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To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement for the Heavenly Ski Resort Master Plan

Proposed Action: The Draft Heavenly Ski Resort Master Plan and Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) are presently being circulated for public comment. The 60-day public comment period began April 4, 1995 and is scheduled to close on June 2, 1995. Following the close of the comment period, a Final EIR/EIS will be prepared.

Recommended Action: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) conduct a public hearing for the purpose of taking comment from the public and the APC. No further action is being requested at this time.

Background: In April 1995 copies of the six-volume package comprising the Draft Master Plan and EIR/EIS (including technical appendices) were sent to members of the APC. If possible, please bring any of the volumes which you wish to address to the APC meeting.

The Draft Master Plan has been prepared in accordance with TRPA’s Ski Area Master Plan Guidelines. It generally includes expansion and redevelopment of the existing Heavenly Ski Resort. The resort is on private and national forest lands and lies in and out of the Tahoe Region. The EIR/EIS, therefore, has been prepared as a joint environmental document between TRPA, the USDA Forest Service, and El Dorado County.

New facilities proposed include additional ski lifts and ski runs, additional snowmaking, a new high-speed gondola which would leave from the South Stateline area, an additional day lodge and gondola mid-station, related skier support facilities, and expanded transit. No new additional automobile parking is proposed. Proposed facilities to be redeveloped include the existing base lodges and related areas. A comprehensive watershed rehabilitation program known as the Cumulative Watershed Effects (CWE) analysis is a key element of the plan.

This item will begin with a presentation on the proposed project and EIR/EIS by staff, Heavenly Ski Resort, and the EIR/EIS consultant. Please contact Jerry Wells or Andrew Strain at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this matter.

AS/rd
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, June 14, 1995, at the North Tahoe Conference Center, 8318 North Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, California. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

June 2, 1995

By: James W. Baetge
Executive 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.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

North Tahoe Conference Center
Kings Beach, California

June 14, 1995
9:30 a.m.

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 RECOMMENDATION TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

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

B. Amendment of Chapter 22, Height Standards, Regarding Additional Height for Certain Buildings

C. Amendment of 1994-1998 List of Additional Public Service Facilities to Add Edgewood Water Company New Water Tank and Ozonation Facility, Douglas County APN 07-040-03

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Coordinated Transportation System (CTS) Agreement Proposed by the South Shore Transportation Management Agency

B. Discussion of Proposed Three-Year Strategic Plan (July 1995 - June 1998)
VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director
B. Legal Counsel
C. APC Members

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
June 1, 1995

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 Portions of 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 approximately 6.2 acres of 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, Exhibit B, Applicant’s Proposed Plan Area Boundary, and Exhibit C, Portion of APN 092-010-18 to be added to PAS 014. The balance of the parcel (20.3 acres) would remain in Plan Area 013.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission recommend approval of the proposed amendment to the Governing Board subject to the threshold improvements proposed by the applicant which are shown on page 6 of the staff report.

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 floodplain 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. Existing Placer County zoning for the entire parcel is TR-1, Single Residence Tahoe, which generally permits single family uses. It is located outside the TRPA Urban Boundary. The Urban Boundary is coincident with the existing boundary of Plan Area 014, Cedar Flat Residential. Plan Area Statement 014 is shown in Exhibit D. The surrounding land use pattern is shown in Exhibit E.
The applicant also owns two vacant, residential parcels in the existing sub-
division 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 very 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 appli-
cant, 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 UmP) are designated as land capability classes 3 and 1a,
respectively. Tahoma series soils with slopes greater than fifteen (15) per-
cent are Jorge/Tahoma soils (JwE and JwP) rather than Tahoma soils and are
designated as land capability classes 4 and 2, respectively. The land capa-
bility is presently being verified by TRPA staff.

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 FUN-
CTION 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 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 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 standpoint 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, significant expansions of the Urban Boundary are generally inconsistent with the Goals and Policies stated above.

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

Chapter 13 Findings


Rationale: The parcel is presently located in Plan Area Statement 013. Plan Area Statement 013 describes the plan area as "mostly undeveloped and in public ownership." Planning consideration #2 states, in part, "...that the potential
for developed recreational sites is limited due to lack of the necessary infrastructure such as sewer, water, and improved roads."

By contrast, however, the subject parcel is privately owned and bordered by undeveloped land to the west and some to the north, but is surrounded by parcels developed with single family dwellings to the south and east. The portion of the parcel to be relocated is consistent in size with other adjacent estate sized parcels located in PAS 014 that are residentially developed. Infrastructure is available to the property via both Wildwood and Antone Road which are paved and contain all utilities stubbed to the subject parcel.

Conservation plan areas are defined by TRPA as follows:

**Conservation Areas:** Conservation areas are areas with value as primitive or natural areas, with strong environmental limitations on use, and with a potential for dispersed recreation or low intensity resource management. Conservation areas include:

(i) public lands already set aside for this purpose;
(ii) high-hazard land, stream environment zones, and other fragile areas, without substantial existing improvements;
(iii) isolated areas which do not contain the necessary infrastructure for development;
(iv) areas capable of sustaining only passive recreation or non-intensive agriculture; or
(v) areas suitable for low-to-moderate resource management.

Residential plan areas are defined by TRPA as follows:

**Residential Areas:** Residential areas are areas having potential to provide housing for the residents of the Region. In addition, the purpose of this classification is to identify density patterns related to both the physical and manmade characteristics of the land and to allow accessory and nonresidential uses that complement the residential neighborhood. These lands include:

(i) areas now developed for residential purposes;
(ii) areas of moderate-to-good land capability;
(iii) areas serviced by utilities; or
(iv) areas of centralized location in close proximity to commercial services and public facilities.
Amendment of Plan Area Statement Boundary
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The subject parcel is privately owned, is not isolated, has necessary infrastructure for development in the vicinity of the parcel, and has areas of high land capability adjacent to the existing residential subdivision. The property is adjacent to developed residential uses and is serviced by utilities which are stubbed to the end of the existing access road.

Management Strategy: The management strategy for Plan Area 013, Watson Creek and Plan Area 014, Cedar Flat is "Development with Mitigation." Areas with this designation can accommodate additional development if the impacts are fully mitigated and the land is capable of withstanding the use. Both onsite and offsite mitigation of environmental impacts from development shall be required. Additional development which may be approved on the site must demonstrate that all impacts are fully mitigated.

Special Designations: Neither plan area contains any special designations.

2. Finding:

If the amendment is to expand an existing urban plan area boundary or to add residential, tourist accommodation, commercial, or public service as permissible uses to a non-urban plan area, it must be found that the amendment will make the plan area statement consistent with an adopted policy or standard of the Regional Plan, and that the amendment will satisfy one or more of the following criteria:

(a) The amendment is to correct an error which occurred at the time of adoption, including but not limited to a mapping error, an editing error, or an error based on erroneous information; or
(b) The amendment is to enable TRPA to make progress toward one or more environmental thresholds without degradation to other thresholds as measured by the Chapter 32 indicators; or
(c) The amendment is needed to protect public health and safety and there is no reasonable alternative.

Rationale: The proposed amendment would expand the existing Urban Boundary by approximately 6.2 acres. The amendment will make the amended Plan Area Statement consistent with Goal #2, Policy 2 of the Land Use Element, Land Use Subelement shown above and subsection 13.5.B(1)(c) of the Code by permitting an incremental level of additional development immediately adjacent to an existing residential subdivision which has moderate to high capability lands available for development.
The second part of the Finding can be met by item (b) as shown above regarding progress toward attainment of one or more adopted environmental thresholds without degradation to the others as measured by the Chapter 32 threshold indicators.

The applicant proposes to restore and revegetate approximately 15,500 square feet of existing soft and disturbed coverage presently on-site in the form of roads. Further, the applicant proposes to permanently retire potential land coverage as follows:

Five percent of the first 100,000 square feet of potential coverage over the entire 26.5-acre parcel; and Seven percent of all potential land coverage greater than 100,000 square feet over the entire 26.5 acre parcel.

The coverage restoration and retirement would assist attainment of the Soil Conservation threshold, known as SC-1. Based on information submitted by the applicant, it appears that none of the other thresholds would be degraded by the proposal.

Because the threshold improvement finding is required for the plan area amendment and not for any future development of a residential project, the amendment’s adopting ordinance will not become effective until the applicant has completed the land coverage restoration and retirement.

The amended plan area boundary will be described by a metes and bounds survey to be prepared by the applicant prior to the Governing Board meeting.

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:** Based on the environmental threshold improvements contained in the proposal, the project is expected to enhance implementation of the Regional Plan.

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

   **Rationale:** Environmental threshold improvements are included in the project which will assist in threshold attainment.
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(8) 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.

**Comments Received:** As part of the original amendment proposal which was on the September 1994 APC Agenda, TRPA received numerous comment letters and telephone calls from surrounding property owners (see attached letters). They were generally opposed to the original amendment which proposed relocating the entire 26.5 acre parcel into Plan Area 014. Based on the revised proposal, TRPA is sending a new public hearing notice to surrounding property owners. TRPA staff will provide the APC with any new comments received as part of the public hearing.

**Environmental Documentation:** Staff has prepared an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) for the proposed project. Staff proposes a finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) based on the following:

1. No additional development would be permitted by the amendment than is otherwise permissible under the Regional Plan; and

2. The amendment includes improvements to be completed by the applicant which will assist in attainment of the Soil Conservation threshold.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. Please contact Andrew Strain at (702) 583-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this item.
PORTION OF APN 092-010-18
TO BE ADDED TO PAS 014

EXHIBIT C
6/5/95
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.
prohibited within this Plan Area.

General List: The following list of permissible uses is applicable throughout the Plan Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Summer homes (S).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>Transmission and receiving facilities (S) and pipelines and power transmission (S).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
programs, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.

**USE**

**MAXIMUM DENSITY**

Residential

Single Family Dwelling 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 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

**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 1 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.)
MR. STRAIN

REGARDING THE IDENIFIDENT RCH NOV. 92-000-18, MY CONCERN'S ARE TO ACCESS OF THE PARCEL.

YOUR AGENCY RECENTLY ALLOWED A RESIDENCE TO BE CONSTRUCTED ON PARCEL NUMBER 092-100-18 WITH ACCESS WHICH IMPACTS MY PROPERTY (092-010-25) THIS RESIDENCE FRONT'S OLD COUNTY RD. WITH EASY ACCESS, RATHER THAN USING A PRIVATE COUNTRY ROAD WHICH LEADS TO MY RESIDENCE.

BECAUSE OF THE TERRAIN, I BELIEVE ACCESS TO THE 26.5 ACRES WILL ALSO FRONT MY 10 ACRES AND NOT DIRECTLY FROM OLD COUNTY RD AS IT SHOULD BE.

[Signature]
September 9, 1994

To: Andrew Strain  
TRPA  
Fax: 702-588-4527

From: Karen McBride and Fil Aguirre  
Fax: 916-583-6614

Re: Proposed plan amendment to amend the boundary line between PAS 013 Watson Creek Conservation and PAS 014 Cedar Flat Residential: 26 acre parcel

Dear Mr. Strain,

We have some questions regarding the notice we received about this proposed amendment/change.

1. What is the "Conservation" classification, what are its limitations, and what was its original intent with regard to this land's use?

2. Does amending/changing to residential negatively impact this forest area? Would this change allow subdivision?

3. What steps have been taken to assure that public access to the Dollar Reservoir through this property would be protected and guaranteed, as it has historically been established and enjoyed by considerable numbers of residents in the surrounding areas?

We appreciate your answers to these questions. We can most easily be reached at our business number 916-583-6141, and you can leave messages with our service if we are not in. Thank you for your assistance.

Very sincerely,

Karen McBride and Fil Aguirre  
440 Nightingale Road, Cedar Flat

Post Office Box 539  •  Tahoe City  •  CA 95730  •  916/583-6141
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
PO Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448-1038

Attention Andrew Strain

I am writing to you to make my opinion known to the TRPA about the proposed change of status of land use classification of the 26 acre parcel, Placer County APN 092-010-18, from conservation to residential.

The vicinity map included in the notice shows that the parcel is not adjacent to "Old County Road," as stated in the notice, but adjacent to several much smaller parcels which are adjacent to Old County Road and with which, I suspect, it is the intent of the (new) owner(s) to combine and re-subdivide the parcel in question. I'm not sure of the proper terminology but involves redrawing property lines so that several parcels will disappear from their present locations only to reappear as new parcels within the 26 acre parcel in question, the net number of parcels involved remaining the same. These new reconstituted parcels will no longer be adjacent to Old County Road. They will, however, be adjacent to Dollar Creek which runs through the middle of the 26 acre parcel as your vicinity map does not show. If the parcel were to remain in its present form as a single parcel then the impact of a single residential development wouldn't be great. However, it is my belief that the (new) owner(s) will exploit the powers of your agency in its true capacity as a brokerage house for land "development" to subvert the intent of the present classification of the parcel as "conservation." I urge you to forgo the forthcoming "contingency" fees and do your publicly mandated duty of protecting the environment of the Tahoe basin by leaving the land use classification of APN 092-010-18 as it now stands.

The parcel in question also contains several trails that allow access to the Dollar Hill area, Dollar Reservoir, and the Nordic Ski Area for the residents of the Cedar Flat and Fulton Acres area that have been used daily for many years. In the event that the parcel status is changed and reconstituted, I believe the (new) owner(s) will attempt to deny this present public use.

Please do not allow the change in status of APN 092-010-18 to benefit speculators.

Thank you.

Kurt Neff
432 Nightingale Road
PO Box 1658
Tahoe City, CA 96145
TRPA -

It has come to my attention that a request has been made to change 26.5 acres Place County APN 092-010-18 from PAS 873 to PAS 014.

I am adamantly opposed to changing this property from conservation to residential. I urge you to maintain your original classification.

Sincerely,

George E. Richardson
TO the TRPA

RECEIVED 23 Sept 1994

SEP 26 1994

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Sirs:

This letter is in response to a motion to amend the boundary line between Plan Area Statement 013 Watson Creek Conservation and Plan Area Statement 014 Cedar Flat Residential to incorporate a 26.5 acre parcel into PAS 014. I find this motion to be an outrage and I strongly urge the TRPA to not grant this motion. This parcel should remain in a conservation classification. Many local residents, myself and my husband included, enjoy hiking and the natural wonders of this area. Changing its classification would be one more move to changing Lake Tahoe into a suburban nightmare. It would enable the owner to split the parcel into residential lots for immense personal gain and to his monetary advantage. This land was originally classified as a conservation zone for good reason—to protect areas of Lake Tahoe for the enjoyment of everyone—now and in the future. Please do not change the classification of this land.
would appreciate remaining apprised of the status of this motion.

Thank you—

Kim & Jim March
and Family
P.O. Box 720
Kings Beach, CA 96143
November 23, 1994

Mr. Andrew Strain
Tahoe Regional Planning Authority
Post Office Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89441

Ref: lot 82, block 3, Lake Forest Unit #3
(Placer County assessor’s map book 92, page 11)

Dear Mr. Strain:

We are long-time residents of Lake Forest subdivision who are disturbed by the proposed rezoning actions on Old County Road. We are appalled and quite concerned by the proposal of Messrs. Lanza and Rivlin to use two vacant lots adjacent to our property on Old County Road as possible access points to a new condominium development. They propose to take long-standing parcels that have been determined to be environmentally fragile since before TRPA came into existence. In fact, at one time, we attempted to purchase this same property in this area and were informed that because of poor drainage and overload on the sewage system we could not build on this property. The two lots that Mr. Lanza purchased were at one time identified as problem lots and, if developed, presented special drainage and sewage problems. This includes the area from above these parcels all the way into Lake Tahoe.

The latest information from TRPA reveals that in August 1993 Messrs. Lanza and Rivlin submitted a boundary line adjustment which was approved by Placer County (ref TRPA plan areas 13 & 14). This action violated TRPA covenants requiring TRPA approval for these changes. You indicated to us that TRPA was not in favor of granting the variance. We are positive that if a search is conducted of microfiche records, it would be revealed that the original property was zoned as environmentally fragile and, as such, could not be developed. We are also reviewing our records to determine if we still have TRPA’s casefile rejection for the purchase and subsequent development of similar parcels.
Please understand, we are not obstructionists and, yet, we are concerned about our environment. We ask that before TRPA approves this zoning change, you realize the existing rural environment will be changed forever. This would create a commercial development and put an additional stress on the already fragile environment. We urge caution and restraint to prevent a further stress on beautiful Lake Tahoe.

Sincerely,

Floyd E. Gori

John P. Gori
ATTN: ANDREW STRAIN
ROXANE DUMER

RE: BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT (PAS) 013 WATSON CREEK AND (PAS) 014 CEDAR FLAT

THE MAJORITY OF MEMBERS OF LAKE FOREST #3 ARE OPPOSED TO THIS PROJECT.
ALSO, ONLY TWO HOMEOWNERS RECEIVED NOTIFICATION OF THIS MEETING.

ED FERRELL
PRESIDENT

(408) 423-4087 Home
612 Button
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

255 Old County Road
Salinas City, CA 93960/45
March 31, 1995

To: Andrew Strain
   TRPA
   Fax: 702-588-4527

From: Karen McBride and Fil Aguirre
   Fax: 916-583-6614

Re: Lanza Project

Dear Mr. Strain,

In response to our earlier letter to TRPA regarding the Lanza project, Joe Lanza asked to meet with us and inform us fully about his plans in our area.

We understand the minor boundary line adjustments he intends to make application for, and—as described by him with three homes spread out on the total acreage the three lots entail—it sounds like a very tolerable impact on the land in question and on the neighborhood in general. Combined with county and TRPA supervision of the project, as is the norm, it does not appear that there would be any complaints about the development of the land as Joe Lanza described it to us.

While we will certainly miss the historical access to the Dollar Reservoir along the old dirt road, it appears that he has made attempts to provide access by donating the portion of his land which encompasses the creek. This indicates a future vision which is admirable.

In making inquiries about Joe Lanza in the area, we were told by several folks that he is a man who prides himself on honoring his word. That is a good thing to hear.

As described to us, his project seems to be well thought out and to be of relatively low impact on the land in question.

Very sincerely,

Karen McBride and Fil Aguirre
March 5, 1995

Dear Mr. Strain,

I am writing in regard to the proposed amendment to change the classification of a 26.5 acre parcel adjacent to Old County Road from Watson Creek Conservation to Cedar Flat Residential which would extend the existing TRPA urban boundary.

Like the TRPA recommendation on this proposal, I am opposed to the reclassification of the parcel. The acreage was purchased with complete knowledge on behalf of the buyer – there was no deception here. He purchased conservation land and he received conservation land. Obviously, any modifications to the classification is based on the anticipation of personal gain, and while that in itself is not condemnable, there is no basis on which this request should be granted.

On the other hand, to permit a reclassification would be rife with negative impact on the immediate area. Expanding the TRPA urban boundary would displace existing wildlife in the area and would be detrimental to the stream environment which is nurtured by nearby Watson Creek. New development implied by the residential classification would entail excavation; that is soil disruption and an accelerated rate of erosion. The deforestation that would be mandated to improve access to the parcel would only multiply the harm to these elements - wildlife and the soil.

Since its inception, the TRPA has been dedicated to the conservation and preservation of the Tahoe Basin. It is in keeping with this objective that the 26.5 acre parcel was originally classified as conservation land, and given no compelling reason to the contrary, including the financial gain of two individuals, I urge you to deny the request for reclassification.

May I ask that you keep me apprised as to the status of this proposal and inform me of any subsequent meetings that may address this subject.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kelly Truro
June 2, 1995

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Chapter 22, Height Standards, Regarding Additional Height For Certain Buildings

Proposed Action: The Lake Tahoe Community College (LTCC) has applied for a Regional Plan amendment to amend Section 22.4 of the Code of Ordinances, Additional Height for Certain Buildings. As proposed by LTCC, the amendment would allow two feet of additional building height in excess of that presently permitted under the Code for public service projects, without the required coverage reduction.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC conduct the public hearing and recommend approval to the Governing Board of the staff proposed amendment language contained in Attachment A to this staff report. Attachment A provides the following amendments:

1. Amend Subparagraph 22.4.A.2, Additional Height for Reduced Land Coverage: Add a sliding scale of maximum land coverage reduction percentages combined with a cap on the absolute amount of coverage which would be retired on all project areas greater than 20 acres in area.

2. Amend Subparagraph 22.4.A.3, Additional Height for Public Service Buildings: Permit additional height for public service projects not visible from scenic roadway units.

Background: LTCC proposed the height amendment in order to avoid having to reduce three acres of allowable land coverage for a recently permitted performing arts and theater building on the campus which needed additional height for stage and overhead support equipment for lighting and set backdrops. The LTCC feel that the 10 percent reduction requirement is excessive for two additional feet of height on a building not visible from the Lake or a scenic roadway unit.
In March, the APC reviewed several alternatives and the staff's recommendation on the proposed amendment. Based on the APC's concerns of complexity, impact on large public service parcels, relationships of height/bulk, and the college's specific situation, the item was continued for further analysis by staff.

Section 22.4 of the Code permits additional building height for unique situations (refer to Attachment A, Code of Ordinances excerpt). The additional height is available for buildings which require greater height due to their functional or programmatic needs, including tourist accommodation buildings, public service, and recreational uses such as gymnasiums and indoor sports courts.

Subparagraph 22.4.A(2) permits an increase in maximum building heights for eligible buildings by one foot for each on-site reduction in land coverage equal to five percent of the base allowable coverage, or existing land coverage, whichever is greater, up to a limit of four additional feet, but not to exceed a maximum of 42 feet, provided TRPA makes certain findings. The subparagraph in question is based in part on the design principle of minimizing building footprint size and related land coverage by permitting taller buildings. Conversely, there are certain situations where a building's functional needs in terms of height cannot be reduced by simply enlarging the footprint.

Due to the college's relatively large project area (164 acres), the applicant feels the existing regulation requires too much base allowable land coverage to be retired in exchange for the increment of additional building height. Nearly 80 percent of LTCC's 29.6 acres of base allowable coverage is found in land capability district seven.

The applicant has, however, already accepted the conditioned building permit from TRPA, constructed the building, and agreed to retire the potential land coverage (approximately 128,000 square feet) necessary to obtain the additional building height prior to building occupancy. Since the project permit has not been completed, the applicant may submit a plan revision to place the project under the amended ordinance requirements, if said amendment is approved under the existing Regional Plan.

Discussion: Working with the applicant and APC, staff has identified alternative solutions (listed below) which have been evaluated against the Regional Plan package. Alternatives 1-3 are also shown in the attached matrix (Attachment B). Each alternative was evaluated against a range of three parcel sizes: (1) small parcels (10-20 acres in area); (2) medium parcels (20-100 acres in area); and (3) large parcels (greater than 100 acres in area). The fourth alternative has been added in response to the APC and can stand alone or be added to the coverage alternatives. At the request of APC, staff did consider adding bulk as a factor, but analysis indicates it has little effect on large parcels and would add undue complexity for the limited number of public service parcels. Bulk should be considered as a factor when staff reconsiders Chapter 22.
Alternatives Analyzed

1. Existing regulations (5 percent coverage reduction per foot of additional height, up to four additional feet).

2. Existing regulations with a cap on the amount of absolute coverage retired:

   a. 5,000 square feet maximum per foot of additional height;
   b. 15,000 square feet maximum per foot of additional height; and
   c. 25,000 square feet maximum per foot of additional height.

3. A modified percentage of coverage reduction:

   a. four percent coverage reduction per foot of additional height, up to four additional feet;
   b. three percent coverage reduction per foot of additional height, up to four additional feet; and
   c. two percent coverage reduction per foot of additional height, up to four additional feet.

4. Additional height for public service projects not visible from the Lake or scenic roadway units.

The analysis examined both a typical or sample project in each alternative and parcel size as well as the estimated cumulative effects of the different alternatives.

Attachment B contains the matrix which was prepared to compare several Code amendment alternatives. These alternatives include: "Existing Condition" (5 percent per one foot); "Reduction Cap" of 5,000 square feet per one foot, 15,000 square feet per one foot, or 25,000 square feet per one foot; and "Modified Percentage" of 4 percent per one foot, 3 percent per one foot, or 2 percent per one foot.

Several assumptions have been made in order to analyze the alternatives in the matrix. These assumptions are:

1. The potential land coverage reduction for parcels under 10 acres was not included in the matrix because subparagraph 22.4.A(2) applies to Public Service, Recreation and Tourist Accommodation projects, which generally require a parcel larger than 10 acres.

2. Parcels were grouped into three categories (small, medium and large) for the comparison of potential land coverage reduction. These categories include 10 to 20-acre parcels; 20 to 100-acre parcels, and parcels greater than 100 acres.

3. Base allowable land coverage was determined using a maximum Bailey coverage of 30 percent of the total parcel size.
4. The land coverage reduction was determined using four feet of additional height. This is the maximum additional height allowable under subparagraph 22.4.A(2) of the Code.

An inventory of parcels within the Region was prepared according to acreage and ownership. Parcels were grouped into the categories described above and totaled. Parcels determined to be unsuitable for public service, recreation, or tourist accommodation use, or that were located in back country areas, were removed from the inventory. The remaining parcels were totaled and used to cumulatively analyze the alternatives as shown in the matrix included in Attachment B.

To provide another comparison, several sample parcel sizes were defined for each category. The sample parcels were sized at ten acres (small), 20 acres (small/medium), 50 acres (medium), 100 acres (medium/large), and 150 acres (large). This sample parcel comparison was done in order to demonstrate the differences between varying parcel sizes rather than the cumulative sum of the three categories. The sample parcel analysis is shown in the matrix included in Attachment B.

Conclusion

The existing subparagraph 22.4.A(2) is not applied equally to the various parcel sizes within the Region. Large parcels, due to their extensive potential land coverage allowances, are penalized in a relative sense with the use of a fixed percentage formula. Smaller and medium sized parcels currently receive the same additional height benefits as large ones with a comparatively minor land coverage retirement. Attachment B provides examples of the land coverage reduction for several sample parcels. Under existing conditions, a ten-acre parcel would retire approximately 6,500 square feet per foot of additional height, while a 150-acre parcel would have to retire approximately 98,000 square feet per foot. Likewise, a reduction cap alternative alone would not be equitable because it would allow very large parcels, which may have significantly more potential land coverage than smaller parcels, to use the same land coverage cap.

In order to achieve an equitable land coverage reduction for all parcel sizes, an alternative which includes components of all three alternatives analyzed in Attachment B is recommended. The recommended alternative would include a sliding percentage and reduction cap for the different parcel size categories greater than 20 acres. Combining the two approaches (modified percentage and reduction cap) into one alternative achieves the fairest implementation of subparagraph 22.4.A(2) to realize the greatest benefit in terms of land coverage reduction for the Region.

Also, in response to the issue of projects not visible from the scenic roadway units, recommended language similar to the applicant’s proposal has been added. This allows two additional feet, still within the maximum cap of 42 feet, for such projects. Functionally this would allow public service buildings (meeting the view criteria) to achieve the maximum height limit of 42 feet with 3:12 pitched roofs instead of the now required 5:12 without a coverage reduction.
The table below combines the alternatives for land coverage and constitutes part of the staff's recommended alternative. It states the land coverage reduction percentage and reduction cap required for each foot of additional height pursuant to the amended subparagraph 22.4.A(2). Actual ordinance language is contained in Attachment A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Size Category</th>
<th>Land Coverage Reduction Formula per Foot of Additional Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 acres</td>
<td>Existing regulation remains in effect. The maximum heights may be increased by one foot for each onsite reduction in land coverage equal to five percent of the base allowable coverage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 acres up to 50 acres</td>
<td>The maximum heights may be increased by one foot for each onsite reduction in land coverage equal to four percent of the base allowable coverage with a cap of 15,000 square feet for each one foot of height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 acres up to 100 acres</td>
<td>The maximum heights may be increased by one foot for each onsite reduction in land coverage equal to three percent of the base allowable coverage with a cap of 25,000 square feet for each one foot of height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 acres and above</td>
<td>The maximum heights may be increased by one foot for each onsite reduction in land coverage equal to two percent of the base allowable coverage with a cap of 25,000 square feet for each one foot of height.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some parcels may benefit from using the land coverage reduction formula prepared for the next greater parcel size category. These are parcels between 16-20, 37.5-50, or 66.66-100 acres. This benefit exists because of the sliding percentage used when parcel size categories increase (5 percent for parcels < 20 acres to 2 percent for parcels > 100 acres).

In order to use the land coverage reduction formula of the next greater parcel size category, the base allowable land coverage percentage must first be determined for the applicant's parcel. This calculated base allowable land coverage percentage will be multiplied by the minimum land area of the next greater parcel size category. The land coverage reduction percentage (four percent for parcels 20 to 49.99 acres, three percent for parcels 50 to 99.99 acres, and two percent for parcels 100 acres and greater) of the next greater parcel size category will then
be used to determine the land coverage reduction per foot of additional height. The lesser of the two land coverage reduction calculations will be used for each foot of additional height granted.

Attachment D shows a sample worksheet which calculates the land coverage reduction per foot of additional height. This worksheet calculates the land coverage reduction using both the parcel's size category and the next greater parcel size category as defined above.

Using the recommended alternative above, a ten-acre parcel would be required to retire approximately 6,500 square feet of coverage for one foot of additional height. However, a 150-acre parcel would now be required to retire just 25,000 square feet. This square footage difference, while still significant, is considerably more equitable when the land coverage reductions are compared to the parcel's size and base allowable coverage. It is staff's conclusion that this recommended alternative will result in greater use of the subparagraph and, therefore, a greater reduction in the base allowable or existing land coverage within the Region permitting greater opportunities for soil conservation threshold attainment and maintenance.

Required Findings: The following findings must be made prior to adopting the proposed amendments:

A. Chapter 6 Findings:

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

Rationale: The amendments would remain consistent with Goal #2, Policy 1B of the Land Use Element, Community Design Subelement of the Regional Plan (provided below) by continuing to provide limited opportunities for additional height for unique situations. The revised land coverage reduction requirement would continue to assist in attaining and maintaining the soil conservation threshold, while permitting very large project areas to reasonably reduce land coverage in exchange for gaining additional building height. The additional height findings regarding building function and visual impact mitigation required in Chapter 22 of the Code would assist in Regional Plan implementation.

Policy 1B

BUILDING HEIGHT, BULK AND SCALE: STANDARDS SHALL BE ADOPTED TO ENSURE ATTRACTIVE AND COMPATIBLE DEVELOPMENT. THE FOLLOWING SHALL BE CONSIDERED:
1) BUILDING HEIGHT SHALL BE LIMITED TO TWO STORIES EXCEPT THAT PROVISIONS FOR ADDITIONAL HEIGHT REQUIREMENTS SHALL BE PROVIDED FOR UNIQUE SITUATIONS SUCH AS LIGHTING TOWERS, SKI TOWERS, STEEP SITES, REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND TOURIST ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES.

2) BUILDING HEIGHT LIMITS SHALL BE ESTABLISHED TO ENSURE THAT BUILDINGS DO NOT PROJECT ABOVE THE FOREST CANOPY, RIDGE LINES, OR OTHERWISE DETRACT FROM THE VIEWSHED.

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

Rationale: The Community Design threshold would be maintained by requiring projects utilizing the amended provisions to meet Section 22.7 findings (1), (2), (3), and (5) of the Code of Ordinances which require architectural and site planning techniques to minimize a building's impact on the surrounding area and preserve lake and mountain views.

The Scenic Resources thresholds would be attained and maintained by requiring projects utilizing the amended provision to meet Section 30.12 of the Code of Ordinances which prohibits any project or activity from degrading applicable scenic resource threshold ratings.

Attainment and maintenance of the Soil Conservation threshold would be assisted by requiring land coverage reductions in exchange for additional building height.

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

Rationale: Project applicants must continue to implement the Regional Plan package, including maintenance of applicable air and water standards.

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

Rationale: For the reasons stated in Findings 1 and 2 above, the Regional Plan will continue to achieve and maintain the threshold.
B. Ordinance 87-8 Findings: Section 2.40 of Ordinance 87-8 requires the following findings prior to Code amendments. The proposed amendment provides for an equal or better means of attainment or maintenance of the thresholds. The required findings and their rationales are:

1. The amendments are consistent with the Compact and with attainment or maintenance of the thresholds.

   Rationale: For the reasons stated in Findings 1 and 2 above, the proposed amendment is consistent with attainment or maintenance of the thresholds.

2. One of the following findings:
   a. There is a demonstrated conflict between provisions of the Regional Plan package, and the conflict threatens to preclude attainment or maintenance of thresholds; or
   b. The provision to be amended has been shown through experience to be counter-productive or ineffective and the amendment is designed to correct the demonstrated problem and is an equal or better means of implementing the Regional Plan package and complying with the Compact; or
   c. Legal constraints, such as court orders, decisions or Compact amendments, require amendment of the Goals and Policies or Code; or
   d. Technical or scientific information demonstrates the need for modification of a provision of the Goals and Policies or Code; or
   e. The provision to be amended has been shown, through experience and time, to be counter-productive to or ineffective in attainment or maintenance of the thresholds; or
   f. Implementation of the provision sought to be amended has been demonstrated to be impracticable or impossible because of one or more of the following reasons:
      (1) The cost of implementation outweighs the environmental gain to be achieved;
      (2) Implementation will result in unacceptable impacts on public health and safety; or
      (3) Fiscal support for implementation is insufficient and such insufficiency is expected to be a long-term problem.
Staff proposes to make Finding b for the following reasons:

Rationale: Presently, public service, tourist accommodation, and certain recreation uses which have unique dimensional requirements are severely restricted in terms of maximum allowable building heights under the Code. The situation is made more difficult when the uses are located on very large sites where reducing up to 20 percent of the base allowable land coverage in order to gain the needed building height would otherwise be cost prohibitive. This results in a counter-productive Regional Plan provision. The amendments are designed to correct the identified problem and better implement the Regional Plan by providing a more feasible opportunity to gain additional building height for the use types identified above on very large sites provided it is demonstrated the additional height is absolutely necessary, the required findings can be made, and land coverage is retired in exchange for the additional height.

Environmental Documentation: Staff has prepared an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) for the proposed action and recommends a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) for the reasons discussed below.

Each alternative analyzed, including the existing regulations, requires a reduction of potential or existing land coverage. Land coverage reductions generally provide an environmental benefit to soil conservation and water quality. Community design and scenic resources are the elements of the environment which may be impacted by the proposed action. The impacts, however, are not expected to be significant because any building seeking additional height is subject to specific findings protecting community design in Chapter 22 of the Code. Further, Chapter 30 findings must also be made which protect scenic resources.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. Please contact John Hitchcock or Gordon Barrett at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this matter.
CHAPTER 22, HEIGHT STANDARDS: PROPOSED AMENDMENT LANGUAGE

22.4 Additional Height For Certain Buildings: TRPA may approve building heights greater than those set forth in Section 22.3 in accordance with the following provisions and if TRPA makes the specified findings.

22.4.A Additional Height For Public Service, Tourist Accommodation, and Certain Recreation Buildings: TRPA may approve building heights greater than those set forth in Section 22.3 for buildings whose primary use is public service, tourist accommodation, or whose primary recreation use is participant sports facilities, recreation centers, or sport assembly as follows:

(1) Additional Height With Required Findings: The maximum heights specified in Table A may be increased by up to four feet, but not to exceed a maximum height of 38 feet, if TRPA makes the following findings in Section 22.7: findings (1), (2), and (3) for tourist accommodation buildings; findings (1), (3), and (2) or (4) for public service buildings; and findings (1), (2), (3), (4), and (7) for the recreation uses identified in 22.4.A.

(2) Additional Height For Reduced Land Coverage: The maximum heights specified in Table A may be increased for reductions in the amount of land coverage otherwise permitted within a project area pursuant to Chapter 20. The maximum heights may be increased as shown in the following chart by one foot for each onsite reduction in land coverage equal to five percent of the base allowable coverage, or existing land coverage, whichever is greater, up to a limit of four additional feet, but not to exceed a maximum height of 42 feet, if TRPA makes findings (1), (2), (3) and (5) as set forth in Section 22.7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Area</th>
<th>Minimum Percent Reduction, Per One Foot of Additional Height</th>
<th>Maximum Coverage Reduction, (Square feet per one foot of Additional Height)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 acres</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 49.99 acres</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15,000 sq. ft. per 1 foot, whichever is less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 99.99 acres</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25,000 sq. ft. per 1 foot, whichever is less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater than 100 acres</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25,000 sq. ft. per 1 foot, whichever is less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) **Additional Height For Public Service Buildings Which Are Not Visible From Lake Tahoe and Which Are Not Located Within Designated Scenic Highway Corridors**: The maximum heights specified in Table A may be increased by up to eight feet, but not to exceed a maximum of 42 feet, if the building will not be visible from Lake Tahoe and the building is not located within a TRPA designated Scenic Highway Corridor pursuant to Chapter 30, provided TRPA makes findings (1), (3), (4), (7), and (8) as set forth in Section 22.7. An additional two feet, not to exceed a maximum of 42 feet, may be earned if the building meets the criteria and findings set forth above and is not visible from a TRPA designated Scenic Highway Corridor pursuant to Chapter 30.
## Calculation of Estimated Land Coverage Reduction by Alternative
- **Sample Parcel and Cumulative**

### I. Land Coverage Reduction Calculations - By Sample Parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Small/Med</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Med/Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (acres)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (square feet)</td>
<td>435,600</td>
<td>871,200</td>
<td>2,178,000</td>
<td>4,356,000</td>
<td>6,534,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Land Coverage @ 30%</td>
<td>130,680</td>
<td>261,360</td>
<td>653,400</td>
<td>1,306,800</td>
<td>1,960,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>(square ft.)</td>
<td>(square ft.)</td>
<td>(square ft.)</td>
<td>(square ft.)</td>
<td>(square ft.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternative 1 - Existing Conditions - 5% Reduction per 1 Foot Additional Height**

| Land Cov. Reduction ( @ 4 ft. addl. ht.) | 26,136 | 52,272 | 130,680 | 261,360 | 382,040 |

**Alternative 2a - 5% Reduction with Cap @ 5,000/ft. per 1 Foot Additional Height**

| Land Cov. Reduction ( @ 4 ft. addl. ht.) | 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 |

**Alternative 2b - 5% Reduction with Cap @ 15,000/ft. per 1 Foot Additional Height**

| Land Cov. Reduction ( @ 4 ft. addl. ht.) | 26,136 | 52,272 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 |

**Alternative 2c - 5% Reduction with Cap @ 25,000/ft. per 1 Foot Additional Height**

| Land Cov. Reduction ( @ 4 ft. addl. ht.) | 26,136 | 52,272 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 |

**Alternative 3a - Modified Percentage @ 4% Reduction per 1 Foot Additional Height**

| Land Cov. Reduction ( @ 4 ft. addl. ht.) | 20,909 | 41,818 | 104,544 | 209,088 | 313,632 |

**Alternative 3b - Modified Percentage @ 3% Reduction per 1 Foot Additional Height**

| Land Cov. Reduction ( @ 4 ft. addl. ht.) | 15,682 | 31,363 | 78,468 | 156,815 | 235,224 |

**Alternative 3c - Modified Percentage @ 2% Reduction per 1 Foot Additional Height**

| Land Cov. Reduction ( @ 4 ft. addl. ht.) | 10,454 | 20,909 | 52,272 | 104,544 | 156,816 |
II. Parcel Inventory by County and Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado Co. Parcels</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado Co. Parcels (acres)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Co. Parcels</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Co. Parcels (acres)</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe Co. Parcels</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe Co. Parcels (acres)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer Co. Parcels</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer Co. Parcels (acres)</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Parcels</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Parcels (acres)</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>2,648</td>
<td>2,102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Land Coverage Reduction Calculations - Cumulative by Parcel Size Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (acres)</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>2,648</td>
<td>2,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (square feet)</td>
<td>47,436,840</td>
<td>115,346,880</td>
<td>91,563,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Land Coverage @ 30%</td>
<td>14,231,052</td>
<td>34,604,064</td>
<td>27,468,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>(square ft.)</td>
<td>(square ft.)</td>
<td>(square ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 - Existing Conditions - 5% Reduction per 1 Foot Additional Height</td>
<td>2,846,210</td>
<td>6,920,813</td>
<td>5,493,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2a - 5% Reduction with Cap @ 5,000/ft., per 1 Foot Additional Height</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,420,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2b - 5% Reduction with Cap @ 15,000/ft., per 1 Foot Additional Height</td>
<td>4,800,000</td>
<td>4,260,000</td>
<td>540,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2c - 5% Reduction with Cap @ 25,000/ft., per 1 Foot Additional Height</td>
<td>4,800,000</td>
<td>7,100,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3a - Modified Percentage @ 4% Reduction per 1 Foot Additional Height</td>
<td>2,276,368</td>
<td>5,536,650</td>
<td>4,395,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3b - Modified Percentage @ 3% Reduction per 1 Foot Additional Height</td>
<td>1,707,726</td>
<td>4,152,488</td>
<td>3,296,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3c - Modified Percentage @ 2% Reduction per 1 Foot Additional Height</td>
<td>1,138,484</td>
<td>2,768,325</td>
<td>2,197,515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 1, 1995

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of the 1995-1999 List of Additional Public Service Facilities to Add the Edgewood Ozonation Project


Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and, based on its outcome, recommend approval to the Governing Board to amend the adopted 1995-1999 List of Additional Public Service Facilities to add the Edgewood Ozonation project pursuant to Section 33.5.A(4).

Background: The applicant, the Edgewood Water Company, submitted the ozonation project for review. The applicant proposes to build a new storage tank to meet the requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act. The project is a federally mandated ozonation treatment project.

Due to the requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Edgewood Water Company will be required to install a new raw water line and an additional tank as part of the ozonation facility. The additional tank is required for a stilling basin after completion of the ozone purification process, and to facilitate the necessary connections between the treatment facility and the distribution system.

The additional tank will also provide emergency fire storage and the ability to take the old tank off-line for maintenance. The new storage tank can also be used in the future for a contact basin if a secondary disinfectant such as chlorine is needed to achieve higher inactivation rates of cryptosporidium.

Although the existing system can meet normal fire flow demands, there is concern over the lack of additional storage capacity in the event of emergencies. During the review process, staff made a determination that the project would be required to be on the Public Service List. This project was not originally included in the 1995-1999 update in January because at the time the applicant did not intend to have an additional storage tank. Furthermore, the applicant did not anticipate that the project would be required on the Public Service List and did not submit the project for inclusion on the list. As the tank is part of a federally mandated ozonation project action to amend the public service list prior to the next annual update is required.
Eligibility for Inclusion on List: Projects included on the list shall be projects for which the sponsoring entity demonstrates, and TRPA finds, that:

(a) There is a need for the project:

An additional storage tank is needed to meet the requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act. The additional tank is required for a stilling basin after completion of the ozone purification process, and to facilitate the necessary connections between the treatment facility and the distribution system. The additional tank will also provide emergency fire storage, and the ability to take the old tank off-line for maintenance. The new tank can also be used in the future for a contact basin if a secondary disinfectant such as chlorine is needed to achieve higher inactivation rates of cryptosporidium.

(b) The project complies with the Goals and Policies, applicable Plan Area Statements, and this Code:

The proposed additional tank is an allowable use in the plan area, and meets the applicable county, regional, state and federal health and safety requirements. The project will create additional storage capacity to meet fire flow needs of its existing users, and is not intended to increase service capacity at this time. Goal #1 of the Public Service Element of TRPA's Goals and Policies allows public service providers to upgrade and expand to support existing and new development consistent with the development anticipated under the Regional Plan. The proposed project has been represented by the applicant to be sized to meet fire flow demands and new development that is anticipated and permitted by TRPA's Regional Plan, Goals and Policies, and applicable community plans.

(c) The project is consistent with the TRPA Capital Improvement Program:

The proposed project is not an element of the TRPA Capital Improvements Program, and will be financed privately by the Edgewood Water Company and its users. The project is consistent with the Public Service Element of the Goals and Policies which allows for expansion of public service facilities provided they are consistent with the Regional Plan.

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

The project does not result in the violation of any adopted thresholds, nor will it result in a degradation of the existing thresholds.

(e) Where the project was unforeseen and action is required before the next annual update, or the project relates to an emergency involving public health and welfare, safety and general welfare, the project must be placed upon the list immediately.
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It was not originally intended that an additional tank would be required, nor did the applicant anticipate the need for the tank addition to be included on the public service list. As the tank was unforeseen and is part of a federally mandated ozonation project, this finding can be made and the project placed on the list immediately.

(f) Where the proposed project is to be located within the boundaries of a community plan area then, to the extent possible, consistent with public health and safety, the project will be compatible with the applicable community plan;

The proposed project is not located within a community plan area. It will serve the Stateline Community Plan area, therefore, it must be consistent with the policies of the Stateline Community Plan at the project review stage.

(g) Where a public service project is proposed for construction in a community plan area before the community plan has been adopted by TRPA, the sponsoring entity shall demonstrate that the need for such a construction schedule outweighs the need for the prior completion of the community plan process.

Not applicable. The Stateline Community Plan has been adopted and is in effect.

Environmental Documentation: The applicant has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) for the project and proposes a Finding Of No Significant Effect (FONSE). The action is administrative in nature and does not constitute a project approval. The project must be found to be consistent with all applicable elements of the Regional Plan at the project review stage to be granted a permit.

Please contact John Hitchcock at (702) 588-4547 or Internet E-mail at trpa@sierra.net if you have any questions or comments on this agenda item.
June 1, 1995

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: South Shore Consolidated Transit System Agreement

TRPA staff and the project proponents will present details on efforts to establish a Consolidated Transit System (CTS) on the South Shore. Topics will include provisions of a Memorandum of Understanding, CTS Implementation Plan, funding arrangements and transportation/air quality mitigation proposals. Staff is requesting APC comments and concerns prior to finalizing the agreement.
June 6, 1995

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Three-Year Strategic Plan (FY95-98)

TRPA staff will present the draft Strategic Plan for FY 1995 - 1998 at the June APC meeting for your review and comment.

The proposed Strategic Plan has been developed in response to the planning retreat held with the APC and Governing Board in April 1995, and as further refined at the TRPA Management Team retreat held in May 1995. Based on the Strategic Plan, TRPA staff will prepare the annual work program along with a workload model and proposed budget for FY 1995-1996 to be presented to the Governing Board in June. Specific staff resources (person-months) will be allocated to each work element based on the staffing level contained in the proposed FY 1995-1996 budget.

It is anticipated that certain adjustments in the annual work program will need to be made to respond to any budget amendments from California and Nevada once we have final budget approval. The work program will also be modified periodically throughout the fiscal year to respond to changes in workload and work priorities. Each of the work elements contained in the work program will be reviewed on an ongoing basis to monitor work progress in accordance with the proposed completion schedules (milestones) and to make any necessary adjustments.

If you should have any questions on this matter, please contact Jerry Wells, Deputy Director, at (702) 588-4547.

JW:
6/6/95

AGENDA ITEM VI. B.

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land