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GOVERNING BOARD AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on August 28, 1996, commencing at 9:30 a.m.,
at the South Lake Tahoe City Council Chambers, 1900 Lake Tahoe Boulevard,
South Lake Tahoe, California, the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional
Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting. The agenda is attached
hereeto and made a part of this notice.

Governing Board Committee items are action items unless otherwise noted.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on August 28, 1996, commencing at 8:30
a.m. at the same location, the Finance Committee will meet. The agenda will
be as follows: 1) public interest comments (no action); 2) receipt of the
July check register and financial statement; 3) discussion on hiring of grant
writer; and 4) member comments. (Committee: Neft, Cole, Heller, Hime,
Chairman Bennett)

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on August 28, 1996, commencing at 12:00 noon
during the lunch recess at Passaretti’s Restaurant, 1181 Emerald Bay Road,
South Lake Tahoe, California, the Rules Committee will meet. The agenda will
be as follows: 1) public interest comments (no action); 2) discussion of rule
relating to time limit for action by TRPA on permit applications; 3) member
comments. (Committee: DeLanoy, Neft, Sevison, Hime, Chairman Bradhurst)

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on August 28, 1996, commencing at 12:00 noon
during the lunch recess at the City Council Chambers, 1900 Lake Tahoe
Boulevard, the Capital Financing Committee will meet. The agenda will be as
follows: 1) public interest comments; 2) discussion of 1997 legislative packet;
3) updating information contained in 1974 McDonald & Smart, Inc. report entitled Tahoe Regional General Plan Implementation: Financial Feasibility; 4) update on California Proposition 204 and Nevada Question 12; and 5) member comments. (Committee: Westergard, Miner, Cronk, Waldie, Wynn, Chairman Cole)

Date: August 19, 1996

By: James W. Baetge
Executive Director

OVERFLOW PARKING FOR THOSE ATTENDING THE MEETING IS
AVAILABLE ON TATA LANS ACROSS FROM K-MART NURSERY;
PLEASE DO NOT DOUBLE PARK IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER PARKING LOT OR OCCUPY THE 30-MINUTE PARKING SPACES.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

South Lake Tahoe City Council Chambers
1900 Lake Tahoe Boulevard
South Lake Tahoe, California

August 28, 1996
9:30 a.m.

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

AGENDA

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS (No Action)

Any member of the public wishing to address the Governing Board on any agenda item not listed as a Project Review, Public Hearing, RTPA, Appeal, or Planning Matter item may do so at this time. However, public comment on Project Review, Public Hearing, RTPA, Appeal, and Planning Matter items will be taken at the time those agenda items are heard.

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

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

V. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR (see page 3)

VII. PUBLIC HEARING (*items include action on the findings plus action on related ordinances, resolutions, environmental documents, and/or plans)

A. Amendment of Goal #1, Housing Subelement of the Land Use Element of the Goals and Policies, and Chapter 2 of the Code of Ordinances Relative to Regional Median Income Levels and Definition of Affordable Housing*

    107

B. Amendment of Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities, to Provide for an MOU Between TRPA and Contel/GTE*

    113

C. Draft RIS for the Lake Tahoe Shorezone Development Cumulative Impact Analysis

    123

D. Certification of the U.S. Forest Service Final RIS for the North Shore Project*

    125
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VIII. PROJECT REVIEW

A. U.S. Forest Service North Shore Project, Substantial Tree Removal, Portions of Washoe and Placer Counties, TRPA File #950172

B. Paiute Gas/Southwest Gas, Phase 2 Gas Main Expansion, Washoe and Placer Counties, Project Number 540-305-95

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

A. Resolution Authorizing Program Supplement to Local Agency-State Agreement for Use of Transit Demand Management (TDM) Funding

X. PLANNING MATTERS

A. 1996 Threshold Evaluation Report
   1. Water Quality Status Report and Recommendations
   2. Air Quality Status Report and Recommendations

B. Six Month Status Report on Individual Parcel Evaluation System

XI. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Resolution in Support of Ballot Measures to Fund Erosion Control, Stormwater Drainage and Stream Environment Zone Restoration Projects (California Proposition 204 and Nevada Question 12)

B. Report on Performance Statistics for the Project Review and Environmental Compliance Divisions

XII. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND BOARD ACTION

A. Finance Committee Report
   1. Receipt of July Financial Statement and Check Register

B. Legal Committee Report

C. Capital Financing Committee Report

D. Rules Committee Report

E. Shorezone Policy Committee Report

F. Local Government Committee Report

G. Performance Audit Committee Report
   1. Selection of Consultant to Conduct Performance Audit

XIII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Monthly Status Report
**CONSENT CALENDAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Subdivision of Reserved Bonus Units In Lieu of Development Rights Transfers for Previously Approved Subdivisions in Incline Village, Washoe County APNs 124-041-31, 132-211-24, and 132-211-06</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gene Akers, Land Capability Challenge, 1700 Grizzly Mountain Drive, El Dorado County APN 33-354-23</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. KRXI Television Translator, Temporary Use Special Use Determination, 5190 Westlake Boulevard, Placer County APN 97-241-06</td>
<td>Approval With Findings And Conditions</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ski Way Villas, New Multi-Family Dwelling And Condominium Subdivision (8 Units), 1004 Tahoe Boulevard, Incline Village, Washoe County APN 130-050-04</td>
<td>Approval With Findings And Conditions</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lakeside Park Association, Water Treatment Facility, Pine Boulevard, El Dorado County APN 29-036-23</td>
<td>Approval With Findings And Conditions</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. North Tahoe Cruises, Permit Modification to Allow Special Event Charter Cruises, Special Use Determination, Placer County APN 94-110-19</td>
<td>Approval With Findings And Conditions</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bottomley Pier Expansion, 4694 North Lake Boulevard, Placer County APN 115-070-07</td>
<td>Approval With Findings And Conditions</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Konda, Land Capability Challenge, 256 Rim Drive, Placer County APN 117-030-12</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. North Tahoe Public Utility District, Outdoor Recreation Concession, Special Use Determination, Coon Street and State Route 28, Placer County APN 90-080-04</td>
<td>Approval With Findings And Conditions</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

Article III (g) Public Law 96-551

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

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

August 18, 1996

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Substitution of Reserved Bonus Units in Lieu of Development Rights Transfers for Previously-Approved Subdivisions in Incline Village, Nevada APNs 124-041-31; 132-211-24; and 132-211-06

PROPOSED ACTION: The permittees for three multi-residential and subdivision approvals are requesting approval of the use of bonus units reserved by Bitterbrush Development, in lieu of development rights transfers. The three projects are: Madzey, 359 Cottonwood Ct. APN 124-041-31; Madzey, 211 Lark Ct., APN 132-211-24; and Lee, 844 Southwood, APN 132-211-06.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends the substitution of bonus units reserved by Bitterbrush.

BACKGROUND: In December 1993, as part of the transfer of 56 existing residential units from Bitterbrush to Country Club Estates, Bitterbrush earned 560 points, or a maximum of 56 bonus units. There are currently 176 points remaining and staff continues to reserve a maximum of 17 bonus units for Bitterbrush. If the bonus points are used for subdivided projects, then the remaining point balance is reduced to 115 points or 11 bonus units.

DISCUSSION: The three projects are subdivision projects which were approved at last month’s Governing Board meeting. The permittees, through their representative Phil Gilanfarr, have stated that they are having difficulty finding development rights for sale within their jurisdiction. They have requested permission to use the remaining bonus units
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Consent Calendar Item #1

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
Substitution of Reserved Bonus Units  
August 19, 1996  
Page 2

reserved by Bitterbrush for their projects, in lieu of development rights transfers. All three projects are located in Plan Area Statement 046, which has 24 bonus units remaining. The three projects and the corresponding points/units they require are:

Madzey, 359 Cottonwood Ct., APN 124-041-31  
(30 points/2 units)

Madzey, 211 Lark Ct., APN 132-211-24  
(30 points/2 units)

Lee, 844 Southwood, APN 132-211-06  
(45 points/3 units)

Therefore, in order to accommodate the needs of the above projects, 145 points would be subtracted from the remaining 176 points, for a balance of 31 points or a maximum of three bonus units remaining (2 bonus units if they are subdivided units).

Staff recommends the substitution in order to use up most of the remaining bonus units reserved by Bitterbrush. The pending December 1996 deadline for using bonus units in subdivided projects may negatively impact the use of the remaining reserved bonus units in 1997. Use of most of the remaining bonus units reserved by Bitterbrush before the end of 1996 would help avoid any controversy over any limitations on bonus units in the future. Reduction of the reservation will also simplify the tracking and availability of Incline Village bonus units.

ACTION REQUIRED: In order to approve the substitution of reserved bonus units in lieu of development rights transfers, the Governing Board must make a motion to approve the modification to the projects.

Consent Calendar Item #1
August 5, 1996

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Land Capability Challenge; Gene Ackers, APN 33-354-23
1700 Grizzly Mountain Drive, El Dorado County, California

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

Staff Recommendation

The staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the land capability challenge changing the land capability class from 3 to 6.

Background

The subject parcel is shown as Land Capability Class 3 on the TRPA Land Capability Overlay maps. The Soil Survey for the Lake Tahoe Basin Area places this parcel within the Jbd (Jabu coarse sandy loam, seeped, 2 to 15 percent slopes), and MKD (Meeks gravelly loamy course sand, 5 to 15 percent slopes) soil map units. A land capability verification was completed on this parcel in October 1995 and the land capability class was verified as 3. A land capability challenge was filed to change the land capability for the parcel.

The parcel is a developed residential parcel in Unit No. 19 of the Tahoe Paradise subdivision of El Dorado County, California (see attached location map). The parcel is approximately 10,500 square feet in size and has a natural slope of 3 to 8 percent.

Findings

This parcel is mapped within geomorphic unit E-1 (Moraine land undifferentiated, moderate hazard lands) on the TRPA Bailey Geomorphic Analysis Map of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

The soils investigation was completed by Joseph Pepi, Certified Professional Soil Scientist, and a report was prepared. Based on four soil pits, one representative soil profile was described (see attached Soils Investigation). The soils were found to have physical characteristics which would place in land capability class 6, associated with the Rbc (Elmira loamy coarse sand, 0 to 9 percent slopes) map unit, allowing 30 percent land coverage.

If you have any questions on this agenda item, please contact Joe Pepi, at (702) 588-4547.

/jp
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CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM 2

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
August 3, 1996

SOIL INVESTIGATION
FOR
EL DORADO COUNTY APN 33-354-23
1700 GRIZZLY MOUNTAIN DR

INTRODUCTION

A soil investigation was conducted on APN 33-354-23, El Dorado County, on
August 1, 1996. This parcel is approximately 10,500 square feet in size and
is located in Tahoe Paradise Unit No. 19. A land capability verification was
completed on this parcel in August 1993, and the parcel was verified as land
capability class 3, associated with the JbD (Jabu coarse sandy loam, seeped, 2
to 15 percent slopes), and the MkD (Meeks very stony loamy coarse sand, 5 to
15 percent slopes) soil map units. A land capability challenge was filed to
confirm the land capability class for the parcel.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

This parcel are shown as land capability class 3 on the TRPA Land Capability
Overlay Maps. The Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for the
Lake Tahoe Basin places this parcel within the MkD (Meeks gravelly loamy
coarse sand, 5 to 15 percent slopes), and the JbD (Jabu coarse sandy loam,
seeped, 2 to 15 percent slopes) map units.

The parcel is mapped within geomorphic unit E-1 (Moraine land
undifferentiated, moderate hazard lands) on the TRPA Geomorphic Analysis Map
of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The MsE soil map unit is consistent with this
geomorphic unit classification, the JbD map unit is not. The Meeks soil
formed in glacial outwash on glacial moraines. The Jabu soils formed in
granitic alluvium on glacial outwash terraces.

This parcel is on a east facing slope. The natural slope is 3 to 8
percent. The natural vegetation is Jeffrey pine, western white pine, white
fir, manzanita, whitethorn, mules ear wyethia, and lupine.

PROCEDURES

Four soil pits were dug on these parcels using hand tools. After examination
of these pits, one was chosen as representative of the soils on the parcel.
The soil in this pits was examined and described in detail. A copy of this
description is included in this report. Slopes were measured with a
clinometer.
FINDINGS

One soil series and soil map unit were identified on this parcel. The soil on the majority of this parcel is deep and is excessively well drained. It is characterized as having a dark grayish brown loamy sand surface layer over a brown to yellowish brown loamy sand or very gravelly loamy coarse sand underlying layer. These soils have a low runoff potential and the surface soils have a slight relative erosion hazard.

This soil is representative of the Elmira soil series mapped in the Tahoe Basin. For the purposes of land capability classification it is most similar to the Ebc (Elmira gravelly loamy coarse sand, 0 to 9 percent) soil map unit.

CONCLUSION

The soils on APN 33-354-23 were determined to be consistent with land capability class 6, in accordance with the Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin (Bailey, 1974). The soils found on the parcel are consistent with the Ebc (Elmira gravelly loamy coarse sand, 0 to 9 percent) soil map unit. The Ebc map unit are in land capability class 6 and is assigned 30 percent allowable land coverage.

Joseph Pepi
Certified Professional Soil Scientist
ARCPACS No. 2372

JP
Enclosure
Representative Soil Profile

Soil Classification: mixed, frigid, Alfic Xeropsamment

Soil Series: Elmira

O1-- 1/2 to 0 inches; White fir and jeffrey pine needles and litter

A1-- 0 to 6 inches; dark grayish brown (10YR 4/2) loamy sand, very dark
grayish brown (10YR 3/2 moist; single grain to massive structure; soft,
very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common fine and medium and few
coarse roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; medium acid;
clear wavy boundary.

A2-- 6 to 15 inches; brown (10YR 5/3) loamy sand; brown (10YR 4/3) moist;
massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common fine and
medium, and few coarse roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores;
medium acid; clear wavy boundary.

AC-- 15 to 31 inches; yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) loamy sand; brown
(10YR 4/3 moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic;
common fine and medium and few coarse roots; many very fine and fine
interstitial pores; 5 percent gravel; medium acid; clear wavy boundary.

C1-- 31 to 42 inches; yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) loamy sand; brown (10YR 4/3)
mist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few fine
and medium roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 10 percent
gravel; medium acid; gradual wavy boundary.

C2-- 42 to 55 inches; yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) very gravelly loamy coarse
sand; brown (10YR 4/3 moist; soft; very friable, nonsticky and
nonplastic; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 5 percent gravel;
medium acid; clear smooth boundary.

C2-- 55 to 60 inches; unable to auger.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY

Project Name: KRXI Television Translator Antennas

Application Type: Public Service, Temporary Use Special Use Determination

Applicant: Nevada Television Corporation, KRXI-TV

Agency Planner: Paul Nielsen, Associate Planner

Location: 5190 Westlake Boulevard

Assessor’s Parcel Number/Project Number: 97-241-06/960310

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

Project Description: The applicant proposes to temporarily install one television transmitting and one receiving antenna on the side of the Homewood High and Dry Marina boat storage building. The permit will be valid for six months with the potential for one 6-month extension. One four foot diameter satellite dish will be mounted to the lakeward facing wall of the marina boat storage building in the upper right hand corner just below the roof line. The second antenna will be located northward facing wall of the marina and will be minimally visible from Lake Tahoe. The second antenna will be located just above the roof line in order to provide effective transmissions. Both antennas will be painted to match the existing color of the marina (tan). The project will not result in the creation of land coverage.

Upon expiration of the permit, the antennas will need to be removed or permanent approval obtained to allow the antennas to remain. Should the applicant submit an application to allow permanent approval at the marina building, TRPA staff will evaluate the potential scenic impacts associated with the permanent approval.

Site Description: The project site is the Homewood High and Dry Marina located at 5190 Westlake Boulevard. The two proposed antenna will be located on the exterior wall of the main boat storage building. The four foot diameter satellite dish and a portion of the second antenna will be visible from Lake Tahoe however, neither antenna will be visible from State Route 89. A mix of commercial, recreational and residential uses surround the project site.

Issue: The proposed project involves a special use for the plan area (transmission and receiving facilities), and therefore requires Governing Board review in accordance with Chapter 4, Appendix A, of the TRPA Code. There are no primary project related issues.
Staff Analysis:

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

B. Plan Area Statement: The project is located within Plan Area 159, Homewood/Commercial. The Land Use Classification is Tourist and the Management Strategy is Redirection. Agency staff has reviewed the subject Plan Area and has determined that the project is consistent with the applicable planning statement, planning considerations and special policies. The proposed activity (transmission and receiving facilities) is listed as a special use.

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

1. The project is consistent with and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and maps, the Code, and other TRPA plans and programs.
   
   (a) Land Use: Transmission and receiving facilities are a special use in the plan area.

   (b) Transportation: No impacts to transportation have been identified. This project will not result in the creation of vehicle trips.

   (c) Conservation: The project is located within Scenic Shoreline Unit 12, McKinney Bay. The proposed antennas will be painted to match the existing building color. Temporary installation of the antenna will not affect applicable travel route or scenic quality ratings. The antennas will not be visible from State Route 89. There are no known special interest species, sensitive or uncommon plants or cultural resources within the project area.

   (d) Recreation: This project does not involve any recreation facilities or uses.
(e) **Public Service and Facilities:** This project does not require any additions to public services or facilities.

(f) **Implementation:** The project does not require the allocation of development.

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

The basis for this finding is provided on the checklist entitled "Project Review Conformance Checklist and Article V(g) Findings" in accordance with Chapter 6, Subsection 6.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All responses contained on said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. A copy of the completed checklist will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.

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

(Refer to paragraph 2, above.)

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

The size and location of the proposed temporary antennas will not interfere with on site and adjacent land uses.

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

The proposed temporary transmitting and receiving facilities will not generate light or noise and will be painted a color that will enable them to blend with the existing development. No new land coverage will be created as a result of this project.
6. The project, to which the use pertains, will not change the character of the neighborhood, detrimentally affect or alter the purpose of the applicable planning area statement, community plan and specific or master plan, as the case may be.

The proposed temporary transmitting and receiving facilities are compatible with existing on site and off site land uses. The visibility of the antenna will be insignificant as seen from adjacent parcels. This project is not within an adopted community, specific or master plan area and will not alter or affect the purpose of the applicable plan area.

D. **Required Actions:** Agency staff recommends that the Governing Board make the following motions based on this staff summary and the evidence in the record:

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

2. A motion to approve the project, based on the staff summary, subject to the following conditions:

A. This permit is for the temporary installation of one television transmitting and one receiving antenna on the existing boat storage building located at the Homewood High and Dry Marina. The size of the antennas are limited to one 4 foot diameter receiving dish and one 3 foot by 3 foot transmitting antenna. This permit is valid for 6-months with the possibility for a one-time 6-month extension. Prior to the expiration of this temporary use permit the permittee shall remove or obtain permanent approval for the two proposed antenna.

B. Prior to commencement of construction the following special conditions of approval must be satisfied:

(1) The elevation drawings shall be revised to show final locations of the proposed antennas. The antenna located on the northward facing wall of the marina building shall not extend above the roof line more than the minimum amount necessary to provide effective transmissions.

(2) The proposed antennas shall be painted to match the existing color to the marina boat storage building. Color samples shall be submitted to TRPA for review and approval.
(3) The security required under Standard Condition A.3 of Attachment R shall be $1,500.00. Please see Attachment J, Security Procedures for acceptable ways to post a security.

(4) The permittee shall submit 3 sets of final construction drawings and site plans to TRPA.
Top View - Homewood Marina
Storage Building W/ Proposed Antennae
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WESTLAKE

Homewood Ski Area
Parking Lot
14

Lake Tahoe

Asphalt Pavement

Fawn Street

Scotts Valley Group, Inc.
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Project Name: Ski Way Villas

Application Type: Multi-Family Dwellings and Condominium Subdivision, Special Use Determination

Applicant: Jim Clark and Paul Zahler

Applicant's Representative: Phil Gilanfarr

Agency Planner: Vanessa Mongeon, Associate Planner

Location: 1004 Tahoe Boulevard, Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada

Assessor's Parcel Number/Project Numbers: 130-050-04/960249 and 960261

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

Project Description: This project consists of two separate components. The first component is the construction of eight multi-family units, which consist of four detached structures containing two units each. The proposed project will be constructed on a 65,200 square foot (1.5 acre) parcel located between Tahoe Boulevard (State Route 28) and Ski Way in Incline Village. Each of the four detached two-unit structures will create approximately 2,676 square feet of land coverage. The units are similar in design with common driveways for each of the four structures and a two-car garage for each unit. The four detached duplex units will utilize eight residential allocations, and eight residential development rights.

The second component involves the subdivision of the eight multi-family dwellings (four duplexes). Chapter 43 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances permits subdivisions in urban areas after the approval of an underlying project. The condominium style (airspace ownership) subdivision will create eight building envelopes with a common area, and will change the use from a multi-family development into a single family dwelling development. Multi-family dwellings are a special use in the Plan Area and require the applicable findings, and single family dwellings are an allowable use in the Plan Area.

Site Description: The 65,200 square foot (1.5 acre) parcel is located near the northeast corner of Tahoe Boulevard and Country Club Drive and is within the boundaries of the Incline Village Tourist Community Plan Area. The verified land capability district is class 4 which permits a base allowable land coverage of 13,040 square feet. Surrounding land uses consist of a motel, commercial building, and Sierra Nevada College to the south, vacant land to the north, multi-family dwellings to the east and the IVGID Golf Course to the west.
Issues: The proposed project involves an eight unit multi-family development, and a special use determination (multi-family dwellings), and therefore requires Governing Board review in accordance with Chapter 4, Appendix A, of the TRPA Code.

1. Scenic Impact: The project will be visible from Tahoe Boulevard (State Route 28). The roadway travel route ratings are not in attainment, however the ratings did not drop when last reviewed in 1991. This project is not expected to contribute to a decline in the roadway travel route ratings. The project, as conditioned, will include dark colors and materials which blend into the natural background, and a landscaping plan which will further screen the project as viewed from Tahoe Boulevard (State Route 28).

2. Subdivision of Post-1987 Structures: The applicant is also proposing to subdivide all eight residential units into a condominium subdivision. The TRPA subdivision ordinance only allows approval of a subdivision in urban areas for existing or approved projects. Urban areas are defined in the TRPA Code of Ordinances as those areas designated as Residential, Tourist, or Commercial/Public Service by the Plan Area Statement. The land use classification for the applicable Community Plan Area Statement (048), for this project is Tourist. The Community Plan Area Statement identifies this area as a preferred affordable housing area. The TRPA Code of Ordinance amendments approved by the TRPA Governing Board on December 21, 1994, which limit the ability to subdivide in preferred affordable housing areas, do not go into effect until December 31, 1996. After December 31, 1996, approval of this project would be prohibited unless TRPA finds the County has demonstrated its commitment to assume its “fair share” responsibility to provide lower and very low income housing within the existing urban areas pursuant to Goal #1 of the TRPA Housing Subelement of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies.

Staff Analysis:

A. Environmental Documentation: TRPA staff has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) in order to assess the potential environmental impacts of the project. No significant environmental impacts were identified and staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. A copy of the completed IEC will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.
B. Plan Area Statement: The project is located within Incline Village Tourist Community Plan Area Statement 048. The Land Use Classification is Tourist and the Management Strategy is Mitigation. The Plan Area Statement identifies this area as a preferred affordable housing area. TRPA staff has reviewed the Plan Area and has determined that the project is consistent with the applicable planning statement, planning considerations and special policies. Multi-family dwellings are listed as a special use and single family dwellings are listed as an allowed use.

C. Land Coverage:

1. Land Capability District:

The verified land capability district of the 65,200 square foot project area is class 4.

2. Total Allowable Land Coverage:

65,200 square feet x 20% = 13,040 square feet.

3. Total Existing Land Coverage:

Total: 527 square feet.

4. Total Proposed Land Coverage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Roof Pitch</th>
<th>Allowed Height</th>
<th>Proposed Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residences and garages</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>32'3&quot;</td>
<td>31'6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decks and porches</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>34'3&quot;</td>
<td>33'9&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patios</td>
<td>144 square feet</td>
<td>2,151 square feet</td>
<td>12,855 square feet</td>
<td>2,788 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveways</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>34'9&quot;</td>
<td>34'9&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Onsite</td>
<td>10,080 square feet</td>
<td>480 square feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Offsite</td>
<td>144 square feet</td>
<td>2,151 square feet</td>
<td>12,855 square feet</td>
<td>2,788 square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Building Height:
The allowed and proposed building heights for the structures are as follows:

The proposed building heights comply with Chapter 22 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.
E. Required Findings: The following is a list of the required findings as set forth in Chapters 6, 18 and 22 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, agency staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the finding can be made.

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

(a) Land Use: Multi-family dwellings are a special use in the Plan Area and single family dwellings are an allowed use. Surrounding land uses consist of a motel, commercial building, Sierra Nevada College to the south, vacant land to the north, several multi-family dwellings to the east and the IVGID Golf Course to the west.

(b) Transportation: The permittee shall submit a $200 air quality mitigation fee for each dvt (daily vehicle trip end) generated as a result of the additional (new) development. For each unit of additional (new) development, the air quality mitigation on a per unit basis will be $1,294 if the project is approved as multi-family dwelling or $1,172 if each unit is subdivided and converted to residential condominiums.

(c) Conservation: The applicant will be required to apply Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the project area. The project is located within a scenic roadway unit and will be required to mitigate the scenic impacts created by the project. The project is not located within a scenic shoreline unit. There are no known special interest species, sensitive or uncommon plants or cultural resources within the project area.

(d) Recreation: This project does not involve any recreation facilities or uses.

(e) Public Service and Facilities: This project does not require any additions to public services or facilities.

(f) Implementation: Construction of the eight multi-family units will utilize eight allocations. Since this property was given an IPES score, a residential development right has been assigned to the parcel, pursuant to Chapter 21 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. The applicant will be required to transfer seven development rights to the parcel.
2. The project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.

The basis for this finding is provided on the checklist entitled "Project Review Conformance Checklist and Article V(g) Findings" in accordance with Chapter 6, Subsection 6.3.3 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All responses contained on said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. A copy of the completed checklist will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.

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

(Refer to paragraph 2, above.)

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

The area to the east of the project area is developed with several multi-family dwellings. To the south of the the project area is a motel, commercial building, and single family dwellings. The area to the north is vacant, and the area to the west of the project area includes the IVGID Golf Course and Sierra Nevada College.

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

There is no evidence that the proposed project will be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood, or general welfare of the Region. The applicant will be required to apply both temporary and permanent Best Management Practices to protect the land, water, and air resources of the subject property and that of the surrounding property owners.
6. The project, to which the use pertains, will not change the character of the neighborhood, detrimentally affect or alter the purpose of the applicable planning area statement, community plan and specific or master plan, as the case may be.

The proposed residential use is consistent with the existing residential uses located to the east of the project area, and is not expected to alter the character of the neighborhood. The plan area statement lists multi-family dwellings as a special use and single-family dwellings as an allowed use. The project is part of the Incline Village Tourist Community Plan Area.

7. When viewed from major arterials, scenic turnouts, public recreation areas or the waters of Lake Tahoe, but not from a distance of less than 300 feet, the additional height will not cause a building to extend above the forest canopy, when present, or a ridgeline.

The proposed project is visible from a major arterial, Tahoe Boulevard (State Route 28). The maximum proposed building height is 34 feet, 9 inches, which is below the height of the forest canopy as viewed from Tahoe Boulevard (State Route 28). The proposed project is not visible from a scenic turnout, public recreation area or the waters of Lake Tahoe.

F. Required Actions: Agency staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the project by making the following motions based on this staff summary and the evidence contained in the record:

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

II. A motion to approve the eight unit multi-family dwelling project based on this staff summary subject to conditions 1 thru 10 listed below.

III. A motion based on this staff summary, for the findings contained in Section E above, and a finding of no significant environmental effect for the condominium subdivision of the eight residential units.

IV. A motion to approve the condominium subdivision of the eight residential units based on the staff summary, subject to conditions 11 thru 13 listed below.
1. This permit is for the construction and subdivision of eight multi-family dwellings, consisting of four detached structures containing two units each, on property located at 1004 Tahoe Boulevard (State Route 28) in Incline Village (APN 130-050-04).

2. The Standard Conditions of Approval listed in Attachment R.

3. Prior to permit acknowledgement the following special conditions of approval must be satisfied:

   a. The site plan shall be revised to include:

      1. The following revised land coverage calculations:

         a. Proposed land coverage shall indicate:

            | Coverage          | Square Feet   |
            |-------------------|---------------|
            | Residences and Garages | 10,080        |
            | Decks and porches    | 480           |
            | Patios               | 144           |
            | Driveways            | 2,151         |
            | Total proposed coverage | 12,855       |

         b. Existing land coverage shall indicate 527 square feet.

         c. A notation indicating that the existing land coverage, 527 square feet, to be removed and revegetated.

      2. Notations indicating slope stabilization and/or revegetation in the areas between the driveways up to the existing edge of pavement along the entire property frontage.

      3. The north arrow on the site plan shall be accurately drawn.

      4. A three-inch layer of gravel (pea or 3/4" drainrock) beneath all raised decks, including driveway decks.

      5. Location and details of all proposed exterior lighting. All lighting shall be conformance with Subsection 30.8 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

      6. A note indicating that the area outside the proposed building envelopes is "Common Area."
(7) A construction equipment and material staging area shall be identified on the site plan.

(8) Location of snow storage areas.

(b) A landscape plan shall be submitted to TRPA for review and approval prior to final acknowledgement of the permit. The landscape plan shall be designed to screen the proposed multi-family units from Tahoe Boulevard (State Route 28). The proposed landscape plan shall include 20 (twenty) native conifers, on the southwest side of units 7 and 8, minimum size six feet tall. In addition, the landscape plan shall include additional vegetation in the front areas of each unit in conformance with Subsection 30.7 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. The common area behind the units shall remain as natural vegetation.

(c) A water quality mitigation fee of $15,410 shall be paid to TRPA. This fee is based on the creation of 12,328 square feet of base allowable onsite land coverage.

(d) The permittee shall submit a $200 air quality mitigation fee for each dvt (daily vehicle trip end) generated as a result of the additional (new) development. For each unit of additional (new) development, the air quality mitigation on a per unit basis will be $1,294 if the project is approved as multi-family dwelling or $1,172 if each unit is subdivided and converted to residential condominiums.

(e) The permittee shall submit an offsite coverage mitigation fee of $13,940 for the creation of 2,788 square feet of land coverage in the public right-of-way.

(f) The security required under Standard Condition A.3 of Attachment R shall be determined upon the permittee's submittal of required Best Management Practices plan and related cost estimate. Please see Attachment J, Security Procedures. In no case shall the security be less than $5,000.

(g) The permittee shall submit a projected construction completion schedule to TRPA prior to commencement of construction. Said schedule shall include completion dates for each item of construction, as well as BMP installations for the entire project area.
(h) The permittee shall provide evidence that all basic service requirements for minimum fire flow will be met or exceeded in accordance with Section 27.3.B, Table 27-1 of the TRPA Code.

(i) The final construction drawings shall have notes indicating conformance to the following design standards for color and roofs:

1. **Color:** The color of this structure, including any fences on the property, shall be compatible with the surroundings. Subdued colors in the earthtone and woodtone ranges shall be used for the primary color of this structure. Hues shall be within the range of natural colors that blend, rather than contrast, with the existing vegetation and earth hues.

2. **Roofs:** Roofs shall be composed of nonglare earthtone or woodtone materials that minimize reflectivity.

The permittee shall submit color and material samples to TRPA for review and approval prior to final permit acknowledgement.

(j) The permittee shall complete and record the deed restrictions associated with APNs 129-550-01 and 02, permanently retiring these parcels, and transferring two allocations to APN 130-050-04. Copies of the recorded deed restrictions or the original recorded deed restrictions shall be provided to TRPA prior to permit acknowledgement.

(k) Prior to permit acknowledgement seven development rights shall be transferred to the property under separate TRPA approval.

(l) The permittee shall submit three (3) sets of final construction drawings and site plans to TRPA.

(4) Excavation equipment be limited to the foundation foot print to minimize site disturbance.
The architectural design of this project shall include elements that screen from public view all external mechanical equipment, satellite receiving disks, communication equipment, and utility hardware on roofs, buildings or the ground. Roofs, including mechanical equipment and skylights, shall be constructed of nonglare finishes that minimize reflectivity.

Fertilizer use on this property shall be managed to include the appropriate type of fertilizer, rate, and frequency of application to avoid release of excess nutrients and minimize use of fertilizer.

Ground disturbance shall be limited to the area within the building footprint and the footprint of the proposed common driveway. The areas outside the proposed building envelopes shall be left in a natural condition. The clearing of vegetation in the common area for any purposes except for creating a "defensible space," is prohibited.

This permit allows for TRPA approved gas inserts only for the eight multi-family units.

This permit does not address any signage. Any proposed signage will require a separate TRPA permit.

All utilities shall be underground.

If the TRPA Governing Board approves the subdivision, the permittee shall provide, prior to recordation, a final map, or a similar document, for an approved subdivision which contains a signature block for TRPA to document regional approval. A final subdivision map shall be submitted to TRPA within 30 days of recording.

If the subdivision is approved, the permittee must submit covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs) pursuant to Subsection 43.4.M of the TRPA Code of Ordinances for review and approval prior to construction, which must include the following:

(i) A requirement that all resident vehicle parking must be in the garages and on the driveway serving each unit so long as the parked vehicle does not extend into the right-of-way of Ski Way.
(ii) A requirement that each residence comply with the exterior lighting standards as applicable in section 30.8 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

(iii) A requirement that provisions be made for maintenance of all common area Best Management Practices.

(13) If the approval for the construction of the eight residential units expires, in whole or in part, then the subdivision map approval is void as to the subdivision of incomplete or unbuilt units. The final subdivision map, if recorded prior to completion of all units, shall include, on its face, this condition. The incomplete or unbuilt units shall revert to common area. In no event shall this approval operate to create a subdivision of land unassociated with a complete residential unit.
Project Name: Lakeside Park Association - Water Treatment Facility

Application Type: Public Service

Applicant: Lakeside Park Association

Applicant's Representative: Susan Simon

Agency Planner: Jim Lawrence, Associate Planner

Location: Pine Boulevard, City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County

Assessor's Parcel Number: 29-036-23

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

Project Description: Lakeside Park Association is proposing improvements to their domestic water system to meet federal standards following the 1986 amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act. The improvements include expanding the existing building to accommodate a filtration treatment system consistent with federal standards. The project also involves the construction of a 42 foot diameter by 24 foot tall water storage tank. The proposed project will create an additional 675 square feet of land coverage.

Site Description: The site is located on Pine Boulevard between the Station House Inn and Tahoe Country Inn. Surrounding land uses consist primarily of tourist accommodation and residential. There are tourist accommodation uses adjacent to the north, south and east; residential uses are adjacent to the west. The site is flat and consists entirely of land classified as Land Capability 7. The site currently includes one operational and one abandoned well, three hydropneumatic tanks within a wooden enclosure and gravel areas. During the summer months, the site is also used for outdoor church services.

Issue: The proposed project involves an addition of over 1,000 square feet of public service floor area and, therefore, requires Governing Board review in accordance with Chapter 4, Appendix A, of the TRPA Code.
Staff Analysis:

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

B. Community Plan: The project is located within the Stateline Community Plan (Lakeside District). The Land Use Classification is Tourist and the Management Strategy is Redirection. Staff has reviewed the subject Community Plan and has determined that the project is consistent with the applicable planning statement, planning considerations and special policies. The proposed activity (local public health and safety facility) is listed as an allowed use.

C. Land Coverage:

1. Land Capability District:

   The land capability district of the project area is Class 7. The total project area is approximately 12,500 square feet.

2. Existing Coverage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Structure/Use</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Story Building</td>
<td>1,584 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shed (Well #3)</td>
<td>66 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Parking</td>
<td>1,208 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Paths/Sanctuary</td>
<td>2,785 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirt Parking</td>
<td>674 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shed/Alter Area</td>
<td>88 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,405 square feet</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Proposed Coverage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Structure/Use</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Story Building</td>
<td>700 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shed (Well #3)</td>
<td>66 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Parking</td>
<td>1,208 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Filter Building</td>
<td>2,008 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Storage Tank</td>
<td>1,257 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>212 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Parking Area</td>
<td>1,449 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Generator Room Drive</td>
<td>180 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,080 square feet</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Allowed Coverage:

   | Class 7                     | 3,750 square feet |
Lakeside Park, Water Treatment Facility
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5. Coverage Mitigation:

The project area presently exceeds the allowable coverage by 2,655 square feet. The permittee will be required to mitigate the excess land coverage pursuant to Section 20.5.A(3) of the TRPA Code. In addition, the project requires an additional 675 square feet of land coverage. Conditions of approval will require the permittee to transfer 675 square feet to the project area consistent with Chapter 20 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. In order to allow the additional land coverage the Governing Board must make findings 4, 5, 6 and 7 of Section E, below.

D. Building Height: Based on a 0 percent slope across the building site and a 6:12 roof pitch, the maximum allowed building height for the proposed filtration facility is 31 feet 2 inches. The proposed building height is 19 feet four inches. Based on a 0 percent slope and 0 roof pitch, the maximum allowed height for the water storage tank is 24 feet. The proposed height of the tank is 24 feet. Both of these structures are consistent with TRPA height ordinances.

E. Required Findings: The following is a list of the required findings as set forth in Chapters 6 and 20 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, Agency staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the finding can be made.

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

   (a) Land Use: The project site presently consists of water treatment equipment and an outdoor church. The purpose of this project is to improve the facility to meet requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act. Local Public Health and Safety Facilities are listed as an allowed use in the applicable Community Plan.

   (b) Transportation: The project will not result in an increase of daily vehicle trip ends or vehicle miles traveled and, as such, no significant impacts to transportation have been identified.

   (c) Conservation: The site is not visible from a TRPA Scenic Shoreline or Roadway Unit. No sensitive species or cultural resources have been identified within the project area.

   (d) Recreation: The project is not located within, or adjacent to, a public recreation area and, as such, the project will not adversely impact the recreation threshold.

   (e) Public Service and Facilities: The project has been determined to be necessary to ensure compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Act. The project is on the Five Year List of Public Service Facilities 1995-1999.
(f) **Implementation:** The project does not require allocations of any units of use, commercial floor area or PAOTs.

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

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

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

(Refer to paragraph 2, above.)

4. **The project is on the list of additional public service facilities if required pursuant to Section 33.5.**

The project is on the Five Year List of Public Service Facilities.

5. **There is no feasible alternative that would reduce land coverage.**

The proposed project involves the minimum amount of land coverage necessary to improve the facility in compliance with federal safe drinking water standards.

6. **The project, because of its unusual configuration or service requirement, requires special consideration.**

The additional land coverage is necessary for the required improvements mandated by the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act.

7. **The facility primarily serves the needs of persons other than those who are, or will be residents of the lands in question, or the owners of the land in question.**

The facility will serve all of the properties receiving water from the Lakeside Park Association water treatment facility.

**F. Required Actions:** Agency staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the project by making the following motions based on this staff summary and the evidence contained in the record:

I. A motion based on this staff summary, for the findings contained in Section E above, and a finding of no significant environmental effect.
II. A motion to approve the project, based on the staff summary, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Standard Conditions of Approval listed in Attachment Q.

2. Prior to commencement of construction the following special conditions of approval must be satisfied:

   A. The permittee shall submit dewatering plans to TRPA for approval prior to permit acknowledgement.

   B. The site plan shall be revised to include: 1) A slotted drain, and appropriate sized drywell, located along the connection between the existing motel parking area and the proposed paved area; 2) Temporary erosion control structures located along the southern property line; and 3) Vegetation protective fencing installed where appropriate.

   C. The security required under Standard Condition 1.2 of Attachment Q shall be $2,500.

   D. The permittee mitigate excess land coverage on this property by submitting an excess coverage mitigation fee, or by removing coverage within Hydrologic Transfer Area Number 4.

      The excess coverage mitigation fee shall be calculated as follows:

      (1) Estimated Project Construction Cost x 0.01

      Excess land coverage may be removed in lieu of an excess coverage mitigation fee. To calculate the amount of excess coverage to be removed use the following formula:

      (2) Excess Coverage mitigation fee (per formula (1) above) divided by $5.00 per square foot.

   E. The permittee shall transfer 675 square feet of coverage to this parcel. All transferred coverage shall be from within hydrologic Area 4. (Note all coverage transfers must be in compliance with Chapter 20 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and the TRPA Rules of Procedure.)

   F. The permittee shall submit building and material samples for the proposed building and water storage tank. All colors and materials shall be consistent with the Design Review Standards and Guidelines of the Stateline Community Plan. All colors and material must be approved by TRPA prior to acknowledgment of this permit.
The permittee shall submit a landscape plan designed to screen the improvements when viewed from public streets and adjacent properties. The landscape plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. At least four 15 gallon Jeffrey pine trees (or similar species) in the norther portion of the project site.

2. At least five 15 gallon poplars (or similar species) in the norther portion of the site.

3. At least three 15 gallon Jeffrey pine trees (or similar species) in the area of the site plan denoted as "turf".

4. At least three 15 gallon Jeffrey pine trees (or similar species) located along the western edge of the property. The purpose is to screen the proposed water storage tank from residences to the west.

The permittee shall consolidate the portions of lots 9 and 10, comprising APN 23-036-23, into one legal lot of record pursuant to applicable local subdivision ordinances and state subdivision law, or the permittee shall record a deed restriction permanently consolidating the affected lots.

The permittee shall submit 5 sets of final construction drawings and site plans to TRPA.

3. Any exterior lighting shall conform to Chapter 30 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

4. The architectural design of this project shall include elements that screen from public view all external mechanical equipment and refuse enclosures. The materials used for screening shall be approved by TRPA prior to installation.

5. All spoil materials shall be stored up-slope from construction trenches during the water line replacement. Temporary erosion control structures shall be located downslope of proposed construction areas where trenching does not capture surface runoff.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY

Project Name: North Tahoe Cruises - Special Event Cruises

Application Type: Shorezone, Tour Boat Operation

Applicant: North Tahoe Cruises

Applicant’s Representative: Leah Kaufman

Agency Planner: Jim Lawrence, Associate Planner

Location: 950 North Lake Boulevard, Placer County

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

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

Project Description: In November 1993, the TRPA Governing Board granted approval to North Tahoe Cruises to operate a new tour boat on Lake Tahoe. The new tour boat (Tahoe Gal) was conditioned at a maximum capacity of 165 passengers and that loading and unloading of passengers would occur at the Lighthouse Shopping Center in Tahoe City. North Tahoe Cruises has requested to revise the permit to allow passengers to board for special event cruises at the following locations:

1) Gar Woods Grill and Pier - Carnelian Bay
2) Sierra Boat Company - Carnelian Bay
3) Tahoe Boat Company - Tahoe City
4) Sugar Pine Point Recreation Area
5) Round Hill Pines Resort - Round Hill
6) Zephyr Cove Resort - Zephyr Cove
7) Hyatt - Incline Village
8) North Tahoe Marina - Tahoe Vista

North Tahoe Cruises is proposing to utilize these locations to provide private group charters on an "as requested" basis. The maximum capacity of 165 passengers would remain the same and passengers for the special group charters would be bused to these locations to avoid parking conflicts with existing uses.

Site Description: The following is a brief site description of each of the proposed locations:

Gar Woods Grill and Pier: The site is occupied by a restaurant, public pier, restrooms and approximately 100 parking spaces. Tour Boat Operations are listed as an allowed use in the applicable Plan Area (PAS 17).
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Sierra Boat Company: The site is occupied by a marina consisting of a pier, restrooms, buoy field, boat slips, fueling, marine shop and approximately 50 parking spaces. Tour Boat Operations are listed as an allowed use in the applicable Plan Area (PAS 17).

Tahoe Boat Company: The site is occupied by a marina consisting of a public pier, boat slips and fueling. The site also consists of restaurants, retail shops and approximately 175 parking spaces. This location is presently the "home port" for the Tahoe Gal. Tour Boat Operations are listed as an allowed use at this location in the Tahoe City Community Plan.

Sugar Pine Point: The site is managed by the California Department of State Parks as a day use area and consists of picnic facilities, public pier, restrooms and approximately 100 parking spaces. Tour Boat Operations are listed as an allowed use in the applicable Plan Area (PAS 153).

Round Hill Pines Resort: The site is owned by the U.S. Forest Service and consists of a pier, fueling, restrooms and approximately 100 parking spaces. Tour Boat Operations are listed as a special use in the applicable Plan Area (PAS 68).

Zephyr Cove Resort: The site is owned by the U.S. Forest Service and consists of a pier, fueling, restrooms, restaurant, cabins, campground, and approximately 210 parking spaces. The site serves as the base for the M.S. Dixie II tour boat. Tour Boat Operations are listed as an allowed use in the applicable Plan Area (PAS 66).

Hyatt Hotel: The site is occupied by a hotel, restaurant, private pier and approximately 100 parking spaces. Tour Boat Operations are listed as a special use in the Incline Village Community Plan.

North Tahoe Marina: The site is occupied by a marina consisting of a public pier, boat slips, buoy field, fueling facilities, restrooms, marine shop, restaurant and approximately 75 parking spaces. This location was originally approved as the "home port" for the Tahoe Gal. Tour Boat Operations are listed as a special use in the applicable Plan Area (PAS 22).

TRPA staff has reviewed each of these locations and determined that there are adequate facilities to support the proposed special cruises.

Issue: The proposed project involves a new tour boat operation at many of the proposed locations and therefore requires Governing Board review in accordance with Chapter 4, Appendix A, of the TRPA Code. The proposed project is listed as a special use in the lakezone and in three of the proposed locations. The special use findings for the lakezone were made as part of the original project approval for operation of the Tahoe Gal.

Staff Analysis:

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

B. Plan Area Statement/Community Plans: TRPA staff has reviewed the subject Plan Areas and Community plans and has determined that the project is consistent with the applicable planning statements, planning considerations and special policies. Tour Boat Operations are listed as an allowed use in all of the proposed locations except for North Tahoe Marina, the Hyatt Hotel and Round Hill Pines Resort. Tour Boat Operations are listed as a special use in those locations.

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

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

   (a) Land Use: Tour boat operations are listed as a permissible use in all of the proposed locations. All of the locations have water-oriented facilities associated with the site (e.g. pier, marina, etc.). The proposed project will not alter existing land uses at the proposed locations.

   (b) Transportation: Conditions of approval will require that passengers for each of the special cruises be bused to the proposed location, thus, the project will not result in a significant impact to transportation.

   (c) Conservation: The project is consistent with the fisheries, shorezone, and scenic subelements of the Conservation Element of the Regional Plan. The project does not involve any additional structures or expansions and therefore will not have any adverse impacts to fisheries, the shorezone, or scenic thresholds.

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

   (e) Public Service and Facilities: The proposed project will not require additional public services or facilities. There is no evidence that the project will adversely affect implementation of the Public Services and Facilities Element of the Regional Plan.

   (f) Implementation: The proposed project does not require any allocations of PAOTs or commercial floor area. There is no evidence that the project will adversely affect the Implementation Element of the Regional Plan.
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2. The project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.

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

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

(Refer to paragraph 2, above.)

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

Tour boat operations are a permissible use at each of the proposed locations and all of the proposed locations have adequate parking and docking facilities to support special event cruises. The proposed project will not require any modifications to either the use or structures of the subject parcels.

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

The subject tour boat has operated on the waters of Lake Tahoe for approximately two years. North Tahoe Cruises has submitted documentation that the tour boat is consistent with TRPA noise standards. In addition, the tour boat has been inspected by the U.S. Coast Guard for safety standards. There is no evidence that the proposed project will be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or the general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood or the region.

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

Tour boat operations are a permissible use within the applicable Plan Areas and Community Plans. The project is consistent with the special policies and planning considerations for the applicable Plan Areas and Community Plans.
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7. The proposed project will not adversely impact: (1) littoral processes; (2) fish spawning; (3) backshore stability; and (4) on-shore wildlife habitat, including wildfowl nesting areas.

The proposed project will utilize existing shorezone structures in which existing boating activity presently occurs. As such, impacts to littoral processes, fish spawning, backshore stability, and on-shore wildlife habitat are not expected.

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

Each of the proposed locations have existing docking facilities and parking facilities to accommodate the proposed project. Conditions of approval will ensure that there is adequate water depth for docking the tour boat. In addition, conditions of approval will require that passengers be bused for each special event cruise. This will eliminate potential parking conflicts.

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

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

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

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

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

This approval will incorporate all of the original conditions of approval for the Tahoe Gal. These conditions prohibit the use of spray painting, the use of tributyltin (TBT), and the discharge of any hazardous materials into the lake.

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

The proposed project does not involve any construction.

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

The proposed project does not involve additional structures. There is no evidence that the project will adversely impact navigation or create a threat to public safety. The tour boat has passed safety inspection by the U.S. Coast Guard.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM 6
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14. TRPA has solicited comments from those public agencies having jurisdiction over the nearshore and foreshore and all such comments received were considered by TRPA prior to action being taken on this project.

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

E. Required Actions: Agency staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the project by making the following motions based on this staff summary and the evidence contained in the record.

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

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

A. This approval authorizes North Tahoe Cruises (Tahoe Gal) to operate special event cruises at the following locations:
   1) Tahoe Boat Company; 2) Sugar Pine Point; 3) Roundhill Pines;
   4) Zephyr Cove Resort; 5) Hyatt Hotel in Incline Village; 6) North Tahoe Marina; 7) Gar Woods Grill and Pier; and 8) Sierra Boat Company. The maximum occupancy for each cruise is 165 passengers.

B. The tourboat's propeller wash shall be controlled to eliminate high water currents that could result in detrimental changes in the lake bottom substrate.

C. Special event cruises shall not occur if water levels are so low that the Tahoe Gal significantly disturbs the lake bottom. "Significant disturbance" shall be defined as the movement of gravel, rock, and cobble size, or larger, lake bottom substrate.

D. Special event cruises are not permitted at the Hyatt Hotel if lake levels reaches 6224' or lower.

E. Passengers for the special event cruises shall arrive and leave through mass transit as a group.

F. Promotion or advertising activities claiming North Tahoe Cruises operates to or from the special event locations is prohibited.

G. This permit does not authorize any modifications/additions to any existing structures or construction of any new or temporary structures in the shorezone.
H. All other conditions of permittee operation of the Tahoe Gal are incorporated herein by reference.

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

Project Name: Bottomley Pier Expansion

Application Type: Shorezone

Applicant: John and Marion Bottomley III

Applicant’s Representative: Kevin Agan

Location: 4694 North Lake Boulevard, Placer County

Assessor’s Parcel Number/Project Number: 115-070-07/960095

Agency Staff: Melissa Joyce, Assistant Planner

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

Project Description: The applicant proposes to expand a legally existing, 120 foot-long pier. The expansion consists of an approximately 60 square-foot addition to accommodate installation of a 30-foot by 3-foot catwalk and installation of a boatlift. The project will not extend the pier further into the lake. The proposed project will also include scenic quality mitigation measures. Proposed scenic quality mitigation includes removal of three-fourths (150 square feet) of an existing raised wood walkway that extends along the shore and below the high water line. The portion of the walkway to be removed will be replaced by a ground-level path. The railing will be removed from the remaining walkway, and the resultant structure will be screened by plantings. Landscaping/screening will also be provided for existing upland structures.

Site Description: The site is near Cedar Flat and is in an area mapped and verified as prime fish habitat (spawning habitat). The foreshore consists predominantly of cobble and gravel with some medium to large rocks. TRPA staff have inspected the site and determined that the pier expansion will not degrade fish habitat. The project area consists of one parcel (APN 115-070-07) which is occupied by one single-family dwelling. All adjacent uses are residential.

Issues: The proposed project involves the expansion of a non-conforming pier (based on fish habitat), and therefore requires Governing Board review in accordance with Chapter 4, Appendix A, of the TRPA Code. The primary project related issues are:
A. Fish Habitat: The project is within an area that is mapped and verified as prime fish habitat (spawning habitat). TRPA staff have inspected the site and determined that the proposed project will not significantly degrade fish habitat because the expansion will not create an increase in activity associated with the pier. This determination is consistent with past actions of the Governing Board regarding pier expansions.

B. Scenic Quality: The proposed project is visible from Scenic Shoreline Travel Unit 18. The unit has a Travel Route Rating of 8, which is in attainment with TRPA scenic thresholds. The proposed project includes the removal of three-fourths of the existing raised wood walkway that extends from the pier to an existing pumphouse. The walkway encroaches below the high water line. The portion removed will be replaced with a ground-level path located in the backshore. The railing on the remaining structure will be removed, and landscaping/screening will be provided. Landscaping/screening is also proposed for the upland residence and garage. Staff have reviewed the proposed mitigation measures and determined that the pier expansion, as conditioned, will result in a minor improvement to the existing scenic condition.

Staff Analysis:

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

B. Plan Area Statement: The project is within Plan Area 14, Cedar Flat. The Land Use Classification is Residential and the Management Strategy is Mitigation. Agency staff have reviewed the subject Plan Area and have determined that the project is consistent with the applicable planning statement, planning considerations and special policies. Piers are listed as allowed accessory structures for the applicable Shorezone Tolerance District (Shorezone Tolerance District 2).

C. Land Coverage:

1. Land Capability District:

   The land capability districts of the project area are backshore, Class 2, and Class 4. The total project area is approximately 9,647 square feet.

2. Existing Coverage:

   | Backshore | 217 sq.ft. |
   | Class 2   | 164 sq.ft. |
   | Class 4   | 3,204 sq.ft. |
   | Total     | 3,585 sq.ft. |
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3. **Proposed Coverage:**

The applicant is proposing a small walkway relocation in the upland (Class 4) area of the site, and the removal of a large portion of the wood walkway in the backshore. The portion of the walkway removed will be replaced with a ground-level 30 foot-long, 2 foot-wide path to provide access to the pump house.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Backshore</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144 sq.ft.*</td>
<td>147 sq.ft.**</td>
<td>3,211 sq.ft.</td>
<td>3,502 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be banked: 43 sq.ft. (Class 1b) 10 sq.ft. (Class 2)

* Relocation of coverage in the backshore was at a ratio of 1.5 to 1. 30 square feet of coverage has been permanently retired.
** 7 square feet of coverage has been relocated to the upland Class 4 area of the site for an expanded walkway.

4. **Allowed Coverage:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Backshore</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 sq.ft.</td>
<td>25 sq.ft.</td>
<td>1,197 sq.ft.</td>
<td>1,233 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Excess Coverage:**

Excess coverage 2,352 sq.ft. 100 sq.ft. (previously mitigated)

Total remaining 2,252 sq.ft.

6. **Coverage Mitigation:**

The applicant will be required to mitigate remaining excess coverage by paying an excess coverage mitigation fee or by reducing existing coverage pursuant to Subsection 20.5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

D. **Shorezone Tolerance District:** The subject parcel is located within Shorezone Tolerance District 2. The project, as conditioned, complies with the shorezone tolerance district standards.

E. **Required Findings:** The following is a list of the required findings as set forth in Chapters 6, 20, 50 and 52 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, Agency staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the finding can be made.
1. The project is consistent with and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and maps, the Code, and other TRPA plans and programs.

(a) Land Use: The present use (single-family dwelling) of the subject parcel is an allowed use within the applicable plan area. The proposed project involves the expansion of an allowed accessory use and is consistent with the applicable Shorezone Tolerance District. The project is consistent with the Land Use Element of the Regional Plan.

(b) Transportation: The pier will be used by the owners of the existing residence and, as such, will not result in an increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) and daily vehicle trip ends (DVTEs).

(c) Conservation: The project, as conditioned, is consistent with the fisheries, shorezone, and scenic subelements of the Conservation Element of the Regional Plan. The proposed project will result in a minor improvement in the existing scenic condition because of the partial removal of an existing raised wood walkway that extends along the shoreline. The railing will be removed from the remaining portion of the walkway, and the remaining structure will be screened with landscaping. Landscaping/screening of upland structures will also be provided. The project is consistent with the shorezone tolerance district. Fisheries are discussed further in Finding 4, below. Best Management Practices (BMPs) were required to be installed on the property as a condition of a previous approval for an upland addition. No special interest species or historic resources were identified on the parcel.

(d) Recreation: The proposed pier expansion will not extend the existing pier further into the lake. As a result, significant impacts to topline trolling and boating have not been identified.

(e) Public Service and Facilities: The project does not require additional public services or facilities. There is no evidence that the project will adversely affect implementation of the Public Services and Facilities Element of the Regional Plan.

(f) Implementation: The proposed project does not require any allocations of use. There is no evidence that the project will adversely affect the Implementation Element of the Regional Plan.
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2. The project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.

The basis for this finding is provided on the checklist entitled "Project Review Conformance Checklist and Article V(g) Findings" in accordance with Chapter 6, Subsection 6.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All responses contained on said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. A copy of the completed checklist will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.

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

Refer to paragraph 2, above.

4. The relocation of land coverage within a stream environment zone (i.e., the backshore) results in a net environmental benefit.

A net environmental benefit was achieved by reducing land coverage in the backshore by 30 square feet.

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

The proposed project will not have an impact on littoral processes because the project does not involve a structure that is less than 90 percent open. The proposed project is located within an area mapped as fish spawning habitat; however, TRPA staff have determined that the proposed project will not degrade fish habitat because the expansion will not create an increase in activity associated with the pier. All construction will occur during the non-spawning season. Plantings proposed in the backshore as scenic mitigation will promote backshore stability. The project is not located in an area mapped as on-shore wildlife habitat. Based on the submitted YE, staff have determined that the project will not impact littoral processes, fish habitat, backshore stability, or on-shore wildlife habitat.

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

The pier is located offshore of property occupied by a single-family residence. The pier will only be used by the owners of this property, and the property has adequate parking and access to accommodate the pier.
7. The project is compatible with existing shorezone and lakezone uses or structures on, or in the immediate vicinity of, the littoral parcel; or that modification of such existing uses or structures will be undertaken to assure compatibility.

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

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

The pier is located in the foreshore and nearshore of Lake Tahoe and is water-dependent.

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

This approval prohibits the use of spray painting and the use of tributyltin (TBT). Hazardous materials will not be permitted to be stored on the pier.

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

The applicant shall not be permitted to store construction materials on the beach. Construction of the pier will be done from the lake, by barge.

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

The pier does not extend beyond the pierhead line. The pier will not be extended further into the lake; therefore impacts to navigation are not expected. The project also must be reviewed by the California State Lands Commission and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, who make their own public safety findings.

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

This project must receive approval from the California State Lands Commission, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the California Department of Fish and Game. Comments from the above agencies were solicited as part of the review of this project. No adverse comments were received from any of the above agencies.
13. **The expansion decreases the extent to which the structure does not comply with the development standards and/or improves the ability to attain or maintain the environmental thresholds.**

The project will not create a degradation of any of the environmental thresholds and will result in an improvement to scenic quality. The project will not result in an impact to fisheries because increased activity associated with the existing pier will not occur as a result of this project. As conditioned, the project will result in an improvement to the existing scenic condition because a large portion of the existing, highly visible raised walkway will be removed. The walkway will be replaced by a ground-level path. The railing will be removed from the remaining walkway, and the remaining structure will be screened by plantings. Landscaping/screening is also proposed for upland structures.

14. **The project complies with the requirements to install BMPs as set forth in Chapter 25.**

The conditions of approval insure that all required BMPs will be installed.

15. **The project complies with the design standards in Section 53.10.**

Conditions of approval will ensure that the color of the pier will be earth-tone and will blend with the surroundings.

16. **The structure has not been unserviceable for more than five years.**

The pier has been continually serviceable.

F. **Required Actions:** Agency staff recommend that the Governing Board approve the project by making the following motions based on this staff summary and the evidence contained in the record:

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

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

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

B. This permit is for a pier expansion including an approximately 60 square-foot addition to the pierhead, installation of a 3-foot by 30-foot catwalk, and installation of a boatlift. As scenic mitigation for the proposed pier expansion, three-fourths (150 square feet) of an existing
raised walkway that extends along the shore shall be removed and replaced with a 30 foot-long, 2 foot-wide ground-level path in the backshore. The existing railing shall be removed from the remaining walkway, and the remaining structure shall be screened with plantings and landscaping. The replacement of the walkway shall result in a reduction in land coverage within the backshore and the permanent retirement of 30 square feet of coverage.

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

1. The security required under Standard Condition A.3 of Attachment S shall be equal to 110 percent of the cost of all scenic quality mitigation. The permittee shall submit cost estimates for the scenic mitigation measures including walkway removal and landscaping. Please see Attachment J, Security Procedures.

2. The permittee shall mitigate 2,252 square feet of excess land coverage within the project area by submitting an excess coverage mitigation fee, or by removing coverage within Hydrologic Transfer Area Number 9.

The excess coverage mitigation fee shall be calculated as follows: Estimated Construction Cost x 0.0100. Please provide a construction cost estimate by your contractor, architect or engineer.

Excess land coverage may be removed in lieu of an excess coverage mitigation fee. To calculate the amount of excess coverage to be removed, use the following formula: Excess coverage mitigation fee (per formula 1 above) divided by $5.00 per square foot.

3. The permittee shall submit a pier mitigation fee of $500 for the addition of a new boatlift.

4. The applicant shall submit a construction schedule prior to commencement of construction. The schedule will identify dates for the following: when installation of temporary erosion control structures will occur; when construction will start; when construction slash and debris will be removed; when installation of all permanent erosion control structures will occur; and when construction will be completed.

5. The permittee shall submit a landscaping plan and fertilizer management plan to be approved by TRPA, for the screening of the remaining walkway and upland structures.
6. The permittee shall submit to TRPA color and material samples for the pier. All colors and materials for the pier shall be approved by TRPA prior to acknowledgment of this permit.

7. The applicant shall submit 3 sets of final construction drawings and upland site plans to TRPA.

D. Spray painting and the use of tributyltin (TBT) is prohibited.

E. Storage of construction materials shall be prohibited on the beach or within 50 feet of the beach bluff.

F. Disturbance of the lake bed materials shall be kept to the minimum necessary for project construction.

G. The discharge of petroleum products, construction waste and litter (including sawdust), or earthen materials to the surface waters of the Lake Tahoe Basin is prohibited. All surplus construction waste materials shall be removed from the project and deposited only at approved points of disposal.

H. Gravel, cobble, or small boulders shall not be disturbed or removed to leave exposed sandy areas, before, during, or after construction.

I. All construction activity shall take place during the non-spawning season, between July 1 and October 15.

J. The applicant shall submit post-construction photos within 30 days of the project completion date, demonstrating any resultant impacts to scenic quality as viewed from 300 feet from shore looking landward and to lake bottom conditions as viewed from the subject parcel.

K. The use of wood preservatives on wood in contact with the water is prohibited and extreme care shall be taken to insure that wood preservatives are not introduced into Lake Tahoe.

L. Best practical control technology shall be employed to prevent earthen materials to be resuspended as a result of pier construction and from being transported to adjacent lake waters.

M. Cassions shall be installed for the construction of the pier pilings.

N. No containers of fuel, paint, or other hazardous materials may be stored on the pier.
NOTES
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MEMORANDUM

August 5, 1996

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Land Capability Challenge; Konda; APN 117-030-12
256 Rim Drive, Placer County, California

Staff Recommendation

The staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the land capability
challenge changing the land capability class from 1c to 5 and 1c (see attached
capability boundary map).

Background

The subject parcel is shown as Land Capability Class 1c on the TRPA Land
Capability Overlay maps. The Soil Survey for the Lake Tahoe Basin Area places
this parcel within the Rx (Rock Outcrop and Rubbleland) soil map unit. A land
capability verification was completed on this parcel in May 1995 and the
parcel was verified as land capability class 1c. A land capability challenge
was filed to confirm the soil series and land capability class for the
parcel.

The parcel is a developed residential parcel in the Agate Bay subdivision of
Placer County, California (see attached location map). The parcel is
approximately 11,800 square feet in size and has a natural slope of 2 to 55
percent.

Findings

This parcel is mapped within geomorphic unit D-1 (Toe slope lands low hazard
lands) on the TRPA Bailey Geomorphic Analysis Map of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

The soils investigation was completed by Joseph Pepi, Certified Professional
Soil Scientist, and a report was prepared. Based on two soil pits, one
representative soil profile was described (see attached Soils Investigation).
The soils were found to have physical characteristics most similar to the FUD
(Fugawee very stony sandy loams, 2 to 15 percent) and the Rx (Rock Outcrop and
Rubbleland) map unit. The FUD map unit is in land capability class 5, and the
Rx map unit is in land capability class 1c.

If you have any questions on this agenda item, please contact Joe Pepi, at
(702) 588-4547.

/jp
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SOIL INVESTIGATION
FOR
PLACER COUNTY APN 117-030-12
256 RIM DRIVE

INTRODUCTION

A soil investigation was conducted on APN 117-030-12, Placer County, on August 2, 1996. This parcel is approximately 11,800 square feet in size and is located in the Agate Bay Subdivision, near Tahoe City, California. A land capability verification was completed on this parcel in May 1995 by TRPA staff, and the parcel was verified as land capability class 1c associated with the Rx (Rock Outcrop and Rubbleland) map unit. A land capability challenge was filed to confirm the soil series and land capability class for the parcel.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

This parcel is shown as land capability class 1c on the TRPA Land Capability Overlay Maps. The Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey for the Lake Tahoe Basin places this parcel within the Rx (Rock Outcrop and Rubbleland) soil map unit. The parcel is mapped within geomorphic unit D-1, (Toe slope lands, low hazard lands) in the Geomorphic Analysis of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Rx soil map unit is inconsistent with this geomorphic unit classification.

This parcel is on a southeast facing slope. The natural slope is 3 to 55 percent. The natural vegetation is Jeffrey pine, western white pine, white fir, manzanita, and chinquapin.

PROCEDURES

Two soil pits were dug by TRPA staff on this parcel using hand tools, and the roadcut at the lower end of the parcel along Stag Drive was examined. After examination of these pits, one was chosen as representative of the soils on the parcel. The soils in this pit were examined and described in detail. A copy of this description is included in this report. Slopes were measured with a clinometer.
FINDINGS

One soil series and two soil map units were identified on this parcel. The soil on this parcel is deep. The soil on the flatter portion of the parcel is well drained and is characterized as having a light brownish gray very gravelly loam surface layer over a pale brown very cobbly clay loam and very gravelly loam subsoil. Volcanic bedrock is at a depth of 39 inches. These soils have a moderately high runoff potential and the surface soils have a slight relative erosion hazard.

This soil is most similar to the FuD (Fugawee very stony sandy loam, 2 to 15 percent) map unit the FuD map unit is identified in the Soil Survey for the Lake Tahoe Basin.

The steep portion of the parcel, with slopes over 50 percent remains in land capability class 1c, associated with the Rx map unit.

CONCLUSION

The soils on APN 117-030-12 were determined to be consistent with land capability class 5 and 1c, in accordance with the Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin (Bailey, 1974). These findings are based on the physical characteristics of the the soils being most similar to the FuD (Fugawee very stony sandy loam, 2 to 15 percent slopes) and the Rx (Rock Outcrop and Rubble land) map units.

The FuD map unit is within geomorphic unit D-1 (Toe slope lands, low hazard lands), and is in land capability class 5. The Rx map unit is within geomorphic unit F-1 (Canyon Lands, high hazard lands), and is in land capability class 1c.

Joseph Pepi
Certified Professional Soil Scientist
ARCPACS No. 2372

JP

Enclosure
Representative Soil Profile:

Soil Classification: sandy-skeletal, mixed, frigid, Ultic Haploxeralf

Soil Series: Fugawee

Oi-- 1/2 to 0 inches; Jeffrey pine & white fir needles; abrupt smooth boundary.

A1-- 0 to 5 inches; light brownish gray (10YR 6/2) dark brown (10YR 3/3) sandy loam moist; weak fine subangular blocky structure; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; many very fine and fine and common medium roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 35 percent gravel, 10 percent cobble; medium acid; clear smooth boundary.

BA-- 5 to 17 inches; light brownish gray (10YR 6/2) very gravelly loam, dark brown (10YR 3/2) moist; weak medium subangular blocky structure; soft, friable, slightly sticky and slightly plastic; common very fine and fine and few medium and coarse roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 35 percent gravel and 15 percent cobbles; medium acid; clear wavy boundary.

Bt1- 17 to 34 inches; pale brown (10YR 6/3) very cobbly clay loam; dark dark brown (10YR 3/2) moist; few thin clay films on ped faces; moderate medium subangular blocky structure; hard, friable, slightly sticky and plastic; common medium and coarse roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 25 percent gravel, 20 percent cobble; medium acid; clear wavy boundary.

Bt2--34 to 39 inches; light brownish gray (10YR 6/2) very gravelly loam; brown (10YR 4/3) moist; common thin clay films on ped faces and pores; moderate medium subangular blocky structure; hard, friable, sticky and plastic; few medium and coarse roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 30 percent gravel, and 15 percent cobble; medium acid; abrupt smooth boundary.

Cr- 39 inches; weathered andesite bedrock.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY

**Project Name:** North Tahoe Public Utility District Water Oriented Outdoor Recreation Concession

**Application Type:** Shorezone

**Applicant:** North Tahoe Public Utility District

**Agency Planner:** Paul Nielsen, Associate Planner

**Location:** Kings Beach State Recreation Area located at the southwest corner of Coon Street and State Route 28, Kings Beach

**Assessor's Parcel Number/ Project Number:** 90-080-04/960153

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

**Project Description:** The applicant proposes to add one parasail boat and one ski boat to an existing water oriented outdoor recreation concession. The existing concessionaire rents personal watercraft (wave runners), sail boats, canoes, kayaks, paddle boats, aqua cycles and miscellaneous beach equipment such as chairs and umbrellas. The applicant is also proposing to eliminate 4 fishing boats as part of the proposal. Although the existing operation occupies a larger area, the applicant proposes to restrict the area of equipment storage to an approximately 50 foot x 50 foot area located on the beach.

The water-ski boat and parasail boat will be moored at the east end of the existing pier during operations. At the end of the day, the boats are removed from the lake or moored at the North Tahoe Marina. Parking is available at the North Tahoe Conference Center located adjacent to the project area. The applicant is also requesting permanent approval for a small (112 square foot) storage shed that is currently located on-site. However, due to the seasonal nature of the operation, staff is recommending that the storage shed be removed after each operating season. The proposed hours are from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., seven days a week from Memorial Day weekend through September 30th every year.

**Site Description:** The project site is the Kings Beach State Recreation Area located at the southwest corner of Coon Street and State Route 28 in Kings Beach. The parcel is well vegetated and includes a basketball court, picnic benches and meandering paths through the park. The land capability districts are 1b, 3 and 5. The surrounding land uses consist of a public beach and the North Tahoe Conference Center to the west, various commercial uses to the north and east with Lake Tahoe bordering the property to the south.
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CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM NO. 9
Issue: The proposed project involves a special use for the Plan Area (water oriented outdoor recreation concession), and therefore requires Governing Board review in accordance with Chapter 4, Appendix A, of the TRPA Code. The primary project related issues are:

1. Land Use:

The existing concession offers motorized watercraft for rent (wave runners and fishing boats). The applicant is proposing to eliminate four fishing boats and add one parasail boat and a water-ski boat. Motorized watercraft have the potential to conflict with nearby passive beach use (e.g., swimming, sunbathing, kayaking, canoeing, fishing, inflatable rafting, etc.).

To help avoid potential conflicts with these passive beach uses the concessionaire advises each customer of the appropriate safety rules. In addition, every morning a yellow marker float is positioned 300 yards from shore which marks the end of the "no wake" zone or low speed area. The watercraft are not allowed to operate closer than 300 yards from shore except when returning to the concession area. The concessionaire also designates an area adjacent to the pier which extends out from the beach to the offshore marker buoy. This is the only area where the motorized watercraft are allowed to depart from and return to the concession area.

2. Signs:

The concessionaire has an existing 5 foot by 8 foot sign mounted to the back of an existing storage shed. Additional signage has also recently been displayed off-site in the public right-of-way. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing signs and replace them with one, 14 square foot sign mounted to the back of the storage shed. The proposed sign size is consistent with the Kings Beach Community Plan standards.

Staff Analysis:

A. Environmental Documentation: The applicant has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) in order to assess the potential environmental impacts of the project. No significant environmental impacts were identified and staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. A copy of the completed IEC will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.
B. Plan Area Statement: The project is located within the Kings Beach Community Plan Area Statement. The Land Use Classification is Commercial/Public Use and the Management Strategy is Redirection. Agency staff has reviewed the subject Plan Area and has determined that the project is consistent with the applicable planning statement, planning considerations and special policies. The proposed activity (water oriented outdoor recreation concession) is listed as a special use.

C. Land Coverage:

1. Allowed Coverage:

   The 110,663 square foot project area is allowed 21,808 square feet of land coverage.

2. Existing Land Coverage:

   The total existing land coverage is 18,827 square feet.

3. Proposed On-Site Land Coverage:

   The applicant is proposing to 112 square feet of land coverage in land capability district 5.

4. Existing Banked Land Coverage:

   The total existing banked land coverage is 31,508 square feet.

5. Remaining banked land coverage after project:

   Upon completion of the project the remaining banked land coverage will be 31,396 square feet.

D. Building Height:

   Based on a 0% cross slope through the building site and a roof pitch of 6:12 the maximum allowed height is 31'2". The proposed structure (storage shed) has a maximum building height of 7 feet.

E. Shorezone Tolerance Districts

   The shorezone tolerance district is 7 which allows water oriented outdoor recreation concessions as a special use.
E. Required Findings: The following is a list of the required findings as set forth in Chapters 6, 18, 50 and 52 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, Agency staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the finding can be made.

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

   (a) Land Use: The proposed project is compatible with the existing use within the project area (day use area). The Kings Beach Community Plan includes permissible uses in this area oriented toward outdoor recreation activities. Water oriented outdoor recreation concessions are listed as a special use in the Kings Beach Community Plan Area Statement.

   (b) Transportation: The project does not involve an increase in daily vehicle trips.

   (c) Conservation: The project, as conditioned, is consistent with the fisheries, shorezone, and scenic subelements of the Conservation Element of the Regional Plan. No new structures are proposed in the shorezone. Staff has determined that the project will not have an adverse effect on sensitive plant and animals or historic resources.

   (d) Recreation: The applicant is proposing to limit the storage area for concession equipment to a 50’ x 50’ area which will not interfere with public access along the shoreline.

   (e) Public Service and Facilities: The project does not require additional public services or facilities.

   (f) Implementation: The project does not require an allocation of development.

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

The basis for this finding is provided on the checklist entitled "Project Review Conformance Checklist and Article V(g) Findings" in accordance with Chapter 6, Subsection 6.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All responses contained on said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. A copy of the completed checklist will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.
3. Wherever federal, state or local air and water quality standards applicable for the Region, whichever are strictest, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(q) of the TRPA Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

(Refer to paragraph 2, above.)

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

Staff has determined that the project, as designed, will not adversely impact littoral processes. This section of shoreline is not mapped as fish habitat. The backshore in the project area is mostly stable and the project, as conditioned, involves stabilization of needed areas. The project is not located within an identified on-shore wildlife habitat area.

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

As conditioned, there are sufficient accessory facilities (parking area and restrooms) to accommodate the project.

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

The project is compatible with existing shorezone and lakezone uses and structures in the area. The applicant proposes to restrict specific areas where motorized watercraft associated with the concession are to be operated in order to reduce the potential conflicts with passive beach uses.

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

The proposed water oriented outdoor recreation concession is water-dependent.
8. Measures will be taken to prevent spills or discharges of hazardous materials.

This approval prohibits the fueling of the water-ski boat and parasail boat other than at approved marina fueling locations. Personal watercraft may be re-fueled within the shoreline but must be removed from the waters of Lake Tahoe and will be re-fueled using no spill "Gas Caddies."

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

The applicant is not proposing any new construction.

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

There is no evidence, including comments from the U.S. Coast Guard, that the project will adversely impact navigation or create a threat to public safety.

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

The U.S. Coast Guard, California Department of Boating and Waterways, and the North Tahoe Fire Protection District Division have submitted comments as part of the review of this project. No adverse comments were received from any of the above agencies.

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

The project involves the concession of water oriented recreation equipment. The project site is a water oriented recreation area. The storage area for concession equipment will consist of a 50 x 50 foot area on the beach. The proposed use involves the permanent placement of a 112 square foot shed.
13. The project, to which the use pertains, will not be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood, or in the region.

The project includes methods for minimizing conflicts with passive beach recreation uses in the vicinity. Use of the public beach for storage of recreation equipment will be kept to a minimum. Existing signage will be brought into conformance with the requirements of the Code.

14. The applicant has taken reasonable steps to protect the land, water, and air resources of both the applicant's property and that of the surrounding property owners.

The project, as conditioned, includes permanent BMPs to protect both the land and water resources of the area. Noise generated by the concession equipment will not exceed the Community Noise Equivalent Levels or Single Noise Event standards specified in the Kings Beach Community Plan Area Statement.

15. The project, to which the use pertains, will not change the character of the neighborhood, detrimentally affect or alter the purpose of the applicable plan area statement, community, redevelopment, specific, or master plan as the case maybe.

Staff has reviewed the proposed project and determined that it does not alter the purpose of, nor detrimentally affect, the community plan area statement. The project area and adjoining littoral parcels are currently used for a variety of water related uses.

16. The structure does not cause significant shoreline erosion or interference with sediment transport.

The proposed structure will be located outside the shorezone.

17. The project is in compliance with the scenic threshold.

Based upon the proposed location and size of the structure, staff has determined that the project, as conditioned, will not degrade the applicable scenic thresholds.
18. The project complies with the requirements to install BMPs as set forth in Chapter 25.

The project area has all required BMPs currently installed except for some minor revegetation that needs to occur in the vicinity of the existing concession.

19. The project complies with the design standards in Section 53.10.

No structures are proposed in the shorezone.

F. Required Actions: Agency staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the project by making the following motions based on this staff summary and the evidence contained in the record:

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

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

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

B. Prior to commencement of construction the following special conditions of approval must be satisfied:

1. This permit is for the addition of a water-ski boat and parasail boat to the existing seasonal outdoor recreation concession located at the Kings Beach Recreation Area and operated by the North Tahoe Public Utility District. The storage area for the recreation equipment is limited to a 50 foot x 50 foot beach area that shall be shown on the final plans. All other aspects of the operation shall be consistent with the "Proposed Operations" plan contained in the project file. The approved operating season is Memorial Day weekend through September 30. Additions of equipment and permanent or temporary structures will required written approval from TRPA.
2. The final site plan shall be amended to include a contained bark or gravel walkway leading from the storage shed to the beach area and from the storage shed to the existing walkway. The disturbed areas located outside the proposed walkway shall be revegetated and provision shall be made to protect the revegetated areas from being disturbed. The land coverage calculations shall be amended accordingly.

3. The applicant shall paint the proposed shed a dark brown or dark green color. Please submit color samples to TRPA for review and approval.

4. This permit authorizes one 14 square foot sign consistent with the requirements of the Kings Beach Community Plan sign standards. The applicant shall submit a sign plan to TRPA for review and approval. This permit specifically prohibits off-site signs.

5. The applicant shall submit a noise study which evaluates the effects of the proposed additional watercraft on the Community Noise Equivalent Levels and the Single Noise Event standards. The report shall be consistent with the requirements of Chapter 23 and a preliminary scoping report shall be submitted to TRPA for review and approval.

6. The applicant shall submit an off-site parking agreement for use of the North Tahoe Public Utility Districts King Beach Conference Center parking area.

7. The applicant shall submit a plan depicting the off-shore area designated for personal watercraft use.

C. Fueling of the parasail boat and water-ski boat shall only occur at a marina. Fueling of the personal watercraft may occur onsite if the watercraft are removed from the waters of Lake Tahoe and fueling is accomplished by the use of a "Gas Caddy." Onsite maintenance of watercraft is prohibited and shall only occur at a marina or other approved location.

D. The speed and revolutions per minute (RPMs) of all watercraft shall be such that disturbance (i.e. turbidity) to the lake bottom is minimized.
E. This approval specifically prohibits the permanent attachment of boat bumpers or guards to the pier.

F. All motorized watercraft shall be kept properly tuned for operation at Lake Tahoe (elevation 6,223 feet) to reduce exhaust emissions to the greatest extent possible.

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

H. The discharge of petroleum products, construction waste and litter (including sawdust), or earthen materials to the surface waters of the Lake Tahoe Basin is prohibited. All surplus construction waste materials shall be removed from the project and deposited only at approved points of disposal.
To whom it may concern:

This letter is written to strongly oppose the addition of personal watercraft, parasailing, and water-skiing at the Kings Beach Recreation boat ramp area. The addition of more motorized vehicles into the Kings Beach lake area will only make an already dangerous situation worse. There has already been one serious accident and a number of close calls have been witnessed.

The Crown Motel, the Goldcrest Resort and the Falcon Lodge are already on record as opposing the operation to the Parasailing and Jet Ski operation which is also operating in front of Steamers. After a number of discussions between ourselves and the Placer County Sheriff's Department a compromise was reached involving these operations including an extended buoy system. Last summer passed without a serious problem but not without several close calls witnessed by myself and Ray Lamb. As you all know, our liability as hospitality providers now can extend into anything our guests do. More importantly, the experience for those who choose to come to North Tahoe is adversely impacted by a noisy, cluttered and dangerous situation on the Lake. It cannot be emphasized enough the noise factor of this equation. It has been over 10 years since the Lake has been this high. However, we received steady complaints about noise even then when the traffic was probably one third of what it is now.

As someone who has witnessed for over 30 years the activity on the lake in this area, I cannot believe that the TRPA, and the NTPUD would even consider this addition to an already overcrowded area. Through the help of the State of California, the Tahoe Conservancy and the NTPUD, we finally have a beach area that both local and visitor can be proud of and enjoy. Yet, now we seek to turn this into a circus atmosphere independent of concern for the majority of lake users who cannot afford and otherwise choose not to use motorized vehicles. From the North Tahoe Beach Center to the State boat ramp (about 400 yards of beach) there exists two personal watercraft rentals, one parasailing operation, one water-ski operation plus the non-motorized kayaks, rafts, pedalboats, sailboats etc. rented at the Beach Center, boat ramp and the approximately four rental outlets on the highway. This does not include the swimmers, boaters and personal watercraft owners which come from the two time share locations, 4 motels, and personal residences which exist in this area. An increase to this more than ample rental situation is inviting disaster and threatening to spoil the experience of the Lake for locals and visitors alike. Please give careful consideration to your decision and inform us of any meetings open to public input.
Sincerely,

Ray Lamb
Goldcrest Resort
Owner
916-546-3301
Box 579
Kings Beach
96143

David Ferrari
for the Ferrari family
owners and residents
of the Crown Motel
916-546-3388
Box 845
Kings Beach
96143
Dear Paul Nielson,

August 18, 1996

Associate Planner
Project Review Division
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448-1038

To Whom it may concern;

We are an affected property owner by the North Tahoe Public Utility Districts proposal to add anything to an outdoor concession located at the Coon Street Park.

When we purchased our property three years ago there was no building at the park for concessions and we have strenuously objected to the North Tahoe Public Utility District several times as the view is a large part of our business for people to sit in a beautiful place to do their ceramics or doll making and this is the first time we have been notified by you. Thankyou. Enclosed is a picture showing and proving there was nothing there by the North Tahoe Public Utility District.

Last year in 1995 we lost our view for 3 months in the fall when a building (Shed) was pulled up off the beach and finally tucked into a tree section after repeated protests and left there all winter. In the spring of this year it was pulled back out to a major obstruction point of our view and a second building was built on the spot of the previous one in the trees and for two months they both were there and we had repeated protests with the N.T. P.U.D. When finally the first Shed was removed, and we still protested the location of the second structure which is still in place.

There are illegal signs on it which we protested to Mr. Hassenplug to no avail and now the concessionaire have attached signs to vehicles and park them from early a.m. to evening detracting from other local businesses who have legal signs and now are even parking their vehicle right in front of our shop and leaving it there all day on weekends even in a two hour parking zone.

WE DO PROTEST AS THEIR ENCROACHMENTS ARE A VIOLATION OF OUR VIEW, AND ARE BREAKING TWO LAWS, SIGN CODES AND PARKING CODES WHERE THERE IS A TWO HOUR RESTRICTION. ALSO IT HAS DETRACTED FROM OUR WINDOW DISPLAY AS ONLY PEDESTRIANS COULD VIEW IT AND THESE. SIGNS USURPS OURS NOT ALLOWING US THE RIGHTS TO OUR ADVERTISING( our business) WHICH WE HAVE WORKED SO
HARD FOR, ALSO WE WERE TOLD BY MR. HASSENPLUG (Manager of North Tahoe P.U.D.), THAT THE BUILDING WAS TO BE TEMPORARY ONLY AND REMOVED IN THE WINTER, HOWEVER WE NOW ARE HEARING THAT THIS A TEMPORARY/PERMANANT STRUCTURE (Complete With Water, Telephone and Power Into it). WE STRONGLY OBJECT.

Enclosed please find the photos we enclosed with our sign code violation forms when we made a protest to sign code enforcement, plus new pictures taken this weekend. Also a ad showing they are already in operation and a panoramic of several pictures put together in sequence to show there was not a concession in place when we purchased this property.

Saturday August 17 we filed a formal protest with the Sheriffs office also with Officer Mike Thomas.

Sincerely Phil and Pat Edwards
Affected property owner at 8499 North Lake Blvd. Kings Beach, Calif.

[Signature]

Phil & Pat Edwards
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY

Project Name: Fett Residential Garage Addition

Application Type: Residential, Single-Family Dwelling Addition, Special Use Determination

Applicant: Elise Fett and Rhed Fett McColl

Applicant's Representative: Elise Fett

Agency Planner: Betsy Wilson, Assistant Planner

Location: 440 Highway 28, Crystal Bay, Washoe County, Nevada

Assessor's Parcel Number/Project Number: 123-101-13/950511

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

Project Description: The applicant is proposing the addition of a detached two-car garage and a lower floor storage/work shop area. The parcel is located in Plan Area 34 (Crystal Bay) and the area is identified as a potential avalanche zone. The applicant has submitted an avalanche hazard evaluation report prepared by qualified avalanche specialist, Larry Heywood, which concludes that it is unlikely the study site has been, or will be, overrun by snow avalanches. The report is attached as Exhibit A. As a condition of approval, TRPA is requiring that the applicants record a deed restriction holding TRPA harmless and indemnifying TRPA in the event of avalanche damage to the property.

Site Description: The parcel has an average slope of 34-50 percent and is situated in a residential neighborhood which is within Scenic Roadway Unit #21 (Stateline) and Scenic Shoreline Unit #23 (Crystal Bay). The parcel is located off of State Highway 28 between Gonowable Road to the east and Amagosa Road to the west. Access is from State Highway 28. The existing development consists of a two-story single-family dwelling, a parking area, and an arbor.

Issues: The proposed project involves an expansion of a single-family dwelling in Plan Area 34. Plan Area 34 identifies single-family dwelling as a special use. Therefore, this project requires Governing Board review in accordance with Chapter 4, Appendix A, of the TRPA Code. The primary project related issues are:
1. **Potential Avalanche Zone:** The proposed project is located in an area identified as a potential avalanche zone. An avalanche hazard evaluation report prepared by Larry Heywood, a qualified avalanche specialist concludes that it is unlikely that the proposed study site has been, or will be, overrun by snow avalanches.

2. **Scenic Impact:** The proposed project is visible from TRPA Scenic Roadway Unit 21 (Stateline) and Scenic Shorezone Unit 23 (Crystal Bay). The scenic quality ratings for both units are in attainment with TRPA scenic thresholds, however, the ratings did decrease when last reviewed in 1991. The proposed garage addition is located on the site so as to minimize the scenic impacts of the addition. The project has been designed such that with removal of the existing arbor along State Highway 28, there will be a net improvement and increase in views to the Lake and background ridges. Furthermore, the project will be conditioned to include dark colors and materials which blend into the natural background. All existing trees on the property shall be preserved, with the exception of the one tree being removed as a part of the project, in order to provide screening of the proposed addition from the waters of Lake Tahoe and State Highway 28. In summary, considering the project design and siting, the removal of the existing arbor, and the dark colors and materials, the project is expected to result in a slight increase in the scenic quality ratings.

**Staff Analysis:**

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

B. **Plan Area Statement:** The project is located within Plan Area 34 (Crystal Bay). The Land Use Classification is Residential and the Management Strategy is Mitigation. Agency staff has reviewed the subject Plan Area and has determined that the project is consistent with the applicable planning statement, planning considerations, and special policies. The proposed activity (single-family dwelling) is listed as a special use.
C. Land Coverage:

1. Land Capability District:

   The land capability district of the project area is class 1a. The total project area is 13,240 square feet.

2. Existing Coverage:

   Total: 2,414 square feet

3. Proposed Coverage:

   Total: 2,414 square feet

4. Allowed Coverage:

   Class 1a: 132 square feet

5. Coverage Mitigation:

   Based on the above coverage figures, the existing project area contains 2,282 square feet of excess land coverage. Pursuant to Chapter 20 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the applicant will be required to pay an excess coverage mitigation fee or reduce existing land coverage to mitigate the excess land coverage.

D. Building Height: Based on a greater than 24 percent cross-slope retained across the building site, and a 6:12 roof pitch, the maximum allowed height for the proposed building is 37 feet 2 inches. The proposed garage addition has a maximum building height of 27 feet 2 inches.

E. Required Findings: The following is a list of the required findings as set forth in Chapters 6, 18, 22 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, Agency staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the finding can be made.

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

   (a) Land Use: The applicant will be required to apply temporary and permanent Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the entire project area. The single-family dwelling addition is a special use in the Plan Area.
(b) **Transportation:** This project will generate no additional daily vehicle trip ends (dvet) and, thus, will have no impact on the Transportation Element of the Regional Plan.

(c) **Conservation:** The project is located in Scenic Roadway Unit #21 and Scenic Shoreline Unit #23, which are in attainment. The proposed project, as conditioned, is expected to result in a slight increase in the visual rating of both scenic units. In addition, there are no known cultural resources, special interest species, or sensitive or uncommon plants that would be affected within the project area.

(d) **Recreation:** This project does not involve any recreation facilities or uses.

(e) **Public Service and Facilities:** The project does not require any additions to existing public services or facilities.

(f) **Implementation:** This project does not require any allocations of development.

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

The basis for this finding is provided on the checklist entitled "Project Review Conformance Checklist and Article V(g) Findings" in accordance with Chapter 6, Subsection 6.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All responses contained on said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. A copy of the completed checklist will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.

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

(Refer to paragraph 2, above.)

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

The addition of a two-car garage to the property will not increase density and is not considered an intensification of use. Several single-family dwellings in the neighborhood have two-car garages.
5. The project, to which the use pertains, will not be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood, or general welfare of the region, and the applicant has taken reasonable steps to protect against any such injury and to protect the land, water and air resources of both the applicant's property and that of surrounding property owners.

The applicant will be required to apply temporary and permanent water quality improvements to the entire project area to protect the applicant's property from soil erosion.

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

The project is providing an accessory use to the primary use of a single-family dwelling. Other single-family dwellings in the Plan Area have garages. The project is not located within a community, specific, or master plan area.

7. When viewed from major arterials, scenic turnouts, public recreation areas or the waters of Lake Tahoe, from a distance of 300 feet, the additional height will not cause a building to extend above the forest canopy, when present, or a ridgeline.

The proposed building will not extend above the forest canopy or a ridgeline when viewed from State Highway 28 or from the waters of Lake Tahoe.

8. When outside a community plan, the additional height is consistent with the surrounding uses.

The surrounding structures are similar in height to the proposed structure.

9. The maximum height at any corner of two exterior walls of the building is not greater than 90 percent of the maximum building height. The maximum height of the corner of two exterior walls is the difference between the point of lowest natural ground elevation along an exterior wall of the building, and point at which the corner of the same exterior wall meets the roof.

The proposed height of the structure at any corner of two exterior walls of the building is not greater than 90 percent of the maximum height.
F. Required Actions: Agency staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the project by making the following motions based on this staff summary and the evidence contained in the record:

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

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

(1) The Standard Conditions of Approval listed in Attachment R.

(2) Prior to commencement of construction the following special conditions of approval must be satisfied:

(a) The site plan shall be revised to include:

(i) A three-inch layer of gravel (pea or 3/4" drainrock) beneath all raised decks, bridges, and stairways. Measures to contain the gravel (e.g., a wood border) shall be installed downslope.

(ii) Infiltration device(s) adequate to infiltrate all driveway runoff (consistent with Standard Condition A.1.d of Attachment R.)

(iii) A note indicating: "All barren areas and areas disturbed by construction shall be revegetated in accordance with the TRPA Handbook of Best Management Practices. Application of a mulch may enhance vegetative establishment."

(iv) Dripline infiltration trenches, sized 18" wide x 8" deep, constructed beneath roof driplines.

(v) Vegetation protective fencing around the entire construction site.

(vi) The label indicating coverage to be removed shall be revised to indicate coverage to be removed and revegetated.

(vii) Tree(s) to be removed.
(b) The elevation plan shall be revised to include:

(i) Percent slope across building site.

(ii) Roof pitch.

(iii) Maximum height allowed.

(iv) Proposed maximum building height.

(c) The permittee shall submit the $250 balance due on the filing fee. This fee is based on the $680 filing fee for a major residential addition requiring TRPA Governing Board review, of which $430 has already been paid.

(d) The security required under Standard Condition A.3 of Attachment R shall be $1,500. Please see Attachment J, Security Procedures.

(e) The permittee shall mitigate 2,282 square feet of excess land coverage on this property by submitting an excess coverage mitigation fee, or by removing coverage within Hydrologic Transfer Area Number 9 (see attached map).

The excess coverage mitigation fee shall be calculated as follows:

(1) Estimated Project Construction Cost x .01

Please provide a construction cost estimate by your contractor, architect or engineer. In no case shall the mitigation fee be less than $100.00.

Excess land coverage may be removed in lieu of an excess coverage mitigation fee. To calculate the amount of excess coverage to be removed use the following formula:

(2) Excess coverage mitigation fee (per formula (1), above) divided by $5.00 per square foot.

If you choose this option, please revise your final site plan and land coverage calculations to account for the coverage removal.
(f) The final construction drawings shall have notes indicating conformance to the following design standards for color and roofs:

(i) **Color**: The color of this structure, including any fences on the property, shall be compatible with the surroundings. Subdued colors in the earthtone and woodtone ranges shall be used for the primary color of the structure. Hues shall be within the range of natural colors that blend, rather than contrast, with the existing vegetation and earth hues.

(ii) **Roofs**: All exposed metal roofing materials shall be painted or preweathered to minimize reflectivity.

(g) The permittee shall submit color and material samples to TRPA for review and approval.

(h) All existing trees shall be preserved. These trees minimize the visibility of the proposed residence from State Highway 28 and the waters of Lake Tahoe and are considered scenic mitigation. These trees may not be removed or trimmed for the purposes of view enhancement. If any tree is removed for any reason, with the exception of the one tree being removed as a part of this project, the removed tree shall be replaced with a minimum of three trees minimum 6 feet high and 1-1/2" diameter at breast height (dbh).

(i) The existing arbor shall be removed. The removal of the arbor is considered scenic mitigation for the proposed garage addition.

(j) The permittee shall record a TRPA approved deed restriction which holds TRPA harmless and indemnifies TRPA in the event of an avalanche destroying property on this parcel.

(k) The permittee shall submit three (3) sets of final construction drawings and site plans to TRPA.

(3) This permit does not constitute an approval of the proposed relocation of the existing guardrail located in the public-right-of-way. The applicant shall obtain approval to relocate the existing guardrail from the Nevada Department of Transportation.
(4) Excavation equipment shall be limited to the foundation footprint to minimize site disturbance.

(5) The excavation for the project shall be visually inspected by a TRPA Ground Water Technical Advisory Committee (GWTAC) member to verify that the excavation is above the highest recorded existing or seasonal groundwater level. If groundwater is intercepted, then the excavation and foundation design shall be immediately revised to not intercept groundwater. The revised depth shall be subject to approval by the GWTAC.

(6) By acceptance of this permit, the permittee acknowledges that the TRPA Code of Ordinances requires that this property, located within a Priority 1 watershed group, install and maintain all Best Management Practices immediately since installation was required by October 15, 1995 under the BMP Retrofit Program.
Elise Felt  
P.O. Box 5989  
Incline Village, NV 89450

Re. Avalanche Hazard Evaluation  
Felt Residence  
Washoe County, Nevada

INTRODUCTION

This letter discusses the results of the avalanche hazard evaluation I performed for the Felt Residence located at 440 Highway 28, Crystal Bay, Nevada. The study methods included terrain analysis, vegetation analysis, aerial photo interpretation and local weather and climate effects.

TERRAIN ANALYSIS

The results of the terrain analysis indicates the site is located at the base of a small spur ridge which runs west to east off of the dominant north-south trending ridge above Crystal Bay. The site is located at an elevation of approximately 6350 feet and is to the north of the Crystal Bay avalanche area.

The area above the study site is characterized by gentle to moderately steep hillside with moderate forest cover. The slope angles above the site range form 20 to 25 degrees to the top of the spur ridge. The elevation of the top of the spur ridge directly above the site is approximately 6460 feet.

Snow slab avalanches originate on a wide variety of terrain. The main requirement is steepness. Dangerous slab avalanches are most likely to start on slopes in the 30 to 45 degree range. For slopes of less than 30 degrees, shear stress on the bed surface is not enough to cause shear failure and avalanching.

VEGETATION ANALYSIS

The effects of avalanches on forest depends on the geomorphic situation, size of avalanche, type of snow and other factors. During an avalanche large enough to damage established trees damage is caused not only by the impact by the snow, but also by included debris such as broken trees and rock from higher up the slope. Damage may extend from starting zone to runout area. Smaller avalanches may merely tilt or break small trees and lateral branches along a trimline up to several feet above the ground level.

The plant species and size present on a site indicate the frequency of avalanching. Paths which avalanche frequently have few or no large trees and these are badly damaged. Some large avalanches occur infrequently, but devastatingly, on slopes which, prior to the slide, were covered in fir and pine forest. There can be evidence of former avalanches, however, in the form
of damaged or fallen trees or stands of forest younger than the mode for the area.

The vegetation analysis of the study site, as well as, the hillside above it to the top of the ridge showed no evidence of physical damage from snow avalanches.

AIR PHOTO ANALYSIS

United States Forest Service aerial photos dated 1939, 1951, and 1983 were used analysis the effects of snow avalanches on the study site. These photos are available in stereo pairs. This allows the user to identify in considerable detail changes to locations studied. Specific trees can be identified and changes to the landscape between photos can also be seen.

For the purpose of this study the photos were used to identify changes in vegetation due to avalanche events. Although the photos show changes to the area due to logging and human interference, there is no evidence from the photos suggesting snow avalanches have effected the study site.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the avalanche hazard evaluation, based of terrain analysis, vegetation analysis, and aerial photo analysis, indicate it is unlikely the study site located at 440 Highway 28, Crystal Bay has been, or will be, overrun by snow avalanches. This study is based on reasonably foreseeable snow and weather conditions.

I trust this provides the information you need at the time; however, if you have any questions, please contact me.

Yours very truly

Larry Heywood
Avalanche Specialist
P.O. Box 222
Homewood, Ca. 96141
(916) 525-7571
MEMORANDUM

August 15, 1996

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Goal #1, Housing Subelement of the Land Use Element of the Goals and Policies, and Chapter 2 of the Code of Ordinances relative to a regional median income level

Proposed Action: To amend the Goals and Policies and the Code of Ordinances relative to a regional median income level. The amendments are summarized below and provided in detail in the adopting ordinance (Attachment A.)

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the proposed amendments. The Advisory Planning Commission voted 12 to 2 to recommend approval of these amendments to the Governing Board.

Background: In December 1995, TRPA hired a contract planner to produce an affordable housing needs assessment of the Tahoe Basin to be known as the "Fair Share" report. This report is to identify affordable housing needs and to attribute responsibility for those needs among the six jurisdictions based upon demographics and employment. In the process of producing this report, it became evident that the current definition of affordable housing, as it now stands in both the Code of Ordinances as well as the Goals and Policies, impedes the ability to conduct an objective assessment of affordable housing needs and relative "fair share."

Discussion: The usage of the term, "... region's median income" creates difficulty in producing a housing assessment that will be both accurate and objective due to the vast disparity in income levels for different locales within the Tahoe Basin. A regional median income level (which would be skewed by the high income extremes) would incorrectly identify more affordable housing needed than is actual or realistic. Furthermore, the idea of a regional median income is highly ambiguous in itself. Calculating this number requires detailed extrapolation of 1990 Census figures and remains debatable. The most convincing reason, however, for amending the median income requirements for affordable housing is that each jurisdiction, in order to receive funding for affordable housing projects must utilize their respective county's median income level in assessing their housing needs. This is the recognized figure by most agencies responsible for providing funds to affordable housing, not TRPA's "regional median income." It is necessary that TRPA's requirements of the jurisdictions, relative to affordable housing remain consistent with those parameters already set forth by other State and Federal agencies. In this way, TRPA's efforts such as the "Fair Share" report
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will serve a more productive function in assisting the jurisdictions towards assessing their housing needs and it will facilitate the process of making affordable housing a reality in the Basin. Finding in favor of these proposed amendments will serve to remove a potential barrier to future affordable housing projects.

This proposal is based upon a recommendation from the Housing Advisory Group that is reporting to the Local Government Committee on issues relative to continued affordable housing efforts in the Basin.

It is then proposed that the wording in both the Goals and Policies and the Code of Ordinances be changed as follows:

The proposed action would affect the Goals and Policies such that Goal #1, Housing Subelement of the Land Use Element would change to:

"Special incentives, such as bonus development units will be given to promote affordable or government-assisted housing for lower income households (80 percent of Regional/Median/Income respective county’s median income) and for very low income households (50 percent of the Regional/Median/Income respective county’s median income)."

A result of amending Goal #1 is the need to also amend Chapter two of the Code of Ordinances. The Code of Ordinances (Chapter two) would be amended to read:

"Residential housing for lower-income households (income not in excess of 80 percent of the Regional/Median/Income respective county’s median income) and for very low-income households (income not in excess of 50 percent of the Regional/Median/Income respective county’s median income)..."

Required Findings: Prior to amending the Goals and Policies and the Code of Ordinances, TRPA must make certain findings. Following each finding below is a brief rationale for making the finding.

Chapter 5 and 6 Findings:

1. Finding: The project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Rationale: Staff has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist on the proposed amendment to the TRPA Goals and Policies and has determined that a finding of no significant environmental effect is appropriate.

2. 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 amendment to the Goals and Policies will better implement the overall scope of the Land Use element by
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eliminating a potential barrier to the development of affordable housing in the Basin. The amendment to the Code of Ordinances will subsequently reflect the standards set forth in the Goals and Policies.

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

Rationale: The amendments are consistent with the Regional Plan and will help attain the environmental thresholds. See also Finding 1 above.

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

Rationale: See Findings 2 and 3 above.

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

Rationale: For the reason set forth in Finding 2 above, this amendment better implements the Regional Plan and will assist in the achievement and maintenance of the environmental thresholds.

Section 6.4 Finding

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

Rationale: See Findings 1 - 4 above.

Ordinance 87-8 Findings:

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

Rationale: The Compact directs TRPA to adopt regional ordinances relating to the achievement and maintenance of thresholds and, for the reasons set forth above, the amendments will not significantly affect the thresholds.

2. One or more of the following:

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

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

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

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

(1) The cost of implementation outweighs the environmental gain to be achieved.

(2) Implementation will result in unacceptable impacts on public health and safety; or

(3) Fiscal support for implementation is insufficient and such insufficiency is expected to be a long-term problem.

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

Rationale: Staff recommends Findings (c) and (f) because statistical analysis as well as past experience has demonstrated that the current parameters for affordable housing are inaccurate and act as an impediment to the implementation of the Regional Plan.

Environmental Documentation: In accordance with the findings made above, staff recommends a finding of no significant impact. See Chapter 5 and 6 Finding 1.

Required Action: To adopt the proposed amendments, the Governing Board must take the following actions:

1. Make a finding of No Significant Environmental Effect and the findings required by Ordinance 87-8 and Chapters 5 and 6; and

2. Adopt the attached ordinance.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item, please contact David Atkins at (702) 588-4547.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE NO. 96-

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 87-9, AS AMENDED, OF THE
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY; AMENDING THE HOUSING
SUBLELEMENT, LAND USE ELEMENT OF THE GOALS AND POLICIES PLAN;
AMENDING CHAPTER 2 OF THE CODE OF ORDNANCES RELATING TO
AFFORDABLE HOUSING; 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 the Housing Subelement, Land Use Element, of the
Regional Plan Goals and Policies, and amending Chapter 2 of the Code of
Ordinances, relating to "Regional median income" as part of the
definition of "Affordable Housing," 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 approval of the amendments. The Governing Board has
conducted a noticed public hearing on the amendments. Oral testimony
and documentary evidence were received and considered.

1.30 The provisions of this ordinance have been found not to have a
significant environmental effect on the environment, and thus 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 of Ordinances and Article V(g) of the Compact, and the findings
required by Section 2.40 of Ordinance 87-8. As to the Ordinance 87-8
findings, the Board finds that those findings were supported by a
preponderance of the evidence in the record.

1.50 The Board further finds that the amendments adopted hereby continue to
implement the Regional Plan, as amended, in a manner that achieves and
maintains the adopted environmental 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 the Land Use Element of the Goals and Policies

2.10 Subparagraph (1) of Section 6.10 of Ordinance 87-9, as amended, is
hereby amended by amending Policy 1, Goal #1 of the Housing Subelement
of the Land Use Element as follows, with added language underlined and
deleted language stricken:
Policies

1. SPECIAL INCENTIVES, SUCH AS BONUS DEVELOPMENT UNITS, WILL BE GIVEN TO PROMOTE AFFORDABLE OR GOVERNMENT-ASSISTED HOUSING FOR LOWER INCOME HOUSEHOLDS (80 PERCENT OF REGION/S RESPECTIVE COUNTY'S MEDIAN INCOME) AND FOR VERY LOW INCOME HOUSEHOLDS (50 PERCENT OF REGION/S RESPECTIVE COUNTY'S MEDIAN INCOME).

Section 3.00 Amendment of Chapter 2 of the Code

3.10 The definition of "affordable housing" in Subsection 2.2 is hereby amended as follows with added language underlined and deleted language stricken:

Affordable Housing: Residential Housing for lower-income households (income not in excess of 80 percent of the Region's respective county's median income) and for very low-income households (income not in excess of 50 percent of the Region's respective county's median income), which are designed and occupied in accordance with local, regional, state and federal standards for the assistance of households with such incomes. Such housing units shall be made available for rental or sale at a cost that does not exceed the recommended state and federal standards.

Section 4.00 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 shall not be affected. For this purpose, the provisions of this ordinance and the amendments are hereby declared respectively severable.

Section 5.00 Effective Date

Section 2.00 of this ordinance shall be effective immediately upon adoption. Section 3.00 of this ordinance shall become effective 60 days after the date of its adoption.

PASSED and ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held August 28, 1996, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent:

John E. Upton, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
MEMORANDUM

August 15, 1996

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities, to Adopt a Memorandum of Understanding Between TRPA and Contel/GTE

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Governing Board amend Chapter 4 of the Code of Ordinances to exempt certain activities of Contel/GTE from TRPA review by adopting the attached ordinance.

Advisory Planning Commission Recommendation

The APC conducted a public hearing on this matter and unanimously recommended adoption of the proposed Code amendment.

Description and Discussion

Pursuant to Section 4.8 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, TRPA may amend Chapter 4 to exempt those activities of public and quasi-public entities as set forth in memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between TRPA and such entities. The format of the MOU is similar to that found in Sections 4.2 and 4.3 of the Code. Activities are separated into categories of exempt and qualified exempt. Those activities are described in the attached MOU. Contel/GTE may undertake exempt activities without contacting TRPA and may commence activity on qualified exempt activities provided they give written notice five business days prior to the activity commencing. All activities, whether exempt or not, must comply with the TRPA Regional Plan, including the Code of Ordinances and Handbook of Best Management Practices.

Contel/GTE has reviewed the proposed MOU and is in agreement with the provisions contained therein.

Environmental Documentation

Staff has completed the Environmental Checklist and has made an initial determination of no significant effect on the environment.

JW: 8/15/96
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 4.8 of the Code allows for the development and implementation of MOUs to exempt certain activities not otherwise considered exempt or qualified exempt under Chapter 4. The activities described in the proposed MOU are minor in nature and are subject to all the provisions of the Regional Plan. 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 minor in nature, are subject to restrictions, and are geared toward essential activities and maintenance of existing facilities. 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; and

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.
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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.

Section 4.8 of the Code allows for the implementation of MOUs with public
tentities to exempt activities from TRPA review. The proposed MOU with
Contel/GTE exempts minor activities undertaken by public utility districts
charged with providing essential public services. Under the MOU, Contel/GTE
will be able to more effectively and efficiently provide 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.

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 Contel/GTE will
implement Section 4.8 of the Code which allows amendments to exempt certain
activities of public and quasi-public entities.

Please contact Jerry Wells, Deputy Director, at (702) 588-4547 if you have any
comments or questions on this agenda item.
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY AND
CONTEL/GTE

AUGUST 1996

This Memorandum of Understanding is entered into this ___ day of August 1996, by and between the TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY (TRPA), through its Executive Director as authorized by the Governing Board, and CONTEL/GTE, by and through its Vice President of Network Design.

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. 87-9, as amended from time to time. Activities exempt under this MOU shall not result in the creation of additional land coverage, relocation of existing coverage, or an increase in vehicle trips in excess of that otherwise exempt pursuant to Subsection 4.3.B of the TRPA Code. All activities undertaken by CONTEL/GTE pursuant to this MOU shall comply with applicable Best Management Practices (BMPs), and 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.

I. EXEMPT ACTIVITIES

The following activities of CONTEL/GTE, in addition to those exempt pursuant to Section 4.2. of the TRPA Code, are not subject to review and approval by TRPA provided any related excavation or backfilling work does not exceed 10 cubic yards (unless modified below), occurs during the grading season (May 1 to October 15) in land capability districts 4 through 7 and/or within an existing paved area or compacted road shoulder, and the site is stabilized and/or revegetated within 72 hours to prevent erosion.

A. SERVICE CONNECTIONS

1. Repair and replacement of existing underground or overhead facilities such as vaults, pedestals, associated hardware, conduit, service boxes and other appurtenant facilities, provided there is no increase in size or capacity and the replacement facilities are similar in type and function.

2. Installation of new underground service connections for TRPA-approved projects, and for existing improved properties.

3. Location of existing underground facilities.

B. DISTRIBUTION FACILITIES

1. Reinforcement of existing distribution facilities, including aerial facilities or underground facilities in existing conduits. (Reinforcement is defined in Chapter 2 of the Code).
2. Extension of underground distribution facilities for new or additional service connections.

3. Pole replacements in place.

4. Replacement of existing aerial or underground facilities.

5. Location of underground facilities.

C. GENERAL OPERATIONS FOR OUTSIDE PLANT AND BUILDINGS

1. Repair or replacement of splice boxes, conduits, pedestals, cross-connect boxes, and other appurtenant facilities.

2. Gravel existing roadways provided that BMPs are in place, including dust control measures.

3. Traffic control and lane closures for installation and maintenance activities provided any lane closures are limited to the minimum amount of time needed to complete the activity and, with the exception of emergencies, do not occur during holidays or weekends.

4. Use of portable generators, pumps, and compressors for maintenance and repair operations.

5. Installation of roadside warning signs related to construction/maintenance activities or needed for safety purposes, provided signs are removed within 10 business days following completion of the activities, or within 10 business days of the removal of the safety hazard.

6. Demolition of structures provided the structure is not designated, or pending designation on the TRPA Historic Resource Map, as amended from time to time.

7. Structural repair or remodeling pursuant to Section 4.2.A of the TRPA Code.

8. Excavation and removal of contaminated soil or other material resulting from petroleum product or chemical spills.

9. Installation of observation wells and soil borings for groundwater monitoring and soil investigations.

D. EROSION CONTROL AND RESTORATION ACTIVITIES

1. Installation of erosion control devices such as:
   a. Sediment basins not exceeding 150 square feet in size.
   b. Swales
c. Rock slope protection not visible from any TRPA-designated scenic roadway or shorezone unit, class I bike paths, or recreation area.

d. Rock-lined ditches.

e. Willow wattling.

f. Access barriers, i.e., bollards and split-rail fencing.

g. Installation of temporary erosion control devices.

2. Restoration of disturbed areas of one acre or less provided scarification does not exceed 6" in depth and excavation and filling does not exceed 20 cubic yards.

II. QUALIFIED EXEMPT ACTIVITIES

The following activities of CONTEL/GTE are not subject to review and approval by TRPA, provided CONTEL/GTE certifies, on a form provided by TRPA, that the activity does not result in the creation of additional land coverage or relocation of land coverage, excavation and backfilling does not exceed 25 cubic yards (unless modified below), occurs during the grading season (May 1 to October 15) in land capability districts 4-7 and/or within an existing paved area or compacted road shoulder, and the site is stabilized and/or revegetated within 72 hours to prevent erosion, and the activity is in conformance with the applicable provisions of the TRPA Code. The form shall be filed with TRPA at least five working days before the activity commences. For those activities involving in excess of 25 cubic yards of excavation (as provided below), CONTEL/GTE shall submit the form to TRPA at least 30 days before the activity commences. The following activities are in addition to those activities deemed "Qualified Exempt" pursuant to Section 4.3 of the TRPA Code.

A. SERVICE CONNECTIONS

1. Installation of new service connections for TRPA-approved projects and existing improved properties provided the service connection, if overhead, is not visible from any TRPA-designated scenic roadway or shorezone unit, and is not located within 300 feet of any designated scenic highway corridor right-of-way in urban corridors, within 1000 feet in rural transition corridors, and within one-half mile in rural corridors.

2. Repair or replacement of existing overhead or underground service connections.

B. DISTRIBUTION FACILITIES

1. Reinforcement of existing buried distribution facilities.

2. Extension of underground facilities for new or additional service connections.

3. Repair or replacement of existing aerial or underground facilities.

4. Realignment of existing pole lines due to construction of an
erosion control project or road improvement project provided that the realigned pole line is not visible from any TRPA-designated scenic roadway or shoreline units.

C. GENERAL OPERATIONS FOR OUTSIDE PLANT AND BUILDINGS

1. Repair or replacement of submarine cable.

D. MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES

1. Conversion from overhead to underground or replacement and/or repair of existing underground facilities including pipelines, conduit and conductor for a distance of not more than 2500 lineal feet, provided all excavation is within an existing road right-of-way, relocations or conversions of facilities to underground are within existing paved areas or compacted road shoulders, the amount of excavation is the minimum necessary, and all stockpiling of spoil material is accomplished in accordance with TRPA BMPs.

2. Installation of snow barrier walls to protect pad-mounted equipment, provided walls do not exceed 5 feet in height and 25 feet in length, are not visible from any TRPA-designated scenic roadway or shoreline unit, and are consistent with the TRPA Design Review Guidelines (Chapter 1, Section C(7) and Section 30.13.C(2) of the TRPA Code.

3. Tree removal for public health and safety pursuant to Section 71.4.B(2) of the TRPA Code, and in accordance with any requirements of the owner of the underlying land within the utility easement or right-of-way.

E. EROSION CONTROL AND RESTORATION ACTIVITIES

1. Installation of retaining walls not exceeding 25 feet in length and 3 feet in height, provided that if located within a TRPA-designated scenic roadway or shoreline unit, the wall design is consistent with the TRPA Design Review Guidelines (Chapter 1, Section C(7) and Section 30.13.C(2) of the TRPA Code.

2. Restoration of disturbed areas not exceeding 2 acres, provided scarification does not exceed 6" in depth.

III. TREATMENT AND ACCOUNTING OF COVERAGE

It is understood by CONTEL/GTE and TRPA that the activities set forth herein may result in a requirement to mitigate existing excess coverage. Further, many of the activities involve removal of existing land coverage or restoration of disturbed lands.

Chapter 38 of the Code provides for the accounting, tracking, and banking of coverage in conjunction with Chapter 20. CONTEL/GTE shall report to the Executive Director of TRPA annually on the status of compliance with all excess coverage mitigation, coverage removal and restoration requirements as related to all activities undertaken pursuant to this MDU.
IV. LOSS OF EXEMPTION

Any exempt activity set forth herein shall be considered a project requiring TRPA review if the Executive Director determines that, because of unusual circumstances, the activity may have a substantial effect on the land, air, water, space, or any other natural resource in the Region.

V. TERMINATION

This MOU may be terminated by either party upon sixty (60) days notice in writing.

CONTEL/GTE

DATED: ____________________________

Michael Burke
Vice President, Network Design

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

DATED: ____________________________

James W. Baetge, Executive Director
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TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE NO. 96-____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 87-9 AS AMENDED, BY AMENDING
CHAPTER 4 OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY CODE OF ORDINANCE
RELATING TO EXEMPT ACTIVITIES; ADOPTING A MEMORANDUM OF
UNDERSTANDING WITH CONTEL/GTE TO EXEMPT CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF
CONTEL/GTE FROM TRPA REVIEW; AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS
PROPERTY 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
Contel/GTE regarding exemption of certain Contel/GTE
activities 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 noticed
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 of Ordinances 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

The following subsection is hereby added to Section 4.5 of the Code as
follows:

"4.5.Y MOU with Contel/GTE (Telephone Utility Company): As set
forth in Appendix FF of this chapter."
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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 amended MOU by Contel/GTE, whichever is later.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held August 28, 1996, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent:

John E. Upton, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
MEMORANDUM

August 19, 1996

To: TRPA Governing Board
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Lake Tahoe Shorezone Development Cumulative Impact Analysis and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

This item is an ongoing issue that is placed on the Governing Board agenda each month throughout the comment period which will end October 25, 1996.

For the last five months TRPA staff along with 24 other representatives of public and private interests have been working in a partnership to gain consensus on the difficult issues highlighted in the Shorezone DEIS. The Shorezone Partnership Committee meets twice a month for all day facilitated sessions. These meetings are scheduled to continue through October, 1996 (see attached schedule).

Please contact Coleen Shade at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this matter.
MEMORANDUM

August 20, 1996

To: TRPA Governing Board
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Final EIR/EIS for the U.S. Forest Service North Shore Project

Copies of the above-referenced document were previously mailed to you under separate cover. The 60-day public comment period began on October 20, 1995 and concluded on December 19, 1995.

The Final EIR/EIS contains comments received during the public comment review period and written responses to those comments. TRPA staff and the U.S. Forest Service staff will be presenting the Final EIR/EIS at the August 28, 1996 Governing Board meeting.

APC Recommendation: At the August 14, 1996 Advisory Planning Commission meeting the APC unanimously recommended that the Governing Board certify the Final EIR/EIS. Certification is defined as a finding that the Final EIS is in compliance, procedurally and substantively, with Article VII of the Compact, Chapter 5 of the Code, and the Rules of Procedure.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this matter please contact Paul Nielsen of the TRPA staff at (702) 588-4547.

/PN

AGENDA ITEM VII.D

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
Project Name: U.S. Forest Service North Shore Project

Application Type: Resource Management

Applicant: U.S. Forest Service

Agency Planner: Paul Nielsen, Associate Planner

Location: The project is located within portions of Washoe and Placer Counties on public lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service. Specifically, the project area extends from the Truckee River east to Incline Creek and encompasses approximately 7,000 acres.

Project File Number/TRPA File Number: 580-101-95/950172

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the project. The required findings and recommended conditions are outlined in Section 6 of this staff summary.

Project Description: The applicant is proposing to improve the health of the forest by removing dead and dying trees and by thinning overstocked stands of trees. In addition, watershed restoration work, primarily road obliteration and closures are proposed. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared for this project and Alternative 2 was selected as the Forest Service's project to be implemented. More specifically, Alternative 2 proposes the following activities within the project area:

* Salvaging (removing) dead trees, and trees expected to die within six months of the time of harvest, to reduce fuel loads and risk of fire.

* Creation of Defensible Fuels Profile Zones (DFPZ) adjacent to urban development to create areas that will have an acceptable fire spread rate and intensity.

* Removal of hazard trees that may cause failure resulting in property damage or personal injury.

* Removal of live trees for the purpose of regulating stocking levels and species composition to improve stand health.

* Permanent restoration of 26 miles of roads, closure of nine miles of roads and conversion of four miles of roads to non-motorized use trails.
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* Underburning of approximately 980 acres over a five year period.
* Fish habitat improvements on approximately 1.5 miles of Watson Creek.

The primary tree removal method for this project is tractor yarding which will occur on approximately 3,435 acres, or 63% of the treatment area. Helicopter yarding will occur on approximately 1,875 acres, or 34% of the treatment area with the remaining 160 acres or 3% of the treatment area harvested using oversnow yarding. The estimated volume to be removed is approximately 31.9 million board feet. In comparison, the previously approved Forest Service’s East Shore Project may eventually remove 35.6 million board feet. The tree removal methods proposed are consistent with Chapter 71 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Site Description: The North Shore Project will encompass 7,000 acres of forest located on the north side of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The primary vegetation types based upon dominant overstory species are pine, mixed conifer, red fir, mixed subalpine and riparian. Slopes vary from 0 percent to greater than 30 percent. The project area consists of soils from both volcanic and granitic parent material. All land capability districts are found within the project area. Of the 70 proposed log and equipment landings, 62 currently exist. Due to the extensive system and non-system roads existing, no new permanent roads will be constructed.

Issues: The proposed project involves substantial tree removal and therefore requires Governing Board review in accordance with Chapter 4, Appendix A, of the TRPA Code. The following issues were discussed in the EIS and mitigations listed in the EIS are incorporated into the project by reference.

1. Water Quality:

Substantial tree removal by its nature involves ground disturbance. The project, as proposed and conditioned, includes the implementation of temporary and permanent Best Management Practices (BMPs). The applicant is proposing to use helicopter yarding on lower land capability classes and tractor yarding on higher capability classes. During certain conditions, winter operations will be allowed. To mitigate the cumulative watershed effects of the proposed project the Forest Service has committed to the closure, permanent obliteration or conversion to non-motorized use trails of 39 miles of roads. Road closure refers to an intermittent service road that is closed to all vehicular traffic for more than one year. A permanently obliterated road refers to the physical removal or recontouring of a road to a natural condition.
2. Air Quality:

The project includes two specific areas potentially affecting air quality.

a. Temporary air quality impacts will result from the controlled burning of slash generated during the timber removal project. Chapters 71 and 91 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances sets forth standards for prescribed and open burning for fuels management purposes with which the project must comply. TRPA ordinances limit burning to days on which meteorological and atmospheric conditions will insure that dispersion of the smoke will occur during the day of the burn. Monitoring of air quality during burn events will provide data on how these activities affect air quality standards.

b. Vehicle operation associated with removal of the timber may result in impacts to air quality on a temporary basis. The timber harvest does not constitute additional or transferred development and therefore is exempt from air quality mitigation fees. The use of appropriate BMPs to control dust on the Forest Service roads will aid in minimizing potential air quality impacts resulting from the generation of fugitive dust. In addition, TRPA is requiring the Forest Service to coordinate with the California and Nevada Department of Transportation, appropriate local governments and any affected Homeowners Associations which may have responsibility for maintaining residential roads, to ensure adequate measures are taken to avoid damage to roadway surfaces.

3. Noise:

The project is expected to have noise impacts on the adjacent residential neighborhood from the helicopter and logging truck activities. Subsection 23.8 of the TRPA Code exempts TRPA-approved construction or maintenance activities from the TRPA Community Noise Equivalent Levels (CNEL) between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. The Forest Service has requested that the 8:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. limitation apply only to certain activity areas (Unit 32 and Defensible Fuels Profile Zones (DFPZ) 1, 8, and 9) that are located near residential areas. However, due to the close proximity of proposed activity areas to other residential areas TRPA staff is conditioning that the limitation also apply to DFPZ 2, 7, and 10.

For all other harvest units, the Forest Service is requesting that TRPA exempt harvest activities from the 8:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. limitations. Typical helicopter yarding operations commence at daybreak, as the early morning hours are cooler, less windy, and provide better "lift" for the helicopters. Staff has reviewed the proposal and determined that the request is consistent with the provisions of Subsection 23.8 of the TRPA
4. Historic Resources:

There are two large and complex historic districts that are eligible to be included in the National Register of Historic Places and meet TRPA criteria of significance within the project area. Historic properties located in the Nevada portion of the North Shore project area may contribute to the Comstock Logging Historic District. The other district is the proposed Basalt Quarrying Prehistoric District located on the California side of the project area. Potential negative effects to the historic values of properties in California will be mitigated by applying the stipulations attached to the Memorandum of Understanding between the LTEMU and the California Office of Historic Preservation for the avoidance of historic properties. Potential negative effects to historic properties located in Nevada will be mitigated by the continued negotiation of treatments appropriate to preservation of these values with the Nevada Office of Historic Preservation.

5. Fuels Management

Fuel treatments can have the potential to reduce wildfire intensities which may reduce the risk of wildfires. However, different fuel management techniques result in different residual fuel levels. This project will not result in a landscape completely treated to the maximum level of fuels management. For example, lop and scatter techniques will be used on approximately 3,980 acres or 72% of the treatment area. After completion of vegetation treatments, these areas will have a layer of residual tree tops and limbs scattered across the landscape to a maximum depth of 18 inches. Over time, snow loads will help crush these fuels to a lower level which will help promote decomposition. This treatment does temporarily increase the fire hazard since fuel beds become more receptive to fire starts. However, the situation is still less hazardous than if no treatment were to occur since the fuels which contribute to higher intensity fires will have been removed.

The Forest Service is proposing other fuel treatment techniques designed to reduce fuel loads. Handpiling and burning, use of prescribed fire and the creation of Defensible Fuels Profile Zones (DFPZ) will be conducted in strategic areas to maximize their effectiveness. For example, a DFPZ is a strategically located strip or block of land approximately one quarter mile wide on which the vegetation has been changed by a variety of fuel treatments into a fuel profile with an acceptable fire spread rate and intensity.
North Shore Project
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Staff Analysis:

A. **Environmental Documentation:** The Forest Service has completed a joint USFS/TRPA Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in order to assess the potential environmental impacts of the project. A copy of the Final EIS has been previously distributed to the Governing Board and one will be made available at the hearing and at TRPA.

B. **Plan Area Statement:** The project is located within several plan areas covering the area between the Truckee River and Incline Creek. They are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Area Statement</th>
<th>Land Use Classification</th>
<th>Management Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>003-Lower Truckee</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Redirection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004-Burton Creek</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012-North Tahoe High School</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015-North Star</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019-Martis Peak</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024-North Tahoe Recreation Area</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030-Mount Rose</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043-Chateau/Country Club Residential</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051-Tyrolian Village Residential</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All proposed activities (sanitation salvage cut, thinning, non-structural and structural fish habitat management, erosion control, reforestation and prescribed fire management) are listed as allowed uses in the applicable plan area statements. Agency staff has reviewed the subject plan areas and has determined that the project is consistent with the applicable planning statements, planning considerations and special policies.

C. **Land Coverage:** Reconstruction of certain existing roads will create new land coverage. However, the obliteration of 25 miles of roads will ensure that upon completion of the project, there will be a net decrease in land coverage over the project area. No new roads will be constructed as a result of the project. New coverage will be mitigated by removing existing coverage in the same watershed, such as existing roads and existing landings. All existing and proposed landings, a short temporary road, and certain primary skid trails will be revegetated. The Forest Service will be responsible for tracking land coverage reductions in accordance with the Forest Service-TRPA Memorandum of Understanding.
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AGENDA ITEM NO. VIII.A.
**D. Required Findings:** The following is a list of the required findings as set forth in Chapters 5, 6, 20 and 71 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, Agency staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the finding can be made.

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

   a. **Land Use:** The proposed activities will occur in National Forest woodlands which are appropriate locations for such activities. Log and equipment landings and other accessory uses are necessary to conduct the proposed activities. The timber removal methods are consistent with Chapter 71 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. The proposed activities are listed as allowed uses in the applicable plan areas.

   b. **Transportation:** There will be a short term increase in vehicle traffic associated with the transportation of timber. The project includes the closure of nine miles of roads, obliteration of 26 miles of roads and conversion of four miles of roads to non-motorized use trails and the reconstruction of approximately 9.3 miles of roads.

   c. **Conservation:** The removal of dead and dying trees, and thinning of suppressed trees will promote forest health and enhance wildlife habitat. Residual snags, downed logs and slash treatment will comply with Chapter 71 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All proposed timber removal methods are consistent with the land capability system. All cultural resources or sensitive plant and animal species within the project area will be protected in accordance with Chapters 29 and 75 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, except where modified by the Memorandum of Agreement between the Forest Service and the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office. The Forest Service will apply temporary and permanent BMPs to the project area.

   d. **Recreation:** The project area has many roads and trails that have been used by off-road vehicles. Many of these roads are not a part of the Forest Service’s off-road vehicle plan and are not proposed to be maintained for such use. Many of these roads will be eliminated by this project. Sixty-four percent of the existing roads and trails will remain after completion of the project, which will provide sufficient access to the...
area by all user groups. Access into portions of the project area would be temporarily restricted during the harvest activities for public safety.

e. Public Service and Facilities: This project will not require any additions to be made to existing public service facilities.

f. Implementation: This project does not require any allocations of development.

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

The basis for this finding is provided in the North Shore Project EIS and Article V(g) Findings in accordance with Chapter 6, Subsection 6.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. A copy of the Final EIS will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.

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

(Refer to paragraph 2, above.)

4. The project or activity, based on a report by a qualified forester, is consistent with Chapter 71, Tree Removal, and the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

The proposed timber harvest plan was prepared by the U.S. Forest Service. The proposed harvest activity, as conditioned, meets the requirements of Chapter 71 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. An EIS has been prepared for this project.

5. The relocation of land coverage is to an equal or superior portion of the parcel or project area.

Relocated land coverage will be to areas where there are existing roads that need to be widened. In most cases, side cast material from road maintenance has disturbed the fringes of the existing roads where the land coverage is to be relocated to. Widening existing roads to facilitate project activities fits the scheme of the project area.

6. The area from which the land coverage was removed for relocation is restored in accordance with Subsection 20.4.C.
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The areas from which the land coverage will be relocated will be restored such that the area will function in a natural state. Recontouring, tilling and revegetation will ensure adequate restoration.

7. The relocation is not to Land Capability Districts 1a, 1b, 1c, 2 or 3, from any higher numbered land capability district.

The Forest Service will provide land coverage relocation tracking information which will be reviewed by TRPA to ensure relocated coverage was not from any higher numbered land capability district. Information pertaining to relocated land coverage will include hydrologic boundaries, location of land coverage removed or relocated and the land capability of these areas.

8. If the relocation is from one portion of a stream environment zone to another portion, there is a net environmental benefit to the stream environment zone.

Retirement of land coverage will occur at a rate of 1.5:1 for land coverage being relocated within a stream environment zone.

9. With respect to the possibly significant effects on WATER QUALITY identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Implementation of the proposed restoration of 26 miles of roads, closure of nine miles of roads and conversion to non-motorized use trails by the year 2002 will ensure protection of water quality. A proposed winter operations plan, designed to avoid impacts to water quality, has been added to the project.

10. With respect to the possibly significant effects on AIR QUALITY identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Mitigation of air quality impacts caused by the project will be reduced to a less than significant level by including burning prescriptions that minimize smoke emissions and through dust abatement on unpaved roads. Implementation of Alternative 2 was selected to ensure impacts to air quality are less than significant.

11. With respect to the possibly significant effects on SOILS
identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Mitigation of potential impacts to soils are reduced to a less than significant level by the use of helicopters for vegetation removal on low capability lands, through the use of oversnow harvesting methods and through the revegetation of disturbed areas upon completion of the project. Also see finding 9 above.

12. With respect to the possibly significant effects on Wildlife identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Implementation of limited operating periods, ensuring minimum standards for snag retention are met and limiting equipment in Stream Environment Zones will help reduce impacts to wildlife to a less than significant level. Prescribed underburning will enhance wildlife habitat for certain species as will proposed thinning prescriptions.

13. With respect to the possibly significant effects on Heritage Resources identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Implementing Heritage Resource protection measures such as avoidance and use of firefighting foam around resources during prescribed burning will protect resources. Data collection and additional mitigations recommend by the Nevada office of Historic Preservation will also ensure impacts to Historic Resources will be less than significant.

E. **Required Actions.** Agency staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the project by making the following motions based on this staff summary and the evidence contained in the record.

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

II. A motion to approve the project, based on the staff summary, subject to the following conditions:
A. This permit is for the North Shore Project related activities described in the Environmental Impact Statement, Alternative 2. Stream restoration work will require separate TRPA approval. This approval is based on the following implementation schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Timber harvest and fuels treatment</td>
<td>1997-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prescribed underburning</td>
<td>1998-2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Road Closure/Obliteration</td>
<td>1999-2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation of activities prior to the proposed implementation dates is authorized by TRPA.

B. The Standard Conditions of Approval listed in Attachment T (USFS).

C. Prior to commencement of the timber harvest activity, the following special conditions of approval shall be satisfied:

1. The Forest Service shall submit grading plans (typical road sections) for all road improvements, including any stream crossing improvements and landings, for TRPA review and approval. Plans shall include all applicable BMPs. Perennial stream crossings shall be limited to improved crossings that meet Best Management Practices (BMPs) or to temporary bridge spans that can be removed upon project completion or at the end of the work season, whichever is sooner. Dry stream crossings (intermittent and ephemeral) shall include temporary erosion control in accordance with the Handbook of BMPs. Stream bed crossings shall be minimized to avoid disturbance whenever possible. The placing of rock and earthen materials in perennial stream channels to improve a crossing is prohibited. The use of culverts is allowed.

2. The Forest Service shall submit a detailed narrative describing the techniques that will be used to create the Defensible Fuel Profile Zones. Specifically, equipment type, access locations and staging areas.

3. The Forest Service shall submit written confirmation that the proposed activities will be in conformance with the agreements stipulated by the Nevada Office of Historic Preservation.

4. The Forest Service shall submit written authorization
from the appropriate jurisdictions, including homeowners associations, for use of roadways associated with log hauling.

D. The discharge of petroleum products, construction waste and litter (including sawdust), or earthen materials to the surface waters of the Lake Tahoe Basin is prohibited. Spill containment and absorbant materials, sufficient to handle spills associated with equipment maintenance, shall be kept on site, or on service trucks, at all times. All petroleum products and hazardous waste shall be removed from the project area and disposed at an appropriate location.

E. No new permanent roads are authorized.

F. Outlets of culverts will require rip-rapping for energy dissipation, such a rock rip-rap, unless exempted by a TRPA Environmental Compliance Inspector determination that the outlet of the culvert is in a stable condition.

G. Dewatering of roads or landings is prohibited unless authorized by TRPA in writing prior to dewatering activities.

H. Prior to January 1, 1997, the Forest Service shall submit a maintenance plan for the DFPZs which will ensure the long term effectiveness of the DFPZs.

I. Any activity occurring after October 15 and prior to May 1 shall not commence without prior written approval from TRPA. Deviations from the approved winter operation plan must be approved by TRPA. TRPA reserves the right to suspend operations, which includes vehicle movement, at any time should resource damage occur as determined by TRPA.

J. Live trees greater than 30" dbh shall only be removed if they are determined to be hazardous to life or property or are required for landings or temporary road construction. TRPA staff shall review the marking of live trees greater than 30" that are not determined to be hazardous to life or property or are not required for landings or temporary road construction.

K. Following completion of the timber harvest and water quality improvements, the Forest Service shall document with TRPA, in accordance with the existing Memorandum of Understanding, all
areas where land coverage has been removed and restored. Documentation shall also include the amount of new land coverage created by land capability districts (i.e. high capability, low capability and stream environment zones).

L. All mitigations listed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the North Shore Project are hereby incorporated as conditions of this permit by reference.

M. Pursuant to Subsection 23.8 of the TRPA Code, the 8:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. construction activity limitation shall apply to unit 32 and DPPZ 1, 2, 3, 7, 7A, 8, 9 and 10. The activity limitations do not apply to other activity areas. The Forest Service is responsible for investigating any complaints regarding potential violations of noise standards and shall report violations to TRPA within 24 hours.

N. Lights use to illuminate helicopter staging areas for post-daylight maintenance activities and to provide security shall be directed downward and away from roadways.

O. Prior to commencement of burning activities the U.S. Forest Service shall submit an air quality monitoring plan using California Air Resources Board protocol. Visibility monitoring shall utilize instruments capable of measuring impacts to TRPA visibility standards. The air quality monitoring plan shall also include provisions for monitoring PM10 generated by burning activities.
Project Name: Southwest Gas Corporation and Paiute Pipeline Company, Northern Nevada and California Gas Main Extension

Application Type: Gas Main Extension, Public Service

Applicant: Southwest Gas Corporation and Paiute Pipeline Company

Applicant’s Representative: Summit EnviroSolutions

Agency Planner: Jim Allison, Associate Planner

Location: The proposed route begins in Incline Village along Highway 28, crosses through a Washoe County maintenance yard, under and along Highway 431, and then up residential streets, Ponderosa, Silvertip, Sugar Pine, and Knotty Pine. From this point it continues uphill along an existing utility easement until a connection with a four wheel drive road is made. The route then follows the four wheel drive road south, west, and then north until an intersection with an existing 12 inch pipeline already installed is made.

Project Number/File Number: 540-304-95/950707

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

Project Description: The proposed project involves the construction of approximately 3.6 miles of 12-inch natural gas pipeline. The proposed project is a portion of a much more extensive gas main expansion project being pursued by Paiute Pipeline Company in areas outside the Tahoe Basin. In Nevada, the project is proposed by Paiute Pipeline Company and under Federal review requirements of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). In California, the project is proposed by Southwest Gas Corporation (SWG) and reviewed by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). Both the Nevada and California portions of the project are subject to TRPA review and approval and are treated as one project. For the TRPA review, an Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared for TRPA by Summit EnviroSolutions. The preferred alternative selected from the EA will be the same alternative approved by FERC and CPUC.

Currently, there is an 8-inch diameter pipeline that provides natural gas service to the North Shore of Lake Tahoe and Truckee, California. The existing facilities are not sufficient to provide gas to new customers in Truckee. Hence, Paiute and SWG are proposing to construct approximately 3.6 miles of 12 inch pipeline to provide additional volumes of natural gas to the North Shore of Lake Tahoe and to the Town of Truckee, California.

The proposed project will provide an additional 2.4 million cubic feet per day of natural gas to commercial and residential customers on the North Shore of Lake Tahoe. In addition, this project will provide up to 10 million cubic feet per day of natural gas to new customers in and around the Town of Truckee, California. This is anticipated to serve approximately 8,200 homes and businesses or approximately 32,800 people on the North Shore of Lake Tahoe and within the vicinity of the Town of Truckee, California. The project is expected to provide additional system capacity for the next 13 years.
Construction along paved rights-of-way (residential areas in Incline Village) will not require additional width for construction to take place. Minimal water quality impacts are expected with this portion of the project. Careful and prescribed use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) as outlined in the Revegetation, Restoration, and Erosion Control Plan are expected to mitigate the impacts.

Construction taking place in the forested section of the project will involve new permanent disturbance in varying widths depending upon the construction methods used and the amount of existing disturbance present before construction. Unlike the paved sections of the project, this section has greater potential for severe water quality impacts. A Revegetation, Restoration, and Erosion Control Plan is included as Section V of the EA and outlines the methods for minimizing such impacts. A variety of standard water quality mitigations are proposed which are designed to minimize temporary impacts occurring during construction.

For the most part, construction will require disturbance beyond that which is existing. Where feasible, construction methods will be used which reduce disturbance to a width of 25 feet, however, a width of 40 feet will be the norm. The permittee will be required to mitigate all new disturbance on low land capabilities at a ratio of 1:5:1 per the requirements of Subsection 20.4.C of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Also required is stabilizing those areas that are currently considered disturbed but which will be highly erosive after construction passes through.

The restoration and stabilization of the areas disturbed during construction will require sufficient time to establish. During the planning process, it was recognized that off-road vehicle usage in these areas would hinder successful restoration. Working with USFS staff, the applicant is planning to put together a mitigation package which will include restoration of four wheel drive roads and result in better protection of unstable soils within the construction area.

Long term monitoring of the disturbed and restored areas will be required as a condition of project approval. If problems are identified, the applicant is required to return to the site and ensure that mitigation is successful.

Site Description: Beginning in Incline Village, Nevada and ending northeast of Kings Beach, California, the beginning of the approximately 3.6 mile route traverses across road ROWs, an existing natural gas/electrical powerline easement, and finally along an existing four wheel drive road which traverses land managed by the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU) of the United States Forest Service (USFS). The total width of existing road ROWs through the residential areas of Incline Village vary from approximately 25 feet (Ponderosa Way) to approximately 50 feet (SR-28). Where the proposed pipeline easement traverses USFS land, west of the community of Incline Village, the easement is approximately 25 feet wide for the first one-half mile and 50 feet wide for the remaining mile. The existing disturbed utility corridor is approximately 40 feet wide and was previously disturbed during the development and maintenance of an electrical powerline and a natural gas pipeline. The four wheel drive road varies in width from approximately 7 to 12 feet and will require a new easement. Outside the residential section of the pipeline, the terrain is steep and forested.

Issues: The project involves a special use and therefore requires Governing Board review in accordance with Chapter 4, Appendix A, of the TRPA Code. The primary project related issues are:
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1. Project Purpose and Need: Currently, there is an 8-inch diameter pipeline that provides natural gas service to the North Shore of Lake Tahoe and Truckee, California. The existing facilities are not sufficient to provide gas to new customers in Truckee. The purpose of the project is to provide additional volumes of gas to future customers both in North Lake Tahoe and the Truckee area.

Southwest Gas has conducted several pipeline simulation studies which indicate that on an extremely cold winter day, sufficient volumes of natural gas will not be available to serve the entire North Shore of Lake Tahoe. Existing and future customers on the North Shore may not be guaranteed their supply of natural gas for heating without construction of this project. There is also a growing demand for natural gas in areas outside of the Lake Tahoe Basin, such as the Town of Truckee. The project will supplement the existing natural gas service to the North Shore of Lake Tahoe and provide natural gas service to new customers outside of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Through installation of the pipeline and being able to serve existing and future load points, Paiute believes it can eliminate the necessity for additional construction within the North Shore of the Lake Tahoe Basin for the next 13 years. This is due to the new pipeline being constructed with a higher maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP) than the existing line. In the future, the pipeline pressure can be increased in the new line to provide additional volumes of natural gas, rather than requiring additional construction.

2. Construction Methods and Restoration: Construction equipment and techniques for each section will vary due to terrain and land disturbance constraints. Along the paved road ROWs, there will be room for the equipment to maneuver without disturbing existing vegetation or soil. Furthermore, the ground is relatively level and there are numerous paved access roads for the equipment to access the corridor. Along the powerline ROW, within LTBMU land, the terrain is steep. The machinery will be restricted to a narrow corridor to minimize disturbance to soil and vegetation. Furthermore, the trees and overhead powerpoles restrict equipment movement along the corridor. Along the four wheel drive road, within ITEMU land, the terrain is more level except for approximately 1,500 feet where the road traverses 20 to 30 percent side slopes. When available, less sensitive areas may be utilized by the construction machinery so that the new disturbance along the road can be held to a minimum.

The right-of-way will be marked for the working area and for sensitive areas to avoid. Where unpaved, the working area will be cleared and graded. Topsoil will be separated and stored for replacement later and other soil spoil piles will be maintained directly upslope to the pipeline trench. The trench depth will be approximately 4 to 6 feet while trench width will vary according to soil stability. In the paved sections, open trenches will be covered at the end of each day.

The restoration and revegetation of the construction area will be completed according to the restoration requirements discussed in the restoration plan included as Appendix V in the EA. The restoration plan utilizes BMPs designated in the TRPA Handbook of Best Management Practices.
3. Scenic Quality: The highway, neighborhood and east facing dense forest areas are visible from the Incline Village side of the California/Nevada stateline, while the west facing dense forest area can be seen only from the California side of the stateline. Any scenic impacts which may occur (linear form, and contrasting color and texture) are expected as a result of ground disturbance created during the construction of the pipeline in the forested section of the project. The results of scenic analysis were a primary factor in selecting the four wheel drive alternative as the preferred route, other environmental impacts being roughly equal.

Visual simulations representing how the project is expected to appear from the key viewpoints immediately upon completion of construction were created. Of the viewpoints, the project was most visible from the Mt. Rose Highway overlook. From this view, which is approximately 400 feet higher than the highest elevation of the project and four miles to the northeast, two portions of the project will be visible due to the vegetation removal and clearing, temporary road widening, and grading. One is the intersection of the powerline and four wheel drive road where vegetation will be cleared and trenching activities will be conducted. The is expected to appear as a short, lightly colored horizontal line. The second is where the road steeply climbs to the high point of the project alignment, approximately half-way between the powerline and the lowest ridge saddle. This will appear as a light colored backward "s" line. However, the simulation shows that the project's overall visibility from this particular viewpoint will not be greatly noticeable, especially in consideration of the entire context of the view, which includes nearly the entire Tahoe Basin and Incline Village below. The other viewpoints showed no or only slight visual impacts that will be imperceptible immediately after project completion.

While this project is not expected to significantly degrade scenic quality thresholds, several viewpoints are identified by TRPA as visually sensitive, requiring scenic restoration. Projects visible from these points must demonstrate a net scenic improvement. Cut and fill slopes exposed by grading will be revegetated as part of the Revegetation, Restoration, and Erosion Control Plan (Appendix V of the EA). The new cut and fill slopes will be graded and revegetated. Excavated boulders will be stacked against the inside cuts to reduce glare and pockets of soil will be created to enhance conditions for vegetative growth. Furthermore, by locating the project along an existing road which is on the land form in areas where tree cover is more dense, many of the project's impacts will be "visually absorbed" by the forest. By the implementation of the restoration plan, an incremental scenic improvement is expected. However, because revegetation success is uncertain due to the remote location, harsh site conditions, aspect, elevation, and short growing season, a post-construction evaluation is required as a condition of approval.

4. Analysis of Alternatives: In addition to the No Project Alternative, geographic route alternatives were evaluated to avoid and/or minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive resources, which may be impacted by the Preferred Alternative. The origin points for the route alternatives are the same. All alternatives
parallel the Preferred Alternative for varying distances from the
point of origin. The delivery points for the route alternatives
are different but all alternative routes join with the same 12-
inch pipeline which was completed in 1995. All route alternatives
are described in the EA for their entire length from the point of
origin to the point of delivery.

The primary route alternatives considered were two routes which
utilized existing paved roadways, and a powerline alternative
route. One of the paved roadway alternatives (Highway 28
Alternative) involved pipeline construction entirely within the
Highway 28 right of way. The other roadway alternative
(Residential Alternative) was similar except that where possible,
residential streets paralleling Highway 28 were proposed. Impacts
to SEZs and wetlands, threatened and endangered species,
vegetation, fish and wildlife are substantially less when
comparing these alternatives to the Preferred Alternative.
However, traffic delays due to construction activities would be
substantial as well as increased impacts to air quality, noise,
socioeconomics, and public safety. Traffic delays along SR-28
would occur for approximately 46 10-hour working periods. These
alternatives were rejected for the unfeasibility of shutting
Highway 28 to through traffic for such an extended period.

The Powerline Alternative received the most serious consideration
next to the Preferred Alternative. The Powerline Alternative
continues up and over the ridge between Incline Village and Kings
Beach at the point where the Preferred Alternative intersects and
follows the four wheel drive road. Heading west, after that
intersection, the proposed construction area is highly visible.
The visually sensitive nature of the Powerline Alternative
compounded by the steep and rocky terrain are issues that cause
this alternative to be less favorable than the Preferred
Alternative. There would be no side slope cuts required to create
a level working area, less soil disturbance and fewer trees
removed than the Preferred Alternative. This alternative would
potentially have fewer impacts than the Preferred Alternative in
the areas of earth resources, vegetation, wildlife and recreation.
However, the visual impacts expected to be incurred through this
alternative are much greater than the Preferred Alternative.
Furthermore, this alternative is steep, rocky, and has a
southwestern exposure which could cause revegetation efforts to be
more difficult and possibly less successful than the Preferred
Alternative.

The Preferred Alternative could potentially have greater impacts
(greater area of impact) than the Powerline Alternative, State
Route 28 Alternative and the Residential Alternative in the areas
of earth resources and vegetation, however, the revegetation
efforts are expected to be more successful than with the Powerline
Alternative. The Preferred Alternative will have fewer impacts
than the Powerline Alternative for visual resources. The
Preferred Alternative will have fewer impacts than the State Route
28 Alternative and the Residential Alternative for traffic, noise,
air and socioeconomics. From a water quality perspective, the
Preferred Alternative is similar to the Powerline Alternative but
has much less impact on scenic resources and therefore was
selected as the Preferred Alternative.
Below is a table summarizing the impacts for each alternative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural or Environmental Resource</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Preferred Alternative</th>
<th>Powerline Alternative</th>
<th>State Route-20 Alternative</th>
<th>Residential Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate Length (miles)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate Cost</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2.4 million</td>
<td>$2.6 million</td>
<td>$4.6 million</td>
<td>$4.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARTH RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Disturbance</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Land Capabilities</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WATER RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAs and WETLANDS</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VEGETATION</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FISH &amp; WILDLIFE</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECREATION</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIR QUALITY</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAFFIC &amp; CIRCULATION</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOISE</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIOECONOMIC</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VISUAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Analysis:**

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

B. Plan Area Statement: The project is located within several Plan Areas. The Land Use Classification and the Management Strategy for each Plan Area and pipelines and power transmissions use classification (allowed or special use) are presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAS</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Special Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Special Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Special Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all the plan areas, the project is considered a special use and the Governing Board must make findings 4, 5, and 6 as addressed below in this staff summary under Section C.

C. Required Findings: The following is a list of the required findings as set forth in Chapters 6, 18 and 20 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, Agency staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the finding can be made.
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1. The project is consistent with and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and maps, the Code, and other TRPA plans and programs.

(a) Land Use: The proposed project is considered a special use in all Plan Area Statements this project crosses. The proposed project will become the primary natural gas transmission line between Nevada and California. It will allow for expanded service in the North Lake Tahoe area and allow for service to the town of Truckee, California. No new land use is proposed.

(b) Transportation: The only additional daily vehicle trip ends (dvte) within the project area will be temporary and those associated with construction and restoration. No permanent dvte will be generated as a result of this project. It is likely that some off road vehicle routes will be removed as mitigation for this project in connection with USFS plans to remove some off road facilities.

(c) Conservation: The EA does not identify any significant impacts which will be in conflict with the Conservation Element of the Regional Plan. Where there is potential to impact conservation resources, the EA has identified mitigation measures and steps to be taken to avoid or minimize the impact. The portions of the pipeline project in the forest will disturb new ground and create erosive conditions on lands previously disturbed and will be subject to the restoration plan in Appendix V of the EA. As conditioned, a security/performance bond will be posted to ensure that restoration is successful.

(d) Recreation: The project may temporarily impact recreation users such as hikers, off-highway vehicle users (OHVs) and mountain bikers during construction. In conjunction with the USFS, the permittee is expected to participate in restoration and removal of existing off road vehicle routes. Recreation users in this area will still have use of off road routes although the miles of trail will be reduced.

(e) Public Service and Facilities: The purpose of this project is to allow for expansion of natural gas service in the North Lake Tahoe area and allow for natural gas service to extend into the town of Truckee, outside the Tahoe Basin. This project is expected to meet demand in those areas for the next 13 years.

(f) Implementation: The project does not require any allocations or development rights. The project is on the TRPA Five Year Public Service Facility List.

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

The basis for this finding is provided on the checklist entitled "Project Review Conformance Checklist and Article V(g) Findings" in accordance with Chapter 6, Subsection 6.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All responses contained on said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities.
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A copy of the completed checklist will be made available at the Governing board hearing and at TRPA.

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

Refer to paragraph 2, above.

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

The proposed pipeline location will follow an existing natural gas pipeline and powerline for a portion of the proposed route. The proposed location of the pipeline in the residential areas of Incline Village will be placed in the road right-of-way which is a common place for utility placement. The four-wheel drive portion of the route has no utilities within the immediate vicinity. In all sections, the pipeline will be undergrounded and the presence of a natural gas pipeline will not be evident.

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

Safety standards for natural gas pipelines and safety of the pipeline during and after construction are subject to Federal DOT Minimum Federal Safety Standards in 49 CFR Part 192. In the Incline residential portion of the project, the pipeline will be constructed to Class 3 classifications which are designed to meet safety requirements when residences are within 100 yards of the pipeline. Once construction is complete no visible evidence that a natural gas pipeline is underground is expected. After construction, no disturbance to property or welfare is expected. The project includes mitigation measures and a site restoration plan which will protect land, water, and air resources. The applicant does not own the subject property but has or will receive easements for the pipeline route.

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

The EA did not identify any significant impacts that would change the character of the neighborhood, detrimentally affect or alter the purpose of the applicable planning area statements. The project is not located within a community, specific, or master plan area. In the future, the forested portion of the project may be part of a USFS timber harvest area. It is not expected that the presence of the pipeline will be harmful to timber harvesting.
The project is necessary for public health, safety, or environmental protection.

Without the project, the ability to provide additional residences and businesses with natural gas will not be possible. Conversion to natural gas from propane provides a means of heating which is not as subject to explosion due to environmental elements and human error. Conversion to natural gas produces less emissions than alternative heating fuels such as coal, wood, and heating oil. Use of natural gas in lieu of woodstoves will help air quality and visibility.

There is no reasonable alternative, including a bridge span or relocation, which avoids or reduces the extent of encroachment in the stream environment zone, or Land Capability Districts 1a, 1c, 2, and 3.

The EA identified alternatives which would not require new disturbance to stream environment zones, Land Capability Districts 1a, 1c, 2, and 3. However, the alternatives identified were deemed unreasonable by TRPA staff due to impacts to traffic and transportation. TRPA staff has worked with the applicant to identify methods of construction which reduce the extent of encroachment into these environmentally sensitive lands. Where significant disturbance is proposed, during several lengths of the proposed route the extent of construction disturbance has been slimmed down to a width of 26 feet which represents the minimum disturbance possible given natural gas pipeline construction requirements.

The impacts of the coverage and disturbance are fully mitigated in the manner prescribed by Subparagraph 20.4.A(2)(e) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

No new land coverage is proposed as a result of this project, however, the project will involve new disturbance. The area of new disturbance will be restored as identified in the restoration plan in Appendix V of the EA. In addition, to comply with Subsection 20.4.(2)(e) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the applicant will restore 1.5 times the area of new disturbance in low land capabilities. TRPA anticipates that the restoration to comply with this requirement will involve restoration of off-road vehicle routes the USFS plans to close. The areas restored will correspond with the land capability disturbed, multiplied by 1.5.

D. Required Actions: Agency staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the project by making the following motions based on this staff summary and the evidence contained in the record:

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

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

(1) The Standard Conditions of Approval listed in Attachment Q.
(2) This project is for construction of a 12 inch natural gas pipeline as described as the preferred alternative in the Environmental Assessment (EA).

(3) Prior to commencement of construction, the following special conditions of approval must be satisfied:

(a) The applicant shall post a security with TRPA in an amount 110 percent of the estimated total cost for implementation of Best Management Practices (BMP) and the restoration work described in Appendix V of the EA. The applicable cost shall be based on the identified BMP and restoration methods identified on the construction plans and in the EA, plus 50% of the calculated BMP cost to account for additional mitigation where the monitoring program may deem initial mitigation unsuccessful. The security will be released when TRPA has determined that revegetation, stabilization, and restoration has been successful. The cost estimate shall be itemized based on the restoration/BMP item identified.

(b) The applicant shall submit 3 sets of a projected construction completion schedule. No construction may take place between October 15 and May 1 of any given year. The schedule shall include, but is not limited to, survey staking in the field, vegetation protection placement, intermediate TRPA inspection dates, stages in construction (trenching, pipe installation, etc.) by section of pipeline, and permanent restoration applications (by section, if appropriate). A narrative shall accompany the schedule that identifies how work will proceed (e.g. how many crews, staging areas, miscellaneous).

(c) The permittee shall submit three final sets of construction drawings and details to TRPA for final review and approval. The construction drawings shall include all delineations of the project area, including staging areas.

(d) A comprehensive series of photographs or a videotape of the construction area within the forested section shall be provided to TRPA for the purposes of documenting the existing stability and vegetative cover. Upon installation of the pipeline and initial application of BMPs/restoration, the same task shall be performed. The adequacy of the documentation to satisfy this condition shall be subject to TRPA review and approval.

(e) Construction widths in SEZ and SEZ setback areas shall be revised to indicate a maximum width of 26 feet. The 26 feet width shall supersede the 35 feet stated in the EA. The final construction plans shall be revised to indicate conformance to this maximum width. Accordingly, the amount of new disturbance calculations shall be amended to reflect this condition (1.5:1 restoration requirements shall reflect this as well).
(f) A copy of the document which identifies the mitigations for impacts to archeological site 26Wa5229 shall be provided to TRPA.

(g) The permittee shall identify the total square footage of new disturbance and mitigate the that area by 1.5 times relative to the land capability the disturbance occurs upon. All restoration shall meet with the standards of Subsection 20.4.C of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. The areas of restoration shall be subject to TRPA review and approval. The approved restoration site(s) shall then be identified in a restoration plan and a security in the amount of 110% of the estimated restoration cost plus 50% of the restoration cost (to account for ensuring mitigation is successful) shall be posted and subject to return once TRPA determines that restoration is successful. The 1.5:1 restoration plan shall be similar in scope to the restoration plan in Appendix V of the EA.

(4) Vegetation protection fencing shall be used on a daily basis as construction proceeds in the forested portion of the project. The vegetation protection fencing shall clearly define the limits of the project area established for construction.

(5) TRPA shall receive biweekly copies of the construction status reports that are prepared under FERC guidelines (condition 8 of the Palute Expansion II Project Environmental Assessment, FERC).

(6) Once construction is complete, an as-built and as-disturbed plan similar to the approved plan shall be provided to TRPA. The final amount of 1.5:1 mitigation for new disturbance by land capability shall be modified relative to the original disturbance calculations made prior to construction commencement.

(7) The baseline restoration monitoring for the right-of-way shall be provided to TRPA as an initial report immediately following construction and application of initial restoration measures. On a yearly basis, thereafter, as identified in the EA, a similar report shall be provided to TRPA. The report shall indicate when the monitoring entity indicates when restoration work is complete. At that point, TRPA staff shall be contacted by the applicant to perform an inspection to indicate concurrence with such conclusions. If deemed appropriate, the TRPA may release the security posted per condition (3)(a) above. The mitigation monitoring program may cease once the TRPA security has been released.

(8) Prior to commencing construction in SEZs and SEZ setbacks, the applicant’s onsite environmental inspector as identified in the EA shall insure that the required controls are in place and functioning. The inspector shall insure that such devices are maintained and that flows or seeps function downstream of the construction site.
Prior to construction beginning in SEZs and SEZ setbacks, the applicant shall contact the TRPA Compliance Inspector to arrange intermediate inspections of SEZ crossings, boundaries, methodologies, and miscellaneous issues. At the inspection, TRPA may require modifications to SEZ construction based on determinations made in the field. The anticipated inspection times shall be mentioned in the construction schedule so that TRPA and the applicant can avoid timing conflicts.

A post-construction evaluation of scenic impacts shall be provided to TRPA by the applicant, prepared by the consultants who performed the scenic analysis for the EA or an approved equal. The evaluation shall be in the form of a report and shall be subject to TRPA review and approval for its content. The report shall suggest means of mitigating scenic and visual impacts if they are greater or differ from the scenic analysis prepared in the EA. Such mitigations may become requirements of project compliance as determined by TRPA.

Boulders stacked against cut banks for stabilization shall be spaced apart or screened so that visual impacts of this method of stabilization are minimized.

All mitigation measures referenced in the EA for the proposed alternative are hereby incorporated into the permit as conditions of approval unless modified above.
MEMORANDUM

August 20, 1996

To: TRPA Governing Board Sitting as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Resolution Authorizing Program Supplement to Local-State Agency Agreement for Use of TDM Funding

Proposed Action: Approve attached resolution authorizing the Executive Director to execute the Program Supplement to Local-State Agency Agreement for use of Transportation Demand Management funding.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommend that the Governing Board adopt the attached resolution.

Discussion: In November 1995 the TRPA Governing Board authorized the Executive Director to execute a Local-State Agency Agreement (Master Agreement) between TRPA and Caltrans. The Agreement allows for TRPA to administer funding for certain federal aid projects described in specific Program Supplements to the Master Agreement.

Subsequently, Caltrans, through the California Transportation Commission’s Rural Counties Task Force, allocated $16,161 in federal Transportation Demand Management funds to TRPA for FY 95/96. In order to access these funds, TRPA needs to execute a Program Supplement with Caltrans.

TRPA coordinated with the Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Association (TMA) and the South Shore TMA to develop a Program for the expenditure of the TDM funds. The Program Supplement under consideration by the TRPA Governing Board provides for the development, implementation, promotion and evaluation of public and private TDM strategies for both the North and South Shore regions. The strategies include operational, financial and marketing plans for the trolley services, special event traffic mitigation services, coordination of the trolleys with STAGE and TART, and expansion of STAGE, TART, trolley and Lake Lapper services.
Memorandum to Governing Board
Resolution Authorizing Program Supplement as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency
Page 2

Of the $16,161 that TRPA will be responsible for administering, $8,080 will be passed through to the Truckee-North Tahoe TMA, and $8,081 will be passed through to the South Shore TMA. TRPA will not receive any of these funds.

Conclusion: Authorization of the Program Supplement will provide TDM funding for the TMAs to support TRPA’s transportation goals and objectives.

If you have any questions regarding this agenda item, please feel free to contact Richard Wiggins at (702) 588-4547.
WHEREAS, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) was designated by the State of California as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the California portion of the Tahoe Region; and

WHEREAS, TRPA, acting as the RTPA, has the responsibility of administering the programs contained in the Transportation Development Act (TDA) in the California portion of the Tahoe Region; and

WHEREAS, TRPA, acting as the RTPA, has the responsibility of administering Caltrans programs and projects under the provisions of the Local-State Agency Agreement for Federal Aid Projects Number 03-6125, effective January 5, 1996; and

WHEREAS, TRPA, acting as the RTPA, has been allocated $16,161 in FY 1995/96 federal aid Transportation Demand Management funds; and

WHEREAS, TRPA, acting as the RTPA, has coordinated with the Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Association and the South Shore Transportation Management Association for transit and TDM projects for the appropriate use of the TDM funds allocated to TRPA; and

WHEREAS, Caltrans has requested that the TRPA Governing Board, acting as the RTPA, authorize the Executive Director to execute Program Supplement No. 096, Project No. STPLI-6200 (008), E.A. No. 51-995205.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the TRPA Governing Board, acting as the RTPA, authorize the Executive Director to execute Program Supplement No. 096 to the Local-State Agency Agreement for Federal Aid Projects No. 03-6125.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this __________ day of August, 1996, by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, sitting as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

John E. Upton, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency,
Sitting as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency
MEMORANDUM

August 19, 1996

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: 1996 Threshold Evaluation Report

Proposed Action: No action is requested at this time. This is the beginning of a series of presentations to inform the Governing Board about the 1996 Threshold Evaluation Report.

Background: The staff will make presentations on the nine threshold categories, economics, and allocations during the next three months. The schedule (Attachment A) indicates the order of presentations and also shows that the 1996 Threshold Evaluation Report is due to be released at the beginning of September. Following the presentations, TRPA will complete a final draft for public hearings in November. The first two presentations will be on water quality and air quality.

1. Presentation on Water Quality: Since 1990, TRPA staff has prepared an Annual Water Quality Report, which summarizes current water quality conditions and long-term trends for each water quality threshold. This report is the basis for the water quality chapter of the 1996 Threshold Evaluation. In addition to current information, the report has evolved into a compilation of historical data collection by other agencies and analysis of previous studies.

The Water Quality Report and the threshold review summarizes data collected primarily by the Tahoe Research Group, the U.S. Geological Survey, TRPA, and several local agencies and is based on all of the water quality thresholds. Data from Water Year 1995 shows that Lake clarity matched 1993 as the lowest recorded value on record. Algal productivity reached the second highest recorded value on record, with the highest value occurring in 1993. Littoral Lake Tahoe (area less than 100 meters) turbidity values did not exceed the threshold. California and Nevada tributaries typically did not meet state standard limits for total nitrogen, total phosphorus, and total iron. Stormwater runoff typically does not meet state standards. California and Nevada Other Lakes typically meet state standards.

Staff will present 1996 Threshold Evaluation recommendations on the future of water quality threshold attainment for the next five years and beyond. Generally speaking, the focus will be on watershed improvements rather than a regulatory-oriented process. We should focus our
monitoring efforts on one or two watersheds. This approach will allow us
to learn much more detailed information as opposed to spreading
monitoring throughout the Basin and obtaining only general information.
Additionally, there continues to be a need for development of a clarity
model for Lake Tahoe to mathematically link algal growth rate, nutrient
loading, and changes in water quality. Theoretically, this model would
identify the total amount of nutrient loading per year required to
achieve the Secchi depth or algal productivity thresholds.

If you have any questions regarding this agenda item, please contact
Kevin Hill at (702) 588-4547.

2. Presentation on Air Quality: TRPA has been preparing the air quality
chapter of the 1996 Threshold Evaluation over the past year or so. In
preparing the evaluation, data were gathered for each of the threshold
categories over many years. In the air quality category, there are eight
different parameters to be evaluated. These parameters include carbon
monoxide (CO), ozone ($O_3$), particulate matter ($PM_{10}$), visibility, traffic
volumes, vehicle miles of travel (VMT), woodsmoke, and atmospheric
nutrient loading.

TRPA maintains several monitoring sites in the Region for visibility and
particulate sampling and relies on data from the California Air Resources
Board (CARB) and the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection (NDEP)
for the remainder of the pollutant data. The VMT numbers are generated
by TRPA staff using a computer traffic model, and traffic volumes are
provided by Caltrans.

At the August Governing Board meeting, the status of each of the air
quality threshold parameters will be shared with the Governing Board.
Recommendations will also be presented which will assist in achieving and
maintaining each threshold. Several recommendations that were suggested
by the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee relate to the threshold
standards themselves.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item, please
contact Bridget Cornell at (702) 588-4547.
1996 EVALUATION SCHEDULE OF PRESENTATIONS & DOCUMENT RELEASES

AUGUST
- APC W.Q.
- GB W.Q. A.Q.

SEPTEMBER
- APC A.Q.
- GB FISH WILDLIFE VEGETATION NOISE SOILS/SEZ
- GB ECONOMIC SCENIC RECREATION ALLOCATION

OCTOBER
- APC
- GB RECREATION SCENIC ALLOCATION
- APC HEARINGS
- GB HEARINGS

NOVEMBER

DOCUMENT RELEASES
- DRAFT 1996 EVALUATION REPORT
- DRAFT EIP
- DRAFT AMENDMENTS
- DRAFT E.A.

ATTACHMENT A
July 1, 1996

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: IPES/Land Capability Status Report

The status of IPES/Land Capability determinations for the period of January 1, 1996, through June 30, 1996 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSLT/</th>
<th>Douglas</th>
<th>El Dorado</th>
<th>Placer</th>
<th>Washoe</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Capability Verifications (LCV)</td>
<td>Applications received</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verifications completed</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verifications pending</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Capability Challenges</td>
<td>Applications received</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges completed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges pending</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPES Determinations of Allowable Coverage</td>
<td>Applications received</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determinations completed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determinations pending</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPES Reevaluations</td>
<td>Applications received</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reevaluations completed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reevaluations pending</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial IPES Evaluations</td>
<td>Applications received</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluations completed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluations pending</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPES Appeals</td>
<td>Applications received</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeals processed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeals pending</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Board Hearing Requests</td>
<td>GB hearing requests received</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB hearing requests processed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requests pending (7/1/96)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/tas
7/1/96

AGENDA ITEM X.B

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
WHEREAS Lake Tahoe is a natural resource of national significance because of its unique scenic and recreational value; and

WHEREAS the water clarity of Lake Tahoe has declined by approximately 30 feet in the last 30 years due to disturbances to the watershed; and

WHEREAS soil erosion, stormwater runoff, and disturbed stream environment zones are the primary non-point sources of pollution which result in the loss of water clarity; and

WHEREAS the primary non-point sources can be controlled by investing in capital improvement projects; and

WHEREAS, although substantial public and private investments have been made in water quality improvement projects, these improvements represent only partial completion of the environmental improvements called for in the Region's Environmental Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS additional investment in environmental improvement projects must be made in the immediate future if the rate of decline in water clarity is to be slowed and eventually reversed; and

WHEREAS the State Legislatures in Nevada and California have placed questions on the general election ballot (Question 12 in Nevada and Proposition 204 in California) which would generate $20 million and $10 million, respectively, in general obligation bond revenue for erosion control, stormwater drainage, and stream environment zone restoration projects;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency strongly supports Question 12 on the Nevada ballot and Proposition 204 on the California ballot.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of August, 1996, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

John E. Upton, Chairman
Governing Board

AGENDA ITEM XI.A.
August 14, 1996

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff


The Project Review Division is responsible for reviewing all development proposals within the Lake Tahoe Region to ensure consistency with the Agency’s Regional Plan, Rules, and Code of Ordinances. This includes residential, tourist accommodation, commercial, public service, recreation, resource management, shorezone, water quality, gaming, subdivisions, redevelopment proposals, BMP retrofits, and MOU administration. During the past fiscal year, the Division has continued to include the review of master plans, Code amendments, and Plan Area Statement amendments. In addition, the Division has assumed responsibility for most scenic reviews. The Division has also implemented a program of providing "Site Assessments" to the public. The Site Assessments determine the applicant’s land capability, verify existing land coverage and determine what, if any, water quality/erosion control (Best Management Practices) are needed on the property. Further, the Division is the lead for the 1996 Threshold Evaluation of Noise.

The Division is also responsible for responding to a large number of public inquiries pertaining to the project review process, the Code of Ordinances, the Rules of Procedure, and the Regional Plan in general. Daily activities include site inspections, land coverage verifications, BMP evaluations, technical project review, staff summary research and preparation, intergovernmental coordination, public education workshops, fish habitat verifications, scenic evaluations, environmental document management, MOU administration and training, exempt activity administration, and BMP Retrofit Program management. In addition, based upon the Division’s past performance in becoming more effective with less resources, the Division has been given the responsibility for developing streamlining measures for all Agency operations.

I. Statistical Performance:

For the period of July 1, 1995 through June 30, 1996, the Division received 925 applications and processed 1036 applications. Previous year performance statistics are as shown in the following chart:
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AGENDA ITEM X.G.
Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
II. Statistical Evaluation:

Attachment A provides statistical data including: the total number and type of applications received and processed for the fiscal year; the number of applications received by type and month; the number of applications processed by type and month; and the number and type of applications reviewed by the Governing Board each month.

Analysis of this data shows:

* Over 94% of the applications are reviewed and processed at the staff level.

* The highest monthly levels of submitted applications generally occur during March through September.

* The highest monthly levels of applications processed generally occurs during May through September.

* In terms of volume, more Residential applications were submitted and processed than any other project type. Site Assessments were second, Commercial third and Public Service projects were fourth in volume.

* Commercial and Public Service projects made up the majority of projects reviewed by the Governing Board.
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AGENDA ITEM XI.B
III. Processing Times:

The California Legislative Conference Committee recommended restoration of TRPA's FY 1996-97 budget with the understanding that TRPA strive to achieve processing times of 120 days or less for projects not involving significant environmental documentation. A review of the performance of the TRPA during Fiscal Year 1995-96 shows that approximately 94% of the applications submitted were processed within 120 days. Of the 6% which exceeded 120 days in processing times, the most prominent reason related to the time of year the applications were submitted and the inability of TRPA staff to inspect the site due to snow conditions, delaying action beyond 120 days.

IV. Significant Accomplishments:

- The Division continues to implement an over-the-counter permit program for driveway paving projects and underground tank removals. With the correct information, an applicant for these types of projects can apply and receive a TRPA permit at the counter with no waiting. This program has greatly streamlined the permit process for these types of projects. The Division continues to explore and expand the types of applications eligible for processing over-the-counter.

- The Division continues to implement a monthly Shorezone Review Committee to coordinate review of shorezone project proposals with all affected state and federal agencies (State Lands Commissions, Army Corps of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife Departments, and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board). This has resulted in a more coordinated effort among affected agencies as well as a reduction in the amount of duplicated effort.

- The Division has increased its efforts in the area of public education. The Division is updating the public information/application packets to make them more reader friendly and reflect adopted Code amendments.

- The Division represents the agency as a member or liaison on the following committees:

  Incline Village Community Composting Committee, South Lake Tahoe Arts Council, Erosion Control Technical Advisory Committee for Nevada and California, the Meyers Visitor Center Interagency Technical Advisory Committee, the Forest Health Consensus Group, the Lake Tahoe Community College Demonstration Garden Committee, and the Incline Village Demonstration Garden.

- The Division has a major role in implementing the Best Management Practices (BMP) Retrofit Program. To this end, the Division has held several workshops to educate the public on the Agency requirements. Further, the Division assisted in applying for and receiving a $160,000 Section 319 Clean Water Act grant to assist in implementing the BMP Retrofit Program.

- The Division processed and approved several million dollars in water quality improvement projects.
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The Division assisted the Long Range Planning Division in processing Plan Area Statement and Code amendments.

The Division is assisting in the development of the Bikeway Master Plan.

The Division is currently the lead in the 1996 Noise Threshold Evaluation.

The Division processed several Environmental Assessments (EA) and Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) during the past year. This included the EIS for the South Tahoe Public Utility District (STPUD) Future Facilities Plan, the STPUD A - Line Pipeline Replacement Project EIS, the Redevelopment Project No.1 Supplemental EIS, and the Park Avenue Development Project EIS.

The Division has recently been given the task of streamlining the entire Agency operations. To this end, the Division has established an internal e-mail suggestion box to allow all employees to make anonymous (if they wish) streamlining suggestions and an internal streamlining committee with representation from each Division. Further, with regards to Project Review operations, the Division has revised the on-call procedures to allow more quality time for the planners to process permits while still providing the necessary public response. In addition, the Division revised the phone voice mail message to direct phone inquiries to the appropriate local jurisdictions where MOUs have been implemented. The Division also revised the front counter operations by dedicating a phone for public use to direct inquiries to the appropriate Division (Long Range Planning, Compliance) freeing up Project Review staff to work on permit applications.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Rick Angelocci, Chief, Project Review Division at (702) 588-4547.

/RA
August 14, 1996

AGENDA ITEM XI.B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IN</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Residential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Modification</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Res. Plan Rev.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Mod. Plan Rev.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Accommodation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaming</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvlp./Cov. Verif.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvlp./Cov. Banking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvlp./Cov. Transfer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eros. Control/Grading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHDA/Subdivision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorezone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevolopment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils/Hydro Report</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Received</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Residential</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Modification</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Res. Plan Rev.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Mod. Plan Rev.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Accommodation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvlp./Cov. Verif.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvlp./Cov. Banking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvlp./Cov. Transfer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eros. Control/Grading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA/Subdivision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorezone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil/Hydro Report</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Assessments</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GB PROJECTS OUT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Shorezone | 1    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 1    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 5      |
| Commercial | 1    | 1    | 1    | 4    | 1    | 1    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 1    | 4    | 3    | 2    | 19     |
| Public Service | 1    | 3    | 1    | 0    | 1    | 1    | 2    | 0    | 2    | 0    | 1    | 2    | 14     |
| New Residential | 0    | 1    | 0    | 1    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 0    | 3      |
| Res. Modification | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0      |
| Recreation | 2    | 0    | 2    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0      |
| Subdivision | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 0    | 0    | 6      |
| Tourist Accommodation | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0      |
| Gaming | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0      |
| Erosion Control | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1      |
| Resource Mgmt. | 0    | 1    | 1    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 3      |
| Redevelopment | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 2      |

Total Processed: 1036
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects by Work Element</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(29) Appeals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30) Residential Projects</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31) Commercial Projects</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32) Gaming Projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33) Tour. Acc. Projects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34) Recreation Projects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35) Public Service Projects</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36) Resource Mgmt. Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37) Shorezone Projects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38) Erosion Control Projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39) Redevelopment Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40) Subdivision Projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41) Violation Resolution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORK ELEMENT TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects By Work Element</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(29) Appeals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30) Residential Projects</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31) Commercial Projects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32) Gaming Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33) Tour. Acc. Projects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34) Recreation Projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35) Public Service Projects</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36) Resource Mgmt. Projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37) Shorezone Projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38) Erosion Control Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39) Redevelopment Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40) Subdivision Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41) Violation Resolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORK ELEMENT TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 16, 1996

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff


Staffing of the Division consists of a Division Chief, a Senior Environmental Specialist, four Associate Environmental Specialists, and a Project Securities Administrator. The Division has had no staff turnover since March of 1991. This report covers the activities of the Division during Fiscal Year 95-96.

The responsibilities of the Environmental Compliance Division can be divided into four areas:

- Permitted Projects
- Unpermitted Projects
- Special Programs
- Monitoring of Memoranda of Understanding

PERMITTED PROJECTS

The Compliance Division must insure that all projects under permit from TRPA are conducted and completed in accordance with all conditions of approval. Approximately 900 permits for development are written by TRPA each year. These permits contain a three-year period during which the project must start. Because a project generally takes more than one building season to construct, it is estimated that there are approximately 2,700 active projects in differing stages of completion each year in the Lake Tahoe Region. Fiscal Year 1995-1996 has been a year of exceptionally large projects. Ski Run Redevelopment, including the new Chevron station, the old station contamination remediation, McDonalds and Ski Run Marina, the STPUD "A" line replacement, the Martin Ave bridge replacement, Sierra Pacific Power Company power line undergrounding, the USFS East Shore Project, the NDOT Highway 28 and other large projects have presented a challenging, but satisfying year to Division staff. Due to their complexity and evolving design, many crucial decisions are made by staff on the project site. Our record with contractors and public works officials has
fostered a cooperative and positive attitude on the job site. For most of these large projects this has been the first year of construction and therefore a period of discovering unanticipated obstacles to success.

For each permitted project, the Division conducts a pregrading inspection, a winterization inspection, and a security return inspection. Most projects also receive at least one intermediate inspection during construction. The Division conducted 312 pregrades during the fiscal year. The pregrading inspection occurs prior to construction and is triggered by the permittee or their contractor scheduling the inspection.

PRE-EARLY OR PRE-CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION

Staff conducts either an onsite pregrade or a telephone pregrade for every permitted project requiring a pregrade. For residential projects without a stream environment zone, projects outside of the shorezone, or not visible from scenic unit or a Designated Recreation Area, or projects involving grading less than 50 cubic yards, commencement of construction can be authorized over the telephone. All other projects require an onsite pregrade.

In a telephone pregrade, the permittee must have the same environmental control devices in place as required when an onsite inspection is made, and is informed of the date upon which the project must be completed (usually two years from that date), continuing BMP requirements, and that non-compliance with the project conditions of approval will result in a Cease and Desist Order on the project, and payment of a double filing fee before the project can resume. The staff may then authorize commencement of construction. The site is inspected within two weeks of the start of construction. Random monitoring has shown few problems.

During onsite pregrade meetings, the permittee or contractor must be present, the foundation footprint must be staked, all temporary erosion controls and vegetation protection must be installed, and the TRPA and local building department plans must be onsite. Staff inspects the temporary controls for proper placement and installation, the conditions of approval are reviewed by each party, and the building plans and scheduling are discussed. Any minor changes which would result in a better project are made at that time. The project is then approved to commence construction. This inspection normally takes an hour, not including travel time to the site.

During fiscal year 95-96, 146 projects were authorized to begin by phone pregrade, and 166 other projects were subject to an onsite pregrade. All projects authorized over the telephone are later inspected by staff.

Telephone pregrades allow staff to allocate less time to lower impact residential projects, and more time towards potentially higher impact projects, security return inspections, educating the public, responding to citizen complaints of violations, monitoring of forestry projects, random monitoring of projects, violation resolution, special projects, and policy refinement.
INTERMEDIATE INSPECTIONS

During construction, intermediate inspections are conducted on each of these projects and on many of the continuing projects from previous years. These inspections range from quick discussions with workers on the building site to more involved inspections covering temporary controls, coverage, landscaping, construction debris, location of drainage improvements, and contractor parking. Most of these inspections result in staff and the contractor having a better understanding of the project and the constraints the contractor faces. Four hundred and eight (408) intermediate inspections were conducted by staff in this twelve month period.

WINTERIZATION INSPECTIONS

All on-going construction sites are required to be winterized by October 15 of each building season. Every building site in the Region receives a winterization inspection during the period of September 15 through October 15 of each year. These inspections range from quick reviews of temporary controls to an intense inspection of all facets of the project, including the schedule of construction.

FINAL OR SECURITY RETURN INSPECTIONS

The security return inspection is the final inspection the Division will conduct on a project. The Agency holds over $12,500,478 in project securities. The Division conducted 982 security return inspections and returned 453 project securities totalling $2,028,722 during this fiscal year. The inspection is usually conducted at the request of the permittee. However, during this past twelve month period staff initiated thirty-five inspections of securities posted prior to 1988. Turnaround time for return of securities ranged from seven to thirty days, and averaged about fifteen days.

Security return inspections were completed for all requests received before significant snowfall occurred this winter.

The security return inspection often occurs three to four years after the project was approved. At this time, the project is inspected thoroughly for compliance with the approval, including: vegetation, infiltration, coverage, height, use, and scenic aspects. Many projects require a second security return inspection typically due to lack of vegetation or overcoverage. The permittee is sent a letter explaining the problem and given alternatives for resolution. Plan revisions are required when a final inspection reveals significant onsite deviations from the approved plans. In the past twelve months, Division Staff processed 52 plan revision approvals as a result of these deviations. When the permittee believes they have complied, they contact the Division and a re-inspection is conducted. Some projects require a third and fourth inspection before all items identified in the initial letter are resolved.

The Division continues to target review of older projects and active securities posted prior to 1988 by performing unrequested final inspections as a special security return objective. As a result, $262,822 of pre-1988 securities have been released in fiscal year 95-96. Other pre-1988 projects not in compliance with their original permit will require that appropriate compliance actions be taken.
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The Division Securities Administrator oversees the return of securities in addition to determining that securities are posted in the proper format, and when required, that they are replaced (as when a property changes ownership) in the proper manner.

UNPERMITTED PROJECTS

The Environmental Compliance Division is responsible for dealing with unpermitted projects and resolving violations involving these activity areas. A great deal of time is spent resolving violations. The Division resolved 84 major violations which required an action during this twelve month period, and initiated and continued resolutions of 55 more. Approximately 2,955 hours were spent on violation resolutions. Satisfactory resolution of a violation is a very time-consuming process. Violations range from unpermitted decks and additions to illegal tree cutting and shorezone activities. A great deal of time is spent on research and developing alternative resolutions. Major violations can affect multiple properties and regulatory jurisdictions, and require additional time to coordinate and reach acceptable, and sometimes joint, settlements. Alternatives are presented to the violator, and in most situations an amicable resolution is agreed upon, which is in compliance with TRPA regulations. In most instances the violator makes an "after the fact" application, staff reviews the application for compliance with TRPA regulations, and, if approvable, a permit is issued. Penalties typically range from a double filing fee to substantial fines for more grievous activities. During fiscal year 95-96, the Division collected $130,534 in fines and double filing fees. Additionally, staff negotiated a settlement in a tree cutting violation which provided $9000 to the Tahoe ReGreen Campaign.

The Environmental Compliance Division writes Notices of Violation (NOV) for serious offenses. This procedure is detailed in Chapter IX of the TRPA Rules of Procedure. The Compliance Procedures for NOVs require substantial investigation and factual research by Division staff. The NOV is a major part of the pleadings used when a case is brought before the courts for enforcement, as are the testimonies of staff responsible for discovering and developing the case. Many settlements are reached without a formal NOV being issued. All settlements, where a monetary penalty is a component, are placed on the Legal Committee and Governing Board agendas for approval.

Staff has been extremely successful in negotiating settlements without having to resort to time-consuming show-cause hearings and court actions. The last show-cause hearing before the TRPA Governing Board was the Schumacher Tree Cutting and Dredging case in April of 1992. Staff has only had to file complaints in three cases in the past three years: Schumacher, Chase, and Barbieri. Of these, we were successful in negotiating a settlement prior to trial in Chase, during trial in Schumacher, and are actively pursuing pre-trial settlement in Barbieri. Since July of 1992, staff has been successful in negotiating 65 major case settlements without the need of a show-cause hearing.

The Division is also called upon to testify in Federal and State court by other jurisdictions, and TRPA Legal Counsel, to describe events and to interpret regulations in cases where TRPA is not a party.
GRADING DEADLINE EXCEPTIONS

All requests for exceptions to the October 15 to May 1 grading season, where a TRPA permit has been issued, are processed through the Compliance Division. Fifty-six (56) grading season exceptions were granted by the Division during fiscal year 95-96. Staff must evaluate each request using criteria in Chapter 64 of the Code and follow up with repeated project inspections to insure that the project remains in compliance, and to address unforeseen circumstances.

ABANDONED SECURITIES

Staff instituted a process for forfeiture of securities in accordance with TRPA Code Subsection 8.8.D(2), amended on July 27, 1994. This section allows TRPA to collect project securities when a project has been completed in accordance with its approval, and the owner of the security cannot be located. In accordance with the Code, staff has posted a notice in all local newspapers naming the person who posted the security. The noticed person has one year to claim the security. Fifteen parties were noticed during this period. As a result of this process, we were able to locate two of the noticed parties. The remaining thirteen securities totalling $18,275 were forfeited and used for public information, and the Tahoe ReGreen Program.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS

The Division is involved in many special programs and committees. Programs include: the compliance components of the IPES program, Residential BMP Retrofit and Effectiveness Program, Small Dischargers BMP Retrofit Program, NPDES permitting, public workshops on project review and compliance, land use mapping, soil and water contamination remediation, jet ski operations, revisions to the Code regarding resource management activities, lead on forestry matters, highway de-icing, authors of the annual dredging report, fish habitat restoration review guidelines, project specific groundwater investigations as a member of the Ground Water Technical Advisory Committee, TRPA Listed Sensitive Species, grazing and livestock issues, and TRPA’s streamlining efforts.

Staff has spent 280 hours on the Shorezone Cumulative Impact Study in this fiscal year, completing much of the work on the water quality and soils chapters of the Environmental Impact Statement.

The Division has also spent substantial time on the upcoming 1996 Threshold Evaluation. Compliance Division staff has been assigned as Program Manager for the Vegetation Thresholds including: common plants, (the forest in general), uncommon plant communities, and TRPA listed sensitive plants. This has included inventories of forest types by acres, analysis of data and formulation of recommendations. Staff has also been digitizing maps to the GIS system for locating deep water plant habitat. The Division is also following up on a 1991 Evaluation recommendation; writing a new threshold for old-growth forests. Utilizing detailed LandSat forest inventory information, which is in a geographical information system (GIS) format, compatible with our present GIS system, staff has used the forest inventory data combined with 1995 aerial photos to locate potential stands of old-growth forests. These potential
stands have to be field checked for old-growth characteristics and suitability for inclusion in the final inventory. Stands which are found to be suitable will be located and mapped using Geographical Positioning System (GPS) coordinates.

The Division is the lead on the Cascade Watershed BMP retrofit program, the first pro-active attempt by TRPA to implement BMP retrofit on a watershed basis.

The Division is also involved with the following committees:

- Resource Conservation Districts/TRPA BMP Retrofit Programs
- Tahoe Re-Green Project
- Tahoe Basin Area Oil and Hazardous Substance Contingency Plan
- Shorezone Monitoring and Project Review Committee
- Forest Health Consensus Group
- Lake Tahoe Basin Steering Group for Forest Assessment and Planning
- Tahoe-Douglas Chamber of Commerce Board
- Sierra Economic Development District

FOREST MANAGEMENT

Due to the sharp increase in forest management related activities, and the Division’s considerable expertise in forestry matters (staff credentials include one staff with a Master’s Degree in forestry and Professional Foresters registration, two with BS degrees in natural resources and considerable forestry experience, two geologists, and a staff member with considerable raptor experience), the Division has been designated as the Agency lead in forestry matters. A Code amendment was brought to the Governing Board by Compliance staff and adopted in October 1995 which streamlined the regulatory review for salvage logging operations on parcels of 20 acres or less. Staff has also worked with the California Board of Forestry so their Tahoe Basin exemption mirrored TRPA’s. Due to continuing tree mortality, there has been a notable increase in tree removal and harvest activities on private, state, and federal lands, resulting in more staff time spent in planning and monitoring timber harvests. During fiscal year 95-96, staff spent the following hours inspecting timber operations:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timber Operations Inspected</th>
<th>Staff Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Lands</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Lands</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Lands</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOURS</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOREST HEALTH CONSENSUS GROUP

Division staff continue to be the Agency lead on the Forest Health Consensus Group, an assemblage of interested professionals, citizens, and cooperating agency personnel working to identify and resolve the many problems facing the Region’s forest ecosystems. The group is evaluating the TRPA Goals and Policies and the Code of Ordinances and will be recommending changes where appropriate. The consensus group has defined, "Desired Future Conditions" of the forest, as closely resembling conditions prior to the arrival of European-American settlers in the mid 1800s. Entitled, "Desired Future Conditions of the Lake Tahoe Basin Forest Ecosystem," the statement includes six specific, broad forest vegetation types. These descriptions serve as general targets for land managers in their effort to re-establish forest health in the Lake Tahoe Region. The Group’s goals include a gradual return to proportions of age classes, including old growth stands that approximate pre-Comstock logging levels. The Group has established a Forest Health Consensus Group Library containing information on forest health, prescribed burning, ecosystem management, urban forestry, management techniques, and other relevant subjects. The Library is located in the Executive Office at TRPA.

Among the issues the Group is currently working on are: Forest Health Problem Statement and Funding Request included in the Lake Tahoe Legislative Agenda for 1996, Management Strategies; Forest Inventory and Coordination with the Sierra-Nevada Ecosystem Project (SNEP) on a Tahoe Case Study; Prescribed Burning; Old growth Forest Definition; Input on North Shore Ecosystem Management Project; Ordinance Flexibility to Provide for New Technologies. Staff and members of the Group have provided testimony to the Nevada Legislative Committee to Continue the Review of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency; and also testified to the Nevada Assembly Government Affairs Committee regarding Assembly Joint Resolution No. 7. The Resolution expresses the support of the Nevada Legislature for the mission of the Tahoe Basin Forest Health Consensus Group.

Staff also co-authored the forest health element of the 1996 Federal Legislative Agenda and were instrumental in obtaining agreement from the Forest Health Consensus Group on all elements of the Legislative Agenda.

The Division has co-sponsored field trips for the California Board of Forestry, Nevada Legislature, South Lake Tahoe City Council, the Forest Health Consensus group and the media. Staff have given talks and been on panels at the American Association of Consulting Foresters annual meeting and at forest health workshops.
HIGHWAY DE-ICING

The Division has been involved in the highway de-icing issue and presented reports by the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), to the Governing Board at its January 1996 meeting. NDOT reported on their new equipment, roadway monitoring systems, and experimental programs they will employ for anti-icing during 95-96. Caltrans presented its Monitoring and Reporting Procedures Report which addresses water quality issues within the Lake Tahoe Basin as they relate to highway de-icing and erosion control projects.

SOIL AND WATER CONTAMINATION

Division staff is also involved in evaluating soil and water contamination. Division staff regularly respond to reports of sewage or hazardous material discharges, as a non-lead agency, in coordination with Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.

TRPA issues permits for the removal of underground storage tanks (USTs). Many older USTs have leaked hazardous materials into the soil or groundwater. If contamination is discovered at the time of removal, the applicant must provide the Compliance Division with a supplementary report and remediation plan. The Compliance Division is currently monitoring 59 groundwater and soil remediation projects, most of which have resulted from leaky USTs.

MONITORING OF MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING

TRPA currently has thirty-one Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with public and quasi-public entities operating in the Region. MOUs can be divided into three categories: MOUs which exempt other entities from TRPA review for certain activities; MOUs which delegate some minor TRPA permitting and compliance duties to some counties, and the City of South Lake Tahoe; and MOUs which delegate some forestry practices permitting duties to each state.

The Division monitors the operation of the exempt activity MOUs for compliance with the Code of Ordinances. The most frequently monitored, or those demanding the most attention include: Caltrans, STPUD, NTAPUD, IVGID, USFS, NDOT, CTC, SWGAS, SPFFCO, FACBELL, TCI, CA P&R, WPGAS, and TCPUD. Monitoring includes review of the qualified exempt forms which are submitted, and annual or as needed field or office meetings to share concerns and guidelines for MOU administration. Frequent communication with the entities is important to keep the activities within the scope, and in conformance with the MOUs, and to keep Division staff informed of ongoing activities. Most field monitoring is done on an informal basis, except on larger scale activities where a scheduled inspection is warranted. Pregrading inspections, though not required, are arranged at the discretion of staff and the entity when it is determined that it would be beneficial for contractors, the entity, or in preventing potential adverse impacts.

Division staff has coordinated with the City of South Lake Tahoe, Placer County, El Dorado County, and starting this season in Washoe County on implementation of the delegation agreements regarding the review of residential projects. Field and office training sessions have been held to
acquaint personnel with the compliance inspections and procedures used by TRPA. Monitoring includes: several joint pregrade and security return inspections with each of these entities; auditing 10 percent of all projects finalised under the MOU; and ongoing informal field observations for proper use of BMPs. The process for reporting, tracking, and auditing of projects processed under the delegation agreements has improved, and further refinements will be a focus in the future. Annual roundtable discussions will be continued between city, county, and TRPA personnel to improve proper administration of the agreements.

The Division also manages MOUs with the Nevada Department of Forestry (NDF) and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) for tree removal permits. During the first half of this fiscal year, NDF issued tree removal permits to 354 properties, and CDF issued 535. Division staff issued 32 tree removal permits for hazard trees and for defensible space purposes.

Staff meets at least once a year with the forestry agencies for coordination and interpretation purposes. Due to an increase in tree cutting violations, and unauthorized tree marking, in December of 1993 it was decided that all agencies marking trees in the Tahoe Region would use tracer paint. Tracer paint contains trace elements which make it identifiable as an authorized mark. We also meet periodically in the field with their staff on projects and in conjunction with our compliance program.

**ALLOCATION OF TIME**

During fiscal year 95-96, the Division logged the following hours for the corresponding work program elements relevant to this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Element</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Coordination/ Partnerships</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Public Information and Education</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MOU Development and Administration</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Program</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Planning - Special Studies</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Implementation - Water Quality Program</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Tegis/Database</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>IPES Program</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Residential Projects</td>
<td>2470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Commercial Projects</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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During fiscal year 95-96 the Division has accomplished many things in the areas of settlements, streamlining, returning old securities, public education, natural resource management, Shorezone Cumulative Impact Study, 1996 Threshold Evaluation, and monitoring for compliance with the Code and other aspects of the Regional Plan. Staff continues to see new challenges resulting from the upcoming 1996 Evaluation, BMP retrofits for priority watersheds, stormwater discharge permits, increased activities exempt from TRPA review, more MOUs with agencies, approval of community plans, commercial sign amortization schedules.

Additional delegation has resulted from amendments to MOUs with the City of South Lake Tahoe and Placer County, and the recently adopted Washoe County MOU. These all relate to residential review and compliance responsibilities where less staff will be required. Compliance staff has adjusted their workload model to provide staff hours for an inventory of existing buoys on Lake Tahoe. With this information staff will also undertake a program of bringing buoys into compliance with the Code of Ordinances, or require their removal. Unauthorized buoys are a continuing problem that all agencies with jurisdiction have grappled with for many years. The acquisition of an Agency boat earlier this fiscal year was an essential step to a positive and successful program for management of buoys, and effective on lake presence.

Staff will continue to spend considerable time on the forest health issue and the vegetation threshold report over the next year. Field mapping, inventory, technical advisory, research, and compilation into a report format will be activities which demand additional staff time. TRPA, as a member of the Tahoe Re-Green Program worked on a special exemption to expedite removal of dead or dying trees from parcels of 20 acres or less in the Tahoe Basin.
Staff has developed general criteria to guide treatment of vegetation for fire fuels reduction on small undeveloped private and public parcels. The treatment guidelines are designed to meet TRPA resource management objectives as well as the Tahoe Re-Green directives. TRPA continues its sponsorship of the Forest Health Consensus Group. Compliance staff will remain busy again this year with continued logging and other resource management work.

Staff organized a rest stop on an around Lake Tahoe bicycle ride and dedicated the rest stop to the Bikeway 2000 program for completion of a loop bikeway system around Lake Tahoe.

Staff have been actively researching state and federal surplus equipment and were successful in gaining TRPA eligibility for procurement of surplus property. Currently staff are attempting to obtain surplus vehicles for field work.

During the past year the Division has utilized two unpaid interns to accomplish research and daily duties. The interns have proven to be an extremely practical means of performing our ever increasing workload while educating students about Lake Tahoe.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Steve Chilton, Chief, Environmental Compliance Division at (702) 588-4547.