vegetation along the creek and pond areas, wherever possible.

2. Protect the Rorippa populations in this beach area adjoining the mobile home park.

3. A master plan should be prepared for the 4-H Camp area to outline the long-term improvements, management, and uses of the entire facility.

4. New or additional commercial development in the general area shall be limited to parcels with commercial development on the effective date of this plan.

5. The Edgewood Water Company and its accessory uses shall be considered an allowed use (A) pursuant to Chapter 18 and the permissible uses section of this Plan Area Statement.

6. The restaurant and bar in the Edgewood Golf Course club house shall be considered an allowed use (A) pursuant to Chapter 18 and the Permissible Uses section in this Plan Area Statement.

7. In Special Area #1 (Residential Area), multi-residential and recreational uses are encouraged by the permissible use list. Additional residential development shall be limited to the equivalent of 155 residential units. Private and public assembly shall be limited to outdoor performing arts facilities. The boundary for this area is recorded in Book page of the official records of Douglas County.

Additional residential development in Special Area #1 (beyond that originally permitted in PAS 80), shall be conditioned on the developer making an irrevocable commitment to provide or cause to be provided 75 units of affordable housing, a sidewalk or trail connecting new uses in Special Area #1 with the casino core, and a recreation trail connecting to Van Sickle State Park/Stateline area.

Prior to construction of the affordable housing, TRPA and affected local governments will facilitate the acquisition of required allocations/transfers and other approvals necessary for the market rate housing. It is understood that these allocations/transfers and associated approvals must be provided in a timely and cost effective manner to permit development of the affordable housing.

8. In Special Area #2 (Tourist Area) tourist accommodations and recreation uses are encouraged. Additional tourist accommodation uses shall not exceed the equivalent of 250 tourist accommodation units. The boundary for this area is recorded in Book page of the official records of Douglas County.

Hotel/conference center development in Special Area #2 of the Edgewood plan area (PAS 070A) will be conditioned on the developer making an irrevocable commitment to improve access, capacity, and/or the range and quality of lakefront experiences available to the public in the California/Nevada Stateline area. These improvements may be undertaken by the Park Castle Company alone or be part of the broader public-private effort to improve lake access in the Stateline/South Lake Tahoe area. Provision of additional lake access shall focus on access for Stateline overnight visitors. In addition, to lake access provided for the subject hotel/conference center, such access shall include the beach.
improvement and access policies presented in the Stateline Community Plan.
As a result of the actions by the developer, additional lakefront opportunities in the California/
Nevada target area will be made available sufficient to accommodate up to a total capacity of 250
people at one time. The capacity requirement assumes the construction of a 250 unit hotel and shall
be adjusted in proportion to the actual units approved. New lakefront activities provided will include
some or all of the categories listed below, provided that no more than half the goal may be met by
areas of passive lakefront recreation.

(i) Area(s) of Passive Lakefront recreation

(ii) New and/or improved access to existing Active Recreation lakefront parks;

(iii) Assistance in establishment of a Stateline/South Lake Tahoe Regional Developed Recreation
      lakefront area.

If beach access improvements similar to those above are made within the target area by another
entity or it is determined to be infeasible by TRPA, the developer can fulfill the above condition by
expending and/or depositing with TRPA an amount not to exceed two percent (2%) or $400,000,
adjusted for inflation (whichever is smaller) of the construction cost of the hotel/conference center
to provide other forms of public recreation benefits. Examples of environmental or recreation
improvements include trail systems, specific facilities such as an amphitheater, or restoration of dis-
turbed land or stream zones. (If improvements have been made by the developer meeting some por-
tion of the 250 people at one time condition, the alternative expenditure discussed in this paragraph
shall be reduced accordingly. Construction costs include costs directly associated with building the
hotel/conference center, but exclude costs such as land, acquisition of development rights, project
approvals and design).

10. This plan area is a recreation area which is in the influence area of the Stateline Community Plan.
    All projects shall be subject to the policies and standards of this plan area and, where applicable,
    shall be consistent with the planning direction provided in Chapter I of the Stateline Community
    Plan.

11. Commercial uses in S.A. #1 may only be permitted in conjunction with public recreation uses per-
    missible in the S.A.

12. Uses and structures permitted in the meadow/pasture area of S.A. #3 shall not degrade the scenic
    character of the area.

PERMISSIBLE USES: Pursuant to Chapter 18 PERMISSIBLE USES and if applicable, Chapter 51 PERMIS-
SIBLE USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES IN THE SHOREZONE AND LAKEZONE, the following pri-
mary uses may be permitted within all or a portion of the Plan Area. The list indicates if the use is allowed (A) or must
be considered under the provisions for a special use (S). Existing uses not listed shall be considered nonconforming
uses within this Plan Area. The establishment of new uses not listed shall be prohibited within this Plan Area.

General List: Except as noted for Special Area #1 and #2, the following list of permissible uses is applicable
throughout the Plan Area.

Residential Single family dwelling (S).

Commercial Eating and drinking places (S).

Public Service Pipelines and power transmission (S), local public health and safety
    facilities (S), public utility centers (S), transmission and receiving
    facilities (S), transportation routes (S), transit stations and terminals
Recreation

Beach recreation (A), marinas (S), cross country skiing courses (S), day use areas (A), participant sports facilities (S), outdoor recreation concessions (A), group facilities (S) snowmobile courses (S), and golf courses (A).

Resource Management

Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), selection cut (S), special cut (S), thinning (A), nonstructural fish habitat management (A), nonstructural wildlife habitat management (A), structural fish habitat management (S), structural wildlife habitat management (S), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment (S), insect and disease suppression (A), prescribed fire management (A), sensitive plant management (A), uncommon plant community management (A), erosion control (A), runoff control (A), and SEZ restoration (A).

Special Area #1 (Residential Area): The following list of permissible uses is applicable in Special Area #1.

Residential

Employee housing (A), multiple family dwelling (A), multiple-person dwelling (A), and single family dwelling (A).

Commercial

Vehicle storage and parking (S), and Eating and drinking places (S) and privately owned assembly and entertainment (S).

Public Service

A. General

Cemeteries (S), cultural facilities (S), day care centers-pre-schools (A), local post office (S), and local public health and safety facilities (S), and public utility centers (S).

B. Linear Public Facilities

 Pipelines and power transmission (S), publicly owned assembly and entertainment (S), transit stations and terminals (S), transportation routes (S), and transmission and receiving facilities (S).

Recreation

Cross country ski courses (A), day use areas (A), developed campgrounds (S), golf courses (S), group facilities (S), outdoor recreation concessions (S), participant sports facilities (S), recreational vehicle parks (S), riding and hiking trails (A), rural sports (S), snowmobile courses (S), and visitor information centers (S).

Resource Management

Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), selection cut (S), special cut (S), thinning (A), nonstructural fish habitat management (A), nonstructural wildlife habitat management (A), structural fish habitat management (S), structural wildlife habitat management (S), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment (S), insect and disease suppression (A), prescribed fire management (A), sensitive plant management (A), uncommon plant community management (A), erosion control (A), runoff control (A), and SEZ restoration (A), farm ranch accessory structures (A), and range pasture management (A).
Special Area #2 (Tourist Area): The following list of permissible uses is applicable throughout Special Area 2.

Residential

Employee housing Single family housing (S), and multiple-family dwellings (S).

Tourist Accommodations

Bed and breakfast facilities (A), hotel, motel, and other transient dwelling units (A), timesharing (residential design) (S), and time sharing (hotel/motel design) (S).

Commercial

A. Retail
   Eating and drinking places (A) (S), food and beverage retail sales (A), and general merchandise stores (S).

B. Entertainment
   Amusements and recreation services (S), and privately owned assembly and entertainment (S).

C. Services
   School—pre-schools (S).

Public Service

A. General
   Cultural facilities (S), day care centers (S), local assembly and entertainment (S), and local public health and safety facilities (S), and publicly owned assembly and entertainment (S).

B. Linear Public Facilities
   Pipelines and power transmission (S), transit stations and terminals (S), and transportation routes (S).

Recreation

Day use areas (A), recreation centers (S), participant sports facilities (S), and sport assembly (S), beach recreation (A), boat launching facilities (A), cross country skiing courses (A) (S), developed campground (S), golf courses (A), group facilities (A) (S), outdoor recreation concessions (A), recreational vehicle park (S), and riding and hiking trails (A), and visitor information center (S).

Resource Management

Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), selection cut (S), special cut (S), thinning (A), nonstructural fish habitat management (A), nonstructural wildlife habitat management (A), structural fish habitat management (S), structural wildlife habitat management (S), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment (S), insect and disease suppression (A), prescribed fire management (A), sensitive plant management (A), uncommon plant community management (A), erosion control (A), runoff control (A), and SEZ restoration (A).

Special Area #3 (Ranch Area): The following list of permissible uses is applicable throughout Special Area 3.

Residential

Domestic animal raising (S) and single family dwelling (S).
Public Service

Cemeteries (S), pipelines and power transmission lines (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), and local public health and safety facilities (S).

Recreation

Cross country skiing courses (S), day use area (S), riding and hiking trails (A), snowmobile courses (S).

Resource Management

Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), timber stand improvement (A), tree farms (A), early successional stage vegetation management (A), nonstructural fish habitat management (A), nonstructural wildlife habitat management (A), structural fish habitat management (A), structural wildlife habitat management (A), farm/ranch accessory structures (A), grazing (A), range pasture management (A), range improvement (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment (A), insect and disease suppression (A), prescribed fire management (A), sensitive plant management (A), uncommon plant community management (A), erosion control (A), runoff control (A), and SEZ restoration (A).

Shorezone: Within the specified shorezone tolerance district, the following primary uses may be permitted in the backshore, nearshore, and foreshore. Accessory structures shall be regulated pursuant to the regulations applicable to the primary use upon which they are dependent in accordance with Chapter 18. The following structures may be permitted in the shorezone as an allowed (A) or Special (S) use only if they are accessory to an exiting, allowed use located on the same or adjoining littoral parcel.

Tolerance District 1

Primary Uses

Safety and navigation facilities (A), beach recreation (S), and salvage operations (A).

Accessory Structures

Buoys (A), piers (A), fences (S), boat ramps (A), structures-shoreline protective structures (S), floating docks and platforms (A), and water intake lines (A).

Tolerance District 7

Primary Uses

Water oriented outdoor recreation concessions (A), beach recreation (A), boat launching facilities (S), tour boat operations (A), safety and navigation facilities (A), salvage operation (A), marinas (S), and water intake lines (A).

Accessory Structures

Buoys (A), piers (A), fences (S), boat ramps (A), shoreline protective structures (S), floating docks and platforms (A), and water intake lines (A).

MAXIMUM DENSITIES: Pursuant to Chapter 21 DENSITY, the following list establishes the maximum allowable densities that may be permitted for any parcel located within the Plan Area. The actual development permitted may be further limited by transfer of development rights limitations, residential density incentive program, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.
USE

Residential

Summer Home
Single Family Dwelling
Multiple Family Dwellings
Multiple Person Dwellings
Employee Housing
Tourist Accommodations
Bed and Breakfast Facilities
Hotel, Motel and other Transient Units
with less than 10% of units with kitchens
with 10% or more units with kitchens
Timeshare
Recreation
Recreation Vehicle Parks
Developed Campgrounds
Group Facilities

MAXIMUM DENSITY

1 unit per parcel
15 units per acre
25 people per acre
As per above limitations
10 units per acre
40 units per acre
15 units per acre
As per the limitations set forth in this table
10 sites per acre
8 sites per acre
25 persons per acre

RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS: Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of residential bonus units which may be permitted for this Plan Area is 0 155 units.

MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL: The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area is 55.60 CNEL and 55 CNEL for the shorezone. The maximum community noise equivalent level for the Highway 50 corridor is 65 CNEL.

ADDITIONAL DEVELOPED OUTDOOR RECREATION: The following are the targets and limits for additional developed outdoor recreation facilities specified in Chapter 13 to be located within this Plan Area. Specific projects and their timing are addressed in the TRPA Five-Year Recreation Program pursuant to Chapter 33 Allocation of Development. The following additional capacities allowed are measured in persons at one time.

SUMMER DAY USES 0 PAOT WINTER DAY USES 0 PAOT OVERNIGHT USES 0 PAOT

IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS: The capital improvement and other improvement programs required by the Regional Goals and Policies Plan for this area shall be implemented. The improvements include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Improvements required by Volume III of the Surface Water Quality Management Plan as shown on Figure VIII-1 through 18 of Volume I of the JOR Water Quality Plan.
2. The highway and transit improvements indicated in the Transportation Element of the Regional Goals and Policies Plan.
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A) Framework of Regional Plan................................... I - 1

B) Plan Area Statement Relationship to Other Documents.. I - 4

C) Plan Area Maps..................................................... I - 5

D) Plan Area Amendments........................................... I - 5

E) Existing Uses...................................................... I - 5

II PLAN AREA FORMAT AND DESCRIPTION........................ II - 1

Example................................................................. II - 2

Legend to Plan Area Statement Sections........................ II - 8
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001A -- TAHOE CITY
001B -- TAHOE CITY INDUSTRIAL
002 -- FAIRWAY TRACT
003 -- LOWER TRUCKEE
004 -- BURTON CREEK
005 -- ROCKY RIDGE
006 -- FISH HATCHERY
007 -- LAKE FOREST GLEN
008 -- LAKE FOREST
009A -- LAKE FOREST COMMERCIAL
009B -- DOLLAR HILL
010 -- DOLLAR POINT
011 -- HIGHLANDS
012 -- NORTH TAHOE HIGH SCHOOL
013 -- WATSON CREEK
014 -- CEDAR FLAT
015 -- NORTH STAR
016A -- CARNELIAN WOODS
016B -- CARNELIAN BAY SUBDIVISION
017 -- CARNELIAN BAY
018 -- FLICK POINT/AGATE BAY
019 -- MARTIS PEAK
III PLAN AREA STATEMENTS (continued)

020 -- KINGSWOOD WEST
021 -- TAHOE ESTATES
022 -- TAHOE VISTA COMMERCIAL
023 -- TAHOE VISTA SUBDIVISION
024A-- NORTH TAHOE RECREATION AREA
024B-- SNOW CREEK
025 -- KINGSWOOD EAST
026 -- KINGS BEACH INDUSTRIAL
027 -- WOODVISTA
028 -- KINGS BEACH RESIDENTIAL
029 -- KINGS BEACH COMMERCIAL
030 -- MOUNT ROSE
031 -- BROCKWAY
032 -- NORTH STATELINE CASINO CORE
033 -- STATELINE POINT
034 -- CRYSTAL BAY
035 -- CRYSTAL BAY CONDOMINIUMS
036 -- INCLINE VILLAGE #4/PONDEROSA
037 -- LAKEVIEW
038 -- WOOD CREEK
039 -- INCLINE VILLAGE #2
040 -- INCLINE VILLAGE #1
041 -- INCLINE VILLAGE #3
042 -- INCLINE VILLAGE #5
043 -- CHATEAU/COUNTRY CLUB
044 -- FAIRWAY
045 -- INCLINE VILLAGE COMMERCIAL
046 -- INCLINE VILLAGE RESIDENTIAL
047 -- TUNNEL CREEK
048 -- INCLINE VILLAGE TOURIST
049 -- MILL CREEK
050 -- MT. SHADOWS
051 -- TYROLIAN VILLAGE
052 -- INCLINE SKI
053 -- INCLINE LAKE
054 -- INCLINE VILLAGE INDUSTRIAL
055 -- EAST SHORE
056 -- MARLETTE LAKE
057 -- SPOONER LAKE
058 -- GLENBROOK
059 -- SHAKESPEARE POINT
060 -- GENOA PEAK
061 -- LOGAN CREEK
062 -- CAVE ROCK
063 -- LINCOLN
064 -- LAKERIDGE
065 -- SKYLAND
066 -- ZEPHYR COVE
067 -- MARLA BAY/ZEPHYR HEIGHTS
068 -- ROUND MOUND
069 -- ELKS POINT
070A-- EDGECWOOD
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070B -- RABE
071 -- ROUNDHILL-COMMERCIAL Replaced by the Round Hill Community Plan
072 -- ROUND HILL/TAHOE DEMPSEY
073 -- LAKE VILLAGE
074 -- ROUND HILL RESIDENTIAL
075 -- DOUGLAS COUNTY SEWER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
076 -- KINGSBURY-COMMERCIAL Replaced by the Kingsbury Community Plan
077 -- OLIVER PARK
078 -- MIDDLE KINGSBURY
079 -- CHIMNEY ROCK
080 -- KINGSBURY DRAINAGE
081 -- KINGSBURY VILLAGE
082 -- UPPER KINGSBURY
083 -- KINGSBURY HEIGHTS
084 -- PALISADES
085 -- LAKEVIEW HEIGHTS
086 -- HEAVENLY VALLEY NEVADA
087 -- HEAVENLY VALLEY CALIFORNIA
088 -- TAHOE VILLAGE
089A-- NEVADA-SOUTH-STATELINE-RESORT-AREA Replaced by the Stateline Community Plan
089B-- CALIFORNIA SOUTH STATELINE RESORT AREA
090 -- TAHOE MEADOWS
091 -- SKI RUN
092 -- PIONEER/SKI RUN
093 -- BIJOU
094 -- GLENWOOD
095 -- TROUT/COLD CREEK
096 -- PIONEER VILLAGE
097 -- BIJOU PINES
098 -- BIJOU/AL TAHOE
099 -- AL TAHOE
100 -- TRUCKEE MARSH
101 -- BIJOU MEADOW
102 -- TAHOE KEYS
103 -- SIERRA TRACT-COMMERCIAL
104 -- HIGHLAND WOODS
105 -- SIERRA TRACT
106 -- MONTGOMERY ESTATES
107 -- BLACK BART
108 -- WINNEMUCCA
109 -- TAHOE VALLEY CAMPGROUND
110 -- SOUTH "Y"
111 -- TAHOE ISLAND
112 -- GARDNER MOUNTAIN
113 -- INDUSTRIAL TRACT
114 -- BONANZA
115 -- GOLDEN BEAR
116 -- AIRPORT
117 -- TAHOE PARADISE (T.P.) WASHOAN
118 -- TWIN PEAKS
119 -- COUNTRY CLUB MEADOW
120 -- TAHOE PARADISE (T.P.) MEADOWVALE
PLAN AREA STATEMENT 071
ROUND HILL COMMERCIAL
HAS BEEN REPLACED BY THE
ROUND HILL COMMUNITY PLAN

(SEE DOUGLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY PLANS)
PLAN AREA STATEMENT 076
KINGSBURY COMMERCIAL
HAS BEEN REPLACED BY THE
KINGSBURY COMMUNITY PLAN

(SEE DOUGLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY PLANS)
PLAN AREA STATEMENT 089A
NEVADA SOUTH STATELINE RESORT AREA
HAS BEEN REPLACED BY THE
STATELINE COMMUNITY PLAN

(SEE DOUGLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY PLANS)
October 4, 1993

To: Gordon Barrett, Senior Planner

From: Joe Pepi, Senior Planner

Subject: Land Capability Verification for the Douglas County Community Plan Areas

The verification of the land capability classes and the soil map units for the area included in the Douglas County Community Plan Areas was begun in 1987. Mr. Bruce Kenney completed mapping on an area extending from the Loop Road to the Douglas County Administrative Building. A larger area of mapping, including Kahle Drive, the Edgewood Golf Course, the Kingsbury Grade Commercial area, and Round Hill, was done in the summer of 1989. This work was done using standard soil survey mapping procedures. The 1989 field work was done by Mr. Joe Pepi and Mr. Russel Almaraz, Certified Professional Soil Scientists and Mr. John Cobourn, Hydrologist. Soils were examined at close intervals using soil pits dug with shovels and a hand auger. The soils at the pit sites were examined with enough detail to determine the soil classification and the appropriate soil series. Slope measurements were also taken at these sites using a clinometer, to determine the appropriate soil map unit of that series (which includes the slope range) in which the soil found at that pit should be placed. The field notes on soil characteristics and slope were recorded on the field maps which had a scale of 1 inch equal 400 feet.

To assist in the identification of soil series and map units from which the land capability classes were determined and the boundaries between them, aerial photographs of several types were utilized. These included U-2 infrared photos developed by the U.S. Forest Service and enlarged to a scale of 1 inch equal 400 feet, and color photos with a scale of 1 inch equal 2000 feet.

The identification of areas classified as stream environment zone (SEZ) and land capability class 1b, was done jointly by Mr. Pepi, Mr. Almaraz and Mr. Cobourn. Working together, they determined the presence of any soil, vegetative, or hydrologic SEZ indicators and the boundaries between the SEZs and the other land capability classes.

The land capability class and soil map unit delineations were depicted on a copy of the TRPA 1 inch equal 400 foot base map series for the Douglas County area. The mapping is an accurate representation of soils and land capability within the Douglas County Community Plan Area.

Attachment D

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
CHAPTER 30
DESIGN STANDARDS

Chapter Contents

30.0 Purpose
30.1 Applicability
30.2 Design Review Guidelines
30.3 Scenic Quality Improvement Program
30.4 Substitution Of Standards And Guidelines
30.5 Site Design Standards
30.6 Building Design Standards
30.7 Landscaping Standards
30.8 Exterior Lighting Standards
30.9 Water Conservation Standards
30.10 Standards For Combustion Appliances
30.11 Outdoor Advertising
30.13 Establishment of Scenic Highway Corridors

30.0 Purpose: The purpose of this chapter is to ensure that projects are designed and constructed consistent with the Community Design Subelement of the Land Use Element and related elements of the Goals and Policies.

30.1 Applicability: All projects shall comply with the standards set forth in this chapter, except the Douglas County Design Standards and Guidelines shall apply to the Round Hill, Kingsbury, and Stateline Community Plans. In addition, exempt activities, as defined in Chapter 4, shall comply with sections 30.9 and 30.10. Appropriate provisions of the Design Review Guidelines and Scenic Quality Improvement Program may be considered as conditions of project approval.

30.2 Design Review Guidelines: Design and site planning methods and techniques shall be set forth in a handbook called Design Review Guidelines.

30.3 Scenic Quality Improvement Program: Additional design guidelines applicable to specific areas shall be set forth in a document called the Scenic Quality Improvement Program. Provisions of that program shall be required by TRPA, as appropriate, as conditions of project approval.
CHAPTER 26

SIGNS

Chapter Contents

26.0 Purpose
26.1 Applicability
26.2 Sign Package Review
26.3 List of Exempt Activities
26.4 List of Qualified Exempt Activities
26.5 Substitution of Standards
26.6 General Sign Standards
26.7 Signs in Conservation Plan Areas
26.8 Signs in Recreation Plan Areas
26.9 Signs in Residential Plan Areas
26.10 Signs in Commercial/Public Service Plan Areas
26.11 Signs in Tourist Plan Areas
26.12 Gasoline Price Signs
26.13 Temporary Signs
26.14 Existing Signs

26.0 Purpose: The purpose of this chapter is to promote and protect the public health, welfare, and safety of the general public by implementing regional outdoor advertising regulations pursuant to Article VI of the Compact, to protect property values, create a more attractive economic and business climate, enhance the aesthetic appearance of the physical community, preserve the scenic and natural beauty and provide an enjoyable and pleasing community in accordance with Community Design Subelement of the Land Use Element and related elements of the Goals and Policies. It is further intended to reduce signs or advertising distractions and obstructions that may contribute to traffic accidents.

26.1 Applicability: All signs shall comply with the applicable standards set forth in this Chapter, except the Douglas County Design Standards and Guidelines still apply to Round Hill, Kingsbury, and Stateline Community Plans. Except as exempted in Section 26.3, installation, modification or replacement of signs requires review and approval as a project in accordance with this Chapter and other applicable provisions of the Code. In addition, sign projects also may have imposed, as conditions of approval, appropriate provisions of the Design Review Guidelines and the Scenic Quality Improvement Program.
CHAPTER 24

DRIVEWAY AND PARKING STANDARDS

Chapter Contents

24.0 Purpose
24.1 Applicability
24.2 Driveways
24.3 Parking (Reserved)

24.0 Purpose: This chapter sets forth minimum standards for driveways and parking facilities to minimize interference with traffic flow on the street and highway system of the Tahoe Region.

24.1 Applicability: This chapter is applicable to all development that requires or uses vehicular access or parking, except the Douglas County Design Standards and Guidelines shall apply to the Round Hill, Kingsbury, and Stateline Community Plans.

24.2 Driveways: To ensure organized and well-designed ingress and egress of vehicles from driveways, TRPA shall review the design of driveways according to the following standards and procedures:

24.2.A Driveway Defined: A driveway is a clearly identifiable path of vehicular access from the parking area of a parcel to the public right-of-way or other access road. A driveway may be either one-way or two-way.

24.2.B Compliance Program: The standards set forth in Subsections 24.2.C through 24.2.F, inclusive, shall be conditions of approval for projects with driveways, and for projects for which TRPA finds that the driveways are not in compliance with the standards set forth in Subsections 24.2.C through 24.2.F, inclusive, and are causing significant adverse impacts on traffic, transportation, air quality, water quality, or safety. If TRPA finds that driveways associated with existing development are causing such impacts, TRPA may implement corrective measures pursuant to Chapter 9.
PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification: RESIDENTIAL
Management Strategy: MITIGATION
Special Designation: SCENIC RESTORATION AREA
TDR RECEIVING AREA FOR:
1. Multi-Residential Units
2. Existing Development
PREFERRED AFFORDABLE HOUSING AREA

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This is the undeveloped area between Round Hill and Lake Village on the east side of Highway 50 and is located on TRPA map H-15.

Existing Uses: The area is undeveloped and is half owned by the Round Hill Improvement District and half owned by Dillingham Corporation. The area is five percent built out.

Existing Environment: The land capability for this area is indicated as 66 percent high hazard; however, land capability challenges indicate there are substantially more low and moderate hazard lands than indicated. The land coverage and disturbance are less than five percent.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should be a receiving area for transfer of residential development.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. Any bypass improvements must be in conformance with an approved bypass plan.
2. Senior citizen housing should be encouraged in this area.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. This is a suitable area to increase the supply of low/moderate income housing.
2. Water rights have been an issue with past development proposals in this area.
3. A proposed bypass may be located in this area according to the Transportation Element.
4. Scenic Roadway Unit 31 is within this Plan Area.

PERMISSIBLE USES: Pursuant to Chapter 18 PERMISSIBLE USES and if applicable, Chapter 51 PERMISSIBLE USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES IN THE SHOREZONE AND LAKEZONE, the following primary uses may be permitted within all or a portion of the Plan Area. The list indicates if the use is allowed (A) or must
be considered under the provisions for a special use (S). Existing uses not listed shall be considered nonconforming uses within this Plan Area. The establishment of new uses not listed shall be prohibited within this Plan Area.

**General List:** The following list of permissible uses is applicable throughout the Plan Area (except as noted in a special areas #1, #2 and #3).

- **Residential**
  - Single family dwelling (A), multiple family dwellings (S), and employee housing (S).

- **Tourist Accommodation**
  - Timeshare (residential design) (S)

- **Public Service**
  - Local public health and safety facilities (S), transit stations and terminals (S), pipelines and power transmission (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), public utility centers (S), churches (S), and local post offices (S).

- **Recreation**
  - Participant sports facilities (S), day use areas (A), riding and hiking trails (A), and cross country skiing course (S).

- **Resource Management**
  - Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), early successional stage vegetation management (A), timber stand improvement (S), structural and nonstructural fish/wildlife habitat management (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment management (A), insect and disease suppression (A), sensitive and uncommon plant management (A), erosion control (A), SEZ restoration (A), and runoff control (A).

**MAXIMUM DENSITIES:** Pursuant to Chapter 21 DENSITY, the following list establishes the maximum allowable densities that may be permitted for any parcel located within the Plan Area. The actual development permitted may be further limited by transfer of development rights limitations, residential density incentive program, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Dwellings</td>
<td>8 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeshare (residential design)</td>
<td>8 units per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS:** Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of residential bonus units which may be permitted for this Plan Area is 430 0 units.

**MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL:** The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area is 50 CNEL. The maximum community noise equivalent level for the Highway 50 corridor is 65 CNEL.

**ADDITIONAL DEVELOPED OUTDOOR RECREATION:** The following are the targets and limits for additional developed outdoor recreation facilities specified in Chapter 13 to be located within this Plan Area. Specific projects and their timing are addressed in the TRPA Five-Year Recreation Program pursuant to Chapter 33 Allo-
cation of Development. The following additional capacities allowed are measured in persons at one time.

**SUMMER DAY USES 0 PAOT  WINTER DAY USES 0 PAOT  OVERNIGHT USES 0 PAOT**

**IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS:** The capital improvement and other improvement programs required by the Regional Goals and Policies Plan for this area shall be implemented. The improvements include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Improvements required by the *Surface Water Management Plan* as shown on Figure VIII-1 through 48 of Volume IV of the 208 Water Quality Plan.

2. The highway and transit improvements indicated in the Transportation Element of the Regional Goals and Policies Plan.

3. Stream zone restoration as indicated in the *Stream Environment Zone Restoration Program.* (To be completed) Volume III of the Water Quality Plan.
074 - ROUND HILL RESIDENTIAL

PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification: RESIDENTIAL
Management Strategy: MITIGATION
Special Designation: TDR RECEIVING AREA FOR:

1. Existing Developments
2. Multi-Residential Units

MULTI-RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This is the residential area to the north of the Round Hill commercial area and is located on TRPA map H-15.

Existing Uses: This area is a mixture of low-density residential, apartments and condominiums. The area is 85 percent built out.

Existing Environment: This area is 85 percent high hazard with the rest moderate or SEZ. The land coverage is 20 percent plus an additional 20 percent disturbed.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should continue to be residential, maintaining the existing character of the neighborhood.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Some Round Hill General Improvement District property is in this Plan Area.

SPECIAL POLICIES: No special policies.

PERMISSIBLE USES: Pursuant to Chapter 18 PERMISSIBLE USES and if applicable, Chapter 51 PERMISSIBLE USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES IN THE SHOREZONE AND LAKEZONE, the following primary uses may be permitted within all or a portion of the Plan Area. The list indicates if the use is allowed (A) or must be considered under the provisions for a special use (S). Existing uses not listed shall be considered nonconforming uses within this Plan Area. The establishment of new uses not listed shall be prohibited within this Plan Area.

General List: The following list of permissible uses is applicable throughout the Plan Area.

Residential Single family dwelling (A), multiple family dwellings (S).
Public Service Local public health and safety facilities (S), transit stations and terminals (S), pipelines and power transmission (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), public utility centers (S), churches (S), and day care centers/pre-school (S).
Recreation Participant sports facilities (S), day use areas (A), riding and hiking trails (A).
Resource Management

Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), thinning (A), early successional stage vegetation management (A), structural and nonstructural fish/wildlife habitat management (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment management (A), insect and disease suppression (A), sensitive and uncommon plant management (A), erosion control (A), SEZ restoration (A), and run-off control (A).

**MAXIMUM DENSITIES:** Pursuant to Chapter 21 DENSITY, the following list establishes the maximum allowable densities that may be permitted for any parcel located within the Plan Area. The actual development permitted may be further limited by transfer of development rights limitations, residential density incentive program, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.

**USE**

Residential

Single Family Dwelling 1 unit per parcel

Multiple Family Dwellings 10 units per acre

**RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS:** Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of residential bonus units which may be permitted for this Plan Area is 20 units.

**MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL:** The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area is 50 CNEL. The maximum community noise equivalent level for the Highway 39 corridor is 65 CNEL.

**ADDITIONAL DEVELOPED OUTDOOR RECREATION:** The following are the targets and limits for additional developed outdoor recreation facilities specified in Chapter 13 to be located within this Plan Area. Specific projects and their timing are addressed in the TRPA Five-Year Recreation Program pursuant to Chapter 33 Allocation of Development. The following additional capacities allowed are measured in persons at one time.

**SUMMER DAY USES 0 PAOT**  **WINTER DAY USES 0 PAOT**  **OVERNIGHT USES 0 PAOT**

**IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS:** The capital improvement and other improvement programs required by the Regional Goals and Policies Plan for this area shall be implemented. The improvements include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Improvements required by the Surface Water Management Plan as shown on Figure VIII-1 through 18 of Volume IV of the 208 Water Quality Plan.

2. The highway and transit improvements indicated in the Transportation Element of the Regional Goals and Policies Plan.

3. Stream zone restoration as indicated in the Stream Environment Zone Restoration Program. (To be completed) Volume III of the Water Quality Plan.
077 - OLIVER PARK

PLAN DESIGNATION:
Land Use Classification: RESIDENTIAL
Management Strategy: REDIRECTION
Special Designation: TDR RECEIVING AREA FOR:
1. Multi-Residential Units

DESCRIPTION:
Location: This area is located along Kahle Drive just west of Highway 50 and is depicted on TRPA map H-16.

Existing Uses: The area is a mixture of lower income residential uses which include a large trailer court, large apartment complex, and numerous other residential units. The area is 95 percent built out.

Existing Environment: This area is classified as SEZ. The land coverage is 50 percent and the disturbance is 35 percent.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should continue to serve as a residential area subject to a rehabilitation program.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:
1. The Oliver Park Subdivision portion of the SEZ has been substantially modified.
2. The area contains identified scenic problems associated with Scenic Shorezone Unit 30 and Roadway unit 31.
3. The future of four parcels behind Lakeside Inn that are owned by Douglas County is unresolved.
4. The area contains parking and transit access problems.
5. The lower trailer park area has been identified for possible SEZ restoration.

SPECIAL POLICIES:
1. Any new development should conform to a rehabilitation plan that provides for scenic and SEZ restoration.
2. The four parcels owned by Douglas County may be sold to pay for substantial improvements in this planning area or traded for restoration projects in the watershed.
3. A scenic restoration plan for this area shall be required. This is not on a roadway unit identified by scenic thresholds for mandatory attainment but is in the watershed of a Roadway Unit 31 and is identified as an area of concern.
PERMISSIBLE USES: Pursuant to Chapter 18 PERMISSIBLE USES and if applicable, Chapter 51 PERMISSIBLE USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES IN THE SHOREZONE AND LAKEZONE, the following primary uses may be permitted within all or a portion of the Plan Area. The list indicates if the use is allowed (A) or must be considered under the provisions for a special use (S). Existing uses not listed shall be considered nonconforming uses within this Plan Area. The establishment of new uses not listed shall be prohibited within this Plan Area.

**General List:** The following list of permissible uses is applicable throughout the Plan Area.

**Residential**
- Single family dwelling (A), multiple family dwellings (A), multi-person dwellings (S) employee housing (S), and mobile home dwellings (S).

**Public Service**
- Local public health and safety facilities (S), transit stations and terminals (S), pipelines and power transmission (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), public utility centers (S), and day care centers/pre-school (S).

**Recreation**
- Participant sports facilities (S), day use areas (A), riding and hiking trails (A).

**Resource Management**
- Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), early successional stage vegetation management (A), structural and nonstructural fish/wildlife habitat management (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment management (A), insect and disease suppression (A), sensitive and uncommon plant management (A), erosion control (A), SEZ restoration (A), and runoff control (A).

**MAXIMUM DENSITIES:** Pursuant to Chapter 21 DENSTITY, the following list establishes the maximum allowable densities that may be permitted for any parcel located within the Plan Area. The actual development permitted may be further limited by transfer of development rights limitations, residential density incentive program, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Dwellings</td>
<td>8 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-person Dwellings</td>
<td>25 persons per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Dwellings</td>
<td>15 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Housing</td>
<td>As per the limitations above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS:** Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of residential bonus units which may be permitted for this Plan Area is 30 units.

**MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL:** The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area is 55 CNEL.
ADDITIONAL DEVELOPED OUTDOOR RECREATION: The following are the targets and limits for additional developed outdoor recreation facilities specified in Chapter 13 to be located within this Plan Area. Specific projects and their timing are addressed in the TRPA Five-Year Recreation Program pursuant to Chapter 33 Allocation of Development. The following additional capacities allowed are measured in persons at one time.

SUMMER DAY USES 0 PAOT    WINTER DAY USES 0 PAOT    OVERNIGHT USES 0 PAOT

IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS: The capital improvement and other improvement programs required by the Regional Goals and Policies Plan for this area shall be implemented. The improvements include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Improvements required by the Surface Water Management Plan as shown on Figure VIII-1 through 48 of Volume IV of the 208 Water Quality Plan.

2. The highway and transit improvements indicated in the Transportation Element of the Regional Goals and Policies Plan.

FINDINGS FOR ROUND HILL COMMUNITY PLAN

I. Article VII(d) Findings for the EIS: These findings are made and based upon the administrative record of the EIS and the Round Hill Community Plan, including other documents prepared pursuant to the Round Hill Community Plan. A summary of impacts and mitigations is provided in Table 7.2-C of the Final EIS.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on EARTH AND SOILS identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to land coverage and soils disturbance will provide mitigation for soils impacts. In addition, the CP sets forth targets and a CIP to further mitigate impacts.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to water quality will provide mitigation for soils impacts. In addition area wide remedial water quality improvement projects are encouraged as part of this plan.

With respect to the significant and possibly significant effects on AIR QUALITY identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: Although there are no identified air quality impacts associated with this CP, compliance with the Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to air quality will provide assurances that no adverse impacts will occur.

With respect to the significant and possibly significant effects on TRANSPORTATION identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to transportation will provide mitigation for transportation impacts. Mitigation projects are proposed with this CP to attain VMT targets. LOS and parking do not require mitigation in this CP.
With respect to the possibly significant effects on VEGETATION, WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: There are no impacts identified with vegetation, wildlife and fisheries for this CP assuming compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on NOISE identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effect to a less than significant level.

Rationale: The additional noise levels identified will be mitigated through compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements. The CP does list noise targets and strategies to attain the targets.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on RECREATION identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: There are no recreation impacts identified. Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to recreation will provide mitigation for unidentified impacts.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on SCENIC QUALITY identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: The CP proposes scenic targets and strategies to attain the targets. The CP proposes Design Standards and Guidelines to address signs and other scenic improvement measures.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on LIGHT AND GLARE identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements and the new Design Standards and Guidelines relating to light and glare will provide mitigation for those impacts.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on SAFETY AND RISK OF UPSET identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: There were no safety impacts identified.

II. Chapter 6 Findings for Community Plan Adoption and adoption of related Code and PAS Amendments: The following findings must be made prior to adopting the proposed plan and amendments:
A. Chapter 6 Findings:

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: Community plans are addressed in the Land Use Element of the Goals and Policies Plan and the TRPA Code. The RTP and 208 Plan consider CPs as part of their implementation strategies.

2. Finding: That the project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.
   
   Rationale: The Community Plan sets forth environmental threshold related targets with strategies to achieve those targets. The EIS for this plan did not find any threshold to be exceeded.

3. Finding: Wherever federal, state and local air and water quality standards applicable for the Region, whichever are strictest, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.
   
   Rationale: The Community Plan sets forth environmental threshold related targets (for air quality and water quality, the threshold targets are the applicable standards) and strategies to achieve those targets. The EIS for this plan did not find any standard to be exceeded.

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

5. Finding: The Regional Plan, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.
   
   Rationale: See 1 and 2 above.

III. 87-8 Findings for Code Amendments

B. Ordinance 87-8 Findings: Section 2.40 of Ordinance 87-8 requires the following findings prior to Code amendments. The proposed amendment provides for an equal or better means of attainment or maintenance of the thresholds. The required findings and their rationales are:

1. The amendments are consistent with the Compact and with attainment or maintenance of the thresholds.
Rationale: The Code amendments are technical amendments needed to implement the community plan and its substitute "equal or superior" standards as permitted by the Regional Plan.

2. That the amendment provides for an equal or better means of attainment or maintenance of the thresholds.

Rationale: The substitute standards have been found by the EIS prepared for this plan to be an equal or superior set of standards.

3. One of the following findings:

a. There is a demonstrated conflict between provisions of the Regional Plan package, and the conflict threatens to preclude attainment or maintenance of thresholds; or

b. 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; or

c. Legal constraints, such as court orders, decisions or Compact amendments, require amendment of the Goals and Policies or Code; or

d. Technical or scientific information demonstrates the need for modification of a provision of the Goals and Policies or Code; or

e. 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; or

f. 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.

Staff proposes to make Finding d.

Rationale and Evidence: To clarify which provisions of the Code apply, technical amendments must be made to the applicable Chapters.
IV. Special Findings and Considerations Related to Community Plan Adoption

A. Chapter 14 Community Plans Findings and Considerations,

1. Section 14.3 Boundary Findings - As documented in the Final EIS and the Staff Summary, the findings cannot be made for the proposed addition; therefore, no additions are proposed by staff.

2. Section 14.5.C Equal or Superior Standards for Density, Noise, Driveways, Parking, Outdoor Advertising, Historic and Design - The Final EIS documents that the proposed substitute standards and guidelines are equal or superior to the existing TRPA standards and guidelines.

3. Subsection 14.6.D Approval of the Community Plan -
   a. The APC has obtained and considered the recommendations of local government and other responsible public agencies and has made a recommendation to the Governing Board.
   b. The Governing Board has determined that the plan is consistent with the Goals and Policies, the Code, the attainment of the targets and the requirements of 14.6.B(1).
   c. The Governing Board determined the effect on other plan areas and determined no PAS amendments are appropriate.
   d. The Governing Board established the initial allocations set forth in Chapter II of the Community Plan.

B. Chapter 33 Commercial Allocation Required Considerations

1. Subsection 33.3.C Initial Allocations - TRPA has considered the demonstrated need, the expected ability to achieve or maintain environmental thresholds, the reasonableness of projected time schedules, the degree of certainty for obtaining needed funds for implementation, and compatibility with other community plans.

2. Subsection 33.3.C Allocation of Reserve - TRPA has reviewed a sufficient number of proposed CPs (18) to determine which CPs best demonstrate the ability to maintain environmental thresholds, and have a clearly demonstrated need for the additional allocation.

C. Chapter 26 Substitute Standards

1. Subsection 26.5.B Community Plan Standards - Section 4.7.2 of the Final EIS gives TRPA the basis for finding the community plan scenic quality improvement program and sign provisions are equal or superior.
FINDINGS FOR KINGSBURY COMMUNITY PLAN

I. Article VII(d) Findings for the EIS: These findings are made and based upon the administrative record of the EIS and the Kingsbury Community Plan, including other documents prepared pursuant to the Kingsbury Community Plan. A summary of impacts and mitigations is provided in Table 7.2-8 of the Final EIS.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on EARTH AND SOILS identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to land coverage and soils disturbance will provide mitigation for soils impacts. In addition, the CP sets forth targets and a CIP to further mitigate impacts.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to water quality will provide mitigation for soils impacts. In addition three area wide remedial water quality improvement projects are required as part of this plan.

With respect to the significant and possibly significant effects on AIR QUALITY identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: Although there are no identified air quality impacts associated with this CP, compliance with the Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to air quality will provide assurances that no adverse impacts will occur.

With respect to the significant and possibly significant effects on TRANSPORTATION identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to transportation will provide mitigation for transportation impacts. Mitigation projects are proposed with this CP to attain VMT and LOS targets. Parking does require mitigation through application of the parking ordinance.
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With respect to the possibly significant effects on VEGETATION, WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** Except for the Kingsbury Connector option, there are no impacts identified with vegetation, wildlife and fisheries for this CP assuming compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements. The Kingsbury connector may have cumulative impacts and will require a wildlife survey as part of project review.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on NOISE identified in the EIS changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effect to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** The additional noise levels identified will be mitigated through compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements. The CP does list noise targets and strategies to attain the targets.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on RECREATION identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** There are no recreation impacts identified. Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to recreation will provide mitigation for unidentified impacts.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on SCENIC QUALITY identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** The CP proposes scenic targets and strategies to attain the targets. The CP proposes Design Standards and Guidelines to address signs and other scenic improvement measures.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on LIGHT AND GLARE identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements and the new Design Standards and Guidelines relating to light and glare will provide mitigation for those impacts.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on SAFETY AND RISK OF UPSET identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** There were no safety impacts identified.
II. Chapter 6 Findings for Community Plan Adoption and adoption of related Code and PAS Amendments: The following findings must be made prior to adopting the proposed plan and amendments:

A. Chapter 6 Findings:

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:** Community plans are addressed in the Land Use Element of the Goals and Policies Plan and the TRPA Code. The RTP and 208 Plan consider CPs as part of their implementation strategies.

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

   **Rationale:** The Community Plan sets forth environmental threshold related targets with strategies to achieve those targets. The EIS for this plan did not find any threshold to be exceeded.

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

   **Rationale:** The Community Plan sets forth environmental threshold related targets (for air quality and water quality, the threshold targets are the applicable standards) and strategies to achieve those targets. The EIS for this plan did not find any standard to be exceeded.

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

   **Rationale:** See 2 above.

5. **Finding:** The Regional Plan, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

   **Rationale:** See 1 and 2 above.

IV. Special Findings and Considerations Related to Community Plan Adoption

A. Chapter 14 Community Plans Findings and Considerations,

1. **Section 14.3 Boundary Findings** - As documented in Table 4.1.D in the Final EIS and the Staff Summary, the required findings can be made for the proposed addition.
2. **Section 14.5.C Equal or Superior Standards for Density, Noise, Driveways, Parking, Outdoor Advertising, Historic and Design** - The Final EIS documents that the proposed substitute standards and guidelines are equal or superior to the existing TRPA standards and guidelines.

3. **Subsection 14.6.D Approval of the Community Plan**
   
a. The APC has obtained and consider the recommendations of local government and other responsible public agencies and has made a recommendation to the Governing Board.

b. The Governing Board has determined that the plan is consistent with the Goals and Policies, the Code, the attainment of the targets and the requirements of 14.6.B(1).

c. The Governing Board determined the effect on other plan areas and determined no PAS amendments are appropriate.

d. The Governing Board established the initial allocations set forth in Chapter II of the Community Plan.

B. **Chapter 33 Commercial Allocation Required Considerations**

1. **Subsection 33.3.C InitialAllocations** - TRPA has considered the demonstrated need, the expected ability to achieve or maintain environmental thresholds, the reasonableness of projected time schedules, the degree of certainty for obtaining needed funds for implementation, and compatibility with other community plans.

2. **Subsection 33.3.C Allocation of Reserve** - TRPA has reviewed a sufficient number of proposed CPs (18) to determine which CPs best demonstrate the ability to maintain environmental thresholds, and have a clearly demonstrated need for the additional allocation.

C. **Chapter 26 Substitute Standards**

1. **Subsection 26.5.B Community Plan Standards** - Section 4.7.2 of the Final EIS gives TRPA the basis for finding the community plan scenic quality improvement program and sign provisions are equal or superior to TRPAs.

2. **Subsection 26.11.C Signs in Plan Areas 089A and Portions of 076** - The scenic evaluation prepared for these areas indicates that with mitigation they can achieve a scenic roadway unit score of 16 by 2007. TRPA can make the finding that these standards and improvements are equal or superior to TRPAs.
FINDINGS FOR STATELINE COMMUNITY PLAN

I. Article VII(d) Findings for the EIS: These findings are made and based upon the administrative record of the EIS and the Stateline Community Plan, including other documents prepared pursuant to the Stateline Community Plan. A summary of impacts and mitigations is provided in Table 7.2-A of the Final EIS.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on EARTH AND SOILS identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to land coverage and soils disturbance will provide mitigation for soils impacts. In addition, the CP sets forth coverage and disturbance reduction targets and a related CIP to further mitigate impacts.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to water quality will provide mitigation for soils impacts. In addition an area wide remedial water quality improvement project and SEZ restoration projects are required as part of this plan.

With respect to the significant and possibly significant effects on AIR QUALITY identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: There are no identified air quality impacts associated with this CP, as mitigated by proposed transportation projects. Compliance with the Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to air quality will provide assurances that no adverse impacts will occur.

With respect to the significant and possibly significant effects on TRANSPORTATION identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to transportation will provide mitigation for transportation impacts. Mitigation projects are proposed with this CP to attain VMT and LOS targets. Parking does require mitigation in this CP. No additional parking can be approved until a parking program is adopted.
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With respect to the possibly significant effects on VEGETATION, WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** The Kingsbury Connector option and the PAS amendment for residential development and beach development require further study. There are no impacts identified with vegetation, wildlife and fisheries for this CP assuming compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements. The Kingsbury connector and residential development may have cumulative impacts and will require a wildlife survey as part of project review. The hotel development will need to survey and protect Rorippa sites.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on NOISE identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effect to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** The additional noise levels identified will be mitigated through compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements. The CP does list noise targets and strategies to attain the targets.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on RECREATION identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** There are no recreation impacts identified. Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to recreation will provide mitigation for unidentified impacts.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on SCENIC QUALITY identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** The CP proposes scenic targets and strategies to attain the targets. The CP proposes Design Standards and Guidelines to address signs and other scenic improvement measures.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on LIGHT AND GLARE identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements and the new Design Standards and Guidelines relating to light and glare will provide mitigation for those impacts.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on SAFETY AND RISK OF UPSET identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.
Chapter 6 Findings for Community Plan Adoption and adoption of related Code and PAS Amendments: The following findings must be made prior to adopting the proposed plan and amendments:

A. Chapter 6 Findings:

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: Community plans are addressed in the Land Use Element of the Goals and Policies Plan and the TRPA Code. The RTP and 208 Plan consider CPs as part of their implementation strategies.

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

   Rationale: The Community Plan sets forth environmental threshold related targets with strategies to achieve those targets. The EIS for this plan did not find any threshold to be exceeded.

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

   Rationale: The Community Plan sets forth environmental threshold related targets (for air quality and water quality, the threshold targets are the applicable standards) and strategies to achieve those targets. The EIS for this plan did not find any standard would be exceeded.

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

   Rationale: See 2 above.

5. Finding: The Regional Plan, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

   Rationale: See 1 and 2 above.
IV. Special Findings and Considerations Related to Community Plan Adoption

A. Chapter 14 Community Plans Findings and Considerations,

1. **Section 14.3 Boundary Findings** - No additions to this Community Plan are proposed.

2. **Section 14.5.C Equal or Superior Standards for Density, Noise, Driveways, Parking, Outdoor Advertising, Historic and Design** - The Final EIS documents that the proposed substitute standards and guidelines are equal or superior to the existing TRPA standards and guidelines.

3. **Subsection 14.6.D Approval of the Community Plan** -
   a. The APC has obtained and considered the recommendations of local government and other responsible public agencies and has made a recommendation to the Governing Board.
   b. The Governing Board has determined that the plan is consistent with the Goals and Policies, the Code, the attainment of the targets and the requirements of 14.6.B(1).
   c. The Governing Board determined the effect on other plan areas and determined no PAS amendments are appropriate.
   d. The Governing Board established the initial allocations set forth in Chapter II of the Community Plan.

B. Chapter 33 Commercial Allocation Required Considerations

1. **Subsection 33.3.C Initial Allocations** - TRPA has considered the demonstrated need, the expected ability to achieve or maintain environmental thresholds, the reasonableness of projected time schedules, the degree of certainty for obtaining needed funds for implementation, and compatibility with other community plans.

2. **Subsection 33.3.C Allocation of Reserve** - TRPA has reviewed a sufficient number of proposed CPs (18) to determine which CPs best demonstrate the ability to maintain environmental thresholds, and have a clearly demonstrated need for the additional allocation.

C. Chapter 26 Substitute Standards

1. **Subsection 26.5.B Community Plan Standards** - Section 4.7.2 of the Final EIS gives TRPA the basis for finding the community plan scenic quality improvement program and sign provisions are equal or superior to TRPAs.
2. **Subsection 26.11.C Signs in Plan Areas 089A and Portions of 076**

   - The scenic evaluation prepared for these areas indicates that with mitigation they can achieve a scenic roadway unit score of 16 by 2007. TRPA can make the finding that these standards and improvements are equal or superior to TRPAs.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE NO. 93-__

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 87-9, AS AMENDED, BY
AMENDING THE REGIONAL PLAN OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING
AGENCY, AS AMENDED; ADOPTING THE DOUGLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY
PLANS FOR ROUND HILL, STATETLINE AND KINGSBURY; AMENDING PLAN
AREA STATEMENTS 071, 076, AND 089A AND THE OVERLAY MAPS
RELATING TO THE DOUGLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY PLANS; AMENDING LAND
CAPABILITY OVERLAY MAPS; AMENDING PLAN AREA STATEMENTS 070A,
072, 074 AND 077, RELATING TO RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS;
AMENDING THE BOUNDARIES BETWEEN PLAN AREAS 070A AND 080;
AMENDING PLAN AREA STATEMENT 070A TO ADD PERMISSIBLE USES AND
SPECIAL AREAS AND RELATED OVERLAY AMENDMENTS; AMENDING
CHAPTERS 24, 26 AND 30 TO PROVIDE SUBSTITUTE STANDARDS; AND
PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO.

The Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency does ordain
as follows:

Section 1.00 Findings

1.10 It is necessary and desirable to amend TRPA Ordinance No. 87-9,
as amended, by adopting the Douglas County Community Plans for
Round Hill, Stateline and Kingsbury, amending Plan Area
Statements 071, 076, and 089A and the plan area overlays relating
to the adoption of the community plans, amending land capability
overlay maps H-15 and H-16, amending Plan Area Statements 070A,
072, 074 and 077 relating to residential bonus units, amending
plan area boundaries between plan areas 070A and 080, amending
Plan Area Statement 070A and the associated plan area overlay
maps to add permissible uses and create special areas, and
amending Chapters 24, 26 and 30 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances to
include substitute standards for the Douglas County Community
Plans, to further implement the Regional Plan pursuant to the
Land Use Subelement of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies,
Chapter 14 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and Article VI(a) and
other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning
Compact and Regional Plan.

1.20 The Advisory Planning Commission ("APC") held a public hearing on
the adoption of the Douglas County Community Plans and related
plan area statement, overlay map and Code amendments and
recommended adoption. The Governing Board has also conducted a
noticed public hearing on the adoption of the Douglas County
Community Plans and related amendments. Oral testimony and
documentary evidence were received and considered at the
hearings.

1.30 The Douglas County Community Plans were the subject of an
environmental impact statement (EIS), which was processed,
reviewed and certified by TRPA in accordance with the substantive
and procedural provisions of Article VII of the Compact, Chapter
5 of the TRPA Code, and Article VI of the Rules of Procedure.
1.40 The Governing Board finds that, prior to the adoption of this ordinance, the Board made the findings required by Sections 6.4 and 6.5 of the Code and Articles V(g) and VII(d) of the Compact. With respect to the Code amendments, the Board further finds that, prior to the adoption of the amendments, it made the findings required by Section 2.40 of Ordinance 87-8 and that such findings were supported by a preponderance of the evidence.

1.50 The Governing Board finds that the amendments adopted hereby will continue to implement the Regional Plan, as amended, in a manner that achieves and maintains the environmental thresholds as required by Article V(c) of the Compact.

1.60 Each of the foregoing findings is supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Section 2.00 Adoption of the Douglas County Community Plans

Subsection 6.10 of Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, is hereby further amended to add subparagraph (26) as follows:


Section 3.00 Amendment of Plan Area Statements 070A, 071, 076 and 089A

Subsection 6.10(2) of Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, is hereby further amended to add subparagraph (cc) as follows:

(cc) As amended by the deletion of Plan Area Statements 071, 076 and 089A and the substitution of the Douglas County Community Plans for Round Hill, Kingsbury and Stateline, respectively, October 1993 and, as to Plan Area 070A, as amended as set forth in Attachment B, dated 10/4/93.

Section 4.00 Amendment of Plan Area Overlay Maps

Subsection 6.20 (1) of TRPA Ordinance 87-9, as amended, is hereby further amended to add subparagraph (r) as follows:

(r) Relocate the boundary between Plan Areas 070A and 080, redesignate Plan Area 071 as the Round Hill Community Plan, redesignate Plan Area 076 as the Kingsbury Community Plan, designate Plan Area 089A as the Stateline Community Plan, and add special areas within Plan Area 070A, as shown on Attachment B, dated September 29, 1993, which amendments shall be incorporated into the Plan Area Overlays, dated January 1987.
Section 5.00 Amendment of Land Capability Overlay Maps

Subsection 6.20(2) of Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, is hereby further amended to add subparagraph (j) as follows:


Section 6.00 Amendment of Chapters 24, 26 and 30 of the Code of Ordinances

6.10 Chapter 24, Section 24.1 is hereby amended to add the underlined language as follows:

24.1 Applicability: This chapter is applicable to all development that requires or uses vehicular access or parking, except that the Douglas County Community Plans, Design Standards and Guidelines, August 1993, shall apply within the Round Hill, Kingsbury and Stateline Community Plans.

6.20 Chapter 26, Section 26.1 is hereby amended to add the underlined language as follows:

26.1 Applicability: All signs shall comply with the applicable standards set forth in this Chapter, except that the Douglas County Community Plans, Design Standards and Guidelines, August 1993, shall apply within the Round Hill, Kingsbury and Stateline Community Plans. Except as exempted in Section 26.3, installation, modification or replacement of signs requires review and approval as a project in accordance with this Chapter and other applicable provisions of the Code. In addition, sign projects also may have imposed, as conditions of approval, appropriate provisions of the Design Review Guidelines and the Scenic Quality Improvement Program.

6.30 Chapter 30, Section 30.1 is hereby amended to add the underlined language as follows:

30.1 Applicability: All projects shall comply with the standards set forth in this chapter, except that the Douglas County Community Plans, Design Standards and Guidelines, August 1993, shall apply within the Round Hill, Kingsbury and Stateline Community Plans. In addition, exempt activities, as defined in Chapter 4, shall comply with Sections 30.9 and 30.10. Appropriate provisions of the Design Review Guidelines and the Scenic Quality Improvement Program may be considered as conditions of project approval.

Section 7.00 Interpretation and Severability

The provisions of this ordinance and the amendments to the Regional Plan Package adopted hereby shall be liberally construed to effect their purposes. If any section, clause, provision or portion of this ordinance or
the amendments adopted hereby is declared unconstitutional or invalid by a
court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this ordinance, or the
amendments to the Regional Plan Package, shall not be affected thereby. For
this purpose, the provisions of this ordinance and the amendments are hereby
declared respectively severable.

Section 8.00   Effective Date

Sections 2.00, 3.00, 4.00 and 5.00 of this ordinance shall be effective
immediately. Section 6.00 of this ordinance shall be effective 60 days
after the date of its adoption.

PASSED and ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning
Agency at a regular meeting held ____________, 1993, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent:

Wayne S. Chimarusti, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
MEMORANDUM

October 7, 1993

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Progress Report on Priority Milestones Contained in the Strategic Plan and FY 93-94 Program of Work (July 1 - September 30)

The Strategic Plan and Program of Work for FY 93-94 were presented to the Governing Board in July 1993. The Strategic Plan identified approximately 30 of the milestones contained in the Program of Work as the highest priorities.

The Program of Work is reviewed by staff on an ongoing basis throughout the fiscal year to monitor work progress in accordance with the assigned completion schedules (milestones) and to make any necessary adjustments. This progress report focuses on only those priority milestones identified in the Strategic Plan for completion in the first quarter.

In the first quarter there were three priority milestones identified for completion. Two milestones were completed and one has been deferred to the second quarter. Following is the current status of these first quarter milestones:

A. Administration/Service Delivery

Continue streamlining in the area of mitigation fund management.

Implementation of jurisdictional MOU (El Dorado County) 9-93

In order to streamline the release of mitigation funds, the TRPA Governing Board adopted an MOU in September allowing the TRPA Executive Director, rather than the Governing Board, to disburse air and water quality mitigation funds to El Dorado County. Similar MOUs with other local jurisdictions will be presented to the Governing Board for adoption over the next several months.
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B. Scenic Resources

Adopt scenic quality ratings for views from public recreation areas and bike paths.

Amend Code Chapter 30 (Recreation Area Scenic Threshold) 9-93

The TRPA Governing Board amended Code Chapter 30 in September and adopted scenic quality ratings for views from public recreation areas and bike paths.

C. Water Quality

Consider and take action on staff recommendations regarding movement of the IPES line.

Complete IPES line movement analysis and make recommendation to Governing Board

TRPA staff presented a preliminary report to the APC and Governing Board in September on movement of the IPES line. Staff will present its final report and recommendation to the APC and Governing Board in October to move the IPES line in those jurisdictions where the required findings can be made.

If you should have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item, please contact Jerry Wells, Deputy Director, at (702) 588-4547.
MEMORANDUM

October 18, 1993

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Air and Water Quality Mitigation Fund Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between TRPA and Douglas County

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the subject MOU and authorize the Executive Director to release mitigation funds in accordance with the MOU and approved project list.

Discussion: TRPA collects air and water quality mitigation funds from project applicants to mitigate the impacts of additional development within the Region. TRPA maintains these funds for use by the local jurisdictions upon approval of a specific project. Currently, the TRPA Finance Committee and Governing Board approve the disbursement of funds by TRPA to the county for a specific project. Subsequently, the project is approved by TRPA staff or the Governing Board as a "Project" under the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

The purpose of this MOU is to streamline the process of funding air and water quality improvement projects within the region by reducing project funding approval steps. The MOU involves the creation of jurisdictional lists of projects consistent with the adopted Air and Water Quality Management Plans of TRPA. The subject lists would be approved by the Finance Committee and the Governing Board. Upon approval of the MOU and project list, the County can request transfer of funds, through the Executive Director, for any project on the list, as opposed to the Governing Board having to act on each individual project funding request separately. This MOU would not alter the process of project approval as a "Project" under the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

If you have any questions regarding the subject MOU please contact Jim Dana, at (702) 588-4547.
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN DOUGLAS COUNTY AND TRPA
MITIGATION FUND ADMINISTRATION

This agreement is made and entered into this_______ day of________, 1993 by and between the County of Douglas, "COUNTY," and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, "TRPA," a bi-state agency created pursuant to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (P.L. 96-551).

Whereas, TRPA has adopted the "208" Water Quality Management Plan which contains Erosion and Runoff Control Projects for improvement of water quality within the Lake Tahoe Region; and

Whereas, the COUNTY has instituted plans for Erosion and Runoff Control Projects consistent with the "208" Plan; and

Whereas, TRPA has adopted the Regional Transportation and Air Quality Plan; and

Whereas, COUNTY has instituted plans for Transportation and Air Quality Improvement Projects consistent with the Regional Plan; and

Whereas, Water and Air Quality Projects are defined to include design, capital improvements, project administration, acquisitions, operations and maintenance; and

Whereas TRPA collects Water and Air Quality Mitigation Funds for the implementation of water and air quality projects consistent with the respective plans;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED AND AGREED as follows:

COUNTY agrees to prepare a five (5) year project list for air and water quality projects consistent with the adopted TRPA "208" Plan and Transportation and Air Quality Plan and to amend such list from time to time to maintain consistency. The list shall include cost estimates for each project proposed.

COUNTY agrees to obtain TRPA approval for water and air quality projects pursuant to TRPA permit requirements for a "Project" and other applicable laws, regulations, and ordinances.

COUNTY agrees to cause such funded projects to be constructed and completed in accordance with the plans and specifications as approved by COUNTY and TRPA. This agreement does not bind COUNTY to complete projects included on the list that have not been funded by TRPA.
Mitigation Fund MOU
Douglas County
page 2

COUNTY agrees that after the work is completed and accepted, title to the work or project so installed shall vest with the COUNTY and shall at all times thereafter be used, operated and maintained by the COUNTY. Mitigation funds may be requested for such purposes.

COUNTY agrees to hold mitigation funds separately from other COUNTY funds and to use such funds solely for the purposes of mitigation projects as approved by TRPA.

COUNTY shall keep complete records of all funds deposited and how such funds were used or disbursed for each project. Such records shall be made available for review and audit by TRPA or its accountants upon written request within 30 days.

COUNTY shall reimburse or reallocate the mitigation fund or be accountable for said funds if an approved project is not completed as proposed by the COUNTY and approved by TRPA.

TRPA agrees that, after acceptance of the list of projects, it shall provide funds for the construction of such projects at the request of the COUNTY. The TRPA Finance Committee and the TRPA Governing Board shall be responsible for approving the COUNTY project list and any amendments to such list.

TRPA agrees that the COUNTY may make annual requests for deposited funds. Such requests shall include an identification of the projects to which such funds will be applied. Transferred funds may only be used for the identified projects unless TRPA agrees to specific project substitutions. Substituted projects shall be included on the COUNTY list of projects. At no time shall TRPA transfer more funds than have been collected or allocated to COUNTY. Should funds requested exceed those which have been collected and allocated, TRPA shall, as additional funds become available, make deposits with COUNTY of such additional funds until total funds requested have been deposited.

TRPA agrees that the COUNTY may make specific requests for funds for individual projects for accumulated mitigation funds if funds have not already been transferred to the COUNTY. Such projects must have been previously included on the project list prepared by the COUNTY.

Interest earned on deposits held by TRPA prior to disbursement shall accrue to and be retained within the mitigation fund. Interest shall be apportioned proportionally to the COUNTY based on its share of funds to the total fund balance. Upon transfer to the COUNTY, interest earned on the funds shall be used for mitigation projects.

TRPA agrees that if additional funds are needed for an approved project, TRPA shall, upon written request by the COUNTY and upon TRPA staff approval, deposit such funds when mitigation funds become available. TRPA staff reserves the right to forward requests for additional project funds to the TRPA Finance Committee and Governing Board.
This agreement may be terminated upon 30 days written notice given by either party to this agreement. If this agreement is terminated, all unexpended transferred funds shall be returned to TRPA within 30 days or as soon as possible according to the COUNTY’s financial practices.

Douglas County

Date

Date

Douglas County
Department of Public Works

David S. Ziegler
Executive Director
MEMORANDUM

October 18, 1993

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: Susan E. Scholley, Special Projects Attorney

Subject: Reallocation of Bitterbrush Mitigation Fund and Replacement of Securities

PROPOSED ACTION: The proposed action is to discuss the reallocation of the Bitterbrush mitigation fund given the increase in the estimated cost of construction for the secondary access and to authorize legal action to recover the securities released during the pendency of the 1990 appeal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends continuance of the reallocation of the mitigation fund until the January 1994 meeting to permit additional time for Washoe County action on the secondary access issue. Staff further recommends that the Board authorize legal action to recover the securities released in 1990 while the enforceability of the Settlement Agreement was on appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

REALLOCATION OF MITIGATION FUND: The amount of the $750,000 Bitterbrush Settlement Agreement mitigation fund allocated to secondary access by the Governing Board in 1986 was $262,460. The revised cost of the secondary access is now estimated between $454,500 to $600,000. The Governing Board must determine whether it will fund the secondary access or will reallocate the mitigation fund to other projects.

The reallocation of the mitigation fund was first discussed by the Board in May 1993. At the May 1993 meeting, Steve Bradhurst, as the Washoe County representative, suggested that the matter be continued by the Governing Board to permit time for Washoe County to consider the secondary access issue and investigate alternative funding mechanisms. Washoe County has considered the matter and currently the Washoe County Commission is waiting for an opinion from the District Attorney's office on their legal options with respect to Bitterbrush and the secondary access issue.

Reconsideration of the mitigation fund allocation to secondary access is premature given the pending request from the County Commission to the District Attorney. Accordingly, staff recommends a further continuance to the January 1994 meeting to permit additional time for Washoe County to take an action with respect to the secondary access issue.
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REPLACEMENT OF RELEASED SECURITIES: The Bitterbrush Settlement Agreement provides for a deed of trust in the amount of $750,000 against the property to insure performance of the mitigation measures required by the Settlement Agreement. In order to permit the release of individual units from the deed of trust as they are built and sold to third parties, the developer is required to post a replacement security in the amount of $4054.05 per unit.

In 1989, the developer (then Leroy Land Development) filed a motion in federal court seeking to set aside the off-site mitigation requirements of the Settlement Agreement. Judge Reed agreed with Leroy Land and released them from all but $100,000 of the remaining mitigation obligation. TRPA appealed the decision to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

During the pendency of the appeal, Leroy demanded the release of a letter of credit in the amount of $36,486.45 (the security for nine released units) based on Judge Reed's decision. In order to avoid further litigation costs, TRPA agreed to release the letter of credit with the understanding that it was not waiving its right to seek reinstatement in the event the decision was overturned on appeal. Those 1990 letters are attached as Exhibits A and B.

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the lower court decision and reaffirmed the enforceability of the $750,000 mitigation obligation in July 1991. Sometime in 1991, Mr. Cy Yehros purchased the project from Leroy Land Development. TRPA staff has been working with Mr. Yehros to bring the securities for released units current. Attached as Exhibit C is the most recent letter from Mr. Yehros' attorney, Tom Hall, informing TRPA that Leroy Land has agreed to replace two lapsed letters of credit totalling $12,500. The letter goes on to say that Leroy Land will not agree to replace the $36,486.45 released in 1990 during the appeal.

Staff recommends that the Board authorize the filing of a motion in federal court seeking an order to compel replacement of the nine released securities for Units 75-83 by either Leroy Land or Bitterbrush Limited Partnership (Yehros). Both the prior and current owners would have to be named in the motion since TRPA is not able to determine who has the ultimate responsibility to replace the security as between the buyer and seller.

ACTION REQUESTED: TRPA staff requests a motion to continue the item on reallocation of the mitigation fund until the January 1994 meeting and a motion to authorize the filing of a motion in federal court in Leroy Land v. TRPA (Case No. CVR-81-0202-ECR) to compel replacement of the securities for Lots 75-83 released in 1990 during the pendency of the appeal.

If you should have any questions on this matter, please contact Susan E. Scholley, Special Projects Attorney, at (702) 588-4547.
March 21, 1990

Louis R. Doescher, Esq.
HEATON & DOESCHER
Post Office Box 605
Carson City, NV 89702

Re: Leroy Land v. TRPA; Release of Irrevocable
    Standby Letter of Credit No. 00884

Dear Lou:

Pursuant to our recent telephone conversation, I enclose
for your ready reference a copy of Valley Bank of Nevada
Irrevocable Standby Letter of Credit No. 00884 in the amount
of $36,486.45, provided to release Unit Nos. 75 through 83
of Unit No. 2, Ski-Lane Bitterbrush Condominiums, in accordance
with Section I.D.2., page 7, of the Settlement Agreement and
Release between Leroy Land Development Corporation and the
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency dated December 17, 1982, and
approved June 17, 1983.

In view of the Order filed herein on February 9, 1990,
which partially grants Plaintiff's Motion to Abate and Partially
Release and Discharge the Deed of Trust and to Declare Rights
and Obligations Under Stipulated Judgment, request is hereby
made that the TRPA release any and all interest under the
Irrevocable Standby Letter of Credit.

Your cooperation and assistance in obtaining this
requested relief is greatly appreciated.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. HALL, ESQ.

TJH:sas
Enclosure

cc: Alan Roselinsky

EXHIBIT A
July 6, 1990

Thomas J. Hall, Esq.
Attorney at Law
305 South Arlington Avenue
Post Office Box 3948
Reno, Nevada 89505

Re: Leroy Land v. TRPA

Dear Tom:

I am enclosing herewith the original Irrevocable Standby Letter of Credit by Valley Bank, No. LV4478, on July 13, 1989.

The fact of our agreement concerning the return to you of this original letter of credit and TRPA's release of the funds represented thereby should not be construed, and is not intended, as a waiver of any other rights for security to which the TRPA is entitled under the agreed to judgment. The release of security is effective only as to units 75 through 83 and no other units.

Further, the TRPA does not waive its right to contest releases in the event of future sales and intends to seek reinstatement of the letter of credit in the event of favorable appellate court action.

Sincerely yours,

HEATON & DOESCHER, LTD.

By: Louis R. Doescher

LRD/kme
Enclosure

cc: Gary Owen, Esq.
   Attorney at Law
   Post Office Box 1000
   Carson City, NV 89702
   Susan Scholley, Esq.
   TRPA
   Post Office Box 1038
   Zephyr Cove, NV 89448-1038

EXHIBIT B
September 9, 1993

Susan E. Scholley, Agency Counsel
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
Post Office Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448-1038

Re: Bitterbrush Project

Dear Susan:

In reply to your letter of August 16, 1993, regarding Bitterbrush securities, we have thoroughly researched the matter and have reviewed your letter of May 20, 1993.

As I mentioned to you at our last meeting, you are recommending granting credit for the initial 11 lots only in the amount of $44,594.55. The work claimed under the EIS study has been estimated by Milton L. Sharp, P.E., to yield a credit of $63,740.00. A diligent search of our records and the files of Leroy Land Development Corporation in Las Vegas has revealed no additional information.

Therefore, my client has determined that he has little basis to argue or claim additional credit for the $63,740.00 of work detailed in my letter to you of April 9, 1993. Therefore, we will accept credit of $44,594.55 at this time.

My client has investigated other matters and reports which indicate that there were two (2) CDs posted by Leroy Land to obtain releases of lots prior to the purchase by my client of 135 units which were subject to the TRPA deed of trust. Nevertheless, the CDs were posted as collateral to secure letters of credit to be utilized by Leroy to obtain releases. One CD for $8,500 matures December 18, 1993, and a second CD for $4,000 matures March 1, 1995. The beneficiary under the CDs is Realty Partners, an entity controlled by Leo Frey. To resolve the matter, Leo Frey proposes to irrevocably assign these two CDs to the TRPA, so that the funds will be paid to the TRPA upon maturity.
The $36,486.45 letter of credit No. 0884 was returned by the TRPA and the units were previously released. There is no easy solution now, inasmuch as Leo Frey will not make good on the $36,486.45. We will continue to explore ways to assist the TRPA to recover the security it released on units never dealt with or acquired by my client, Cy Yehros.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. HALL, ESQ.

TJH:sas

cc: Cy Yehros
    Alan Dapp
October 13, 1993

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Projects Reviewed at Staff Level and Governing Board Level for the period of September 1, 1993 through September 30, 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Reviewed at Staff Level</th>
<th>CSLT/Placer/Washoe/Douglas Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Residential</td>
<td>El Dorado Placer Washoe Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Modification</td>
<td>0 21 17 10 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Res. Plan Rev.</td>
<td>12 0 5 3 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Mod. Plan Rev.</td>
<td>2 3 3 0 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>5 1 1 0 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>9 4 2 0 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvlp./Cov. Verif.</td>
<td>2 1 1 0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvlp./Cov. Banking</td>
<td>1 2 0 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvlp./Cov. Transfer</td>
<td>4 1 3 0 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eros. Control/Grading</td>
<td>0 2 0 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBLA/Subdivision</td>
<td>3 0 1 0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorezone</td>
<td>2 1 0 0 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Reviewed at Governing Board Level</th>
<th>CSLT/Placer/Washoe/Douglas Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0 1 1 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Modification</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Mgmt.</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Processed</td>
<td>47 43 39 16 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Received</td>
<td>33 10 8 6 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Assessments Processed: 3
Operating Backlog: 7
Compliance Cases Pending: 19

10/13/93
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October 1, 1993

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: IPES/Land Capability Status Report

The status of IPES/Land Capability determinations for the period of September 1, 1993, through September 30, 1993 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSLT/</th>
<th>Douglas</th>
<th>El Dorado</th>
<th>Placer</th>
<th>Washoe</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Capability Verifications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications received</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verifications completed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24 (5)*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating backlog</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Capability Challenges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications received</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges completed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating backlog</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPES Determinations of Allowable Coverage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications received</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinations completed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating backlog</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPES Revaluations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications received</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revaluations completed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating backlog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial IPES Evaluations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications received</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations completed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating backlog</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPES Appeals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications received</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals processed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating backlog</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governing Board Hearing Requests</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Board Appeals Processed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pending</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Per Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between TRPA and El Dorado County, some LCV's are being processed jointly by the TRPA Project Review Division and El Dorado County as site assessments. The TRPA IPES/Land Capability Office completed the LCV portion on 5 site assessments in August.

/tdc
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AGENDA ITEM X A.2

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
MEMORANDUM

October 18, 1993

To: TRPA Governing Board Finance Committee
From: Environmental Compliance Division

Subject: Status Report on Project Securities

The Program of Work for fiscal year 1993-1994 includes quarterly reports on project securities held by TRPA. The Environmental Compliance Division administers project securities. On October 18, 1993, the Division held $10,131,411.45 in non-cash securities. The following is a breakdown of non-cash securities held on October 18, 1993 by type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hold on Account</td>
<td>$2,127,909.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Credit</td>
<td>$684,709.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$4,439,667.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment of Account</td>
<td>$825,246.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Deposit</td>
<td>$2,053,878.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All cash securities are held by the Finance Division until the Compliance Division approves a release of each security.

SC: jsd
10-18-93

AGENDA ITEM X.A.3.

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
MEMORANDUM

October 15, 1993

To: RTPA Governing Board
From: Agency Staff
Subject: Approval of Amended 1991 TRPA Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

Proposed Action: To approve the attached resolution adopting an amended TRPA 1991 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) to include the projects approved in the accelerated cycle of the Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) Program.

Recommendation: TRPA staff is recommending the adoption of the attached resolution approving the amendment to the TRPA 1991 RTIP.

Background: Transportation projects in the State of California are programmed for funding by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) through three programming documents. These programming documents are the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the Highway Systems Operation and Protection Plan (HSOPP), and the Traffic Systems Management (TSM) program.

The CTC may include a project in the STIP only if it is included in one of the following:

- The immediately prior STIP;
- The Proposed State Transportation Improvement Program (PSTIP);
- The Interregional Road System (IRS) plan; or
- The current Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

Each Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) is to prepare a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for their respective regions. This RTIP is to be submitted to the CTC by December 1st of each odd-numbered year. Regional Transportation Planning Agencies are to consult with Caltrans in the development of the RTIP in order to allow Caltrans to consider the impact of the RTIP on the programming of projects in the PSTIP prepared by Caltrans.

The only new projects being accepted for inclusion in current STIPs are TEA approved projects. Both the projects proposed for amendment to the TRPA 1991 STIP are TEA approved projects.

/bm

AGENDA ITEM I.A.
Each RTIP is to include a list of projects that are candidates for inclusion in the STIP adopted by the CTC. These projects are to be ranked in priority order, and shall be consistent with the priorities of the Congestion Management Programs (CMP) prepared as required by counties within a region. Candidate projects may include flexible congestion relief projects and commuter and urban rail projects. A regional planning agency may also include in its RTIP a list of long lead-time projects. This list authorizes Caltrans to perform project development work for State highway projects that are not yet in the STIP.

The CTC adopted RTIP guidelines require that the RTIP prepared by the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies shall support and be consistent with the most recent update of the region's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). TRPA's most recent update of its RTP was the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan approved by the TRPA Governing Board in May 1992.

The current TRPA RTIP was approved by the TRPA Governing Board in November, 1991. The following candidate projects were included in the 1991 RTIP:

**Placer County**
- California 28 and 267, Intersection Improvements
- California 28, Pedestrian Facilities (Kings Beach)
- California 89 Dedicated Transit Lane and Realignment: Special Study

**El Dorado County**
- U.S. Highway 50 at Tahoe Keys, Intersection Improvements
- Montreal Road Extension, New Construction
- Pioneer Trail, Improvements
- Meyers Bike Trail (Phase I)
- U.S. Highway 50 Biketrail / Pedestrian Facility

**Public Transit**
- U.S. Highway 50 Fixed Guideway System

These projects are described in detail in the RTIP (attached). The projects that are proposed for amendment to the 1991 RTIP are projects that were approved by the CTC in July 1993 for funding under the Transportation Enhancement Activities Program. These projects consist of the following:

**El Dorado County**
- Phase II, Pat Lowe Memorial Bike Trail and Erosion Control Project
- El Dorado County Beach Landscape Project (South Lake Tahoe)

In order to proceed with the TEA process, these projects must be amended into the RTIP, for inclusion into the STIP. The CTC will be approving projects for the 1994 STIP Cycle in February 1994.

If you have any questions in regard to this agenda item, please contact Bridget Mahern at (702) 588-4547.

/ bm

AGENDA ITEM I.A.
Placer County

Candidate Projects

1. California 28 and 267, Intersection Improvements (Flexible congestion relief)

   Intersection and signal improvements at the intersection of California 28 and 267. A Project Study Report has not been completed by Caltrans for this project. The cost estimate considers hazardous material clean up and removal, and land coverage mitigation. Cost revisions could be necessary after further study.

   Cost Estimate - $1.322 million

   Funding Requested for 1992 STIP Programming - $1.322 million

2. California 28, Pedestrian Facilities (Flexible Congestion Relief)

   Complete construction of pedestrian facilities along California 28 in the Kings Beach area. Reduction of pedestrian conflicts will improve capacity of California 28.

   Cost Estimate - $400,000

   Funding Requested for 1992 STIP Programming - $400,000

Special Studies

1. California 89 Dedicated Transit Lane and Realignment

   Widening of the existing roadway to accommodate a dedicated transit lane between Tahoe City and Alpine Meadows Road and the realignment of California 89 from the intersection of Granlibakken Road, through the "64 Acre Tract", across the Truckee River, to California 89 in the vicinity of the Caltrans maintenance yard.

   The realignment of the California 89 through the 64 Acre Tract was included on the 1988 STIP Special Studies list, with the CTC recommending TRPA taking the lead role in completing this study. TRPA is requesting that the special study for the realignment be combined with the study of the widening of the existing California 89 roadway to accommodate an exclusive transit lane and that Caltrans assume the lead for this study.

   Funding Requested for 1992 STIP Programming - $200,000
El Dorado County

Candidate Projects

1. Phase II, Pat Lowe Memorial Bike Trail and Erosion Control Project

Construction of .85 mile of Class I Bicycle trail near the north side of U.S. Highway 50 in Meyers. The trail will link bicycle lanes on U.S. Highway 89 and Pioneer Trail and provide non-vehicular access to business and recreational facilities in the area. Includes erosion control, water quality improvements to treat highway runoff, revegetation, stabilization and scenic enhancement of the project area.

Cost Estimate: $457,624
Funding Requested for 1992 STIP Programming: $457,624

2. El Dorado Beach Landscape Project

Enhancement of the El Dorado Beach / Lakeview Avenue Bicycle Trail Project. This project consists of construction of a depressed picnic area, rock and timber retaining walls, improved beach access and installation of native sod and trees. The overall goal is to provide a scenic area along the bicycle trail/lake frontage.

Cost Estimate: $199,000
Funding Requested for STIP Programming: $199,000

3. U.S. 50 at Tahoe Keys, Intersection Improvements (Flexible Congestion Relief)

Improve the capacity of the intersection of U.S. 50 and Tahoe Keys Boulevard by constructing a right-turn lane on U.S. 50, a right-turn lane on Tahoe Keys Boulevard, and sidewalk and drainage improvements. A Project Study Report was completed by Caltrans in August 1991. The PSR for the project suggested staging of the construction to alleviate funding and programming constraints. The project could be staged as follows:

Stage 1 - Construction of a right-turn lane, and associated improvements, westbound on U.S. 50 to Tahoe Keys Boulevard.

Stage 2 - Construction of a right-turn lane, and associated improvements, on Tahoe Keys Boulevard to U.S. 50.

Stage 3 - Construction of improvements along eastbound on U.S. 50 from Tahoe Keys Boulevard to Truckee Drive.

Cost Estimate - $2.41 million.
If staged, the cost of each stage would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>$920,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>768,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>886,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$2,574,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Requested for 1992 STIP Programming - $2.41 million

4. Montreal Road Extension, New Construction (Flexible Congestion Relief, Off System)

Construct Montreal Road Extension as a local arterial, from the Upper Loop Road to Pioneer Trail at Needle Peak Drive.

Cost Estimate - $7.8 million

Funding Requested for 1992 STIP Programming - $7.8 million

5. Pioneer Trail, Improvements (Flexible Congestion Relief, Off System)

Improve capacity by completing improvements to Pioneer Trail as an upgraded two-lane arterial with a Class II Bicycle facility, from its intersection with U.S. 50 in Meyers to the proposed Montreal Road extension.

Cost Estimate - $8.1 million

Funding Requested for 1992 STIP Programming - $8.1 million

6. Meyers Bike Trail (Flexible Congestion Relief, Off System)

Class I Bike Trail to be constructed in Meyers, from the intersection of California 89 and U.S. 50, along U.S. 50 to Pioneer Trail.

Cost Estimate - $400,000

Funding Requested for 1992 STIP Programming - $100,000

7. U.S. 50 Biketrail/Pedestrian Facility (Flexible Congestion Relief, Rte. 50/local)

Construct a biketrail/pedestrian facility on north side of U.S. Highway 50, from Loop Road intersection to Ski Run Boulevard.

Cost Estimate - $200,000

Funding Requested for 1992 STIP Programming - $200,000
Public Transit, Intermodal Terminal, Light Rail Facilities

1. U.S. Highway 50 Fixed Guideway System (Commuter and Urban Rail Program)

   Acquisition of rights-of-way, construction of an intermodal station, and related facilities for an exclusive public mass transit guideway project.

   Cost Estimate - $69,000,000

   Funding Requested for 1992 STIP Programming - $7,000,000 (Prop. 116)
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY
RESOLUTION NO. 93-___

Approval of Amended TRPA 1991 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

WHEREAS the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) has been designated the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the California portion of the Tahoe Region;

WHEREAS rural Regional Transportation Planning Agencies may now prepare their own Regional Transportation Improvement Programs (RTIP);

WHEREAS the Amended RTIPs are to be submitted to the California Transportation Commission to be amended into the 1992 STIP;

WHEREAS following review of the 1991 STIP Policies put forth by the California Transportation Commission, TRPA has prepared its 1991 RTIP for the Tahoe Region; and

WHEREAS the projects proposed for amendment and inclusion in the 1991 STIP are consistent with the TRPA Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the TRPA Governing Board approves the Amended the TRPA 1991 Regional Transportation Improvement Program for submission to the California Transportation Commission for amendment to the 1992 State Transportation Improvement Program.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ______________ day of October, 1993, by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

John E. Upton, Vice Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
* COUNTY: Placer  
ROUTE: State Route 28  
PM: 9.1 - 9.5

* PROJECT LOCATION: Kings Beach

* PROPOSED PROJECT: Intersection improvements with left- and right-turn lanes, signal modifications, and possible hazardous waste removal.

* EXISTING CONDITIONS:  
  Facility: 4 lane urban arterial  
  Avg. Daily Traffic: 16,900  
  Demand (Peak Hr.)/Capacity: .86  
  Congestion: Hrs./Wk.  
  Level of Service (LOS) & Speed: D

* CAPITAL COSTS: 1991 - $1.322 million  
  Escalated $1.577 million  
  FY: 1996-97

* PROPOSED FUNDING:
  State Program: Flexible Congestion Relief
  Other Project Funding: Interregional Road System

* REGIONAL PRIORITY: 1 of 3.
* COUNTY: Placer

* ROUTE: State Route 28

* PM: 9.3 - 10.5

* PROJECT LOCATION: Kings Beach

* PROPOSED PROJECT: Construction of pedestrian facilities to reduce pedestrian conflicts with State Route 28 in the Kings Beach area.

* EXISTING CONDITIONS:

  Facility: 4 lane urban arterial

  Avg. Daily Traffic: 16,900

  Demand (Peak Hr.)/Capacity: .86

  Congestion: Hrs./Wk.

  Level of Service (LOS) & Speed: D

* CAPITAL COSTS: 1991 $400,000

  Escalated $477,000 FY: 1996-97

* PROPOSED FUNDING:

  State Program: Flexible Congestion Relief

  Other Project Funding:

* REGIONAL PRIORITY: 2 of 3.
PROJECT INFORMATION SHEET
Highway, Street & Road Projects

* COUNTY: Placer  ROUTE: State Route 89  PM: 8.00 - 12.35

* PROJECT LOCATION: Truckee River corridor, Tahoe City to Alpine Meadows Road

* PROPOSED PROJECT: Special study for exclusive transit lane along State Route 89 from Tahoe City to Alpine Meadows Road and realignment of State Route 89 to the west through the 64 acre tract.

* EXISTING CONDITIONS: Facility: 2 lane arterial
  Avg. Daily Traffic: 14,100-11,800  Demand (Peak Hr.)/Capacity: 9-1.0
  Congestion: Hrs./Wk.  Level of Service (LOS) & Speed: E-F

* CAPITAL COSTS: 1991 $200,000 (study only)
  Escalated $200,000  FY: 1992-93

* PROPOSED FUNDING:
  State Program: Flexible Congestion Relief
  Other Project Funding: Interregional Road System

* REGIONAL PRIORITY: 3 of 3.
PROJECT INFORMATION SHEET
Highway, Street & Road Projects

* COUNTY: El Dorado

ROUTE: U.S. 50

PM: 70.6 - 71.5

* PROJECT LOCATION: Meyers, CA; between S.R. 89 and Pioneer Trail

* PROPOSED PROJECT: Phase II, Pat Lowe Memorial Bike Trail and Erosion Control Project: Construct Class I pedestrian and bicycle facility along U.S. 50, including erosion control, water quality improvements, revegetation, stabilization and scenic enhancement of the project area.

* EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Facility: 2 lane arterial

Avg. Daily Traffic: 24,200

Demand (Peak Hr.)/Capacity: 1.36

Congestion: Hrs./Wk.

Level of Service (LOS) & Speed: F

* CAPITAL COSTS: 1993 $457,624

Escalated $457,624 FY: 1993-94

* PROPOSED FUNDING:

State Program:

Other Project Funding: Transportation Enhancement Activities Program

TRPA Water Quality Mitigation Funds (match)

El Dorado County (match)

* REGIONAL PRIORITY: 1 of 7
COUNTY: El Dorado
ROUTE: U.S. 50

PROJECT LOCATION: South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado Beach (Lakeview Avenue and U.S. Highway 50)

PROPOSED PROJECT: El Dorado Beach Landscape Project: Enhancement of the El Dorado Beach / Lakeview Avenue Bicycle Trail Project.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
Facility:
Avg. Daily Traffic:
Demand (Peak Hr.)/Capacity:
Congestion: Hrs./Wk.
Level of Service (LOS) & Speed:

CAPITAL COSTS: 1993 $199,000
Escalated $199,000 FY: 1993-94

PROPOSED FUNDING:
State Program:
Other Project Funding: Transportation Enhancement Activities Program
City of South Lake Tahoe (match)

REGIONAL PRIORITY: 2 of 7.
**PROJECT INFORMATION SHEET**
Highway, Street & Road Projects

* COUNTY: El Dorado  
    ROUTE: U.S. 50  
    PM: 75.9 – 76.2

* PROJECT LOCATION: South Lake Tahoe

* PROPOSED PROJECT: Reconstruction of intersection of U.S. Highway 50 and Tahoe Keys Boulevard to include left- and right-turn lanes and signal improvements.

* EXISTING CONDITIONS:
  
  **Facility:** 5 lane urban arterial
  
  **Avg. Daily Traffic:** 52,000  
  **Demand (Peak Hr.)/Capacity:** 1.10

  **Congestion:** Hrs./Wk.  
  **Level of Service (LOS) & Speed:** F

* CAPITAL COSTS:  
  
  **1991**  
  **$2.41 million**

  **Escalated $2.63 million**  
  **FY: 1994-95**

* PROPOSED FUNDING:
  
  Other Project Funding: Interregional Road System

* REGIONAL PRIORITY: 3 of 7.
PROJECT INFORMATION SHEET
Highway, Street & Road Projects

* COUNTY: El Dorado
* ROUTE: Off System
* PM:

* PROJECT LOCATION: South Lake Tahoe

* PROPOSED PROJECT: Construct a new local arterial from end of Montreal Road in South Stateline area to Pioneer Trail at Needle Peak

* EXISTING CONDITIONS:
  Facility:
  Avg. Daily Traffic:
  Demand (Peak Hr.)/Capacity:
  Congestion: Hrs./Wk.
  Level of Service (LOS) & Speed:

* CAPITAL COSTS: 1991 $7.8 million
  Escalated $8.9 million FY: 1994-95

* PROPOSED FUNDING:
  State Program: Flexible Congestion Relief
  Other Project Funding: Interregional Road System

* REGIONAL PRIORITY: 4 of 7.
* COUNTY: El Dorado
* ROUTE: Off system PM:

* PROJECT LOCATION: South Lake Tahoe along Pioneer Trail

* PROPOSED PROJECT: Upgrade Pioneer Trail between Mandan Street and Needle Peak Road to relieve demand on U.S. Highway 50.

* EXISTING CONDITIONS:
  - Facility: 2 lane local arterial
  - Avg. Daily Traffic: 11,500
  - Demand (Peak Hr.)/Capacity: .88
  - Congestion: Hrs./Wk.
  - Level of Service (LOS) & Speed: D

* CAPITAL COSTS: 1991 $8.1 million
  - Escalated $10.1 million FY: 1994-95

* PROPOSED FUNDING:
  - State Program: Flexible Congestion Relief
  - Other Project Funding:

* REGIONAL PRIORITY: 5 of 7.
* COUNTY: El Dorado  
* ROUTE: U.S. 50  
* PM: 70.6 - 71.5

* PROJECT LOCATION: South Lake Tahoe, between S.R. 89 and Pioneer Trail

* PROPOSED PROJECT: Construct pedestrian and bicycle facility along U.S. 50

* EXISTING CONDITIONS:  
  Facility: 2 lane arterial  
  Avg. Daily Traffic: 24,200  
  Demand (Peak Hr.)/Capacity: 1.36  
  Congestion: Hrs./Wk.  
  Level of Service (LOS) & Speed: F

* CAPITAL COSTS: 1991 $400,000  
  Escalated $456,000 FY: 1995-96

* PROPOSED FUNDING:  
  State Program: Flexible Congestion Relief  
  Other Project Funding: Bicycle Lane Account

* REGIONAL PRIORITY: 6 of 7.
* COUNTY: El Dorado  
* ROUTE: U.S. 50  
* PM: 79.3 - 80.1

* PROJECT LOCATION: South Lake Tahoe, along U.S. 50 from Park Avenue and Ski Run Boulevard

* PROPOSED PROJECT: Construct pedestrian facility adjacent to U.S. 50 to preserve capacity of U.S. 50

* EXISTING CONDITIONS: 
  
  Facility: 5 lane urban arterial 
  
  Avg. Daily Traffic: 41,500 
  Demand (Peak Hr.)/Capacity: 1.05 
  Congestion: Hrs./Wk. 
  Level of Service (LOS) & Speed: F

* CAPITAL COSTS: 1991 $200,000 
  Escalated $200,000 FY: 1992-93

* PROPOSED FUNDING: 
  State Program: Flexible Congestion Relief 
  Other Project Funding: Bicycle Lane Account

* REGIONAL PRIORITY: 7 of 7.
PROJECT INFORMATION SHEET
Transit Projects

* COUNTY: El Dorado  ROUTE: not applicable

* PROJECT LOCATION: South Lake Tahoe, along U.S. Highway 50

* PROPOSED PROJECT: Acquisition of ROW, construction of intermodal transportation terminal, and related facilities for a mass transit fixed guideway project

* EXISTING CONDITIONS: Facility/Service: Fixed route transit
   Avg. Daily Ridership: Peak Capacity:
   Peak Loads: Hrs./Wk. Peak Hr. Load Factor:

* CAPITAL COSTS: 1991 $7.0 million for intermodal facility, acquisition of partial ROW for fixed guideway, and engineering for fixed guideway. ($69.0 million total)

   Escalated $8.35 FY: 1996-97

* PROPOSED FUNDING:

   State Program: Proposition 116 (for Tahoe)
   Other Project Funding:

* REGIONAL PRIORITY: 1 of 1.