TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
NOTICE OF MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, September 14, 1994, at the Glenbrook Room of the Horizon Casino Resort, Stateline, Nevada. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

September 2, 1994

By: [Signature]

Jerry Wells
Deputy Director

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.
All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted.

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS (No Action)

   Any member of the public wishing to address the Advisory Planning Commission on an agenda item not listed as a Public Hearing or a Planning Matter item, or on any other issue, may do so at this time. However, public comment on Public Hearing items will be taken at the time those agenda items are heard.

   NOTE: THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION IS PROHIBITED BY LAW FROM TAKING IMMEDIATE ACTION ON, OR DISCUSSING ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC THAT ARE NOT LISTED ON THIS AGENDA.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

V. PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

A. Amendment of Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities, MOU Between TRPA and Placer County to Implement Sign Ordinance

B. Amendment of Plan Area Statement Boundary Between Plan Area 013, Watson Creek (Conservation) and Plan Area 014, Cedar Flat (Residential), to Add APN 092-010-18 to Plan Area 014

C. Amendment of Plan Area Statement 115, Golden Bear (Residential), to Add Multiple Family Dwellings as a Permissible Use, and to Add El Dorado County APNs 080-010-15 and 080-030-01 to Plan Area 115

D. Amendment of Plan Area Statement 168, Talmont, and Plan Area Statement 166, Upper Ward Valley, Boundaries to Include Remainder of Talmont Estates Parcels (APNs 83-460-22 Through -27) Within Plan Area Statement 168

E. Application by Tahoe Redevelopment Agency, Park Avenue Development Project, Amendment of the Regional Plan Land Capability Overlay Map Pursuant to Man-Modified Determination, El Dorado County APNs 29-440-04, 29-400-14, 29-200-12, 29-200-22, 29-200-23

38-
VI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Discussion on Recreation Threshold Program Management

B. Review of Tentative Scope of Work for Preparation of an EIR/EIS for Park Avenue Redevelopment Project EIR/EIS

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Role of the Advisory Planning Commission (APC), Recommendations to the Rules Committee of the Governing Board Regarding Project Review, Testimony, and Role of Official APC Members

VIII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

B. Legal Counsel

C. APC Members

IX. ADJOURNMENT
September 1, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities, MOU between TRPA and Placer County to Implement Sign Ordinance

Proposed Action: Placer County and TRPA staff propose to amend Chapter 4 to adopt a MOU delegating sign review in the Tahoe City Community Plan to Placer County. APC is requested to make a recommendation to the Governing Board on the proposal. Copies of the proposed adopting ordinance and MOU are attached (Attachment A).

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the adopting ordinance and MOU (Attachment A).

Background: Pursuant to Section 4.4 and 26.5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, TRPA and Placer County may adopt substitute sign standards for the Tahoe City Community Plan area. The recently adopted substitute sign standards are contained in Chapter 18, Placer County Design Standards and Guidelines, of the Tahoe City Community Plan (Appendix B).

The APC recommended approval of these standards in February of 1994 and the Governing Board adopted them in February of 1994. These standards are now in effect. The approval of the MOU will permit Placer County to take its first step in assuming delegated permitting authority under the new sign standards.

It is the intent of TRPA and Placer County staffs to adopt the Tahoe City CP sign regulations for the other Placer community plans and for the Lake Tahoe portion of Placer County in the future.

Findings: The following findings are required for the Governing Board to approve the MOU amendment.

Chapter 6 Findings

Section 6.5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances requires the following four findings be made prior to Code amendments:
A. 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.

Section 26.5 of the Code allows for the development and implementation of MOUs to exempt signs not otherwise considered exempt or qualified exempt under Chapter 4. The activities permitted in the proposed MOU have been evaluated in the Tahoe City CP EIS/EIR and were found to be equal or superior to the provisions of Chapter 26. The proposed MOU is consistent with, and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan.

B. The project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.

Activities undertaken pursuant to this MOU are subject to the provisions of the Regional Plan. The activities are subject to restrictions of the adopted TRPA sign standards, and any significant exemptions will also be subject to TRPA review. Therefore, the activities will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded. This finding is also based on the Article V(g) checklist completed for the proposed amendment.

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

Activities undertaken pursuant to this MOU are subject to the standards of the Regional Plan and Code. This finding is also based on the Article V(g) checklist completed for the proposed amendment.

D. 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.

As explained under findings A, B, and C, above, the Regional Plan will continue to attain and maintain the thresholds.

**Article VI(a) Findings**

**Article VI(a) states,**

The Agency shall prescribe by ordinance those activities which it has determined will not have a substantial effect on the land, water, air, space, or any other natural resources in the region and therefore will be exempt from its review and approval.

Sections 4.4 and 26.5 of the Code allows for the implementation of MOUs with Placer County to delegate sign permitting and enforcement activities. The proposed MOU effectively and efficiently provides these services. The MOU has no impact on the regulatory structure and does not result in an increase in development. The minor nature of the activities, and the limitations elsewhere in the Code, assure the MOU will not have a substantial effect on the land, water, air, space, or other natural resources in the Region.

GWB:rd
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Ordinance 87-8 Findings

Section 2.5 of Ordinance 87-8 provides that findings under Section 2.40 are not needed to add policies or ordinances designed to make existing policies and ordinances more effective. The proposed MOU with Placer County will implement Section 26.5 of the Code which allows amendments to exempt certain sign review activities of public entities.

Environmental Documentation: Based on the Tahoe City Community Plan EIS/EIR analysis, staff has completed the Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) for the initial determination of no significant effect on the environment.

Please contact Gabby Barrett at (702) 588-4547 if you have any comments or questions on this agenda item.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE NO. 94-

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 87-9, AS AMENDED, BY AMENDING CHAPTER 4 OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATING TO EXEMPT ACTIVITIES; ADOPTING A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH PLACER COUNTY TO EXEMPT CERTAIN SIGN ACTIVITIES FROM TRPA REVIEW; 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 amending Chapter 4 of the Code of Ordinances to adopt a memorandum of understanding with Placer County pursuant to Section 4.4 of Chapter 4 of the Code in order to further implement the Regional Plan and Article VI(a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

1.20  The Advisory Planning Commission ("APC") conducted a public hearing and recommended adoption of the amendments. The Governing Board has also conducted a noticed public hearing on the amendments. Oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and considered.

1.30  The proposed amendments have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and are 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 Section 6.5 of the Code and Articles V(g) and VI(a) of the Compact.

1.50  The amendments adopted by this ordinance continue to implement the Regional Plan, as amended, in a manner that attains 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  Amendment of Chapter 4 of the Code

Subsection 4.4.D of Chapter 4 is hereby added as follows:

"4.4.D  Sign Activities Within The Placer County Portion of the Region: As set forth in the Memorandum of Understanding regarding exemption of sign activities from TRPA review and approval between Placer County and TRPA dated September 1, 1994 and set forth in Appendix DD of this Chapter."
Section 3.00 Interpretation and Severability

The provisions of this ordinance and the amendments to the Code 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 Code, 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 its adoption or the execution of the MOU by Placer County, whichever is later.

PASSED and ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held September __, 1994, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent:

Wayne S. Chimarusti, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
AND THE COUNTY OF PLACER

1994

This Memorandum of Understanding is entered into this _______ day of
_______ by and between the TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY (TRPA), through
its Executive Director as authorized by the Governing Board, and the COUNTY OF
PLACER (COUNTY), by and through its Board of Supervisors.

All activities described in this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) shall be in
accordance with the Regional Plan package of TRPA as adopted by Ordinance
No. ________, as amended from time to time. All activities undertaken by the
COUNTY pursuant to the MOU shall comply with all provisions of the TRPA Code
of Ordinances (Code), as it may be amended from time to time, except for the
procedural provisions replaced by this MOU, and such guidelines as may be
adopted by TRPA.

This MOU sets forth the responsibilities of the parties with regard to the
regulation of signage and related activities, in accordance with the desire of
the parties to provide a regulatory structure which is consistent with the
most efficient possible use of public resources.

RECITALS

A. TRPA is required by the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (P.L. 96-551, 94
Stat. 3233, Cal. Govt. Code 66801; NRS 277.200) to regulate activities
within the Tahoe Basin which may have a substantial effect on the natural
resources of the Basin. The bistate Compact, Article VI(a) required TRPA
to define which activities are exempt from TRPA review and approval.

B. Given the existing comprehensive regulatory structure of the COUNTY as it
pertains to the installation of signs within the area encompassed by the
Tahoe City Community Plan (hereafter referred to as "Tahoe City"), and
consistent with the mandate of the Compact to defer land use regulation to
local government wherever feasible, the COUNTY and TRPA agree that the
COUNTY shall review signage and related activities within the "Tahoe
City" boundaries. Such review by the COUNTY shall include application of
all applicable TRPA regulations to signage projects otherwise subjected
to TRPA review. As long as the applicable TRPA regulations are being
complied with and enforced, such activities shall be deemed an exempt
activity under TRPA regulations.

IT IS NOW THEREFORE UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED BY THE PARTIES:

1. Effective _____________, 1994, signage reviewed and approved by the
County, consistent with Chapter 26 of the Code as amended by Chapter 18
of Placer County Design Standards and Guidelines, shall be exempt from TRPA review except as set forth in paragraphs 2 and 3 below. All applications for signage and related activities will be reviewed by the County through its normal and customary review process, including the review and recommendations of the Tahoe City Design Review Committee, and final action by County staff (Design/Site Review Committee [D/SRC]), except for signs or other activities exempt by statute from County review, in which case TRPA shall review said signs. In the event the County is not able to determine whether or not an application is to be reviewed by the County or TRPA, the County shall consult TRPA consistent with provisions established for that purpose by the County Manager or his designee and the Executive Director or his designee.

2. Amortization of signs pursuant to the Chapter 26 schedule will be the sole responsibility of TRPA to administer and enforce in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 26.

3. The COUNTY and TRPA shall jointly review all proposed sign projects involving exemptions or exceptions from any provision of the Sign Ordinance for "Tahoe City" or involving any additional or relocation of land coverage. These projects shall be subject to the procedures established for joint review of such applications by the Placer County Manager or his designee and the Executive Director or his designee.

4. The COUNTY and TRPA staff shall review semi-annually the implementation of this MOU and shall report to their respective governing boards following such reviews.

5. The COUNTY shall perform compliance inspections to ensure that the sign and projects activities permitted under this MOU are constructed in accordance with the plans previously submitted and approved.

The COUNTY shall have authority and responsibility to take any and all administrative steps to enforce the standards of the adopted ordinances as authorized by this MOU, including the processing of Code violations involving unpermitted sign activities.

In the event litigation is necessary to enforce provisions of the TRPA Code, the COUNTY shall contact TRPA Legal Counsel. If a show cause hearing is required, the COUNTY is authorized to institute legal action.

In the event an applicant desires to appeal any administrative action or decision on the part of the COUNTY, acting on behalf of TRPA, such appeal shall be to TRPA.

6. Any exempt activity set forth herein shall be considered a project requiring TRPA review if the Executive Director of TRPA determines that, because of unusual circumstances or failure to comply with this MOU, the activity may have a substantial effect on the land, air, water, space, or any other natural resource of the region.
7. This MOU shall continue until sixty (60) days' written notice of termination is given by either party. Both parties hereby agree to cooperate in good faith to carry out the provisions of this MOU to achieve the objectives set forth in the Recitals herein.

8. None of the duties set forth in this MOU shall be assigned, transferred, or subcontracted by the COUNTY without the prior written approval of TRPA.

9. None of this MOU shall be construed to limit the authority of the COUNTY to administer state or local regulations or to impose reasonable conditions of approval on any application. Further, nothing in this MOU shall be deemed to limit the regulatory powers of either the COUNTY or TRPA.

10. In carrying out the intent of this MOU, the COUNTY and TRPA shall adhere to all provisions contained within TRPA Code Chapter 38 relating to accounting and tracking of coverage and any other applicable procedures. All project accounting and tracking shall be completed by the COUNTY and transmitted to TRPA to be included in its permanent accounting and tracking records. In carrying out the provisions of this MOU, the COUNTY shall utilize tracking forms provided by TRPA to record all inspections, verifications, and other project review activities. The COUNTY shall submit completed tracking forms to TRPA on a monthly basis.

COUNTY OF PLACER

Dated: ____________________________

Chairman of the Board of Supervisors

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Dated: ____________________________

James W. Baetge, Executive Director
August 31, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Plan Area Statement Boundary Between Plan Area 013, Watson Creek (Conservation), and Plan Area 014, Cedar Flat (Residential), to Add Placer County APN 092-010-18 to Plan Area 014

Proposed Action: The owner of a 26.5 acre parcel in Placer County, presently located in Plan Area 013, Watson Creek (Conservation), proposes to relocate the parcel into Plan Area 014, Cedar Flat Residential, for the purposes of developing additional residential uses. The proposed action would expand the TRPA Urban Boundary. Refer to Exhibit A, Existing Plan Area Boundaries, and Exhibit B, Applicant's Proposed Plan Area Boundary.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission recommend denial of the proposed amendment to the Governing Board for the reasons set forth below in the Discussion section.

Background: The subject parcel is shown in Exhibit A, Existing Plan Area Boundaries. It is vacant. It is approximately twenty six and one-half acres in size and contains Dollar Creek, a perennial stream. The Dollar Creek riparian corridor is stable and well-vegetated, and not in need of restoration. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has mapped a 100-year flood plain along the creek which varies from 50 to 100 feet wide through the site.

The existing Plan Area designation for the subject parcel is Plan Area 013, Watson Creek Conservation. Refer to Exhibit C, Plan Area Statement 013, Watson Creek. Permissible uses include residential summer homes and several developed recreation uses. It is located outside the TRPA Urban Boundary which is coincident with the existing boundary of Plan Area 014, Cedar Flat Residential. Plan Area Statement 014 is shown in Exhibit D.
The applicant also owns two vacant, residential parcels in the existing subdivision located adjacent to the subject parcel in Plan Area 014. The applicant has stated his desired intentions are to create three large lot parcels through a series of boundary line adjustments involving the subject parcel and the two parcels in Plan Area 014. It is uncertain at this time whether TRPA could approve the ultimate parcel configuration proposed by the applicant.

Land Capability: TRPA mapped land capability includes class 1b (SEZ), class 5 (Umpa very stony sandy loam, Umd), and class 6 (Tahoma stony sandy loam, Tbd) found on site. The two soil types have slope ranges up to a maximum of fifteen (15) percent. A more refined slope analysis submitted by the applicant, however, estimates that approximately 15 acres have slopes in excess of fifteen (15) percent. Slopes greater than fifteen (15) percent in the Umpa soil series (UmE and UmF) are designated as land capability classes 3 and 1a, respectively. Tahoma series soils with slopes greater than fifteen (15) percent are Jorge/Tahoma soils (JwE and JwF) rather than Tahoma soils and are designated as land capability classes 4 and 2, respectively. The correct land capability will have to be ascertained prior to any project development.

Discussion: In evaluating proposed plan area amendments, staff uses a three-step procedure. The first step is to determine whether a mistake was made in mapping the original plan area boundaries in this area. Based on the existing land use pattern, including the Urban Boundary located at the edge of the platted, residential subdivision, and the presence of Dollar Creek and its related flood plain on the subject parcel, there is no evidence that a mistake was made in the original mapping on the subject parcel.

The second step is to determine whether some other factor has changed in terms of the land use pattern or character of the site. Based on staff's review, nothing appears to have changed which would warrant relocating the parcel into the residential plan area and, at the same time, expand the urban boundary. Further, the recent Douglas County Community Plan litigation settlement agreement prohibits TRPA from taking action on subdivision applications filed after July 1, 1994, on lands which are located outside the TRPA Urban Boundary existing on August 1, 1994. This prohibition applies to the subject parcel and may affect the owner's ultimate plans for the site. Refer to the TRPA Urban Boundary section below for additional discussion.

The third step is to determine whether amending the Plan Area would change the land use patterns such that attainment and maintenance of the environmental thresholds is improved or enhanced. The subject parcel contains Dollar Creek and its associated riparian corridor and flood plain, and appears to have large areas of slopes greater than fifteen (15) percent. As discussed earlier, the stretch of Dollar Creek and its associated SEZ on the subject parcel are in stable condition and not in need of restoration. Dollar Creek is not included in the SEZ restoration program of the adopted Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin (208 Plan). It contains several intrinsic values in the areas of soil conservation, water quality, wildlife habitat and in-stream fish habitat. Similarly, the 208 Plan states that "This alternative will maintain the existing boundaries of the urban area within the
Amendment of Plan Area Statement Boundary
Between Plan Area 013 and Plan Area 014
Page 3

Region, and will generally result in the in-fill of property in land
capability districts 4 through 7 with urban land uses, consistent with the
TRPA Plan Area Statements (Volume I, p. 218). There are no regional benefits
to be gained by approving the proposed amendment.

TRPA Urban Boundary: In 1986, as part of the Regional Plan package, TRPA
established an Urban Boundary. All residential, commercial/public service and
tourist accommodation plan areas are included within the Urban Boundary. The
subject parcel is in a Conservation Plan Area which is not included within the
Urban Boundary. Adding it to the Residential Plan Area (014) would expand the
Urban Boundary.

TRPA established Urban Area Boundaries to clearly direct the location of
all future residential, commercial/public service and tourist accommodation
development. The Urban Boundary represents TRPA policy (shown below) that
additional development occur within already developed areas. These areas
contain the necessary public utilities, road system, and other supporting
infrastructure to accommodate the additional development permitted under the
Regional Plan.

The following sections of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies, Land Use
Element, Land Use Subelement contains the Urban Boundaries policies.

"GOAL #2 DIRECT THE AMOUNT AND LOCATION OF NEW LAND USES IN CONFORMANCE WITH
THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES AND THE OTHER GOALS
OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING COMPACT.

Based on the findings of the Compact, evidence included in the environ-
mental impact statement prepared for this Plan, and public testimony, the
Tahoe Region is experiencing resource use problems and deficient environ-
mental controls.

POLICIES

1. THE TOTAL POPULATION PERMITTED IN THE REGION AT ONE TIME SHALL BE A FUNCT-
ION OF THE CONSTRAINTS OF THE REGIONAL PLAN AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRES-
HOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES.

Population growth in the Region will be guided by the limitations on land
use set forth in the Plan. This Plan identifies land use, densities,
traffic volumes, urban boundaries, and other factors that indirectly
determine the population at any given time. All of these factors have
been set to ensure compliance with the environmental thresholds.

2. SPECIFIC LAND USE POLICIES SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED THROUGH THE USE OF PLANN-
ING AREA STATEMENTS FOR EACH OF THE PLANNING AREAS IDENTIFIED IN THE MAP
INCLUDED IN THIS PLAN (LOCATED INSIDE BACK COVER). AREAS OF SIMILAR USE
AND CHARACTER HAVE BEEN MAPPED AND CATEGORIZED WITHIN ONE OR MORE OF
THE FOLLOWING FIVE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS: CONSERVATION, RECREATION, RESI-
DENTIAL, COMMERCIAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE, AND TOURIST. THESE LAND USE
CLASSIFICATIONS SHALL DICTATE ALLOWABLE LAND USES. MORE DETAILED PLANS,
CALLED COMMUNITY PLANS, MAY BE DEVELOPED FOR DESIGNATED COMMERCIAL AREAS.
OTHER DETAILED PLANS, SUCH AS THE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN, SKI AREA MASTER
PLANS, AND REDEVELOPMENT PLANS, MAY ALSO BE DEVELOPED. THESE DETAILED PLANS MAY COMBINE TWO OR MORE OF THE FIVE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS.

Since the development permitted under this Plan is generally limited to the existing urban boundaries in which uses have already been established, the concept of this land use plan is directed toward regulating infill and redirection. The intent of this system is to provide flexibility when dealing with existing uses, continuation of acceptable land use patterns, and redirection of unacceptable land use patterns. Implementation ordinances set forth the detailed management criteria and allowed uses for each land use classification.

For example, as of March 1, 1993, there were approximately 1,244 vacant single-family parcels in Placer County which were above the IPES line and eligible for development. At the same time, there were 935 parcels in Placer County which are below the IPES line.

From a land use planning standard and in terms of attaining and maintaining the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities, the existing lands within the Urban Boundary should first be built out prior to expanding into those areas outside of it. A fundamental concept of the Regional Plan is to infill additional development into existing developed areas. Cumulatively, the incremental expansions of the Urban Boundary would be inconsistent with the Goals and Policies stated above.

In summary, staff believes that the parcel in question is appropriately mapped in Plan Area 013 and should not be relocated.

Findings: Prior to amending the plan area boundary, TRPA must make the following findings.

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: This Finding cannot be made. Adding Conservation Plan Area lands to a residential plan area and consequently expanding the Urban Boundary is inconsistent with the Regional Plan Goals and Policies which direct new residential development into existing developed areas to infill rather than expanding into areas outside the Urban Boundary.

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

   Rationale: This Finding cannot be made. As stated in page II-2 of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies, establishing the Urban Boundary infilling additional development in existing developed areas rather than expanding into undeveloped areas was one of the key factors which have been set to ensure compliance with the environmental thresholds.
Expanding the Urban Boundary at this time combined with the slower than anticipated progress toward threshold compliance will adversely effect the Region's ability to attain and maintain the environmental thresholds.

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

**Rationale:** See findings 1 and 2 above.

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

**Rationale:** See findings 1 and 2 above.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. Please contact Andrew Strain at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this item.
013 -- WATSON CREEK

PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification: CONSERVATION
33Management Strategy: MITIGATION
Special Designation: NONE

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This is a large Plan Area that covers the backdrop country between Dollar Point and Flick Point and is located on Agency maps D-4, D-5, D-6, E-3, E-4 and the Martis Peak Quadrangle.

Existing Uses: The Plan Area is mostly undeveloped and in public ownership. Existing uses are mostly limited to dispersed-types of recreation and to timber management.

Existing Environment: This area has a good mixture and distribution of plant communities, but mature fir trees still dominate the overall plant composition. Much of the area has good land capability.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This planning area should be managed with an emphasis on providing improved opportunities for dispersed recreation and timber harvest.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. There is an over abundance of unimproved roads.
2. There is good capability land for long range relocation of recreational development. However, the potential for developed recreational sites is constrained due to lack of the necessary infrastructure such as sewer, water, and improved roads.
3. The lack of significant natural features such as large streams or lakes limit the attractiveness of the area for campsite development.
4. The legal status of the North Rim Subdivision is uncertain.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. The development or relocation of recreational facilities should be limited to good capability lands within close proximity to urban services.
2. Some bank stabilization and fish passage barrier removal work should be performed on Watson Creek.

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

- Summer homes (S).

Public Service

- Transmission and receiving facilities (S) and pipelines and power transmission (S).

Recreation

- Day use areas (S), developed campgrounds (S), off-road vehicle courses (S), outdoor recreation concessions (S), riding and hiking trails (A), rural sports (S), group facilities (S), undeveloped campgrounds (S), and snowmobile courses (S).

Resource Management

- Reforestation (A), regeneration harvest (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), selection cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), timber stand improvement (A), tree farms (S), 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 (S), grazing (S), 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).

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>Summer Homes</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Campgrounds</td>
<td>8 sites per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Facilities</td>
<td>25 persons 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 0 units.

MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL: The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area is 50 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 pur-
suant 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 USE 0 PAOT  OVERNIGHT USES 400 PAOT

OTHER: Seven miles of trail.

**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. Stream zone restoration as indicated in the Stream Environment Zone Restoration Program. (To be completed.)
014 -- CEDAR FLAT

PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification: RESIDENTIAL
Management Strategy: MITIGATION
Special Designation: NONE

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This area is located in the Cedar Flat area north of Dollar Point and can be found on TRPA maps D-6 and D-5.

Existing Uses: The area consists of older low density residential subdivisions. The entire length of the shoreline below the highway is single family residential with minor access to a county-owned strip of shoreline. The area is 75 percent built out.

Existing Environment: The lands are classified 60 percent low hazard, 15 percent high hazard and 15 percent moderate hazard. The high hazard and steeper lands are located along the shoreline which is a tolerance district 2 and 4 and is designated as prime fish habitat. The land coverage is 15 percent plus an additional 25 percent disturbed.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should continue as a residential area of the same type and character now existing.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Erosion is evident on over steepened lands adjacent to the lake.
2. Subdivision and highway improvements are not up to minimal BMP standards.
3. Private use of the county-owned shorezone strip has created conflicts between public and private uses.
4. The prime fish habitat in Lake Tahoe is tentatively identified for habitat restoration.
5. Severe flooding and erosion problems associated with development within SEZs and channelization of natural drainages.
6. Scenic Roadway Unit 17 and Scenic Shoreline Unit 18 are within this Plan Area.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. A specific plan shall be developed by Placer County for the county littoral strip of land known as Lake Forest #2 prior to any further shorezone development. The plan should balance private pier and buoy uses with public recreation and fishery management.
2. Attention should be given to an overall hydrologic study of the area and appropriate remedial actions to correct the problems.
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).

**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), local post offices (S), and day care centers/pre-schools (S).

**Recreation**
- Participant sports facilities (S), day use areas (A), riding and hiking trails (A), and beach recreation (A).

**Resource Management**
- Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), special cut (A), selection cut (S), 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).

**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 existing, allowed use located on the same or adjoining littoral parcel.

**Tolerance District 2**

**Primary Uses**
- Safety and navigational devices (A) and salvage operations (A).

**Accessory Structures**
- Buoys (A), piers (A), fences (S), boat ramps (S), breakwaters or jetties (S), floating docks and platforms (A), shoreline protective structures (S), and water intake lines (S).

**Tolerance District 4**

**Primary Uses**
- Beach recreation (A), safety and navigational devices (A), and salvage operations (A).

**Accessory Structures**
- Buoys (A), piers (A), fences (S), boat ramps (S), breakwaters or jetties (S), floating docks and platforms (A), shoreline protective structures (S), and water intake lines (S).

**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.

PAS 014 -- CEDAR FLAT
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programs, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.

**USE**

Residential

Single Family Dwelling

**MAXIMUM DENSITY**

1 unit per parcel

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

**MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL:** The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area, including the Highway 28 corridor, is 55 CNEIL.

**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 USE 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 I 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.)
August 31, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Plan Area Statement 115, Golden Bear (Residential), to add Multiple Family Dwellings as a Permissible Use, and to Add El Dorado County APNs 080-010-15 an 080-030-01 to Plan Area 115

Proposed Action: The owner of two parcels in El Dorado County totalling approximately 80 acres in size, presently located in Plan Area 095, Trout/Cold Creek (Conservation), proposes to relocate both parcels into the neighboring Plan Area 115, Golden Bear Residential, and, at the same time, to add Multiple Family Residential uses at a density of one unit per acre to the entire Plan Area for the purposes of developing additional residential uses. The proposed action would expand the TRPA Urban Boundary. Refer to Exhibit A, Existing Plan Area Boundaries, and Exhibit B, Applicant's Proposed Plan Area Boundaries.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission recommend denial of the proposed amendments to the Governing Board for the reasons set forth below in the Discussion section.

Background: The subject parcels are shown in Exhibit A, Existing Plan Area Boundaries. They are vacant. At this time, the applicant could develop one single family dwelling and one secondary residence on each parcel. Plan Area 095 permits single family dwellings as a special use at a density of one unit per parcel. Secondary residences on the same parcels are permitted under certain conditions. The two subject parcels would be eligible for secondary residences. Refer to Exhibit C, Trout/Cold Creek Plan Area Statement. Existing El Dorado County zoning on the subject parcels is Residential R-1. R-1 zoning in the Tahoe Region generally permits the same amount of residential development as TRPA presently allows.

In 1972, the property in question was zoned Low Density Residential (LDR) by TRPA along with other surrounding good capability land. This permitted residential subdivision development at four units per acre. In 1976, CTRPA adopted a plan that limited density to one unit per acre and prohibited subdivisions and multi-family uses until 85% of the lots were built out.
Also, during the 1970s there were sewer moratoriums that limited allocations of development. The 1980 TRPA Compact made the CTRPA Plan the TRPA Plan until TRPA adopted its 1984 Plan.

Under the current 1987 Plan Area Statement (PAS) system, this area is designated Conservation with single family dwellings (one per parcel) being a special use. Most of the undeveloped land that was zoned LDR in 1972 is now in public ownership. These parcels were not considered to be a good location for multi-residential due to their location away from commercial and public services. The choice to put the subject parcels in the Conservation PAS instead of the adjoining Residential PAS (which does not allow multi-residential) was based on the range of recreational uses allowed in the Conservation PAS. Refer to Appendix C.

Discussion: In evaluating proposed plan area amendments, staff uses a three-step procedure. The first step is to determine whether a mistake was made in mapping the original plan area boundaries in this area. The 1987 adopted Plan Area 115 boundary was specifically drawn to include just the Golden Bear subdivision which allows single family dwellings only. Refer to Exhibit D, Golden Bear Plan Area Statement. Based on the existing land use pattern, the location of the Urban Boundary at the edge of the existing residential subdivision, and the previous discussion regarding the parcel’s history, there is no evidence that a mistake was made in the original mapping.

The second step is to determine whether some other factor has changed in terms of the land use pattern or character of the site. Based on staff’s review, nothing appears to have changed which would warrant adding multiple family uses, relocating the parcel into the residential plan area and, at the same time, expand the Urban Boundary. Further, the recent Douglas County Community Plan litigation settlement agreement prohibits TRPA from taking action on subdivision applications filed after July 19, 1994, on lands which are located outside the TRPA Urban Boundary existing on August 1, 1994. The prohibition applies to the subject parcels and may affect the owner’s ultimate plans for the site. Refer to the TRPA Urban Boundary section below for additional discussion.

The third step is to determine whether amending the Plan Area Statement would change the land use patterns such that attainment and maintenance of the environmental thresholds is improved or enhanced. There are no regional benefits to be gained by approving the proposed amendment. Adding up to 80 additional dwellings to the parcels which are outside the existing urban areas and in areas not regularly served by mass transit would adversely affect attainment of transportation and air quality thresholds. Because of the low densities and somewhat isolated location, the site is not integrated into the south shore transit system. Conversely, by developing the parcels under the existing Plan Area Statement, developed recreation uses could assist in implementing the Recreation thresholds.

TRPA Urban Boundary: In 1986, as part of the Regional Plan package, TRPA established an Urban Boundary. All residential, commercial/public service and tourist accommodation plan areas are included within the Urban Boundary. The subject parcels are in a Conservation Plan Area which is not included within the Urban Boundary. Adding them to the Residential Plan Area would expand the Urban Boundary.
TRPA established the Urban Boundary to clearly direct the location of all future residential, commercial/public service and tourist accommodation development. The Urban Boundary represents TRPA policy (shown below) that additional development occur within existing developed areas. These areas contain the necessary public utilities, road system, transit service and other supporting infrastructure to accommodate all additional development permitted under the Regional Plan.

The following sections of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies, Land Use Element, Land Use Subelement contains the Urban Boundaries policies.

GOAL #2 DIRECT THE AMOUNT AND LOCATION OF NEW LAND USES IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES AND THE OTHER GOALS OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING COMPACT.

Based on the findings of the Compact, evidence included in the environmental impact statement prepared for this Plan, and public testimony, the Tahoe Region is experiencing resource use problems and deficient environmental controls.

POLICIES

1. THE TOTAL POPULATION PERMITTED IN THE REGION AT ONE TIME SHALL BE A FUNCTION OF THE CONSTRAINTS OF THE REGIONAL PLAN AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES.

Population growth in the Region will be guided by the limitations on land use set forth in the Plan. This Plan identifies land use, densities, traffic volumes, urban boundaries, and other factors that indirectly determine the population at any given time. All of these factors have been set to ensure compliance with the environmental thresholds.

2. SPECIFIC LAND USE POLICIES SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED THROUGH THE USE OF PLANNING AREA STATEMENTS FOR EACH OF THE PLANNING AREAS IDENTIFIED IN THE MAP INCLUDED IN THIS PLAN (LOCATED INSIDE BACK COVER). AREAS OF SIMILAR USE AND CHARACTER HAVE BEEN MAPPED AND CATEGORIZED WITHIN ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS: CONSERVATION, RECREATION, RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE, AND TOURIST. THESE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS SHALL DICRATE ALLOWABLE LAND USES. MORE DETAILED PLANS, CALLED COMMUNITY PLANS, MAY BE DEVELOPED FOR DESIGNATED COMMERCIAL AREAS. OTHER DETAILED PLANS, SUCH AS THE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN, SKI AREA MASTER PLANS, AND REDEVELOPMENT PLANS, MAY ALSO BE DEVELOPED. THESE DETAILED PLANS MAY COMBINE TWO OR MORE OF THE FIVE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS.

Since the development permitted under this Plan is generally limited to the existing urban boundaries in which uses have already been established, the concept of this land use plan is directed toward regulating infill and redirection. The intent of this system is to provide flexibility when dealing with existing uses, continuation of acceptable land use patterns, and redirection of unacceptable land use patterns. Implementation ordinances set forth the detailed management criteria and allowed uses for each land use classification.
For example, as of March 1, 1993, there were approximately 4,508 vacant single-family parcels in El Dorado County/City of South Lake Tahoe which are above the IPES line and are eligible for development. There are 1,508 parcels in same area which are below the IPES line.

In terms of land use planning and attaining and maintaining the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities, lands within the existing Urban Boundary should first be built out prior to expanding into those areas outside of it. A fundamental concept of the Regional Plan is to infill additional development into existing developed areas. Cumulatively, the incremental expansions of the Urban Boundary would be inconsistent with the Goals and Policies stated above.

In summary, staff believes that the parcels in question are appropriately mapped in Plan Area 095 and should not be relocated, nor should multiple family uses be added to the Golden Bear Plan Area 115.

**Findings:** Prior to amending the plan area boundary, TRPA must make the following findings.

**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:**
   This Finding cannot be made. Adding Conservation plan area lands to a residential plan area and consequently expanding the Urban Boundary is inconsistent with the Regional Plan Goals and Policies which direct new residential development into existing developed areas to infill rather than expand into areas outside the Urban Boundary.

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

   **Rationale:**
   This Finding cannot be made. As stated in page II-2 of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies, establishing the Urban Boundary infilling additional development in existing developed areas rather than expanding into undeveloped areas was one of the key factors which have been set to ensure compliance with the environmental thresholds. Expanding the Urban Boundary at this time combined with the slower than anticipated progress toward threshold compliance will adversely effect the Region’s ability to attain and maintain the environmental thresholds.

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

**AS/rd**
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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: See findings 1 and 2 above.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. Please contact Andrew Strain at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this item.
095 -- TROUT/COLD CREEK

PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification
CONSERVATION
Management Strategy
MITIGATION
Special Designation
NONE

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This is a large undeveloped area south of the City of South Lake Tahoe. The area is depicted on TRPA maps G-20, G-21, H-18, H-19, and the South Lake Tahoe and Freel Peak Quadrangles.

Existing Uses: Most of this area is in public ownership and is managed by the USFS for low to moderate resource use. Forest practices include range allotment, timber harvest, wildlife habitat improvements, and dispersed recreation management. Recreational activities include hiking, fishing, cross country skiing, and off-road vehicle use.

Existing Environment: The land capability of this area is a mixture of low, moderate, and high hazard. Creeks passing through this area include Heavenly Valley, Cold, Trout, and Saxon. Dominant plant species include red and white fir, lodgepole pine, willow, greenleaf manzanita, and Basin sagebrush.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should continue to be managed for low to moderate resource use to include timber, grazing, recreation, and wildlife habitat management.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Off-road vehicle use is creating localized erosion problems and nuisances.
2. Access to Star Lake and Freel Peak is through private land with no public right-of-way.
3. Proximity to urban areas provides potential for developed recreation sites.
4. The future status of a Caltrans right-of-way through this area is uncertain.
5. The Agency Wildlife Map identifies peregrine falcon habitat and major deer migration corridors through this Plan Area, and the USFS has identified active goshawk habitat here.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. Reduce conflicts between residents and off-road vehicle users.
2. Improve the instream habitats for fishes in the various creeks that pass through this area.
3. Low hazard lands adjacent to the Sierra Tract should be considered for development of urban recreation uses.

PERMISSIBLE USES: Pursuant to Chapter 18 PERMISSIBLE USES and if applicable, Chapter 51 PER-
MISSIBLE 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**
  - Domestic animal raising (S), employee housing (S), and single family dwelling (S).

- **Commercial**
  - Nursery (S).

- **Public Service**
  - Cemeteries (S), pipelines and power transmission lines (S), local public health and safety facilities (S), public utility centers (S), transit stations and terminals (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), and transportation routes (S).

- **Recreation**
  - Cross country skiing courses (S), day use areas (S), developed campgrounds (S), outdoor recreation concessions (S), off-road vehicle courses (S), participant sports facilities (S), riding and hiking trails (A), rural sports (S), group facilities (S), snowmobile courses (S), and undeveloped campgrounds (S).

- **Resource Management**
  - Reforestation (A), regeneration harvest (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), selection cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), timber stand improvement (A), tree farms (S), 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 (S), grazing (S), 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).

**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>Employee Housing</td>
<td>15 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recreation

Developed Campgrounds 8 sites per acre
Group Facilities 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 units.

**MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL:** The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area is 50 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 USE 0 PAOT  OVERNIGHT USES 0 PAOT

**OTHER:** Trailhead and ten miles of trail.

**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. Stream zone restoration as indicated in the Stream Environment Zone Restoration Program. (To be completed.)
115 -- GOLDEN BEAR

PLAN DESIGNATION:

- Land Use Classification: RESIDENTIAL
- Management Strategy: MITIGATION
- Special Designation: NONE

DESCRIPTION:

Location: The Golden Bear Plan Area is located north of Pioneer Trail near where the road crosses Trout Creek. It includes all the residential lots accessible from Golden Bear Trail and can be found on TRPA map G-19.

Existing Uses: The primary use of this area is residential at a density of one single family dwelling per parcel of record. The area is 40 percent built out.

Existing Environment: The Golden Bear Plan Area is located entirely on low (70 percent) and moderate (30 percent) hazard lands. The area is currently about 18 percent covered and 24 percent disturbed.

PLANNING STATEMENT: The area should remain residential, maintaining the existing character of the neighborhood.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Some areas do not meet minimal BMP standards.

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.

- 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), and public utility centers (S).
- Recreation: Participant sports facilities (S), day use areas (A), and riding and hiking trails (A).
Resource Management

Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), Managementspecial 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 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>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td></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 0 units.

**MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL:** The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area is 50 CNEQ.

**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 USE 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 I 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.)
August 30, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Plan Area 168 and 166 Boundaries to include remainder of Talmont Estates (APNs 83-460-22 thru -27) in Plan Area 168

PROPOSED ACTION: The proposed action is to make a recommendation to the Governing Board on amending the boundary between Plan Area 168 and 166 to include the remainder of Talmont Estates in Plan Area 168.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends adoption of the boundary amendment.

DISCUSSION: As shown on Attachment A, the six parcels which are part of Talmont Estates Unit #5 are located in Plan Area 166 where single family residences are a special use. These parcels were created in conjunction with a litigation settlement between Talland Corp. and TRPA. The litigation settlement included a resubdivision of forty vacant building envelopes into five single family parcels with assigned coverages, and sale of the remaining land to the California Tahoe Conservancy. In addition, there are four existing residences which were built in the mid-1970's.

The parties to the litigation settlement did not realize that six of the parcels were in a different plan area statement than the other three and that single family residences were a special use for six of the 9 parcels. The three single family residential parcels in Plan Area 168 (two existing homes and one vacant parcel) are an allowed use.

The plan area boundary amendment moves the six parcels on Clearview Court into the same plan area statement as the rest of the subdivision and would permit single family residences as an allowed use. As currently mapped, the four vacant parcels would require Governing Board review of any residential construction. Given the litigation settlement and the two existing homes on Clearview Court, the single family uses on the six parcels should be allowed. It appears the plan area statement boundary was initially drawn based on the belief that some or all of Talmont Estates Unit #5 was a paper subdivision.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION: Due to the existing uses in the subdivision and the litigation settlement, staff recommends a finding of no significant environmental effect.
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ACTION REQUESTED: Staff requests the APC to conduct a public hearing and to make a recommendation to the Governing Board for consideration at their September 1994 meeting.
MEMORANDUM

September 6, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Application by Tahoe Redevelopment Agency, Park Avenue Development Project, Amendment of the Regional Plan Land Capability Overlay Map, El Dorado County

This item is to be continued to the October APC meeting to give more time to evaluate mitigation alternatives.
September 2, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Discussion on Recreation Threshold Program Management

At the September Advisory Planning Commission meeting, TRPA staff will present the draft recreation threshold attainment program. Attached to this memorandum are draft copies of specific program elements, including significant implementation milestones. Adopted recreation thresholds are shown below.

"RECREATION

POLICY STATEMENTS
It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Body in development of the Regional Plan to preserve and enhance the high quality recreational experience, including preservation of high quality undeveloped shorezone and other natural areas. In developing the Regional Plan, the staff and Governing Body shall consider provisions for additional access, where lawful and feasible, to the shorezone and high quality undeveloped areas for low density recreational uses.

It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Body in development of the Regional Plan to establish and insure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation is available to the general public."

Exhibit A shows a conceptual inventory of regional recreation facilities and how it is expected to grow over time. Specific data will be added following completion of a recreation facility inventory now underway.

Exhibit B shows a critical path flow chart leading to recreation threshold attainment. As shown, it is planned to be a partnership approach with the Tahoe Coalition of Recreation Providers (TCORP).

Exhibit C represents a more detailed step-by-step approach to completion of a Regional Recreation Plan and Capital Improvement Program, called for in the 1991 Regional Plan and Threshold Evaluation. TCORP is scheduled to address the plan and improvement program on September 13, 1994. Staff will brief the APC on the September 13 meeting.

Please contact Andrew Strain at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this matter.
ATTAINING THE RECREATION THRESHOLDS: INVENTORY OF FACILITIES AND CAPACITIES

1987 Facilities at Time of Regional Plan Adoption

1997 Additional Facilities at the 10-Year Plan & Threshold Evaluation

2007 Projected Facilities at Regional Plan Buildout (Compared to 1987)
ATTAINING THE RECREATION THRESHOLDS: A PARTNERSHIP APPROACH

1987
- 5-Year Plan & Threshold Evaluation

1992
- Region Plan Package Becomes Effective
- Recreation TAC: Regional Plan Amendment (1989)
- Goal & Policies: P&OT Allocations
- Regional Plan Recreation Element: Core

1997
- Regional Plan & 1993 Threshold Evaluation & Recommendation
- Recreation User Surveys
- Recreation Travel Study, Including Activity Survey
- Recreation Facility Inventory
- Recreation Issues Paper
- Identify Additional Capacity for Recreation
- Regional Recreation Plan/Capital Improvement Program
- Reserve Land & Other Capacities for Recreation Development
- Public Opinion Survey: Quality of Recreation Experience
- 1998 Evaluation & Recommendations
- 2002 Evaluation & Recommendations
- 2007 Evaluation & Recommendations

2002
- 15-Year Plan & Threshold Evaluation

2007
- 20-Year Plan & Threshold Evaluation

Develop Recreation Projects

COMPLETED ACTIVITY

ACTIVITY TO BE COMPLETED
ATTAINING THE RECREATION THRESHOLDS: WRITING THE REGIONAL RECREATION PLAN AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Target Date for Completion 7/96

- Revise Recreation Plan & Improvement Program
  Adopted by TRPA

Steering Committee Formed

- Work Program
- Recreation Report
- Bikeway Master Plan
  Opportunities & Constraints
  Demographic Trends
  Recreation Trends
- Recreation Facility Inventory
- Recreation User Surveys
- Recreation Travel Study
- Recreation Plans of Others
- Shorezone Study

Spring '95 Annual Conference: Creating The Vision

Administrative Draft Plan & Program Written
Environmental Document Prepared
Draft Plan & Program Circulated
Public Review & Comments
TCORP Oversight
August 30, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Review of Tentative Scope of Work for Preparation of an EIR/EIS for the Park Avenue Redevelopment Project

Requested Action: There is no action requested for this item. This item is for discussion and direction only.

Discussion: As provided for in Article 6.11 of the TRPA Rules of Procedure, TRPA staff is seeking your input on the scope of work for preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Park Avenue Redevelopment project. At the APC meeting a presentation will be made regarding the description of the proposed project and the tentative scope of work.

Attached you will find a Notice of Preparation (NOP), which includes a project description and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and TRPA Initial Environmental Checklists, as well as a Work Plan, which outlines the specific tasks to be performed by the consultant, Balloffet and Associates.

If you have any questions regarding this item, please contact Rick Angelo of the TRPA staff at (702) 588-4547.
NOTICE OF PREPARATION SUPPLEMENT

PARK AVENUE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

1 PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed Park Avenue Redevelopment Project is located in South Lake Tahoe adjacent to the California/Nevada Stateline as shown on Figure 1. The majority of the proposed project is bounded by U.S. Highway 50 (Highway 50) or Lake Tahoe Boulevard to the west, the Embassy Suites Hotel to the north, Van Sickle and Montreal roads to the east, and Fern Road to the south. The proposed project will also involve off-site stormwater management facilities that are not fully defined, but are currently proposed to be located west of Highway 50.

2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The need for redevelopment in the South Lake Tahoe Area has been recognized for a long time. In February, 1987 the Redevelopment Agency accepted a conceptual Redevelopment Plan for the Stateline and Ski Run Areas (Redevelopment Plan). In June 1988, the City certified an EIR for the Redevelopment Plan. In May 1989, the Redevelopment Agency published the South Tahoe Redevelopment Demonstration Plan for the Ski Run and Stateline Areas. As a result of these efforts the Embassy Suites Hotel was completed and the proposed Park Avenue Redevelopment Project has been initiated. Based on a cooperative effort between the Redevelopment Agency and the project proponents, a conceptual master plan has been developed for the project area and detailed project planning is currently underway.

3 NEED FOR THIS DOCUMENT

This Notice of Preparation (NOP) has been prepared to inform responsible agencies that an EIR/EIS will be prepared for the Park Avenue Redevelopment Project. Section 5.8 of the TRPA Code states that if the Agency finds that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, it shall cause an EIS to be prepared. To accomplish this, there is a requirement to consult with and obtain the comments of any federal, state, or local agency which has jurisdiction, by law or special expertise, with respect to any environmental impact involved.

Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the preparation of the NOP and states that the notice shall be sent to every federal agency involved in approving of funding the project and to each Trustee agency responsible for natural resources affected by the project.

As defined in Section 15082 of the Guidelines, the NOP must include sufficient information describing the project and the potential environmental effects to enable the Responsible agencies to make a meaningful response. At a minimum, the information shall include:
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• a description of the project;
• the location of the project; and
• the probable environmental effects of the project.

4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Park Avenue Redevelopment Project encompasses 34 acres where the on-site improvements will take place. The project site, as shown on Figure 2, presently includes 27 separate parcels with two and three story buildings and over a thousand parking spaces to accommodate motel and commercial land uses. The existing land coverage is calculated to be 97 percent and the site has been largely disturbed by past development as shown on Figure 3.

The site is gently sloping, with grades ranging from two to 10 percent on average. A small section of 15 to 20 percent slope occurs in the parking lot behind the Crescent V Shopping Center. The vegetation on the site consists of landscaping associated with the motels and commercial facilities and includes a number of large Jeffrey pines.

There are only minimal building set backs from Highway 50, except at the Crescent V. Currently there are 15 curb cuts along Highway 50 and the existing facilities are accessible from both right and left turn movements. Because the proposed Loop Road has not been completed, Montreal Road and Park Avenue function as the California portion of the Loop Road moving traffic through the site. Due to the unrestricted automobile access and narrow sidewalks, the area is not conducive to pedestrian activity.

The proposed Park Avenue Redevelopment Project, as shown on Figure 4, calls for the demolition of all buildings on the site, except for the Crescent V south of Park Avenue. Some existing buildings within the Crescent V are to remain but will be remodeled and the parking lot will be reconfigured. The proposed project will result in the following:

• An Intermodal Transit Center will be developed south of the Stateline and adjacent to Highway 50. The proposed outdoor facility will ultimately provide capacity for boarding and unloading 11 buses. There will be information, ticketing, and public restroom services provided and retail commercial space will be located bordering the Intermodal Transit Center. Entry to the facility will be from Highway 50 and a new road segment will carry traffic exiting the center to Van Sickle Road. Provision for the future development of a Light Rail Transit System along Highway 50 has also been incorporated into the project design.

• The existing Lake Tahoe Inn will be redeveloped in its present location to the south of the Intermodal Transit Center. The new Inn will contain approximately 400 hotel rooms with reserved below-grade parking. The five story building will wrap around existing trees creating a private interior courtyard. Access will be directly to Highway 50; the Inn and the Intermodal Transit Center will have the only direct curb cuts on Highway 50 between the Embassy Suites and Park Avenue.

• A gondola connecting the Stateline area with the Heavenly Ski Area will be installed south of the Lake Tahoe Inn. The gondola will serve skiers during the winter and be operated
year-round to provide access to other mountain recreation activities. The gondola will be located in a public plaza or park incorporating existing trees with a visual link to Highway 50. The Gondola Park will have pedestrian linkages to the other features in the project area and will be bordered by commercial space.

- A new Park Place Hotel and related commercial space will be developed to the south of the Gondola Park. The new five story hotel will be located at the corner of Highway 50 and Park Avenue and provide approximately 200 lodging units, a conference space, and supporting common facilities including a pool and recreation facilities as well as an estimated 60,000 square feet of retail commercial space. Vehicle access will be from Park Avenue and hotel parking will be provided below grade and in an adjacent parking structure.

- A public plaza with an ice skating rink is to be located east of the Park Place Hotel and related commercial space. Adjacent to the Ice Skating Park, additional commercial space is proposed as well as a new 4-plex cinema. The other major feature planned for the area north of Park Avenue is a new four level parking structure on the east side of the area that will have primary access from Park Avenue with secondary access to Van Sickle Road.

- To the south of Park Avenue, the existing structures in the Crescent V Shopping Center will be renovated and three additional structures will be built. As previously introduced, the surface parking at the Crescent V will be reconfigured and the area will be landscaped.

Common to all of the elements of the project is the proposal to enhance existing pedestrian access by setting all buildings back a minimum of 30 feet from Highway 50 and providing a pedestrian corridor paralleling the highway that links the Intermodal Transit Center and Gondola Park to the Ice Skating Park and across Park Avenue to the Crescent V. Pedestrian circulation throughout the site is to be a priority and pedestrians' status in relationship to automobiles is to be elevated to create a comfortable, safe, and enjoyable experience. The pedestrian access scheme is to be linked to other bicycle and pedestrian systems to enhance the overall experience. Landscape features are proposed that will include new plantings, street furniture, lighting, signs, and related amenities that are intended to create a desirable setting for both visitors and residents.

---
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# CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

**SOUTH TAHOE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

### I. Background

1. **Name of Proponent:** South Tahoe Redevelopment Agency
   - 1052 Tata Lane
   - South Lake Tahoe, CA  96150-6324
   - (916) 541-1292
   - Attn: Ms. Judith Von Klug
   - Redevelopment Manager

2. **Address and Phone Number of Proponent:**
   - South Tahoe Redevelopment Agency

3. **Date of Checklist Submittal:**
   - South Tahoe Redevelopment Agency

4. **Agency Requiring Checklist:**
   - Park Avenue Redevelopment Project

5. **Name of Proposal, if applicable:**
   - City of South Lake Tahoe
   - Planning Department
   - 1900 Lake Tahoe Boulevard
   - South Lake Tahoe, CA  96150-6323
   - (916) 542-6020
   - Attn: Ms. Teri Jamin
   - Planning Director

6. **CEQA contact:**

### II. Environmental Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earth</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Unstable earth conditions or in changes in geologic substructures?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Disruptions, displacements, compaction, or overcovering of the soil?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Change in topography of ground surface relief features?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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d. The destruction, covering, or modifications of any unique geologic or physical features?  

   X

e. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?  

   X

f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in silation, deposition, or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet, or lake?  

   X

g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?  

   X

Discussion:

a. The grading of the site to develop the new facilities, especially the below-grade parking areas, has the potential to create cut slopes that could be unstable during construction. The site construction and the development of the off-site stormwater management improvements could also result in excess spoils that would have to be taken out of the basin to a TRPA approved location. Once construction is completed, it is not contemplated that there will be remaining unstable earth conditions.

b. There is a possibility that soils could be disrupted as a result of the site demolition and the subsequent construction activities. The development of the new structures, parking areas, and vehicle circulation facilities may require soil compaction as well as placement of aggregate base materials which may have an effect on the soils underneath. It is assumed that the proposed project will comply with the TRPA Code.

c. Grading of the site to accommodate the proposed facilities will change the existing contours. The development of the off-site stormwater management facilities may also change the ground surface relief where any detention basins are developed.

d. It is not expected that demolition, grading, or construction will destroy, cover, or modify any unique geological features. Also, because 97 percent of the site is presently covered with impervious surfaces, it is not expected that any unique physical earth features will be altered.

e. There is the possibility when soils on-site are exposed as a result of the demolition and construction activities that wind or water based erosion could take place. It is expected that the TRPA requirements for using best management practices would be required during the demolition and construction period to reduce potential erosion problems.
f. Depending on where and how the off-site stormwater management facilities are developed there is a remote possibility that there could be erosion of beach sands at the shore of Lake Tahoe.

g. It is not anticipated that the demolition or construction activities will expose people or property to any geological hazards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Air</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The creation of objectionable odors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a. Demolition of the existing buildings and the construction of the new facilities could result in additional emissions from the construction equipment and the release of dust from debris and exposed soil surfaces. During operation of the proposed project, there is the potential of additional vehicle emissions from automobiles, delivery and service vehicles, and buses. There is also the possibility of additional emissions from heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems located throughout the proposed project.

b. Because the proposed uses will be similar to existing uses on-site, it is not expected that objectionable odors will be created.

c. Given that a number of the proposed structures will be taller than existing structures, there is a potential that air patterns on the site may be altered and that shadows from structures could change micro climate conditions at the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Changes in currents, or the course of direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Alterations to the course or flow of flood waters?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body? 

X

---

e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity? 

X

---

f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? 

--- X ---

---

g. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations? 

X

---

h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies? 

--- --- X

---
i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves? 

--- --- X

---

Discussion:

a. Depending on the final drainage plans for the site and the off-site stormwater management system, there is the potential that site runoff could impact surface water conditions.

b. The development of the proposed project will change existing drainage patterns. Given that the existing land coverage on the site is 97 percent and that the new development will have to comply with the TRPA Code, there will be a reduction in land coverage which should result in reduced runoff from areas that are presently covered with impervious surfaces.

c. The proposed project will result in a different drainage pattern for the site which will alter the existing course and flow of flood waters. The proposed project will also be built in a historical flood plain and could further alter the flood plain.

d. The stormwater management system will include a number of on-site and off-site detention basins which will act as seasonal surface water bodies.

e. Depending on how the stormwater management system is developed and maintained, there is the possibility that runoff will be directed to existing surface water bodies which could alter their quality or flow.
There is the potential to intercept groundwater as a result of the proposed construction. The proposed project will have to comply with the requirements of the TRPA Code so that there is no disruption of the flow of the groundwater. No site dewatering is proposed as part of the construction or operation of the project. Groundwater quality could be impacted if oil and grease, nutrients, and other potential untreated contaminants were to be discharged. The proposed stormwater management system includes provisions for collecting and controlling runoff, in part, to minimize the potential ground water quality impacts.

Depending on how the site and the stormwater management system are developed and maintained, there is also the possibility that there could be increased releases of nutrient such as nitrogen and phosphorous, oil and greases, and turbidity that could reduce surface water or groundwater quality.

It is expected that the proposed project will comply with current requirements for low-flow plumbing and will incorporate other water-efficient facilities so that there will be no reduction in the amount of public water supplies.

Given the potential changes to the drainage pattern and the runoff from the site, there is a potential that properties located between Highway 50 and Lake Tahoe could have increased potential for flooding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Plant Life</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Change in the diversity of species,</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or number of any species of plants (</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including trees, shrubs, grass,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crops, and aquatic plants)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Reduction of the numbers of any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unique, rare, or endangered species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of plants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Introduction of new species of</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plants into an area, or in a barrier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the normal replenishment of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing species?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Reduction in acreage of any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural crop?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion:

a. The proposed project is based on the concept of incorporating the Jeffrey pine on the site into the final design to the extent feasible. Additional new landscaping will be installed. As a result of the landscaping program, there is the potential that the diversity of existing plant species will change.

b. Given that 97 percent of the site is currently impervious surface, it is not anticipated that unique, rare, or endangered plant species will be impacted.

c. There is the potential that the landscape plans for the proposed project could introduce plant species that are not native to the Tahoe Basin.

d. Because of the current land use in the proposed project area, no agricultural crops will be removed from production as a result of the demolition or construction activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Animal Life</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Change in the diversity of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms or insects)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare, or endangered species of animals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a. Because 97 percent of the proposed project site is currently impervious surface, it is not expected that the demolition or construction will change the diversity of species or numbers of any species of animals.

b. The project is not expected to reduce the numbers of any unique, rare, or endangered species as a result of the demolition or construction activities.

c. Because of the current development on the site and the changes to be carried out by the proposed project, it is not anticipated that new animal species will be introduced or that there will be any change to current animal migration or movement.
d. The proposed project incorporates provisions for a stormwater management system to protect water quality. No deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat is expected.

6. Noise
   Will the proposal result in:
   a. Increases in existing noise levels?  
      X  |
   b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?
      _  | X  | _

Discussion:
   a. The demolition of the existing structures will result in additional noise as will the construction of the proposed facilities.
   b. There is the potential that people passing the demolition and construction area, as well as nearby residents, will experience increased noise. Assuming that the gondola and other facilities meet existing noise standards, there is less possibility that these individuals will experience increased noise when the proposed project is completed and all of the facilities are in operation.

7. Light and Glare
   Will the proposal produce new light and glare?
   _  | X  | _

Discussion:
   A number of the proposed new buildings will be taller than the existing structures and will result in additional sources of light that will be visible off-site. In addition, the proposed parking structure will have lights on the top floor which will also be the source of new illumination. However, the proposed facilities will have to comply with the requirements of the TRPA Code so the potential impact may be minimized.

8. Land Use
   Will the proposal result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?  
      X  |

Discussion:
   The proposed Intermodal Transit Center, Gondola Park, and Ice Skating Park will result in uses that presently do not exist in the proposed project area.
9. Natural Resources
Will the proposal result in:

a. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources? __ X __

b. Substantial depletion of any nonrenewable natural resources? __ __ X

Discussion:

a. Construction of the proposed facilities will consume aggregate, timber, metal, and other nonrenewable natural resources. Depending on the final design for the proposed project, the demand for these resources may be greater than the current use rate.

b. It is not expected that the construction of the proposed project will substantially deplete nonrenewable natural resources and that the materials required can be readily supplied from available sources.

10. Risk of Upset
Will the proposal involve:

a. A risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions? __ X __

b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan? __ __ X

Discussion:

a. During demolition and construction, vehicle fuels and other potentially combustible materials may be stored and used on site. While applicable laws and regulations require that all such materials be properly stored, used, and disposed of, there is the potential that an accident could occur that could result in a release of these materials.

b. The proposed project has been designed so that there is access for emergency response vehicles and that it will not interfere with evaluation in case of an emergency.
11. Population
Will the proposal alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

The proposed project will result in an increase in commercial floor space which will result in increased job opportunities. This could lead to increased permanent population in the Tahoe Basin. While the number of visitor lodging accommodations will decrease in the proposed project area, the attractiveness of the area when the proposed project is completed should draw additional visitors to the area.

12. Housing
Will the proposal affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

The number of visitor accommodation units in the area as a result of the proposed project will be decreased. However, it is likely that the employment base in the area could increase, which could result in increased housing demand.

13. Transportation/Circulation
Will the proposal result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Discussion:

a. There is the potential that, given the attractiveness of the proposed redevelopment, the project area will be the destination for a larger number of vehicular trips. However, given that the Intermodal Transit Center is an integral part of the proposed project, there is the potential that automobile trips could be substituted with bus trips for individuals working in the area or who are not housed in either of the two hotels. In addition, because the proposed gondola will provide direct access to the Heavenly Ski Area, there is the potential that automobile trips from the area to the Heavenly California or Nevada base lodges will be decreased.

b. The existing surface parking in the proposed project area will be replace by new subsurface parking under the two hotels and commercial space between Park Avenue and the Embassy Suites Hotel, by a new above grade parking structure in the same area, and by a reconfiguration of the surface parking at the Crescent V.

c. The development of the Intermodal Transit Center and the potential for adding a Light Rail Transit System in the future along Highway 50, in combination with the road and parking improvements proposed, will result in a change to the existing transportation systems in the area.

d. The changes that are proposed with respect to site access and egress will change the present circulation movements in the area. Reduction of the curb cuts along Highway 50, increased pedestrian facilities, and the proposed access to service the two hotels and the commercial space will change how people and goods circulate in the project area.

e. While waterborne and air traffic should not be substantially changed as a result of the proposed project, the provision for the Light Rail Transit System adjacent to Highway 50 could result in a significant change.

f. Because of the reduction of the 15 curb cuts between the Embassy Suites Hotel and Park Avenue to two and the provisions for pedestrians as an integral component of the proposed project, it is expected that there will be a decrease in traffic hazards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. Public Services</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for, new governmental services in any of the following areas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Fire protection?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Police protection?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Schools?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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d. Parks or other recreational facilities?
   [ ] Yes [X] Maybe [ ] No

e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?
   [X] Yes [ ] Maybe [ ] No

f. Other governmental services?
   [ ] Yes [X] Maybe [ ] No

Discussion:

a. There is the potential that the proposed project will result in a changed demand for fire protection services. While the proposed buildings will be taller than existing structures on the site, it is assumed that they will be built to current fire codes which include requirements for sprinkler systems and the use of fire retardant materials.

b. There is the potential, based on the types of commercial uses and the final project design, that a change in the need for police services could occur.

c. If additional employees result in increased housing demands, there is the potential that there could be increased demand for school services to educate the children of the enlarged work force.

d. Depending on the final design of the proposed project and the amount of park and plaza space contemplated for public use, there could be a changed demand for public recreation in the area. Also, the potential for additional population could result in increased demand on existing recreation facilities.

e. If Van Sickle Road and the road from the Intermodal Transit Center to Van Sickle Road are both dedicated as public rights-of-way, there will be increased public maintenance required. In addition, the landscaping along the roadways and throughout the public parks and plazas will also require increased maintenance which will have budget and personnel implications.

f. Because final design has not been completed for the proposed project, there may be a need for other governmental services that are not foreseen at this time. Also, the project makes provision for a satellite City Hall near the Intermodal Transit Center which could require additional government services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. Energy</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?</td>
<td></td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

August 10, 1994
Discussion:

a. The demolition of the existing structure and the construction of the proposed project will require energy to transport materials to and from the site and for the equipment used at the site. The proposed development should result in a decrease in current energy use on the site because more efficient HVAC systems would be used and because transit facilities and the gondola have been incorporated as part of the overall proposal and they should result in a reduction of vehicle trips.

b. It is assumed that the proposed project will not require the development of new energy sources to provide for the demolition or construction or to service the facilities that are developed.

### 16. Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Power or natural gas?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Communications systems?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Sewer or septic tanks?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Stormwater drainage?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Solid waste disposal?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Local or regional water supplies?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a. The demolition of the existing structures and the construction of the proposed project will result in the need for all new electric and natural gas distribution systems.

b. There will be the need to develop new telephone and other communication systems within the proposed project area.

c. There will be the need for new water distribution systems within the proposed project area.
d. There will be the need for new sewer lines within the proposed project area to collect wastewater so that it can be transported to the South Tahoe Public Utility District for treatment and export from the Tahoe Basin.

e. The proposed project will require both on and off-site stormwater management facilities.

f. The proposed project will generate solid waste that will need to be managed to meet State and local requirements.

g. There is the possibility because of the size and nature of the proposed development, that there could be impacts on the water supplies. While low-flow plumbing and other water-efficient devices will be incorporated into the project, there is the potential that the new landscaping could result in additional water demands for irrigation purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Human Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Creation of any health hazards or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a. During the demolition of the existing structures and the construction of the proposed improvements, there is a potential that individuals on the site could be exposed to conditions that could threaten their health. Working in excavations and at high elevations require that the standards of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration be met. When demolition and construction are completed, it is assumed that all structures will comply with existing safety requirements.

b. During demolition there is the potential that workers could come in contact with contaminated soils, abandoned storage tanks, friable asbestos, or other unknown hazardous materials or wastes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal result in the obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public, or will the proposal result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to the public view?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

August 10, 1994
Discussion:

The five story buildings and other facilities that are proposed have the potential to obstruct scenic vistas and the views that are available to the public. In addition, depending on the final design of the facilities, there is the potential that they could create a condition that is aesthetically offensive. However, the development of the project will have to comply with the requirements of the TRPA Code which should insure that aesthetic impacts are minimized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19. Recreation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

The proposed project has the potential to change recreation patterns and supply as a result of the amenities such as the Gondola Park, the Ice Skating Park, the 4-plex cinema, and the other features that are contemplated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Will the proposal result in the alteration of or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic archaeological site?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Will the proposal result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, or object?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Will the proposal restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a. The land disturbance associated with the demolition of the existing buildings and the development of the proposed facilities has the potential to uncover items that have cultural resource value.
b. While none of the existing buildings are known to be on the National Register of Historical Places, there is the potential that a very limited number of structures to be demolished could have historical value, and this will need to be documented in relation to developing the proposed project.

c. It is not anticipated that the facilities proposed for the site will result in any physical changes that would affect unique ethnic cultural values.

d. Existing religious or sacred uses are not expected to be changed as a result of the proposed project.

21. Mandatory Findings of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time, while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a. The proposed project has the potential to increase erosion and sedimentation during demolition and construction. However, because best management practices will be required during demolition and construction, potential erosion and sedimentation impacts should be minimized. In addition, because the proposed project will include site landscaping and revegetation, erosion and sedimentation problems should also be reduced.
Water quality could be reduced as a result of the erosion and sedimentation caused by demolition and construction. However, the application of best management practices during demolition and construction will also minimize potential water quality impacts. In addition, because the proposed project will include a comprehensive stormwater management system to control potential non-point pollution sources, water quality impacts should be minimized.

Air quality could be degraded as a result of the demolition and construction activities and as a result of additional vehicle trips associated with the new facilities and the operation of HVAC equipment. However, it is not expected that the proposed project will substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

There is the potential that a very limited number of structures to be demolished could have historical value. Documentation of structures with such potential value will be required as part of the proposed project.

b. The proposed project has the potential to create both short-term and long-term impacts. The short-term impacts, such as soil disturbance or the release of friable asbestos, are limited to the demolition and construction activities. The long-term impacts could be largely beneficial, but there are potential impacts from additional vehicle trips, increased light and glare, and additional demands for public services and housing.

c. Because the proposed project will result in the redevelopment of approximately 34 acres and could demonstrate the utility of further redevelopment in the area, there is a potential for additional impacts that could be cumulatively significant. Proposed project features such as the two hotels, the Gondola Park, and the Intermodal Transit Center could result in additional vehicle trips and other impacts on the environment that, combined with other foreseeable changes, could have a cumulative impact.

d. During demolition and construction, there is the potential that human health and safety problems could occur. Because the demolition and construction activities will have to comply with the requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration as well as other federal and State regulations related to hazardous materials and wastes, the potential for direct or indirect adverse effects on human beings should be minimized.
III. Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project.

A NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED.

I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

8/10/94
Date

August 10, 1994
TRPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
for
The Initial Determination of Environmental Impact

I. PROJECT NAME OR IDENTIFICATION:
Park Avenue Redevelopment Project

II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:
1. Land

   Will the proposal result in:
   a. Compaction of covering of the soil beyond the limits prescribed in the land capacity system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   It is anticipated that the proposed project will comply with all of the TRPA Code requirements with respect to the land capability classification system.

   b. A change in the topography or ground surface relief features of the site inconsistent with the natural surrounding conditions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Grading of the site to accommodate the proposed facilities will change the existing contours. The development of the off-site stormwater management facilities may also change the ground surface relief where any detention basins are developed.
c. Unstable earth conditions during or after completion of the proposal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grading of the site to develop the new facilities, especially the below-grade parking areas, has the potential to create cut slopes that could be unstable during construction. The site construction and the development of the off-site stormwater management improvements could also result in excess spoils that would have to be taken out of the basin to a TRPA approved location. Once construction is completed, it is not contemplated that there will be remaining unstable earth conditions.

d. Changes in the soil or geologic substructures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is the potential that soil compaction could occur as a result of the proposed construction. The TRPA requirements for use of best management practices should minimize the impacts to soils/geologic substructures.

e. The continuation of or increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is the possibility when soils on-site are exposed as a result of the demolition and construction activities that wind or water based erosion could take place. It is expected that the TRPA requirements for using best management practices would be required during the demolition and construction period to reduce potential erosion problems.
f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sand, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depending on where and how the off-site stormwater management facilities are developed there is a remote possibility that there could be erosion of beach sands at the shore of Lake Tahoe.

g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mud slides, ground failure, or similar hazards?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not anticipated that the demolition or construction activities will expose people or property to any geological hazards.
2. Air Quality

Will the proposal result in:

a. Substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demolition of the existing buildings and the construction of the new facilities could result in additional emissions from the construction equipment and the release of dust from debris and exposed soil surfaces. During operation of the proposed project, there is the potential of additional vehicle emissions from automobiles, delivery and service vehicles, and buses. There is also the possibility of additional emissions from heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems located throughout the proposed project.

b. The creation of objectionable odors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the proposed uses will be similar to existing uses on-site, it is not expected that objectionable odors will be created.

c. Alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that a number of the proposed structures will be taller than existing structures, there is a potential that air patterns on the site may be altered and that shadows from structures could change microclimate conditions at the site.
3. Water

Will the proposal result in:

a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depending on the final drainage plans for the site and the off-site stormwater management system, there is the potential that site runoff could impact surface water conditions.

b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff so that a 20-year 1-hour storm runoff cannot be contained on the site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development of the proposed project will change existing drainage patterns. Given that the existing land coverage on the site is 97 percent and that the new development will have to comply with the TRPA Code, there will be a reduction in land coverage which should result in reduced runoff from areas that are presently covered with impervious surfaces.

c. Alterations to the course of flow of 100 year flood waters?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project will result in a different drainage pattern for the site which will alter the existing course and flow of flood waters. The proposed project will also be built in a historical flood plain and could further alter the flood plain.
d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stormwater management system will include a number of on-site and off-site detention basins which will act as seasonal surface water bodies.

e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depending on how the stormwater management system is developed and maintained, there is the possibility that runoff will be directed to existing surface water bodies which could alter their quality or flow.
f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of groundwater?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is the potential to intercept groundwater as a result of the proposed construction. The proposed project will have to comply with the requirements of the TRPA Code so that there is no disruption of the flow of the groundwater. No site dewatering is proposed as part of the construction or operation of the project. Groundwater quality could be impacted if oil and grease, nutrients, and other potential untreated contaminants were to be discharged. The proposed stormwater management system includes provisions for collecting and controlling runoff, in part, to minimize the potential groundwater quality impacts.

g. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depending on how the site and the stormwater management system are developed and maintained, there is also the possibility that there could be increased releases of nutrient such as nitrogen and phosphorous, oil and greases, and turbidity that could reduce surface water or groundwater quality.
h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is expected that the proposed project will comply with current requirements for low-flow plumbing and will incorporate other water-efficient facilities so that there will be no reduction in the amount of public water supplies.

i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding and/or wave action from 100 year storm occurrence or seiches?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the potential changes to the drainage pattern and the runoff from the site, there is a potential that properties located between Highway 50 and Lake Tahoe could have increased potential for flooding.

4. Plant Life

Will the proposal result in:

a. Removal of native vegetation in excess of the area utilized for the actual development permitted by the land capability system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is the potential that native vegetation could be removed to develop the stormwater management system.
b. Removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depending on the design of the stormwater management system, there is the potential that riparian habitat could be removed.

c. Introduction of new vegetation that will require excessive fertilizer or water, or will provide a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is the potential that the landscape plans for the proposed project could introduce plant species that are not native to the Tahoe Basin.

d. Change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, microflora and aquatic plants)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project is based on the concept of incorporating the Jeffrey pine on the site into the final design to the extent feasible. Additional new landscaping will be installed. As a result of the landscaping program, there is the potential that the diversity of existing plant species will change.
5. Animal Life

Will the proposal result in:

a. Change in the diversity of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms, insects, or microfauna)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that 97 percent of the site is currently impervious surface, it is not anticipated that unique, rare, or endangered plant species will be impacted.

b. Reduction of the number of any unique, rare, or endangered species of animals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because 97 percent of the proposed project site is currently impervious surface, it is not expected that the demolition or construction will change the diversity of species or numbers of any species of animals.

The project is not expected to reduce the numbers of any unique, rare, or endangered species as a result of the demolition or construction activities.
c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the current development on the site and the changes to be carried out by the proposed project, it is not anticipated that new animal species will be introduced or that there will be any change to current animal migration or movement.

d. Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project incorporates provisions for a stormwater management system to protect water quality. No deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat is expected.

6. Noise

Will the proposal result in:

a. Increases in existing noise levels?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demolition of the existing structures will result in additional noise as will the construction of the proposed facilities.
b. Exposure or people to severe noise levels?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is the potential that people passing the demolition and construction area, as well as nearby residents, will experience increased noise. Assuming that the gondola and other facilities meet existing noise standards, there is less possibility that these individuals will experience increased noise when the proposed project is completed and all of the facilities are in operation.

7. Light and Glare

Will the proposal produce new light or glare inconsistent with the surrounding area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of the proposed new buildings will be taller than the existing structures and will result in additional sources of light that will be visible off-site. In addition, the proposed parking structure will have lights on the top floor which will also be the source of new illumination. However, the proposed facilities will have to comply with the requirements of the TRPA Code so the potential impact may be minimized.
8. Land Use

Will the proposal result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned use of an area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed Intermodal Transit Center, Gondola Park, and Ice Skating Park will result in uses that presently do not exist in the proposed project area.

9. Natural Resources

Will the proposal result in:

a. An increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction of the proposed facilities will consume aggregate, timber, metal, and other nonrenewable natural resources. Depending on the final design for the proposed project, the demand for these resources may be greater than the current use rate.

b. Substantial depletion of any nonrenewable natural resource?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not expected that the construction of the proposed project will substantially deplete nonrenewable natural resources and that the materials required can be readily supplied from available sources.
10. **Risk of Upset**

Does the proposal involve a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During demolition and construction, vehicle fuels and other potentially combustible materials may be stored and used on site. While applicable laws and regulations require that all such materials be properly stored, used, and disposed of, there is the potential that an accident could occur that could result in a release of these materials.

11. **Population**

Will the proposal alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project will result in an increase in commercial floor space which will result in increased job opportunities. This could lead to increased permanent population in the Tahoe Basin. While the number of visitor lodging accommodations will decrease in the proposed project area, the attractiveness of the area when the proposed project is completed should draw additional visitors to the area.
12. Housing

Will the proposal affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of visitor accommodation units in the area as a result of the proposed project will be decreased. However, it is likely that the employment base in the area could increase, which could result in increased housing demand.

13. Transportation/Circulation

Will the proposal result in:

a. Generation of 100 or more vehicle trips or in excess of 1 percent of the remaining road capacity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is the potential that, given the attractiveness of the proposed redevelopment, the project area will be the destination for a larger number of vehicular trips. However, given that the Intermodal Transit Center is an integral part of the proposed project, there is the potential that automobile trips could be substituted with bus trips for individuals working in the area or who are not housed in either of the two hotels. In addition, because the proposed gondola will provide direct access to the Heavenly Ski Area, there is the potential that automobile trips from the area to the Heavenly California or Nevada base lodges will be decreased.
b. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The existing surface parking in the proposed project area will be replaced by new subsurface parking under the two hotels and commercial space between Park Avenue and the Embassy Suites Hotel, by a new above grade parking structure in the same area, and by a reconfiguration of the surface parking at the Crescent V.

c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development of the Intermodal Transit Center and the potential for adding a Light Rail Transit System in the future along Highway 50, in combination with the road and parking improvements proposed, will result in a change to the existing transportation systems in the area.

d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The changes that are proposed with respect to site access and egress will change the present circulation movements in the area. Reduction of the curb cuts along Highway 50, increased pedestrian facilities, and the proposed access to service the two hotels and the commercial space will change how people and goods circulate in the project area.
c. Alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While waterborne and air traffic should not be substantially changed as a result of the proposed project, the provision for the Light Rail Transit System adjacent to Highway 50 could result in a significant change.

f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the reduction of the 15 curb cuts between the Embassy Suites Hotel and Park Avenue to two and the provisions for pedestrians as an integral component of the proposed project, it is expected that there will be a decrease in traffic hazards.

14. Public Services

Will the proposal have an unplanned effect upon, or result in a need for, new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas?

a. Fire protection?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is the potential that the proposed project will result in a changed demand for fire protection services. While the proposed buildings will be taller than existing structures on the site, it is assumed that they will be built to current fire codes which include requirements for sprinkler systems and the use of fire retardant materials.
b. Police protection?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is the potential, based on the types of commercial uses and the final project design, that a change in the need for police services could occur.

c. Schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If additional employees result in increased housing demands, there is the potential that there could be increased demand for school services to educate the children of the enlarged work force.

d. Parks or other recreational facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depending on the final design of the proposed project and the amount of park and plaza space contemplated for public use, there could be a changed demand for public recreation in the area. Also, the potential for additional population could result in increased demand on existing recreation facilities.
e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Van Sickle Road and the road from the Intermodal Transit Center to Van Sickle Road are both dedicated as public rights-of-way, there will be increased public maintenance required. In addition, the landscaping along the roadways and throughout the public parks and plazas will also require increased maintenance which will have budget and personnel implications.

f. Other governmental services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because final design has not been completed for the proposed project, there may be a need for other governmental services that are not foreseen at this time. Also, the project makes provision for a satellite City Hall near the Intermodal Transit Center which could require additional governmental services.
15. Energy

Will the proposal result in:

a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demolition of the existing structure and the construction of the proposed project will require energy to transport materials to and from the site and for the equipment used at the site. The proposed development should result in a decrease in current energy use on the site because more efficient HVAC systems would be used and because transit facilities and the gondola have been incorporated as part of the overall proposal and they should result in a reduction of vehicle trips.

b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is assumed that the proposed project will not require the development of new energy sources to provide for the demolition or construction or to service the facilities that are developed.
16. Utilities

Except for planned improvements, will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

a. Power or natural gas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project will include the replacement of electric and natural gas distribution systems in the redevelopment area. It is not anticipated that other changes to the electric and gas system components will be required to develop and operate the proposed project.

b. Communication systems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project will include the replacement of communication systems, including telephones, in the redevelopment area. It is not anticipated that other communication system improvements will be required to develop and operate the proposed project.

c. Water?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project will include replacement of existing water distribution systems. It is uncertain if the project will require additional improvements to ensure adequate flows for fire service.
d. Sewer or septic tanks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project will include the replacement of sewer lines in the redevelopment area. It is not anticipated that other changes to the South Tahoe Public Utility District collection, treatment, or export system will be required to develop and operate the proposed project.

e. Stormwater drainage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project will require both on and off-site stormwater management facilities.

f. Solid waste and disposal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project will include designated areas and facilities for the collection and storage of solid waste on-site. It is not anticipated that the amount of solid waste to be managed will require any significant changes to the South Tahoe Refuse collection and disposal program.
17. Human Health

Will the proposal result in:

a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the demolition of the existing structures and the construction of the proposed improvements, there is a potential that individuals on the site could be exposed to conditions that could threaten their health. Working in excavations and at high elevations require that the standards of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration be met. When demolition and construction are completed, it is assumed that all structures will comply with existing safety requirements.

b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During demolition there is the potential that workers could come in contact with contaminated soils, abandoned storage tanks, friable asbestos, or other unknown hazardous materials or wastes.
18. Aesthetics

Will the proposal result in the obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public, or will the proposal result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to the public view?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five-story buildings and other facilities that are proposed have the potential to obstruct scenic vistas and the views that are available to the public. In addition, depending on the final design of the facilities, there is the potential that they could create a condition that is aesthetically offensive. However, the development of the project will have to comply with the requirements of the TRPA Code which should insure that aesthetic impacts are minimized.

19. Recreation

Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project has the potential to change recreation patterns and supply as a result of the amenities such as the Gondola Park, the Ice Skating Park, the 4-plex cinema, and the other features that are contemplated.
20. Archaeological/Historical

Will the proposal result in an alteration of a significant archaeological or historical site, structure, object or building?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While none of the existing buildings are known to be on the National Register of Historical Places, there is the potential that a very limited number of structures to be demolished could have historical value, and this will need to be documented in relation to developing the proposed project.

21. Mandatory Findings of Significance

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California or Nevada history or prehistory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project has the potential to increase erosion and sedimentation during demolition and construction. However, because best management practices will be required during demolition and construction, potential erosion and sedimentation impacts should be minimized. In addition, because the proposed project will include site landscaping and revegetation, erosion and sedimentation problems should also be reduced.
Water quality could be reduced as a result of the erosion and sedimentation caused by demolition and construction. However, the application of best management practices during demolition and construction will also minimize potential water quality impacts. In addition, because the proposed project will include a comprehensive stormwater management system to control potential non-point pollution sources, potential water quality impacts should be minimized.

Air quality could be degraded as a result of the demolition and construction activities and as a result of additional vehicle trips associated with the new facilities and the operation of HVAC equipment. However, it is not expected that the proposed project will substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

There is the potential that a very limited number of structures to be demolished could have historical value. Documentation of structures with such potential value will be required as part of the proposed project.
b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time, while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project has the potential to create both short-term and long-term impacts. The short-term impacts, such as soil disturbance or the release of friable asbestos, are limited to the demolition and construction activities. The long-term impacts could be largely beneficial, but there are potential impacts from additional vehicle trips, increased light and glare, and additional demands for public services and housing.

c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environmental is significant.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the proposed project will result in the redevelopment of approximately 34 acres and could demonstrate the utility of further redevelopment in the area, there is a potential for additional impacts that could be cumulatively significant. Proposed project features such as the two hotels, the Gondola Park, and the Intermodal Transit Center could result in additional vehicle trips and other impacts on the environment that, combined with other foreseeable changes, could have a cumulative impact.
d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During demolition and construction, there is the potential that human health and safety problems could occur. Because the demolition and construction activities will have to comply with the requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration as well as other federal and State regulations related to hazardous materials and wastes, the potential for direct or indirect adverse effects on human beings should be minimized.

III. CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the statements furnished above and in the attached exhibits present the data and information required for this initial evaluation to the best of my ability, and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Date: 8/10/94

[Signature]

(Signature of person completing this form)

IV. DETERMINATION (TO BE COMPLETED BY TRPA)

On the basis of this evaluation:

The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment and a finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules of Procedure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but due to the listed mitigation measures which have been added to the project, could have no significant effect on the environment and a mitigated finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA’s Rules of Procedure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment and an environmental impact statement shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA’s Rules of Procedure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of Evaluator and Title

8.10.94
Date
WORK PLAN

Balloffet and Associates will provide all of the services to the South Tahoe Redevelopment Agency (Redevelopment Agency) and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) to complete all California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and TRPA requirements for environmental documentation of the proposed redevelopment plan in the City of South Lake Tahoe. The work will be accomplished on a phased basis with a discrete product developed at the conclusion of each. After review and acceptance, the results of one phase will be used to develop the next. It is expected that the work will be undertaken and completed in a collaborative and iterative process involving the co-lead agencies, the project sponsors, the design team, and the various technical consultants hired by the project sponsors.

The work will be accomplished in 4 phases:
- Project Initiation
- Development of Administrative Draft Document
- Development of Draft Document
- Development of Final Document

Phase 1: Project Initiation

The Project Initiation phase is crucial to the success of the environmental documentation process. If all of the tasks are undertaken and effective communication is developed, it will form a solid foundation for all of the tasks to be completed in the subsequent phases. Phase I will allow the Balloffet and Associates team members the opportunity to review information collected and prepared by the project sponsors and their consultants. It will also allow the Balloffet and Associates team members to explore the availability of data from other sources that may need to be incorporated into the environmental analyses.

Phase I will involve participation in formal scoping meetings and consultation with different agencies that have an interest in the project or that may need to be consulted with during the environmental analysis. Phase I will also provide an opportunity to identify the assumptions that will be incorporated into the analytical methodologies which will be used and will also involve developing an annotated draft of the report outline so that the assumptions, potential conclusions, and method of presentation can be reviewed and consensus reached in the initial stage. As a result of Phase I, a summary report will be prepared describing the results of the tasks and proposing any additional work efforts, including the budget and schedule for the next phase of the work.

Following are the tasks to be performed during Phase I.

Task 1: Project Quality Management (PQM)

Balloffet and Associates has found that holding a PQM meeting at the inception of a project is the most effective mechanism for establishing a solid foundation for the environmental analysis effort. To accomplish this, Balloffet and Associates will work with the
Redevelopment Agency in organizing the PQM meeting and will be responsible for developing a meeting agenda. Balloffet and Associates will facilitate the PQM meeting with the participation of the Redevelopment Agency, TRPA, the project sponsors, and other key organizations or individuals. The purpose of the PQM will be to further define the roles and responsibilities of the redevelopment EIR/EIS project team. Issues to be addressed include paths of communication, the specific requirements related to the scoping process, and how refinement of the work program will be handled as the project progresses. Balloffet and Associates will also use this meeting to collect available project information and for an initial review of additional data requirements.

A draft PQM meeting summary will be prepared setting forth all of the issues addressed at the meeting and their resolution with the intent of clearly defining roles and responsibilities. Ten copies of the draft report will be provided to the Redevelopment Agency for distribution to the meeting participants for review and comment. When a single set of comments is received from the Redevelopment Agency that reflects a consensus of the meeting participants, the PQM report will be revised to reflect the agreed on changes and the final report will be produced and used to guide the preparation of the EIR/EIS. Ten copies of the PQM report will be provided to the Redevelopment Agency.

Task 2: Review Available Data

Balloffet and Associates is aware that the project sponsors have collected a significant amount of information that could be incorporated into the environmental documentation effort. However, before a decision as to the adequacy of the data is made Balloffet and Associates will conduct an independent, objective analysis of the data. As a result of the analysis Balloffet and Associates will publish a Report of Data Adequacy which will specify what data was made available and evaluated, the utility of the data for the EIR/EIS, and what additional data is needed.

Where additional data needs are identified the nature and extent of the information required will be specified. If additional data is needed, there are probably only two feasible options: for the project sponsors to collect it or for the Balloffet and Associates team to collect it. The Report of Data Adequacy will identify the steps Balloffet and Associates would take to collect the data, the schedule that would be required, and the level of effort involved. Ten copies of the Report of Data Adequacy will be provided to the Redevelopment Agency.

Task 3: Develop Notice of Preparation (NOP)

One of the outputs of the PQM will be an agreed on outline and format for the NOP. Balloffet and Associates will prepare a draft NOP for submittal to the Redevelopment Agency and TRPA for review and comment. When a single set of comments is received from the Redevelopment Agency which reflects the consensus of both agencies, a single camera ready copy of the NOP for circulation will be submitted to the Redevelopment Agency. It is assumed that both the Redevelopment Agency and TRPA already have current distribution lists for the NOP and that they will handle the postage, posting, and other distribution responsibilities.
Task 4: Conduct Project Scoping

Baloffet and Associates will work with the Redevelopment Agency, TRPA, and the project sponsors to develop a project description that is of sufficient detail for inclusion in the NOP and for use in scoping. Baloffet and Associates will then coordinate with the Redevelopment Agency and TRPA to plan the scoping process. It is anticipated that most of the scoping requirements will be established as a result of the PQM process.

At a minimum, one scoping session should be held for regulatory agencies with an interest in the project. The purpose of this session would be to develop a comprehensive list of agency expectations for the EIR/EIS and any additional requirements that should be incorporated in the environmental analysis effort. Experience shows that agency scoping is best accomplished during the "normal working day" (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.) to gain maximum participation. This would be followed by a minimum of two public scoping sessions.

Given the nature of the South Lake Tahoe community it is recommended that one public session be held during the normal working day and that one be held during early evening hours. It may also be desirable to hold sessions that accommodate day, swing, and graveyard time frames and also to consider a weekend session to accommodate parties, such as second-home users, that are only available on weekends.

Task 5: Refine Work Scope

Following review of all comments received on the NOP and through the scoping process, Baloffet and Associates will prepare an assessment to determine if supplementary information, in addition to that specified in the Report of Data Adequacy, is required by the agencies or other parties for the development of the EIR/EIS. The results of this assessment will be incorporated into the proposed Work Program for Phase II.

The Phase II Work Plan will specify the work to be undertaken to complete the Administrative Draft of the EIR/EIS, a cost breakdown by task, and schedule. The Phase II Work Plan will also provide an initial estimate of the Phase III work effort which will involve responding to comments on the Administrative Draft and producing the Draft EIR/EIS. Baloffet and Associates would then meet with the Redevelopment Agency, TRPA, and, as appropriate, the project sponsors to receive comments on the Phase II Work Plan and to clarify the information presented. When a consensus on the Phase II Work Plan is reached, it will be revised and submitted.

Phase II: Prepare Administrative Draft Document

The Administrative Draft EIR/EIS Phase of the work effort will concentrate on taking the available information to develop a comprehensive project description and a description of the existing environment that will be used as the baseline for the environmental analysis. An agreed upon set of alternatives to the proposed project will also need to be defined in coordination with the Redevelopment Agency and TRPA. Based on this information the impact assessment will be performed and ten copies of the Administrative Draft of the document submitted to address the requirements of CEQA and TRPA.
Task 1: Refine Project Description

Balloffet and Associates will continue to work closely with the project sponsors and agency staff to refine and develop a clear and concise description of the redevelopment project, as well as project objectives, history, and characteristics. The project description will include text and exhibits illustrating the regional context, the project location within the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan Area, and the adjacent study area. As part of the description, Balloffet and Associates will describe the proposed phasing of the project.

Task 2: Define Project Alternatives

Balloffet and Associates will meet with the Redevelopment Agency and TRPA to discuss and agree to the alternatives that will be analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS. In addition to a "no project" alternative, it is assumed that a maximum of three other alternatives will be analyzed. Based on current knowledge of the proposed project, the three alternatives could be one with reduced density or height, one with increased density or height, and one with different phasing.

Obviously, there are numerous permutations and it will be necessary to collectively arrive at not only the number but also the specifics of the alternatives to be analyzed. Given that the feasibility of any project is dependent on finances it will be necessary to gain input from the project sponsors about any alternative prior to concluding which ones will be analyzed. An equal level of analysis for all proposed alternatives will be conducted for the environmental evaluation.

Task 3: Develop Setting Description, Conduct Impact Analysis, and Identify Mitigations

For each environmental issue to be addressed in the Draft EIR/EIS, the analysis will describe the relevant aspects of the project setting and delineate the short- and long-term operational effects, including adverse and beneficial effects of the project, taking into account the proposed phasing of project development and the contingencies related to the Loop Road and other activities in the project area. Where adverse effects are predicted, the level of significance or non-significance of those effects will be characterized based on a list of clearly stated "significance criteria" that will be developed for each issue area.

Appropriate mitigation measures will be identified for each significant adverse impact. These mitigation measures will be feasible and clearly stated including their relationship to contingent activities in the project area. For each mitigation measure the responsibility for implementation, timing, and phasing will be identified. The level of significance of adverse impacts, after the mitigation is applied, will also be described.

As currently proposed, the key issues of potential concern that will be discussed in the EIR/EIS are outlined below. The issues to be addressed will be reviewed and modified as part of the Phase I effort.
Earth Resources

The topographic and soils evaluations prepared by the project sponsors will be reviewed and evaluated for accuracy and adequacy. It is anticipated that these evaluations, in addition to information provided in the site plan and conceptual grading plan, will provide the basis for determining consistency of the proposed project and the alternatives with TRPA land coverage limits and Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) restrictions. Soil erosion and seismic effects of the proposed project and the alternatives will be evaluated using the available data and analyses and standard TRPA mitigation requirements.

Air Resources

A description of the climate of the redevelopment area, historical air quality data, and current efforts to attain and maintain identified TRPA air quality thresholds will be prepared. Using data supplied by the project sponsors, the project will be analyzed regarding its consistency with federal, state, and TRPA standards. Existing air pollution sources will be discussed relative to several constituents including carbon monoxide, ozone, nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter, and visibility.

Project land use elements which have been incorporated in the redevelopment plan to reduce potential air quality impacts will be identified and their potential effectiveness discussed. A carbon monoxide hot spot analysis will be conducted for selected major intersections affected by the project. Sensitive receptor areas within the project vicinity will be identified as part of the hot spot analysis. Adverse impacts will be identified where the project would result in violations of Federal, state, or TRPA standards or increase pollutants for which the Tahoe Basin is already in non-attainment. A similar analysis will also be performed for the alternatives.

Water Quality

Conceptual drainage plans, ground water analyses, descriptions of soil disturbance, and flood plain mapping supplied by the project sponsors or made available from other sources will be used to develop the setting description and to evaluate the potential impacts on water quality. Impacts from construction activities related to increased surface runoff, potential flooding, and drainage problems as well as issues related to impervious cover associated with the proposed project will be discussed. Additionally, potential impacts on identified SEZ will be addressed. All potential impacts of the project and the alternatives will be assessed in the context of existing TRPA and other appropriate standards and the achievement and maintenance of water quality and public safety thresholds.

Vegetation, Wildlife, and Fisheries

The potential impact of the proposed redevelopment facilities on vegetative communities, wildlife habitat, and fisheries in relation to applicable standards will be evaluated. Given that natural conditions have been changed to a certain extent by the development in the area, the biological emphasis will be on the native as well as introduced biota in the proposed project area to analyze both the proposed project and the alternatives.
- **Noise**

The potential noise associated with construction and operation of the proposed project will be evaluated. To accomplish this, the noise evaluations prepared by the project sponsors will be reviewed for accuracy and adequacy. As appropriate, these analyses will be incorporated into an EIR/EIS section discussing the existing noise environment and the potential short- and long-term impacts resulting directly from project related facilities and indirectly from increases in automobile or bus traffic related to the project.

The noise section of the EIR/EIS will discuss acoustic fundamentals and provide a detailed description of the regulatory environment within the Tahoe Basin as it pertains to noise. Existing noise sources will be described using information provided by the project sponsors. Significant noise impacts will be identified if the redevelopment plan or the alternatives will result in noise increases beyond TRPA Plan Area Statement standards.

- **Land Use**

Existing and proposed land uses in the project area and their relationship to adjacent uses will be described. The proposed project's relationship to TRPA Plan Area Statements and the pending Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan will be described. A thorough analysis of proposed density transfers and land coverage will be presented in terms of current TRPA standards. This analysis will rely heavily on information provided by the project sponsors.

- **Risk of Upset and Safety**

Based on information provided by the project sponsors, the potential impacts of project construction and operation on public safety will be described. Given the proposed land uses in the project area, while the discussion will address safety issues related to construction, the primary focus will be on the potential health and safety issues related to operation of the proposed facilities. The discussion will factor in the phasing of the proposed project, related activities associated with the Loop Road, and programmed public expenditures for infrastructure and services.

- **Population/Employment**

The population and employment projections provided by the project sponsors will be used to describe existing conditions and to calculate impacts on area population levels and job opportunities.

- **Traffic/Circulation**

The project sponsors' transportation analysis will be reviewed for accuracy and adequacy. Based on this analysis, a description of the existing traffic and circulation conditions will be developed. Also, an analysis will be prepared that addresses potential impacts of redevelopment improvements on existing roadways and standards. Critical to this analysis is a thorough evaluation of project phasing and potential effects of this phasing on local...
roadways. The status of the Loop Road will be factored into the impact analysis to establish impacts related to Level of Service, roadway safety conditions, public transit, pedestrian access, and related concerns.

- Public Services and Utilities

The existing conditions related to public services and utilities in the redevelopment area will be described, drawing on information from the project sponsors, the City of South Lake Tahoe, the South Tahoe Public Utilities District, and other appropriate sources. Potential impacts to the following public services, as appropriate, will be described.

- Police
- Fire
- Water Supply
- Sewage
- Libraries
- City Administration
- Parks and Recreation
- Solid Waste
- Schools

In assessing these impacts, Balloffet and Associates will rely upon the City and the utility and school district’s staff to provide the criteria necessary to determine the level of impact to each service.

- Energy

The existing energy system serving the redevelopment area will be described. Based on this, the project impacts will be identified and appropriate mitigation measures for energy consumption will be specified using the Energy Aware Planning Guide prepared by the California Energy Commission.

- Recreation

The potential beneficial and adverse impacts of the project on area-wide recreational facilities will be described. This analysis will incorporate needs for winter and non-winter recreation in both active and passive settings.

- Scenic Resources

Recognizing the important role analysis of scenic resources plays in the redevelopment plan, the existing scenic resources in the project area will be described. The Scenic Quality Program prepared for TRPA and other related information available from TRPA or the project sponsors will be discussed in relation to the proposed project. The resolutions reached as a result to the current effort related to the height concerns will be incorporated into the analysis. An evaluation of potential adverse and beneficial impacts of the redevelopment project on scenic resources will be prepared in accordance with TRPA.
standards. It is anticipated that photos of three existing views within the plan area will be provided by the project sponsors as well as computer generated photo simulations of each of these views showing post project conditions to support this effort.

- Cultural Resources

The data base searches, background research, and site surveys necessary for preparation of the EIR/EIS’s Cultural Resources section will be conducted to describe the existing conditions. Potential impacts to the existing cultural/historic resources will be identified and feasible mitigation measures developed.

- Cumulative Impacts

The impacts of the proposed redevelopment project in combination with other known and approved development activity in the South Tahoe area will be identified. This cumulative impact assessment will assess each issue covered in the environmental analysis and identify appropriate mitigation measures which could be employed by the lead agencies, responsible agencies, or the project sponsors to lessen the project’s adverse environmental impacts.

- Growth Inducement

The growth trends in the region will be analyzed as the basis for establishing the effect of the proposed redevelopment project within that context. Consistency of the proposed redevelopment project with adopted plans will also be addressed.

- Impact Summary

A summary of the proposed project and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures for each category will be developed once the analysis has been completed for that issue. Unless otherwise dictated by the lead agencies, a three column matrix format will be employed, with the first column describing the impacts of the proposed project, the second column specifying the measure required to reduce or eliminate any adverse impacts, and the third column describing any significant impacts anticipated to remain following mitigation. This format will facilitate the preparation of findings and, if necessary, a statement of overriding considerations. The development of the summary will also note any significant impacts and mitigation measures triggered by project phasing or the contingent activities in the project area.

Phase III: Prepare Draft Document

This phase will involve responding to the comments on the Administrative Draft EIR/EIS and producing the Draft EIR/EIS.

Task 1: Review Comments

When a single, correlated set of comments on the Administrative Draft are received they will be reviewed. The review will identify comments that can readily be addressed given the
available data and the scope of analysis that was intended. Comments that require additional data that was not available at the time of analysis or which require work beyond the scope originally set will be identified.

Task 2: Consensus Development

A meeting will be held with the Redevelopment Agency and TRPA to discuss their comments on the Administrative Draft EIR/EIS and to resolve how to address those that require additional data or are identified as beyond the scope of the analysis.

Task 3: Develop the Draft EIR/EIS

As a result of the consensus established in Task 2, the agreed to corrections and changes will be made. When a camera ready document is produced, 100 copies of the Draft EIR/EIS printed and provided to the agencies for distribution.

Task 4: Participate in Public Hearings

After the Draft EIR/EIS is released for review, it is anticipate that key team members will participate in one public hearing with the Redevelopment Agency, one with the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission, and one with the TRPA Governing Board to discuss the findings in the draft document.

Phase IV: Develop Final Document

This phase will involve preparing responses to the comments on the Draft EIR/EIS and preparing the Final EIR/EIS. The Work Plan to accomplish this task is somewhat speculative until the nature and extent of the comments are known and there is an agreed upon course of action for developing the final document. Following is a preliminary identification of the tasks that would be conducted.

Task 1: Prepare Analysis of Comments Received

The comments from all sources will be collected, a master list of comments received will be developed, and all of the comments will be reviewed to identify those that can readily be addressed given existing information and the analyses performed and those which require additional data and analysis or that are outside the original intent of the Work Plan. The results of this analysis will be presented to the Redevelopment Agency, TRPA, and the project sponsors for review.

Task 2: Consensus Development

A meeting will be held with the Redevelopment Agency, TRPA, and the project sponsors to develop a consensus on how to respond to the comments.
Task 3: Revise Work Plan

Based on the results of Task 2, the Work Plan for Phase IV will be revised to provide for addressing the comments and preparing an Administrative Draft Final EIR/EIS.

Task 4: Prepare Comment Responses

Draft responses to comments submitted during the Draft EIR/EIS public review period will be prepared.

Task 5: Prepare Administrative Draft Final EIR/EIS

The comment responses will ultimately comprise the Final EIR/EIS which will be bound under separate cover as Volume II. Changes in the Draft EIR/EIS text necessitated by the comments will also be provided and summarized on an errata sheet. Volume II will include all other necessary content required for a Final EIR/EIS. Ten copies of an Administrative Final EIR/EIS will be provided for review and comment.

Task 6: Prepare Draft Mitigation Monitoring Program

Based on the comment responses, a draft mitigation monitoring program will be prepared using the information from the environmental analysis, including the specific mitigation measures, assignments of responsibility, relationships of project phasing, and time frames for implementation identified in the impact analyses. The draft monitoring program will also address any other conditions of approval which are anticipated to be adopted by the lead agencies. The draft mitigation monitoring program will utilize a notebook format which defines each measures, specific actions, responsibilities, anticipated costs, phasing and time frames, and identifies individuals who must sign off on each measure. The notebook will also include a summary chart which can be quickly perused to ascertain the status of all measures.

Task 7: Prepare Final EIR/EIS

Comments on the Administrative Final EIR/EIS will be addressed and suggested revisions made as a basis for submitting 100 copies of the Final EIR/EIS to the Redevelopment Agency and TRPA for circulation.
September 6, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment to Article VII of the Rules of Procedure Pertaining to the Following: 1) APC Review of Projects for which an EIS has been prepared; 2) Mandatory Presentation of Issues to the APC; and 3) Official Members

Proposed Action: Adoption of amended Rules of Procedure by: 1) Allowing the APC to request (and the Governing Board to approve) that the APC be allowed to review a project for which an EIS has been prepared; 2) Requiring testimony to first be presented to the APC before it is presented to the Governing Board; and 3) Clarifying that official members of the APC shall not be deemed to be actions that bind their respective agency.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Governing Board review the amendments in Exhibit "A", and if they are deemed desirable.

DISCUSSION: A joint Governing Board and Rules Committee and APC meeting was scheduled on August 24, 1994. At that time, a series of concerns were raised concerning the following:

1. The desire of the APC to review the projects which go along with an EIS which the APC is asked to review.

2. The frustration that many individuals and groups were not presenting their testimony to the APC, but were choosing only to raise substantive issues before the Governing Board.

3. The concern that official members of the APC would bind their agency when they took a position on the APC.

After discussion of the above issues, it was agreed that staff would draft a number of proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure and would bring the proposed amendments back to the APC and the TRPA Rules Committee.

If there are any questions regarding this agenda item, please contact R. J. Nicolls, Agency Counsel, or Susan E. Scholley, TRPA Special Projects Attorney, at (702) 588-4547.
ARTICLE VII - ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

7.1. **General:** The Compact provides for the appointment of an Advisory Planning Commission (APC) by the Agency and establishes and sets forth certain functions and duties of the APC relating to the Regional Plan and amendments thereto. In addition, it is contemplated that the APC make recommendations to the Agency respecting matters over which the Agency has jurisdiction and exercises powers.

7.2. **APC Review:** Matters regarding Agency plans and ordinances and other matters the Governing Body determines appropriate for APC consideration shall first be submitted to the APC for review and recommendation. The APC may request that the Governing Body authorize them to review and make a recommendation on a project for which the EIS was prepared, at the time that the APC reviews the draft project EIS. The Governing Body may determine that a particular matter is of such urgency that the public interest requires it to act without delay and without review and recommendation of the APC.

7.3. **Recommendations:** The APC shall consider each matter submitted concerning conformity with the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended, the Regional Plan and the ordinances, rules, regulations and policies of the Agency. Based upon such consideration, the APC shall submit a report and recommendation of the pertinent matters to the Governing Body. The report shall show the vote of the members of the APC and may include the position of the minority, if any.

7.4. **Procedures:** The APC shall be governed by these Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure. To the extent practicable, the rules provided herein for the Governing Body shall also govern the APC, but the APC may provide a different time and place of meeting from that set forth herein for the Governing Body and may also adopt different rules in those cases where these rules and regulations are not applicable or would be impracticable for the APC to follow. The APC shall notify the Governing Body in writing of any such rule or regulation which the APC has determined to be inapplicable or impracticable when applied to it and the change or substitute for such rule or regulation adopted by the APC.

7.5. **Transmittal of Reports:** Copies of reports and recommendations made by the APC shall be mailed or delivered to the Governing Body and to every interested party, including the local government affected by the matter reported upon.

7.6. **Consideration by Governing Body:** At the next regular meeting of the Governing Body, or at any special meeting that may be scheduled, the Governing Body shall consider the report and recommendations of the APC. The Governing Body shall not take additional testimony and argument concerning any matter or proposal submitted to it, except for additional testimony which could not reasonably have been presented to the APC. Examples of appropriate bases for presenting additional testimony are significant new information became available after the APC meeting; the person testifying could not attend the APC meeting or present their testimony in writing.
7.7 Participation by Governing Body Members: Members of the Governing Body may attend and participate in APC meetings, but their presence shall not be counted in determining whether a quorum is present nor shall Governing Body members be entitled to vote.

7.8 Continuance: The APC may continue to a specific date any matter which it determines lacks sufficient information for proper consideration.

7.9 Meeting Date: Regular meetings of the APC shall be held on the second Wednesday of the month. Should any meeting day fall on a holiday, the meeting shall be held on the next business day thereafter which is not a holiday.

7.10 Quorum and Vote Required: A majority of members (not counting vacant positions) of the Advisory Planning Commission constitutes a quorum for the transaction of the business of the Commission. The quorum shall be calculated on a strictly numerical basis, without regard to the state or entity each Commission member represents. A majority vote of the quorum present is required to take action, without regard to the state of representation.

7.11 Official Members: The votes of official members of APC, including the bi-state lay positions for the Soil Conservation Service and the Tahoe Transportation District, shall not be deemed actions of the agency they represent and shall not be binding in subsequent review, permitting or commenting activities of the agency.